

Linguistic Interplay and Convergence Dimensions: A Comparative Analysis of Hebrew Loanwords in Palestinian Arabic

Duaa Abu Elhija,¹ Tasnim Swaiti² & Naila Tallas-Mahajna³

Abstract

This study analyses the process and extent of adaptation of Hebrew loanwords in Palestinian Arabic, comparing speakers from Hebron in the West Bank with Israeli Palestinians from the northern Triangle region in Israel. It underscores that, through social and cultural contact, languages can subtly affect one another in phonological, semantic, morphological, and verbal ways. In Hebron, where Hebrew–Arabic contact remains indirect and informal, loanwords undergo various phonological adaptations and may acquire independent or shifted semantic functions. In contrast, Arab speakers in Israel who are bilingual and have formal education in Hebrew acquire such loanwords with greater phonological and semantic adherence. This study analyses loanword evidence to help decipher the processes underlying language change across different multilingual settings, reflecting linguistic ‘borrowing’ and broader socio-cultural transfers and adaptations. Thus, it emphasises the importance of linguistic proximity, conversational frequency, and sociocultural integration in adaptation at the phonetic and semantic levels.

Keywords: Hebrew loanwords, Palestinian Arabic, Hebron, linguistic convergence, phonological adaptation, semantic shift

¹ Al-Qasemi College of Education.

² Smart University College for Modern Education, Hebron, Palestine.

³ Al-Qasemi College of Education.

Introduction

Language, where it is considered, is a very complicated phenomenon. It embodies human civilization and culture, enabling individuals to convey their ideas, desires, and experiences to others (Heba et al., 2020). This research compares Hebrew loanwords used by Palestinians in the city of Hebron and those from Israel.

The city of Hebron, located in the West Bank, is among the cities governed by the Palestinian Authority. Its community speaks Arabic. Few people speak Hebrew, and those who speak it are not fluent. The primary contact with the language comes from those who enter Israel to work- usually in blue-collar jobs. Arabs in Israel are Palestinians who live in Israel, and they speak Arabic as their first language and Hebrew as their second language. According to Manor et al. (2023), the acquisition of spoken Hebrew is vital as a second language for integration into higher education and the labor market for Arabs in Israel.

Arabs in Israel frequently use loanwords from Hebrew, given that it is the dominant and formal language in universities, most colleges, and workplaces. Their extensive use of such words results from their daily interactions with Jews in many aspects of life. The Hebrew language also entered the Arabic spoken in the city of Hebron orally, primarily through geographic proximity to Jewish living quarters and those of people living in Hebron and through citizens who had direct contact with Jews while working in cities in Israel. Considering the phonetic system of the Arabic language spoken in the city of Hebron and the Hebron dialects spoken therein, these loanwords have been adapted and integrated into this phonological system.

Borrowed words can create new sounds and combinations in the target language (Cook, 2022). Languages borrow words from other languages for several reasons. One reason is the need to fill semantic gaps in the language,

where there is no existing word to express a particular concept (Alekseenko, 2023). Borrowing allows languages to expand their vocabulary and express new ideas or phenomena (Spahiu & Nuredini, 2023). Another reason for borrowing is the influence of cultural, social, and economic factors, such as globalization and language contact (Esmira, 2022). Additionally, borrowing can occur when a language lacks a specific word and borrows it from another language to fill the gap. Overall, borrowing words from other languages is a natural part of language evolution and allows languages to adapt and grow in response to changing societal needs and influences.

This study asks: To what extent does degree of contact shape phonological, semantic, and morphological adaptation? Moreover, it aims to illuminate the unique linguistic variations that have emerged from exploring and analyzing Hebrew loanwords incorporated in Arabic in Hebron and Israel.

Literature Review

A study conducted by Im (2023) concerning Turkish loanwords in Russian focused on the nature of variations in the Russian language. The researcher concluded that oral communication transmitted Turkish words and changed in their phonetic composition and semantics to integrate with the Russian language's phonological, morphological, and semantic standards. As a result, these loanwords became frequently used in the Russian language.

Jdetawy et al. (2020) argue that loanword adoption is not a random process but is shaped by an interplay of linguistic, social, and functional pressures. While lexical gaps (“linguistic deficit”) often motivate borrowing, social factors—particularly the prestige and dominance of the donor language—play an equally significant role in promoting adoption. Moreover, borrowing frequently arises from the need to encode new concepts introduced through language contact. However, not all borrowed items are retained; their survival depends on their

compatibility with the phonological, morphological, and semantic systems of the recipient language. This suggests that borrowing is both need-driven and system-constrained.

Research on loanword adaptation further demonstrates that this process is governed by both perceptual and structural factors. Peperkamp (2003) and Smith (2005) contend that adaptation is shaped by the interaction between speech perception and the phonological grammar of the borrowing language, rather than by simple imitation of the source form. Empirical evidence from Grema's (2022) study of Pabɔr/ Bura-Kanuri loanwords supports this view, showing systematic use of processes such as vowel insertion, deletion, and substitution. Likewise, Kochetov (2008) highlights the importance of phonetic and phonological mapping in shaping adapted forms. Taken together, these studies challenge purely surface-level accounts of borrowing and instead point to a structured, rule-governed process in which perceptual input is filtered through the phonological system of the recipient language.

Abu Elhija (2017) studied Hebrew loanwords in written Arabic by Nazarene and Iksali¹ Palestinian Israelis, specifically analyzing data from Facebook Timelines. The study examined the frequency of borrowing items, phonological adaptation, and the underlying reasons for borrowing. The study's findings indicated that nouns are borrowed the most frequently, borrowed items are adapted to the Arabic phonological system, and the main reasons for borrowing are to introduce new cultural or technological concepts and new ways to refer to preexisting notions.

Furthermore, Abu Elhija (2024) delves into the study of Hebrew loanwords in spoken Arabic. Her primary findings indicate that the spoken corpus contained more loanwords than the written corpus. Additionally, words related to topics such as education, employment, and technology were found to be the most

prevalent. Lastly, it is essential to note that a word can still be considered a loanword regardless of its phonology.

In their research, Yeshoda and Swaitti (2023) examined the phonological changes in Hebrew loanwords adopted into Palestinian Arabic in Hebron City. According to the results, substitution, epenthesis, and deletion were Palestinian Arabic's most popular phonological changes. Moreover, Swaitti and Yeshoda (2022) emphasized the changes in the Palestinian Arabic lexical items due to the contact between Arabic and Hebrew. They concluded that the high impact of Hebrew lexical elements is using nouns more than other elements.

In another study, Laks (2018) examined the criteria for form selection in the formation of new verbs in modern Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic. This study focused on the verbal systems of these languages, specifically the Templatic forms known as binyanim. Moreover, the patterns of verb formation in modern Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic by analyzing collected data on new verb productions. The study concluded that the selection of binyan for new verbs is influenced by a combination of thematic-semantic and morpho-phonological criteria. Additionally, certain binyanim are favored over others in forming new verbs by the interaction of thematic-semantic and morpho-phonological factors.

Davis et al. (2018) studied the nonconcatenative morphology of Arabic, focusing on its templatic nature. They discussed the incorporation of prosodic templates into the schema of CxM and explored the implications of root-based vs. word-based approaches to Arabic morphology. The study aimed to understand the full extent of Arabic templatic morphology beyond the verbal system and demonstrate the advantages of construction-based approaches. The authors concluded that the SYN component of constructions includes Arabic prosodic templates, and they conceptualize root consonants as labels for a family of lexemes.

Methodology

Data Collection and Corpus

The data for this study were collected longitudinally over a period of twelve months through continuous observation of naturally occurring speech in two communities: Hebron in the West Bank and the northern Triangle region in Israel. This approach was adopted to ensure ecological validity and to capture authentic patterns of loanword usage as they occur in real communicative settings. The researchers maintained a structured field diary in which instances of Hebrew loanwords used in everyday Arabic conversations were systematically documented. Only loanwords that occurred spontaneously in natural interaction were included in the dataset.

Given the exploratory nature of the study, the corpus was not derived from a controlled or pre-recorded dataset but from real-life linguistic exposure. The collected examples were subsequently compiled into a working corpus and categorized according to phonological, morphological, and semantic features, as well as the formation of nominal verbs.

Participants and Sociolinguistic Context

The data were drawn from speakers in the two regions mentioned above, representing two distinct sociolinguistic contexts. In Hebron, speakers are predominantly monolingual Arabic adult speakers with limited and indirect exposure to Hebrew, mainly through occupational contact. In contrast, adults speakers from the northern Triangle region are typically bilingual, with formal education in Hebrew and regular interaction with Hebrew speakers.

Although individual participants were not systematically sampled or formally profiled, the data reflect a range of naturally occurring speech across different

everyday contexts, capturing variation shaped by differing degrees of language contact.

Data Organization and Analysis

Following collection, the data were organized into comparative tables based on key linguistic dimensions: phonological variation, semantic shift, morphological adaptation, and the formation of nominal verbs. Each category was analyzed qualitatively to identify systematic differences between the two speech communities.

The analysis focused on identifying recurring patterns of adaptation and linking these patterns to sociolinguistic factors, particularly degree of contact with Hebrew and level of bilingualism.

Reliability and Limitations

Given the observational and diary-based nature of the data collection, the study adopts a qualitative and exploratory approach. While this method allows for rich, context-sensitive insights, it does not provide a fully quantifiable corpus or controlled sampling. As such, the findings should be interpreted as indicative of broader patterns rather than statistically generalizable results.

Ethical Considerations

The data were collected through informal observation of everyday speech in public and social settings. No personally identifiable information was documented, and all examples are presented anonymously. The study adheres to standard ethical practices in linguistic research concerning privacy and confidentiality.

Results and Discussion

In the following section, we will illustrate the results in the tables and provide the discussion underneath every table.

The data has revealed various aspects; some loanwords are similar in both areas (See table A in the appendix), others were only found in Hebron and not used by Arabs in Israel (See table B in the appendix), other groups of such words differ in phonology, semantics, morphology, or undergone morphophonological adaptation. Another interesting group is the nominal verbs that appeared in both areas with the different dialects.

Nominal Verbs

Table one shows nominal verbs, which are verbs that were formed from Hebrew nouns.

Table 1: Nominal verbs - From Hebrew loanword nouns to Innovative verbs in Arabic spoken in Israel.

IPA	Hebrew	Translation	POS	Root	Pattern
ʃoʔe:v	שואב	Vacuum cleaner	N	ʃ. ʔ. V	
ʃaʔ:avit	שאבתי	To vacuum clean	V	ʃ. ʔ.V	faʕʕal (SPA faʕ: ɪl
mazga:n	מזגן	Air conditioner	N		
bitmazgan			V	m.z.g.n	faʕʕal
ħasimah	חסימה	Block	N		
ħas:amit	חסמתי	Blocked	V	ħ.s.m	faʕʕal
ʔitu:t	איתות	Signal (Winker)	N		
ʔat:it		To give a signal/ winker	V	ʔ.t.t	faʕʕal
barsa:	פרסה	U turn	N		
bar:asit		Make a U turn	V	b.r.s	faʕʕal

IPA	Hebrew	Translation	POS	Root	Pattern
dikaʔon	דכאון	Depression	N		
dakʔanɪt		depressed	V	d.k. ʔ.n	faʕlal
ħofiʃ	חופש	Vacation	N		
ħaf:afna*		went on vacation	V	ħ.f.ʃ.	faʕʕal
tiku:n	תיקון	Repair	N		
tak:anɪt		repaired	V	t.k.n	faʕʕal
maxʃɪr	מכשיר	Electric Inhalator	N		
maxʃarɪt		To give someone an inhalator	V	m.x. ʃ.r	faʕlal
de:lik	דלק	Fuel	N		
tadlak	תדלק	To Fuel	V	t.d.l.k	faʕlal
ʔadrixalut	אדריכלות	architecture	N		
ʔadraxna		designed	V	ʔ.d.r.x	faʕlal
mahlɪk	מחליק	Hair straightener	N		
mahlakɪt		straightened my hair	V	m.ħ.l.k	faʕlal
ħagora	חגורה	seatbelt	N		
thag:arɪt		To put on the seatbelt	V	ħ.gr	faʕʕal
migre:na	מגרנה	migraine	N		
magranɪt		To have a migraine	V	m.g.r.n	faʕlal
ħɪbur	חבור	Connection	N		
ħab:arɪt	חברתי	To connect	V	ħ.b.r	faʕʕal
madgɪʃ	מדגיש	Marker	N		
madgaʃ	למדגש?	To mark	V	m.d.g.ʃ	faʕlal
hazmana:	הזמנה	Order	N		
ʔazmanɪt		To order	V	ʔ.z.m.n	faʕlal

IPA	Hebrew	Translation	POS	Root	Pattern
sɪbuxim	סיבוכים	Complications	N		
tasbax	תסבך	Got complicated	V	t.s.b.x	faʕlal
ʃixbu:l	שכפול	Xerox	N		
ʃaxbal	שכפל	Xeroxed	V	ʃ.x.b.l	faʕlal
tɪst	טסט	Test (car check)	N		
tas:at		Checked the car	V	t.s.t.	faʕʕal
bitʕu:aħ	בטוח	Insurance	N		
batʕaħ		To make an insurance policy	V	b.tʕ.h.	faʕʕal
hafsaka:	הפסקה	A break	N		
hafsak		To have a break	V	h.f.s.k	faʕlal
mavriga:	מבריגה	Screwdriver	N		
mavrag	מברג	To twist screws	V	m.v.r.g	faʕlal
banʃar	פנצ'ר	Puncture	N		
banʃar		To puncture or to be exhausted.	V	b.n.ʃ.r	faʕlal

Both faʕʕal and faʕlal instantiate the same surface template, CaCCaC, although they differ morphologically: faʕʕal is based on a trilateral root with gemination of the second consonant, whereas faʕlal is based on a quadrilateral root (Tallas-Mahajna, Armon-Lotem, & Saiegh-Haddad, 2023). Nevertheless, the two patterns are sufficiently similar in their verbal inflection, at least in the past and non-past forms relevant to the present analysis, to be treated together here. This patterning suggests that these loanwords are integrated into Arabic through a decomposed root that feeds into the Arabic verbal system. In this respect, the data differ from the strictly word-based approach emphasized by Laks (2018), according to which word formation proceeds from existing lexical

items rather than from abstract units such as roots. Instead, these forms appear to constitute another case of a reconstructed root derived from the borrowed Hebrew noun or adjective.

The other thing that the example [ʔazman] 'he ordered' shows is that the root in Arabic is reconstructed or decomposed, supporting the above suggestion. Given the Hebrew source, the word-initial glottal stop in [ʔazman] corresponds to the /h/ in the Hebrew hazmana: The Hebrew /h/ is a prefix not part of the triconsonantal root. Still, in Arabic borrowing, it is reconstructed or decomposed as the root consonant /ʔ/, becomes part of a quadriliteral root, and conjugates on the pattern of faʕlal.

Phonological Variations

The second table shows Hebrew loanwords pronounced differently in Hebron vs. Arabs in Israel.

Table 2: Different pronunciation/phonology

Hebron	Arabs in Israel	Hebrew	Translation	POS
ʔafsaka:	hafsaka:	הפסקה	A break	N
nʔafsik /ʔafskna:	Nhafsik hafsakna		To have a break	V
ramzo:n	ramzo:r	רמזור	traffic lights	N
gfi:f	kvi:f	כביש	road	N
ʃimi:nit	ʃame:nit	שמנת	yogurt cream	N
maʃula:f	mifula:f	משולש	triangle	N
mæku:m	miku:m	מיקום	location	N
klo:f	tlu:f	תלוש	paycheck	N
ħammamat	ħamamo:t	חממות	greenhouses	N

The data above highlights significant variations in pronunciation between people in Hebron and Arabs in Israel for the same Hebrew loanwords. These

differences in pronunciation may be influenced by dialectal variations and socio-cultural influences. Understanding such linguistic variations is crucial for communication and cultural exchange between regional communities.

The table compares the pronunciation of certain Hebrew loanwords between people in Hebron and Arabs in Israel. There are several variations in pronunciation. For example, the word “break” is pronounced “ʔafsaka” in Hebron, while Arabs in Israel pronounce it as “hafsaka:”. In Hebrew, the underlying form - used in careful, slow pronunciation - is “hafsaka:”, but in connected, faster speech it surfaces as “ʔafsaka” due to a process of dissimilation. The table also provides additional comparisons, such as the word *traffic lights*, pronounced as “ramzo:n” by people in Hebron, and *road* pronounced as “kvi:ʃ” in Hebrew, pronounced as “gfi:ʃ.” These differences are attributed to people from Hebron repeating what they hear while Arabs in Israel study the language formally. They know the orthographic rules and the variety in pronunciation. Arabs in Israel pronounce Hebrew similarly to the Mizrahi dialect. One main reason is to emphasize their identity as Arabs. While workers from Hebron do not need to worry much about emphasizing their identity, and they do not know the language enough, they imitate what they hear to a great extent.

Moreover, the table shows that vowels in the first syllable of the words yogurt cream, triangle, and location differ from those used in Hebrew and Arabic spoken in Israel. This vowel alternation (Grema's 2022) could be due to the dialectal variation spoken in Hebron, which tends to lengthen the vowels in the initial syllable. In this dialect, short vowels are lengthened, and long vowels are extra lengthened in the Hebron dialect.

The example of klo:ʃ for tlu:ʃ *paycheck* is no less interesting. Remember that people in Hebron do not formally study Hebrew, but they have second-hand contact with it via Hebron people who travel to work in Israel. This may cause

alterations of some vowels and consonants. Another interesting observation that needs more investigation is that from the data collected, we have noticed that the closer the village to the Israeli borders, the closer the pronunciation to Hebrew; the farther it is, the more variations and alternations were found in the pronunciation.

Finally, the word *greenhouses* is pronounced *ħammamat* instead of *ħamamo:t*. In this example, speakers approximated the pronunciation of another Arabic word *ħammamat*. When borrowing a word, it must conform to the source language rules (Smith 2005; Peperkamp 2003; Kochetov 2008). A plausible reason for borrowing the word *ħamamo:t* as *ħammamat*, is that in standard Arabic, the word is *dafiʔa* from the word *difʔ* (warmth). In spoken Arabic, this word is translated as *ħamm*; thus, changing the word from *ħamamo:t* to *ħammamat* is reasonable since it would then mean the thing that supplies warmth.

The data provides valuable insights into the linguistic diversity and variations in Hebrew loanword pronunciation of people in Hebron and Arabs in Israel. This data shows that Hebrew loanwords Arabs use in Israel are closer to Hebrew than those borrowed in Hebron. This is because Hebrew is their L2, formally studied, and they are in direct contact with Hebrew speakers. Moreover, the data indicates that people from Hebron are monolinguals who were partially exposed to another language and had to have some contact with it to make a living. Some examples are somewhat similar to “pidgin” languages, where people combine an external language with their local tongue.

Semantic Variations

The third table indicates Hebrew loanwords with different meanings in Hebron vs. Arabs in Israel.

Table 3: Differences in Semantics

Hebron	Translation	Arabs in Israel	Translation	Hebrew	POS
mirdaf	chasing or driving the car for fun (wandering)	mirdaf	chasing (a police chasing an offender)	מִרְדָּף	N
fu'eev	car washing- vacuum cleaner	fu'eev	vacuum cleaner	שוואב	N

The above data shows excellent examples of semantic broadening and narrowing of meanings.

The Hebrew word mirdaf is borrowed from Arabic, spoken by Arabs in Israel with the meaning of a police chasing an offender. However, in Hebron, this word encompasses a broader meaning: chasing or driving the car purposelessly (wandering). It seems that this word was introduced as police chasing an offender, but with time, the amelioration process happened to the meaning gradually; it started as a pejoration but then changed.

Another example is fu'eev, borrowed by Arabs in Israel as any type of vacuum cleaner; in Hebron, the meaning was narrowed to only mean the one used to clean the inside of a car. It could be that the word was introduced by people who work in garages or car cleansing.

Understanding these subtleties of meaning is critical to effective communication between speakers.

Morphological Variations

The fourth table below presents some examples of Hebrew loanwords that differ in morphology (Hebron vs. Arabs in Israel).

Table 4: Differences in Morphology

Hebron	Arabs in Israel	Hebrew	Translation	POS
tikuni:m	tikuni:m	תיקון	fix	N
ʔatakni:m	ʔatak:in	אתקן	I fix	V
ʔataknımlak	ʔatak:mlak	אתקן לך	fix for you	V
ʔaʕzorlak	baʕo:zir	(עזור/ יעזור/ אעזור)	to help someone (at work)	V
baʕzor				

The contrast between *ʔatakni:m* (Hebron) and *ʔatak:m* (Arabs in Israel) reflects a fundamental difference in how Hebrew verbal morphology is processed in borrowing. Arabs in Israel, who have access to Hebrew morphological structure, analyze *tikuni:m* as the plural of *tikun* (“repair”) and relate it to the Hebrew verb *ʔitaken* (“I fix”). This structural awareness enables them to extract a trilateral root and integrate the verb into the Arabic pattern *faʕʕal*.

In Hebron, by contrast, speakers rely on surface forms rather than underlying morphological structure. The plural *tikuni:m* is reanalyzed as a base, leading to the incorporation of the plural suffix into the root itself. The resulting form is mapped onto the quadrilateral pattern *faʕlal*, yielding *ʔatakni:m*. This reflects a process of root reconstruction driven by phonological perception rather than morphological decomposition.

The same mechanism is observable in forms such as *ʔaʕzorlak* (“to help you [at work]”), which derives from the Hebrew future *לך אעזור* (“I will help you”) but

is adapted into Arabic without reference to the full verbal paradigm. In contrast, Arabs in Israel integrate such verbs into existing Spoken Arabic patterns (e.g., *foʕil*), again reflecting their access to Hebrew structure.

Table 5: Morphophonological adaptation of Hebrew loanwords in Arabic spoken in Israel

IPA	Hebrew	Translation	POS	Root	Pattern
ħasum	חסום	Blocked	ADJ		
ħas:amit	חסמתי		V	ħ.s.m	faʕ:al
mʃaħrarin	משוחררים	Released	ADJ		
ʃaħrar	שחרר		V	ʃ.ħ.r.r	faʕlal
mʃaʕbad	משועבד	Mortgaged/ oppressed	ADJ		
yʃaʕbid	ישעבד		V	ʃ.ʕ.b.d	faʕlal
mʕadkan	מעודכן	Updated	ADJ		
aʕadkɪn	אעדכן		V	ʕ.d.k.n	faʕlal
nɪxʃa:l	נכשל	Failed	ADJ		
naxʃalit/ maxʃalɪnɪ	נכשלתי		V	n.x.ʃ.l m.x.ʃ.l	faʕlal
jaʃa:r	ישר	Straight	ADJ		
jaʃ:ɪr	תיישר		V	j.ʃ.r	faʕ:al

Rather than representing isolated cases, these patterns point to two distinct adaptation strategies: structurally informed integration versus surface-based reanalysis. Framing the data in these terms allows for a more precise account of how morphological awareness conditions root extraction and pattern assignment in loanword adaptation, moving beyond purely sequential explanation toward a more theoretically grounded analysis.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that the adaptation of Hebrew loanwords in Palestinian Arabic is not simply a function of exposure, but is systematically conditioned by speakers' access to morphological structure. The comparison between Hebron speakers and Arabs in Israel reveals two distinct pathways of loanword integration: structurally informed adaptation, driven by bilingual competence, and surface-based reanalysis, driven by limited and indirect contact. These findings contribute to ongoing debates in contact linguistics by providing empirical evidence that loanword adaptation involves differential morphological reanalysis rather than uniform phonological accommodation. Speakers with access to Hebrew structure (Arabs in Israel) map borrowed items onto existing Arabic templates through root extraction and pattern alignment, whereas speakers without such access (Hebron) reconstruct roots from perceived surface forms, often resulting in quadriliteral expansions. This contrast challenges models that treat loanword integration as a primarily phonological or perceptual process and instead highlights the role of morphological knowledge in shaping adaptation outcomes.

More broadly, the data demonstrate that structured exposure to a donor language affects not only the degree of phonological and semantic convergence, but also the internal restructuring of borrowed forms within the recipient language. In this sense, borrowing is not merely additive but transformative: it reorganizes lexical items in ways that reflect speakers' linguistic competence and sociolinguistic positioning.

The study also has implications for understanding the relationship between language contact and identity. The differing adaptation strategies observed here index distinct sociolinguistic orientations, one grounded in bilingual integration

and the other in indirect contact, thereby linking morphological outcomes to patterns of language use and social alignment.

By foregrounding the role of morphological awareness in loanword adaptation, this study refines existing accounts of borrowing and offers a more nuanced framework for analyzing how contact-induced change operates across different sociolinguistic contexts. Future research can build on this approach by examining how varying degrees of bilingualism shape morphological restructuring in other contact settings.

Appendix

Table A: Loanwords that have the same adaptation (Hebron vs. Arabs in Israel)

Hebron/Arabs in Israel	Hebrew	Translation	POS
ʕuze:r	עוזר	worker	N
se:ɡɪr	סגר	Strike	N
mazɡa:n	מזגן	Air conditioner	N
mazɡɪna ʔatmazɡan		To open the air conditioner	V
ʃu:mer	שומר	Guard	N
ʔaʃmɪrlk / ʃamarli:		To guard	V
ħofɪʃ	חופש	Vacation	N
ħuf:aʃna		went on vacation	V
maxʃɪr	מכשיר	Electric Inhalator	N
maxʃart		To give someone an inhalator	V
banʃar	פנצ'ר	Puncture	N
banʃart		1-To puncture or to be exhausted 2- to feel tired	V
Dɪbq	דבק	Glue	N
ʔadabɪq		To stick / to glue	V
dabaqɪtha:			
dabaqɪthɪn			
ʔazmana:	הזמנה	Order	N
ʔazmanɪt		To order	V
ʔazmɪn			

Table B: Loanwords found in Hebron and not in the Arabic spoken by Arabs in Israel

Hebron	Hebrew	Translation	POS
si:garna:	סיגר	To stop work due to official	V
si:garat		holidays	
ʔamardif / mardafit	מרדף	To drive a car (it used for car racing	V
nmardif		and to demonstrate driving skills)	
mardafna			
geʃemat	גשם	To rain	V
ʔislaxli:	סלח לי	to excuse	V
tislaxli:			
ʔatʕi:h	טייח	to bleach /to plaster a wall	V

References

- Alekseenko, Evgeniia S. On the fate of loanwords in a language (the case of the German language). *Diskurs*, 9(3), (2023): 177.
- Cook, Edward M. *Biblical Aramaic and related dialects: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- Davis, Stuart, and Natsuko Tsujimura. Arabic nonconcatenative morphology in construction morphology. In *The construction of words: Advances in construction morphology* (2018): 315–339.
- Abu Elhija, Duaa. Hebrew loanwords in the Palestinian Israeli variety of Arabic (Facebook data). *Journal of Language Contact*, 10(3), (2017): 422–449.
- Abu Elhija, Duaa. Hebrew loanwords in two rural dialects of Arabic in Israel. *Journal of Language Contact*, 16(1), (2024): 34–53.
- Aghamirzayeva Esmira. Enrichment of languages in the process of language relations. *Globus: Humanities*, (2/40), (2022): 14–16.
- Grema, Musa, and Saleh Jibir. A study of vowel adaptation in Kanuri loanwords in Pabər/Bura. *Tasambo Journal of Language, Literature, and Culture*, (2022). 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.36349/tjllc.2022.v01i01.001>
- Heba Holta, Klodiana Rafti, and Romina Caushaj. *Language and context: The importance of their interconnection in the communication process*. (2020).
- Im, Svetlana B. The use of Turkic loanwords in Russian. In *E3S Web of Conferences*. Vol. 413. (2023). EDP Sciences.
- Jdetawy, Loae Fakhri, and Mohd Hilmi Hamzah. Loanwords in the taxonomy of borrowing: A sociolinguistic analysis. *Language in India*, 20(12) (2020).

- Kochetov, Alexei. Phonology and phonetics of loanword adaptation: Russian place names in Japanese and Korean. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*, 28. (2008).
- Rama Manor and Adi Binhas. Teaching Hebrew as a second language in Arab schools in Israel: Policy and identity politics. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 2023.
- Peperkamp, Sharon, and Emmanuel Dupoux. Reinterpreting loanword adaptations: The role of perception. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (2003): 367–370.
- Smith, Jennifer L. Loan phonology is not all perception: Evidence from Japanese loan doublets. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 14 (2005): 63–74.
- Spahiu, Isa, and Zarije Nuredini. Lexical borrowings and adaptations of anglicism. *The International Journal of Applied Language Studies and Culture* 6(1) (2023): 13–16.
- Swaitti, Tasnim, and Krishna Yeshoda. (2022). Semantic shift of Hebrew words borrowed into Palestinian Arabic in Hebron city. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(5), 578–587.
- Swaitti, Tasnim, and Krishna Yeshoda. The phonological change in Hebrew words borrowed into Palestinian Arabic in the Hebron city. *Journal of Contemporary Language Research* 2(1) (2023): 49–56.
- Tallas-Mahajna, N., Armon-Lotem, S., & Saiegh-Haddad, E. (2023). Emergence of verb-pattern morphology in young Arabic speakers: morphological and semantic features. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1127640.
DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1127640