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Abstract

This research examines borrowings from Hebrew into Arabic as used by Nazarene and Iksali Palestinian Israelis in the context of Arabic computer-mediated communication (CMC), specifically the written colloquial Palestinian Israeli dialect of Arabic in Facebook. The study focuses on the frequency of the borrowed items, phonological adaptation, and the reasons for borrowing from Hebrew. Three hypotheses are investigated: First, the most frequent borrowed items are nouns. Second, borrowed items are adapted to the Arabic phonological system. Finally, the main reasons for borrowing are to introduce culturally or technologically new concepts, as well as new ways to refer to preexisting notions. Most of these hypotheses are shown to be correct. However, the frequency of borrowing in the corpus does not reflect the intensity of the language contact between Hebrew and the Palestinian Israeli dialect. I describe the language contact situation between Hebrew and Arabic and demonstrate how intense it is, classifying it as falling between the third and fourth level of intensity according to Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) borrowing scale. However, borrowing is restricted to lexical borrowing, particularly of nouns. I provide explanations that refer to the political and cultural situation (including identity issues) of Palestinian Israelis.
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1 I.e., from the towns of Nazareth and Iksal in the Galilee.
1 Introduction

The research presented in this paper investigates Hebrew loanwords in colloquial Arabic written in Latin/Arabic/Hebrew scripts on Facebook by Palestinian Israelis. The study investigates loanwords in the dialects of Nazareth and Iksal. The latter is a village located in the Jezreel Valley in the lower Galilee and very close to the city of Nazareth (see Map 1). The study constitutes a new type of research in that it extends the research on borrowings from spoken to written dialects. Moreover, the issue of Hebrew borrowings into Arabic has not received much attention from a linguistic perspective or in the context of computer-mediated communication (CMC). This paper is an attempt to add to the literature.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides background information regarding contact between Arabic and Hebrew inside Israel and some information about multilingualism online and Facebook. Section 3 explains the data collection process as well as the hypotheses used in the study. Section 4 displays and examines the results and provides further details and explanations. Section 5 offers conclusions, with implications for future research.

2 Background

In this section I am going to discuss the background of language contact background, as well as other social and political issues that affect language contact and attitudes. Moreover, I am going to provide some background about multilingualism in social networking websites as well as some information about Facebook.

---

2 For the purpose of this study, Palestinian Israelis and Palestinian Israeli Arabs are used interchangeably to refer to the Arab minority population in Israel. They are Arabic-speaking non-Jewish citizens of Israel, and their contacts with Hebrew-speaking society is much more than that with Arabic speakers outside of Israel. For the sake of this paper, I simply chose a label for the sake of convenience; however, it is not intended to have any ideological implications.

3 Sometimes certain words are borrowed in one micro-Palestinian dialect and not in another. In this paper, I am focusing on the Iksali and Nazarene dialects, because I grew up speaking these two dialects. These are two different dialects, but they more or less share the same borrowed Hebrew words.
2.1 The Contact Situation between Hebrew and Arabic in Modern Palestine

The language contact situation has been complex throughout the history of modern Palestine, and several core factors have had an influence on the contact between Hebrew and Arabic.

The dialects of Palestinian Israelis have been in contact with Hebrew since 1948. While according to Henkin (2013) there has been contact since the mid-19th century (the late Ottoman period, 1850s), at first it was mostly restricted to land brokers and feudalists. Nowadays, Hebrew influences all Palestinian Israeli varieties of Arabic due to the relatively intensive language contact.
between the two languages in various domains, such as work, higher education, trade, and administration. However, specific contact occurs in “a context of asymmetrical power relations on the political and social fronts” (Suleiman, 2004: 29).

The major factors that promote contact intensity, discussed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 72), are readily apparent in Israeli society. Israel has exercised political rule over the Palestinians for about 67 years, a time period sufficient for bilingualism to develop. Moreover, Hebrew speakers (the source language) are the majority, and they outnumber Arabic speakers (the borrowing language or recipient language) due to massive immigration from all over the world, and particularly Russia, that took place shortly after 1948. Another factor is political—in Israel, there are two official languages: Hebrew and Arabic. However, making up about 20% of the population, Arabic speakers are in the minority in Israel. In practice, Hebrew is the dominant language and is used as the only official language; Arabic is marginalized and not used as an official language for practical purposes (see Amara, 2006: 464).

Additionally, Palestinian Israelis study Hebrew as a second language from a very early age at school, starting in the second or third grade, for at least four hours a week until high school, and Arab students are tested for their knowledge of Hebrew in the Bagrut exam (see Amara, 2007; Mar’i, 2013: 15).

Moreover, a good level of Hebrew proficiency is required for entry into Israeli universities, whereas only intermediate-level Arabic is needed for an applicant to get accepted. Meanwhile, Arabic is not a compulsory subject for Hebrew speakers, because Hebrew is the language of instruction at universities.

Therefore, Palestinian Israelis, especially those who work and study outside of their villages and cities, borrow and sometimes code-switch a great deal between the two languages.

Borrowing, as defined by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37), “is the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features.” According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988) the first items that enter the borrowing language are content words (nouns, adjectives,

---

4 Women were only exposed to Hebrew at a later stage, because between 1948 and 1975 very few Arab women worked, and if they did so, they usually worked in their local areas.

5 The Bagrut is a set of high school final exams, conducted in core subjects like mathematics and English, as well as elective subjects.

6 However, the language of instruction from kindergarten through high school is Arabic in the Arab sector, causing several problems for those students who wish to be accepted to university and, once accepted, also difficulties in their first year of university studies.
verbs), and loanwords are the most common indicators of borrowing. In their fourth chapter about language maintenance, Thomason and Kaufman (1988) introduce the “borrowing scale” that consists of five thresholds; they claim that the features that appear higher on the scale (for example, 3–5) have to be borrowed after the features that appear lower on the scale (1–2). The five stages of the scale are as follows:

1. Casual contact that results in lexical borrowing only (mainly nouns)
2. Somewhat more intense contact resulting in slight structural borrowing of functional words like conjunctions, adverbials, discourse markers, as well as limited structure—minor phonological, syntactic, and lexical semantic features
3. More intense contact leading to slightly more structural borrowing, such as prepositions and postpositions, and slightly less minor structural features than in (2).
4. Strong cultural pressure resulting in moderate structural borrowing
5. Very strong cultural pressure leading to heavy structural borrowing

In this paper, I place the case of Hebrew borrowings into the Palestinian Israeli dialect in relation to Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) borrowing scale.

Given the background provided above on the language contact situation between Arabic and Hebrew, it would seem that the contact between the two is intensive and is between stages 3 and 4 on Thomason and Kaufman’s borrowing scale (1988), due to the fact that being fluent in Hebrew—the dominant language—is essential to progress and economic success as a citizen in the State of Israel. This means that we should expect to find not only lexical borrowings but also a few structural borrowings.

2.2 Beyond Language Contact
At the same time, there are issues that might hinder the effects of language contact. In order to understand the situation of Palestinian Israelis, one needs to consider identity and politics. Palestinian Israelis are to a great extent separated and isolated from the Arab world. This is because they cannot enter most Arab countries, including Syria, Lebanon, or any of the Gulf countries with their Israeli passports, except for purposes of pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia. Because they hold an Israeli passport, Palestinian Israelis are often disliked and considered betrayers of their “Arabness” and of “the Palestinian Cause” by other Arabs. They are sometimes referred to as “Arabs of ’48,” which is understood to be derogatory. This has been the case for many years, although it is less severe at present—due to globalization, many Arabs are becoming more aware and
The situation of Druze and some Bedouins in northern Israel is somewhat different in the sense that the men normally do serve in the Israeli military, and when they write on Facebook, they generally write using the Hebrew alphabet (Zoabi, 2012). Therefore, a lot of the ideological reasons for limiting borrowing from Hebrew aren’t there for this group, and one might suppose that they borrow from Hebrew more intensively.

Based on my own experience and observations, even if Israel allowed Palestinian Israelis to better integrate into its majority society, it would be very hard for them to do so. The Arab population’s culture, generally speaking, tends to be Middle Eastern and conservative—very different from the western culture of most Hebrew speakers or at least that of Ashkenazi Jews, who are descendants of Jews from Europe and have the highest prestige of any group in Israel. Moreover, the political situation and the conflict with neighboring Arab countries, particularly Palestine (in the West Bank and Gaza), hinder coexistence in Israel between Palestinian Israelis and Jews. For instance, most Palestinian Israelis, particularly Muslims and Christians, do not serve in the Israeli military because they will not fight and kill their brothers and sisters in the occupied lands of Palestine. However, some claim that if there were peace between Israel and Palestine, they would serve in the army.

---

7 The situation of Druze and some Bedouins in northern Israel is somewhat different in the sense that the men normally do serve in the Israeli military, and when they write on Facebook, they generally write using the Hebrew alphabet (Zoabi, 2012). Therefore, a lot of the ideological reasons for limiting borrowing from Hebrew aren’t there for this group, and one might suppose that they borrow from Hebrew more intensively.

8 Israeli society is Ashkenazi-centric (Suleiman, 2004; Wolf, 2007).
The political situation along with the definition of the Arab identity plays an essential role in the language contact situation in Israel. Suleiman (2004: 38) claims that the "role of language as a marker of national or ethnic identity is well attested in many cultures and at different times in history." During the 20th century, Arabs have invoked several ideological stands as means of expressing identity, including (pan-)Arab nationalism, territorial nationalism, and Islamic nationalism. I concentrate here on Islamic nationalism and Arab nationalism, because for these two ideologies, Arabic is a core component. Islamic nationalism, referred to as the Islamic Umma, is not just restricted to Arabs but includes Muslims of all nationalities. Tibi (1997) explains the idea of the Islamic Umma as follows: “Every Muslim belongs to the Islamic Umma regardless of his or her ethnicity or location. Umma is the universal community of believers and not a civic community related to a particular society in the modern sense” (p. 17).

According to Suleiman (2004), this ideology of Islamic Umma has had linguistic consequences in launching several arguments defending the Arabic language:

1. Arabic is associated with Islam doctrinally, because it is the language of God’s revelation to the prophet verbatim.
2. Arabic cannot be separated from the religion, because it is the language of the Qur’an and the prophetic traditions (hadith literature).
3. “The position of Arabic in the world derives its currency in historical terms from its association with Islam. ... Thus Arabic without Islam is like a body without a soul” (p. 40).

Thus, from a religious perspective, there is a strong pull to use Arabic and keep it “pure.”

Around the time of World War I, Arab nationalists began applying the notion of umma (nation) to language identity instead of just religious identity (the Islamic Umma). Thus, the notion of al-Umma l’Arabbiyya (the Arab nation) arose, which includes all native speakers of Arabic regardless of their religious affiliation. This new, more secular, idea was developed by al-Husri in the 1920s in his book titled ad-Din li-Allah wa al-Wat’aan li-il’dami? (Garra, 2007: 41; translated in Suleiman, 2004: 40). Arab nationalism, according to Suleiman (2004: 38), “is of the cultural type ... [and] there is almost universal agreement that language is a primary, if not the primary, ingredient in defining this nation.” Hence, similar to the notion of Islamic Umma, Classical Arabic is very important for this type of identity, although for a different reason—namely because it is the bond that ties the Arab Umma together.
These different ideologies of identity, one religious and one secular, both consider the Arabic language to be an important part of identity. As a result of the political conflict with Israel and the importance of the Arabic language and culture in the formation of Arab identity, one might expect that despite the intense language contact situation in Israel, borrowings from Hebrew into Arabic will basically be limited—to nouns, for example, since borrowings of nouns tend to have little effect on the overall structure of a language. Whatever the findings of this research, they will add to the understanding of the contact situation between Arabic and Hebrew.

2.3 Facebook

Facebook, as a social network site, differs from other CMC environments in terms of three main characteristics. First, users construct a public or semi-public profile within a restricted system. Second, they share connections with other users by claiming them as “friends.” Finally, the site allows users to view and navigate their contacts’ profiles as well as that of other contacts in the system (boyd and Ellison, 2007).

Facebook and social network sites in general limit the public space to friends selected by the profile owner (ego). These friends are usually known to ego, although not always equally well (boyd and Ellison, 2007; Papacharissi, 2009). These friends sometimes also share histories, experiences, and linguistic repertoires. The posts on ego’s timeline (profile/wall) and those directed to other addressees are seen by all the networked audience (boyd, 2011; Lee, 2011; Papacharissi, 2009).

As an example of Hebrew borrowing into Arabic, consider the following Facebook timeline post comments from the corpus collected for the purpose of this research (Hebrew borrowings are italicized):

Example (A) Sami: mtb3t.esh madet el.mt7an 5erbat el .mdbesit
NEG.print. material DEF.exam Breakdown. DEF. printer.
NEG. 1SG. PAST.3SG. FEM.
“I did not print the exam material because the printer broke down.”

Example (B) Muna: bede 2ashtre kman t5shiteem!!
Want.1SG buy.FUT. more accessories.PL.
“I want to buy more accessories!!”

Borrowing is usually used in order to fill in some lexical, conceptual gap, whereas code-switching can be a pragmatic substitute for the use of phonological variation, prosody, gaze, and posture (Georgakopoulou, 1997). In the examples
above, *mdbesit* (printer) is used instead of Arabic *matˁbaʕa* because the latter is usually used for the copy machine (Xerox machine). Borrowing the word *mdbesit* fills the lexical need for another word. As for *t5shiteem* (accessories) in the second example, in Hebrew it can mean either jewelry or accessories. In Palestinian Israeli dialect the word *mojawharat* (accessories) belongs to a higher, more formal register; moreover, *mojawharat* is usually used for accessories made from precious materials. Therefore, this dialect tends to use the borrowed Hebrew word *t5shiteem* interchangeably with an equivalent word, *iksiswarat*, which is actually borrowed from the French word *accessoires*.

### 2.4 Multilingualism Online

Borrowing and code-switching (cs) are phenomena that originate from language contact. Usually, to address one of these phenomena, it is necessary to address the other as well. This makes sense, given that they are sometimes seen as similar phenomena that can be situated on two related points along a continuum (Matras, 2009). Thus, one-word switches can be considered either borrowing or code-switching, depending on their frequency, on whether they can be alternated with words from their native language or not, and also on the nature of their pronunciation.

**cs** and borrowing are common in the speech of bilinguals and multilinguals. They also “easily find their way into communication via digital media” (Androutsopoulos, 2013: 659), which is pervasive nowadays. Indeed, code-switching and borrowing, while originally spoken-language phenomena, have often been observed to be written (typed) in textual **cmc** (Androutsopoulos, 2013; Danet and Herring, 2007; Dorleijn and Nortier, 2009; Leppanen and Peuronen, 2012).

Herring (2007: 1) defines **cmc** as “predominantly text-based human-human interaction mediated by networked computers or mobile telephony—[and it] provides an abundance of data on human behavior and language use.” Thus, it is not surprising to observe the influence of the Hebrew language in the writings of Palestinian Israelis on a social network site like Facebook.

The frequency of code-switching in **cmc** is influenced by factors like synchronicity, formality, and intimacy. Paolillo (2011) studied English and Punjabi/Hindi language use on chat system **irc** and on Usenet. He concluded that “conversational” code-switching was found more in the synchronous mode (**irc**) than the asynchronous one (**Usenet**). Other research has supported this finding, such as the study by Lee (2007), who found that code-switching was more commonly used in **icq** than that was synchronous and informal, than in asynchronous emails by the same users, which were usually more formal.
With regard to intimacy, Androutsopoulos (2013) writes that the “limitation of language mixing to wall dialogues [on Facebook] among ‘best friends’ suggests that bilingual talk might be recontextualised as an index of intimacy in network language practices” (p. 17).

Facebook users tend to code-switch less in asynchronous timeline dialogues, which can be read by all the users’ friends. We might expect more code-switching in the Facebook chat window, when two best friends are interacting, than in their interactions on Facebook timelines.

The fact that synchronous CMC encourages the use of short turns in exchanges with rapid transitions makes it more similar to spoken interaction. In contrast, asynchronous CMC takes longer in terms of individual contributions and transition gaps between each contribution, and thus it differs from prototypical spoken interaction. These observations support the assumption that CMC in its synchronous modes is closer to spoken language than its asynchronous ones (Dorleijn and Nortier, 2009).

3 Data Corpus and Hypotheses

In this section, I discuss the corpus of data and the methods used in the present study. I also present the research questions and hypotheses of the study. Between September 2012 and November 2012, 150 tokens of Hebrew borrowings were manually sampled after collecting all the borrowings (that is, 150 tokens) that appeared in 100 timeline posts and the comments on each post (1,257 comments total) from 20 subjects, after obtaining their consent. The subjects, nine females and 11 males, are 19–30-year-old university students and graduates who are Iksali and Nazarene Facebook friends of the author. The collected words were written in Arabic, Hebrew, or English script.

Out of these 150 tokens, 80 are unique tokens (see Appendix A); the other 70 tokens are repetitions. Instances where a Hebrew and an Arabic word of identical meaning appear in postings were excluded. For instance, if the Arabic word dashrak [daʃ:rak] (do not bother) and the Hebrew 3azov ot5a [ʕazov otxa] (do not bother) appeared interchangeably in postings, then they were both excluded and regarded as code-switching, which is outside the scope of

---

9 ICQ is an instant messaging program that was developed by the Israeli company Mirabilis.
10 Palestinian Israeli varieties have English borrowings as well, which I do not deal with in this paper, because they merit a study of their own.
this paper. However, from my observations, such cases of code-switching tend to be more common in face-to-face (F2F/offline) settings and chat rooms than in Facebook timeline posts and comments.

All the borrowings were entered into an Excel spreadsheet. I measured frequency by grouping the tokens according to parts of speech, counting each type, and generating charts of frequency. In this way, I was able to identify which parts of speech are the most frequently borrowed (for example, nouns, verbs, adjectives, discourse markers).

Based on the discussion of Thomason and Kaufman (1988) in Section 2.0, I address three research questions:

(1) What are the most frequently borrowed items from Hebrew in the Facebook corpus?
(2) Do the typed representations of the borrowed words reflect adjustment to Arabic phonology?
(3) Why are these words, in particular, borrowed from Hebrew into Palestinian Israeli dialect?

My hypotheses are as follows:

(1) The most frequently borrowed items—if not the only borrowed items—will be nouns. This would be consistent with the view that the first elements to be borrowed in a language are content words (excluding verbs, because they have embedded grammar, like inflections and derivatives). Nouns are borrowed more frequently because they are salient and transparent compared to other borrowable elements, and they may be the least intrusive to borrow from the perspective of grammatical structure. For example, if a verb were borrowed, it would have to be conjugated. Therefore, nouns should be among the first borrowed items (Field, 2002).

(2) Typed borrowed words will be adjusted to the Arabic sound system instead of retaining the Hebrew phonological system.

(3) Borrowing occurs in order to introduce a novel concept into Arab culture or refer to a preexisting notion in a new way.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Frequency of Borrowing

Regarding the first research question, which has to do with the frequency of the borrowed items, 100 timeline posts and 1,257 comments were collected,
with a total of 9,032 words and 150 borrowed words from Hebrew. This means that only about 1.7% of the words are borrowed words, which suggests a very low frequency compared to the level of intensity. Nouns are the most common of the borrowed items in the corpus. The distribution of borrowed items according to parts of speech is shown in Table 1.

These results confirm that nouns are more likely to be borrowed in this data sample. Yet, nouns are not the only borrowed items, for there are a few borrowed adjectives and discourse markers, and one verb. Regarding the claim that content words (nouns, adjectives, verbs) are more likely to be borrowed than bound morphemes (for example, Moravcsik, 1978), my data sample supports this regarding nouns only. There is a wide consensus that nouns are borrowed more easily than other parts of speech (Moravcsik, 1978; Myers-Scotton, 2002; Whitney, 1881). This was explained by Van Hout and Muysken (1994) as follows: “A very important factor involves one of the primary motivations for lexical borrowing, that is, to extend the referential potential of a language. Since reference is established primarily through nouns, these are the elements borrowed most easily” (p. 42).

Moreover, the nouns borrowed from Hebrew mainly deal with technology, food, the health system, education, and relatively recent concepts, such as ָלֹּת ָֽם (lōṭ 75am) [luwəḥ haxa:m] (smart board), ָֽלָּמְּנָ֣יִּוֹת (ləmnyot) [laxmənjo:t] (bread rolls), ָֽקָּבָּט ָֽלַּום (kobat7olem) [kubat holim] (health center), ָֽחָּלֶמּוּט (hshtalmoot) [hIʃtəlmu:t] (continuing education program), and ָֽקָּבְּטֵס (kəbəts) [kIbʊts] (kibbutz, collective settlement), respectively.

Many of the borrowed nouns relate to the public-institutional area. Borrowed words from Hebrew into Arabic encompass many aspects of life, like economy, society, education, health, and politics (Mar’i, 2013:27; Amara and Spolsky, 1986). However, the data that were collected for the purpose of this study is limited. It was also taken from subjects in northern Israel, where Palestinian Israelis are generally less exposed to Hebrew than those living in the Triangle region and in mixed cities. It seems that more borrowings and code-switches can be observed in speech rather than in writing.

| Nouns | Adjectives | Discourse markers | Verbs | Prepositions | Other | Total |
|-------|------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Tokens | 74         | 2                 | 3     | 1            | 0     | 0     | 80    |
| Percentage | 92.5% | 2.5% | 3.75% | 1.25% | 0% | 0% | 100% |

Table 1: Frequency of borrowed items
precise, the data was collected from Facebook timelines, which can be considered slightly more formal than private chat. Hence, fewer borrowings and code-switches seem to appear in a formal setting.

Furthermore, since most Palestinian Israelis live in Arabs villages and cities and not in mixed cities, the main interaction with Hebrew speakers is at work or at universities; hence, it makes sense that many borrowed items are connected to institutional rather than private issues.

A valid question to ask here is what types of verbs, adjectives, and discourse markers were borrowed. Table 2 shows all of the verbs, adjectives, and discourse markers found in the Facebook data.

The borrowed verb *tʕədken* (to update) has an equivalent in Arabic [juʕatlIn], but this Arabic verb was coined recently, and not many people are actually aware of it. Moreover, it is very formal. The adjective *mʕudka:n* is the Hebrew adjective of the borrowed Hebrew verb *tʕədken* (a four-consonant root, ʕIdken, “updated”). The other adjective, *mʕənjen* (interesting), has two synonyms in Arabic, *ʃəjjiq* and *muɵir lIl-ˀIhtIma:m*, but these two words are considered very formal and literary, and for that reason they are likely to be used less on Facebook, which is considered a less formal setting. The discourse marker *sta:m* is borrowed because it has a wider range of usage compared to the dialectal Arabic *Hek*. Moreover, a discourse marker like *KIdaj* does not exist in Palestinian dialect, although it has verb and noun semi-equivalents (*bənsəћk* and *nəsiћa*, respectively). The last discourse marker, *blsedIr*, actually has several equivalents in this dialect (*tˁəjjIb, m:aʃI, təma:m*, etc.); however, in addition to these agreement discourse markers, *blsedIr* is most likely added because it started as a code-switch and came to be frequently borrowed. That is, it started at one point along the borrowing continuum and moved to the other end (Matras, 2009).\(^{11}\) To sum up, these borrowed verbs, adjectives, and

---

\(^{11}\) Matras (2009) states that code-switching and borrowings are not distinct phenomena, but rather are situated at different ends of the same continuum.
discourse markers are borrowed because this dialect does not otherwise have words for them, to avoid formal Arabic words, or for use in varied environments. In other words, a common reason for borrowing is that although there is an Arabic word with the same general meaning, the Arabic word is appropriate for more formal contexts. Skaaraas’ (2009: 6) subjects explained the code-switching between Hebrew and Arabic is because of the fact that they can only find the Arabic counterpart in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and that the usage of MSA is considered strange because it is the formal register. It is also important to mention that these borrowed discourse markers occur with high frequency in spoken Hebrew discourse, which plausibly increases the likelihood of their being borrowed.

4.2 Phonological Adaptation

For the second research question, regarding phonological adaptation, I focus here on certain consonants that are written only in Arabic or Latin script, and Hebrew stressed vowels that are perceived as long vowels in Arabic script. This is for several reasons:

(1) The consonants that I am focusing on are those that are different in the two languages when spoken (albeit not when written). For example, Arabic usually preserves the consonants that Modern Hebrew, particularly the predominant Ashkenazi variety, has historically lost. These lost consonants are reflected in Hebrew orthography but are pronounced in a different way. These sounds include /h/, /tˁ/, /ʕ/, along with some others, and they are pronounced [x], [t], and [ʔ], respectively (see Henkin, 2013). Moreover, Arabic does not have the sounds /p/ and /v/ that occur in Hebrew and are represented in its spelling. Arabic uses /b/ and sometimes /f/ as their substitutions.

(2) I am focusing on the written spoken varieties in Arabic and Latin scripts, not in Hebrew script. This is because when an Arabic speaker writes his or her dialect in the Hebrew alphabet, when borrowing a Hebrew word he or she writes the word in Hebrew spelling that is different from the Hebrew prestigious pronunciation. For instance, the Hebrew word for dorm, [ma’on], is written as מִזְנֵן <מ‘ון> in the Hebrew script. Notice that in the written form there is /ʕ/ <ע>, but in speech it is /ˀ/, meaning that the writing does not reflect its pronunciation. If the same word is written in the Latin alphabet, it will be written as mazon, where the <3> represents /ʕ/. In contrast, if it is pronounced in the Hebrew way, it will be written as <ma3on>, where <2> stands for /ˀ/. In Arabic script, the borrowed Hebrew word for dorm is written ماعون. The <ع> in the middle is /ʕ/,
meaning that Palestinian Israelis pronounce it with Arabic pronunciation rather than the Ashkenazi (Hebrew) pronunciation, which would be written as مامون, where <ؤ> stands for /ʔ/. In other words, Arabic and Latin scripts are transparent regarding to the pronunciation of this word, while the Hebrew script is not. Even if one says /məʔon/ instead of /mə能看出/, when writing it in Hebrew, there is no way to write it other than <מום>ממון.

Moreover, in Arabic script we notice that ماعون has a long vowel <ؤ> <aa>, but the Hebrew word has a stressed short vowel that optionally appears as a diacritic under the word מאון. Modern Hebrew contains stressed short vowels, which are often perceived as long vowels by Arabic speakers. This, as mentioned before, clearly appears in Arabic script but not Latin script, unless <aa>, <oo>, <ee> are used; however, in most cases <a> in Latin script can represent either a short or long vowel, because there is a lack of consistency in written Arabic on social media. That is, the <a> in مامون is used with other Arabic words that have short vowels in them, like <بأيбу> (I love him), in addition to being used with words that have long vowels, like <مألم> (male form for “What’s wrong with you?”).

The following table summarizes the orthography of the six Hebrew consonants which will be dealt with, the corresponding Hebrew prestigious pronunciations, and the Latin script and Arabic script consonants used in Arabic CMC that correspond to these Hebrew consonants and pronunciations.

Table 3 above indicates that Arabic preserves historical Hebrew pronunciation (compare Columns 1 and 3, or 1 and 5). In other words, the pronunciations of the four consonants in the table are not lost in Arabic, but they are in Modern Hebrew. When speaking Hebrew, many Palestinian Israeli Arabs keep the historical Hebrew pronunciation, which is different from Hebrew prestigious dialect in modern times. When a loanword from Hebrew is used, we can easily tell if the script reflects Arabic pronunciation or not in these four cases in the table (compare Columns 3 and 4, and 5 and 6). For instance, if a word has /ɾ/ in it and is represented in CMC in Latin script as <ɾ>, it would be evidence that

---

12 In Arabic CMC, short vowels can also be omitted, like <مألم>, which can also be written as <말ום>, where the first <ؤ> is a long vowel and the second is the short. Speakers of this dialect can easily figure out which word is intended, mainly from the context.

13 These are the six letters that are written in one way but pronounced in a different way by Ashkenazi Hebrew speakers, whose speech is considered prestigious (albeit historically inaccurate).
Arabic phonology is being implemented. The same phoneme /r/, if represented as <3'>, would indicate that Hebrew phonology is being reflected. Consider the word <المشيّر> [məxʃIr] (device): In Hebrew it is pronounced as [maxʃIʁ]. The <r> (underlined) shows that this word conforms to Arabic pronunciation rather than Hebrew, since if the Hebrew pronunciation were reflected we would expect the word <المشيّر> to appear instead. Another example is [لحميّات] <ləmnyot> (bread rolls), which is considered to have Hebrew phonology because of the /x/ instead of the /ћ/.

The /x/ sound can be a dialectal pronunciation for /ћ/ or a correct pronunciation for Hebrew <כ> /k/, which is sometimes pronounced as [x] or [k], depending on the diacritic and the word. However, the pharyngealized [tˁ] does not always appear; there is inconsistency sometimes, and [t] substitutes it.

---

**Table 3**  
Explanation of orthography

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hebrew consonants | Hebrew consonants with historical pronunciation indicated in transcription | Dialectal Arabic in Latin script | Dialectal Hebrew in Latin script | Hebrew in Arabic script | Dialectal Arabic in Arabic script |
| cmc in Latin script | cmc in Arabic Script |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <ן> [r] | <ך> [🍗] | <ר> [ʁ] | <3> [ʁ] | <ג> [ʁ] |
| <ם> [ʕ] | <נ> [ʁ] | <ש> [ʕ] | <ז> [ʕ] | <ג> [ʕ] |
| <ס> [tˁ] | <ת> [t] | <ד> [tˁ] | <ט> [t] | <ת> [t] |

---

14 The Hebrew script used in Arabic cmc is the same as Hebrew consonants. It is excluded from this analysis since it does not supply any clues regarding phonological adaptation.

15 The Latin script used for Arabic cmc uses numerals for emphatic letters (i.e., pharyngeal and pharyngealized sounds), which Latin does not have (see Palfreyman and Al Khalil, 2003).

16 The /x/ sound can be a dialectal pronunciation for /ћ/ or a correct pronunciation for Hebrew <כ> /k/, which is sometimes pronounced as [x] or [k], depending on the diacritic and the word.

17 However, the pharyngealized [tˁ] does not always appear; there is inconsistency sometimes, and [t] substitutes it.
Another significant point is that if we look at Columns 1 and 2, we find that Hebrew script does not reflect the pronunciation of these four consonants. The consonants are written in a way that reflect historical Hebrew pronunciation but are pronounced in recent times in Modern Hebrew as reflected in the table. Hence, if someone decided to use the Hebrew script to write Arabic cmc, we would have no clue regarding the phonology his or her Hebrew loanword. Therefore, these cases were excluded.

There are two slightly more complicated consonants in Hebrew, פ and ב. The former can be pronounced in Hebrew either as [p] or [f], and the latter either as [b] or [v], depending on the word. The Palestinian Israeli dialect, in contrast, has the phonemes /b/ and /f/, but not /p/ or /v/. The phonemes /v/ and /p/ are alien to this dialect; however, /v/ is more frequent in loanword phonology than /p/, which can be hard for some native speakers of this dialect to perceive. The borrowed Hebrew word written in Latin script [mdbesIt] <mdbesIt> (printer) is considered to be adapted to the Arabic phonological system because of the <b>, which is [p] in Hebrew, while the same word [madpesIt] <mdpesIt>, in which the letter <b>, changed to <p> reflects the Hebrew pronunciation embedded in the word.

It is worth mentioning that Arabic script does not give us a lot of input about the adopted phonology for the phonemes /p/ and /v/, because in Arabic script they will only appear as /b/ for /p/ and either /b/ or /f/ for /v/. Therefore, since timeline postings on Facebook tend to be in Arabic, and the comments tend to be in Latin script, I tried to compare the same word when it appears again by the same person in both scripts, and the Latin script is the one that reflects the pronunciation. For example, a person may write the word [belfon] (cell phone) in Arabic script and in Latin write it as <pilifon> [pelefon]; the latter is an indication that the person is most likely using Hebrew phonology. The problem in Arabic script is that there is no representation for the /p/ sound, since it does not exist. As for the /v/ sound, it is represented as either ف /f/ or ب /b/. If represented as /f/ it means that it follows Hebrew phonology, because there is no representation for /v/ in Arabic, so /f/ takes its place. However, if /b/ is used, then it is hard to decide, unless the word reappears in Latin script written by the same user. Consider the word מחשב (computer), reflecting the Hebrew writing and not the pronunciation of המחשב <mahʃev>. When the same word is written in Latin script as <mʃhev> [maxʃev], it tells me that it is likely this user pronounces the word according
to the Hebrew phonological system. Alternatively, if it was written as <maћʃe v>, it would be considered to follow the Hebrew writing system for <ћ> and Arabic phonology for <v>, because the phoneme /v/—despite the fact that it originally did not exist—does frequently appear in loanwords of this dialect.

With respect to vowels, I concentrated on the Arabic script, where every stressed /a/ and /e/ in Hebrew is usually written in cmc as long /a/ <א> and /e/ <א>, respectively. These are considered to be adapted to Arabic phonology; for instance, we find [mɪftsæʔ] for the Hebrew [mɪvtsæʔ] (sale). The long vowel in the final syllable reflects Arabic. In Hebrew, a final stressed syllable of the shape cv(c) can have a short vowel, but this is not the case in Arabic. Usually, the vowel in the stressed syllable in a Hebrew word is lengthened to preserve the stress when the word is borrowed into Arabic. In the example of [mɪʕrɛ:xɪlt] for [maʕrɛ:xɪlt] (system), the penultimate long vowel reflects Arabic phonology.

The following table shows the use of Arabic vs. Hebrew phonology in the lexical items borrowed from Hebrew, according to the analysis discussed above.

|               | Nouns | Adjectives | Verbs | Discourse markers | Total |
|---------------|-------|------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| Arabic phonology | 48    | 2          | 1     | 3                 | 54    |
| Hebrew phonology | 26    | 0          | 0     | 0                 | 26    |

The results in Table 4 show that Arabic phonology is imposed on Hebrew borrowings. It is relevant to mention again here that borrowing and code-switching are considered “related points on a continuum” (Matras, 2009: 110). Usually, when code-switching, bilinguals preserve the phonology of the source language. However, when borrowing, the borrowed item is integrated into the recipient language and takes the recipient language's phonology and
morphology. One example that includes a morphological adjustment is the word for “comprehensive high school final exam,” with the Arabic broken plural [bagarit], instead of the Hebrew plural בגרויות [bagrujot]. This might indicate an initial incorporation of the Hebrew word into Arabic (Koplewitz, 1990: 182). In contrast, fewer lexical items borrowed from Hebrew into Arabic retain Hebrew phonology. One case where this occurs is when the root is a cognate, but the meaning in the two languages is quite distinct. For example, the word לחמניות [lahmanjot] (bread rolls) has the root l. h. m.; the root in Hebrew means “bread,” but in Arabic it means “meat.” When borrowed into Arabic the word is pronounced in the Hebrew way [laxmanjot] and not as [lahmanjot] in the Arabic manner, to maintain this distinction. It would be potentially confusing to pronounce it as [lahmanjot] in Arabic, since the cognate root in Arabic means “meat,” not “bread.” Therefore, the Hebrew pronunciation [laxmanjot] is preserved. Moreover, although Arabic morphology in most cases is added to Hebrew borrowings, there are still some cases where borrowed items have Hebrew plurals. An example is the word [mazganím] (air conditioners); the Hebrew masculine plural [im] is borrowed along with the word. It might be the case that some words started as code-switch and moved along the continuum toward borrowing due to frequent usage. Another way of analyzing this might be that some words, along with their morphology, were borrowed as single unanalyzed items into the Palestinian Israeli dialect, while others were borrowed without the plurals, and Arabic plurals were added to them. This is a matter for future research.

4.3 Which Words get Borrowed?
Having considered a few aspects of borrowings from Modern Hebrew into colloquial Palestinian Israeli dialect, I would now like to address the question of why this Arabic dialect has borrowed these words, particularly nouns, from Hebrew. Poplack and Miller (1988) discuss the reasons that languages borrow words from each other, including the following:

(1) To specify culturally or technologically new concepts
(2) To refer to existing notions in a new way
(3) To form a new compound
(4) To nominalize a verb or an adjective
(5) Analogical use of derivational morphology

Some, but not all, of these reasons apply to the data at hand. I divided the borrowed items that appeared in the Facebook data into the groups above; the results are presented in Table 5 below.
I based my classification on the following: Words that did not exist in Arab culture previously, like [kibots] (kibbutz, collective settlement) and [moʃav] (cooperative Israeli settlement) were classified under “culturally or technologically new concepts.” Words that introduce a new reference for previously existing things or concepts were classified under “new way(s) to refer to existing notions.” Examples of these words include [ʃamɛnIt] (sour cream) and [dɛʃɛ] (lawn—particularly symmetrical backyard lawns in private homes).

I expected that borrowings in these two categories would be the most common; however, I found that some of the borrowed words actually have corresponding Arabic words, and yet they are still used in Hebrew. These I classified under “other.” A possible reason that words like [gaːn] (kindergarten), [maʃɔːn] (dorm), [maʃʃir] (device), and [dIraː] (apartment)—in Arabic [ћədˁani], [səkəntˁolab], [jihaz], and [ʃəˀˀa], respectively—are borrowed might be that they entered the language through code-switching and moved along the continuum to become lexical borrowings. These words would have been heard in Hebrew more than in Arabic due to the intensive contact with Hebrew and the likelihood that the usage of these words was more common in Israeli culture than in traditional Arab culture. Another possible reason for these Hebrew words to be borrowed is that the Arabic counterparts are not exclusively informal (dialectal) words; they are rather also used in formal Arabic. This might affect the decision to borrow them from Hebrew rather than just using the “partially” formal Arabic words, which sound somewhat odd when used in colloquial speech.

An objection that might be raised at this point is that there is another explanation for Arabic to borrow from Hebrew, which is the typological similarity between the two languages. McMahon (1994) suggests that related
(typologically similar) languages are more likely to borrow from each other, particularly if they are so closely related that mutual intelligibility is relatively easy to establish. Hebrew and Arabic do have structural similarities, since both are Semitic languages. However, this does not explain why in such intensive language contact the degree of borrowing in the collected data is relatively low. Therefore, the typological similarity between the two Semitic languages here, Arabic and Hebrew, is not sufficient as an explanation, because it implies a high degree of borrowing when such is not actually the case.

The restricted number and type of borrowings that actually occur might be explained by the fact that, consistent with previous research (Androutsopoulos, 2013; Paolillo, 2011), Facebook posts and comments are asynchronous, and it seems that code-switching is typically limited in asynchronous CMC modes. This tendency might be extended to borrowings as well. Moreover, in the Facebook context, all ego’s friends, and sometimes friends’ of friends, see timeline postings and comments. Given the fact that many people have friends from other geographical areas due to globalization, one might also expect restrictions in borrowings. Many of the subjects in this study have Arabic speakers as friends who do not know Hebrew, particularly those in Jordan and Europe. Such restrictions are reflected in the fact that I did not find more than one Hebrew word in the corpus borrowed as a verb with conjugation into Palestinian Israeli dialect, despite the fact that there are borrowed words that occur in speech like mballim (he is not responding/mental block) and biṭrshin (he is studying very hard). It seems that people use borrowings less on Facebook timelines and comments than in F2F conversations. However, it would be interesting to conduct another study in the future and examine synchronous CMC modes, like the Facebook one-to-one synchronous messaging (Messenger) for instance, and compare the two environments.

Despite the fact that informal speech is the vector through which lexical borrowings are most commonly introduced and propagated (Poplack and Dion, 2012), the political and cultural situation of Palestinian Israelis also hinders borrowing. The Arabic language is a significant entity in the formation of the Arab identity, whether considered as the secular “Arab Umma” or the religious “Islamic Umma.” Moreover, different cultures have different attitudes toward borrowing, which could explain different borrowing behaviors and degrees. Arab culture is purist in nature (Haspelmath, 2003; Suleiman, 2004) and generally tends to reject borrowings from other languages, preferring rather to come up with alternatives from its own internal resources.21 Palestinian Israeli society is mainly divided into two groups: religious and secular. What unites

---

21 As an observation, diasporic Arabic speakers accept borrowings more readily than those who live in Arab countries, where the mainstream is purist.
them is the Arabic language and its importance in maintaining unity in the nation. Some youth groups on Facebook demand not to mix Hebrew in Arabic speech, while others demand that signs in Arabic should be added in places like train stations. When writing—unlike when speaking—people usually have enough time to think and edit; consequently this results in less borrowings and code-switching. Another reason might be the political struggle between Arabs and Jews, and the difference in perception might also hamper the process of borrowing. All of the above reasons could plausibly hinder borrowing from Hebrew, despite intense contact, limiting it basically to a restricted number of nouns.

5 Conclusion and Implications

On the one hand, language contact between Hebrew and Arabic in Israel is intense. It can be hierarchized between the third and fourth level on Thomason and Kaufman's scale (1988). On the other hand, a corpus taken from Facebook timeline posts and comments—a setting where innovations are allowed and new ways of writing (for example, abbreviations22 or the use of Latin characters to write dialectal Arabic) are common and acceptable—produced a scarce corpus of borrowings, and the types of borrowing were very restricted relative to the intensity of contact between the two languages. I also showed that when Hebrew words were borrowed into Arabic, their orthography typically reflected Arabic phonology rather than Hebrew phonology.

Accordingly, we need to take into consideration that the population that was examined is northern Palestinian Israelis (therefore none of them are Druze). This population, unlike Palestinian Israelis who live in mixed cities and the Triangle region, lives in towns and villages relatively isolated from Hebrew speakers. This is due to the fact that a smaller number of Jewish towns are located in the north compared to central Israel. Moreover, many of these people work in their local areas and do not communicate with Jews on a daily basis. In addition, it is expected from this data to have an inclination to Arabic phonology more than Hebrew, because the data are taken from people who live in the north of Israel. Had the data been taken from a mixed city or the Triangle region, the results would probably have been slightly different. For instance, according to Horesh (2014), the Arabic spoken in the Tel Aviv-Jaffa area is going through a structural change due to the intense contact with Hebrew. In other words, it seems that Hebrew is significantly influencing the Arabic spoken

---

22 One example of abbreviations is ISA for inshAlla (if God wills).
by Palestinian Israelis in mixed cities—not to mention its influence when it comes to the intensity of borrowing and phonology interference.

I proposed explanations for these limited results in terms of the nature of Facebook and asynchronous CMC in general, as well as in terms of cultural and political factors. It would be interesting to reevaluate the situation again, after collecting two larger data sets from different CMC modes (synchronous and asynchronous) and F2F conversations. Then we could have more information to help us determine which factor is more influential—the nature of CMC or the political and cultural situation. Further, it would be interesting to evaluate the political views and inclinations of Palestinian Israelis according to their region. In other words, it would be interesting to conduct a survey in a future research in an attempt to investigate how, to what extent, and in what direction the intensity of language contact affect the political views of Palestinian Israelis. This might give some insight on how language contact changes the way people think.

Appendix

The following are all 80 borrowed words found in the Facebook corpus:

| Verbs | Adjectives | Discourse markers |
|-------|------------|-------------------|
| t3dkin [tIʕədke:n], [tI'adkɛn] to update | mi3odkan [mIʕudka:n], [mIʔodkan] updated | Kday [kIdaj], [kIdaj] worthwhile |
| מַעֲנֵיִים [mIʕənje:n], [mIʔanjɛn] interesting | | פָּרוּשֵׁי [bIsedIr], [bIsIdɛʁ] okay |
| | Stam [stam], [stam] purposelessly, simple |

| Nouns | Nouns | Nouns | Nouns |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| [hodəʔot], [hodαʔot]23 text messages | Mdbesit [madbesIt], [madpeset] printer | bgareet [bagarit], [bagsojot] (high school comprehensive exam) | 3vodot [ʔavodot], 3vodot research papers |

23 All transcriptions in this table are in Arabic pronunciation followed by Hebrew pronunciation.
| Nouns                        | Nouns                        | Nouns                        | Nouns                        |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ləxmənjo:t, [laxmanjı:t]    | [defl], [defɛ]              | məʃfıɾ, [məʃfıɾ]            | Toranlıjı:t, [toranlıjı:t]   |
| bread rolls                 | lawn                        | device                      | duty roster                 |
| ʔIljonıt, [ʔIljınit]        | [məʃme:rlt], [maʃme:rlt]    | ʔIljonıt, [ʔIljonıt]        | [mərɛxIt], [maʃmɛrIt]       |
| tunic, vest                 | cooperative                 | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| Moshav [muʃa:v],           | Israeli settlement          | border police              | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [məʃʃ ImageView],           | [məʃʃ ImageView],           | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [maxʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          |
| pocket calculator          | technical                   | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| bIlnıam, [bInjan]           | [bɛnjan]                    | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          |
| building (usually used to  | barrier                     | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          |
| talk about buildings on    | tʃIʃIjıt], [ʃIʃIjıt]        | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| university campuses)       | technical                   | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| ʔIʃIjıt], [ʔIʃIjıt]         | [ʔIʃIjıt], [ʔIʃIjıt]        | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Belefon [bIlfon], [pelefon] | cell phone                  | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaʁ gvol] |
| [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | [məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvol] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Belefon [bIlfon], [pelefon] | cell phone                  | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Belefon [bIlfon], [pelefon] | cell phone                  | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Belefon [bIlfon], [pelefon] | cell phone                  | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Mzgan [mazganı], [mazganı] | [maʃon], [maʃon]            | [mIʃmar gvo:l], [mɛʃmaɾ gvo] |
| [mazganı] air conditioner   | məʃʃIjıVent], [məʃʃIjıVent] | take into account          | [mItʃəʃvim], [mItxaʃvim]   |
| Nouns                     | Nouns                     | Nouns                     | Nouns                     |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 30lam t7ton              | hrt2a [hαrt2aː] lecture  | Shi5bool [ʃiβool],       | dod shemsh               |
| [ʔulam təhton],          | [hαrt2aː] lecture         | [ʃiβool] replication, copying | [dud fɛmʃ], solar-heated water tank |
| [ʔulam taxton]           | the criminal             |                          |  |
| underworld               |                          |                          |  |
| kobot7olem [kubat         | hots2a lbo3al            | Simenaryon               | gan [gan], kindergarten |
| holim], [kopat xolim]    | [hots2aː lboʃɔːl],       |                          |  |
| health center            | [hots2aː lapolɔːl]       |                          |  |
|                         | implementation (in      |                          |  |
|                         | the legal sense of the  |                          |  |
|                         | word)                   |                          |  |
| Meyon [mljoːn],          | M5tesh [mαxteʃ] crater   | Hshtalmoot               | shla6 [ʃalat], remote    |
| [mijon] emergency        |                          |                          | control                  |
| room                     |                          |                          |  |
| bet kafe [bet kafe]      | md3ee m7shev             | Tres [tɾis],            | Nyad [najad], laptop     |
| coffee shop              | [mɑdaʃe mɑʃeːv],         | [tɾis] window shutters, |  |
|                          | [mɑdaʃe mɑʃeːv] computer science |  |  |
| m7laka [mlhakaː],        | 7vela [havela],          | Dera [dɾa],            | Shmenit                   |
| [mexlaka] hospital unit  | [xavIla] package         | [diʃa] apartment        | [ʃamɛnt] sour cream      |
| Kubah [kubbaː],          | Mshta7 [mʃtaː],          |  |
| [kopa] cash register     | [meʃtax] pallet          |  |
| kuba2e [kubaːʔi],        | hnds2a2ee                | Sbaba [ʃabaːbaː],        | matsa matzo              |
| [kopaʔe] cashier         | [hɑnds2aʔi],             | [ʃabaːbaː] slang         | (unleavened bread made from flour and water, eaten on the Jewish holiday of Passover) |
|                          | [hɑnds2aʔi] practical    | terrific, wonderful,     |  |
|                          | engineer                 | great                    |  |
|                          |                          |                          |  |
Nouns

| Nouns                     | Nouns                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| se7a [sl̂a], [sl̂a]       | Sofganyot                |
| telephone call            | tājelIt,                  |
| [tajelIt] promenade       | [sofganjot],              |
| Bgiya [bəgIja], [pagIja] | 7vyah [həvəja],          |
| neonatal intensive-care  | Yofe [jo:fe], [jofɛ]     |
| unit                      | hooray                   |
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