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Preface

Semitic dialectology seems to be in crisis. While its main goal is to describe previously unknown languages/dialects with data collected during fieldwork, fewer and fewer researchers are able and willing to spend their time in the field. Such research is a series of sacrifices and commitments, months spent in other countries after a long period of preparation and training, but also significant financial costs. The person conducting it is also required to have some special skills. He or she needs to communicate in the language studied or master it as quickly as possible to analyse it. Characterised by the multiplicity and diversity of research and methodology, the European tradition of Semitic linguistics has always supported fieldwork and highly valued the data obtained in this way. It should not abandon research into spoken languages in favour of, for example, only comparative studies, which can be comfortably done in armchairs.

In the spirit of this tradition and to uphold it, the present book is a collection of articles whose data was gathered primarily during field research. The volume is divided into two parts—Studies on various specific linguistic issues and Texts containing previously unpublished transcriptions of audio recordings in Arabic dialects and Jībbalī/Shehret.

The first part opens with an article by Manfred Woidich on the term ‘blind’ in Arabic dialects. Besides the common term āma, the author discusses a number of others, like kafif, makfūf, ḏarīr, ḏasīf, ṣāgīz, maʿzūr, ṭasīs etc., and uses the concept of lexical absorption to explain them. In another paper, Giuliano Castagna deals with the toponomastics of the island al-Ḥallānīya in the archipelago of Kuria Muria, off the southeastern coast of Oman. He analyses, etymologically and grammatically, data obtained by interviewing one of the most prominent elders of the island. In the article that follows, we remain in Oman, where Roberta Morano conducted her field research on Arabic dialects in al-ṢAwābī district. She devotes her text to the expression of possession in this vernacular and focuses on the syntactic use and occurrence of the analytic genitive compared with the synthetic one. Aziza Al-Essa’s article draws attention to Arabic interdentals and processes of variation and change affecting them, particularly in Saudi Arabia. Assaf Bar-Moshe describes, using the example of
the Jewish Arabic dialect of Baghdad, a construction called The Argument Flagging and Indexing Construction (AFIC). He shows that the AIFC is more frequent in use in this dialect than in any other modern dialect known today. Letizia Cerqueglini deals with internal variations in the dialects of the Muṭallaṭ region. She describes such issues as anaptyctic vowels, presentative forms, personal pronouns, final imāla, pausal forms, lexical items etc. Meanwhile, Liesbeth Zack presents two theories on the origin of vowels in the pronominal suffixes after two consonants in Cairene Arabic. She uses grammars and textbooks from the 19th century, which cite two sets of such suffixes: -aha, -ukum, -uhum, and -iha, -ikum, -ihum. Then we move to Morocco with three articles. Mina Afkir, discusses zero-marked nouns and how to delimit depictive secondary predicates from adverbials in Moroccan Arabic. Peter Behnstedt, without doubt the most important dialect geographer of the Arabic language, describes his language atlas of Morocco. He discusses the circumstances that surrounded its rejection and opportunities offered by latest publications. The third text on Moroccan dialects, by Felipe Benjamin Francisco, is a short description of the current situation of the Jewish Arabic dialect of Essaouira, showing that the levelling process towards the Muslim dialect has not been completed, as linguistic characteristics specific to the Jewish dialect have been preserved. The first part of the book closes with three texts on the Maltese dialects of Gozo. Ruben Farrugia focuses on acoustic measurements and accounts for the quality of vowels present in the vowel systems of two dialects—Sannati and Naduri. Maciej Klimiuk deals with vowel length in Maltese and Gozitan dialects and postulates that in rural Gozitan dialects, it is phonetic, not phonological.

In the last article, Maria Lipnicka focuses on pausal diphthongisation in Gozitan dialects, comparing this phenomenon with pausal forms in the Arabic dialect of Zahlé in Lebanon.

The second part of the book contains texts recorded in dialects and languages from the following towns, regions or countries: al-Ḥallānīya (Giuliano Castagna), Arabkhane and Khalaf (Volkan Bozkurt), Khuzestan (Bettina Leitner), Sarāb (Ulrich Seeger), Ṭaybe (Letizia Cerqueglini), Damascus (Maciej Klimiuk), Harran-Urfa (Stephan Procházka and İsmail Batan), il-Kāf (Veronika Ritt-Benmimoun), Essaouira (Felipe Benjamin Francisco), Mauritania (Peter Behnstedt and Ahmed-Salem Ould Mohamed-Baba), and Sannat (Maciej Klimiuk and Ruben Farrugia).

The publication of the volume has been supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) under the programme ‘Kleine Fächer – Große Potenziale’ through the project ‘GozoDia: Gemeinschaftsorientierte dialektologische Studien zur Sprachdynamik der Insel Gozo (Malta),’ grant no. 01UL1834X.

Maciej Klimiuk
Heidelberg, April 2022
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<td>PTCP.PASS</td>
<td>participle passive</td>
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<td>REF</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC</td>
<td>synthetic genitive construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š2STEM</td>
<td>second causative/reflexive verbal stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1STEM</td>
<td>first reflexive verbal stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>vowel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I: Studies
Lexikalische Kreativität in den arabischen Dialekten: „blind“

**ABSTRACT** The notion ‘blind’ is commonly rendered into Arabic with اَعْمَأ. Besides this omnipresent word, both in Classical and in the modern spoken Arabic, a number of other words are in use, such as كَافِف, مَكْفُع, دَارِي, دَافِن, فَاغِز, مَعاَزِر, تَاسِس, etc., see the WAD I map 69. Many of these developed from a euphemistic paraphrase consisting of a general term for deficiencies and defects combined with a specifying noun telling in which respect these deficiencies occur. The original euphemistic expressions consist of two items, but this number is reduced by ellipsis to one item only. This semantic pathway has been described in Blank-LB (282ff.) and Blank-LS (89, 105) and was termed lexical absorption. Another case is the word تَاسِس, which started as an expressive term reinforcing the meaning of اَعْمَأ, and the whole expression, too, underwent this lexical absorption, but in a different way. The present article tries to apply this concept of lexical absorption to these words meaning ‘blind’ in Arabic in some detail. Moreover, some loanwords are discussed briefly, as well as some cases of metonymic contiguity.

**KEYWORDS** semantic paths, euphemism, lexical absorption, ellipsis, expressivity, metonymic contiguity, Arabic dialectology

Für den Begriff „blind“ findet sich in den arabischen Dialekten nicht nur die bekannte und omnipräsente Bezeichnung اَعْمَأ,1 sondern auch eine Reihe von Lexemen, die die Bedeutung „blind“ aus anderen Wurzeln entwickelt haben. Diese wurden, soweit uns damals bekannt, im Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte, Band I auf Karte 69 vorgestellt

---

1 Nachgewiesen für Malta, Mauretanien, den Maghreb, Ägypten, den Sinai, den Negev, Palästina, Anatolien, Irak, Saudi-Arabien/Dōsiri, Bahrayn, Golf-Gebiet, Oman, Jemen, Sudan, Tschad, Mali, Nigeria, Ki-Nubi (WAD I 196 f.). Gelegentlich findet man anstelle von اَعْمَأ auch eine partizipiale Neubildung zum Verb شَيْمَى, يَيْمَا nach dem Schema CaCCān, etwa اَعْمَا. (HB 603b; Hill 34, Ta-Pe 232b), Tschad اَميِن (Jull 147a), Juba اَميِن (Sm-A 8a). In anderen Fällen kommt es infolge der phonologischen Eigenheiten des betreffenden Dialekts zu leicht veränderten Formen, so etwa اَمِن in Mittelägypten und اَماَرّييَا (Woi-MÄ 61; Drop-Woi 89), Salalah/Dhofar اَميِن (FB), Irak/Busra اَمِن (Mahdi 135).

Man kann aʕmā wohl als die orthophemistische Bezeichnung sehen, zu der sich andere gesellen, die unter Umständen mit leicht verschiedenen Nuancen der Bedeutung auftreten und in anderen Registern angesiedelt sind. Im älteren Arabischen der Form, wie sie uns im Klassischen (KA) überliefert ist, empfand man aber den direkten Gebrauch von aʕmā als grob und wenig rücksichtsvoll, was dazu motivierte, anstelle von aʕmā eine Anzahl von verhüllenden, euphemistischen Bezeichnungen zu gebrauchen (Fischer 426, 430 f.). Der Weg zu einer neuen Bezeichnung führte hier über einen Euphemismus, als solche nennt Fischer (426, 430 f.) die Wörter baṣīr, ḏarīr, makfūf/kafīf, ḏaʕīf, ṭāğīz, maʕḏūr. Diese finden wir auch in den heutigen Dialekten in teilweise abweichender Gestalt wieder.


## 1 Arabische Wurzeln

Wie einleitend erwähnt, liegt von den Wörtern, die neue Bezeichnungen im Wortfeld „blind“ darstellen, ein bedeutender Teil auch im klassischen Lexikon vor. Da es um dieselben semantischen Pfade geht, werden Ausdrücke, die sowohl im KA als auch in

---


3 Nicht nur Rücksichtnahme und Vermeidung von Affront sind hier anzuführen, sondern auch das Bedürfnis, durch Nichtnennung von Worten, die unerwünschte Ereignisse bezeichnen, deren Auftreten abzuwenden, apotropäische Zwecke also. Siehe Wetzstein (S. 312). Nicht umsonst beeilt man sich, bei der Erwähnung negativer Erscheinungen, vor denen man sich selbst oder die Angesprochenen bewahren möchte, Ausdrücke wie ilbiʕīd, iltabʕād hinterherzuschicken. Also erwähnt man sie besser gleich gar nicht, um nichts herbeizureden.


1.1 Lexikalische Absorption

Grundlage der lexikalischen Absorption ist die syntaktische Kontiguität zweier Lexeme. In unserem Zusammenhang sind hier zwei Syntagmen zu nennen. Zunächst die uneigentliche Genitivverbindung mit einem Adjektiv als Regens, dessen Bezug durch ein Nomen eingeschränkt und spezifiziert wird (Genitiv der Spezifikation). Es geht dabei um eine Paraphrase, die euphemistischen Zwecken dient und die hier

---

4 Paul (§ 61 84 ff.) bezeichnet diesen Vorgang als „Übergang einer okkasionellen Bedeutung in das Usuelle.“
5 Mit den Worten von Blank-NM: „Euphemistic and expressive words are subject to a general tendency: their veiling and drastic-hyperbolic power weakens the more frequently they are used. [...] the expressivity or the euphemistic character totally wears away and new euphemisms or expressive words have to be created.“ (Blank-NM 82).
6 Ein „frame“ ist eine prototypische Situation oder ein prototypischer Handlungsablauf, wie er im mentalen Lexikon gespeichert ist (Blank-LS 54 ff.; Blank-LB 86 ff.). Er besteht aus einzelnen Elementen, die durch „das gemeinsame Auftreten bzw. die direkte Abfolge oder logische Aufeinanderbezogenheit“ gekennzeichnet sind (Blank-LS 56 f.). Durch das Auftreten eines Elements werden die anderen mit diesem assoziierten Elemente ins Gedächtnis gerufen.
exemplarisch unter kafif, makfüf behandelt wird. Sodann das Syntagma mit einem Adjektiv und darauffolgendem Attribut, das expressiven Zwecken dient, hier unter tasīs besprochen.

– kafif, makfüf: Diese Ableitungen von der Wurzel √kff in ihrer Bedeutung „abhalten, eindämmen, einschränken, hindern, zurückhalten“ sind über die gesamte arabo-phone Welt verteilt und liegen auch im KA vor:  

kafat Mauretanien kff (FB); Marokko kff (termé poli) (De Premare T. 10, 608), so auch zahlreich belegt in Behnstedts Fragebögen (Beh-EM); Algerien keff (Beau 870b; Belka 44); Tunesien/Takrouna kff („aveugle, employé avec une valeur semi-euphémistique“) (Març-T 3445); Libyen kff/akff (Griff 51); Ägypten kafif (HB 765a; NMÄ 2 BW-4 418b); Syrien kafif (Barth 722); Palästina kafif (plus allusif, délicat) (Elihai 57a); Saudi-Arabien/Dōsīrī čifīf (Kurp 285); Irak/Baṣra kafif (Mahdi 71).

makfüf Ägypten makfüf (HB 765a); Sudan makfüf (Qāsim 848a) als fushā-sūdānī gekennzeichnet; Palästina makfüf (milder als aʿma) (Bauer 62b), makfüf (plus allusif, délicat) (Elihai 57a).

kafif und makfüf gelten allgemein als die höflicheren und rücksichtsvoller Be-zeichnung und gehören damit einem höheren Register an als aʿma. Was kafif im Äg., Syr., Pal. und in Baṣra betrifft, so dürften diese der Schriftsprache entlehnt sein, da sonst kifīf/kff/akff/čff oder Ähnliches zu erwarten wären. Bei letzteren Formen handelt es sich wohl um länger bestehende Entlehnungen, die phonologische Weiterentwicklungen des Dialekts mitgemacht haben. Auch im KA dient die Wurzel √kff als Quelle für euphemistische Ausdrücke für „blind“, und makfüf wird mit aʿmā gleichgesetzt (Lisān 3903c).

Was die semantische Seite angeht, so sieht diese Entwicklung auf den ersten Blick aus wie eine generalisierende Synekdoche (totum pro parte) mit dem Konzept „zurückgehalten, eingeschränkt sein“ als Quelldomäne, die einer Bedeutungsver-engung unterliegt. Dies wäre aber nur eine Beschreibung des „was?“, also des Vor- zustands (generell) und des Endzustands (speziell), aber keine Erklärung für das „wie?“, nämlich die Art und Weise, wie die Bedeutungsverengung zustande kam.

7 Zu mistakaff „blind“ siehe unten.
8 Dialekte wie das Mittelägyptische, in denen die Nominalform KaKīk mit vortonigem /a/ erhalten ist, lassen einen solchen Schluss nicht zu, und die Frage, ob Entlehnung oder nicht, muss im Fall von kafif somit offenbleiben. Wenn in Baṣra [k] „often inexplicably retained“ (Mahdi 71) und nicht [ʃ] geworden ist, dann weil es sich bei den angeführten Beispielen, darunter kafif, um rezentere Entlehnungen aus der Schriftsprache handelt.
9 In Grotzfeld (102 ff.) exemplarisch für das Damaszenische beschrieben.
Einen Weg zur Beantwortung der Frage nach dem „wie?“ bietet der Rückgriff auf das Konzept der lexikalischen Absorption mit nachfolgender Ellipse (Blank-LS 89, 105; Blank-LB 282 ff.). Zu Grunde liegt die euphemistische Paraphrase *kaffā* ~ *kuffa baṣaruhu* „seine Sehkraft wurde behindert, zurückgehalten“ (Lisān 3903c; Bib-Kaz 909b) bzw. die daraus als uneigentliche Genitivverbindung gebildete Phrase *makfūf al-baṣar*¹⁰ „eingeschränkt hinsichtlich des Blickes“ (Lisān 3903c; Wehr-Kr 800b). *makfūf* „eingeschränkt“, syntaktisch gesehen das Regens dieser Genitivverbindung, ist direkt mit dem Genitivattribut *al-baṣar* „Blick“ verbunden, das semantisch gesehen den Fokus des Regens spezifiziert oder, wenn man so will, einengt auf den „Blick“ und damit auf das „Sehen“. Aufgrund der syntaktischen Kontiguität von „eingeschränkt, Blick“ ergibt sich für den Hörer „blind“ als Gesamtbedeutung der Phrase.


Schematisch dargestellt:

```
\[\begin{align*}
\text{aīma} & \text{ „blind“} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} ∧} \\
\text{euph. Paraphrase} & \text{ \hspace{1cm} *makfūf* + *albaṣar*} \\
& \text{„eingeschränkt“ + „Blick“} \\
\text{Genitivverbindung} & \text{ *makfūf al-baṣar*} \\
\text{Gesamtbdeutung} & \text{ „blind“} \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Ellipse} & \text{ *makfūf*} \\
& \text{ „blind“}
\end{align*}\]
```

*darīr* findet sich im Palästinensischen (Bauer s. v. „blind“); auch in Ägypten als *darīr* (HB 521b; BW-4 274b), ebenso im Sudan (Tam-Pe 232b; Hill 34; Wor 26), im Libanon (EM), in Saudi-Arabien/Mekka (FB); im Tschad als *darīr* (Jull 371a);

¹⁰ Für KA scheint in erster Linie *makfūf* belegt zu sein (*makfūf al-baṣar = darīr*, Lisān 3903c). Zum Auftreten von *kaffīf* in späterem Arabisch siehe Fischer (431 Fn. 2). Der hier beschriebene Weg für *makfūf* zur Bedeutung „blind“ gilt ebenso für das gleichbedeutende *kaffīf*. 
im Irak als ḍarīr (Woo-Bee 279a), desgleichen im Golf-Gebiet (Holes 310a), und in Ramalla (West-Bank, See-R 150,4). In Syrien gilt ḍarīr als „mot savant, terme euphémistique“ (Barth 458). Auch für Nordafrika ist es belegt, und zwar als „terme poli“ in der Form dārēr (Marokko, De Premare T. 8, 184) mit Überkompensierung des unbetonten kurzen Vokals in vortoniger Silbe, wodurch es sich als Entlehnung aus der Schriftsprache erweist. Letzteres gilt wohl auch, wenn man der Transkription trauen darf, für algerisch dērīr (Belka 44; Beau 588a), dessen vortoniger Vokal eigentlich elidiert sein sollte. Wahrscheinlich ist ḍarīr rezenter als kafīf übernommen worden, denn es findet sich – im Gegensatz zu kafīf und baṣīr – nirgends ein Beleg für eine Form mit Elision des vortonigen Vokals, das heißt für eine Form, die die phonologische Entwicklung eines Dialekts mitgemacht hätte.

Lane sieht ḍarīr auch im KA als Euphemismus und nennt es „a more respectful epithet than ʿalma“, mit der Bedeutung „blind; harmed by the loss of an eye, diseased“ (Lane 1777a). Der Zusammenhang mit der Basisbedeutung der Wurzel √ḍrr „verletzt, beschädigt“ ist deutlich: „beschädigt hinsichtlich des Auges“, und die semantische Entwicklung dürfte dem gleichen Pfad gefolgt sein wie oben bei makfūf/kafīf beschrieben.


fi nafsaha ilbitt ilmaṣūna btitdḥak ʕalayya, ṭab taṣāli hina warrīni. Sayyida waṭṭit ʕalēha ʔāmit ilmaṛa lʕamya daʕbisit fi sidraha „Umm Sayyida, die blind war, sagte sich: Das verdammte Mädchen will mich reinlegen. Gut, komm mal her, lass mich mal sehen! Sayyida beugte sich zu ihr hin, da begann die blinde Frau ihre Brust zu befummeln“ (Muš 13,3). Um eine eindeutige Verbindung mit dem Begriff „blind“ herzustellen, wird ʕāgiz mit naẓar wie in ʕāgiz naẓar „blind“ oder mit bi ʕēnēh wie in ʕāgiz bi ʕēnēh (Spiro 1923)


- ṭasīs „aveugle“ ist im Libanon synonym zu aʃma (Chak-Mil 71b), auch tsīs = al-ʕamā (Frayха 112b). Syrisch ṭasīs wird als „schwachsichtig“ = al-ʔibṣār aḍ-ḍaʕīf (Yāsīn 977) erklärt und dort als Infinitiv des Verbs ṭass, yṭəss = ʔabṣara qalīlan „schwach sehen“ analysiert und könnte so zu den Fällen der metonymischen Kontiguität gezählt werden. Im Jemen gibt es ṭasīs als „blindness“ (Pia 304a) sowie als „Dunkelheit“ (Beh 775).

Für Syrien ist das Verb ṭass, yṭəss „voir“ (Barth 478) bzw. ṭass „to see“ (Hava 432b; Lewin 217a11) belegt, allerdings nur in Verbindung mit einer Negation. Man ist daher zunächst versucht, die Bedeutung von ṭasīs „blind“ auf Antiphrasis zurückzuführen,12 was eine Parallele zu baṣīr (siehe unten) wäre.

Es ist aber auch ein anderer Entwicklungspfad denkbar, für den die expressive Phrase aʃma ṭasīs = ṭaṣdīd al-ʕamā Yāsīn (1977), also etwa „stockblind“, einen Anhaltspunkt liefert. Eine Ausgangsbetüchung „schwachsichtig“ für ṭasīs ergibt hier wenig Sinn. Yāsīn führt ṭasīs hier auf ein altsyrisches tsīço zurück, das er mit arab. musaffaḥ „gepanzert, mit (Metall-)Platten verkleidet“ (Wehr-Kr 522b) übersetzt. tsīço enthält das Zeichen {ç}, das in der Transkriptionsliste (Yāsīn 5) fehlt. Man


12 Bei /ṣ/ in ṭaṣṣ gegenüber /s/ in ṭasīs handelt es sich lediglich um eine Notationsvariante, die Wurzel ist in beiden Fällen √ṭss.
kann es als altsyri. ṭsīsō interpretieren, das in den Wörterbüchern selbst nicht zu finden ist, wohl aber die Wurzel ʿtss, die im II. Stamm ein tasses „metallum in bracteas tutudit, laminis texit“ bildet (Brock-LS 136b)\(^1\), passiv als ethpaśzial „to be beaten into thin plates“ (Pa-Sm 177b). Die Wurzel scheint also mit „schlägen, stoßen, pressen“ zu tun zu haben, was mit „blind“ zusammenhängen könnte, siehe unten. Es bliebe aber auffällig, dass /s/ einmal mit {s} und einmal mit {ç} transliteriert wird, was doch auf zwei verschiedene Laute hindeutet. Aber muss hier das Altsyrische bemüht werden?

Auf den Begriff „schlagen, stoßen etc.“ bringen uns nämlich auch die idiomatischen Ausdrücke, die al-Barģūṭī\(^1\) in seinem Wörterbuch des Palästinensischen Arabisch verzeichnet (Barģ s. v. ṭs), und die zeigen, wie sich der Begriff „schlagen, stoßen“ (tass)\(^1\) mit den Begriffen „Blindheit“, „Auge“ verbunden: sama yṭussak „Blindheit soll dich schlagen!“,\(^1\) tassasit il‘ēn = ramidat ramadan ūaddan „es hat sich stark entzündet“. Ähnlich äg. yittass fi naqaru „may he be stricken blind!“, itṭassēt fi naẓarak? „have you been blinded?“ (HB 539b). Man kann daher aɪma ṭasis als aɪma „blind“, versehen mit einem Intensifier ṭasis „geschlagen, gestoßen“ auffassen, also etwa als „durch Blindheit geschlagen“. Syntaktisch entspricht dies Phrasen wie äg. sakṛān ṭīna „stockbesoffen“, ērīyān malṭ „splitternackt“, also einem Adjektiv mit einem folgenden Substantiv als Intensifier. Der Beweggrund zur Bildung solcher Phrasen ist hier nicht euphemistischer, sondern expressiver Art, sie dienten der Verstärkung des semantischen Inhalts des Adjektivs. Wie bei der oben angeführten Form der lexikalischen Absorption übernimmt die gesamte Phrase diese intensivierte Bedeutung, das heißt der Begriff „blind“ geht von sama auch auf ṭasis über. Es ist der gleiche Vorgang, den Blank „Absorption ins Determinans“ nennt (Blank-LS 90, 105), nur dass es hier nicht um ein Determinans, sondern um einen Intensifier geht. Expressive Phrasen dieser Art nützen sich in der „semantischen Tretmühle“ gleichermaßen wie Euphemismen ab und es kommt zu dem semantisch einfachen Konzept „blind“. Der syntaktisch komplexen Phrase steht semantisch ein einfaches Konzept gegenüber, was Anlass gibt, die syntaktische Komplexität durch Ellipse von sama zu beseitigen. So bleibt ṭasis als „blind“ übrig.\(^1\)

\(^{13}\) Mit Dank an Werner Diem für diesen Hinweis.

\(^{14}\) Mit Dank an Ulrich Seeger für den Hinweis auf Barģūṭīs Wörterbuch.

\(^{15}\) Auch im Libanesischen „frapper, cogner“ (Chak-Mil 378b im arab.-franz. Teil).

\(^{16}\) Vgl. auch die deutschen und englischen Phrasen „mit Blindheit geschlagen/struck by blindness."

1.2 Redefiguren: Antiphrase und Metapher

- *baṣîr* kann im KA, neben seiner eigentlichen Bedeutung „sehend, scharfsichtig“, auch als „an epithet applied to ‘A blind man’...“ gebraucht werden (Lane 211b; auch Lisân 291c,2 f.). Auch der Prophet soll *baṣîr* auf diese Weise verwendet haben (Fischer 426 ff.). Fischer sieht hierin zu Recht die rhetorische Figur (Trope) der Antiphrasis,18 die aus euphemistischen Gründen eingesetzt wird.

Wir finden *baṣîr* insbesondere im Maghreb als *bṣîr*, *bṣēr*, das dort als euphemistisch gilt (De Premare T. 1, 243; Agu 277). Es ist ferner nachgewiesen für Libyen/Tripoli (FB; Stu-TR 290; Per-TR 171). In Tunesien/Sousse findet sich *bṣîr* (Talmudi 40, 114); in Algerien *bṣîr*, „aveugle, borgne, qui ne voit pas clair“ (Beau 57a); in Marokko *bṣîr* (Har-Sob 12b, 22b; Agu-Ben 210b), bei den Zaër „on préfère l’euphémisme *bṣyr*“ (Loub 502b s. v. *aʃma*); in Casablanca *bṣîr* (FB); im Ḥassaniyya *baṣîr*, „aveugle, qui ne voit pas clair“ (Tai-Chei 27b). Fischer hatte seinerzeit nur Belege aus Nordafrika zur Verfügung und schreibt: „In den heutigen arabischen Dialekten des Ostens ist dagegen die antiphrastische Verwendung von *baṣîr* m. W. noch nicht nachgewiesen worden.“ (Fischer 434,27). Hundert Jahre später hat sich unsere Datenbasis sehr erweitert und *baṣîr*, „blind“ lässt sich auch für den Iraq/Baghdad (Woo-Bee 36a), für Golf-Arabisch (Qaf 45a) sowie für den Libanon (Chak-Mil 71b) nachweisen. Allerdings ist nicht auszuschließen, dass es sich dabei um Entlehnungen aus der Schriftsprache handelt, wenn auch die Bedeutung „blind“ für *baṣîr* sich nicht in Wehr-Kr findet.19 Quellen für andere Regionen melden *baṣîr* nur als „voyant, clairvoyant“, etwa für Syrien (Barth 46). Im Algerischen Arabisch (Algier, Tlemsen, Constantine) bezeichnet *baṣîr* auch den Einäugigen (Març-E 433; Beau 57a).

- *abu munduru* „seeing in daytime, not at night“ (= nachtblind),20 belegt in Bornu (Lethem s. v. „blind“), ansonsten nicht belegt, könnte zur Wurzel √ṇdr ( = *ṇdr*) „sehen“ gebildet sein und seine Bedeutung durch Antiphrasis bekommen haben.

- *mistakaff*

Das Wort *mistakaff* für „blind“ ist im Oberägyptischen belegt (OÄ3): *wu baʕadēn min sūʔ ḥaẓẓa inn kānat ḡaddata diyya mistakaffa* „Es gehörte zu seinem Unglück,
dass seine Großmutter blind war.“ (Woi-H 235,12). Das KA Verb istakaffa „die Augen mit der Hand beschatten“ (Lisān 3903a; Bib-Kazi 909b; Wehr-Kr 800a) gehört zu kaff „Handfläche“ und ist als „seine Handfläche gegen die Augen legen, um sie vor der Sonne zu schützen“ zu verstehen, was die Sicht in gewisser Weise einschränkt. Diese Ausdrucksweise wurde als euphemistische Metapher für „blind“ benutzt, wie das obige Beispiel zeigt. Man vergleiche mittelarabisches mahḡūb „verschleiert“ für „Blinder“ (Naam 490; Lane 516c [nach Ṣiḥāḥ I 107b,-5 al-mahḡūb = ad-ḍarīr]), dort als „understatement“ aufgefasst.

1.3 Metonymische Kontiguität

Einen weiteren Pfad zu einem Bedeutungswandel stellt die metonymische Kontiguität dar. Eine Bezeichnung kann die Bedeutung einer anderen Bezeichnung bekommen, wenn beide im selben Feld/„frame“ stehen und auf Grund unseres Weltwissens ein Zusammenhang zwischen den beiden erkennbar ist, wie dies bei verschiedenen visuellen Defekten der Fall ist. So können Bezeichnungen für solche Defekte für „blind“ eintreten, zunächst zu euphemistisch umschreibenden, nur andeutenden Zwecken. Dabei ist es dem Hörer überlassen, die Schlussfolgerung zu ziehen, dass „blind“ gemeint ist, was dieser auf Grund seines Weltwissens auch tut. Diese Interpretation wird bei größerer Frequenz des Gebrauchs der Metapher habitualisiert und lexikalisiert. Beispiele dafür finden sich auch in den arabischen Dialekten:

- aḥwal
  Algerisch {ahoul} = aḥwal „aveugle“21 (Bussy 75,3; 302,4), normalerweise „schielend“ neben {āāma} = ʿaṣma (Bussy 75,2). Vgl. unten Chaouen ʿwar „bizco, ciego“ „schielend“ und „blind“ (Mosc 367), eigentlich „einäugig“.22

- ʿgamaš
  Oman/Bahlā ʿgamaš „blind“ (Internetbeleg)23, das sich zu KA ʿgams „bad eyesight (because of hunger and thirst)“ (Lisān 3298b), MSA „Ambliopie, Schwachsichtigkeit“ stellen lässt, vgl. Hadramaut {ḏmš} „troubler les yeux“ (Lan-H 453, 671), und äg. ʿaṣmaš „purblind, dim-sighted“ (HB).

21 Allerdings ḥwel, „loucheon, personne qui louche“ (Madouni 146b), ebenso (Beau 255b; Beau-S 67a) und auch marokk. nur als „louche“ belegt.


23 Sablat ʿUmān, https://avb.s-oman.net/showthread.php?t=1216751&page=21 (Zugriff am 01.06.2020 und 05.08.2021), dort das epexegetische w anā ʿgamaš mà bašūf „ich bin blind und sehe nicht“.
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– **āṭmaš**

Zu ʿāṭmaš in Riǧāl Almaʕ/Saudi-Arabia (FB) vgl. liban. ūṭamaš „ignore, fermer les yeux“ (Chak-Mil 382b; Barth 486), „die Augen verbinden“ (Frayḥa 114b). Ferner gehören hierher wohl KA ṭamasā „to loose the glance, lustre, brightness (eye, glance)“ (Hava 438b), āṭmaš/ṭamīs „a blind man“ und ṣayānūn ṭāmisun „an eye of which the sight is going or gone“ (Lane 1881b). ṭamasā = ḏahaba baṣaraḥu (Lisān 2704a), kontaminiert mit den Wurzeln √gmš oder √fmš; vgl. noch syro-lib. ĭoms „ce qui se ne voit pas, ce qui est caché“ (Deni 334). All dies sind Bezeichnungen aus dem Feld „visuelle Defekte“, die man als Euphemismus für „blind“ einsetzen kann.

– **aʕwar**

In diesem Zusammenhang sind auch Bezeichnungen für „einäugig“ wie aʕwar anzuführen, das KA nur „blind on one eye; one-eyed“ (Lane 2195b) bedeutet. In den Dialekten ist dies zwar im Allgemeinen auch nur als „einäugig“ belegt, etwa für Zaër īwar „borgne“ (Loub 504b), äg. aʕwar etc., es findet sich aber in Marokko mancherorts (Bni Yazğa) als „aveugle (= ūma, bsēr)“ (De Premare T. 9, 284), īwar „borgne, aveugle“ (COL Bd. 5 1347), dagegen Chaouen īwar „bizco, ciego“ (Mosc 367) also „schieelend“ und „blind“. Gleiches gilt für Algerien: in Djidjelli (Març-Dj 348, 351), Oran (FB) und Tiemcen (FB) bedeutet aʕwar „einäugig“ und „blind“, und auch in einem Sprachführer findet sich īwar s. v. „aveugle“ und „borgne“ (ALP 153b, 154b). Auch im Sinai finden wir das Substantiv ʿawārah „blindness; one-eyedness“ (Stewart 201b).

Dagegen wird für den Oman aʕwar allein als „blind“ angegeben: īwar (Reinhardt 63), īwar (Reinhardt 8), aʕwar (Brockett 163), īwar (Davey 253), eigenartigerweise bei letzterem dazu īwar/ʔawār „one-eyed“ mit /ʔ/. Auch in Zypern/Kormakiti findet sich aʕwar „blind“ (Borg 348), dort wird auch innerhalb des semitischen Kontexts auf altsyr. ʾawār und ʾūr „blind“ (Nöldeke I 33) hingewiesen, siehe auch noch ʾrawār „caecus“ (Brock-LS s. v.).25 Die Frage stellt sich, ob aʕwar „blind“ aus „einäugig“ im Oman auf metonymische Kontiguität zurückgeht oder einem aramäischen Hintergrund zugeschrieben werden kann.


---

24 Innerhalb des KA zeigt ūṭamaš „become effaced, or obliterated“ (Lane 1880c) den gleichen semantischen Pfad wie √dr, siehe oben. Die Quelldomäne ist auch hier „Schaden, Mangel“.

25 Vgl. dazu in der heutigen Schriftsprache: al-maʕy al-ʔawār für „Blinddarm“ (Wehr-Kr 652b), nicht „einäugiger Darm“. 
2 Entlehnungen

Wie viele Sprachgemeinschaften verfügt auch die arabische über einen einfachen Weg, abwertende oder als zu grob empfundene Bezeichnungen zu vermeiden, indem sie in einem höheren Register, etwa der Schriftsprache, zugehörige Äquivalente an deren Stelle setzen und sie als Euphemismus verwenden. Derartiges ist nichts Ungewöhnliches und lässt sich mit dem Gebrauch lateinischer oder griechischer Termini in Sprachen der westlichen Kultur vergleichen. In gleicher Weise können auch in den heute gesprochenen Dialekten, wenn aʕma als zu direkt und unpassend angesehen wird, dafür kafīf, makfūf, darīr, baṣīr eintreten, als offensichtliche Entlehnungen aus der Schriftsprache, siehe oben.26

Auch Entlehnungen aus anderen, als prestigeträchtig erachteten Sprachen können auf diese Weise gebraucht werden; ein wohl in allen Sprachgemeinschaften übliches Verfahren. Der WAD I (Karte 69) meldet hier für „blind“ nur zwei Fälle, bei denen offensichtlich eine Entlehnung vorliegt: das in den Fragebögen zu Nordmarokko genannte twērta „blind“ (FB), das auf das spanische tuerto „einäugig“ zurückgeht, sowie kör „blind“ in Anatolien/Hasköy (Talay 57,9), worin unschwer das gleichbedeutende türkische kör zu erkennen ist. Die Frage, ob solche Entlehnungen orthophemistisch gebraucht werden, also aʕma oder ein anderes Wort ersetzt haben, oder als Euphemismus, der bei der Abfrage durch den Explorator der Höflichkeit halber angegeben wurde, bleibt zu klären.


3 Zweifelhafte Fälle


---

26 Manche Wörterbücher und Glossare verzeichnen den euphemistischen Charakter dieser Entlehnungen ausdrücklich, etwa wenn L. Bauer für das Palästinensische darīr und makfūf als „milder als aʔma“ angibt (Bauer s. v. „blind“), auch Elihai s. v. „aveugle“. Ähnliche Bemerkungen finden sich auch in Wörterbüchern anderer Dialekte. Dies heißt nicht, dass aʔma verschwunden ist, es wird nach wie vor gebraucht, aber eben als direkte, und daher weniger rücksichtsvolle Bezeichnung, deren direkte Nennung aber gefährlich sein könnte, siehe Fn. 3.
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Irak mit „confuse, scatter-minded“ (Woo-Bee s. v.), so auch im KA (Lane 365c). Vgl. auch یَ تَوِلّا „vieille femme décrépite un peu tocquée“ in der Daṭīna (Lane-D 256).


– akmah ist neben ẓarīr für Bahrayn belegt (Holes 310a, 466b). Für Ägypten wird akmah zwar zusammen mit ʿaʾma, ʾamyān und ẓarīr s. v. „aveugle“ angeführt (Bocthor 93b), doch erscheint dies zweifelhaft. Eher dürfte hier eine Entlehnung aus dem KA vorliegen. Im KA bezeichnet akmah „blind, blindgeboren (auch nachtblind)“ (WKAS 367b). Im Lisān findet sich kamiha baṣarahu und kamihati šāmsu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʕalathu ʔiḍa ʿaw ġarāma (Qāsim 906a) glossiert steht. Davon ausgehend würde man auch den öfters belegten Pfad „geschädigt“ > „blind“ annehmen können. Andererseits ist für layyas auch die Bedeutung „to plaster“ belegt (Tam-Pe 127b), ähnlich äg. „to stop up or seal up (with mud)” (HB 807a), was ebenfalls als Quelldomäne vorstellbar ist, aus der sich die Bedeutung „blind“ über eine metaphorische Verwendung ergeben haben kann. Ebenfalls denkbar ist die Wurzel ʿlwṣ als Ausgangspunkt, die ein Verb lāṣa oder ʿlwṣ „(durch die Türritze od. ein Loch) spähen“ (Wehr-Kr 844b), ʿlwṣ „to look intently on“ (Hava) bildet, so dass eine Antiphrasis vorliegen könnte. Die Wurzel ʿlwṣ ist allerdings für sudanesisches und tschadisches Arabisch nicht in dieser Bedeutung belegt.

Auch der umgekehrte Vorgang wäre für das KA vorstellbar: Ein ursprüngliches kamiha, yakmahu „erblinden“ könnte auch metaphorisch gebraucht werden, wenn die Sonne vom Staub verdunkelt wird. Ob sich solche semantischen Entwicklungen in Bahrayn wirklich so vollzogen haben oder ob es sich um eine Entlehnung aus dem KA handelt, muss hier offen bleiben, da die Wurzel weiter nicht belegt ist. Auch ein aramäisches Erbe wäre denkbar, vgl. dazu altsyr. kamḥā „caecus“ (Brock-LS s. v.).

– līsa „Blinder“ ist außer bei den Šukriyya-Beduinen im Sudan (Reich 132) nirgends belegt. Auf den ersten Blick ist es zur Wurzel ʿlys und zu layyas zu stellen, was im Sudanesischen „jem. Schaden zufügen“ bedeuten kann und mit ʔasābahu bi ẓarar ʔaw ɣarāma (Qāsim 906a) glossiert steht. Davon ausgehend würde man auch den öfters belegten Pfad „geschädigt“ > „blind“ annehmen können. Andererseits ist für layyas auch die Bedeutung „to plaster“ belegt (Tam-Pe 127b), ähnlich äg. „to stop up or seal up (with mud)” (HB 807a), was ebenfalls als Quelldomäne vorstellbar ist, aus der sich die Bedeutung „blind“ über eine metaphorische Verwendung ergeben haben kann. Ebenfalls denkbar ist die Wurzel ʿlwṣ als Ausgangspunkt, die ein Verb lāṣa oder ʿlwṣ „(durch die Türritze od. ein Loch) spähen“ (Wehr-Kr 844b), ʿlwṣ „to look intently on“ (Hava) bildet, so dass eine Antiphrasis vorliegen könnte. Die Wurzel ʿlwṣ ist allerdings für sudanesisches und tschadisches Arabisch nicht in dieser Bedeutung belegt.

28 /s/ für /ṣ/ in līsa erklärt sich dann durch Einfluss des vorangehenden /ī/.
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An Overview of al-Ḥallānīya Place Names

ABSTRACT This paper presents a selection of 30 place names of the island of al-Ḥallānīya in the Kuria Muria archipelago. These data have been obtained by means of elicitation during a semi-structured interview with one of the most prominent elders of the island. Firstly, the scant historical data on the toponomastics of the islands are presented. Subsequently, 25 out of the 30 items are analysed both grammatically and etymologically, and a tentative English translation is provided for each of the analysed place names.

KEYWORDS Modern South Arabian, Kuria Muria, Hallaniyat islands, Jibbali, Shehret, field research

The toponomastics of al-Ḥallānīya, the only inhabited island in the Kuria Muria archipelago (officially known as Ğuzur al-Ḥallānīyāt), is a field which received possibly less attention than the understudied Jibbali/Shehret dialect spoken by the islanders. Indeed, there are records of a good deal of speculation about the origin of the toponym Kuria Muria (Buckingham 1830), as well as that of the other names by which the archipelago has been known: Zenobian islands in the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea (Schoff 1912: 34), Male and Female islands in Marco Polo’s Milione

1 Arabic spelling kūryā mūryā. Also spelt kūryān mūryān, xūryā mūryā and xūryān mūryān.
2 ‘By Kurian-Murian would be meant the islands of Kurian and others around it: as it is common in Arabic, Persian and Hindoostanee, when speaking of several things of the same or a similar kind, to add a word exactly like the name of the thing expressed, except it always begins with an M, as Bundook-Mundook, for musket and all accoutrements thereto belonging; Barsun-Marsun, for plates and dishes, and all the other tableware’ (Buckingham 1830: 434). It can be added here that this figure of speech, akin to paronomasia, is also commonly found in the languages of the Mediterranean-Balkan area. The following examples have been collected by the present author: Turkish saç mac ‘hair and the like,’ Bulgarian водки модки ‘vodka and other liquors,’ Italian ‘cazzi e mazzi ‘various things’ or ‘various annoyances.’
(Cliff 2015: 283–284). In addition to that, Pliny the elder, in his *Naturalis Historia* lists a great number of islands in southern Arabia and provides the names by which they were known to him: among these, we find a few islands that match the position and physical characteristics of the Kuria Muria islands, such as Chelontitis, Deuadæ and Dolicae (Holland 1847 VI: 149). In spite of this, no mention of internal place names of the archipelago can be found in the published literature.

The data presented here proceed from a fieldwork session carried out in April 2017 with a Jibbali/shehret speaker from al-Ḥallānīya, who also provided the text published in this volume (Castagna 2022: 245–253). During a semi-structured interview, the conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee was steered by the interviewer towards the names of specific places in al-Ḥallānīya, which were subsequently elicited with the aid of a physical map of the island. Unfortunately, it was seldom possible to determine the precise location of the places named by the informant, due to his unfamiliarity with maps. However, the place names presented in this paper have been double-checked and confirmed by another collaborator of the present author, who has tribal ties to the island and is considerably more familiar with maps.

The above-mentioned fieldwork session yielded 30 place names, which are listed in Table 1.

The present paper aims at carrying out an etymological analysis of the lexical items which make up the place names and, for the sake of clarity, providing a translation of their meaning. The tentative results thus obtained serve as the means of elaborating on the phonological, morphological and lexical peculiarities of Kuria Muria Jibbali/Shehret encountered, in contrast to mainland varieties.

Firstly, it must be pointed out that al-Ḥallānīya is colloquially referred to as *e-gizīrt ʕamḳés əyɔ́* ‘the island where people are’ by its inhabitants. This probably speaks to the fact that the island in question has been the only inhabited one in the archipelago.

### Table 1. Al-Ḥallānīya place names.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xīżţ ṍ-e-zģár</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>e-nhúr ṭ-rḥóst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>xīżţ ṭ-e-ţe itemprop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>reş eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>xīżţ ṭ-e-gefitemb itemprop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>reş ṭ-e-gemgūt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>xīżţ ṭ-hált itemprop</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>reş maḥābat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>xīżţ ṭ-e-sḥāʕaf itemprop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>šaḥāṭitemb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>xīżţ ġet-tōḥ itemprop</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>xīżţ ṭ-tahlūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>hār ṭ-e-keddōt itemprop</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>xīżţ mištōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>hār axlēf ~ ahlēf itemprop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>xīżţ ġhūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ġadēt ā-gyūt itemprop</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>fokā ṭ-e-ţgīf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>nahûr hendī itemprop</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>xīżţ ġt-e-aśrē ~ ġaṭrē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for a rather long time. Secondly, not all the place names collected are of interest: one of the names islanders use for the main settlement, \textit{mahāl}, is clearly an Arabic loan-word (\textit{maḥall} ‘place, location’).

Most of the place names above contain fixed elements: \textit{ḥār} ‘mountain, hill’ (JL: 111), \textit{n(ə)ḥār} ‘river, wadi,’ probably ultimately akin to Arabic \textit{nahr}, \textit{ḥāt} ‘depression on a mountain’ (JL: 83), \textit{gāt} ‘deep hole, depression’ (JL: 80), \textit{res} ‘head’ (JL: 201), \textit{fəkā} ‘rain pool’ (JL: 55), \textit{ṣayn al-māʔ aḍ-ḍaḥla aš-šaḥīha al-miyāḥ} ‘a shallow and scarce watering place’ (MLẒ: 713). As for \textit{xīżet} \textit{xīżet}, it is a term that in spoken Jibbali/Shehret tends to be used to signify ‘place,’ although this seems to be a recent development, as \textit{Jibbali Lexicon} does not mention it and the \textit{Muʕǧam lisān Žufār} (MLẒ: 307) defines it as \textit{al-xalīǧ aṣ-ṣaġīr; aš-šāṭiʔ ar-ramlī al-wāqiʕ bayn ǧabalayn/mintaqatayn} ‘a small inlet; a sandy beach located between two mountains/areas.’ The two variants may be either singular/plural, or diminutive/non-diminutive respectively. The variant \textit{xīżet} fits into the feminine diminutive pattern (Johnstone 1973: 99; Dufour 2016: 44–45), but \textit{xīżet} does not seem to correspond to a masculine diminutive pattern, which, in the case of the root \textit{x-l-y}, would yield \textit{*xīżē}.

These place names frequently feature a genitive exponent \textit{e-}, which normally coalesces with the definite article \textit{ɛ-} \textit{i-} \textit{ə-} and triggers the elision of /b/ and /m/ at the beginning of a term (Rubin 2014: 308–309): i.e. \textit{ḥār ēnhít} < \textit{ḥār e-e-mənhít}.

Having provided a description of the fixed elements involved, each place name will be now analysed singularly:

1) \textit{xīżet} \textit{ē-zəɣar} contains the term \textit{zəɣar}, which is described in the \textit{Jibbali Lexicon} as ‘kind of bitter, peppery cactus which in an emergency can be chopped up for camel fodder’ (JL: 316). Hence, the place name in question can be translated approximately as ‘place of the \textit{zəɣar} cactus.’

2) \textit{xīżet} \textit{ē-əget} can safely be interpreted as ‘place of the sister’ (JL: 90; MLẒ: 683).

3) \textit{xīżet} \textit{ē-ger bəbəb} contains the term \textit{ger bəbəb} ‘the plain between the sea and the mountains in Dhofar,’ which appears in the \textit{Jibbali Lexicon} as \textit{gerbəb} (JL: 78).

4) The second element in \textit{xīżet} \textit{ēhált} is likely the result of the intervocalic elision of /m/ of \textit{*e-məhəlt}, which can be derived from Arabic \textit{mahal} ‘place of residence’

\footnote{3 The \textit{Jibbali Lexicon} (JL) does not list this term.}
\footnote{4 In the case of place names, this is best translated as ‘cape.’}
\footnote{5 However, compare \textit{xalɛ́} ‘empty place, something empty; loneliness’ (JL: 301) stemming from the same root \textit{x-l-y}.}
\footnote{6 Without the intrusive vowel /a/ which occurs widely in KM, and does not trigger the elision of /b/ (Castagna 2018: 135–137).}
(Wehr & Cowan 1976: 199). Hence, the interpretation of this place name as ‘settlement place’ seems rather unproblematic.7

5) xĭžôt ē-śāʕaf contains the term śāʕaf < śāʕab (see Castagna 2022: 250), which means ‘valley, watercourse’ (JL: 244).

6) The second element in xĭžét ēt-tɔ̄ ḥ may be considered as a nominal form derived from the root t-b-ḥ ‘to swing, to wander off’ (JL: 281). Hence, this place name may be interpreted as ‘place of the wandering.’

7) ḥãr ēk-keddɔ́t exhibits a second element which reflects a feminine diminutive form of kidéd ‘long hill, long ridge’ (JL: 125). Thus, this place name can be interpreted as ‘mountain with a little long ridge.’

8) There are two possible interpretations of ḥãr axlɛ́f ~ aḥlɛ́f (for /ḥ/ < /x/ (see Castagna 2022: 251): it may be either a nominal form derived from the verbal H-stem of the root x-l-f meaning ‘to change, to transhume’ (JL: 299), or an unattested term derived from the same root, but more semantically akin to the term mixiźέf ‘deserted place’ (JL: 299).

9) The second element in ġadɛ́t aġyɔ̃t is a diminutive form of ġām ‘flood’ (MLẒ: 684). Thus, it can be translated as ‘flooded depression.’

10) While nəhûr hendí (literally ‘Indian river’) is rather unproblematic etymologically speaking, this unusual denomination calls for further investigation.

11) The second element in e-nhûr e-rḥɔ̃́ t is, in all likelihood, a diminutive form of erḥût ‘beautiful’ (JL: 210). Thus, this place name may be interpreted as ‘the beautiful little river.’

12) rɛš eb literally translates as ‘big cape.’ The informant who double-checked the present data affirms that this place is also called ras kəbír in Arabic.

13) rɛš e-gemgṹt, whose second element means ‘skull’ (JL: 76), translates as ‘cape skull.’

14) As for rɛš mahábat, its interpretation is less straightforward: the second element seems to be a participial form derived from the root h-b-ṭ whose basic meaning is ‘to swell’ (JL: 102). The non-occurrence of the intervocalic elision of /b/ (Castagna 7 The speaker affirms that this place is located in the vicinity of the harbour, where, in actuality, the main settlement of the island is found.)
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2018: 114–115) points to the presence of an intrusive vowel between C₂ and C₃, but similarly to ḥóboṭ ‘swell at sea’ (Castagna 2018: 227), it seems not to be there. This place name may be translated as ‘swollen cape’ or ‘cape swell.’

15) šaḥāṭót is undoubtedly related to the term šebḥaṭat⁸ ‘sperm whale.’ However, it is not clear whether this form should be considered a diminutive (Johnstone 1973) or a plural form.

16) The second element in xīžêt ṭahlún is related to ḥ-l ‘residue’ ‘mud’ (JL: 276; MLẒ: 578), with the agentive suffix -ūn suffix (Rubin 2014: 36). The place name can then be loosely translated as ‘place full of mud.’

17) xīžêt mištôt contains a problematic second element: the root ṣ-k-w ~ ṣ-k-y⁹ carries the basic meaning of ‘sword’ (JL: 314; MLẒ: 488), hence mištôt would fit into an m-prefixed place pattern¹⁰ and might indicate a ‘place of swords’ or more broadly speaking, a ‘weapon storage.’ However, this term is not attested in the available corpora.

18) xīžêt ḏ[hur contains the element ḏ[hur which should be interpreted as < *e-moḥür. This means ‘raindrops dripping off the trees and bushes’ (JL: 111), and a similar meaning is reported by the Muʿğam lisān Żufār (MLẒ: 267). Therefore, this place name may be interpreted as ‘place of raindrops.’

19) fɔḳá ē-zgif can be quite transparently translated as ‘spring of abundance.’ However, it must be noted that, besides ‘abundance,’ the term zgif can also mean an-nasīm al-ʕalīl ‘a gentle breeze’ (MLẒ: 414).

20) The second element in xīžêt āśrēb ~ āṯrēb¹¹ bears witness to the large number of ticks found on the island. This place name can be interpreted as ‘place of ticks.’

21) xīžôt ē-dafēnôt contains a second element which would be unidentifiable in Jibbali/Shehret. However, a clue for its identification comes from the neighbouring Baṭḥari language, in which dafēnôt indicates a species of small shark.¹²

---

⁸ Informant’s personal communication. JL and MLẒ do not report this term.
¹⁰ This pattern is attested in Jibbali/Shehret (and in MSAL at large), albeit less frequently than in Arabic.
¹² Fabio Gasparini’s personal communication.
22) ḥār ēnhīt, whose second element must be interpreted as a definite form < *e-māhit 'the poor man' (MLẒ: 887), translates as ‘mountain of the poor man.’

23) nḥūr ē-ḥaṭḥōt is rather problematic: the element ḥaṭḥōt seems to be a diminutive form stemming from ḥ-ś-b > ḥāshbé ‘Cucumis Sativus’ (MLẒ: 239; Miller and Morris 1988: 122), with /t/ < /š/, and although it must be pointed out that Cucumis Sativus is not present on al-Ḥallānīya, another closely related species, Cucumis Prophetarum, can be found (Gallagher 2002: 64). Thus, the use of ḥ-ś-b for Cucumis Prophetarum on the part of al-Ḥallānīya islanders is not far-fetched.

24) rɛš ē-kṭenniṭa does not raise any major interpretation issue, as the second element kṭenniṭa is the feminine sound plural of ḫ̣iṭ, meaning al-baqq ‘cimex, bedbug,’ from the root k-t-n (MLẒ: 787). Similarly to xīżet āšreb ~ āṯreb (see above), this place name speaks to the widespread presence of parasitic insects on the island. This is confirmed by Michael Gallagher’s survey of the island, which reports a large number of ticks of the Ornithodoros muesebecki species, as well as an unidentified member of the Solifugae camel spiders (2002: 29).

25) gɔ̃t ąśáʕt. The root m-ś-ʕ has two basic meanings: it can indicate both a ladder/stairway and a type of pot for the storage of butter (MLẒ: 870). Given the proximity of this place to the main harbour and, hence, the settlement, its interpretation as ‘butter storage’ seems to be sensible.

As for the remaining five items in the list above, namely xīżet ēl-lennūt, xīżet ē-tardōt, ḥār ē-šiẓɔḥ and ḥār ē-delatī (and the closely connected nhūr e-delatī), it was not possible, at the present time, to identify their meaning with an acceptable degree of certainty. It goes without saying that the unrecorded historical events of the island (both from a linguistic and a cultural point of view) might easily account for the presence of obscure place names.

One cannot fail to notice an extensive presence of diminutive forms in the toponomastics of al-Ḥallānīya. Currently, however, the semantics of the diminutive in Jibbali/Shehret (as well as in other MSAL) lacks a proper description: Johnstone (1973: 98–99) and Watson (2012: 62) are the only partial accounts of certain properties of the diminutive in these languages.

The raisons d’être of some place names analysed in this paper are obscure, despite their being relatively transparent etymologically, and raise questions with regards to the unwritten history of the island: for example, xīżōt ē-ger-ḇēb (a reference to the plain north of Salalah) and nḥūr hendī.

13 Informant’s personal communication.
Overall, most of the items analysed at this time can be reliably traced back to Modern South Arabian lexical roots (and Semitic in general), although some of them (especially those whose meaning could not be found at this time) call for further study involving other lexical strata of the wider region.14

To this end, a thorough in loco linguistic and anthropological survey of the islands (al-Ḥallānīya in the first place) must be carried out. In all likelihood, this will shed light on the meaning of the place names which have been left undescribed in the present paper, and yield more data.
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The Expression of Possession in the al-ʕAwābī District (Northern Oman)

Abstract Arabic dialects show different ways of expressing possession and ownership. Generally, two main constructions are used: the construct phrase (or synthetic genitive, known in Arabic as iḍāfa), that links together two nouns in a relationship of possessor and possessed, and the analytic genitive, which uses genitive exponents to express possession or relationship between two nouns.

Eksell Harning’s work (1980) is an extensive comparative study of possessive linkers in many different Arabic dialects. However, the sources the author used for Oman were Reinhardt (1894) for the northern part of the country, and Rhodokanakis (1908) for Dhofar (south Oman). More recent studies, including the one by Davey (2016) on Dhofari Arabic, show different behaviour of genitive exponents in both areas. In the al-ʕAwābī district (northern Oman), two main genitive exponents are used, namely māl and ḥāl, indicating two different types of genitive relations.

In this paper, I will outline the syntactic use and occurrence of the analytic genitive compared to the synthetic one in the vernacular of the al-ʕAwābī district, which appear to be different from Reinhardt’s study (1894) and from other Omani varieties. The analysis presented here takes into consideration a cross-dialectal approach and uses data that have been collected during three months of fieldwork in the area, through free speech recordings and direct questions to informants.

Keywords Omani Arabic, Arabic dialectology, syntax, possessive constructions, field research

1 Introduction

When talking about Omani Arabic, two main works come to mind, i.e. Reinhardt’s Ein arabischer Dialekt gesprochen in Omān und Zanzibar (1894) and Rhodokanakis’ Der vulgärarabische Dialekt im Ḥofār (Zfār). I: Prosaische und poetische Texte, Übersetzung und Indices (1908). These works, published at the beginning of the last century, had
been the only sources available on Omani Arabic for a long time, at least until the 1980s when researchers could once again approach the Sultanate.

We cannot forget, however, that Omani Arabic is not a single linguistic entity but rather contains many different varieties, some of which still need to be unveiled. Reinhardt’s (1894) work describes the phonology, morphology and—partially—syntax of the Banū Kharūṣī dialect spoken in the area which today belongs to the district of al-ʕAwābī in northern Oman. His account is not completely reliable due to the lack of supporting data, and more recent works (i.e. Bettega 2019; Morano, Forthcoming) have demonstrated that a consistent part of his original materials are no longer valid today. This is especially true when talking about genitive markers.

This paper examines the use of synthetic genitive and analytic genitive constructions in the dialect spoken by the al-Kharūṣī and al-ʕAbrī tribes in the district of al-ʕAwābī in northern Oman. The aim is to show the syntactic and pragmatic functions which the markers māl and ḥāl convey in the data collected from native speakers in the district. The analysis will also concern the comparison with Reinhardt’s (1894) materials on this matter and will prove that only one of these markers (i.e. māl) really expresses a genitive relation, whereas ḥāl conveys a different function.

After a brief presentation of the data and the methodology used to gather them, the paper looks at the ways of expressing possession in the Arabian Peninsula. It then introduces a discussion on the two constructions usually adopted by modern Arabic dialects to express ownership and possession, i.e. the synthetic genitive—also known in Arabic as ḥālā— and the analytic genitive, which entails the use of genitive markers. The paper will then analyse the specific functions conveyed by the markers māl and ḥāl in the dialect under investigation, demonstrating that the latter cannot be included in the list of genitive markers at least for the al-ʕAwābī district.

2 The data

The material for the present article was obtained during two fieldwork trips made in February–April 2017 and June 2018 and are part of a larger PhD project. The data were collected in the district of al-ʕAwābī, which consists of al-ʕAwābī town and Wādī Banī Kharūṣ—a strip of villages that goes 26 km long deep into al-Hajar mountains. The two places differ significantly in terms of lifestyle: the town hosts a younger population, many of whom had access to higher education and work either in Muscat or in Rustaq; the wadi, on the contrary, is inhabited by older people—on average 60+—who live on farming (dates) and breeding (goats). Therefore, the participants varied from younger literate speakers in al-ʕAwābī town to illiterate elders in Wādī Banī Kharūṣ.

Table 1 shows a detailed list of the participants used for this study.

In the selection of participants, three main criteria were considered: the provenance (i.e. either al-ʕAwābī town or Wādī Banī Kharūṣ); the level of education...
TABLE 1. Metadata relative to the native speakers involved in the documentation process of the Arabic vernacular spoken in the district of al-ʕAwābī, in northern Oman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Wādī Banī Kharūṣ</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60–70</td>
<td>Wādī Banī Kharūṣ</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-ʕAbrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>Wādī Banī Kharūṣ</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-ʕAbrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85–95</td>
<td>Wādī Banī Kharūṣ</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80–90</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-ʕAbrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Wādī Banī Kharūṣ</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>al-ʕAwābī</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>al-Kharūṣī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i.e. from illiterate, with no access to schooling, to higher education); and age. The latter criterion was further divided into three groups: youth (i.e. 25–40), middle aged (i.e. 41–60), and elderly (i.e. 60+). These criteria were chosen in order to better illustrate the diachronic changes that occurred in the district since Reinhardt (1894). Moreover, as Table 1 displays, the data must be considered, with only two exceptions, to be based on women’s speech, since accessing men was difficult for the author and the male data collected are not enough to expand this investigation to the gender variable.

The material presented in this paper was either elicited with native speakers or extrapolated from free speech recordings. The recordings have been then transcribed with the help of a native speaker of the same dialect under investigation in this paper. The examples reported throughout this article are glossed following the speaker’s number as given in Table 1.

3 Expression of possession in Modern Arabic dialects

Modern Arabic dialects show different ways of expressing possession and ownership, which Payne (1997: 104) calls ‘possessive constructions.’ In Arabic, as in other world languages, however, these structures are not used only to express a relationship of possession, as we will see in the course of this paper.¹ Possession can be expressed through two main constructions, namely the synthetic genitive construction (henceforth, SGC)—also known as iḍāfa—, which links together possessor and possessed directly, and the analytic genitive construction (henceforth, AGC), which involves the use of so-called genitive exponents.

¹ Payne (1997: 126) also distinguishes ‘possessive noun phrases’ and ‘possessive clauses’: the first ‘contains two elements, a possessor and a possessed item’ (e.g.), whereas the second can occasionally present the verb ‘to have,’ or, more commonly, ‘a copular verb or particle’ (Payne 1997: 126).
Each Arabic dialect displays its own genitive exponents, which is always the result of a process of grammaticalisation of either a noun meaning ‘property’ or ‘thing’ or of a relative pronoun (cf. Rubin 2004: 328; Eksell Harning 1980: 19). The structure of a sentence with a genitive exponent is the following:

Noun (N) + Genitive Marker (GEN) + Modifier (MD).

The noun is always a substantive, whereas the modifier can be another substantive or a personal pronoun. In most cases—and in the data presented in this paper—the modifier is definite; however, it is also possible—although more rarely—to have an indefinite modifier following a genitive marker. Bettega (2019: 230) reported a few examples from his informants in Oman, which also show how the definiteness or indefiniteness of the modifier impacts on the semantics of the whole construction. In the examples reported in this paper, gathered in the district of al-ʕAwābi, the modifier is always definite and in no instances has it been possible to detect this semantic difference.

Eksell Harning’s work (1980) is an extensive comparative study of possessive linkers in many different Arabic dialects, although her work does not deal with the historical developments of these linkers. Moreover, with regards to Omani Arabic—which this paper deals with—her sources were only Reinhardt (1894) for north Oman, and Rhodokanakis (1908) for south Oman.

More recent studies, however, show that Omani Arabic employs markers to convey various types of relationship, and not just a genitive one. These markers are also more widespread and common in the everyday speech than originally described by Reinhardt (1894) or Rhodokanakis (1908).

4 Genitive exponents in the Arabic dialects of the Arabian Peninsula

In the Arabian Peninsula, Arabic dialects show different trends when it comes to the use of genitive exponents in the AGC. According to Eksell Harning (1980: 69), the sedentary western dialects of the Peninsula (i.e. Yemeni, Hijazi and Hadramawti) ‘use the AG [Analytic Genitive] regularly and they all share the same exponents.’ On the contrary, the sedentary eastern dialects of the Peninsula (i.e. Omani, Gulf and Dhofari) show a more restricted use of the AG.

---


3 Eksell Harning (1980: 71) states that ‘in Dhofår, the AG seems to be absent. The exponents and occur, but only independently,’ making a reference to Rhodokanakis (1908: 107). This has been proved wrong by Davies (2016), as will be further shown in the course of this paper.
however, this is not completely accurate, since new works on Omani varieties show a more widespread use of the genitive markers and the AGC.

Before analysing the SGC and AGC in the Omani vernacular investigated here, it is worth giving a broader picture of genitive markers employed in the Arabian Peninsula:

– The Persian Gulf: According to Qafisheh (1977: 117), the genitive exponents in Gulf Arabic are *māl* and *ḥagg*, mainly used to avoid the ‘structural ambiguity’ resulting from an SGC where the two elements are of the same gender. Moreover, Qafisheh (1977) states that there is a difference in their use: *ḥagg* is generally used with ‘animate or inanimate nouns'; whilst *māl* only with ‘inanimate nouns,’ especially appliances and spare parts. They are often also employed with nouns of foreign origin (cf. Eksell Harning 1980: 70). They do not seem to inflect in gender and number.

– Bahrain: In the Bahārna dialects of Bahrain, Holes (2016: 223–227) reports two genitive markers, namely *māl* and *ḥagg*. He notes a slight difference in the use: if both are generally used to express a wide range of genitive relations in all speakers, *ḥagg* is more often used for the relationship of ‘one of part-whole or purpose, and not always in these cases’ (Holes 2016). One difference is, however, that *māl* presents a feminine form *mālat*.

– Yemen: In Ṣanʿānī Arabic, Watson (2009: 112) reports the genitive exponent *ḥagg* only, which does not inflect in gender or number, and whose use can be determined by rhythmic and stylistic factors.

In Oman, three main genitive markers are in use for the Omani varieties so far documented: *ḥaqq*, *māl* and *ḥāl*. These markers are in use in different parts of the countries and with different functions, as will be clear further on in Section 5. Although they are far more widespread than what Eksell Harning (1980) reported, in the data presented here both the SGC and the AGC are employed, with little pragmatic differences.

### 5 Synthetic genitive construction (SGC)

The SGC ‘consists of a noun in the construct state, immediately followed by a modifier’ (Eksell Harning 1980: 21). The link between the two is made through the definite article (*i*)- depending on the context:

(1)    *bistān  el-gīrān*
      garden.SG  DEF-neighbour.PL
     ‘the garden of the neighbours’ (S 15)
These examples show how the synthetic genitive construction does not exclusively indicate a relationship of possession but also a relationship of generic belonging or characterisation, despite following the same link as other nouns in a possessive construction. This is the case of examples (1) and (4), whereas example (2) provides evidence of a relationship of characterisation or description specifying the type of factory. Lastly, example (3) shows a double construct state. Although in theory there is no limit to the possible coordinated components in a construct state if the juxtaposition is maintained, very long strings of synthetic genitive are almost null in the primary data; strings that count more than three elements are usually interrupted by employing an AG construction.

In the SGC phrase, nothing can come between the noun and the modifier in the construct phrase, except for the definite article or a demonstrative pronoun (e.g. šaʕar haḏī l-bint ‘the hair of this girl’). This is because the demonstrative pronoun is considered in apposition⁴ to the lexical item it precedes, and is therefore not counted as cutting the construct phrase.

According to the distinction made by Qafisheh (1977: 118–119) in his study on Gulf Arabic for ordinary noun constructs, in the data it is possible to find the following: alienable possession (such as example 1 above) and inalienable possession (e.g. yad el-bint ‘the girl’s hand’); naming (e.g. madīnat ar-rustāq ‘the town of Rustāq’), where the first noun is a geographical noun and the second is a proper noun; container-contents (e.g. fingān qahwa ‘a cup of coffee’ and not ‘a coffee cup’⁵, or example 2 above), where the first is a noun denoting an object and the second is a noun of material;⁶

---

⁴ A construction consisting of two (or more) adjacents having identical referents.
⁵ Qafisheh (1977: 119) states that fingān qahwa is derived from fingān min al-qahwa.
⁶ Watson (1993: 183) defines this genitive relation as ‘genitive of description,’ which are usually indefinite: ‘the sense of genitive of description can be rendered attributively by making the modifier a relational () or other adjective.’
material (e.g. \textit{xātim ḏahab} ‘a gold ring’), where the first is a concrete noun and the second is a noun of material. The data collected in the al-ʕAwābī district, however, show that for the latter category the SGC and the AGC can be interchangeable irrespective of age, provenance or level of education of the speaker (e.g. \textit{xātim māl ḏahab} ‘a gold ring’).

The SGC is always considered definite, if the second term of the annexation is determined, as in examples (1)–(3), and in the genitive relations of alienable / inalienable possession and naming. However, there are cases when the synthetic genitive is indefinite, such as in the genitive relations of container-content and material. In both cases, the second term of the annexation is not determined.

Another common example of SGC is the relationship of possession expressed through the possessive pronouns. In the data, this construction is mainly used with nouns that have an ‘inherent possession,’ as it is called by Payne (1997: 105). These are usually body parts, kinship and terms referring to personal adornments (e.g. \textit{bint-ī} ‘my daughter’; \textit{yad-iš} ‘your (FSG) hand’; \textit{kumm-o} ‘his Omani hat’).

6 Analytic genitive construction (AGC)

The second type of possessive construction sees the use of genitive exponents (i.e. grammaticalised nouns expressing ‘property’ or ‘ownership’), and it is known as the analytic genitive. Eksell Harning (1980: 10-11) states that ‘modern Arabic dialects show a tendency towards an analytic language structure,’ probably caused by the loss of the case endings and, in some cases, by the reduction of the categories of number and gender. The truth is that the AGC is found throughout the Arabic-speaking world, although different dialects use different genitive exponents with different functions, scopes and limitations. In most of the dialects, both SGC and AGC are used, ‘and the choice between them creates a dynamic process of language development’ (Eksell Harning 1980: 11).

In her comparative study, Eksell Harning (1980: 158) divides Arabic dialects into six groups according to their use of the analytic genitive construction:

- Group I: the AGC is not used; exponents may occur predicatively or as a lexical borrowing.
- Group II: the AGC occurs sporadically; the semantic categories of the AGC cannot be structured, and formal factors are often decisive for the choice of the AGC.

\footnote{Qafisheh (1977: 119) makes it derive from \textit{al-xātim mīn ḏahab} (‘the ring made of gold’). In a few instances, however, in the district it is possible to use the analytic genitive to express a semantic relationship of qualification, and in particular of material quality (e.g. \textit{xātim māl ḏahab}, lit. ‘the ring of gold’).}
Group III: the AGC is well established; the AGC is chosen for formal or stylistic reasons.

Group IV: the AGC is well established; semantically, the majority of AGCs are found within categories of concrete possession or qualification, in which the AGC is preferred to the synthetic genitive construction.

Group V: the AGC is very well established; formal and stylistic factors are important for the choice of the AGC, even though there is a tendency to prefer the AGC whenever is semantically possible.

Group VI: the AGC is the ordinary way of expressing the genitive.

According to this classification, Eksell Harning assigns Omani dialects to the second group. However, as already mentioned, more recent studies show a different behaviour of exponents in both areas.

The Omani dialects for which we have documentation present three main exponents, all derived from nouns expressing possession and ownership in some way: in Dhofar, according to Davey (2016), ḥaqq (‘right, entitlement’) and māl (‘property’) are of common occurrence, with no difference in the use or function; a third type is ḥāl (‘state’), reported also by Reinhardt (1894) and of common occurrence in my data. Reinhardt (1894: 79) states that ḥāl and māl are ‘häufig’—‘of common occurrence’—, however they rarely appear in the texts reported at the end of his work. He also adds other grammaticalised terms used as genitive exponents, such as the active participles rāy/rāyāt (‘seeing’), ṣāḥib (‘owner’) and bū (< *abū ‘father’). The latter is also used as a relative pronoun in the dialect of the al-ʕAwābī district. With the only exceptions of ḥāl and māl, and in some cases of bū, none of the other genitive exponents reported by Reinhardt (1894) have been found in use in the speech of my informants.

Based on the data I collected in the al-ʕAwābī district, the most common genitive exponents used are indeed ḥāl and māl. However, only māl can be defined as genitive exponent, because, as will be shown further in this section, ḥāl is instead used mainly as a preposition and conveys a completely different type of relation.

In contrast with the genitive exponents in Dhofari Arabic, ḥāl and māl are indeclinable forms, which means that they do not agree in gender and number with the noun they refer to, acting merely as linkers between the possessed and the possessor.

The possessive phrase with a genitive exponent usually follows this construction: N + māl/ḥāl + MD, e.g. dišdaša māl ar-्रiggāl ‘a man’s dishdasha’; hadīya ḥāl nūr ‘a gift for Nur.’ The modifier, as in the case of the SGC, can be another noun, a participle, an adjective, a numeral or an infinitive, and it is usually definite. Examples with an

---

8 Davey (2016: 228), taking into consideration that Eksell Harning’s work uses Rhodokanakis (1908, 1911) as a source for Dhofari Arabic, states: ‘the current data in this study does indeed reveal that the AGC is far more common in CDA [coastal Dhofari Arabic] than was previously thought, and can express a variety of different possessive relationship.’
indefinite modifier are rare in the data collected, but they can be found, for example, in the categories of material (e.g. ḥigāb māl ḥarīr ‘a silk hijab’) and of non possessive qualification (e.g. example 7 below).9

In these cases—although quite rare in the primary data—the exponent does not convey a relationship of possession, but rather a description or qualification.

Similarly, this type of relationship is conveyed by the genitive marker māl in expressions of professions and specialisation, e.g. duktur māl wasm ‘doctor of traditional medicine’, brofesūr māl l-adab il-ingrīziya ‘professor of English literature.’

Brustad (2000: 71) states that ‘constructions involving the exponents often convey specific pragmatic information that the construct phrase does not,’ and she individuates formal and pragmatic motivations in the choice of using or not the genitive exponent. Among the formal motivations, Brustad (2000: 74) considers ‘multi-term annexation (three or more nouns), the presence of modifying adjectives and parallel phrases with more than one head noun.’

In the data, māl can indeed be used to cut the line of coordinated items in a construct phrase, as in

(5) maktab al-qabūl māl el-madrasa

office.SG DEF-admission.SG GEN DEF-school.FSG
‘the admission office of the school’ (S 8)

Furthermore, the genitive exponent is preferred with foreign loanwords:

(6) instagram māl-iš

instagram GEN-PRON.2FSG
‘your Instagram profile’ (S 6)

(7) raqm-o māl whatsapp

number.SG-PRON.3MSG GEN whatsapp
‘his WhatsApp number’ (S 10)

and nouns ending with a long vowel:

(8) kursī māl-i

sofa.SG GEN-PRON.1SG
‘my sofa’ (S 7)

---

9 Bettega (2019: 230) reports one example from his informants, asked to disambiguate between a definite and an indefinite modifier in the following sentence: qaṣʕa māl dxūn (‘a jar of frankincense’) and qaṣʕa māl ad-dxūn (‘a jar for frankincense’).
Words of foreign origin may or may not take the genitive marker: nouns like tilifūn (‘telephone’) or tītūn (‘toddler’) seem to prefer a synthetic genitive construction (e.g. tilifūn-iš ‘your (FSG) phone’, tītūn-he ‘her toddler’). A possible explanation is that they are treated by the speaker as inalienable possessions and behave syntactically as such.

Among the pragmatic functions of the genitive exponent, Brustad (2000: 76, italics in the text) argues that ‘the genitive exponents fulfil specific functions that the construct phrase does not,’ and particularly, ‘the exponent places a focus on the possessing noun not conveyed by the construct phrase.’ This statement can explain the simultaneous use of the construct state and the genitive exponent found in the data. Thus, for example, a phrase like kitāb el-bint (‘the book of the girl’) can be replaced by kitāb māl el-bint, with no apparent difference in meaning, but a difference in function: māl emphasises the possessor, in this case the girl (bint).

This exchange in the constructions for expressing possession is valid for almost every kind of relation, except for terms having inherent possessive value, such as parts of the body and kinship (thus, it is not possible to find in the vernacular under investigation phrases like *umm māl-o ‘his mother,’ but always umm-o; or like *yad māl-iš ‘your (FSG) hand,’ but always yad-iš).

The exponent ḥāl, on the contrary, conveys a different function when compared to māl. As I will demonstrate in the following subsection in accordance with the data collected, ḥāl cannot be considered a genitive exponent, but rather it is a preposition.11 If māl is used mainly to express a genitive relation of belonging, ḥāl is used in contexts that indicate a beneficial relation: in all the examples found in the data, ḥāl expresses a benefit for the modifier (the second item of the annexation, as stated above) and what in English translates as ‘for, to.’

10 tītūn is a Swahili loanword. It comes from the root toto which indicates anything that is ‘small.’

11 Davey (2016: 230) reports some examples where the genitive exponents māl and haqq appear to be interchangeable, ‘with no resulting change in meaning.’ This does not seem to be possible in the speech of my informants in any case, since māl and ḥāl convey two distinct functions in the data.
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(11)  
\[\text{haḏī} \quad \text{l-hadīya} \quad \text{ḥāl-iš}\]  
DEMPROX.FSG DEF-present.FSG GENPRON.2FSG  
‘this gift is for you’ (S 7)

(12)  
\[\text{haḏēlā} \quad \text{l-mšākīk} \quad \text{ḥāl} \quad \text{al-gīrān}\]  
DEMPROX.FPL DEF-skewer.PL GEN DEF-neighbour.PL  
‘these skewers are for the neighbours’ (S 13)

In example (10), the speaker is talking about the division of an inheritance, and ḥāl expresses a beneficial value for the modifier (in this case represented by the possessive pronoun -he, ‘her’). In (12), the speaker is referring to the skewers that are traditionally brought to neighbours and relatives on the second day of Eid celebrations, thus we can presume that again ḥāl is intended as a beneficial relationship.

Consider the following examples which show how māl and ḥāl are not interchangeable in my informants’ speech:

(a)  
\[\text{هذا الكتاب مال البنت}\]  
\[\text{haḏā} \quad \text{l-kitāb} \quad \text{māl} \quad \text{il-bint}\]  
DEMPROX.MSG DEF-book.SG GEN DEF-girl.FSG  
‘this book belongs to the girl’

(b)  
\[\text{هذا الكتاب حال البنت}\]  
\[\text{haḏā} \quad \text{l-kitāb} \quad \text{ḥāl} \quad \text{il-bint}\]  
DEMPROX.MSG DEF-book.SG PREP DEF-girl.FSG  
‘this book is for the girl’

These sentences were elicited from all the informants involved in this study. In all cases, regardless of age, provenance or level of education, the speakers clearly used the two different constructions to convey the two different functions. The same difference is found by Bettega (2019), who states that ḥāl expresses a dative case in his data, thus being a marker of clausal relation rather than genitive. As far as the data in this study are concerned, ḥāl can be considered as a preposition and not a genitive marker, also confuting Reinhardt’s position.12

---

Relative pronoun \textit{bū} used as a genitive exponent

A third, more rarely used, genitive linker is \textit{bū} (\(<abū\) ‘father’) also used as relative pronoun in the speech of my informants. In the data collected, there are only two examples showing \textit{bū} in its genitive functions, and these are more often used by young speakers:

\begin{align*}
(13) & \textit{asmaʕ} & \textit{eṣ-ṣawt} & \textit{bū} & \textit{mmi-nā}^{13} \\
& \text{hear.PRES.1SG} & \text{DEF-voice.SG} & \text{GEN} & \text{mother-PRON.1PL} \\
& \text{‘I hear our mum’s voice’ (S 6)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(14) & \textit{es-siyyāra} & \textit{bū} & \textit{aḥmad} \\
& \text{DEF-car.FSG} & \text{GEN} & \text{aḥmad} \\
& \text{‘Aḥmad’s car’ (S 7)}
\end{align*}

Unfortunately, the examples are not enough to postulate any theory on the use of \textit{bū} as a genitive exponent, and further research is needed.

The use of a grammaticalised form of a relative pronouns as genitive markers is not new to modern Arabic dialects and Semitic languages in general. Rubin (2004: 328) reports examples from Akkadian, Ge’ez, Biblical Aramaic and Mehri. Modern Arabic dialects, however, employ more often a grammaticalised noun meaning ‘property’ or ‘thing,’ as detailed so far.

Conclusions

Eksell Harning (1980: 160) offers two main criteria to detect how and when the AGC is preferred to the SGC: one is geographical, ‘in the western region, the AGC tends to be the ordinary way of expressing genitive,’ whereas ‘in the east, the AG is a more or less extensively used complement to the SG’ (synthetic genitive); the second criterion is socio-cultural, since ‘the AG is most extensively used in the \textit{madani} dialects,’ less in the rural dialects and almost completely absent in Bedouin dialects. The reason lies in the major heterogeneity of urban environments compared to rural realities.\textsuperscript{14} These statements are not entirely applicable to the vernacular as presented here, since in the speech of my informants, the AGC is very productive as it is also in other neighbouring dialects, and it is not always used as a complement to the synthetic genitive but rather it expresses different genitive relations based on pragmatic and functional factors. The examples provided in this article have shown that if, on the one hand,

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{mmi-nā} (lit. ‘our mother’) is the informal way children use to call their mother.

\textsuperscript{14} Eksell Harning (1980: 164–165).
the SGC is almost compulsory for certain type of genitive relation (e.g. inalienable possession), on the other hand, the AGC is preferred in the relations of description and content. Furthermore, we saw how in some cases the AGC and the SGC are interchangeable, as in the case of alienable possession.

No difference has been found in the use of the analytic or the synthetic construction in respect of age, gender or level of education of the speakers involved. Moreover, no difference has been found in respect of the different geographical areas that form the al-ʕAwābī district (i.e. Wādī Banī Kharūṣ and neighbouring villages). It seems, however, that Reinhardt (1894) was right in stating that the exponents māl and ḥāl were ‘häufig’ in the speech of his informants, despite not providing enough examples neither in the grammar nor in the texts at the end of his work.

It would be desirable for more research to be devoted to the use of exponents in Omani Arabic, expanding the investigation to other varieties spoken in areas of Oman still linguistically unexplored.
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Arabic Interdentals: Variation and Linguistic Change

**ABSTRACT** In contrast to other Semitic languages, the Arabic language has retained the interdentals /θ/, /ð/ and /ð̣/ (Versteegh 2001: 19). However, in many Arabic dialects, the plain interdentals have merged with the stops /t/, /d/ or the sibilants /s/, /z/, respectively. The emphatic interdental /ð̣/ changes to its stop or sibilant counterpart /ḍ/, /ẓ/ (see Al-Wer 2004). Whereas stop variants are associated with particular standard regional varieties, e.g. Egyptian and Levantine Arabic, the fricative variants are generally found in the Arabic varieties spoken in the Arabian Peninsula, the Gulf region and Iraq.

Different linguistic patterns of variation in the use of the interdentals were found to exist in contact situations in the Arab world between speakers of different dialects, and the direction of linguistic change takes a different course in different regions. In empirically and statistically tested data from different sociolinguistic studies in Arabic-speaking communities where both the fricative and stop variants are found, the tendency is for the stop variants to expand at the expense of the interdental fricative sounds (see for example, Jordanian Arabic and Palestinian Arabic, among others).

This paper investigates processes of variation and change affecting the interdental variables (θ), (ð) and (ð̣) in the Arabian Peninsula in general and Saudi Arabia in particular. The majority of the dialects spoken in the Arabian Peninsula have the fricative variants; stop variants are used in urban Hijazi dialects in the western region and in Qatif dialect in the region of al-Ahsa in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia and Bahrain. Various studies surveyed in this paper show that in contact zones between speakers of the fricatives and stop variants, the diffusion of the stop variants is characterised by a low rate of frequency. In this paper, I will present the details of the analysis of the process of variation and change affecting the interdental variables in many contact zones in Saudi Arabia in general and among Najdi speakers in Hijaz in particular, and I will argue that, with regard to the pattern and direction of linguistic change, in Saudi Arabia, speakers of the interdentals orient to a supra-local norm rather than the local norm.

**KEYWORDS** Arabic, interdentals, Najdi, Hijazi, supra-local, variation
1 Introduction

One of the consequences of dialect contact situations is the transmission of variants from one dialect to the other (Trudgill 1986: 12). This paper investigates processes of variation and change affecting the interdental sounds /θ/, /ð/ and /ð̣/ in contact zones in the Arab world in general and in Saudi Arabia in particular. Since the interdentals are realised variably as fricatives or stops in different regions in the Arab world, they will be treated as sociolinguistic variables and therefore represented as the following symbols henceforth in this paper: (θ), (ð) and (ð̣).

The majority of the dialects spoken in the Arabian Peninsula have the fricative variants [θ], [ð] and [ð̣]; stop variants /t/, /d/ and /ḍ/ are used in urban Hijazi dialects in the western region and in Qatif dialect in the al-Ahsa region in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia and Bahrain. Various studies surveyed in this paper show that in contact zones between speakers of the fricatives and stop variants, the diffusion of the stop variants is characterised by a low rate of frequency.

In this paper, the details of the analysis of the process of variation and change affecting the use of the interdental sounds in many contact zones in Saudi Arabia in general and among Najdi speakers in Hijaz in particular will be presented, and I will argue that, with regard to the pattern and direction of linguistic change, in Saudi Arabia, speakers of the interdentals orient to a supra-local norm rather than the local norm.

The variation between interdental and stop variants of (θ), (ð) and (ð̣) is a well-known phenomenon in Arabic dialects; in communities where both variants are found, the tendency is for the stop variants to expand at the expense of the interdental fricative sounds (see for example, Jordanian Arabic and Palestinian Arabic, among others). In the contact situation under investigation, my data show that the diffusion of the urban Hijazi stop variants in the speech of 61 Najdi speakers in the city of Jeddah is characterised by a low rate of frequency. This linguistic outcome is not in proportion with the length of stay of the Najdi community in Hijaz, which extends over 70 years. The low rate of acquisition of the urban Hijazi variants by the second generation of Najdi youngsters born in Hijaz contradicts the widely accepted principle in sociolinguistic research that ‘when families move into a new speech community, the children adopt the local vernacular rather than that of their parents’ (Labov 2001: 423).

The data for this paper come from empirical research carried out in 2004 in the city of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, to investigate patterns of language variation and change in the speech of 61 Najdi speakers who speak a dialect that is distinct from the local urban Hijazi dialect. Najdi and urban Hijazi are two varieties of Arabic which employ different sets of variants of the interdental variables (θ), (ð) and (ð̣). Whereas the stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ] are used in the urban Hijazi dialect spoken in the western province of Saudi Arabia and the Baharna dialect spoken in Qatif in the Eastern
province of Saudi Arabia, the fricative variants [θ], [ð] and [ð̣] are the normative use in the Najdi dialect and all other varieties spoken in Saudi Arabia (see Map 1). My data show that the rate of diffusion of urban Hijazi variants in the speech of Najdi speakers in Jeddah is variable and the diffusion of the urban Hijazi variants of the interdental variables is quite low compared to other linguistic variables investigated in my research. In this paper, I will attempt to account for the high rate of maintenance of the fricative variants among Najdi speakers vis-à-vis the stop variants of the interdental variables used by the local natives of Jeddah.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 1.1 explains the diachronic change that affected Arabic interdental sounds and resulted in the synchronic variation found in different regions in the Arab world. Section 1.2 surveys the sociolinguistic studies that examined these patterns of variation in the use of the interdentals in the Levant region and the Arabian Gulf region. Section 2 surveys the sociolinguistic studies of interdentals in Saudi Arabia. Section 3 examines the use of interdentals by Najdi speakers in Jeddah and presents results of the analysis of the correlation between the use of the interdental variables and the social factors of age, gender. Section 4 discusses the
results of analysis and attempts to explain the attested pattern of variation found in
the speech of Najdi speakers in Jeddah with reference to the process of supralocalisation. Section 5 concludes this article.

1.1 The diachronic change of the Arabic interdentals

The interdentals /θ/, /ð/ and /ð̣/ are traditionally used for the typological classification
of Arabic dialects: Bedouin-rural-urban (Cadora 1992: 1). Whereas interdentals are
preserved in the more conservative Bedouin dialects, they are lost in most of the seden-
tary Arabic dialects (Versteegh 2001: 143; Holes 2004: 70). In the sedentary dialects,
the plain interdentals /ð/ and /θ/ merged with dental stops /t/ and /d/:

/θ/ + /t/ → /t/, e.g. [θaːni] → /taːni/ ‘second’

/ð/ + /d/ → /d/, e.g. [haːda] → /haːda/ ‘this’

The merger between the interdental fricative /θ/ and the stop /t/, and /ð/ and /d/ is very
common in most urban Arabic dialects used in the Levant countries, Morocco and Egypt
(Abdel-Jawad and Awwad 1989). In the Arabian Peninsula, the merger is attested in the
varieties spoken in the cities of Mecca, Jeddah and Medina, and Qatif, Saudi Arabia. The
fricative interdentals are used in the rest of the Arabian Peninsula (including the Gulf
countries and Iraq) by most of the sedentary and Bedouin populations (Map 1).

As for the third emphatic fricative /ð̣/, Al-Wer (2004) argues that a phonetic change
and not a merger had taken place in sedentary dialects. She proposes the following
historical development of interdentals into stops. At some point in time during the
pre-Islamic period, a merger occurred first between the original ḍād /ɮ/, a voiced em-
phatic lateral fricative sound which was described by Sibawayh but not heard today
except rarely in some remote areas in the south of Saudi Arabia, and the emphatic
voiced fricative interdental /ð̣/. At a later stage, a phonetic change took place resulting
in the change of /ð̣/ to its emphatic stop counterpart /ḍ/:

/ɮ/ + /ð̣/ → /ḍ/

The latter phonetic change only affected the sedentary dialects. Modern Bedouin dia-
xects did not incorporate the change of the fricative /ð̣/ into dental stop /ḍ/. Whereas
Bedouin dialects retained the interdental system of Classical Arabic: /θ/, /ð/ and /ð̣/,
sedentary dialects merged interdentals with stops: [t], [d] and [ḍ]. In modern sedentary
Arabic dialects, the process of change continues as stops variably change into sibilants
[t] > [s], [d] > [z], [ð̣] > [ẓ]. No contemporary Arabic variety has both sounds, the inter-
dental fricative [ð̣] and the emphatic stop [ḍ], as separate phonemes (Al-Wer 2004: 22).
1.2 The synchronic sociolinguistic variation in the use of interdents in studied Arabic-speaking communities

Various sociolinguistic studies investigated the correlation between the use of the interdental variants and stylistic and other social factors in urban Arabic dialects where the interdental fricative variants are no longer in casual everyday use. Schmidt’s (1974) study of Cairene Arabic, Kojak’s (1983) of Damascus and Hama (Syrian), Abdel-Jawad and Awwad’s (1989) of Jordanian Arabic and Daher’s (1998) study of Damascus Arabic investigated and compared the distribution of the dialectal stop variants with the standard fricative variants in different speech styles. All the studies indicated that dental stops are replaced by their counterpart standard fricative.

The interdents are also investigated as sociolinguistic variables in dialect contact studies which focus on contact situations in Arabic-speaking communities where the speakers of two varieties which employ different sets of the interdental variants come into contact. In such communities, the contact takes place between sedentary dialects where stop variants are used and Bedouin dialects where fricative variants are the normative use. Different linguistic patterns of variation were found to exist in these contact situations.

In the Levantine region, data from Jordanian Arabic show that the stop variants are expanding at the expense of the interdental fricative variants (Al-Wer 1991, 1999, 2004). Al-Wer (1991) investigated the variation in the use of the local fricative variants [θ] and [ð̣] and the non-local (Palestinian) prestigious variants [t] and [ḍ] in the speech of 116 indigenous Jordanian women in three different towns in Jordan. Her data show that the younger and more educated female speakers of indigenous Jordanian varieties adopt the urban Palestinian variants. Al-Wer (1999) reports that the alternation between interdental and stop has become commonplace among speakers of the indigenous varieties of both sexes and ascribes the high rate of maintenance of the local variants [θ] (approx. 70 %) and [ḍ] (approx. 63 %) in her 1991 study to ‘a correlation between the pressure exerted by the local community and speaker’s awareness of alternations: the greater the awareness of the alternation the stronger the pressure to maintain the local features, thus resulting in limited diffusion of the non-local forms’ (Al-Wer 1991: 54). Al-Wer (2004) provides information in real time on the progression of the change from interdental to stop in Jordan. She revisited the town of Sult, one of the towns which was investigated in her 1991 study to collect data from a smaller sample of speakers. The data show that the interdental variables have undergone a dramatic change. Whereas the change from local [ð̣] to urban [ḍ] is near completion in the speech of young women, the change from interdental fricative [θ] to stop [t] has roughly doubled (from 28 % to 45 %). Al-Wer explains the difference in the behaviour of plain interdental /θ/ and emphatic interdental /ḍ̣/ in terms of the different parameters involved in the change from one sound to the other. She argues that the change which affects (θ) is a merger between the variants [θ] and [t]. However, the change
which affects the emphatic /ð̣/ is a straightforward phonetic change from fricative to stop, i.e. [ð] to [d]. Al-Wer explains the disappearance of the local fricative variant [ð̣] in terms of sociolinguistic stereotyping. She argues that, unlike plain interdentals /θ/ and /ð/, /ð̣/ is extremely stigmatised in Jordan. She maintains that ‘this sound is used to mimic and ridicule speakers of the dialects which have it’ (Al-Wer 2004: 25). Therefore, it is abandoned in favour of the urban variant.

In the Gulf region, Holes (1995) points to the emergence of new patterns of dialect use in Bahrain and Iraq. Holes examined the dialect used in Manama, capital of Bahrain, to show the effect of urbanisation on dialect change. He reported that the contact situation in Bahrain between the Baharna group and the Arab group in Manama led to the rise of a new standard based on the dialect of the more dominant group: the Arab group. The change in the Baharna speakers’ realisation of Arabic interdentals from [f] to [θ], [d] to [ð̣] and from [d] to [ḍ] is one the features which are changing towards this new standard which is the product of the fusion of Arab and Baharna dialects in Manama. Holes also examines a similar case in Iraq which was documented by Abu-Haidar (1991). In Baghdad, Christian Baghdadis, who speak a sedentary dialect which employs stop variants of the interdental variables, invariably style-shift when they interact with Muslim Baghdadis. On the other hand, Muslim Baghdadis are not changing the interdental fricatives of their dialect in any context.

2 The sociolinguistic studies of interdentals in Saudi Arabia

In Saudi Arabia, the majority of the dialects spoken in different regions use the fricative variants of the interdental variables. The stop variants /t/, /d/ and /ḍ/ are used in the cities of Mecca, Jeddah, Medina (in the western region). In Qatif (in the eastern region), the reflexes of /θ/ and /ð̣/, /ð/ are /f/, /d/ and /ḍ/ (cf. Watson 2011). The investigation of the variation in the use of interdentals has been carried out in two cities in Saudi Arabia: Mecca and Jeddah. No research has been conducted to investigate the use of the interdentals in the eastern region of Saudi Arabia.

Al-Jehani’s (1985), Al-Ahdal’s (1989) and Al-Ghamdi’s (2014) studies of Meccan Arabic investigated the use of interdentals in the speech of Meccans. The population in Mecca is ethnically divided into tribal and non-tribal groups. Whereas non-tribal Meccans use the stop/sibilant variants of the interdental variables, the tribal group use the fricative variants. The variation in the use of the interdentals across the social groups is exemplified in Table 1.

Al-Jehani and Al-Ahdal reported a general low rate of transmission of the stop and sibilant variants in the speech of the tribal population. They found that the fricative and stop/sibilant variants of the interdental variables function as ethnic markers: the former for the tribal group and the latter for the non-tribal group, hence the low accommodation to these variants by both parties. Data in Al-Ahdal study show
that the tribal speakers used [s] the urban sibilant variant of (ð) 20% of the time. On the other hand, the non-tribal users used the tribal variant [ð̣] 20% of the time. Based on this reciprocal convergence, Al-Ahdal predicted that tribal and non-tribal variables are moving towards each other and therefore the diffused variety in Mecca has a chance of focusing. He predicted that the target model for this focused variety would be the Najdi variety which he identified as the ‘national identity’ of the country. Al-Ghamdi (2014) examined the variation in the use of the interdentals in the speech of Ghamdi emigrants from the southern western region of al-Baha in Mecca. The data from her study show a high rate of maintenance of interdental fricatives and a low rate of use of the stop variants. The adoption of the stop variants was found to be significantly correlated with the integration of the Ghamdi community in the Meccan society.

Al-Shehri (1993) examined the variation in the speech of rural immigrants from the south-western region of Saudi Arabia in Jeddah. Al-Shehri found that the accommodation of urbanised rural speakers to the urban usage of the stop variants [t] and [d] is extremely low, and no accommodation to the sibilant variants [s] and [z]. Like Al-Jehani and Al-Ahdal, Al-Shehri drew upon the concept of ethnicity to explain the lack of accommodation to the urban stop variants. He explains that stop variants are the most salient phonological features of the urban Hijazi dialect because ‘linguistically speaking, these variants represent radical phonetic distance from the local norm (i.e. interdental variants) of the indigenous Arabian dialects, and thus represent a marker of unindigenous speech’ (Al-Shehri 1993: 119). The fricative interdentals have become markers of ethnicity and the indigenousness of the rural immigrants vis-à-vis the urban Hijazi locals.

Al-Qahtani (2015) examines the variation in the use of /ð/ in Tihāmat Qaḥṭān, a remote southern location in Saudi Arabia. In this region, Al-Qahtani found that [ḻ], the ancient lateral realisation of the phoneme /ð/ which was described by Sībawayh, is used variably with the emphatic interdental [ð̣] (the supra-local and majority realisation in Saudi Arabia). The data strongly suggest that there is a change in progress from the old variant (the lateral) to the supra-local variant (the interdental). This change appears to be led mainly by the younger women in the two villages investigated in this study. She adds that this change is socially motivated by the presence of speakers from outside these villages which could have influenced the local dialect and raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The interdental variable</th>
<th>Tribal pronunciation</th>
<th>Urban pronunciation</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>a. [ha:ða]</td>
<td>a. [ha:da]</td>
<td>‘this’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. [ɾ̣ða]</td>
<td>b. [ɾ̣a]</td>
<td>‘if’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. [maθalăn]</td>
<td>b. [masalan]</td>
<td>‘for example’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ð̣/</td>
<td>a. [naði:f]</td>
<td>a. [naði:f]</td>
<td>‘clean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. [ʒulm]</td>
<td>b. [zulm]</td>
<td>‘injustice’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. The variation in the use of the interdentals in Mecca.**
3 The use of interdentals by Najdi speakers in Jeddah

3.1 Methodology

Data for this research were collected over a five-month period from February through June 2004 from 61 male and female speakers by means of social interviews. I conducted the interviews with 50 male and female speakers. Eleven male speakers were interviewed by two male assistants and by two of my female speakers. Speakers were interviewed for 30–60 minutes in their homes most of the time and some at work. The speakers were born in Hijaz or emigrated from their cities of origin at an early age, not later than their late teens. The interdental variables were examined in relation to three social variables: age, gender and contact. The sample was stratified into 4 age groups that represent three generations of male and female Najdi speakers. Out of the 61 speakers interviewed for this study, 55 represent different generations of different families. This generational scheme allowed me to trace linguistic changes across different generations and to reveal the intricacy of the sociolinguistic situation in the community. Speakers were also classified according to their level of contact with Hijazi locals. A contact index which focuses on regular face to face verbal interaction with locals was used to classify speakers into two groups: low contact speakers and high contact speakers. It is a hierarchy of four criteria which correspond to different levels of interaction or contact with urban Hijazi locals. Speakers scored one point for each criterion they fulfilled. These criteria include (1) formal relationships at school and work or marketplace; (2) participation in neighbourhood affairs; (3) close friendships with Hijazi locals and (4) kinship and intermarriage with Hijazis in the family. A score of 1 indicates ‘low contact’; a speaker in this case maintains only formal contact with urban Hijazis. Participants who score between 2–4 are considered high contact speakers. The data were auditorily analysed. At least 30 tokens per speaker for each variable were quantified and coded. In cases where a lexical item is repeatedly used by the same speaker, a ceiling of three tokens of individual items was imposed to avoid lexical effects. The collected data were further subjected to statistical analysis of variance using SPPS 14.

3.2 Data and analysis

The linguistic analysis of the variation in the use of the interdental variables among Najdi speakers shows that the stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ] occur mostly in frequently used words which have /θ/ or /ð/; for example [d] is used in words such as [hada]
‘this’, [kida] ‘like that’ and the verb [haða] ‘take’ and its derivations, and [t] is used in numerals which have /θ/, for example [itne:n] ‘two,’ and in other words such as [aktar] ‘more.’ Najdi speakers are transferring particular words into their inventory. It seems that the diffusion of the urban Hijazi variants takes place gradually through certain lexical sets, such as the ones that were present in the speech of our informants. According to Trudgill, in contact situations the incomplete accommodation of adult speakers to the target variety involves lexical diffusion (Trudgill 1986: 58). As for preadolescents, Chambers (1992: 693) recognises lexical diffusion as one of the mechanisms of dialect acquisition. The phonological acquisition of the variants begins with individual words, and then at a later stage after a considerable number of instances have been acquired, a rule is generalised. Al-Wer (2004: 25) states that the merger which affected the Arabic interdentals, i.e. the change from fricatives to stops, may have taken place by gradual lexical diffusion. Mergers by transfer are externally motivated in the sense that they are triggered by contact between different speech communities (Labov 1994: 327). The lexical diffusion of the stop variants in the speech of Najdi speakers in Jeddah involves different phonological processes i.e. a merger in the case of (θ) and (ð), but a simple phonetic change from fricative to stop in the case of adults’ acquisition of [ḍ].

### 3.3 The social embedding of the variation in the use of the interdental variables

The results of the analysis of the variation in the use of the interdental variables of (θ), (ð) and (ð̣) in relation to three social factors: contact, age and gender is presented in Table 2.

The analysis of the use of the interdental variables across age groups which is given in Table 2 shows a low rate of variation in the use of the stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ]. The ANOVA test at 5% significance level indicates that the differences between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>% [θ]</th>
<th>% [t]</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% [ð]</th>
<th>% [d]</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% [ð̣]</th>
<th>% [ḍ]</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10–24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–38</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39–55</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>F = 1.6, P = 0.196</td>
<td>F = 4.866, P = 0.004</td>
<td>F = 1.855, P = 0.0148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
speakers in the use of the stop variants by age are significant at \( P = 0.004 \) in the case of \([d]\), but insignificant in the case of \([t]\) \( (P = 0.196) \) and \([\text{ḍ}]\) \( (P = 0.148) \). Three observations can be made about the data presented in Table 2. Firstly, the rate of variation in the use of the interdental variables is very low taking into consideration the length of time spent by the speakers in the city of Jeddah. 90% of the speakers who participated in this study, including 81% of the oldest age group, were born and raised in Jeddah or in the cities of Mecca and Medina where the urban Hijazi variety is used. The length of stay of the Najdi community extends over 70 years. For the majority of speakers, the exposure to the urban Hijazi variety supposedly took place early in their lives, at school and/or at work. However, in relation to the adoption of the urban Hijazi stop variants \([d]\), \([t]\) and emphatic \([\text{ḍ}]\), the linguistic outcome is not in proportion with this long period of time spent in Jeddah. The phonological distinction is maintained in the speech of Najdi speakers although the opposition between the variants involved in the contrast does not carry significant semantic functional load. In the absence of intra-linguistic constraint, the diffusion of the urban Hijazi variants is expected to occur. Nevertheless, the data indicate that the diffusion of the urban variants is characterised by a low rate of frequency. More importantly, the distribution of the variants across the age groups indicates the low rate of acquisition of the urban Hijazi variants by the Najdi youngsters, which contradicts the widely accepted principle in sociolinguistic research that ‘when families move into a new speech community, the children adopt the local vernacular rather than that of their parents’ (Labov 2001: 423). The youngest speakers in this study show a minimal rate of variation (1%). The majority of speakers in the young age group (70%) belong to the second generation of Najdis born in Jeddah to mothers who themselves were born in the region of Hijaz.

Equally important, the distribution of the urban variants across the age groups show that the urban variants \([d]\), \([t]\) and \([\text{ḍ}]\) were adopted by first-generation speakers, but the transmission of the urban variants was thwarted in the following younger generations. Table 3 shows that the difference between the oldest speakers and all other age groups with regard to use of the urban variant \([d]\) is statistically significant; however, the difference between the oldest age group and the youngest age group is highly significant at \( P < 0.001 \). With the exception of the oldest age group, the linguistic behaviour of all age groups indicates a case of dialect divergence as the use of the stop variants is receding in the speech of Najdi speakers. It seems that the adoption of the urban Hijazi variants which had started at an earlier point of time as shown by the variation rate in the speech of the oldest speakers has not further progressed in the speech of the subsequent generation. The fricative variants, on the other hand, show a high rate of maintenance among speakers of all age groups. It seems that age is not the determinant factor for the acquisition of the interdental urban variants.

To be able to account for the lack of acquisition of the urban variant among young Najdi speakers, we have to probe further the social context of the dialect
young Najdi speakers, we have to probe further the social context of the dialect is not the determinant factor for the acquisition of the interdental urban variants. It seems that age shows a high rate of maintenance among speakers of all age groups. The fricative variants, on the other hand, the variation rate in the speech of the oldest speakers has not further progressed in the urban Hijazi variants which had started at an earlier point of time as shown by the speech of the subsequent generation. The interdental behaviour of all age groups indicates a case of dialect divergence as the use of the speech community, the children adopt the local vernacular rather than that of their parents (Labov 2001: 423). The youngest speakers in this study show a minimal rate of variation (1%). The majority of speakers in the young age group (70%) belong to the region of Hijaz.

Equally important, the distribution of the urban variants across the age groups indicates the low rate of acquisition of the urban variant [d] in their lives, at school and/or at work. However, in relation to the adoption of the urban Hijazi locals. It is urban Hijazi-oriented speakers who adopted the stop variants in contact situation. We have to uncover the ‘social embedding of language change’ (Labov 1972: 162) by examining the correlation of the interdental with the other social variables of contact and gender.

The results of the quantitative analysis given in Table 4 clearly establish contact as an important social variable. The data in Table 4 indicate that there is a correlation between the use of the urban Hijazi variants [d], [t] and [ḍ] and the level of contact with Hijazi locals. The data show that variation in the use of the urban Hijazi variants is limited to speakers who maintained a high level of contact with urban Hijazis. High contact speakers used [d] 9% of the time and [t] 4% of the time. The difference between speakers according to the level of contact is statistically significant at $P = 0.001$ in the case of [d]; at $P = 0.003$ in the case of [t] and at $P = 0.010$ in the case of emphatic [ḍ]. We can establish with confidence that there is a correlation between the rate of usage of the stop variants and the level of contact with urban Hijazi locals. It is urban Hijazi-oriented speakers who adopted the stop variants in their speech.

With regard to correlation between the use of the stop variants of the interdental variables with gender, the data presented in Table 5 show that male speakers use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups in comparison</th>
<th>T-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 55\10–24</td>
<td>P = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55\25–38</td>
<td>P = 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55\39–55</td>
<td>P = 0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(θ)</th>
<th>(δ)</th>
<th>(ḍ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% [θ]</td>
<td>% [t]</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low contact</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High contact</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test = –3.079, $P = 0.003$</td>
<td>t-test = –3.410, $P = 0.001$</td>
<td>t-test = –2.722, $P = 0.0109$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(θ)</th>
<th>(δ)</th>
<th>(ḍ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% [θ]</td>
<td>% [t]</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test = –1.450, $P = 0.0152$</td>
<td>t-test = 0.168, $P = 0.867$</td>
<td>t-test = 0.968, $P = 0.339$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more of the stop variants of the variables (ð) and (ð̣) than women. Men used [d] 6% of the time and they used emphatic [ḍ] 4% of the time. On the other hand, female speakers’ use of the urban Hijazi variant [t] is higher than male speakers. However, this difference between men and women with regard to the usage of the urban Hijazi variants is not statistically significant.

Since contact emerged as a determinant factor in the variation of the interdental variables, the correlation between age and gender in high contact speakers with regard to the use of the stop variants [d], [t] and [ḍ] is investigated and the results are illustrated in Figures 1, 2 and 3.

A glance at Figure 1 quickly ascertains that there is a steady decline in the use of the urban Hijazi variant [d] among speakers from both sexes. As we explained before, this inverse pattern of variation is actually the result of the level and degree of contact which speakers maintained with urban Hijazi locals. The information illustrated in this figure clearly indicates difference by gender. Male and female speakers differ in their use of the urban Hijazi variant. The oldest male speakers produce the highest number of tokens with [d] realisation of the variable (ð); they used [d] 22% of the time. The oldest female speakers, on the other hand, used less of [d]; they used the urban Hijazi variant 18% of the time. In the middle-age group, male speakers’ use of [d] sharply drops to 4%. On the other hand, 9% of the token of the variable (ð) were realised as [d] by female speakers from the same age group. In the age group (25–38), female speakers used the urban Hijazi variant 6% of the time whereas male speakers’ rates of usage of the urban Hijazi variant drop to 1%. However, in the youngest age group, male speakers’ use of the urban Hijazi variant starts to rise again; 2% of
the tokens of the variable (ð) were realised as [d] by young male speakers. On the other hand, the use of [d] continues to decrease in the speech of young female speakers; it falls from 6% to 1%. The apparent time data given in Figure 1 illustrate the recessive use of the urban Hijazi variant [d] among male and female speakers except for the young male speakers.
Figure 2 clearly shows that there is a correlation between the use of the urban Hijazi stop variant [t] and female speakers. Female speakers showed a higher rate of use of [t] than male speakers across all age groups. It is noticed that although there is a decline in the use of [t] among male and female speakers, it is steeper in the case of male speakers. In the oldest age group, whereas women used [t] 9% of the time, men used the urban Hijazi variant 6% of the time. In the middle-age group, women's use of [t] decreased; female speakers in the (39–54) age group used [t] 6% of the time. On the other hand, male speakers from the same age group did not use the urban Hijazi variant. In the (25–38) age group, female speakers used [t] 4% of the time. However, the stop variant [t] was not used by the male speakers in the same age group. In the youngest age group, [t] is showing a tendency to stabilise in the speech of the youngest female speakers who used it 4% of the time. The use of [t] reappears in the speech of the youngest speakers as they used it 1% of the time.

Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of [ḍ] in male and female speakers across different age cohorts.

The data in Figure 3 show that male speakers' use of [ḍ] has receded to disappear from the speech of age groups (25–38) and (10–24). On the other hand, women's use of [ḍ] increased in the middle-age group. Female speakers in the next age group showed the same rate of usage as the middle-age group; however, the use of [ḍ] drops to 1% in the speech of the youngest female speakers.

Like [ḍ] and [t], [ḍ] emerges as a recessive variant in male and female speakers. Although, the younger women appear to be leading the change towards the urban Hijazi variant [ḍ] in age groups (25–38) and (10–24), the disappearance of [ḍ] from the speech of young male speakers and its decline in the speech of the youngest female speakers indicate that [ḍ] is a recessive variant.

4 Discussion

The analysis of the data has shown the maintenance of the fricative variants in the speech of low contact Najdi speakers and a low rate of variation and recessive use of the stop variants in the speech of high contact Najdi speakers. Although contact emerges as the most significant social factor determining the diffusion of the stop variants in the speech of Najdis, the low rate of use of these variants in the second generation of young high contact speakers remains remarkably low. In the ideal circumstances of dialect contact situations, children usually speak the local vernacular following the linguistic pattern of their peers (Kerswill and Williams 2000; Payne 1980). The linguistic behaviour of young Najdi speakers seems to contradict this widely reported outcome of dialect contact. However, it concurs with the previously reported pattern of variation found in the speakers of other regional dialects which employ the fricative of the interdental variables in Saudi Arabia (see section 2 of this paper). The high
level of maintenance of the fricative variants and the low rate of transmission of the stop variants in the speech of Najdis and speakers of other regional dialects can be explained in terms of the operation of the process of supralocalisation which is a ‘process by which, as a result of mobility and dialect contact, linguistic variants that have a wide geographical currency spread at the expense of those which are much more locally restricted’ (Britain 2011). Supra-local varieties which emerge in dialect contact zones tend to favour features that are found across a region or a country, and they tend to avoid salient linguistic features that are strongly associated with a particular dialect or particular social group. The operation of the process of supralocalisation is evidenced by the fact that Najdi speakers, like other regional groups in the city, do not make wholesale adoption of the urban Hijazi variety. On the one hand, they abandon traditional Najdi forms on the phonological and morphosyntactic level in favour of the urban Hijazi forms (cf. Al-Essa 2008, 2009). On the other hand, they maintain the use of the fricative variants of the interdental variables and avoid the local stop variants. As mentioned earlier, a supra-local variety favours ‘unmarked’ features that have a wider regional distribution. The Najdi speakers rid their speech of the marked forms of their dialect, e.g. affricated variants of /k/ and /ɡ/, but they maintain the fricative variants of the interdentals because they are aware that fricative variants have a wider geographic and demographic distribution in the region. Unlike the stop/sibilant variants which are restricted to the Hijazi cities of Mecca, Medina and Jeddah, the fricative variants of the interdentals have a wider regional distribution, not only in Saudi Arabia but in the Gulf countries and Yemen, as well (see Map 1).

The high rate of maintenance of the fricative variants of the interdental variables in the speech of Najdi speakers and speakers of other Arabian varieties in Saudi Arabia is also associated with the speakers’ perception of the stop and sibilant variants of the interdental variables as an ‘exonorm.’ Unlike all other varieties in Saudi Arabia, the urban dialect of Hijaz has been largely shaped by geopolitical and socio-religious factors, most importantly the external migration of different ethnic groups from outside the Arabian Peninsula in the past centuries. Previous sociolinguistic studies which investigated the use of the interdental variables in other speech communities in Mecca and Jeddah reported that the stop and sibilant variants have become stereotypical of the urban Hijazi variety and that they are perceived by the tribal population as ‘non-Arabian’ speech features. (cf. Al-Jehani 1985; Al-Ahdal 1989; Al-Shehri 1993). This social perception of the stop variants as ‘substrate’ features is accentuated by their phonetic saliency. The stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ] are phonetically distinct from the fricative variants which make them overtly noticed by the community members and they become the subject of social comment. The fact that the stop variants carry such detectable social loading as a marker of another distinct ethnic group whose roots lie outside the Arabian Peninsula worked as a deterring factor against the adoption of the stop variants.
Finally, we cannot conclude this discussion of language variation and change in Saudi Arabia in relation to the interdental sounds without alluding to the fact that there is a lack of a standard spoken variety that is associated with the people of the country. We cannot speak with certainty of ‘Saudi Arabic’ which is based on a ‘prestigious’ dialect associated with a politically or commercially urban centre in the same way we speak about Egyptian Arabic which is associated with the speech of Cairo. We cannot speak of a standard Saudi dialect in which a foreigner may learn to interact with Saudi people. There are manuals to teach different varieties according to the purpose of the learners and the region where they plan to visit or work in geographic, political and social divisions worked against the rise of a standard variety that is recognised collectively by the people of Arabia as such prestigious. With the establishment of the Kingdom in 1932, the different regions of Arabia were unified under one central government for the first time in many centuries. The modernisation process which followed the discovery of oil in 1932 and accelerated after the oil boom in the 1970s led to massive internal migration to major urban centres. The economic growth and in-migration affected the linguistic and cultural makeup of these urban centres. Speakers of different regional dialects interact in the melting pot of major cities like Jeddah, and it is these conditions of dialect contact and economic prosperity which actuate the rise of a supra-local variety which could function as a regional standard for the people of Saudi Arabia. It seems that the interdentals /θ/ and /ð/, /ð̣/ are part and parcel of this emerging regional standard variety in Saudi Arabia.

5 Conclusion

The interdental variables (θ), (ð) and (ð̣) show different patterns of geolinguistic distribution in the Arab world. Whereas stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ] are associated with particular standard regional varieties, e.g. Egyptian Arabic and Levantine Arabic, the fricative variants /θ/ and /ð/, /ð̣/ are found in the Arabic varieties spoken in the Arabian Peninsula, the Gulf region and Iraq. The transmission of either type of variants is investigated in different Arabic-speaking countries in various sociolinguistic studies with different outcomes. Urban centres in Jordan, Bahrain, Iraq and Saudi Arabia were found to be the locus of language change with regard to the use of the interdental variables. Speakers of different dialects responded to the supra-local norms of their regions and hence linguistic change takes a different course in different regions. The urban centres of Hijaz, i.e. Mecca, Jeddah and Medina which are the locus of the stop variants of the interdental variables in Saudi Arabia witnessed massive in-migration by speakers of Arabian dialects that employ the fricative variants of the interdental variables. The results from this study and previous studies show a low rate of variation in the use of stop variants [t], [d] and [ḍ] and a high degree of maintenance of the fricative variants of the interdental /θ/, /ð/ and /ð̣/. I explained that
Najdi speakers are orienting towards a supra-local linguistic norm that is Arabian in essence. The fricative variants have become social markers used by the speakers to signal their Arabian identity. The survival of the fricative variants in the speech of Arabic-speaking communities which have longer history of urbanisation and contact, i.e. Iraq and Tunisia lend further support to the likelihood of the maintenance of the fricative variants in the speech of the people in Saudi Arabia. Another scenario still to be contemplated is that the large conurbation centres in Hijaz such as the city of Jeddah might facilitate the transmission of the stop variants in the speech of third-generation immigrants.
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Substrate Breaking Free: The Case of the Argument Flagging and Indexing Construction in the Jewish Dialect of Baghdad

ABSTRACT  The Argument Flagging and Indexing Construction (AFIC) is commonly used in the Jewish Arabic dialect of Baghdad (JB) to mark arguments of the clause. Traces of equivalent constructions can be found in older Semitic languages as well as Modern Arabic dialects, and it is widely accepted that the existence of the AFIC in JB reflects Aramaic substrate. Nonetheless, neither Syriac nor any modern Aramaic or Arabic dialect present the diversity of syntactic functions and sub-constructions that the AFIC in JB does. Moreover, despite the peculiar semantic or pragmatic nuance that accompanies its use in JB, the AFIC is much more common in use in JB in comparison to other modern dialects. These differences motivated the current study, which aims at understanding the way the AFIC was absorbed into JB as well as the way it was further developed in the dialect.
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1 The AFIC

The Jewish Arabic dialect of Baghdad (JB) employs a particular construction to mark constituents of the clause as arguments. This construction, which we call the Argument Flagging and Indexing Construction (AFIC), typically marks the argument twice—once by a flag and once by a person index:

(1)  \[ \text{tǝnqáʕ-u} \quad \text{l-ǝl-bǝrġǝl} \]
    steep.IPFV.2MSG-3MSG  1-DEF-bulgur
    ‘you steep the bulgur’

---

1 As a central topic of this article, the morpheme \( l- \) will be glossed as is throughout the article.
The object in example (1), ǝl-bǝrgǝl ‘the bulgur,’ is preceded by the morpheme l-. This morpheme, which historically goes back to the dative preposition (see § 2), flags it as the argument of the construction. Apart from that, the same object, which is a 3MSG one, is indexed by a 3MSG pronominal suffix on the verb. We get, then, a construction that can be literally translated to English as ‘you steep it [to] the bulgur,’ whereby the object is flagged by ‘to’ and further indexed by ‘it.’

The terms FLAG and INDEX are adopted from Haspelmath (2019: 94), who distinguishes between them as two means of argument marking. The former relates to the use of case markers and adpositions whereas the latter to argument marking via person indexes. However, while the flag only highlights the argument that the construction marks, the person index is in charge of assigning it with a syntactic function. In (1), the pronoun is suffixed directly to the verb, marking the former as an accusative pronoun. The agreement between this pronoun and the flagged argument assigns the same syntactic function to the argument. This is why ‘bulgur’ serves as the direct object in the sentence.

Other than marking direct objects, the AFIC may mark indirect objects, oblique arguments and genitive arguments respectively, as the following examples show:

(2) qal-l-u l-ǝs-sāyǝq
    say.PVF.3MSG-to-3MSG l-DEF-driver
    ‘he said to the driver’

(3) muḥarram ʕlē-hǝm l-ǝl-aslām
    forbidden.PTCP.PASS.MSG on-3PL l-DEF-Muslims
    ‘[it is] forbidden for the Muslims’

(4) abū-ha l-ǝmm-i
    father-3FSG l-mother-1SG
    ‘the father of my mother’

The differences between the marking of the different syntactic functions by the AFIC can be formulated as follows:

(a) Direct object marking: VERB-Ø-INDEX FLAG-ARGUMENT
(b) Indirect object marking: VERB-l-INDEX FLAG-ARGUMENT
(c) Oblique marking: VERB preposition-INDEX FLAG-ARGUMENT
(d) Genitive marking: NOUN-INDEX FLAG-ARGUMENT

Formulas (a)–(c) show that the difference between direct object marking, indirect object marking and oblique object marking lies in the type of gram that comes between the verb and the index. When a direct object is marked, no gram interferes,
when an indirect object is marked, the dative preposition \( l \)- is infixed between the verb and the person index, and when an oblique argument is marked, a preposition other than \( l \)- comes between the verb and the person index. In addition, while the verb, the gram and the person index constitute a single phonological word when direct and indirect objects are marked, two separate phonological words are produced when an oblique argument is marked. As for genitive argument marking, it stands out from the other formulas since its person index is suffixed to a noun rather than to a verb. A pronominal suffix on a noun is a possessive pronoun, and thus the flagged argument that agrees with the pronoun is assigned with the function of the genitive.

Naturally, argument marking in JB does not have to be realised through the AFIC. There are additional ways to mark objects, or oblique and genitive arguments. Through the use of the AFIC, a specific semantic or pragmatic goal is achieved:

- When direct objects are marked, the AFIC serves as a differential object marking (DOM) instrument, whereby only definite objects are marked. Indefinite objects cannot be marked by the AFIC. The same goes for indirect objects, although indefinite indirect objects are, essentially, very rare.
- The AFIC will be used to mark oblique arguments in order to focus on them or to mark the bit before the climax in a narrative. Thus, to achieve pragmatic goals.
- Finally, when genitive relation is marked by the AFIC, the main noun must be inalienable.

To achieve these semantic or pragmatic goals, however, it is not necessary to use the full AFIC, namely a construction in which the argument is both flagged and indexed. In certain cases, only a flag or a person index might take part in the construction. Moreover, in the case of direct object marking neither a flag nor a person index has to take part. In total, four different constructions can, potentially, be used. We term them Strategy 1–4:

- Strategy 1—indexed and flagged argument (full AFIC)
- Strategy 2—indexed but flag-less argument
- Strategy 3—index-less but flagged argument
- Strategy 4—index-less and flag-less argument (marker-less construction)

The distribution of the different strategies across syntactic functions in our corpus\(^2\) is presented in Table 1:

\(^2\) This research is based on a corpus of JB oral texts (Bar-Moshe 2019).
In Bar-Moshe (2021), the restrictions that dictate the distribution that we see in Table 1 are discussed in detail. Considerations such as the NP type of the argument, its definiteness and individuation, word order, the inclusion of additional arguments into the clause and others are taken into account. We will not repeat them here, but will, nevertheless, highlight the following points about the different marking strategies:

1. Strategy 1 is the most common way by which arguments are marked when the need to achieve the semantic or pragmatic goals that were noted above arises. The only exception is direct object marking, where Strategy 2 is slightly more common.

2. Strategy 2 is mainly used when the argument opens with a definite article. In fact, it is limited to these types of arguments in the case of oblique and genitive marking. While it is rarely used when the need arises to mark indirect objects and genitive or oblique arguments, it is the most common way by which direct objects are marked.

3. Strategy 3 is very rare. Due to the absence of the person index, which, as we know, is in charge of assigning the argument with the syntactic function, Strategy 3 is used only when the syntactic function of the argument can be clearly inferred otherwise from the clause. Moreover, when direct objects are marked using Strategy 3, they are limited to pronominal demonstratives.

4. The only function that is compatible with Strategy 4 is direct object marking. This means that definite direct objects can be marked (or rather can be left unmarked) in the same way that indefinite direct object are, which contradicts our claim above that the AFIC is used as an instrument of DOM. Indeed, DOM is, theoretically, violated under Strategy 4, but the reason for that is parallel unrelated historical developments which are discussed in details in Bar-Moshe (2022: 38–40) and will be further elaborated on in § 2.2.

That different strategies can be synchronically used, as reflected by Table 1, raises the suspicion that diachronic developments that are still ongoing are involved. In the following sections, we will find out whether this suspicion is justified.
2 The diachronic development of the AFIC

Arabic replaced Aramaic as the lingua franca in Iraq following the Arab conquests in the seventh century. The process of adapting Arabic was quicker in the urban centres and in southern Iraq. By the eleventh century, the Jews had stopped using Aramaic as a written language (Khan 2007: 106–107), which means that they ceased using it as a spoken language even before that.

That the AFIC reflects an Aramaic substrate in JB, as well as in Mesopotamian and Levantine Arabic in general, is widely accepted in the literature (Blanc 1964: 130; Diem 1979: 47; Hopkins 1997: 358; Rubin 2005: 106, 115; Palva 2009: 22; del Río Sánchez 2013: 135–136). Thus, looking at the construction in Aramaic and in neighbouring dialects might teach us about the way the four strategies have developed and the constraints that dictate their use.

2.1 The AFIC in Semitic

Marking a direct object by the AFIC received much more description in the linguistic literature in comparison to other syntactic functions. Indirect object marking is usually discussed together with direct object marking, many times without even noting the difference between them. Genitive marking received less treatment in comparison to direct object marking, but still much more than oblique marking, which is almost never mentioned. These tendencies correspond to the distribution of the different functions in JB, as reflected in Table 1, and they probably correspond also to the statistical prominence of the different functions in Semitic. The available information about marking the different syntactic functions with the AFIC in Semitic is gathered in the following paragraphs, function by function.

2.1.1 Direct object marking

Marking the direct object by the dative preposition is a known phenomenon in Semitic languages like Arabic, Aramaic, Late Biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew, Akkadian, Ge’ez, Tigrinya and Tigré (Khan 1984: 468–469; Mansour 1991: 44; Rubin 2005: 92, 95, 107, 109–110). Classical Arabic (CA) and Middle Arabic, as well as modern Arabic dialects,  

---

3 The term AFIC as well as the division into four different strategies were, naturally, not termed and noted as such by scholars other than the author. Nevertheless, for the sake of convenience, they will be used here to refer to equivalent constructions that were identified in the literature.
present the use of the preposition *li-* as a direct object flag (Rubin 2005: 110). This use is marginal, however, especially as far as CA is concerned (Blau 2017: 67).

The full AFIC was widespread in Syriac as well as in later Eastern Aramaic dialects like Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic (Rubin 2005: 100–101, 103). In Arabic, it is found in Baghdadi sources dated as early as the eleventh century, as well as in Judeo Middle Arabic and Christian Palestinian Middle Arabic (Blanc 1964: 130; Levin 1994: 325; Rubin 2005: 106). As for Modern Arabic, it can be found in Lebanese dialects (Féghali 1928: 362; Koutsoudas 1978: 529), Syrian dialects (Cowell 1964: 435, 439; Grotzfeld 1964: 127), and *qal̩tu*-dialects like the Muslim dialect of Mosul (Jastrow 1979: 49), the Jewish dialect of Siverek (Nevo 1999: 75), the dialect of Tikrit (Johnstone 1975: 107) and the Karaite dialect of Hit (Khan 1997: 93). Specifically for the dialects of Baghdad, the full construction is present also in the Muslim (MB) and the Christian dialect (CB) (Blanc 1964: 128–130; Abu-Haidar 1991: 116; Erwin 2004: 332). Blanc claims, however, that it is rarer in both in comparison to JB.

Strategy 2 is attested to some extent in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and in Syriac (Nöldeke 1898: 218–220; Hopkins 1997: 351, 353). It is absent, as far as we could gather, from any other modern Arabic or Aramaic dialect apart from some *qal̩tu*-dialects and MB. Indeed, Blanc (1964: 128) notes the option to use Strategy 2 in all three dialects of Baghdad when a definite article precedes the object. This matches our findings about object-NPs that open with a definite article, but ignores other types of object-NPs that may be hosted under the unflagged strategies. Interestingly, no flag precedes the NP in all the examples that Blanc provides of object-NPs that open with a definite article in CB and JB. In some of the examples that he provides from MB, on the other hand, a flag precedes the definite article. In other modern Arabic dialects, all the examples of object-NPs that open with a definite article show that it is further preceded by a flag (see, for example, Levin 1987: 33–35 for the dialect of the Galilee, and Brustad 2000: 356–357 for Syrian dialects). This is, probably, not a coincidence—it is possible that the unflagged but indexed construction is a feature of *qal̩tu*-dialects that penetrated, to some extent, also into MB.


---

4 Interestingly, neither Abu-Haidar (1991) nor Mansour (1991) mention the option to leave the construction unflagged in CB or JB, respectively.

5 Only one example of object-NP that opens with a definite article and is also preceded by a flag is given by Blanc (1964: 128), but is seems to be a theoretical one, as it is shared by all three dialects.

6 The option to leave the flag out is attested also in the Jewish dialect of Arbīl (Jastrow 1988: 55), the Jewish dialect of Nusaybin/Qamīšli (Jastrow 1989: 158) and the Jewish dialect of Siverek (Nevo 1999: 75). All three dialects belong to the *qal̩tu* group. Strategy 2 seems to be absent from the neo-Aramaic dialect of Ma‘lūla (Hopkins 1997: 358; as well as the descriptions of Spitaler 1938, Correll 1978 and Arnold 1990).
mention such a construction in CB or MB. As for other Arabic dialects, Féghali (1928: 362) notes it in Lebanon, but mentions that it is not as common as Strategy 1 although it probably used to be quite common in the past. Both Spitaler (1938: 219) and Correll (1978: 15) agree that Strategy 3 occurs only rarely in Maʕlūla and that it should not be considered the norm.

Finally, the marker-less construction is not mentioned specifically in the available descriptions due to the absence of any formal marker. However, all the examples that Abu-Haidar provides for the use of the full construction in CB are repeated with the marker-less construction, giving the impression that they stand in free variation, or in her own words, that they have ‘the same semantic value’ (Abu-Haidar 1991: 116). As she only gives examples of object-NPs that open with a definite article, it is difficult to judge whether free variation is valid for other types of object-NPs as well. In any case, at least in JB we know that no free variation applies for the marker-less construction in terms of the types of the NPs that it can cover, as it is incompatible with proper nouns, with pronominal demonstratives and with pronominal quantifiers.

2.1.2 Indirect object marking

Not much could be said about indirect object marking using the AFIC in Semitic since it is rarely mentioned in the literature. Still, it is clear that the option to do that was available in Syriac (Diem 1979: 48; Khan 1984: 468) and Maʕlūla (Arnold 1990: 286, 300). As for modern dialects, Blanc (1964: 131) notes examples only from JB. One additional example from JB is given by Mansour (1991: 44), who provides an equivalent example from Mishnaic Hebrew.

2.1.3 Oblique marking

Oblique marking using the AFIC is attested in Syriac (Diem 1979: 48; Khan 1984: 468, 475), in Ge’ez (Rubin 2005: 107) and in Mishnaic Hebrew (Mansour 1991: 44). However, the Syriac and Mishnaic Hebrew examples that Khan and Mansour provide differ from those we find in JB. In both, the preposition repeats itself twice, once before the person index and once as the flag, as reflected from the following Syriac example: beh bǝ-haw zaḇnā ‘at it—at that time’ (Khan 1984: 468). On the other hand, in JB, as example (3) shows, the argument is always flagged by the morpheme l-.

7 Unindexed but flagged constructions were noted also in Cypriot Arabic (Borg 1985: 138), Malta (Aquilina 1959: 115) and Andalusian Arabic (Corriente 1977: 126), but they have probably developed for different reasons than the ones we will note below.
Back in 1964, Blanc wrote that he could not find traces of oblique AFIC in any other Arabic dialect but JB (Blanc 1964: 132). The only mention of an equivalent construction in modern Arabic dialects other than JB that, as far as we are aware, was gathered since is from the dialect of the Karaites in Hīt, where Khan (1997: 93) noted one example with the preposition ʕala-. As for JB, Blanc provides a few examples using the prepositions b- and ʕǝnd- and says that they are equivalent to examples without the AFIC (Blanc 1964: 131). Free variation as such is not the case, however, since, as we already established, the oblique AFIC is pragmatically marked.

Finally, oblique marking with the AFIC is attested also in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Maʕlûla (Diem 1997: 48).

2.1.4 Genitive marking

A genitive construction equivalent to the AFIC can be found in Aramaic and Ge'ez (Rubin 2005: 106–107), but unlike JB, a relative pronoun (rather than the dative preposition) is the source of its flag (Rubin 2005: 328). Thus, za- is employed as a flag in Ge'ez and zy in Syriac. Nonetheless, the option to use the flag l(a)- in the genitive AFIC has developed in both languages, probably in analogy to the use of this flag to mark the direct object (Barth 1911: 50; Hopkins 1997: 355). This can be seen in Table 2:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/Strategy</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Ge'ez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker-less</td>
<td>ʕatal malkā</td>
<td>bayt malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td>ʕatal-eh l-malkā</td>
<td>bayt-eh zy malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2</td>
<td>ʕatal-eh malkā</td>
<td>bayt-eh malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3</td>
<td>ʕatal l-malkā</td>
<td>bay(t)(ā) zy malkā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The flag l(a)- is productive in the case of the genitive AFIC only in Strategy 1. Its absence from Strategy 3 in Ge'ez was explained by the rarity of the strategy in general (Hopkins 1997: 355). We can see, however, that it is also absent from Strategy 3 in Syriac, which is not a coincidence. Barth (1911: 50) believes that the development of the flag l- in the genitive AFIC in analogy to the accusative AFIC was facilitated by the occurrence of a third person index preceding the flag in both the accusative and

8 The data in Table 2 is gathered from Hopkins (1997: 353–354).
genitive construction. We believe, then, that the absence of a person index can explain why this analogy did not penetrate into Strategy 3 in both Syriac and Ge’ez.

According to Hopkins (1997: 356), the full genitive AFIC is rare, at least in Syriac and in other literary Aramaic dialects. When it is used, the main noun is usually šmā ‘name’ or some other inalienable noun. Hopkins (1997: 359) assumes, thus, that it was a colloquial feature. Indeed, in some Modern Aramaic dialects, the AFIC is the normal genitive construction (Rubin 2005: 104). In Maʕlūla, for example, object marking and genitive marking look exactly like in Ge’ez (Arnold 1990: 301–302; Hopkins 1997: 357–358). More specifically, l- is used in Maʕlūla as the flag in the case of the full genitive AFIC, whereas a relative marker is used in Strategy 3 (Diem 1979: 48; Arnold 1990: 301–302; Hopkins 1997: 357–358).

As for Arabic, the full genitive AFIC is absent from CA (Diem 1979: 48; Hopkins 1997: 359). However, the preposition l- may be used in CA to mark genitive relation (Brockelmann 1908–1913 II: 237; Procházka 1993: 48, 50–51; Versteegh 1997: 78; Brustad 2000: 70; Rubin 2005: 331). In the modern dialects, the full genitive AFIC is found in Lebanon (Féghali 1928: 363), Cypriot Arabic (Borg 1985: 130), Maltese and in the Maghreb9 (Diem 1979: 49). In qältu-dialects, it was noted in Mosul (Jastrow 1979: 49) and in CB (Blanc 1964: 131; Abu-Haidar 1991: 116). Blanc (1964: 131) mentions the occurrence of the construction also in MB. In terms of the semantic constraint on the inalienability of the main noun in the construction, Blanc (1964: 131) notes that the genitive AFIC is common in use with kinship terms whereas the genitive exponent māl- is not. He compares the noun-noun phrase abu Salmān to abu-nu s-Salmān, both meaning ‘Salmān’s father,’ saying that the former can be used as ‘kunya or teknonym’ (Blanc 1964: 131). Melcer (1995: 75) also notes the same semantic restriction in his account of the analytical genitive in JB. As for CB, all the examples of the genitive AFIC that Abu-Haidar (1991: 116) provides conform to the inalienability constraint as well.

2.2 The diachronic development of the AFIC in JB

The survey in § 2.1, combined with what we know about the use of the AFIC in JB, as was generally sketched in § 1 and as elaborated in more detail in Bar-Moshe (2021), enables us to draw some conclusions regarding the diachronic development of the AFIC and its sub-constructions in JB.

9 Diem does not note a source or an example to support this statement. He might have referred to an equivalent construction that occurs ‘in certain urban and mountain dialects’ (Boumans 2006: 221) of Morocco. This construction makes use of the genitive exponent d as a flag when kinship terms are involved.
For reasons that will be discussed in § 2.3, we believe that Strategy 1 was absorbed into the Baghdadi superstrate at first and that Strategies 2–4 were developed later on internally in the dialect. In the next few paragraphs, we will describe the forces that led to the development of the sub-constructions one by one.

Since Strategy 2 is mainly employed to mark direct objects, its diachronic development can be mainly accounted for by this function. The motivation behind the development of Strategy 2 was originally phonetic—to avoid the repetition of the sound $l$- twice. Thus, it applied at first only to object-NPs that open with a definite article. Later on, the ability to host NPs that do not necessarily open with a definite article has developed. This development was enabled because in the absence of the flag, and taking into consideration that the AFIC is a vehicle of DOM, the definiteness of the object NP was generalised as a sufficient condition for its objecthood. The penetration of Strategy 2 into indirect object, oblique and genitive marking probably developed in analogy to direct object marking, and applies in the same environment, namely, when the argument opens with a definite article. When indirect object marking is concerned, like in the case of direct object marking, NPs that do not open with a definite article can also take part in the construction, given that they are definite and that the indirect objecthood of the argument cannot be challenged.

Strategy 3 is productive only in the case of direct and indirect object marking, with the limitation that the direct or indirect objecthood of the NP is clear, namely that the chances that the direct object would be confused as an indirect object, or vice versa, are low. In the absence of a person index that can point at the argument marked by the construction, confusion can be avoided mainly by the inclusion of an additional argument into the clause. The hearers can, then, reason out more easily which of the two arguments fulfills which syntactic function. In fact, it might be the case that Strategy 3 even developed out of the necessity to involve an additional argument in the clause. To avoid the production of a too heavy construction, the person index might have been sacrificed. It is also important to note that while only pronominal demonstratives can constitute the NP under Strategy 3 in the case of direct object marking, no such restriction applies in the case of indirect object marking. Considering the evidence provided in this paragraph, we would like to argue that the ability to mark direct objects using Strategy 3 has developed in analogy to the ability to mark indirect objects with the Strategy, and that it is still very restricted. As for oblique and genitive marking via Strategy 3, the former would yield an ungrammatical combination, while the latter cannot be considered a sub-AFIC construction. Putting a genitive argument into Strategy 3 would produce a definite noun-noun construction. This construction, as an old Semitic marker of genitive relation, cannot have developed out of the AFIC. Moreover, it is not restricted to inalienable nouns. Thus, it cannot be considered a sub-AFIC construction.

Strategy 4 is noted in Table 1 as applicable only to direct object marking. It is incompatible with indirect objects since the produced construction would lack any
trace of the dative preposition *l*-, whose existence is obligatory when indirect object marking is concerned. As for oblique and genitive marking with Strategy 4, the construction that would potentially be produced is grammatical indeed but cannot be considered a sub-construction of the full AFIC because it is diachronically unrelated to it. When an oblique argument is put into Strategy 4, we get a pragmatically neutral preposition phrase, and when a genitive argument is put into Strategy 4, we get an indefinite noun-noun construction, which is not restricted to inalienable nouns. Moreover, neutral preposition phrases and noun-noun constructions are, naturally, not a recent innovation. It follows, then, that Strategy 4 is restricted to direct object marking under the scope of the AFIC. But why do we even consider a marker-less construction as AFIC? The answer to that lies in the historical development of Strategy 4. Unlike Strategy 1–3, which mark only definite objects, Strategy 4 can mark both definite and indefinite objects. This is, however, a mere historical coincidence. In Bar-Moshe (2022: 39–40), we argue that the compatibility of Strategy 4 with definite direct object marking is a later development of Strategies 1–3. Basically, with the erosion of the marking power of the flag and the person index through the development of Strategy 2 and 3, definiteness was reanalysed as a sufficient condition for DOM. This opened the door to the omission of both the flag and the person index. Thus, the marker-less construction is homonymic: it can host indefinite objects and definite objects. The latter case is, however, a later development and is the only one that can be considered as AFIC.

The historical development of the AFIC, as described in the previous paragraphs, is simply a result of language use. Direct object marking with the AFIC underwent so many changes and presents such a diversity of marking strategies because definite direct object marking is quite a common habit. In comparison, definite indirect object marking is rarer. The only reason for the still quite high diversity in the case of indirect object marking is analogy to direct object marking, which results from the use of the same markers. The same cannot be claimed for oblique and genitive marking, which consist of a unique element. In the former case, a preposition (necessarily not *l*-) is involved in the construction and in the latter, a noun rather than a verb. These are considerable differences that allowed oblique and genitive marking through the AFIC to develop in different directions.

### 2.3 The absorption of the AFIC into JB

In the current section, we would like to address the question of the Aramaic-Arabic continuum in relation to the AFIC. More specifically, we will show that the different sub-constructions were not absorbed into JB but rather developed internally. Our discussion will be limited to direct object and genitive marking since they received
relatively more attention in the literature so far, thus enabling us to present quite a full picture of the distribution of the different AFIC strategies in Aramaic, Old Arabic and JB:

At the time of contact between Arabic and Aramaic, the full AFIC was clearly employed in Aramaic. It seems reasonable, then, that the Aramaic speakers who started to adopt the Arabic language forced the construction on their Arabic speech as well. Since the dative preposition was used in Old Arabic also for direct object and genitive marking, it might have also been used, even if in different circumstances, to mark these functions in the superstrate prior to the contact with Aramaic. If this is true then the use of the flag probably did not catch the speakers of the superstrate by surprise. The addition of the person index into the construction in the superstrate, on the other hand, was probably considered a more substantial innovation.

Table 3 gives the impression that at the point of the language contact, the speakers also brought Strategy 2, and possibly even Strategy 3, with them and forced them on the superstrate. This is possible, but even if this was the case, the synchronic Strategy 2 and 3 are different than the ones that existed in Aramaic, and as we saw above, developed out of the full AFIC. In the following paragraphs, we shall provide additional evidence to support this claim.

The conditions that promoted the development of Strategy 2 in JB could not have given rise to Strategy 2 in Aramaic. As we already established, the repetition of the sound $l$, once as a flag and once as a definite article, opened the door to the exclusion of the flag from the full construction in JB. It could not have been the case in Aramaic, where no definite article in the form of $l$- had existed.

10 Having said that, taking into consideration that the diachronic material of the flag in Ge’ez and Syriac is a relative marker and that the relative marker in JB is identical to the flag, it might be the case that the Arabic speakers interpreted the construction as consisting of two appositive components—a person index and an NP. Following this logic, an expression like $abu-ha l-ǝmm-i$ ‘my mother’s father,’ in example (4), could be thought of as literally meaning ‘the father of her, who is my mother.’ In fact, Diem (1986: 238–239) explains the emergence of the genitive semantics by an erosion in the appositional relation between the two components. This is not limited to the genitive AFIC, however, as the same type of apposition occurs in Strategy 1 and 2 regardless to the syntactic function of the argument.

11 In Old Aramaic, the article was suffixed to the noun and in Syriac, it had already lost its meaning (Rubin 2005: 68, 86–88). Hence, similar sound reduction to the one that occurred in JB cannot be hypothesised for Aramaic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Old Arabic</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct object AFIC</td>
<td>1; 2; 3</td>
<td>3; (4, not DOM)</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2 + 3 &gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive AFIC</td>
<td>1; 2; (3, not $l$-)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction had existed in Aramaic, however, might have facilitated the omission of the flag in JB more quickly.

Turning to Strategy 3, the case of the direct object AFIC should be distinguished from the case of the genitive AFIC. The genitive AFIC in JB could not have developed from the equivalent Aramaic one simply because the latter consisted of the relative marker rather than the morpheme \( l \). The chances that the Aramaic speakers adapted and used the JB relative marker, which is, coincidentally, also reflected by the morpheme \( l \), are very slim. As for direct object marking using Strategy 3, the clear and peculiar circumstances under which it occurs in JB simply render the scenario that it continues the Aramaic unindexed but flagged construction less likely. As we saw in § 2.2, Strategy 3 probably developed out of the necessity to mark an additional indirect object argument. In the case of direct object marking, it is restricted to a single type of NP—pronominal demonstrative. Moreover, this construction is barely taken advantage of since in the absence of a person index, the risk of confusing the object with the subject increases.

A final note is in order to explain the diversity of syntactic functions and sub-constructions that JB presents in comparison to other modern dialects, including qǝltu-dialects and MB. It might simply have to do with the marginal role that the AFIC plays in other dialects in comparison to JB. As Levin (1987: 36) puts it, the occurrence of the AFIC ‘in Syrian, Lebanese and Palestinian dialects is marginal and restricted in comparison to Iraqi dialects,’ and as Blanc noticed, the construction is more common in use in JB in comparison to CB, not to mention MB (Blanc 1964: 128–130). This is especially true to direct object marking in JB, where the AFIC serves strictly as a DOM instrument, which does not seem to be the case in any other Arabic dialect.

To conclude, the sub-AFIC strategies operate, synchronically, under different constraints than the ones under which they operated in the substrate or in the superstrate at the point of contact between Aramaic and the Arabic. Moreover, different constraints dictated the use of the sub-AFIC strategies that had existed in the substrate and in the superstrate back then. It follows, then, that the sub-AFIC constructions have developed out of the full AFIC internally in JB.

3 The diachronic development of the flag \( llə- \)

Bar-Moshe (2021: 436–438) showed that pronouns can also be marked by the AFIC. When that happens, the pronoun is flagged by the allomorph \( llə- \) rather than \( l \). Although the pronominal AFIC is not restricted in terms of the syntactic function of the argument, the corpus consists only of examples where it serves as the direct or indirect object. As a matter of fact, even those are rare—a pronominal argument was flagged four times by \( llə- \) as the direct object of the clause and five times as the
indirect object of the clause. Out of the total nine examples, seven reflect the use of Strategy 1 and two of Strategy 3. The flagless Strategies 2 and 4 would yield an ungrammatical structure. The seven examples of the use of pronominal argument marking under Strategy 1 are pragmatically marked. Their pronoun is contrastively focused. As for Strategy 3, it is unclear whether focus is involved in its use as well. In any case, it can only be used to flag indirect pronominal objects.

The intriguing question that we would like to address in this section is how come a separate allomorph developed to flag pronominal arguments, namely why was the flag l- replaced by lla- in the case of the pronominal AFIC? We will try to answer this question by focusing on the most prominent feature that distinguishes both allomorphs—the sound l, which repeats itself twice in the latter allomorph. The only evidence for a somewhat parallel phenomenon in other Arabic dialects comes from Daragözü and Maltese.

The genitive exponent in Daragözü presents two allomorphs: lē- preceding nouns, but līl- preceding pronouns. As for the dative preposition, its form is l-, and Jastrow does not mention any alternative allomorph for it in his detailed description of the dialect (Jastrow 1973: 49–50, 94–95).

The dative preposition in Maltese, which similarly to JB can also flag direct objects, presents the allomorphs l- and lil-. The latter may be used to flag both nominal and pronominal arguments. In practice, mainly highly individuated nominal arguments like proper nouns are flagged by it. As for pronominal ones, they may be flagged by til- in coordinated constructions or when they are contrastively focused (Camilleri and Sadler 2012: 120–121).

Comparing JB to Maltese and Daragözü, JB correlates more closely with Maltese in terms of the syntactic roles (objects) and the semantic constraints (individualization) on the NP that the allomorphs flag, but it correlates more closely with Daragözü in terms of the manner by which the allomorphy is conditioned (nominal vs. pronominal argument flagging). Since both Daragözü and JB belong to the qǝltu family, this similarity cannot be disregarded as it might point to an old qǝltu phenomenon. The fact that traces of similar allomorphy cannot be found in any other qǝltu dialect is, however, quite problematic, especially because Daragözü and JB are located almost at the north most and south most extremes of the qǝltu area, respectively. It cannot be excluded, then, that we are looking at a phenomenon that has developed independently in each of the dialects. In the case of JB and Maltese, it seems quite safe to assume that the similarities have developed in each of the dialects independently. Anyway, the evidence is too circumstantial to make a clear cut conclusion about the genetic relation of the allomorphy in the three dialects.

Curiously, the sound l- occurs twice in the allomorph that precedes the pronoun in all three dialects. As far as we are aware, Daragözü, Maltese and JB are the only dialects that present such repetition. What could be the reason for this repetition? In
the following paragraphs, we would like to propose four explanations. Although the first three explanations will be refuted, at least as far as JB is concerned, they will be useful to lead us to the fourth explanation.

1. Anatolian dialects other than Daragözü exhibit genitive exponents whose origin is, most probably, a relative element. These include forms like ḏīl-, ḏīla-, ḏēl-, ḏēla- and ḏēl-. Equivalent forms, like ṭēl- in Āzax or ṭēl- in Daragözü have probably also been derived from a relative exponent (Jastrow 1978: 125; Eksell Harning 1980: 42). Generally speaking, a noun and a relative clause in Semitic exhibit the same kind of relation as a noun and an additional nominal attribute, and so, relative exponents are equivalent to genitive exponents (Cohen 2019: 9, 44), which can explain why the latter developed out of the former in Daragözü. However, this explanation does not satisfy the reality in JB (and most probably neither in Maltese) since the allomorph llǝ- reflects the dative preposition and not a genitive exponent.

2. Focusing on the allomorph llǝ- in JB, it is tempting to claim that it reflects a combination of the flag (or, diachronically, the dative preposition) and a definite article. However, since the allomorph is specifically limited to the flagging of pronouns and since a pronoun cannot be determined by a definite article, this claim can be rejected. If any, this kind of development should have influenced the allomorph preceding nominal arguments.

3. As we already maintained, the flag originates from the dative preposition. It might be claimed, then, that while its status as a flag was synchronically established, its diachronic value as a dative preposition in the speaker’s mind was gradually forgotten. To compensate on that, the dative preposition might have been added with the time. Two issues invalidate this hypothesis, however. For once, there is no reason to assume such a development in the pronominal case and not in the nominal case. Secondly, while this might explain cases where a pronoun is assigned with the function of the indirect object, it cannot account for the marking of direct objects or genitive and oblique arguments.

4. Alternatively, we would like to argue that the morpheme llǝ- developed for pragmatic reasons. Apparently, l- is not the only preposition that changes its form when a pronoun is suffixed to it in JB. The preposition man- ‘from’ also does. Moreover, the change in both prepositions involves a similar operation that geminates the consonant. Thus, like llǝ-ha ‘to her’ and llǝ-ni ‘to me,’ one finds (m)mann-a ‘from her’ and (m)mann-i ‘from me’ (Bar-Moshe 2019: 63). As one can see, in the case of the preposition ‘from,’ the last consonant, n, always geminates whereas the first, m, does not. Although Blanc (1964: 122) argues for a stable initial gemination of m before a pronominal suffix, it does not seem to be the case in practice. If initial gemination takes place when a pronoun is suffixed to the preposition ‘from’ in the corpus, it is quite difficult to distinguish from a single consonant. The decision
whether to geminate the first consonant is, possibly, pragmatically conditioned. When the pronoun is focused, the allomorph is mǝmn- and when not, it is mǝmn-.

This claim cannot be validated, however, since the need to focus on a pronoun following the preposition ‘from’ arises quite rarely and so the corpus does not consist of any example of a focused pronoun. Nonetheless, the few pragmatically neutral examples that involve the preposition in the corpus seem to lack initial gemination.

If the gemination of the first consonant of the preposition (m)mǝmn- occurs only when the pronoun is focused then focus might be the motivation behind geminating the first consonant also in the case of llǝ-. We already mentioned the close relationship that llǝ- has with focus—when the pronoun is flagged under Strategy 1, it is focused regardless of the syntactic function that it fulfils. The seven examples that are included in our corpus can support that. In these examples, the message can be conveyed differently, without involving the preposition llǝ-, but it would render the pronoun unfocused. If focus is indeed the reason behind the use of llǝ- then the motivation behind the gemination can be explained by iconicity, namely elongating the consonant to symbolically mark focus. As was mentioned above, the allomorph lil- in Maltese is also used to flag contrastively focused pronouns, and so, the gemination can also be explained by iconicity in the case of Maltese.

It should be noted that the argument that the morpheme llǝ- marks is not always focused. Apart from the two examples in which Strategy 3 is used, where the pronoun does not seem to be focused, there is only one example where the allomorph llǝ- takes part in the clause although the pronoun is unfocused:

(5) bǝh-ǝ́g ma llǝ-ha nǝhâya
    sea    not llǝ-3FSG end

‘an endless sea’

Example (5) presents an argument of a semantic type that we have not encountered in our survey yet—an existential possessive one. Since the argument in this example is pronominal, the preposition changes its form into llǝ-. The pronoun, a 3FSG one, refers to the noun bǝh-ǝ́g12 ‘sea.’ This noun is modified by a following relative clause, in which llǝ- plays the role of the predicate.

Unlike the seven examples of the use of llǝ- under Strategy 1, no special pragmatic value is assigned to the argument in (5). Moreover, while the same message can be conveyed without flagging the pronoun (despite the loss of the focus on the pronoun) in the seven examples, the message in example (5) cannot be conveyed

12 The noun bǝh-ǝ́g is a masculine noun, but the speaker refers to it with a feminine pronoun.
other than with \textit{llǝ-} \textsuperscript{13}. It is possible, then, that the allomorph \textit{llǝ-} has generalised to become the vehicle by which pronominal datives are flagged, regardless of their semantic role.

To sum up, nominal arguments are flagged by \textit{l-} while pronominal arguments are flagged by \textit{llǝ-}. This allomorphy is quite unique in Arabic dialects and, as far as we could gather, a similar phenomenon can only be found in Daragözü and Maltese. However, the allomorphs of the flag in both dialects operate in quite distinct morphological or syntactic circumstances. Nonetheless, we attempted to understand the reason behind the allomorphy bearing these differences in mind. Four explanations were provided, but the first three were incompatible with the reality in JB. The only acceptable explanation is that the allomorph \textit{llǝ-} developed iconically to mark focus by gemination. Synchronically, however, unfocused pronouns are also marked by the same allomorph. This, we maintain, is a result of the generalisation of the allomorph as reflecting the (diachronic) dative marker before pronominal suffixes, regardless of whether they are pragmatically marked or not.

4 A note about the name AFIC

The AFIC and its constituents received different names in the literature:

- The flag was termed ‘notae accusative/genitive’ (Hopkins 1997: 349; Rubin 2005: 109), ‘object marker’ (Khan 1984: 469), ‘direct object flag’ (Coghill 2014: 335) or simply ‘\textit{l-}’ (Blanc 1964: 128).
- The name of the construction itself has been derived in many cases from the combination of the different terms for the flag and the person index. Apart from these combinations, we also found the names ‘prepositional accusative construction’ (Rubin 2014: 104) and ‘object pronoun plus epexegetic object introduced by \textit{l-}’ (Blanc 1964: 131). Specifically for the genitive AFIC, the names ‘double construct state’ (Mansour 1991: 44) and ‘object of a noun’ (Blanc 1964: 131) were found as well.

\textsuperscript{13} Apart from the dative, however, the preposition \textit{ʕǝnd-} is normally used to mark existential possession in JB.
Some of the names that were proposed above fit the needs of previous descriptions of the AFIC in Semitic since these descriptions focused on a certain construction or on a certain syntactic function. However, they fail to represent the diversity of functions and sub-constructions that the AFIC offers in JB. This applies, naturally, to all the names that involve words like ‘ accusative,’ ‘object,’ ‘ verb,’ ‘noun,’ ‘construct state,’ etc. Also, the adjective ‘ anticipatory’ does not take into account possible changes in word order (Bar-Moshe 2021: 420–424, 428–429). Other names stress the diachronic essence of the construction and disregard its synchronic reality: ‘appositional’ cannot represent Strategy 3 or 4 and neither can ‘resumptive’ or ‘epexegetic,’ although they capture quite well the nature of the relation between the person index and the argument; ‘prepositional’ fails, at least in the case of direct and oblique object marking, where synchronically it can be argued that the flag lost its prepositional value. Moreover, it also cannot be applied for flag-less strategies.

The name that we chose for the construction, AFIC, is neutral and simply allows to capture the most basic synchronic and syntactic essence of the construction, namely that it involves a flag and/or a person index and that it marks arguments of the clause.

5 Conclusions

The AFIC, a construction that goes back to Aramaic, presents quite a diversity of syntactic functions and sub-constructions in JB in comparison to other Semitic languages or Arabic dialects. Moreover, there is quite a significant overlap between the different sub-constructions and between the different syntactic functions in JB, which suggests that the synchronic argument marking system is unstable, and which points to diachronic developments that have not finalised. The aim of this paper was to account for these diachronic developments.

In § 1, we introduced the different syntactic functions that the AFIC is capable of marking as well as the different sub-constructions by which each of the functions can be marked. We saw that the AFIC is semantically or pragmatically marked. In the case of direct (and indirect) object marking, the AFIC is a vehicle of DOM by which only definite direct objects are marked; in the case of oblique marking, the AFIC is used to focus on the argument or to achieve a narrative goal; and in the case of genitive marking, the AFIC is restricted to inalienable nouns. Constructions by which an argument is marked without achieving these semantic or pragmatic goals are not considered as AFIC.

In § 2, following a detailed survey of the AFIC in Semitic, we argued that at the time of contact between Aramaic and Arabic only the full AFIC was absorbed from Aramaic into JB, and that despite the occurrence of equivalent sub-constructions
in Aramaic, their counterparts in JB were developed later on under peculiar circumstances:

– The indexed but unflagged construction (Strategy 2) developed out of the phonetic necessity to avoid the repetition of the sound /l/ twice, once as a flag and once as a definite article. Naturally, it was restricted, at first, to arguments that open with a definite article, but later on its use was extended to accommodate other types of NPs as well. At least in the case of direct object marking, the omission of the flag opened the door to the reanalysis of definiteness as a sufficient condition for DOM.

– The flagged but unindexed construction (Strategy 3) has probably developed to reduce the heaviness of the AFIC when the need to involve an additional argument in the clause arises. Indeed, the omission of the person index yields a lighter construction, but at the same time gives rise to syntactic ambiguity, which explains why this construction is used quite rarely and only when the syntactic function of the argument can be easily established otherwise. Moreover, in the case of direct object marking, Strategy 3 is restricted to pronominal demonstratives.

– Finally, the marker-less construction (Strategy 4), which is restricted to direct object marking, reflects a further step in the reanalysis of definiteness as a sufficient condition for DOM. If definiteness is sufficient then neither a flag nor a person index are needed to mark a definite direct object. This brought about the synchronic circular reality, whereby definite and indefinite direct objects are marked (or rather unmarked) similarly. This reality is, however, a mere historical coincidence.

In § 3, we accounted for the diachronic development of the allomorph /llә- of the flag, which is used to mark pronominal arguments. Although synchronically the allomorph precedes any personal pronoun, we presented evidence to argue that it might have been used to precede focused personal pronouns only. The gemination in the allomorph, we believe, is an iconic reflection of the focus.

Finally, we attributed the substantial diachronic developments that the AFIC underwent in JB to language use—specifically, to the extensive use of the AFIC in JB in comparison to other dialects, and furthermore, to the extensive use of direct object marking over the other syntactic functions. These developments emerged independently in JB and changed the grammatical nature of the substrative construction, giving rise to the innovative synchronic variety.
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ABSTRACT  In this paper, I show some internal variations in different areas of the Israeli Muṭallaṭ. Muṭallaṭ Arabic, first described by Jastrow (2004), is considered a unitary linguistic area within rural Muslim Palestinian Arabic. I consider here only the traditional varieties, spoken by elders over age 70. In particular, I analyse the diverse diffusion of the loss of emphasis of */q/ and the affrication of */k/ that characterises the entire Muṭallaṭ linguistic region. Dialectal differences are also found in anaptyctic vowels, presentative forms, personal pronouns, final imāla, pausal forms, lexical items, among other features.
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1 Traditional Arabic dialects spoken in Israel

The dialectal geography of Arabic in Israel involves a striking number of varieties that attest to an intense linguistic history and kaleidoscopic modern landscapes. Local sedentary dialects are labelled with the common term Palestinian Arabic (not including local Bedouin varieties) and encompassed within the dialectal area called Greater Syria (Syrian, Lebanese and Palestinian Arabic) (Palva 1984). The exiguous territory included within the boundaries of contemporary Israel is home to a multitude of indigenous Arabic varieties as well as to exogenous types that arrived through the immigration of foreign Arabic-speaking families, groups and religious communities (Cantineau 1939; Cleveland 1967; Fischer and Jastrow 1980; Shahin 2000). Ancient and modern political events, the strategic position of Israel between Africa, Asia, and the Mediterranean, and the presence of places sacred to a plethora of faiths have been in continuous interplay, leading to the linguistic and cultural enrichment of the southern Levant (Borg 2007). Until the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, the
local Bedouin, sedentary, urban and rural Arabic dialects reflected the traditional life patterns of pre-industrial, patriarchal societies (Blau 1960; Féghali 1928; Rice and Sa’ed 1960), endogamous to varying degrees, and extraordinarily linguistically conservative, as the first modern linguistic portraits of some of these communities revealed (Dalman 1928–1942; Spoer and Nasrallah 1909; Schmidt and Kahle 1918; von Mülinen 1907).

The establishment of Israel marked a decisive linguistic turning point. For local Arabic speakers, alongside classical and standard Arabic models, the reference language became Hebrew, increasingly spoken in public offices, state infrastructures and the media (Henkin 2011; van Mol 2003). The level and degree of literacy of the local Arab society proceeded in parallel with an increasing mastery of Hebrew (Amara 2007). In the first decades, the female population, which had relatively little access to formal education, remained less exposed to contact with the new language (Amara 1999; Piamenta 1992). Nonetheless, the situation evolved rapidly over the generations in both sedentary and Bedouin communities (Halloun 2003ff.; Henkin 1995; Levin 1994; Piamenta 1966). Exogenous Arabic types, spoken by Jewish immigrants from Arab countries (Spolsky and Cooper 1991; Spolsky and Shohamy 1999), and Christian vernaculars from neighbouring states were introduced into the local landscape and sometimes mixed with local varieties (Piamenta 2000; Shachmon 2017; Shachmon and Mack 2019). The creation of political borders had several effects. The lifestyle of the Bedouin communities became sedentary (Kressel 1975; Marx and Shmueli 1984), levels of formal education increased over time, especially for women, and the dialects spoken within the new Israeli borders progressively lost contact with the once contiguous dialects spoken beyond them. The results of the progressive loss of contact between the two sides of the border are already evident in the strong koinéization among the Arabic varieties spoken in Israel and the diverging directions developed by these in relation to the varieties of the Palestinian Authority, especially among young speakers in the last decade (Durand 1996). The second half of the twentieth century brought a significant wave of progress that inexorably transformed Israeli Arab societies and led to a deep transformation of the material culture, with profound impacts on the linguistic horizon (Cerqueglini and Henkin 2016, 2018). This contribution focuses on the ‘traditional’ Arabic dialects, i.e. the systems that still reflect the linguistic practices of pre-modern local Arab societies. These are now spoken only by elders over the age of 70, including speakers of Bedouin, rural and urban varieties, and are often hardly mutually intelligible. Mutual intelligibility strongly increases among younger generations, who speak a koinéized variety wherein dialectal features fade. Many of the Arabic dialects spoken in Israel and Palestine have been extensively documented, from the rural, urban and Bedouin Galilean varieties with their communal variants (Blanc 1953; Geva-Kleinberger 2004, 2009, 2018), the foreign types (Geva-Kleinberger 2011, 2012), the varieties of the northern and central coasts (Geva-Kleinberger 2004; Geva-Kleinberger and Tavor 2003; von Mülinen 1907),
the communal dialects of Jerusalem and its surrounding area (Piamenta 1966, 2000), to the varieties of the Negev Bedouin tribes (Alatamin 2011; Henkin 2010; Shawarbah 2007, 2012). Nonetheless, some traditional dialects, such as that of the Muṭallaṭ region (Traditional Muṭallaṭ Arabic, TMA) and their neighbouring northern Cisjordanian rural types, are disappearing without sufficient documentation. The only available description of the Muṭallaṭ dialects consists of a remarkable article by Jastrow (2004), which traces a phonological and morphological profile of these dialects, which emerge from this description as a quite homogeneous regional linguistic expression. Prof. Jastrow’s masterful work deeply inspired me and aroused in me a strong interest in what I thought were unique and, in a sense, mysterious local varieties, very different from the Arabic of the Galilee and Jerusalem, with some typical traits of the Bedouin dialects of the contiguous area, different from the neighbouring northern Palestinian Authority (Nablus-Samaria), and an exceptional lexical richness and specificity. Unfortunately, since then Prof. Jastrow has not addressed TMA varieties, nor have other researchers done so in a systematic manner. To fill this significant gap in the research of this subject and in line with the interests of my students at Tel Aviv University, most of whom come from the Muṭallaṭ, I have dedicated myself to the collection of an oral corpus of TMA varieties.

2 The Israeli Muṭallaṭ Region

The Muṭallaṭ (Hebrew: Ha-Mešullaš) lies along the border with the Palestinian Authority (PA), between Umm el-Faḥm to the north and Kufur Ḳāsim to the south. It comprises the eastern Plain of Sharon, between Nahal Taninim to the north, the Yarkon to the south, the Israeli Central Plain to the west and the Samarian Mountains to the east. The Muṭallaṭ, with its sedentary, agricultural lifestyle, is considered linguistically homogeneous. TMA is generally considered a conservative rural Muslim dialect, characterised by the preservation of interdentals, voiceless uvular (among men) and pre-uvular (among women) articulation of *q, environment-based affrication of *k, and preservation of long unstressed vowels (Jastrow 2004). The young Muṭallaṭ Arabic speakers who have taken my courses on Arabic dialectology and Palestinian Arabic dialectology in the past five years have repeatedly pointed out that ‘Muṭallaṭ Arabic’ seemed to them too general a linguistic category. They supported their claim with the fact that the so-called Muṭallaṭ had by no means in the past ever represented a unitary region with a deep historical identity like that of the Upper Galilee, the Lower Galilee, the Carmel or the Jerusalem area. The Muṭallaṭ became a geographic and military concept when the term mešullaš ‘triangle’ was coined in Hebrew to indicate the area of Kufur Ḳāsim, Ġalğūlya and Kufur Bara (originally: the ‘Small Triangle,’ to differentiate it from the ‘Big Triangle’ between Ḥanīn, Ṭūlkarem and Nablus). Here, Israelis had established control prior to the 1948 war. Of course, this
situation in itself generated a sense of solidarity and belonging among the people of this area. The concept of a unitary region later extended to the entire area along the border with the West Bank, from the Green Line northwards, as people living there suffered from similar vicissitudes of separation, loss and military control. Nonetheless, evident linguistic and cultural differences are still evident among them and are especially striking in terms of lexical choices. Probably only the area of the original ‘Small Triangle,’ i.e. the southern part of the Muṭallaṭ, north-northeast of Tel Aviv, has a unitary linguistic identity, most prototypically reflecting the features described by Jastrow (2004).

The Traditional Muṭallaṭ linguistic area can be subdivided into four main sub-areas:

1. Umm el-Faḥm/Zalafe/ʕArʕara (Northern TMA),
2. Bāḳa l-Ğarbiyya,
3. Ṭīra/Ṭaybe/Ḳalanswe (Central TMA),
4. Kufur Ḳāsim/Kufur Bara/Ğalḡulya (Southern TMA).

Across these micro-areas, the same features may be present to different extents, while often fade, lexical patrimony and heritage are quite varied. Therefore, my main interest here is the comparison of the different varieties included under the general label of ‘Muṭallaṭ Arabic.’ Along the way, this work reveals many surprising linguistic facts, which will be discussed here only briefly. More than one hundred and seventy elders, women and men over the age of 70 have been recruited so far as informants for the present research. They have provided linguistic data from different areas of the Muṭallaṭ region over the course of five years (2016–2019) in the form of folktales, narratives and spontaneous conversations among speakers of the same age, cross-generational conversations in the form of interviews on specific topics, songs, proverbs and jokes. I feel deeply indebted to them and their families for their cooperation, hospitality, efforts and generosity. The linguistic atlas of the Muṭallaṭ currently in preparation is dedicated only to them, a linguistic monument to the years of their youth.

3 The socio-linguistic profile of the Muṭallaṭ dialects: uniformity and internal variation

Due to the absence of major urban centres of acculturation, the diffusion of linguistic models and the innovation as well as the rural character of Muṭallaṭ society, the traditional varieties spoken in this area are still quite well preserved, especially among elderly women. Contrary to other regions, such as the Galilee and Jerusalem, the population of the Muṭallaṭ is homogeneously Sunni Muslim. According to Jastrow (2004), the religious unity of the Muṭallaṭ is one of the major causes of its dialectal evenness. Interestingly, Jastrow (2004) stresses the linguistic uniformity of the Muṭallaṭ area,
but in the title of his contribution, he refers to its ‘dialects.’ My inquiry aims to shed light on the coexistence of both uniformity and differentiation within the ‘Muṭallaṭ linguistic region’ considering its socio-historical background, some aspects of which are mentioned above. In addition to the fact that the Muṭallaṭ only became a socio-political entity after 1948, we should also consider that intermarriage between people from different cities and micro-areas of the Muṭallaṭ, from south to north, was quite rare in the past and remains so. Over the last four years, more than fifty students from the Muṭallaṭ attended my courses, men and women between the ages of twenty and twenty-five, from different social backgrounds, degrees of religious devotion and different micro-areas. Interestingly, yet not surprisingly, none of them reported that his or her parents came from two different areas of the Muṭallaṭ. This is not unusual in the region. The Bedouin tribal order in a quite restricted and homogeneous area, for example the Negev, works in exactly the same way. Community seclusion is customary in the Muṭallaṭ, even within a shared religious and socio-economic landscape. As in every community, jokes, sayings and preconceptions circulate to ironically stigmatise the attitudes and traits of people from neighbouring communities, marking neat distinctions between different social identities. The social differentiation seems to be reflected in a number of linguistic features, notwithstanding the undoubtedly unitary quality of some general, structural characteristics. As we will see below, some linguistic features differ to various extents from place to place, tracing a very nuanced picture. Thus, for example, the final *imāla, the affrication of */k/ the de-emphasising/fronting of */q/ and the pre-pausal lowering of -ī(C)# are realised to different degrees and with variable frequency and distribution among the speakers of different settlements.

4 Unitary features and diverse distributions

The first account of the distinctive features of the TMA dialects appears in Palva (1984), who provides a very informative table in which some linguistic features are observed cross-dialectally in Palestine and Transjordan. The distinctive features typical of TMA (*/q/ > /k/ and */k/ > /č/) are found in the row called ‘Rural Central Palestinian.’ Here, Palva notes that the affrication of */k/ > /č/ takes place in all environments. He reports the phenomenon in both dīč (‘cock,’ SG), after /i/, and dyūč (PL), after /u/. */q/ > /k/ is also treated as a common feature of the entire dialectal group.

From the lexical point of view, the spatial adverb for ‘here’ is reported to be both hān and hēn. In fact, in my corpus, northern TMA seems rather to be characterised by hōn, while southern TMA shows hēn. The form hān appears in the Bedouin varieties still spoken in the Galilee (Rosenhouse 1984). The temporal adverb for ‘now’ is reported to be halkēt and halloḳēt. The latter form appears only twice in my corpus, while the former is very common in the central and southern TMA varieties. In my corpus, hassa is very frequently used for ‘now,’ while the northern varieties use assa instead.
Interestingly, Palva (1984: 15) affirms that ‘Central Palestinian dialects are in many respects more conservative than the Galilean dialects. They have also been indirectly influenced by Bedouin dialects of the Syro-Mesopotamian type (biḳūl).’ Jastrow (2004) provides the following list of the features shared throughout the Muṯallaṭ:

1. the complete interdental series (sounded, soundless and emphatic),
2. the preservation of -h- in the third personal pronominal suffixes -ha, -hum and -hin,
3. the fronting of */q/ > /k/,
4. the palatalisation of */k/ > /č/.

Except for the complete interdental series, these features are quite problematic, as they by no means appear consistently throughout the Muṯallaṭ. Jastrow noted that the behavior of the palatalisation of */k/ > /č/ was quite unclear. Indeed, after having stressed the importance of the */k/ > /č/ process as an identity factor for Muṯallaṭ Arabic speakers, he reported that this shift was ‘by no means complete; quite to the contrary, there are many words in which the old kāf has not been fronted, but preserved as such’ (Jastrow 2004: 168). He reported three words where the shift was not detected: akal ‘he ate,’ akli ‘something to eat, a meal’ and kull ‘all, every.’ Jastrow assumed that there were probably as many words with a shift */k/ > /č/ as words in which */k/ has been preserved, that the conditions of the sound change had not yet been established, and that the shift had probably been triggered by the presence of front vowels, ‘including fronted /a/.’ He wondered why there was hača ‘he spoke,’ but akal ‘he ate.’

He hypothesised that this was probably the case because the prefix conjugation of akal is pronounced bōkil with /k/, due to the presence of the preceding back vowel.

As we will see below, according to my data, classified by place of origin, the prefix conjugation of ‘to eat’ is not pronounced bōkil with a /k/ in all TMA. In fact, the form itself diverges across the region, as stated below in Table 10. Nor do akal, akli, and kull appear everywhere and always with the plosive velar.

Indeed, the affrication of */k/ significantly decreases from south to north, as Jastrow noted. Jastrow reports some comparative examples of affrication of suffixed second person singular and plural pronouns between Umm el-Faḥm (in the extreme north of the Muṯallaṭ) and Kufur Bara (in the south, just north of Kufur Ḳāsim). Both varieties have dārak, ‘your (MSG) house,’ dārič, ‘your (FSG) house,’ dārčin, ‘your (FPL) house,’ but for ‘your (MPL) house,’ Umm el-Faḥm has dārkum, while Kufur Bara has dārčum.

The general impression is indeed that the affrication of */k/ in the northern system is more consistent. It seems to clearly correlate with the presence of front vowels, while, proceeding towards the south, the local systems seem increasingly chaotic.

---

1 The hamza is transcribed only where it is pronounced; in TMA it is heard only rarely.
In the south, the rules of affrication of */k/ seem to have been overextended and overdeveloped already in local TMA varieties, probably because this innovation came from the north and was locally subjected to reanalysis and implementation. In the southern TMA varieties, it is not unusual to hear the same word pronounced in both plosive and affricate ways by the same speaker, as I will report below. This could be considered evidence of the exogenous character of the shift, introduced from the northern area into the south and reanalysed there.

Interestingly, in the southern Muṭallaṭ, young people exaggerate the use of /č/, which they perceive as a linguistic marker of identity, sometimes ironically applying it to improper cases. Apropos, one day in one of my Arabic dialectology classes, in order to mock their friends from Kufur Ḳāsim, two young men from Bāḳa l-Ḡarbiyya pronounced the name of their town ‘Čufur Čāsim!’ This locution sounded very interesting to me mainly because the affricated pronunciation of Kufur Ḳāsim > Čāsim is a clear overextension of the */k/ > /č/ rule. In fact, in the southern TMA phonemic chain, while */k/ becomes /č/, the place of the velar plosive /k/ is taken by */q/, which is pronounced fronted, i.e. completely deemphasised (the fronting of */q/ > /k/, mentioned in the list above.). But the /k/ sound that is derived from */q/ never becomes /č/. Therefore, shouting ‘Čufur Čāsim!’ to their mates, the two students from Bāḳa l-Ḡarbiyya sought to exaggerate the attitude of the southern people towards the use of the affrication of */k/ to /č/, pushing it beyond its phonological limits.

In fact, such a joke is made possible by the fact that in southern TMA varieties */q/ is fully deemphasised/fronted into /k/. Thus, because of the spread of affrication in the south, northern people hint at the possibility that southern people could push themselves as far as */q/ > /k/ > /č/, but this never happens.

Furthermore, going northwards, the fronting of */q/ works differently. In Bāḳa l-Ḡarbiyya, for example, men pronounce */q/ as /q/ or /ḳ/ and women /k/. Further north, */q/ is usually realised as /k/ or just /q/ by those with some education, even among the elders. Further details on geographic and social distribution and realisation of */q/ and */k/ are provided below.

Other features, which are consistent throughout the TMA varieties, are listed in Jastrow (2004). The vowel system is considered unitary and defined as conservative, with three short vowels (/a/, /i/, /u/) and five long vowels (/ā/, /ē/, /ī/, /ō/, /ū/); the old diphthongs */ay/ and */aw/ became /ē/ and /ō/ respectively. Long stressed vowels in open syllables are shortened when they lose the stress, but this kind of shortening does not take place if the syllable is closed, differently from Cairene Arabic, as Jastrow noticed, and from other neighbouring sedentary Palestinian varieties, but similar to what happens in Galilean Bedouin dialects. A series of exceptions to this general rule is produced by the suffixation of the negation -š/-iš, which causes the reduction of the long vowels even when they remain accented (šufnāč, ‘we saw you [FSG]’ vs. ma šufnāčiš, ‘we did not see you [FSG]’). TMA also preserves an independent feminine form in verbs and pronouns for the second and third plural persons. The perfect verbal forms with a suffixed
consonant cluster require an anaptyctic vowel, with possible different placement of the stress: for ‘I hit,’ there is ḍárabit and ḍarábit. Jastrow proposes these forms as full alternatives, without further considerations of geographic and social order.

5 Further observations on Muṭallaṭ dialectal differentiation

In the last five years, I had the opportunity to teach courses on Arabic dialectology to Palestinian Arabic native speakers of different local varieties from the Golan, the Galilee, the central coastal plains and the Negev, but, for the most part, from the Muṭallaṭ. Most of the students come from the Muṭallaṭ. Tel Aviv University is indeed very close to their home area. Fortunately, I had the opportunity to teach several students from all areas of the Muṭallaṭ, from Umm el-Faḥm in the far north of the region to Kufur Ḍāsim and Kufur Bara at the southern boundary.

As I explained some very classical topics of comparative Arabic dialectology, such as the pronunciation of consonants, vowel system, anaptyctic vowels, imāla, pausal forms, syllable structure, pronominal forms, verbal conjugations and so on, students were often requested to pronounce specific words that contained the characteristic that we were discussing in the class. The students liked to raise their hands when in their home village or city the feature in question produced a peculiar outcome compared with what they heard from friends from neighbouring areas. Furthermore, they often added that their grandparents knew a different pronunciation, grammatical form or different word for a certain object.

Certain inter-dialectal differences were certainly expected between the dialects of the different regions of Israel. Indeed, differences between the tribal varieties in the Negev or communal dialects and rural vs. urban dialects in the Galilee are well known and have been addressed in the dialectological literature (Behnstedt and Geva-Kleinberger 2019; Blanc 1953). But what struck me most was the exceptional internal diversity of the Muṭallaṭ varieties that was revealed.

The internal dialectal diversity revealed itself in so clear a way as to be almost suspect. Indeed, today, when speaking of the history of the Arab dialectal varieties spoken in Israel, one must proceed with some caveats. It is necessary to examine the area’s history, as frequent relocations of the Arab populations (Hadawi 1970; Mills 1932; Palmer 1881), the movement of settlements and, inevitably, linguistic mixing all took place (Bergsträsser 1915). Thus, I began asking specific questions about the origins of each informant and, most of all, of his or her family, going back several generations. Through my increasingly frequent visits with families in the Muṭallaṭ, first through my students, and then more and more autonomously, I came to realise that in the decades around the Israeli War of Independence, the Muslim Arab population of the central coastal plains, from Jaffa and Ṣīx Mūnis to the old Ṭanṭūra, had gradually moved towards the central Muṭallaṭ, especially towards Ṭaybe and Ṭīra.
It is difficult to trace the path of the relocations, because, according to my informants’ reports, some families changed their names during the process through the new matrimonial networks that were being established or by taking on the names of the local host families. This immigration from the central plains to the Muṭallaṭ region was, nonetheless, restricted to a relatively small number of families and individuals from the villages of the plains. Furthermore, it must be said that, according to the maps sketched before 1948 (Robinson 1856) and historical and archeological reports (Cytryn-Silvermann 2004; Tavernari 2012), the villages scattered over the central plain between the Muṭallaṭ region and the Mediterranean were not numerous or heavily populated. The stretch of coast between Jaffa and Caesarea was marshy and malarial, and thus it was avoided by the caravan trade routes, which passed instead along the eastern hills. The eastern hills, constituting the current Muṭallaṭ region, were very heavily populated, being rich in water and at an elevation that allowed the cultivation of olive trees, a fundamental activity of the local pre-industrial society, as is clearly expressed by some elderly informants in the stories I have recorded.

From a dialectological point of view, the Sprachatlas of Bergsträsser (1915) clearly notes the linguistic uniformity of the eastern hills and the adjacent western plains. Furthermore, even today, the oldest informants describe the dialect of the people who came from the western plains as nearly the same as that of the central Muṭallaṭ hills, with just a few lexical differences.

In his Sprachatlas, Bergsträsser sketches what is today the Muṭallaṭ and the adjacent coastal plains as a uniform linguistic area, characterised by the following:

1. affricate pronunciation of the consonant ġīm, while Galilee, Jaffa and the urban centres of what constitutes today’s Palestinian Authority are characterised by the fricative pronunciation ž (1915: Karte 2),
2. totally deemphasised (or fronted) realisation of *q, different from the emphatic realisation found in the Galilee and Jaffa (1915: Karte 4),
3. affricate pronunciation of *k, with the exception of Jaffa (1915: Karte 3).

To sum up, the arrival of external elements from the western plains and coastal cities after 1948 did not significantly impact the dialectal configuration of the Muṭallaṭ region, as, with the exception of Jaffa, they belonged together within a uniform linguistic area. Interestingly, in 1915, Bergsträsser did not report any internal dialectal differentiation among the varieties spoken in the region corresponding to today’s Muṭallaṭ, such as the differential treatment of *q and *k in the different Muṭallaṭ sub-regions reported by Jastrow (2004) and mentioned above.

The affrication of *k is a widespread phenomenon in the southern Levant. The dialects of the Bedouin tribes of northern Israel who live in the central and southern Galilee have this feature in addition to the affrication of the original *q > g (Rosenhouse 1984). These features are indeed common among the Najdi/North-Arabian/Jordanian...
Bedouin types, of which the Galilean Bedouin dialects are a part (Cantineau 1936, 1937). The affrication of \( *k \) is found among the sedentary dialects of what is today the Palestinian Authority, both in the immediate vicinity of the border with the Israeli Muṭallaṭ (Bergsträsser 1915) and towards the south, around Ramallah (Seeger 2009a, 2009b, 2013), yet not throughout the area. The areas of Ṭūlkarem and Bāḵa š-Šarkiyya show the affrication of \( *k \) and the fronting of \( *q \) (personal observation), while neither shift is evident in the hills of Šomron (Bergsträsser 1915).

The geographic distribution of the different treatments of \( *q \) and \( *k \) seems to point to the existence of a sedentary conservative area, with the emphatic pronunciation of \( *q \) and the plosive pronunciation of \( *k \) in the central massif of Šomron. This conservative mountainous area seems to be surrounded by Bedouin dialects, to the north and to the east, that are characterised by affrication of \( *k \) and \( *g < *q \), and sedentary dialects, located to the north-west and to the south, characterised by a mixed character. Indeed, in both the Muṭallaṭ (as I will demonstrate) and the rural areas around Ramallah (Seeger 2009a, 2009b, 2013), the fronting of \( *q \) and the affrication of \( *k \) are not distributed homogeneously. In particular, in the Muṭallaṭ, the affrication of \( *k \) is governed by different phonetic rules in the different areas, with an extreme overextension of the phenomenon in the southernmost sub-region, around Kufur Kāsim, while in the northernmost area, the affrication takes place close to front vowels, as it does in the Galilean Bedouin varieties (Rosenhouse 1984). The affrication could thus be a historically contact-induced linguistic change that entered from the northern Muṭallaṭ due to contact with Bedouin varieties of the Galilean type, and then spread towards the southern Muṭallaṭ and the rural area north of Ramallah, where the rules governing the affrication were clearly reinterpreted.

Comparing my data with the outlines sketched by Seeger (2009a, 2009b, 2013), it clearly appears that the continuity between the rural area of the Muṭallaṭ and the rural area north of Ramallah is expressed by the diverse distribution of further features, such as the final \( imāla \) in the FSG ending, the pronominal system, the personal suffix of the third MSG, the negated suffix of the third MSG and the ending of the suffix of the third MPL of verbs with the third radical consonant \( y \). In both these areas, different treatments of these features are scattered across the settlements. This picture seems to point out to a situation of contact between ancient southern Levantine rural dialects and surrounding Bedouin varieties (Najd, Jordan), where the rural varieties acquire exogenous features to different extents in each settlement.

The contact between rural and Bedouin varieties in the Muṭallaṭ and around Ramallah was probably due to the Bedouin presence along the local stretch of the Cairo-Damascus caravan route (Tavernari 2012) between the eleventh and the sixteenth centuries. According to archeological findings, in the southern Levant the caravan route consisted of tracks that ran along the line of the Muṭallaṭ settlements. Jerusalem and Ramallah were touched by the caravan route, which continued along the Muṭallaṭ, as both the internal Palestinian mountain region and the western coastal plains were
avoided for different practical reasons. The historical presence of the caravan route and the passage of diverse Arabic-speaking groups could help explain the high degree of internal variation of dialectal features and lexical items across the Muṭallaṭ region. One should be aware, nonetheless, that the internal dialectal variation is not only a historical phenomenon across the settlements of the Muṭallaṭ. Linguistic dynamicity is very well expressed today through the use of different words for objects associated with modern life. For example, plastic cups are called čulucīb in Kufur Ḳāsim, from the expression kul w-kiibb lit. ‘eat and throw,’ and xadpami in Ṭaybe, from the Hebrew word xadpaʕami, ‘disposable,’ reflecting the actual Modern Hebrew pronunciation. A small part of the population of Ṭaybe also uses čulučīb. Indeed, an interesting aspect of Muṭallaṭ internal variation, both among traditional and neo varieties, is the diffused and gradual way in which features change across sub-regions, genders and age groups.

Nevertheless, some features clearly represent specific sub-regions. Among these are the extended use of affrication in the south and the striking contour-rising and vowel-lengthening of pre-pausal syllables and development of a slight internal conditioned imāla in Bāḳa l-Ġarbiyya. Interestingly, the frequency of such community-specific features seems to have increased over the last generations. The prosodic profile of Bāḳa l-Ġarbiyya is perceived as extraneous and unique by speakers of other communities within the Muṭallaṭ. In fact, it could be seen as a local evolution of the central and northern Levantine prosodic types (Bergsträsser 1924; Chahal 1999; de Jong and Zawaydeh 2002; Hellmuth 2019).

5.1 Internal diversity and utility of the TMA annotated corpus

In light of the historical and sociolinguistic observations made so far on the character of the Muṭallaṭ region, it becomes easier to understand how the linguistic features that characterise the entire area are found to varying degrees in the different communities from north to south, as I explained regarding the *k > č shift. Considering this situation, I felt the need for an annotated corpus for the study of the frequency and contexts of use in which the phenomena that characterise TMA manifest themselves throughout the region. The data provided by the corpus will be presented in a visual format in the form of a linguistic atlas.

The first linguistic insights into TMA internal dialectological differentiation that I present here are based on my 245,000-word corpus of TMA, collected so far (2015–2019) across the Muṭallat settlements and comprising narrative, spontaneous and guided conversations, proverbs, greetings and blessings, poetry and songs of different genres and for various occasions. The corpus currently consists of 300 pieces of different genres and lengths that have been recorded and transcribed and are being annotated for roots, morphological categories and English meanings. The annotation for morphological categories is very important because it enables the searcher
to see all occurrences of the same roots across different vocalic patterns in order to establish the influence of morphophonology on the realisation of */k/, the fronting of */q/, the emergence of *imāla* rising and the colour of anaptyctic vowels across different communities and genders. Pausal forms are annotated. While a detailed description of the content of the corpus and the annotation system that is being followed is beyond the scope of this discussion, I include here some basic explanations necessary for understanding the criteria followed in the transcription of the data provided in the paragraphs below. The transcription does not follow IPA rules but rather the transcribing standards traditionally followed in Arabic dialectology (e.g. ʃ for f, ţ for dj, t for θ, etc.). The transcription is not phonological: e.g. if */q/ is pronounced ƙ, k, or in both ways in the same text, it is transcribed each time just as it is articulated. The same is true for */k/ and for the entire vowel system, including the anaptyctic vowels. In relevant cases, the transcription marks prosodic lowering and lengthening. Secondary emphatic articulation, which is quite rare, is not marked.

Most of my informants are over the age of seventy, with some isolated exceptions between the ages of sixty and seventy. The informants are 54 men and 67 women. None attended school after the first grade. In all cases, they can be considered elders whose dialects represent TMA varieties.

In fact, dialectal communities are divisible by generational varieties. Elders over the age of seventy speak the traditional varieties of the local dialects. The middle generation consists of people between fifty and sixty-five years of age, educated at various levels, depending on gender, economic possibilities and socio-cultural constraints. Young people include those under forty-five years of age, in general highly educated, often up to university level, in Modern Standard Arabic, Hebrew and other languages.

As noted above, the disappearance of the traditional lifestyle—due to formal education in Hebrew, Standard Arabic and English and changes in material life—endangers the traditional varieties, which are converging toward a koineized language in which dialectal differences fade. Many TMA lexical sectors are no longer used or understood by younger people. Several prosodic and phonological distinctions are no longer salient. Both morphology and syntax have been deeply restructured.

The lexical annotation enables a search by English meaning and semantic category (object used for digging, drilling, cutting, sowing, transporting containers, liquid container, grain container, etc.). Indeed, words for objects of material culture are often not directly translatable between different languages. To avoid possible misunderstandings, photographs have been added to each of the agricultural and domestic objects mentioned in the corpus.

The search for objects through images, English terminology and semantic categories has produced an unexpected finding: many names of household utensils, especially supports and metal objects, have different names in the different areas of the Muṯallat, while the terminology for containers, cutlery and agricultural objects is far more homogeneous. Moreover, from a comparative perspective, the terminology
related to agricultural and domestic objects and their formal typology are quite surprisingly different from those described so far in Palestinian varieties, especially in relation to the non-Arabic names, studied mainly in the areas of Jerusalem, Ramallah and the Galilee (Basis 2009; Bassal 2004, 2006–2007, 2010, 2012; Bauer 1903, 1926; Dalman 1928–1942; Diem 1979; Elihai 2004; Fraenkel 1886; Griffith 1997; Elizur 2004; Féghali 1918; Fleisch 1974; Halayqa 2008, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2014; Halloun 2000; Hasson 1984; Hopkins 1995; Neishtadt 2015; Piamenta 1973; Rubinovitch 1923; Shehadeh 1983; von Mülinen 1907; Weninger 2011). Further typological and linguistic comparisons are currently being carried out, in particular with other Syro-Lebanese material cultures and both sedentary and Bedouin linguistic facies (Arnold and Behnstedt 1993; Borg 2003, 2004, 2008; Jastrow 2001; Retsö 2006).

Below are some quantitative data on internal TMA dialectal variation extrapolated from my TMA corpus. For each dialectal region—North, Bāḳa l-Ġarbiyya, Centre, South—I selected a sample of 15 prose texts (around 20,000 words) from 10 men and 10 women, as a balanced sample.

5.2 The affrication */k/ > č: geographic and sociolinguistic distribution

The data from the TMA corpus reported in Table 1 show a differential treatment of the affrication of */k/ > č across the four major areas represented here. The occurrences indicate the number of times */k/ is pronounced č, not necessarily overlapping with the number of words in which the affrication is manifested, i.e. in the same word the affrication can happen more than once. The roots indicate the number of different roots in which the phenomenon is manifested. The k/č overlap indicates the percentage of occurrences of both affricated and non-affricated pronunciation. Each gender group (women and men) in each of the four areas area was assigned the same number of words (10,000) from about ten texts from the TMA corpus as a sample. The data stems from such samples.

| TABLE 1. The affrication */k/ > č in TMA across the Main Areas of the Muṭallaṭ. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | North           | Bāḳa l-Ġarbiyya | Centre          | South           |
|                 | 10,000 words    | 10,000 words    | 10,000 words    | 10,000 words    |
| Women           | occurrences     | 1,230           | 2,002           | 2,434           | 3,878           |
|                 | roots           | 37              | 34              | 36              | 31              |
|                 | k/č overlap     | 1.20%           | 1.34%           | 2.83%           | 6.78%           |
| Men             | occurrences     | 1,036           | 1,245           | 1,728           | 2,678           |
|                 | roots           | 36              | 35              | 36              | 30              |
|                 | k/č overlap     | 1.05%           | 1.12%           | 1.65%           | 3.66%           |
While the number of roots employed in the texts is almost the same among men and women, since the sample prose texts deal with the same topics (marriage, agriculture, natural medical remedies), the number of affricated realisations of */k/ increases meaningfully from north to south, in line with the observations provided by Jastrow (2004). What emerges from this merely quantitative analysis is that there is a remarkable gender-based difference in producing the affricated */k/, with a wide preponderance of this phenomenon among women. A qualitative analysis of the cases in which the affrication is manifested is left for a further monographic enquiry. In general, corpus data support Jastrow’s hypothesis (2004) of an impact of the surrounding vowels on the affrication (northern dārčen/dārkum vs southern dārčēn/dārčum). While cross-generational observations are beyond the scope of the present article, cross-generational comparative data show how affrication decreases among younger people in the north, while it is overextended and implemented in the south.

5.3 The de-emphasising/fronting of *q: geographic and sociolinguistic distribution

The quantitative data regarding the fronting or de-emphasising of */q/ are quite homogeneous. Yet, in the north and in the area of Bāḵa l-Ḡarbiyya, there is a clear gender-based difference in the degree to which the fronting is realised. Among the men, */q/ are pronounced with higher energy than among the women, yet without emphasis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāḵa l-Ḡarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000 words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k/k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 The final *imāla in the feminine singular ending

Similar to what has been reported by Seeger (2009a, 2009b, 2013), the realisation of the final *imāla of the feminine singular ending is not homogeneous. The phenomenon seems to follow different phonetical rules in the different areas. So, while in the northern area the *imāla is in general of middle height (-e, not -i), in the south the rising is more intense (-i). Furthermore, in the area of Bāḵa l-Ḡarbiyya, the *imāla rising seems to correlate with the height of the preceding vowel, as shown in Table 3. The differences in the degrees of *imāla rising across the different varieties are purely
phonetic, with no phonological implications. The phonological vowel system is unitary, as in Jastrow (2004).

**TABLE 3.** The final *imāla* in the feminine singular ending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ġarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000 words</td>
<td>20,000 words</td>
<td>20,000 words</td>
<td>20,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madrasa</td>
<td>-a/-e</td>
<td>-a (midrasa)</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘school’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mʕallima</td>
<td>-a/-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘teacher’ (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sxnūna</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘warmth’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.5 The third person masculine singular pronominal suffix**

As Seeger (2009a, 2009b, 2013) noted, the treatment of the third MSG pronominal suffix may vary across local varieties. In TMA, this morpheme does not vary as widely as it does around Ramallah. The morpheme */-u/ can be high or lowered to */-o/, both after names and after verbs.

**TABLE 4.** The third person masculine singular pronominal suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ġarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.6 Distribution and quality of anaptyctic vowels**

In comparison to the sedentary dialects of the Galilee and the Bedouin dialect of the southern Levant, TMA varieties in general do not easily tolerate *-CC* groups at the ends of words. This phenomenon is reflected in both the nominal and the verbal morphologies. The main reference work on anaptyxis in central rural Palestinian varieties is the work of Palva (1965), who accounts for the existence of different anaptyctic systems in the Lower Galilee and mentions the phonological laws that rule the functioning of the anaptyctic system of Ṭurṭān. As Table 5 shows, different TMA areas have different rules for anaptyxis, regarding the nature of *-CC* cluster as divided and the type and length of the vowel used as a divider. In northern TMA, as in some of the Lower Galilean types described by Palva (1965), the anaptyxis is absent when the second radical consonant of the word is *r* or *l*. In Bāka l-Ġarbiyya, anaptyxis is always there: frontal/dental consonants attract the vowel */-i/, while in other cases */-e/ is used. The anaptyctic vowel is a fully articulated vowel, similar to the vowel used in...
Thai. In central TMA varieties, the anaptyctic vowel is always used and it is very short and quite centralised (ə). A full vowel appears after an emphatic sound in all varieties except southern TMA, where the anaptyctic vowel is stably a full -i-.

**Table 5.** Distribution and quality of anaptyctic vowels.

(*The vowel */u/ in the group CvCC is usually lowered to -o- in the northern TMA varieties, similar to what happens in several Galilean types. Likewise, */i/ in the same group CvCC is usually lowered to -e-. ***In fact, in central TMA, the current word for ‘oven’ is wakkáde)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ḡarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>furn ‘oven’</td>
<td>forn</td>
<td>furen</td>
<td>fur’n***</td>
<td>furin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ħarb ‘war’</td>
<td>ħarb</td>
<td>ħareb</td>
<td>ħarb</td>
<td>ħarib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xubz ‘bread’</td>
<td>xob’z</td>
<td>xubez</td>
<td>xub’z</td>
<td>xubiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milḥ ‘salt’</td>
<td>melḥ**</td>
<td>milḥ</td>
<td>milḥ</td>
<td>milḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naṣr ‘victory’</td>
<td>naṣer</td>
<td>naṣer</td>
<td>naṣer</td>
<td>naṣir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.7 The pre-pausal lowering of -ī(C)#**

I report here an example of the lowering of -i(C)#, i.e. of stressed ī in pre-pausal position. A similar phenomenon is observable for -ū(C)#, which is lowered to ő under the same conditions.

**Table 6.** The pre-pausal lowering of -ī(C)#.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ḡarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qalbī ‘my heart’</td>
<td>k/kalbī</td>
<td>k/kalbē</td>
<td>k/kalbē</td>
<td>k/kalbē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.8 Third person singular independent personal pronouns**

The series of the independent personal pronouns shows some inter-dialectal differences across TMA varieties, more in terms of preference than of exclusive use. For example, huwwe/hu ‘he’ and hiyye/hi ‘she’ are both known to TMA elderly speakers.

**Table 7.** Independent personal pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ḡarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘he’</td>
<td>huwwe/hu</td>
<td>huwwe</td>
<td>hu/huwwe</td>
<td>hūtu/hātū/hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘she’</td>
<td>hiyye/hi</td>
<td>hiyye</td>
<td>hi/hiyye</td>
<td>hūtha/hītū/hi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notably, the long forms are formally feminine nouns and therefore show the degree of the final imāla according to the internal rules of each dialect. In the north, elderly people prefer to use the long forms, while young people prefer the short forms. According to the data yielded from the corpus, in central TMA, the elders use the long forms when the pronouns are uttered in isolation (in a pause), while they use the short forms within an utterance. In the south, the independent pronouns pronounced in isolation are hūti/hīti and hūtu/hūtha, which are also found scattered across the varieties described by Seeger around Ramallah (2009a, 2009b, 2013).

Pragmatic investigations are being carried out in order to reveal the existence of possible additional rules of alternation of long and short pronominal forms in context. Regarding the plural forms of the third person masculine and feminine, southern TMA has hummi (M) and hinni (F), while central TMA more frequently has hum (M) and hin (F). The second person masculine and feminine are generally separated in both the singular and the plural, especially in the southern and the central varieties. The southern series is inta (MSG), intī (FSG), intu (MPL) and intin (FPL). The northern series sounds: intī (M and F), into (MPL), inten (FPL).

5.9 Demonstrative pronouns

The series of the demonstrative pronouns for close and far objects was originally unitary from a morphological point of view, yet it shows the outcomes of different phonological systems. Notably, the northern variety has just one form for the masculine and the feminine singular close demonstrative. While the final -a does not appear in the northern series, it appears very consistently in Bāka l-Ğarbiyya. As with other linguistic features, in the series of the demonstratives central and southern varieties are consistent with each other. Similar to what was noted regarding the independent pronouns, the different treatment of */k/ in the masculine and feminine forms of the second person show that in the southern varieties, the extension of the affrication of */k/ close to -a- and other back vowels is quite a recent phenomenon.

Table 8. Demonstrative pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ğarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre and South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘this’ (M)</td>
<td>ḥāḏ</td>
<td>ḥāḏa</td>
<td>ḥāḏa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘this’ (F)</td>
<td>ḥāy</td>
<td>ḥāḏi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘these’ (M, F)</td>
<td>ḥāḏōl</td>
<td>ḥāḏōla</td>
<td>ḥāḏōla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘that’ (M)</td>
<td>ḥāḏāk</td>
<td>ḥāḏāka</td>
<td>ḥāḏāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘that’ (F)</td>
<td>ḥāḏīč</td>
<td>ḥāḏīč</td>
<td>ḥāḏīč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘those’ (M, F)</td>
<td>ḥāḏlāk</td>
<td>ḥāḏulāka</td>
<td>ḥāḏulāk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10 Presentative forms

Presentative forms are used to for introductions such as ‘here I am!’ and ‘there he is!’ and are one of the grammatical fields in which TMA internal variation is expressed at its best. Table 9 reports only some of the many series of presentative pronouns found across the Muṭallaṭ.

TABLE 9. Presentative forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāḳa l-Ḡarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre and South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'</td>
<td>hiyyāni</td>
<td>haḍāni</td>
<td>hayni/haḍāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you’ (M)</td>
<td>hiyyātak</td>
<td>haḍanti</td>
<td>hayyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you’ (F)</td>
<td>hiyyāṭiḥ</td>
<td>haḍanti</td>
<td>hayyic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he’</td>
<td>hiyyātu</td>
<td>ḥāḍu</td>
<td>hayyu/haḍahū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘she’</td>
<td>hiyyāṭha</td>
<td>haḍahī</td>
<td>hayha/haḍahī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘we’</td>
<td>hiyyāṭna</td>
<td>haḍahna</td>
<td>hayna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you’ (M)</td>
<td>hiyyāṭkum</td>
<td>haḍantu</td>
<td>hayčum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you’ (F)</td>
<td>hiyyāḥin</td>
<td>haḍanten</td>
<td>hayčin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘they’ (M)</td>
<td>hiyyāḥum</td>
<td>haḍahumme</td>
<td>hayhum/haḍahummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘they’ (F)</td>
<td>hiyyāḥin</td>
<td>haḍahinn</td>
<td>hayhin/haḍahinn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 The position of the stress in the perfect paradigm

As Jastrow noted (2004), the perfect paradigm of the strong verb presents two different forms for the first and second person singular: kātabit and katābit (the treatment of the anaptyctic vowel works according to the rules of each dialect). Jastrow also remarked that, in any case, these forms never overlap with the third person feminine singular, which is always katbat. According to my data, the form katābit ‘I/you (M) wrote’ is typical only of Bāḳa l-Ḡarbiyya.

5.12 The position of the stress in the third person masculine plural of the imperfect

In the third person masculine plural of the imperfect, TMA varieties, especially in the southern area, use two different forms derived from different anaptyctic strategies interchangeably. Thus, in the recordings, both byūskunu and byūsuknu ‘they dwell’ can be heard, similar to what Blanc observed among the Galilean Druze (1953).
5.13 TMA internal lexical variation

One of the most striking aspects of TMA internal variation is the presence of several clearly different lexical items for objects associated with the traditional life. Alongside lexical internal variation, TMA dialects also use different roots for very basic actions and states, even for the verb ‘to be.’ Furthermore, the morpho-phonological outcomes of even simple and very frequent verbal forms vary across TMA varieties. Table 10 reports a small number of cases. The existence of a southern lexical facies that diverges from the central and northern one is a matter of fact, clearly demonstrated among TMA varieties and continuing in members of the young generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘broom’</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Bāka l-Ġarbiyya</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>miknasa/e</td>
<td></td>
<td>moṣlaḥa/mičinse</td>
<td></td>
<td>mičinsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I was’</td>
<td>kun’t</td>
<td></td>
<td>bakét</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he eats’</td>
<td>bōkel</td>
<td>bōkel</td>
<td>bōkel</td>
<td>byōčil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘plastic cups’</td>
<td>kubbayāt plastik</td>
<td>kabābi plastik</td>
<td>xadpamī</td>
<td>čulūčib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘watch!’</td>
<td>fakkir</td>
<td>Ŧūf</td>
<td>Ŧūf/bahhar</td>
<td>Ŧūf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he types’</td>
<td>bikbis</td>
<td>byikbis</td>
<td>buṭbuš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘girls’</td>
<td>banāt</td>
<td>banawitti</td>
<td>banāt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cemetery’</td>
<td>maǧğanna</td>
<td>mikbara</td>
<td>makbara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘olive tree’</td>
<td>zītōn</td>
<td></td>
<td>resīs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bee’</td>
<td>samle</td>
<td></td>
<td>nahle/i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cauliflower’</td>
<td>kambūṭa</td>
<td></td>
<td>zāhora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘slim’</td>
<td>ḍīf</td>
<td></td>
<td>rakaš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘baskets’</td>
<td>sallāt</td>
<td></td>
<td>sīl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusions and further plans: towards a linguistic atlas of Traditional Muṭallaṭ dialects

I hope I have at least partially demonstrated the existence of different aspects of variability within the borders of the linguistic region called the Muṭallaṭ, in particular among its traditional dialects. The distribution of linguistic characteristics identifies at least four areas from north to south. From a lexical point of view, at least two macro-areas are clearly evident, one northern and one southern, with profoundly different characters. I have reported only a small number of the changing features. Many others are currently under investigation. Due to the complexity of the distribution of linguistic features and in order to provide a historical interpretation of the
internal diversity of the area, I will prepare a linguistic atlas of the area that represents the geographical and social distribution of variable characteristics.

To conclude, the preliminary analyses carried out so far have encouraged me to support the hypothesis expressed by Palva (1984) that the Muṭallaṯ is a transitional area, characterised by koineization phenomena rather than shared innovations (as in the case of the overextension of *k > č in the south). The region has historically been subject to influences from both rural central-southern Palestine (Galilee and the Ramallah area) and the Bedouins of the Syrian area. As a general pattern, innovative features seem to begin in different focal areas and move from north to south along the path of the caravan route. Morphological and lexical elements are differently distributed across the area in a complex and nuanced way. Therefore, each feature should be identified and described on a geographical basis.
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The Pronominal Suffixes After Two Consonants in Cairene Arabic: A Historical Overview

ABSTRACT Grammars and textbooks of Cairene Arabic dating from the nineteenth century show two sets of suffixes after two consonants: the suffixes as used in modern Cairene Arabic: -aha, -ukum and -uhum, and a set with the vowel i between word and suffix: -iha, -ikum and -ihum. This second set of suffixes started to disappear at the end of the nineteenth century. The vowel i in -iha, -ikum and -ihum is an epenthetic vowel which is inserted between the two consonants at the end of the word (e.g. ism) and the suffixes -ha, -kum, -hum in order to break up the cluster of three consonants. However, the origin of the vowels a and u in the suffixes -aha, -ukum and -uhum is disputed. Some scholars, such as Birkeland (1952) and Diem (1991), argue that these vowels are remnants of old case endings, while others such as Owens (2006) and Watson (2002) claim that they are the result of vowel harmony, in which the epenthetic vowel is influenced by the vowel in the following syllable.

This paper will use historical written sources of Cairene Arabic to investigate the occurrences of these suffixes before the nineteenth century. Then, nineteenth-century sources are used to show the decline and disappearance of the suffixes with i. Finally, the two theories concerning the origin of the vowels of the suffixes will be discussed in light of these findings.

KEYWORDS Cairene Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, historical dialectology, pronominal suffixes, language change
1 Introduction

In modern Cairene Arabic, the pronominal suffixes after two consonants (CC) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-ak</td>
<td>-ik</td>
<td>-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-aha</td>
<td>-uhum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Cairene Arabic, clusters of three consonants are not allowed. Therefore, in 3FSG and in the plural forms (Table 1, in boldface), an extra vowel is needed in order to avoid a cluster of three consonants. This vowel is stressed. In 3FSG the vowel is a, in 1PL it is i, and in 2PL and 3PL it is u.

Sources from the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century display two varieties for 3FSG, 2PL and 3PL. Besides the forms mentioned in Table 1, there existed another set of suffixes. This set contains the buffer vowel i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nineteenth century</th>
<th>Current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3FSG</td>
<td>-iha, -aha</td>
<td>-aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-ikum, -ukum</td>
<td>-ukum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-ihum, -uhum</td>
<td>-uhum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The set of suffixes with i started to disappear at the end of the nineteenth century, and this process was completed at the beginning of the twentieth century. This raises some questions that will be addressed in this paper: Why were there two different sets of suffixes? Which one is the oldest? Why did the suffixes with i disappear? I will attempt to shed light on these questions by looking at the suffixes in pre-twentieth-century texts. This is no easy task, considering that this is a feature that can only be found in texts in Arabic script that are vocalised, or in transcribed texts. Although the latter can be found in abundance in the nineteenth century, they are very scarce in earlier periods.

The article will first discuss the current situation with regard to the vowels of the suffixes in Cairo and the Delta. Then, evidence from texts from the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries will be given, followed by an overview of suffixes found in texts

---

1 See Woidich (2006: 17).
from the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. In the final part, two opposing views on the origin of these vowels will be given: while some researchers claim they are remnants of old case endings, others propose that they are epenthetic vowels that were affected by vowel harmony. These two theories will be discussed in light of the situation in Cairene Arabic.

2 The current situation in Cairo and the Delta

Map 157 in Behnstedt and Woidich’s (1985b) dialect atlas of Egypt (see Map 1) shows that there are three distinct groups of suffixes in the Delta. The unshaded part, which covers most of the Delta, represents the set of suffixes -aha, -ukum, -uhum. The suffix -aha is pronounced as -ihe or -ihi in pause. The second group, indicated with a diamond, has suffixes with the vowel i: -iha, -ikum, -ihum. The third group, marked with a triangle, has both -iha and -aha. According to Behnstedt and Woidich’s (1985a: 78) Anmerkungen zu den Karten, the i in the second and third group can be explained as an epenthetic vowel.

---


---

2 The shaded part on the right, which represents the Šarqiyya, will not be taken into consideration here. Also, the region to the south of Cairo, in the Nile Valley, is not relevant here because the suffixes contain an unstressed schwa. See Behnstedt and Woidich (1985a: 78).
vowel to break up the sequence of three consonants. However, the vowel i in the pausal forms -ihe# and -ihi# in group 1 (which has -aha in context and -ukum and -uhum for the other forms) has a different origin. Because of pausal imāla (raising of final a), -aha# became -ahe# / -ahi#. The i-sound then spread to the left of the suffix. This is the group to which Cairo belongs as well. Note, however, that Cairo does not have the pausal forms -ihe# and -ihi#. The dialect of Cairo does not have pausal imāla anymore; this feature disappeared in the nineteenth century (see Blanc 1973–1974; see also section 4.3 below).

3 Pre-nineteenth-century Cairene Arabic

Pre-nineteenth-century sources written in the dialect of Cairo are rare. There are no reliable texts in transcription, and colloquial texts written in the Arabic script are very scarce. Moreover, texts written in Arabic script in which information about the vowels of the suffixes can be found are even harder to find, as it was not common practice to mark texts with vowel signs. Below, two texts are discussed in which some information can be found; one from the fifteenth, and one from the eighteenth century.

3.1 Fifteenth century: ʕAlī Ibn Sūdūn al-Bašbuğāwī

One of the earliest texts that contains information about the vowels of the suffixes is ʕAlī Ibn Sūdūn al-Bašbuğāwī’s fifteenth-century Nuzhat al-nufūs wa mudhik al-sabūs. Al-Bašbuğāwī was born in Cairo in 1407 and died in Damascus in 1464. His humorous poems contain a good deal of colloquial elements, some of which are vocalised. In his study of this text, Vrolijk (1998: 153) mentions one example of the vocalised suffix كَنْنُهم :هم kannuhum ‘as if they are.’ He also mentions three vocalised examples of the 3FSG suffix with the vowel a: مَهْرَها mahrahā ‘her dowry,’ وُمَّها w-ummaha ‘and her mother’ and في رَاسُهَا fī rāsahā ‘on her head’ (Vrolijk 1998: 153). I need to clarify here that in the first two examples the fatḥa cannot be explained by the accusative case, as in both instances the noun containing the suffix is the subject: وَمَهْرَها تَصِيحَ نِرْنَوْ وُمَّها تصِيحَ نِرْنَوْ and her mum cries meow’ (Vrolijk 1998: 82 a l. 10), and خَطَبْت لَكْ عَرُوسِهْ مَهْرَها خَطَبْت لَكْ عَرُوسِهْ وُمَّها ‘I got you engaged to a bride whose dower is twenty para’

---

3 See Davies and Doss (2013: 26).
5 Text edition and study by Arnoud Vrolijk (1998). The work consists of two parts: the study (in English) and the text edition. When referring to the edition of the Arabic text, the letter a is mentioned after the page number.
6 The poem is about a little kitten.
7 The para was ¼ of a piastre.
83a l. 11). Of course, in the third example (Vrolijk 1998: 139a l. 14), the noun is preceded by في, so if there was a case ending, it would have been a kasra. However, this last example poses a problem because rās ends in a single consonant and therefore the suffix would be expected to be -hā rather than -ahā. An explanation could be that it should be read as raʔsahā. There are two other instances in which the word is vocalised as (Vrolijk 1998: 140a l. 11 and p. 141a l. 13).

Vrolijk states that the suffix was -ihā when the syllable preceding the suffix contained an i or ī:

There is some evidence, however, that the intermediary vowel becomes ‘i’ when the last syllable of the preceding word has an ‘i’ or ‘I’ vowel: bīdihā ‘in her hand’ (82: 9). (Vrolijk 1998: 153)

Vrolijk suggests that this is a case of vowel harmony in which the vowel of the noun influences the vowel of the suffix. Because the word ʔīd is colloquial, he does not seem to consider the possibility that the i is in fact the genitive case ending. However, because ʔīd is preceded by bi-, it cannot be excluded that the vowel does in fact indicate the genitive case, making this a mixed form containing both colloquial and classical elements. However this may be, one example is not enough to establish a general rule. Another important point is that in this example no vowel at all is needed because ʔīd (like rās) ends in one consonant and therefore takes the suffix -hā. This example is from a line of poetry, so the extra vowel is probably dictated by the metre.8 The only other examples with -ihā that I have found in this text are words that are preceded by a preposition. For instance, forms like عَلى رجْلِها (Vrolijk 1998: 112a l. 3) and فى يَومِها (Vrolijk 1998: 114 l. 15) are ambiguous because the kasra could be explained as the genitive case ending. Also, the word إسْمَها ‘her name’ (Vrolijk 1998: 112a l. 2) with an i in the preceding syllable, but the suffix -ahā rather than -ihā, contradicts Vrolijk’s theory of vowel harmony.

Besides the examples mentioned by Vrolijk (1998: 153), I have found additional instances of vocalised suffixes in which the vowel before the suffix is different than the one expected in Classical Arabic:9

-ahā:
على ظهرَها ‘on her back’ (Vrolijk 1998: 112a l. 8 and 139a l. 15);
ان المركب بَطْنَها مُعَوّقَهْ فى المُويِهْ ‘the belly of the boat is held back in the water’ (Vrolijk 1998: 141a l. 1).

8 This is not the case in the examples of في راسها because these all occur in prose text.
9 For instance, كنَّها ‘as if she’ (Vrolijk 1998: 98a l. 13) and تحتِها ‘underneath her’ (Vrolijk 1998: 98a l. 14) both have a as in Classical Arabic.
-ukum:
‘Oh your restive one (?), oh my good luck’ (Vrolijk 1998: 106a l. 4).10

No additional examples of the suffix -هم with vocalisation were found.

There are two passages, ‘The letter of Funayn’ (pp. 137a–139a) and ‘About the difference between a boat and a horse and what relates to this’ (pp. 139a–141a) in which the suffix 3FSG is written as ـِهِهْ, representing the suffix -هي with strong imāla, which can still be found in the Delta (see section 2 above). Examples are رعمل ‘underneath her’ (Vrolijk 1998: 138a l. 15), قال لها ‘he said to her’ (Vrolijk 1998: 140a l. 16) and رجلها ‘her leg’ (Vrolijk 1998: 140a l. 17). ‘The letter of Funayn,’ from which the first example is taken, is a letter written by a fictional character from the Egyptian countryside and was ‘an attempt to imitate and ridicule the speech of a baladi character’ (Vrolijk 1998: 141). The fact that al-Bašbuğaşi wrote the suffix with hāʔ rather than alif and also marked the suffix with two kasras shows that he took some trouble to stress the fact that this was not Cairene Arabic.

3.2. Eighteenth century: Liʕb al-Manār

The text of the shadow play Liʕb al-Manār ‘The play of the lighthouse,’ about the famous lighthouse in Alexandria, dates from the sixteenth century, but the only surviving manuscript containing the text dates from 1707.12 The play was meant to be performed rather than read in silence, and the manuscript shows signs of being used during performances.13 Shadow plays were meant to entertain the masses. It is therefore not surprising that Liʕb al-Manār contains many colloquial elements.14 Although the text is only sparsely vocalised, there are two instances of vocalised suffixes that concern us here: كُلُّهم kulluhum (Kahle 1930: 8a l. 9) and كلَّها kullaha (Kahle 1930: 19a l. 7). However, كُلُّهم is the subject of the sentence, so this could also be interpreted as the Classical Arabic case ending كَلْهَا. كُلُّها would have been in the nominative if it had been Classical Arabic: وَارض قبرص والجزاير كُلُّها تنطاع لقوله ‘and the land of Cyprus and all the islands obey his words.’ So here we do have proof of the suffix -aha.

10 According to the rules of Classical Arabic, حرين should have been in the accusative (see Caspari and Wright 1862, vol. II: 63). The meaning of حرين is not entirely clear. It is also used on p. 82a l. 7: يا حُرَيْن النَاسْ يبَخْتى. As both examples are from children’s rhymes, and the one on p. 82a is full of diminutives, it seems most likely that حَرون is the diminutive of حِرْن ‘restive.’
11 See also Vrolijk (1998: 153).
12 See Kahle (1930: 3–8) and Zack (2012: 333–334). References to Kahle’s (1930) edition of the Arabic text are marked with the letter a after the page number.
13 See Kahle (1930: 1).
What the examples in sections 3.1 and 3.2 show is that the forms with \(a\) and \(u\) most likely were the norm. There are no unambiguous examples of suffixes with \(i\) from this period that could not be attributed to the genitive case; however, the 3FSG form -\(ihi\) was clearly stigmatised.

In the following paragraph, the appearance of the suffixes in nineteenth-century sources will be discussed.

4 The nineteenth century

From the second half of the nineteenth century, many textbooks, language guides and grammars of Cairene Arabic were published. These were written both by native speakers and orientalists and aimed at teaching Arabic to foreign travellers. Most of these used transcribed Arabic, or both transcription and Arabic script, which makes them very useful sources for phonological research.\(^1^5\)

4.1 -\(ikum\) / -\(ukum\) and -\(ihum\) / -\(ukum\)

Many nineteenth-century sources have -\(ukum\) and -\(uhum\), which are the forms that are used in Cairo nowadays. Some examples with \(u\) (ordered from the oldest to the most recent sources) are:

- \(hommâ kân andohoum innâb\)\(^1^6\) (Cadri 1868: 134) ‘they had grapes’;
- \(buddâhum\) (Spitta 1880: 54) ‘they want’;
- \(wêhum saḥtâhum ḥagar kullûhum\) (Spitta 1883: 146) ‘and she turned them all into stone’;
- \(aandoukoum\) (Vaujany 1884: 19) ‘you (PL) have’;
- \(ma ʕandokumš adab\) (Spiro 1912: 50) ‘you have no manners.’

There are also a number of sources that mention -\(ikum\) and -\(ihum\). Examples with \(i\) include:

- \(houmma kân ândehom\) (Nolden 1844: 141) ‘they had’;
- \(intom andikom; nafsi-kom, nafsi-hom\) (Nakhlah 1874: 63; 137) ‘you (PL) have’; ‘your-selves, theirselves’;
- \(كبشت كبشه ذهب ورمتها فى وَسْطِهم\) (Dulac 1889: 67) ‘she took a handful of gold and threw it among them’;
- \(nafsi-kum, nafsi-hum\) (Thimm 1898: 42) ‘yourselves, theirselves.’

\(^1^5\) For more information about these types of books, see Zack (2016 and 2017).
\(^1^6\) The transcriptions have been kept as in the original sources.
Some sources use both $u$ and $i$:

- *tiqdar tohhot-tóhom tãhht el kursee au fil shâbakeh* (Sacroug 1874: 296) ‘you may put them under the seat or in the net’; *hoom’ma aandêhom* (Sacroug 1874: 249) ‘they have’;
- *ahadû nafsûhum* (Van Berchem 1889: 99) ‘they stood up’; *wêqâmet elmara gâbet elhadîde min ennâr wêkauwethum fi kašbihum* (Van Berchem 1889: 101) ‘the woman stood up, got the iron from the fire and ironed their heels’;
- *biddîkum (auch buddûkum) tidrabu* (Seidel 1896: 37) ‘you (PL) want to hit.’

Spitta’s and Seidel’s examples with *bidd* ‘to want’ are interesting because they show vowel harmony: besides *biddûhum*, a form *buddûhum* existed (Spitta 1880: 54) in which *bidd* has become *budd* under the influence of the vowel in the next syllable. Seidel’s (1896: 37) *biddîkum/buddûkum* shows the same phenomenon. I have not found any other examples except for these two with the word *bidd*.

Spitta (1880) is also interesting for another reason. Although his book is a very detailed, scholarly description of the grammar of Cairene Arabic, and lists numerous variations, it does not mention *ı̊* as ‘Bindevocal’ for the suffixes *-kum* and *-hum* (see Spitta 1880: 54).

The last grammar which mentions the forms *-ikum* and *-ihum* is Marriott ([1930]). However, its date of publication is misleading because it is based on C. A. Thimm’s book that first appeared in 1897. It is very likely that this information was not updated in subsequent editions. Another late source which mentions these forms is Chagavat’s *Vocabulaire français-italien-arabe*, which has no year of publication but most probably dates from the early twentieth century.¹⁷ He mentions for instance *andékom, andéhom* (Chagavat s.d.: 305).

### 4.2 *-iha* and *-aha*

Whereas most sources give either the forms with *i* or those with *u* for the suffixes 2PL and 3PL, but not both, the situation is different when it comes to the suffix 3FSG. The majority of the sources from the nineteenth century give both options *-iha* and *-aha*, as can be seen in Table 3.

It is only at the beginning of the twentieth century that the suffix *-iha* falls into disuse, as the table shows. Mahmoud Salem still mentions *-iha* 1940, although it

---

¹⁷ Although undated, some information about its year of publication can be deducted from a list of other publications by the author mentioned at the end of the book. Of the 18 titles, only one can be found in WorldCat: *Mahomet et les Khalifes et l’Empire Ottoman* (see [http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/14992167](http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/14992167), accessed 30 April 2020). This book was published in 1912. Therefore, his *Vocabulaire* must have been published after that.
needs to be noted that Salem is in many ways more conservative than most other sources and therefore is not a reliable source to establish when a certain feature became obsolete.18

Some examples with -iha:
- *anà farragtohoum alal madina kollihà* (Cadri 1868: 346) ‘I showed them the whole city’ (note also *farragtohoum* with *u*);

---

18 Salem’s 1940 publication is the second edition. It is unknown when the first edition was published. It could be much earlier and therefore account for some of the archaic features.
– fālammâ šâfhâ ġaly ḥabbīha (Spitta 1880: 181) ‘when Ali saw her, he fell in love with her’;
– kanit siḫḥitik izzayyī-ha ma·n wa-t ma·chuftik? (Salem 1940: 113) ‘how have you been since I saw you last?’

And some examples with -aha:
– mà rouhtahâch aslan (Cadri 1868: 246) ‘I’ve never been there’;
– es-sâʕa táwwahâ dáqqet t’lāte (Hassan 1869: 32) ‘it has just struck three’;
– issmaha ayh (Nakhlah 1874: 97) ‘what is her name?’;
– min waqtâha (Haggenmacher 1892: 98) ‘since then’;
– bint-ă-ha (Nallino 1900: 29) ‘her daughter.’

Nallino remarks:

I vocaboli terminanti con due consonanti, davanti ai suffissi che cominciano per consonante devono prendere una vocale eufonica (§ 3), ossia ā od ī od innanzi a ħa, ĭ innanzi a nā, ā innanzi a kum, hum. Da bint figlia: bint-ă-ha la figlia di lei, bint-ī-na nostra figlia, bint-ū-kum la figlia vostra, bint-ū-hum la figlia loro. Al Cairo e nelle sue vicinanze si accentua (§ 4) bintáhâ, bintína, bintúkum, bintúhum. (Nallino 1900: 30)

‘The words ending with two consonants before suffixes beginning with a consonant must take a euphonic vowel (§ 3), namely ā or ī before ħa, ĭ before nā, ā before kum, hum. For bint daughter: bint-ă-ha her daughter, bint-ī-na our daughter, bint-ū-kum your daughter, bint-ū-hum their daughter. In Cairo and its surroundings it is stressed (§ 4) bintáhâ, bintína, bintúkum, bintúhum.’ (translation by the author)

What is interesting here is that Nallino first confirms that both a and i can be used before the suffix -ha, but then twice mentions the example bintaha only, which implies that this was the preferred form at that time. This is corroborated by Spitta’s Grammatik des arabischen Vulgärdialektes von Aegypten (1880). In the following paradigm (Figure 1), we can see that although he does not mention the forms -ikum and -ihum (see section 3.1), he does mention both forms -iha and -aha:

| 4) Auf eine doppelt geschlossene kurze Silbe ausgehendes Substantiv: sügl „Geschäft“ | sügléhum ihr Geschäft |
| süglöh sein Geschäft | süglük euer Geschäft |
| sügl’éha (süglēha) ihr Geschäft | sügléna unser Geschäft |
| süglalk dein (m.) Geschäft | |
| süglék dein (f.) Geschäft | |
| sügley mein Geschäft | |

**FIGURE 1.** The suffixes after CC in Spitta (1880: 153).
The fact that the form sugliha is given between brackets indicates that for Spitta it was not the standard or preferred form. Spitta makes three statements about the vowel of the suffix 3FSG:

Ferner steht er [=e], obwohl gerade nicht häufig, vor dem Suffix der 3. P. sing. fem. ha, wenn dieses an Formen gehängt wird, die mit zwei Consonanten eindigen. Beispiele: sandëha „bei ihr“ [...]. (Spitta 1880: 53)

On the same page, he mentions:

Der Zwischenvocal å kommt nur vor dem Suffix der 3. P. fem. sing. ha (ha) vor, wenn dasselbe an Substantiva oder Verba tritt, die mit zwei Consonanten schliessen; er wechselt in dieser Function mit dem eben erwähnten ê, von dem er überhaupt schwer zu unterscheiden ist, und dem gleich zu besprechenden î. (Spitta 1880: 53)

And on the next page:

Der Zwischenvocal î kommt zunächst als Bindevocal vor dem Suffix hä (ha) vor, z. B. 7, 2 bardîha „sie auch“; 7, 7 Yandîha „bei ihr“, wo auch, wie eben erwähnt, ê und å stehen können. (Spitta 1880: 54)

Summarising Spitta’s three statements, it can be concluded that a was the most common vowel for the suffix 3FSG. Besides these, the vowels i and ê were used as well, although the use of the latter was ‘nicht häufig’ (‘not often’).

Taking the evidence from the sources into consideration, it can be concluded that the forms with -ikum and -ihum disappeared from Cairene Arabic at the end of the nineteenth century. The form -iha was more common than -ikum and -ihum and seems to have survived longer: well into the twentieth century. However, even when the two forms existed side by side, the form with a seems to have been the preferred one.

### 4.3 The nineteenth century: appearance and disappearance of a suffix

As discussed in section 3, there are no texts that show the suffixes with i in Cairene Arabic before the nineteenth century. This does not mean that they did not exist at all, but merely that at the moment there is no evidence of their existence. The available texts do indicate that the forms with a and u were used at that time, and that the 3FSG suffix with strong imāla (-ihi) was stigmatised. The numerous attestations of suffixes with i in nineteenth-century sources is interesting considering their absence in the earlier texts.

The appearance of the forms with i coincides with the waves of mass immigration from the surrounding countryside to Cairo that took place during the nineteenth
century. Two devastating epidemics in 1831 and 1835 killed nearly a third of Cairo’s population, but mass migration from the countryside made up for this loss, keeping the number of inhabitants stable.\textsuperscript{19} During the remainder of the nineteenth century, deaths continued to exceed births in the capital, so its growth was dependent entirely on the arrival of rural migrants.\textsuperscript{20} Taking into consideration the influx of migrants from the countryside, it is not surprising that Cairo became a melting pot of different dialects, which accounts for the existence of different suffixes side by side. Peter Trudgill has shown that in situations of dialect contact, stigmatised forms tend to disappear in favour of unmarked forms.\textsuperscript{21} Woidich (1994: 504–505) uses this theory to explain the disappearance of another feature from Cairene Arabic in the second half of the nineteenth century, the pausal \textit{imāla}:\textsuperscript{22}

As townsfolk tend to look down on the peasants and a strong \textit{imāla} was certainly characteristic of peasant speech as it is today, the former avoided it and used the context form instead in order to be different and to avoid being ridiculous. On the other hand, rural speakers who wanted to adapt themselves to urban speech avoided \textit{imāla} for the same reason. (Woidich 1994: 505)

This is likely also the reason why at the turn of the twentieth century, the suffixes with \textit{i} disappeared: they were associated with rural speech. This is corroborated by the current distribution of suffixes with \textit{i}, which shows that it is a feature found in the Delta, especially in the Minūfiyya province, located directly to the north of Cairo. The first generation of immigrants used these ‘rural’ suffixes, which is why they were recorded in the grammars and textbooks, and both sets of suffixes existed side by side. But the forms with \textit{i} were stigmatised by the original inhabitants of Cairo due to their association with rural speech, and as the children of the immigrants took over the ‘neutral’ forms of Cairene Arabic, the forms with \textit{i} disappeared.

5 The vowels: Case endings or epenthetic vowels?

The origin of the vowels \textit{i}, \textit{a} and \textit{u} that come between CC and the following suffixes in Cairene Arabic is disputed. Some scholars, such as Harris Birkeland (1952) and Werner Diem (1991), claim that these vowels are remnants of old case endings. Others, such as Janet Watson (2002) and Jonathan Owens (2006), argue that they are the result of vowel harmony, in which the epenthetic vowel is influenced by the vowel of the

\textsuperscript{19} See Abu-Lughod (1971: 83 fn. 4).
\textsuperscript{20} See Abu-Lughod (1971: 115).
\textsuperscript{21} See Trudgill (1986: 11; 143).
\textsuperscript{22} See also Blanc (1973–1974).
following phoneme. This discussion is quite a significant one because it addresses the question of whether the modern Arabic dialects are descendants of a form of Arabic in which case endings still existed. In this section, I will analyse these two theories in further detail.

### 5.1 Theory 1: Vestiges of case endings

Proponents of the theory that the vowels are vestiges of case endings are Harris Birkeland (1952) and Werner Diem (1991). Carl Brockelmann (1908) already proposed that the vowels of the second person singular are remnants of the case endings. He writes about *kā̆, *kī̆:

> In den neuarab. Dialekten sind die Vokale durchweg abgefallen, und die Geschlechter werden nur noch durch Erhaltung der dem ursprünglichen Suffixvokal entsprechenden Nominalendungen, die auch auf das Verbum übertragen werden, unterschieden: m. ak, f. ik. (Brockelmann 1908: 309)

Birkeland (1952) also focuses on the suffixes of the second person singular, stating that:

> We must be allowed to [...] conclude that in bētak < *bētakā it is the accusative which is preserved, in bētik < *bētikī it is the genitive. The fact that an old case-ending appears as an auxiliary vowel is well-known. And that the quality of this vowel is determined by the following vowel is quite natural. (Birkeland 1952: 12)

Although Birkeland presents the use of old case endings as auxiliary vowels as a well-known fact, he does not actually cite sources supporting this. However, as shown above, Brockelmann (1908: 309) was a proponent of this view and was possibly the inspiration for Birkeland's theory.

Birkeland does not mention the auxiliary vowels of the suffixes -ha, -kum and -hum explicitly, but he does mention that ‘[t]he u in ki’tābu is not the u of -hu, but the auxiliary vowel, which before u was the original case-ending of the nominative […]’ (Birkeland 1952: 30). This shows that Birkeland extends his theory to the vowels of other suffixes.

Diem (1991: 301) supports Birkeland’s view: while according to Diem the inserted vowel is originally a case ending, now become defunct, the choice of case ending was actually dependent on the next vowel. He constructs the reduction of the final vowels of the suffixes of the second person singular in three stages:

1. *bint-aka, bint-iki*
2. *bint-ak, bint-ikt*
3. *bint-ak, bint-ik*
Diem argues that first the case system broke down, but that the dialect still kept the short vowels associated with the cases, and that therefore the choice of short vowels in the suffixes was due to vowel harmony. The final short vowels only disappeared after that, leaving the remnants of the case system in the vowels of -ak and -ik. As for the other suffixes, Diem states that:


Summarising, it can be said that both Birkeland and Diem claim that the auxiliary vowels can be traced back to old case endings, but that the choice of vowel was determined by vowel harmony, i.e. the vowel of the following syllable.

### 5.2 Theory 2: Vowel harmony

The second theory states that the vowels did not originate from a form of the language in which old case endings still existed; rather, they were epenthetic vowels whose quality changed because of vowel harmony. Proponents of this theory are, amongst others, Janet Watson and Jonathan Owens. Watson describes the system of vowel harmony in Cairene Arabic as follows:

Whenever three consonants are potentially juxtaposed within the utterance, epenthesis of [i] occurs between the second and third consonant. Within the word, but not across word boundaries, the epenthetic vowel is realized as [u] to the left of /u/. (Watson 2002: 64)

Watson explains the a in -aha as follows:

The [a] vowel in ḥabbaha ‘he loved her’ is due to assimilation of [guttural] from the following guttural consonant and guttural vowel. (Watson 2002: 183 fn. 6)

Owens has a similar view:

The epenthetic vowel is usually a high vowel whose precise value, front, back or mid, is determined by consonantal context. In a few dialects, including WSA\(^{23}\) and Cairene, the value of the epenthetic vowel is determined by the nature of the following consonant formed by the pronominal suffix. There are three epenthetic vowel values, [i, u, a]; [u] occurs before a suffix with [u], [a] occurs before -ha and otherwise [i] occurs. (Owens 2006: 108)

\(^{23}\) Western Sudanic Arabic.
Owens objects to the idea that the vowels \( u, i, a \) are remnants of old case endings because this would imply that the Arabic dialects, and therefore also Cairene Arabic, are a direct descendant of Old Arabic with a case system, a notion that he rejects. He comments on Birkeland’s (1952) theory of remnants of case endings:

\[
\text{[\ldots] Birkeland offers no independent motivation for his explanation, other than, implicitly, the phonetic identity with CA case suffixes. There is no obvious explanation, for instance, as to why the genitive -}i\text{ should have been preserved before -}na, -u before -}hum, \text{nor does Birkeland explain how the case endings were converted to non-morphological epenthetic status. (Owens 2006: 235)}
\]

Even though both theories have a different starting point, an earlier variety of the dialect that either had, or did not have, case endings, the conclusion is the same: the choice of vowels in the suffixes is due to vowel harmony.

6 Conclusion

In the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, two sets of pronominal suffixes after CC existed side by side in Cairene Arabic: one in which the vowel varies \((a \text{ or } u, \text{ depending on the vowel of the following suffix})\), and another containing the epenthetic vowel \(i\). It is hard to establish which set of suffixes is the oldest one, due to the scarcity of historical colloquial texts that display the vowels. It is possible that the system with the epenthetic vowel \(i\) is the oldest one, and vowel harmony thereafter resulted in the other set of suffixes. There is, however, no data to back this hypothesis. Texts from the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries display the suffixes -aha, -ukum and -uhum, but do not show suffixes with \(i\) that cannot be explained as the genitive case ending, except for the stigmatised suffix of the third person feminine singular with \(imāla: -ihi\).

The suffixes with \(i\) are nowadays found in parts of the Delta. In the nineteenth century, there was a wave of mass migration from the countryside to Cairo. The suffixes with \(i\) could therefore be heard in the streets of Cairo, and were subsequently recorded in grammars and textbooks. It is possible that the original inhabitants of Cairo associated these with rural speech. The disappearance of the suffixes with \(i\) can therefore be explained by the wish of speakers of Cairene Arabic to dissociate themselves from these stigmatised forms.

As for the two theories about the origin of the extra vowels after CC, and whether these are remnants of case endings or epenthetic vowels whose quality changed due to vowel harmony, the current study has shown that vowel harmony does indeed play a role in the formation of the suffixes. This can be seen in the pausal form of the suffix -aha, which is -ihe\# / -ihi\# in some parts of the Delta. This goes back to a suffix
-aha that was pronounced with pausal imāla: /-ahe#/ /-ahi#. The e or i-sound of the last syllable then influenced the vowel in the syllable to its left, turning it into i. This shows that vowel harmony can spread to the left, which makes it likely that the suffixes -iha, -ikum and -ihum, containing an epenthetic vowel i, were influenced in a similar style and became -aha, -akum and -ahum. Additional proof of this is budduhum (< bidduhum), recorded by Spitta (1880), and buddukum (< biddukum) (Seidel 1896), which show that the vowel u of the suffix could even influence the vowel of the preceding noun.
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Zero-marked Nouns in Moroccan Arabic: Depictives or Adverbials?

Abstract The major issue that is raised in this paper is how to delimit depictive secondary predicates from adverbials in Moroccan Arabic (henceforth MA). In syntactic description, depictives and adverbials are both adjuncts and hence are non-obligatory elements in sentences. A basic contrast between the two, however, is ‘their different semantic orientation within the event-internal modification’ (Schroeder 2008: 340). Depictive constructions are adjuncts that add a second predication to one of the participants involved in the main predication, while adverbials are event-oriented in that they add information about manner, time or place to the meaning of a verb. Cross-linguistic research has shown that while it is easy to make a distinction between depictives and adverbials in some languages such as English because they have different morpho-syntactic correlates, in other languages ‘the distinction between participant- and event-orientation is often difficult to draw, and languages abound with constructions which straddle the line between the two’ (Reinöhl and Himmelmann 2011: 131). Much of the research that has examined this issue of how to delimit depictives from other adjuncts such as adverbials was carried out on European languages. The goal of this paper is twofold. First, it provides data from MA, a typologically different language where in some cases depictives converge formally with adverbials and hence the need to find criteria that help distinguish between the two arises. Second, it analyses a special category of depictives that are realised by zero-marked nouns and that are under-resourced compared to the prototypical depictives, which occur in the form of adjectives.

Keywords depictives, secondary predicates, adverbials, adjuncts, zero-marked nouns, Moroccan Arabic
1 Introduction

Depictives are described as a kind of predicates that add a second predication to one of the participants involved in the main predication. They occur in constructions where ‘a single clause contains two predicative constituents, which do not form a complex predicate in the way serial verbs or periphrastic predicates do’ (Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004: 59). A depictive describes a physical or a psychological state or condition, and it can be semantically oriented to any one of the participants or what is also referred to as a controller; it can be subject-oriented as in (1), where the adjective ʕəyyan ‘tired’ describes the state of the subject, or object-oriented as in (2), where barəd ‘cold’ describes the state of the direct object.

(1) kla ʁda-h ʕəyyan (subject-oriented)
eat.PRF.3MSG lunch-3MSG tired
‘he ate his lunch tired’

(2) ʃṛəb l-ħlib barəd (object-oriented)
drink.PRF.3MSG DEF-milk cold
‘he drank the milk cold’

One of the basic properties of depictives is temporal overlap. In his seminal paper, Halliday (1967: 63) defined a depictive as ‘an attribute which characterises the attribuant (i.e. the direct object) in relation to the process, but as a concomitant, not a result, of the process.’ As in (2), the depictive describes a state of affairs which holds at the same time as the eventuality encoded by the main predicate unfolds. The state denoted by the depictive barəd ‘cold’ is linked to the temporal frame set by the main predicate in that it holds during the process of drinking; that is, while the event unfolds. Temporal overlap is also what distinguishes depictives from other secondary predicates such as resultatives as in (3).

(3) səbɾ-at dar-ha bid-a
paint.PRF-3FSG house-3FSG white-FSG
‘she painted her house white’

The object-oriented depictive barəd ‘cold’ in (2) and the resultative secondary predicate bid-a ‘white’ in (3) are not to be distinguished in terms of their syntactic structures. They rather differ as to the way they fit in the temporal frame set by the main predicate. As opposed to a depictive, the resultative bid-a ‘white’ designates ‘the state of an argument resulting from the action determined by the main verb’ (Asada 2012: 54).

Adverbials are entities which refer to the manner, place or time of an action. They may also modify an adjective or another adverb. The adverbs which are examined
in this paper are manner adverbs. A sentence such as ‘John walked slowly,’ with the manner adverb ‘slowly,’ ‘makes the claim that there was a leaving event of which John was the agent and which was slow’ (Katz 2003: 457). Furthermore, as in (4), they are VP-adverbs because they modify the predicate as opposed to S-adverbs, which are described as propositional modifiers (Jackendoff 1972). Another feature that characterises adverbs is that they occur with an eventive verb as opposed to a stative verb, which denotes a state predicate.

(4) \[\text{dəfʕ-u b-ʒ-ʒəhd} \]
\[\text{push.PRF-3MSG by-DEF-force} \]
‘he pushed him \underline{by force}’

One basic contrast between depictives and manner adverbials is their semantic orientation within the event-internal modification. Depictives have a participant orientation while manner adverbials have a process or action orientation (Schroeder 2008). Depictive constructions, which are secondary predicates, add a second predication to one of the participants involved in the main predication, and they can be subject-oriented or objected-oriented as in (1) and (2). Adverbials, on the other hand, are event-oriented, and they add information about manner, time or place to the meaning of a verb or a clause as in (4), where the adverb \[b-ʒ-ʒəhd\] ‘by force’ modifies the main predication rather than assigns a specific property to one of the participants.

In syntactic description, however, both depictives and adverbials are characterised by optionality. They are both adjuncts and hence are non-obligatory elements in sentences; they are free supplements. A depictive can be omitted ‘without rendering the remaining string ungrammatical or changing the structural relationship among the remaining constituents’ (Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004: 65). The adjective \[ʕəyyan-a\] ‘tired’ is optional in \[kla-t ʁda-ha ʕəyyan-a\] ‘she ate her lunch tired’ because it can be omitted as in \[kla-t ʁda-ha\] ‘she ate her lunch’ without affecting the remaining structure of the sentence. Yet, it is non-optional in (5), where it constitutes a basic entity in the argument frame of the main predicate rather than an adjunction.

(5) \[ka-t-ban ʕəyyan-a\]
\[IND-3FSG-look.IMPRF tired-FSG\]
‘she looks \underline{tired}’

The same optionality holds true for adverbials. In (6), the adverb \[b-z-zərb-a\] ‘quickly’ presents an instance of adjunction and hence can be omitted without having any impact on the structural relationship that holds between the remaining entities, namely the subject and the verb.
Cross-linguistic research has shown that while in some languages such as English it is easy to make a distinction between depictives and adverbials given their different morpho-syntactic correlates, in other languages ‘the difference between depictives and adverbials is much less clear-cut, both in formal and semantic terms, than is often assumed’ (Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004: 59). Much of the research that has examined this issue of how to delimit depictives from other adjuncts such as adverbials was carried out on European languages. The major goal of this paper is to provide data from MA, a typologically different language where adjuncts functioning as adverbials and as depictives are sometimes morpho-syntactically similar. An attempt will be made to see on what grounds the line between the two can be drawn and what criteria can be used to delineate the extent to which these two constructions can be delimited.

2 Data

The data which informs the present study is twofold. It was elicited from native speakers of MA, and it was also drawn from Maas’ corpus.

Typological surveys of secondary predicates have shown ‘a high heterogeneity of coding devices for secondary predicates both intra- and inter-linguistically’ (Schroeder et al. 2008: i). Many constructions are candidates for secondary predication, and there is a variety of formal means to express depictives across languages. MA, as other languages, also makes use of a range of formal means to express secondary predication. MA speakers resort to both nominal and verbal strategies to express depictive meaning (Maas 2008). Prototypical depictives, which are very common in many languages as shown by cross linguistic research, are those that occur in the form of adjectives as ‘raw’ in ‘he ate the meat raw’ in English or sxun ‘hot’ in ḥrāb l-ḥlib sxun ‘he drank the milk hot’ in MA.

This paper examines another category of depictives that are realised by zero-marked nouns as in (7) because they are under-resourced compared to prototypical depictives.

(7) ḥrāb-t l-ḥrir-a tal₃
drink.PRF-1SG DEF-soup-FSG snow
‘I drank the soup very cold’

The zero-marked noun tal₃ ‘snow’ is an adjunct that adds a second predication to the direct object l-ḥrir-a ‘the soup,’ one of the arguments involved in the main predication. Its basic property is that it is a metaphor that is employed instead of ‘very cold,’ an
adjective modified by an adverb of degree to show the intensity of something. Nouns similar to təlȤ ‘snow’ in MA are ʕsəl ‘honey’ to describe something very sweet or ḥədʒ-a ‘bitter melon’ to describe something very sour. ʕsəl ‘honey’ and ‘very sweet,’ for instance, lead to one another through their similarity according to the metaphorical way. ʕsəl ‘honey’ is used outside its conventional meaning to express a concept that is similar to it, hence indicating ‘mappings across conceptual domains’ (Lakoff 1993). Building on the contemporary theory of metaphor, Lakoff (1993) made the strong claim that a metaphor is not only part of ‘the realm of poetic language’; it is also part of the ordinary system of thought and language. This is why everyday language is loaded with metaphors.

In MA, zero-marked nouns can also occur in the same position in the structure of the sentence as in (8), where the substantive ḏulm ‘injustice’ is also an adjunct, but is event-oriented rather than participant-oriented and hence an adverb.

(8) dda-ha ḏulm
‘he took it [the land] unjustly’ (Maas’ corpus, J-93-1)

This suggests that, from a formal point of view, entities such as təlȤ ‘snow’ in (7) and ḏulm ‘injustice’ in (8) cannot be assigned to depictive or adverbial expressions on the basis of their morpho-syntactic properties.

3 Findings

3.1 Formal properties

Nouns such as təlȤ ‘snow’ and ḏulm ‘injustice’ exhibit formal overlap because they share many morpho-syntactic properties. First, they both allow syntagmatic expansion to the left because they can be both morphologically specified for definiteness as in (9) and (10).

(9) ḏ-ḍulm dyal l-ʕaʔil-a xayb
‘the injustice of the family [is] bad’

(10) dab t-təlȤ lli ẗah b-z-zərb-a
‘the snow which had fallen melted quickly’

---

1 ‘it’ refers to a piece of land.
Second, both nominal forms allow syntagmatic expansion to the right as in (11) and (12).

(11) $d$-dulm f-xdǝmt-ha dfǝʕ-ha t-xrǝӡ
DEF-injustice in-work-3FSG push.PRF-3FSG 3FSG-leave.IMPRF
‘the injustice in her work pushed her to quit’

(12) $t$-talǝ dyal ӡ-ӡbǝl qaṣǝh
DEF-snow of DEF-mountain harsh
‘the snow of the mountain <is> harsh’

### 3.2 Delimitation criteria

Three criteria were found to delimit zero-marked nouns that are depictives from those that are adverbials, showing that they do not have the same semantic orientation and that $dulm$ ‘injustice’ is event-oriented while $talǝ$ ‘snow’ is participant-oriented.

#### 3.2.1 Concomitance

One criterion that was found to delimit zero-marked nouns as adverbials from those that have the status of depictives is concomitance. A noun that expresses an adverbial modification can function as a manner concomitant preceded by the relator $b$- ‘by’ while a noun that expresses a depictive secondary modification cannot.

The domain of concomitance includes different instrumental and comitative relations that vary in their syntactic coding and that are classified on the basis of participant relations in a sentence (Seiler 1974; Stolz 1996, 2001). As Lehmann and Shin (2005) stated, concomitance is a subdomain of the functional domain of participation where the concern is with ‘the internal linguistic structure of situations.’ A situation involves participants (entities) that have specific features such as $[+/–$ human], $[+/–$ animate], $[+/–$ concrete] and that fulfill distinct participant roles as in the following sentence.

(13) Yazid ta-i-lʕəb mʕa Rayhana
Yazid IND-3MSG-play.IMPRF with Rayhana
‘Yazid is playing with Rayhana’

In (13), there is a core situation where both participants are $[+ $ human] and where Yazid is the actor and Rayhana is the concomitant. However, because this is a reciprocal situation, the roles are symmetric and hence could be subject to reversibility; that is, instead of having ‘Yazid is playing with Rayhana,’ we could also have ‘Rayhana is playing with Yazid.’ Based on this notion of participation, Lehmann and Shin (2005)
posited a functional framework that includes seven concomitants, namely partner, companion, vehicle, tool, material, manner and circumstance.\textsuperscript{2}

Manner is a concomitant that applies to the whole situation. In ‘Linda opened the door by force,’ ‘force’ applies to the situation core (‘the opening was by force’) (Lehmaan and Shin 2005). The examined zero-marked noun \textit{ḍulm} ‘injustice,’ as illustrated in (14), can be preceded by the relator \textit{b- ‘by’} and hence functions as a manner concomitant, which asserts its status as an adverbial.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{dda} & l-ʔərd & \textit{b-ḍ-ḍulm} \\
\textit{take.PRF.3MSG} & DEF-land & \textit{by-DEF-injustice} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘he took the land by injustice \[unjustly\]’

\textit{b-ḍ-ḍulm} ‘by injustice’ (that is, unjustly) applies semantically to the taking of the land, and the concomitant \textit{ḍulm} ‘injustice’ can be conceptualised as an abstract \[– concrete\] instrument.

Nominal forms such as \textit{təlӡ} ‘snow,’ on the other hand, cannot be used with \textit{b- ‘by’} and express manner, which stresses their status as object-oriented depictives.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{fəb-t} & l-ħrir-a & \textit{b-t-təlӡ} \\
\textit{drink.PRF-1SG} & DEF-soup-FSG & \textit{with/by-DEF-snow} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textit{fəb-t l-ħrir-a b-t-təlӡ ‘I drank the soup with/by snow’ is a possible proposition, but it conveys a different meaning where \textit{b-t-təlӡ} ‘with/by snow’ is no longer a depictive.}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{fəb-t} & l-ħrir-a & \textit{b-ḥal} & \textit{t-təlӡ} \\
\textit{drink.PRF-1SG} & DEF-soup-FSG & \textit{like} & DEF-snow \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

‘I drank the soup \textit{like snow}’ \[that is, I drank the soup very cold\]

\textit{b-ḥal} ‘like’

Another criterion that was found to delimit \textit{ḍulm} ‘injustice,’ as an adverbial, from \textit{təlӡ} ‘snow,’ as a depictive, is the similitive marker \textit{bḥal} ‘like.’ The noun \textit{təlӡ} ‘snow’ can be preceded by the similitive marker ‘\textit{bḥal}’ as in (16).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{fəb-t} & l-ħrir-a & \textit{bḥal} & \textit{t-təlӡ} \\
\textit{drink.PRF-1SG} & DEF-soup-FSG & \textit{like} & DEF-snow \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textit{bḥal t-təlӡ ‘I drank the soup \textit{like snow}’ [that is, I drank the soup very cold]}

By contrast, \textit{ḍ-ḍulm} ‘injustice’ cannot occur with it, which betokens its status as an event-modifying entity.

\textsuperscript{2} A detailed description and discussion of the different types of concomitants in Moroccan Arabic is beyond the scope of this paper.
Referentiality is a criterion that was first used by Maas as an argumentative framework in his analysis of prototypical depictives in MA to delimit adjectives used as depictives from those used as modifiers of nouns in a noun phrase. The same criterion is drawn on in this paper to see to what extent it can delimit zero-marked nouns as adverbials from those that are depictive secondary predicates.

Semantic referentiality is defined as pointing to some existent entity in discourse. Thus, [+ Referential] (henceforth [+ REF]) implies the identifiability of the terms thus marked. Some of the nominal expressions that are intrinsically [+ REF] are proper names, demonstratives, and pronouns because they have a referential use. Definite descriptions are also described as referential expressions because they have a definite referent as in (18).

In (18), *l-muḥami-ぁ ‘the lawyer,’ which is used with the prefixed morpheme /l-/ is a definite description. It has a referential function because it points to an identified referent. Pragmatically, a definite description usually represents information that has already been established in the discourse or is assumed to be present in the mind of the interlocutor/s. Pragmatic referentiality pertains to language use and is defined in terms of context-dependency.

Indefinite descriptions, on the other hand, are [– Referential] (henceforth [– REF]) because they rather activate a lexical concept and hence fall on the side of the lexicon, not on that of grammar. Example (19) is an illustration of this.
The zero-marked noun *muḥami-a* ‘a lawyer’ in (19), as opposed to *l-muḥami-a* ‘the lawyer’ in (18), does not have a definite referent. It rather activates a lexical concept and hence has a predicative function. This function also holds in nominative sentences in MA as in (20), where the basic function of the nominal predicate *muḥami-a* ‘a lawyer’ is to activate a lexical concept.

(20) **ana**
    **muḥami-a**
    PRN.1SG INDEF.lawyer-FSG
    [– REF]

‘I am a lawyer’

The investigated nouns *ḍulm* ‘injustice’ and *təlӡ* ‘snow’ are also [– REF]; they both have a predicative use.

From a formal point of view, [+ REF] has been associated with the definite article and [– REF] with the indefinite one. There is not, however, a one-to-one relation between referentiality and the concept of definiteness. Previous work that examined determination in MA (Harrell 1962; Marçais 1977; Youssi 1992; Caubet 1993) has been very biased by the European school tradition, and hence has contrasted the definite article /l-/ (as associated with [+ REF]) with the indefinite articles /ʃi-/ , /waḥəd l-/ and zero morpheme (Ø) (as associated with [– REF]). Maas (2011) asserted that determination in MA is more complex than this. For instance, he pointed out that the marker /l-/ ‘the,’ which is conventionally labeled as a definite article, is also used for indefinite referents as shown below.

(21) **ma-bʁa-u-ha-ʃ ħit ma-ʕənd-ha-ʃ l-wəld**
    NEG-like.PRF-3PL-3FSG-NEG because NEG-have-3FSG-NEG DEF-boy

‘they didn’t want of her because she does not have the boy’

In (21), the noun *wəld* ‘boy’ is marked with the determiner /l-/ ‘the,’ but it is [– REF]. It does not point to an existing entity, and it does not have an identified referent; no definite boy is denoted. This shows that there is an asymmetrical relation between referentiality and definiteness and that MA, a typologically different language, displays a different system of determination marking.

The examined zero-marked nouns *təlӡ* ‘snow’ and *ḍulm* ‘injustice’ behave syntactically and semantically in a different way depending on the referentiality of the direct object of the sentence, that is, the second argument of the main predicate. The nominal form *ḍulm* ‘injustice,’ as (22) and (23) show, expresses adverb content whether the second argument *ʔəṛḍ* ‘land’ is [– REF] or [+ REF], which proves that it adds specific information to the verb and not to the argument.
(22) dda waḥəd l-ʔəṛḍ ċulm u- ma-qnəʕ-ʃ
  take.PRF.3MSG a land injustice and- NEG-have enough.PRF.3MSG-NEG
  ‘he took a land unjustly, and he wanted more’

(23) dda l-ʔəṛḍ lli ka-i-ħṛət daba ċulm
  take.PRF.3MSG DEF-land that IND-3MSG-plough.IMPRF now injustice
  [+ REF]  
  ‘he took the land he is ploughing now unjustly’

The nominal form talʒ ‘snow,’ however, behaves syntactically and hence semantically in a different way as in (24). For it to be a depictive, it has to be [– REF], and the second argument it assigns a property to has to be [+ REF].

(24) ʃṛəb-t l-ħrir-a talʒ
  drink.PRF-1SG DEF-soup-FSG snow
  [+ REF] [– REF]
  ‘I drank the soup very cold’

When the second argument is marked [– REF] as the noun talʒ ‘snow’ itself, which is [– REF], this has an impact on the constituent structure of the clause, as in (25).

(25) ʃṛəb-t ħrir-a talʒ
  drink.PRF-1SG INDEF.soup-FSG snow
  [– REF] [– REF]
  ‘I drank a very cold soup’

The noun talʒ ‘snow’ does not express a depictive content anymore. It is an attributive modifier in the nominal group ħrir-a talʒ ‘a very cold soup.’ Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004), giving for illustration ‘Carol drinks black coffee,’ also pointed out that ‘black’ in this sentence is a constituent of the NP [black coffee]. The same holds true for cases where the category of the depictive is an adjective and not a zero-marked noun as in (26).

(26) ʃṛəb-t ħrir-a bard-a
  drink.PRF-1SG INDEF.soup-FSG cold-FSG
  [– REF]
  ‘I drank a cold soup’

The adjective bard-a ‘cold’ forms a low-level constituent with the noun ħrir-a ‘soup’; it functions as its modifier and both of them constitute the direct object. The same type
of syntactic analysis applies when both the noun and the adjective are preceded by the definite article as in (27).

\[(27) \text{drink.PRF-1SG} \quad \text{DEF-soup-FSG} \quad \text{DEF-cold-FSG} \quad [+ \text{REF}] \]
\[
\text{because} \quad \text{NEG-see.PRF-1SG-NEG} \quad \text{DEF-soup-FSG} \quad \text{DEF-hot-FSG} \quad [+ \text{REF}] \\
\]

‘I drank the cold soup because I did not see the hot soup’

In the clause, \text{drink.PRF-1SG} \text{DEF-soup-FSG} \text{DEF-cold-FSG} ‘I drank the cold soup’ both \text{DEF-soup-FSG} ‘the soup’ and \text{DEF-cold-FSG} ‘the cold’ are preceded by the definite article and form a nominal group.

The above data shows that referentiality can help draw a line between zero-marked nouns when used as adverbs or as depictives. Adverbs are unrestricted with respect to the referentiality of the second argument. Whether it is [– REF] or [+ REF], the zero-marked noun keeps its status as an adverb. With respect to depictives, they are sensitive to the referentiality of the second argument. There is a restriction requiring that the second argument should be [+ REF] and the noun should be [– REF] in order for the latter to express a depictive secondary predication. When the second argument and the noun are both [– REF], they rather constitute a noun phrase which consists of a noun and its modifier.

4 Conclusion

The major issue that has been raised in this paper is how to delimit depictives from adverbials in MA, a typologically different language where sometimes depictives converge formally with adverbials. The analysis has focused on zero-marked nouns such as \text{tal\\textit{z}} ‘snow’ and \text{dulm} ‘injustice,’ which occur as depictives and adverbials respectively and hence as adjuncts of the main predication. \text{tal\\textit{z}} ‘snow’ is participant-oriented because it describes a state pertaining to the second argument of the main predicate while \text{dulm} ‘injustice’ (unjustly) is event-oriented in that it adds information to the meaning of the verb.

The findings have shown that these entities exhibit formal overlap as they share many morpho-syntactic properties. First, they both allow syntagmatic expansion to the left and to the right when not used as adverbs and depictives. Second, when they occur as adjuncts, they occur in the same position in the clause, and they are zero-marked for definiteness because they have a predicative use and not a referential one.

However, a number of criteria have shown that although these nouns are similar from a formal point of view, they do not have the same semantic orientation. One
criterion that was found to distinguish between the two is concomitance. Nouns that express adverbial modification can be used as manner concomitants preceded by the MA relator b- ‘by.’ However, nouns that express depictive secondary predication cannot fulfill this participant role in the domain of concomitance. A second criterion that also delimits ḍulm ‘injustice’ as an adverbial from təlӡ ‘snow’ as a depictive is the similitive marker bħal ‘like.’ The depictive təlӡ ‘snow’ can be preceded by the similitive marker bħal as in frab-t l-hrir-a bħal t-təlӡ ‘I drank the soup like snow’ (that is, I drank the soup very cold), but ḍulm ‘injustice’ cannot as in *dda l-ʔəṛḍ bħal ḍ-ḍulm *‘he took the land like injustice.’ The last criterion that was also found to delimit zero-marked nouns that are adverbials from those that are depictives is referentiality. Nominal forms such as ḍulm ‘injustice’ are unrestricted with respect to referentiality; they express adverb content whether the second argument of the main predicate is [– REFl] or [+ REF], which proves that they add specific information to the verb and not to the object argument. A noun such as təlӡ ‘snow,’ however, is sensitive to the referentiality of the second argument. For it to be a depictive, it has to be [– REF] and the second argument has to be [+ REF].
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Projekt eines Dialektatlas von Nordmarokko

ABSTRACT A project for a dialect atlas of Morocco had to be given up due to unforeseen circumstances at the beginning of this century and only some articles, mainly on north-eastern and north-central Morocco, could be published in EDNA (*Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusi*) and elsewhere. Since in 2007 the atlas of the Rif Berber dialects by Mena Lafkioui was published and recently quite some new material on the Arabic dialects of north-western Morocco, a dialect atlas of Northern Morocco, after filling some gaps in the West, is within reach. It will be primarily an atlas of the Arabic dialects of the area, but whenever it is appropriate, Arabic and Berber data will be combined on maps. This mainly refers to phonological and lexical features which is illustrated by 18 maps.

KEYWORDS Arabic dialectology, Moroccan Arabic, Berber, dialect geography, language contact, substratum


---

1 Der Text wurde als Vortrag am 01.07.2019 in Heidelberg gehalten. Dazu wurden 18 Karten-entwürfe vorgestellt und kommentiert, die in diesem Band am Ende des Beitrags eingefügt sind.


Auf anderen Gebieten ist die Datenlage besser, wie etwa aus Karten zu den Verba Primae Alif und zu den Personalpronomina zu ersehen ist (Karte 2). Die Karten zeigen, dass der Nordwesten gegenüber dem Nordosten viel mehr Variation aufweist; so zum Beispiel drei verschiedene Typen für die Primae Alif im Nordwesten gegenüber einem einheitlichen Block im Nordosten, und über zehn verschiedene Formen für das Pronomen der zweiten Person Sg. m. + f. im Nordwesten gegenüber gerade mal zwei Formen im Nordosten (Karte 3).


Was Phonologisches betrifft, so zeigt die nächste Karte (Karte 5) ein hinlänglich bekanntes Merkmal und einen angeblichen Archaismus der sogenannten Jbala-Dialekte. Den Zusammenfall von Ḍād und Ḏ̣āʔ in ein stimmloses /ṭ/, also etwa *ṭarbu* „sie haben

---


4 Marçais (1911: 435) nennt für Tanger auch *kal*. Die Form ist heutzutage veraltet.
This hypothesis, if correct, would mean that a phonologically conservative dialect similar to the Old Arabic of the Levant was implanted in the Maghreb at an early stage. I say similar because it is impossible to know if this dialect was indeed a reflex of the Old Arabic of southern Syria or of an unattested Arabian dialect with an identical emphatic repertoire.


---

6 Dies bezieht sich wohl auf den Dialekt von im-Maṯ̣ṭ̣ah/Minabbih (Behnstedt 1987: 7–8).
7 Alfaifi und Behnstedt 2010: 56.


Als einer der archaischen Züge der nordwestmarokkanischen Dialekte wird meist die stimmlose Aussprache von Qāf genannt (Karte 9). Was den Lautwandel zum Glottisschlag betrifft, so handelt es sich hier, im Gegensatz zum arabischen Osten, wo letztere Aussprache, da ursprünglich städtisch, prestigeträchtig ist und sich auch auf dem Land verbreitet, um einen steckengebliebenen bzw. rückläufigen Lautwandel. Nur in wenigen Orten ergaben die Untersuchungen, dass vorherrschend der „glottal stop“ gesprochen wird. Vielfach hieß und heißt es, dass diese Aussprache primär bei

10 Vgl. die Schreibung {ç} in Heath (2002: 140).


Die meisten und für mich interessantesten Berührungspunkte zwischen den beiden Sprachen ergeben sich auf dem Gebiet des Lexikons.

Das Verb „hinuntergehen“ (Karte 10) in dem Kontext „einen Abhang hinuntergehen“ ist nach Kossmann (2013: 163) problematisch und die Etymologie des arabischen huwwad unklar. Er erwägt ein berberisches hwa plus ein deiktisches Element

---

11 daqq muss aus einem städtischen Dialekt stammen, denn nur in Städten klopft man an die Tür. Am Beduinenzelt kann man nicht anklopfen!

13 Schuchardt (1858: 54) erwähnt nur spanisch fogón, was aber nicht „Backofen“ bedeutet.
14 Siehe die entsprechende Karte in Behnstedt und Woidich (2012: 87).

Ein weiteres Beispiel ist die Bezeichnung für „nächstes Jahr“ (Karte 13). Hier liegt in einem Großteil der berberischen Rif-Dialekte ein apotropäisches arabisches manʕāš, selten lamanʕaš, vor (Lafkioui 2007: 217), nämlich ein frommer Wunsch man ʕāš, „wer es noch erlebt“. Es handelt sich um die Grammatikalisierung eines Wunschsatzes, wie er in Takrouna vorliegt: ya-manʕāš „ô qui vivra!, i. e. peut-être plus tard; nous verrons ça; qui vivra verra!“ (Marçais 1959: 2764). Die Form kommt ebenfalls im beduinischen Dialekt des Negevs vor: in Shawarbah (2012: 180, 370) minʕaš als „(cf. OA *man ʕāš) […] ‘next year‘“, auch alli yʕīš „in the future {LIT. if he is so fortunate as to still be alive}“. Eine ähnliche Bildung haben wir auch im Dialekt des Γabal Fayfa in Saudi-Arabien mit dā hayyah: ba-him ṭatin da hayyah „they are coming next year (if we are still alive)“ (Alfaifi 2016: 346). Die Karte zeigt daneben Entlehnungen im Berberischen aus dem Arabischen wie liam (i)lla maži bzw. mögliche Lehnübersetzungen vom Typ „das Jahr, welches kommt“ = asugg as di yusin.


15 Für die Bni Znassen ṣtnay in Destaing (1914: 98).
16 ṣtnay(n) muss eine alte Form sein, da sie auch im Maltesischen vorkommt.

El pronombre reflexivo se expresa mediante la preposición \textit{b- + waḥd} y los pronombres personales sufijados. Esta es la forma más habitual de formar el reflexivo en los dialectos del norte de Marruecos.


Soll die Annahme von Substratwirkung nicht Hypothese sein, so müssen m. E. folgende Kriterien erfüllt sein, wenn Substratwirkung als gesichert gelten soll: [...] Die betreffende arabische Erscheinung darf nicht an einer anderen Stelle des arabischen Sprachgebiets erscheinen, das dieses oder ein entsprechendes anderes Substrat nicht aufweist, sofern die Verbreitung der Erscheinung durch Migration oder Wellenbewegung ausgeschlossen ist.

Bildungen mit \textit{rās} finden sich nun im Palästinensischen, im Irakischen, im Sudan und in Nigeria, soweit zu ersehen allerdings lediglich als Intensifikatoren. In Fußnote 9 spricht Diem (1979: 15) im Zusammenhang mit Gemeinsamkeiten verschiedener Sprachen von „Entscheidungshilfe“. In unserem Falle wäre das derart zu
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\textsuperscript{18} Es liegt noch eine zweite Karte zu den Reflexivwörtern vor, die hier aber nicht von Belang ist.

\textsuperscript{19} Vicente (2000: 121) mit eben diesen Beispielen und weiteren Nachweisen in der Literatur.
KARTE 1. „Pflug“.
Projekt eines Dialektatlases von Nordmarokko

KARTE 3. Pronomina: 2.sg.m.+f.
KARTE 4. Ġim.
Projekt eines Dialektatlas von Nordmaroko

KARTE 7. Spirantisierung von /b/.

Spirantisierung von /b/

Berberisch: ṣaṣaṣ, nabil (Laflkoui cartes 28, 29)
Arabisch: ḥāḥū, ḥāḥū, ḥāḥū
8 Spirantisierung von *k > ç

- **orange**: k > ç im Berberischen
- **gelb**: k > ç in den Jbala-Dialekten

KARTE 8. Spirantisierung von *k > ç.
Projekt eines Dialektatlas von Nordmarokko

KARTE 10. „hinuntergehen“.
'Backofen'

Berberisch:
- Reflexe von *tannur: unnur, unnurt, aynunnur, zyynurt etc.
- Lafkioui carte 368

Arabisch:
- farna
- fara
- faynur
- faja
- kasa

Reflexe von *fanen(m): šafant

KARTE 11. „Backofen“.
KARTE 12. „heute“. 
KARTE 13. „nächstes Jahr“.
Projekt eines Dialektatlases von Nordmarokko

Karte 15. "Ellbogen".
KARTE 16. Intensifikatoren.
KARTE 17. Reflexivwörter/Intensifikatoren.
Karte 18. „kaltes Wasser“.
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The Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira Revisited

ABSTRACT This study proposes a description of the current dialectal Arabic spoken by the Jewry of Essaouira (Mogador)—also called Judeo-Arabic—considering updated data obtained with speakers of different generations. The decreasing number of Jews living in Essaouira during the last century suggests that a dialectal levelling process towards the Muslim dialect may have taken place, due to the contact with the Muslim majority. In this way, this study tracks the preservation or change of the linguistic features which traditionally characterised the Jewish dialect of the city (Lévy 1994, 2009; Heath 2002; Chetrit 2012, 2015) in the speech of two Jewish informants: 84 and 60 years old respectively—the second being known as the last Jew living permanently in the city. This preliminary analysis demonstrates that the levelling process towards the current Muslim dialect has not been concluded, which is attested not only by the maintenance of some old Jewish dialectal traits but also by lexicon and phonetical traits described here for the first time.

On the other hand, the comparison of the Jewish dialect with the Muslim dialect of the majority (Francisco 2019) indicates that the levelling process might have begun much earlier before the decline of the Jewish population, in a time when the two communities were very similar in number (Schroeter 1988).

KEYWORDS Arabic dialectology, communal dialects, Essaouira, field research, Judeo-Arabic, Moroccan Arabic, linguistic levelling

1 Introduction

It is well known that the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira is characterised mainly, but not only, by pre-hilalian features and shared traits with the Atlantic strip and Marrakesh Jewish dialects¹, as demonstrated by the studies of Lévy (1994, 2009), Heath (2002) and

---

¹ Heath (2002: 26) includes the Jewish dialect of Essaouira in what he called ‘Atlantic strip group’ along with Muslim and Jewish varieties from Casablanca down the Doukkala area, comprehending El Jadida, Azemmour and Safi. On the other hand, Chetrit (2015: 17) classifies the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira exclusively among the Jewish dialects of North Africa, including it among the urban and semi-urban dialects of the ‘Western Qal group,’ in his terminology.
Chetrit (2012). This variety had been representative of the Arabic dialect of Essaouira for a long time, given that the data concerning the Muslim variety had been restricted to Socin (1893), due to a general lack of linguistic interest in the city, since its Muslim population had been considered ‘mainly Berber-speaking until recently’ (Heath 2002: 28). On the other hand, I could demonstrate (Francisco 2019) that dialectal Arabic has predominated in the city, though we cannot ignore the important number of Tachelhit speakers among its first settlers—mostly from the Haha territory—until today, but also of dialectal Arabic speakers from the Chiadma territory, north of Essaouira, and of groups from urban and rural milieus who ended up speaking a levelled Arabic dialect. Nevertheless, the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira still plays an important role in the description of local Arabic and in the analysis of maintenance and change of linguistic features, due to the size and proportion of the Jewish community in the course of the history of the city.

Some sources indicate that the Jewry of Essaouira might have reached half of the total population of the city during the second part of the 19th century and could have even outnumbered the Muslims at some point. However, the size of the community decreased abruptly in the 20th century (see Table 1), finally being represented by only one last person living permanently in the city.

The Jewish population of the city was composed of both megorashim (‘expelled’) of Andalusi origin and toshavim (‘residents, natives’), Berber Jews. The majority of the Jews belonged to the latter; coming originally from the Sous, they used to live in the Mellah under poor material circumstances (Schroeter 1988: 196). In fact, the Jewish community was divided into two ‘classes’: the Mellah Jews and the Qaṣba Jews, who were closer to the foreign elite and the Muslim aristocracy. Lévy (2009: 362) explains the difficulty to differentiate the dialect spoken by the two groups in 1973, since the ‘melting pot’ effect had already taken place long before, due to the huge number of people migrating from the south—a process that also happened with the Muslim dialect, in my opinion.

The Jewish community seems to have held close relations with Muslims in the quotidian life. Different from other Moroccan urban centers where the segregation between both communities was severer, such as Marrakesh and Meknes, the medina of Essaouira was quite small and the Mellah was not walled-off, similar to the situation in Oujda and Azemmour, where Jews and Muslims used to live in the same streets

---

2 Essaouira is situated at the border between the Haha and the Chiadma territories, therefore, both Tachelhit and distinct Arabic dialects have been in contact and continuously spoken since the foundation of the city in 1765. Essaouira has become a melting pot of Arabic- and Berber-speaking tribes from distinct parts of Morocco, such as the Sous region, Marrakesh, Safi and Fez (al-Kānūnī 1932; ar-Ragrāgī 1935; aṣ-Ṣiddīqi 1969; as-Sūsī 1966; Schroeter 1988). The lexicon of the current Arabic of Essaouira attests this long contact between distinct groups, presenting words with a particular connotation such as the Tachelhit loanwords: tāġārt ‘the beach of Essaouira’ and dylāl ‘seagull.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Muslims and foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867 Beaumier¹</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875 Spanish consular report</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumier</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878 French consular report</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879 Alliance Israelite Universelle</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896 George Broome</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927 French Protectorate</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>9,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 Simon Lévy</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ French consul in Essaouira (Mogador).

(Heath 2002: 10), which should lead—in the case of Essaouira—to a less sharp dialectal cleavage. Usually, the North African cities are well known for Jewish dialects of sedentary type which resist the influence of Bedouin (nomadic, central-type) dialects spoken by Muslims (Khan 2016: 43). However, what is the current situation of the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira and its differences from the Muslim variety? Has any change taken place due to the neighbour relations between both communities or even because of the large number of Judeo-Arabic speakers in the city?

Considering these questions, the purpose of this paper is to describe the current situation of the Jewish dialect of the city, analysing maintenance and change in the linguistic features appointed by Lévy (1994, 2009) as most characteristic of the Jewish dialect of Essaouira.³ These are: the neutralisation of sibilants /š/ > /s/, /ž/ > /z/; the articulation of *qaf; no reduction of diphthongs; the suffix -īt (3FSG perf.); and the predominance of the preverb ta- over ka-. Finally, the paper examines some lexical items of the Jewish dialect comparing it to their equivalents in the current Muslim dialect (Francisco 2019).

The study compares these features in a diachronic perspective, considering the data collected by Lévy in 1973 with at least four informants, and comparing them with two younger speakers recorded by me.⁴ Asher (J1) is an 84-year-old man currently living in Israel, who left the city when he was 16 and part of whose family is originally from Ifrane. The second informant is Joseph (J2), around 60 years old, who presents

³ Lévy (2009: 363) identifies these salient features in agreement with the opinions of his informants from Essaouira after a group interview.

⁴ For a more general view of the speech of each informant, see ‘New Texts in the Arabic Dialect of Essaouira (Jewish and Muslim Varieties)’ in the texts section of this volume (Francisco 2022).
himself as the last Jew living permanently in the city, despite having been abroad for some years. Part of his family is from the Berber zone of Ayt Bayoud.

In the following part, I track the salient Jewish features in Lévy’s data, in the speech of J1 and J2, and contrast them with the Muslim data in order to confirm if any kind of levelling process (Palva 1982) has taken place between the Jewish and Muslim varieties, eliminating the salient Jewish features.

2 Linguistic features appointed by Lévy

2.1 /š/ > /s/ and /ž/ > /z/

Lévy (2009) attested the total neutralisation between the sibilants /s/, /z/ and the fricatives /š/, /ž/, respectively (Table 2). This trait continues to be predominant in J1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>š &gt; s</th>
<th>ž &gt; z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>dōksi ‘that, that thing’</td>
<td>zūz ‘two’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>āsnu ‘what?’</td>
<td>Šōbni ‘I liked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xansa ‘bag’</td>
<td>rāzal ‘man’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Šāsra ‘ten’</td>
<td>Ŧwāyaz ‘things’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marřākas</td>
<td>‘Marrakesh’</td>
<td>izīw ‘they come’ (imperf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāyos</td>
<td>‘living (place)’</td>
<td>zaddi ‘my grandfather’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, some exceptions are found in specific lexical items. For /š/: šūkrān ‘thanks,’ š-šalḥa ‘the Berbers,’ škūn ‘who,’ māšī ‘no, not’ (negation particle). For /ž/: zaddi ‘my grandfather’ (more frequent than zaddī) and žaddāti ‘my grandmother,’ mūžūd ‘present, available,’ džāža ‘hen,’ źīht ‘side,’ mżūwwaz ‘married’ and lāplāž ‘the beach of Essaouira.’ Lévy registers a single occurrence of /ž/ in xāriž ‘outside’ (2009: 367) and /š/ in mšāt ‘she went’ as a result of the effort of pronouncing /š/, according to the author.6

For J2, the neutralisation is not attested, which makes his speech quite similar to the Muslim variety phonetically. Despite that, there remained some occurrences of the neutralisation in very few lexical items in his speech, such as: ḥazzāla ‘widow’ (< haẓẓāla) and fisṭa ‘holiday, festivity’ (< fišṭa).

---

5 < Fr. la plage ‘the beach.’ It consists of a toponym in Essaouira used by old and young generations. The French article la got prefixed to the borrowing in the local Arabic, as can be seen in other examples: lākāl ‘the quay in the port of Essaouira’ (< Fr. la cale); lāmārīya ~ lāmārīyya ‘tide’ (< Sp. la marea) (Francisco 2019: 161).

6 Chetrit (2015: 6) mentions the same intermediary consonant [š] nearer to [s] in Moroccan Jewish dialects.
The neutralisation between the sibilants and the fricatives, which used to characterise the Jewish dialect, seem to have become occasional not only in the youngest informants, as it could be verified in the speech of the older speakers.

2.2 The articulation of /q/ as [k], [q]

The *qāf /q/ realisation in both Muslim and Jewish dialects tend to be [q] in urban and rural Essaouira, while the variant [g] occurs in specific lexical items—e.g. bǝgra ‘cow,’ gamra ‘moon’—found in both dialects, though being more frequent among Muslims (Socin 1893; Francisco 2019). In Jewish dialect, the verb ‘to say’ was registered firstly as qāl ‘he said’ (Lévy 2009: 365), but appeared in J1 and J2 as gāl, like in the Muslim dialect: gūtt (< gült) ‘I said,’ ngūl lǝk ‘I will tell you’ (J1) and gālt ‘she said’ (J2).

Curiously, the variant ḳāl ‘he said’ was also found in J1, whose speech presents the total neutralisation /q/ > /k/, articulated [k] ~ [ḳ], as in: kūl ‘tell me,’ ḳ-kaṣba ‘The Qaṣba,’ ma ṣkalt-s ‘I don’t remember.’ Lévy had registered this phenomenon—he denominates l-haḍra ṣ-ṣġīṛa ‘la petite façon de parler’—in a single speaker from the Mellah of Essaouira, who presented a single occurrence of [q] (2009: 367). This phenomenon occurs rarely in J2, e.g. mʕīlkāț ‘spoons.’ The author adds that he confirmed the same feature in Safi and Azemmour.

Although J2 uses exclusively gāl, he uses the glottal [ʔ] in the imperative form of the verb ‘to say’ only once: ʔălli āš ‘tell me what.’ The glottal realisation of /q/ occurs in other Jewish dialects as well (Chetrit 2015), but in the case of Essaouira it is a strange and rare phenomenon, even though Lévy (2009: 363) explained it as the neutralisation /k/ > /ʔ/ found in a single Souiri speaker whose family was from the Sous. This could explain the occurrence of the glottal in J2; however, the fact is that the imperative form he uses is not *ʔūl li (< qūl li) but the northern imperative form with short vowel ʔălli, suggesting that either he preserved an old form once found in Jewish dialect of Essaouira or it might be the result of the influence of another Jewish dialect he is in contact with, since his family has been living in Casablanca.

To conclude, the Jewish dialectal variants [ʔ], [k] and [ḳ] seem to have lost space to the prestigious [q] and later to the Muslim [g] in some cases. The speech of J2 demonstrates this change by the alternation between [q] and [g]: mqābal ~ mgābal ‘keeper,’ tlāqīti ~ tlāgīti ‘you found.’

7 J1 alternates between [k] ~ [g] for the verb ‘to say.’
2.3 No reduction of diphthongs

Lévy pointed out that the Jewish dialect of Essaouira did not reduce the diphthongs, as he demonstrates in the examples: ḥāyet ‘wall,’ ṭāyl ‘night’ and ṭawż ‘rice’ (2009: 363). In the same way, J1 keeps mostly not reducing diphthongs in both plain and pharyngealised consonantal contexts, while we can attest a more consistent change to the reduction in J2’s speech, like we find it in the Muslim variety: /āw/ > /ū/, /āy/ > /ī/, in all consonantal contexts\(^8\), even though many diphthongs were preserved in specific lexical items (Table 3).

**TABLE 3.** Diphthongs in the Jewish dialect of Essaouira.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J1</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
<th>Monophthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fāyn</td>
<td>‘where’</td>
<td>lūz ‘almond’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mnāyn</td>
<td>‘from where’</td>
<td>i-ḥād ‘the jews’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-tnāyn</td>
<td>‘two o’clock’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭāyṛ</td>
<td>‘cock’(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḏāyf</td>
<td>‘guest’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āwkāt</td>
<td>‘times’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J2</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
<th>Monophthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mnāyn</td>
<td>‘from where’</td>
<td>fīn ‘where’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āymta</td>
<td>‘when’</td>
<td>lūz ‘almond’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭāyfur</td>
<td>‘plate’</td>
<td>lān ‘color’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḏārṭāyṭu</td>
<td>‘butterfly’</td>
<td>šāk ‘thorn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xāyma</td>
<td>‘tent’</td>
<td>l-ṭām ‘today’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>līl ‘night’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) In the southern Jewish dialects, ṭāyṛ means ‘cock’ (Lévy 2009: 343). J1 defines it for us as ṭāzal d-dzāža ‘the husband of the hen.’

Despite reducing diphthongs more frequently, the Muslim variety preserves—in a smaller number—diphthongs in plain consonantal contexts as well, including some words common to the Jewish dialect: āymta ‘when,’ mnāymta (< man āymta) ‘a long time ago,’ tawb ‘fabric,’\(^9\) āysrī ‘left-handed,’ skāyrī ‘inebriate’ (Francisco 2019: 77).

This fact might be explained in two complementary ways. Firstly, as an outcome of the contact with the Chidma population, settled on the outskirts of Essaouira, since their speech contains diphthongs in plain and pharyngealised contexts with

---

\(^8\) As it is expected for hilalian central type dialects (Heath 2002), diphthongs close to pharyngeal and pharyngealised consonants may alternate with monophthongs: šāf ~ šāw ‘wool,’ bīḍ ~ ṣāw ‘eggs.’

a higher frequency than we attest in the urban milieu: \(^{10}\) nsāyt ‘I forgot,’ bnāyna ‘we built,’ ḥāya ‘white (F)’ (2019: 79). Secondly, diphthongs are also found in the Sous region, where a substantial part of the first settlers of Essaouira—Muslims and Jews—came from. The variant aymta ‘when’ with a diphthong may be evidence of this influence since—in southern Morocco—aymta is found basically in Essaouira and in the Sous\(^{11}\), while all the Atlantic Strip and Marrakesh have the variant imta (Heath 2002: 481).

To sum up, J2 presents a higher frequency of reduced diphthongs, like Muslims, than his older peers. However, the examples above demonstrate that the preservation of diphthongs might have occurred even more frequently among Muslims at some point—especially in plain consonantal contexts. Therefore, perhaps in the past diphthongs were even more frequent, not being a distinguishing feature between Muslim and Jewish dialects.

### 2.4 Suffix -īt (3FSG perf.)

As a morphological feature of the Jewish variety, Lévy points out the occurrence of the suffix -īt (3FSG perf.) alternating with -(ǝ)t, such as: qāmīț ‘she got up,’ okʕīt ‘happened’ and tfǝkkīt ‘was saved,’ but xarzaṭ ‘she went out’ (2009: 363–368).\(^{12}\) The same feature was found in J1: sǝrbīț ‘she drank,’ dǝzbādīt ‘she went out’\(^{13}\) and kānīt ‘she was.’ On the other hand, it has a single occurrence in J2: ʾaš-šwīra kānīt ʾgzāla ‘Essaouira was wonderful.’

Like in the Muslim dialect, the suffix -(ǝ)t predominates in J2 for simple hollow verbs, even though variants such as kānt was registered by Lévy (2009: 367) and found in J1, indicating that a change towards the suffix -(ǝ)t with simple hollow verbs was already in progress a long time before.

Heath proposed that the suffix -īt in the Jewish dialects of Safi and Essaouira originated as ‘a mutation of *-at, or else as a lengthening of *-at, functioning to keep the 3FSG distinct’ from the first person (2002: 224).\(^{14}\) In my opinion, his first hypothesis is corroborated by the Muslim dialect usage of the suffix -āt (3FSG perf.), occurring in all but hollow and defective verbs, in urban and rural Essaouira and also parts of

---

\(^{10}\) In fact, urban speakers usually associate diphthongs with the speech of the rural surroundings.

\(^{11}\) Destaing (1937 I: 178).

\(^{12}\) The author’s transcription was maintained.

\(^{13}\) See the section 3.1. of this paper.

\(^{14}\) This seems to be a feature brought from southern Morocco, as Heath attests the suffix in several southern Jewish dialects: Taroudant, Tiznit, Aoulouz, Tazenakht, Iqilnuqu and (Had-)Tahala. Also in Tazzerte and Beni Mellal (2002: 547, map 4–20).
southern Morocco.\footnote{Settat (Aguadé 2013: 4), Tafilalt (Heath 2002: 223), Marrakesh (Sánchez 2014: 116), Essaouira (Francisco 2019: 94).} In fact, it predominates in J2: \textit{darbāt} ‘she hit.’ Curiously, according to two female Muslim informants in Essaouira, elder women in the medina used to add -āt to hollow verbs, as in the following examples provided by them: *\textit{šāfāt}ni (< \textit{šaft}n), *\textit{mātāt} (< \textit{mät}t), just as the Jewish dialect usage of -īt. In this way, the usage of the suffix -īt (3FSG perf.) with hollow verbs in the Jewish dialect could be the result of morphological analogy with verbs presenting -āt in the local Muslim dialect.

To sum up, it seems that the salient suffix -īt has almost disappeared in the younger informant (J2), except for a punctual occurrence.

### 2.5 The suffix -\textit{ti} (2SG perf.)

The usage of the suffix -\textit{ti} (2SG perf.) for masculine and feminine (Lévy 2009: 363; Heath 2002: 546, map 4–15) has been attested in J1 and J2. In Essaouira, the suffix -\textit{ti} (2SG perf.) is shared by both Muslim and Jewish dialects, which could be a sign that dialectal levelling was in progress a long time before. In this case, we do not attest an isogloss separating communal dialects like in Fez, where -\textit{ṭ} (2SG perf.) for both masculine and feminine is exclusive of Jewish speech, distinguishing it from the Muslim speech with -\textit{ṭī} (2009: 225).

### 2.6 Predominance of the preverb \textit{ta-}

The Jewish dialect presents a predominance of the imperfective preverb \textit{ta-} over \textit{ka-} (Lévy 2009: 363) and it is also encountered in J1 and J2 who \textbf{never} use \textit{ka-}. On the other hand, the Muslim variety does contain both preverbs, \textit{ka-} nowadays being found more frequently in the rural speakers of Essaouira (Francisco 2019), but also in the medina, even though in the latter \textit{ta-} still predominates among Muslims. This seems to be another feature which may have been the result of an old levelling, predominating \textit{ta-}over the pre-hilalian \textit{ka-}, more frequent in the north and in old urban dialects (Aguadé 1998: 12). This reality is very similar to the Marrakesh situation, where \textit{ta-} predominates in the Jewish and Muslim dialects (Heath 2002: 544, map 4–1).
3 New-old Jewish features

The features below, most of them lexical items, were found in J1 and J2 and can also enhance the visualisation of a dialectal levelling process. They are separated into two groups:

3.1 Indication of maintenance

/l/ > /n/: this consists of a southern feature encountered in Tafilalt (Behnstedt 2004). It occurs frequently in J2: nūra < lūra ‘behind,’ manyūn < malyūn ‘million,’ manyār < malyār ‘billion,’ āylān < āylāl ‘seagull.’ On the other hand, we can also find the inverse /n/ > /l/: blītāt < bništāt ‘little girls’ (J1).

The usage of fḥāl over bḥāl ‘like, similar to’: J1 and J2 keep using fḥāl exclusively, the second one being restricted to Muslims. However, in Socin (1893) fḥāl appears in the Muslim speech as well.

The use of šāfd ‘to send’ in J1 and J2: šāfd li ‘send to me’; instead of šīfāṭ, which seems restricted to Muslims.

The alternation between ddi ~ di18 and lli ~ li in both J1 and J2, even though the former seems to use di much more frequently. It is also reflected in the use of adverbial maddi ‘when’ (J1) replaced by mali (J2), also used by Muslims together with fāš ‘when.’

The verb dǝzbād (< tǝžbād) ‘to go out’ is used by J1 frequently, but occurs seldomly in J2, e.g. in the expression: dǝzbād m-ʕlĭyya ‘go away!’; who prefers the variant xrǝž.

3.2 Indication of change

On the other hand, many other traits have disappeared from J1 to J2, attesting a tendency to change towards the Muslim variety.

The usage of ra ‘to see’ only by J1: rātni ‘she saw me,’ ās ta-tšūf? ‘what do you see?’ But J1 also gives āś ta-tšāf? ‘what do you see?’ probably because the verb šāf has always occurred frequently in the city. J2 uses only the latter, like Muslims. Heath

16 This word specifically is found in the Jewish dialect of Marrakesh and also in the north (Heath 2002: 549, map 4–32).
17 āylāl designates specifically the ‘seagull’ in Essaouira, attested among elder speakers, and consists probably of a loanword from Tachelhit. On the other hand, the variant āylān (J2) is also found in Marrakesh (Sánchez 2014: 401) in the name of a gate in the medina: bāb āylān.
18 Pre-hilalian feature also found in Andalusi Arabic: a/iddī (IISUZ 2013: 80).
registered ra as the only variant in the Jewish dialect of Essaouira, but finds both variants in the Jewish dialect of Marrakesh (2002: 512, map 2–42).

The complete replacement of the pronoun ntîna ‘you’ (2MSG), predominant in J1, by nta (2MSG) in J2, in line with Muslims.

Substitution of the frequent ḵmal ‘to do’: n̂̃̄fmal ‘I will do’ (J1) by dâr (J2).

The replacement of the verb ḥdâz ‘must’ (< ḥtâž ‘need’),19 in J1, by the usual particle xaṣṣ ‘must’ in J2. It is the first time the verb ḥdâz is registered in Essaouira, occurring frequently in J1 who agrees it with the main verb: nâḥdâz namsi ‘I must go,’ ṭâḥdâz tamsi ‘you must go.’

The substitution of xlâq ~ xlâk (J1) by dzâd (J2) ‘to be born,’ predominant in the urban and rural Muslim dialects of Essaouira.

4 Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to describe the current situation of the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira, analysing the salient features of this variety and their maintenance in the speech of speakers of different generations. The findings of the study confirm the hypothesis of a dialectal levelling towards the Muslim dialect of Essaouira as we expected, supposedly based on the long period of close contact between Muslim and Jewish communities, followed by the decrease of the Jewish population in the city in the 20th century. Tracking the maintenance of salient features of Jewish dialect and comparing the Jewish dialect with the current Muslim dialect suggest that the levelling process may have occurred at two different moments.

Firstly, the levelling could have happened when both communities were similar in numbers, as some salient features of the Jewish dialect were shared by the Muslim dialect as well, such as the predominance of the preverb ta-, the suffix -ti (2SG) and the no reduction of diphthongs. This could explain the reason why these features have been maintained by informants of distinct ages.

Later, the dialectal levelling evolved as attested by the younger informant (J2) who has lost the other distinctive features of the Jewish dialect, but specific lexical items seem to preserve vestiges of these features in his speech—such as kânît ‘she was,’ demonstrating that the levelling process has not been completed. Furthermore, he maintains the usage of the lexicon of the Jewish variety, also found in J1, such as: fḥâl ‘like, similar to’ and the relative dî ~ dâdî. Some of these features, found also in J1, were registered in the local Jewish dialect for the first time, such as the verb dâzbâd ‘to go out’ and the phenomenon of interchange between /n/ and /l/.

---

This study was a partial assessment of the status of the Jewish dialect of Essaouira, since it did not explore several other features of the variety that could demonstrate other aspects of the long dialectal levelling in progress. Besides, it would be important to obtain linguistic data from other informants of the same age of J2—or even younger—, who had left the city much before, in order to estimate if the levelling verified in J2 occurred throughout his generation or only in his case because he is in permanent contact with Muslim dialect speakers.

Finally, the analysis carried out here demonstrates the importance of continuing linguistic data collection for the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira. For instance, registering ḥdāẓ ‘must’ and other new words for the first time in Essaouira demonstrates the importance of describing the Jewish dialect in this area, especially if we consider the reduced number of speakers left.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I presented preliminary findings of this paper firstly in an open lecture at the University of Granada under the title ‘El árabe de los judíos de Essaouira a día de hoy’ and later in the talk ‘Musulmanes y judíos en contacto: ¿un caso de nivelación lingüística en la medina de Essaouira?’ at the Cervantes Institute in Tetouan, both in 2018. Moreover, this study was possible due to a research stay at the University of Cadiz (2017–2018) with a PDSE-Capes scholarship. I would like to thank the remarks and suggestions of Prof. Jordi Aguadé and Prof. Peter Behnstedt on this paper. Special thanks also to my informants Mr. Asher Knafo and Mr. Joseph Sebag who kindly and patiently collaborated with this research.

ORCID®
Felipe Benjamin Francisco ⬅️ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7757-4705

References

Behnstedt, Peter. 2004. ‘Von an-ʾĀṣǝr (Al-Qaṣr) nach ʾĪgni (Īgli): Ein Vorbericht zu einigen arabischen Dialekten der Provinz ʾar-Raḥidiya (Marokko).’ In Martine


IISUZ = Institute of Islamic Studies of the University of Zaragoza. 2013. A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Andalusi Arabic. Leiden and Boston: Brill.


The Acoustic Vowel Space of Gozitan Naduri and Sannati Dialects

ABSTRACT The focus of this study is to apply acoustic measurements and account for the quality of vowels present in the vowel system of two Maltese dialects of Gozo—Sannati and Naduri—in order to establish whether there are any acoustic differences between the vowels that are present in both dialects. The study is restricted to 13 phonemic monophthongs present in both dialects. The test items are five target words for every vowel. Each item was repeated five times in pre-designated sentences by six native speakers for both dialects. This paper presents evidence that the vowel inventory of these two dialects does not vary only phonologically but is also distinguished acoustically in most vowels.

KEYWORDS acoustics, field research, Gozitan, Gozo, Maltese, Maltese dialectology, phonetics, vowel

1 Introduction

Maltese is a language spoken by a few thousand people worldwide, the majority of whom live in its home country, Malta. Despite a relatively extensive body of linguistic research, particularly in the last decade, on all aspects of language including phonetics and phonology, most of the work carried out has focused on standard Maltese (henceforth SM). Research on phonetics and phonology such as the work of Aquilina (1981), Azzopardi(-Alexander) (1981, 2003) and Borg (1976, 1994) describes the sounds and the phonological processes present in Maltese from a diachronic and synchronic perspective. The established vowel inventory of SM is comprised of 11 vowels, of which six are short whilst the remaining five are long: [iː], [ɪ], [ɪː], [ɛ], [ɛː], [ɐ], [ɐː], [ɔ], [ɔː], [ʊ], [uː]. Four vowels are differentiated only by vowel length, which in Maltese has a phonemic status. However, the limited literature on dialectal varieties of
Maltese has shown that, despite the small size of the country, varieties make use of different vowel systems and phonological inventories.¹

This paper shows the detailed acoustic description of Sannati (SD) and Naduri (ND), two regional dialects present in Sannat and Nadur respectively (see Map 1). Both villages are present on the island of Gozo, Malta. The acoustic analysis aims at presenting whether there are differences between the acoustic properties of vowels present in both vowel systems. Auditory studies of ND (Said 2007) and SD (Farrugia 2010) have shown that both dialects make use of a bigger range of vowels than standard Maltese (SM) and the only phonemic difference between the two vowel systems is the /æː/ vowel, which is present in SD but absent in ND, as shown in Figure 1.

Other differences are found in the number of diphthongs. In a similar pattern, SD and ND share the same diphthong inventory (/æw, əj, ɛj, ɔw, ɔj, ʊj/) except for the fact that SD has an extra diphthong /æw/. However, according to Said (2007), ND makes use of an extra two vowels that have diphthongal qualities, [ɔi] and [iɔ]. A comparative analysis shows that the [ɔi] vowel has the same phonological distribution as the diphthong [ɛj] in SD, whilst the [iɔ] vowel has a similar distribution of the [æː] vowel in SD.

However, despite the relative similarity of the vowel and diphthong inventories, the two dialects make use of different phonological and phonemic processes in which these vowels and diphthongs occur. Table 1 above shows examples of the different vowel distributions of minimal pairs present in both dialects.

---

¹ See, among others, the works of such authors as Incorvaja (2007), Said (2007), and Farrugia (2010).
Other differences in the phonological processes are found in the distribution of vowels or diphthongs present in a single-vowel word construction. In cases when the /ɐ/ in SD is the only vowel present in a word, in ND in such an environment, one would find the vowel /ɔ/:

/plet/ – /plɔt/ ‘plate,’
/tʃet/ – /tʃɔt/ ‘flat,’
/rɪmret/ – /rɪmɾɔt/ ‘I got sick,’
/het/ – /hɔt/ ‘I took.’

Diphthongs /əj/ and /ɛj/ in SD, shift to /ɔj/ and /ɐj/ respectively in ND, as in the case of:

/bɐjt/ – /bɔjt/ ‘eggs,’
/tʃɐjt/ – /tʃɔjt/ ‘jokes,’
/bɛjn/ – /bɐjn/ ‘between,’
/bɛnːɐj/ – /bɛnːɔj/ ‘builder.’

Table 1. Phonemic differences between SD and ND.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SM</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[bele]</td>
<td>[bele]</td>
<td>[bɛlæ]</td>
<td>‘stupid’ (adjective, FSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bele]</td>
<td>[bele]</td>
<td>[bele]</td>
<td>‘sip’ (noun, FSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dɐːrɪ]</td>
<td>[durɪ]</td>
<td>[dʊːɾʊj]</td>
<td>‘the past’ (noun, MSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dɐːɾɛj]</td>
<td>[dɐːɾʊj]</td>
<td>[dʊːɾʊj]</td>
<td>‘my back’ (noun, MSG + pronoun, 1st person SG -i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔmɪ:s]</td>
<td>[ʔmɪs]</td>
<td>[ʔmɛjs]</td>
<td>‘shirt’ (noun, FSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔmojs]</td>
<td>[ʔmojs]</td>
<td>[ʔmojs]</td>
<td>‘jumping’ (verbal noun derived from qomos ‘to jump’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has also been observed that in some nominal disyllabic words with a CVCVC construction where V is /ə/ in SD, in ND it is /ɛ/, as in:

/bɐhɐr/ – /bɛhɛr/ ‘sea,’
/lɐhɐm/ – /lɛhɛm/ ‘meat,’
/nɐhɐl/ – /nɛhɛl/ ‘bees.’

Unfortunately, the frequency of occurrence and the influence of consonantal sounds and morpho-phonetic processes on these phonological processes is yet to be studied. On the other hand, they play an important part in the choice of target words chosen for the present study, as discussed below.

Due to the phonemic and phonological differences present in both dialects one would also expect to find a degree of acoustic differences between the two vowel inventories. However, in Gozo there seems to be an ‘inverse’ diglossic situation (Camilleri Grima 2008), where dialect is used both in formal and informal situations and speakers would continue using their dialect, commonly coined as ‘Gozitan’, despite being aware that there are linguistic differences that distinguish them (Casha 2006; Camilleri Grima 2008). In view of this situation, to what degree to SD and ND differ acoustically? Would two dialects with an almost identical vowel system and use vary from each other acoustically as well?

A specific acoustic difference is expected to be observed in the /æː/ vowel present in SD and its phonemic counterpart in ND. These two phonemes are expected to behave differently as one is a near-front unrounded vowel whilst the other is a vowel with diphthongal behaviour. However, sentence repetition and speech contexts affect vowel quality differently and therefore differences are to be expected.

2 Method

A number of universal as well as language dependent factors were taken into consideration for the collection, extraction and analysis of data in order to answer the research question of this study. The methodology chosen is discussed in the sections below.

2.1 Participants

In order to limit variability and obtain a homogeneous and matching group of SD and ND participants, all participants chosen were native speakers of the dialects in question and were born and have lived most of their lives in the villages in
which these dialects are present. The selected participants were volunteers that completed a background questionnaire before the recordings took place for affinity purposes. If they met the requirements needed, they could participate for the study. The requirements were that they have lived most of their lives in the villages in question, that they had at least one parent who was a speaker of the same dialect, would not switch to standard Maltese with other speakers of a Gozitan dialect, are within the 40–55 age group and form part of the middle-working class.

In this way, six speakers from Sannat and six speakers from Nadur were selected. For each of these dialects, there was an equal number of male and female participants due to the different sociolinguistic variables and physiological properties of the vocal tract that both genders have, so that ‘gender dependence of the vowels could be investigated as easily as the dialect-dependence’ (Escudero et al. 2009: 1380). Despite the number of participants being relatively small, one has to consider the relatively small population of both villages in which these dialects occur.

### 2.2 Data collection

All 12 recordings were carried out in two different recording studios, one in Sannat and the other one in Nadur respectively, for sound quality reasons as well as to avoid any ambience noise. All sound files were saved in a .wav format for acoustic quality purposes. The initial 15 target vowels /iː/, /ɪː/, /ɪ/, /ɛ/, /ɛː/, /ɐ/, /ɐː/, /æ/, /æː/, /ɔ/, /ɔː/, /ʊ/, /ʊː/, /uː/ were orthographically represented to their phonologic Maltese Standard correspondents in a specific target word which was embedded in a pre-designated sentence. Five different target words were chosen for each target vowel, which was then repeated five times by each participant. This method ensured 25 occurrences for each vowel per participant.

Each target vowel was produced as a first vowel in a disyllabic sequence and was always in an accented position, except for vowel /æ/, which phonologically occurs only in an unaccented position in both dialects. The CV–CV construction was the preferred structure for the majority of the target words, but due to the different phonological processes and phonotactic rules present in the dialects, as discussed above, this word structure was not always possible. Out of the 15 target vowels, 6 of them (/ɛ/, /ʊ/, /ʌ/, /æː/, /ɔː/, /ɔ/) do not phonologically occur in the desired structure. A pilot study showed that different articulatory and structural possibilities affect formant values. However, different structural possibilities did not considerably affect formant values as long as the syllable structure in which the target vowel occurred was the same in every target word. In the target words chosen, articulatory effects, due to the preceding consonantal sound, did not affect average formant values either. The target words chosen are shown below in Table 2.
For each target word, a speaker had to read aloud, in dialect, a sentence presented in SM orthography. This method is not ideal due to being less true to natural speech, and poses a risk of influencing the speaker to hypercorrect himself or spontaneously switch to SM, as noted by Klimiuik and Lipnicka (2019). On the other hand, controlled speech ensures a more systematic approach and that the same number of occurrences would be collected from each informant. To the researcher's advantage, however, he himself is part of the Gozitan community and resorted to building a relationship with the speakers by speaking in dialect throughout the whole meeting in order to help speakers feel comfortable and carry out the task by staying true to their dialect pronunciation.

On the other hand, predesignated sentences were preferred to the repetition of the target words alone in order to ensure uniformity and avoid practice effects and other extra-linguistic factors that could affect formant values. Also, each target word was put in the middle of the sentence to avoid the rising or lowering of intonation patterns due to practice effects.

Picture aids were used to facilitate the process and avoid any difficulties in recognising what the target word is before switching to dialect.
3 Data analysis

Since data from all speakers could be analysed, there were a total of about 4500 tokens to be examined. However, some of the tokens were rejected due to the values being classified as outliers by R. A visual interpretation of the mismatch of such tokens and the average formant value of the vowels in question confirmed the rejection. Formant values of vowel /y/ and /æː/ were discarded following the fact that they rarely manifested themselves as monophthongs. An analysis on Praat, in fact, showed most of the time that these vowels occur either as monophthongs with diphthongal behaviour or as diphthongs. Variations of /y/ were [yʷ], [ιʷ], [yw] or [iw], while /æː/ in SD occurred mostly as [ι³] as expected to happen in the case of ND.

Formant values were extracted manually on a digital spectrogram on Praat. The vowel nucleus (20–80 %) was considered whilst the starting points and end points of each vowel were discarded due to the co-articulation influence of the neighbouring consonantal sounds. These points offered a uniform and linear shape in spectrographic analysis. Segments were analysed for their F1, F2 and F3 values.

3.1 Averages

The average values of the first three formants in Table 3 were made for the about 25 tokens of each of the 13 monophthong vowels for each speaker. The acoustic analysis of vowels is based on quantitative based formant data and is preferred to qualitative assessment. The computing averages below were measured on R and therefore the values below are affected by the different phonetic events as discussed above, especially in the case of /æː/ where formant values were elicited in an unstressed environment.

An overview of the cross gender acoustic average values shows that whilst gender is a main effect on formant values, there is a distinction between the male and female averages in ND and SD. Whilst in ND this difference is clear, in SD such distinction is not as marked as one would expect. F1 of male and female speakers of SD are very similar in all vowels. The biggest F1 difference is recorded in /e/ (70 Hz) whilst no difference is seen in the value of F1 in /ʊ/. Physiological differences are universal traits, however they vary from one language to another and there are also language dependent (Pépiot 2013).

---
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4 Results

Data analysed was collected in a datasheet and tested on R. One-way ANOVA tests and their effect size (eta²) were tested according to the independent variables of gender and dialect. Acoustic vowel spaces are also plotted on R according to their F1 and F2 mean values to avoid any superimpositions due to the large amount of data collected. Figures 2–5 below show 13 vowels per dialect, and not 15, due to the diphthongal realisations of /y/ and /æː/ discussed above.

4.1 Analysis of results: Gender variation

Figures 2 and 3 below show the vowel plotting according to the gender of the participants. Gender variation was an expected universal variable due to physiological differences in their vocal tract between males and females despite such a difference not being big enough in certain incidences.

Vowel quality of male participants of ND and SD differed significantly in 6 out of the 13 vowels (front: /iː/, /ɪ/, /ɪː/; back: /ɔː/) whilst in the case of female participants, significant variance was observed in 11 out of the 13 vowels (front: /iː/, /ɪ/, /ɪː/, /ɛ/, /ɛː/, /æ/; central: /e/, /ɛː/; back: /o̞/, /oː/, /ʊ/), showing that there are both inter-dialectal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>[iː]</th>
<th>[ɪ]</th>
<th>[ɪː]</th>
<th>[ɛ]</th>
<th>[ɛː]</th>
<th>[æ]</th>
<th>[ɐ]</th>
<th>[ɐː]</th>
<th>[ɔ]</th>
<th>[ɔː]</th>
<th>[ʊ]</th>
<th>[ʊː]</th>
<th>[uː]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2949</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>3085</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>3066</td>
<td>2936</td>
<td>2953</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>2945</td>
<td>2945</td>
<td>2981</td>
<td>3009</td>
<td>3009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>2425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>2897</td>
<td>2908</td>
<td>2922</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>2922</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>2992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and intra-dialectal differences in the dialects in question. The back vowels showed the least acoustical differences whilst significant variance is present in all front vowels. As for the central vowels /ɪ/ and /ɜː/ no significant variance was recorded in the case of the male values whilst in the case of the female participants, significant variance was present in both vowels.

It has also been observed that female participants of both dialects make more use of the vowel space present in the vowel chart whilst the vowels of male participants are more restricted in terms of vowel space. Another distinction between male and female participants is observed in the front-back position of the vowels. The vowels of female participants present are in a more fronted position than that of the male counterparts.

The repeated measures by single-way ANOVA on vowel duration for both dialect and gender revealed a significant main effect on formant values meaning that it does not only show quantitative differences but also qualitative differences. The significant effect of vowel duration on vowel category for both dialects confirms such a statement. This qualitative difference between short vowel (SV) vs long vowels (LV) is consistent in all vowels where this dichotomy exists, except for the /ɑ/-/ɔ:/: distinction in male participants where only durational difference was observed (ND: F1: \(F = 0.01, p < 0.91\); F2: \(F = 4.80, p < 0.06\); F3: \(F = 2.13, p < 0.15\); SD: \(F1: F = 2.07, p < 0.15\); F2: \(F = 0.54, p < 0.46\); F3: \(F = 0.33, p < 0.57\)). To the contrary of what has been observed in the auditory studies of Said (2007) and Farrugia (2010).

Another important characteristic of vowel length is seen in the position of front and back vowels. For both male and female participants, the long vowels /iː/-/ʊː/ have closer proximity to the long vowels /iː/-/ʊː/ rather than to their short vowel counterparts /ɪ/-/ʊ/. It has also been noted that vowel height of front and back vowels is symmetrical for both dialects. The F1 value of vowels /ɪ/-/ɔ/: /iː/-/ʊː/: /iː/-/ʊː/: is very similar. Such symmetry has been observed in vowel inventories having only a small number of vowels, whilst in varieties with bigger vowel inventories, especially Romance and Anglo-Saxon varieties, front vowels tend to have a higher F1 than their back vowel counterparts (Escudero et al. 2009). The two pairs which are not symmetrical are the half-open front vowels /ɛ/ and /ɛː/ and the half-open back vowels /ɔ/ and /ɔː/.

### 4.1.1 Male participants

Front vowels of male participants, in fact, showed a more central position than expected (see Figure 2). Vowel /ɛ:/ is, in fact, closer to the other front long vowel /iː/ than to its short counterpart /ɪ/, showing that vowel length is not only a quantitative factor in terms of duration but also qualitative. On the other hand, /ɪ/ is observed to have a closer front-back position, which is often associated with half-open front vowels. For half-open vowels /ɛ/ and /ɛː/, in both SD and ND, /ɛː/ has a more front a position than /ɛ/, which on the other hand, has a more central position. Vowel /æ/ is also shares
a more central position. Such results show that closed and half-open short front vowels have a lower F2 value than expected, making their vowel positioning more backwards, thus making their position more central in the vowel chart. In SD, ANOVA and effect size results show that /ɛ/ and /æ/ have the same acoustic quality in all three formants: (F1: $[F = 7.49, p < 0.00705^\ast\ast]$; F2: $[F = 0.46, p < 0.4957, \eta^2 = 0.05]$; F3: $[F = 7.16, p < 0.008365^\ast\ast]$). However, it is to bear in mind that /æ/ was analysed in an unaccented position to the contrary of /ɛ/. An auditory analysis confirmed the different auditory quality. Qualitative differences due to vowel length have been observed in the central open vowel /ɐ/ and /ɐː/. Whilst sharing the same front-back positions, /ɐ/ has a higher position due to a lower F1 value in both SD and NS.

For back vowels, the only instance where SD and ND differ is /ʊ/ (F1: $[F = 0.2069, p < 0.65]$; F2: $[F = 49.024; p < 1.13e-10^\ast\ast\ast]$; F3: $[F = 7.8387; p < 0.005876^\ast\ast]$), where SD has a more backward position than that of Naduri. The vowels /ɔː/ and /ɔ/ are the only examples where a durational distinction has been observed in both ND (F1: $[F = 0.014, p < 0.9061]$; F2: $[F = 4.80, p < 0.05731]$; F3: $[F = 2.13, p < 0.1463]$) and SD (F1: $[F = 2.07, p < 0.153]$; F2: $[F = 0.54, p < 0.462]$; F3: $[F = 0.326, p < 0.569]$).

4.1.2 Female participants

A distinctive characteristic of the vowels of female participants is the bigger number of inter- and intra-dialectal features present in both dialects (see Figure 3). The F1 value of the SD vowels is generally lower than that of ND, thus having a higher
position on the chart, except for the two front vowels /iː/ and /ɪː/. On the other hand, the closed (/iː, ɪ, ɪː/) and mid-open (/ɛ, ɛː, æ/) front vowels of ND have a higher F2 value, and thus a more front position that those of SD, to the contrary of what happens in the case of the values of male participants, except for /ɛ/ and /ɛː/ (see Figure 2).

A characteristic, which is similar to male participants, is the vowel position of the closed front and back vowels /ʊː/ and /ɪː/, which is closer to /uː/ and /iː/ rather than to their short vowel counterparts /ʊ/ and /ɪ/, which further confirms the assumption that vowel length influences vowel quality. Another similar characteristic is the more central position of mid-open front vowels /ɛ/ and /ɛː/. However in ND, /ɛː/ has a higher F1 value and its position is below its short counterpart /ɛ/ whilst in SD, the same vowel has closer proximity to /ɪ/ rather than to /ɛ/. The same vowel position can be observed in the formant plotting of the male speakers of Sannati. Another similar observable pattern of SD is that vowels /ɛ/ and /æ/ share the same vowel space, and the significant difference present in the ANOVA results (F1: [F = 6.53, p < 0.012*]; F2: [F = 5.22, p < 0.024*]; F3: [F = 0.25, p < 0.616]) does not have an effect size large enough for vowel quality to be deemed as different (F1: η² = 0.04; F2: η² = 0.03).

The central open vowel /ɐː/ of SD shares the same vowel space of vowel /ɐ/ of ND. ANOVA results show significant differences in both F1 (F = 5.58, p < 0.020*) and F2 (F = 6.57, p < 0.024*) but the test on effect size shows that the size, if different, is very small in both formants (F1: η² = 0.003; F2: η² = 0.03) to be considered as having different qualities.

**Figure 3.** Vowel plotting of female participants of ND (red) and SD (black).
Back vowels tend to differ from the values recorded for male participants. Out of the 5 vowels, no significant difference has been recorded for /ʊː/ and /uː/ in ND and SD. On the other hand, it has been observed that in both ND and SD, there is only a marginal difference in the acoustic quality of /ɔ/ and /ɔː/ in both dialects SD (F1: [F = 5.15, p < 0.025*]; F2 [F = 9.08, p < 0.002**]; F3: [F = 0.2465, p < 0.62]) and ND (F1: F = 4.46, p < 0.037*]; F2: [F = 10.08, p < 0.001**]; F3: [(F = 1.58, p < 0.210]). Also, whilst /ɔː/ has a higher F2 value than /ɔ/ in SD, these values are reversed in ND. The same pattern is observed in the front-back position of /ʊː/ and /ʊ/.

4.2 Dialectal variation

Figure 4 and 5 below show the vowel plotting of the male and female participants of SD and ND respectively. The vowel space for female and male participants is different in both dialects. Whilst both dialects show gender differences, it also shows that between-subject effects are present in both dialects. Vowel position of male and female participants is parallel in both dialects showing that both male and female speakers of the same dialect have vowel systems which are consistent despite the acoustic and statistical differences as discussed above. However, vowel positioning is different. A clear example is the /ɔ/ vowel of SD where the position of /ʊ/ vowels of male participants is close to the /ʊː/ vowel of female participants, whilst this is not the case for ND.
SD is more symmetrical than that of ND. The vowel systems of male and female speakers of SD are equidistant to each other, with the females’ vowel system being more central. In the case of ND, the vowels systems of male and female participants make better use of the vowel space present in the vowels chart despite not being equidistant to each other, especially in the back vowels. The vowel system of females of ND is more central than that of male participants’, as in SD.

4.3 Vowels /y/ and /æː/

The vowels /y/ and /æː/, as mentioned above, both occur only in an accented position when present in a CVC construction. If an unaccented vowel is added to the CVC construction, both vowels change quality to /uː/ and /ɪː/ respectively. The phonological process of /y/ to /ɪː/ is the same for both dialects. However, in Said (2007) and Farrugia (2010) and the pilot study of the present study, it has been observed that both vowels do not always occur as monophthongs when present in an accented position. During the extraction of vowel formants, however, it has been observed that both vowels seldom occurred as monophthongs and in the instances where they presented themselves as such; there was not enough data for a quantitative study to be carried out. In fact, other allophones of the /y/ were [yw], [iw], [yw] or [iw] for both dialects. On the other hand, the vowel /æː:/ presented the [ɪ³] variant. An auditory and acoustic observation showed that the Sannati dialect in fact did not present the [ɛ³] variant as stated in Farrugia (2010) but the [ɪ³] just like in Naduri.
5 Conclusion

The study presents sociolinguistic, cross-dialectal and intra-linguistic concepts apart from an acoustic analysis of the vowels of two dialects. The study has shown that despite the Malta’s small size, there are different dialectal varieties that differentiate themselves not only auditorily but also acoustically. This study does not only present the acoustic properties of vowels of SD and ND but also shows how their acoustic properties. Gender differences and phonetic variations, such as vowel length and vowel space between and within the two dialects, show that there are many acoustic components yet to be analysed in Maltese phonetics.

Despite the lack of local acoustic literature, the study has applied acoustic principles and measurements to what was previously known about the two dialects in question. This study did not only give new insights into how Maltese dialects differ on an acoustic level but has also given a better understanding of how future acoustic studies could be carried out. Future studies on vowel length and the realisations of vowels /æː/ and /y/, for example, would give a better picture of the mechanisms that the different Maltese varieties use.
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ABSTRACT The first part of this article is focused on previous works on the subject, which discuss the vowel system of standard Maltese (SM). The review will show the multiplicity of approaches and lack of unanimity among researchers in describing the vowel inventory of a language assumed to have been standardised. The second part discusses publications that deal with vowel systems in Maltese dialects and focuses on the vowel system of Gozitan dialects, based on the author’s fieldwork.
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1 Introduction

Maltese is not only described by Semitic language scholars, including Arabic dialectologists, but also—and this should be emphasised—general linguists, which makes it quite well represented in general linguistic publications. This is probably due to the fact that Maltese is standardised (although still not entirely), has a wealth of literature and is written in an alphabet based on Roman script. As in works on general linguistics, examples from Standard Arabic are most often used, rather than from its dialects. The same applies to standard Maltese (SM). Such an approach completely blurs the linguistic reality of the Maltese Republic. General linguists show us a situation that has little to do with the linguistic reality of Maltese. There are many reasons for this. One of them is that Arabic dialectologists have not carried out any major fieldwork since Stumme’s studies at the beginning of the 20th century, even to at least confirm his over 100-year-old findings. Obviously, some research has been carried out, but it is quite limited. Another factor is that Maltese studies to date have almost completely omitted dialectological research and even if there have been any trials, they are usually based on the methodology used to study Indo-European languages...
(especially English dialectology) and focus on lexicography. However, dialectology is not lexicography. While all Maltese words may be found in the language’s dictionaries (e.g. Agius 2010; Aquilina 1987; 1990; Barbera 1939–1940; Ellul 2020; Moser 2005; Serracino-Inglott 1975–2003; 2016 etc.), users of the language themselves often do not know them. Thousands of people on the island of Gozo do not know words like haġeb (‘eyebrow’), even though it appears in probably every Maltese lexicon.¹

The current language situation in Malta and Gozo—the two main islands of the Maltese archipelago—is somewhat more complicated than can be inferred from most publications. While the standard language is the subject of general linguistics and Arabic dialectology, inhabitants of Malta and Gozo use mainly dialects in everyday communication. It is therefore surprising that it is not Maltese dialects that are of interest to Arabic dialectologists but only SM. This may be due to the fact that Maltese written texts are easy to understand for people with knowledge of Arabic because the Maltese alphabet reflects the origin of the language, not its today’s pronunciation.

The main focus of this paper is the vowel length in Gozitan dialects, taking into account the findings to date on Maltese vowel system(s) and its dialects. First discussed is a selection of earlier publications where the issue of vowel systems in the standard language is addressed.² I use the term ‘standard’ here to distinguish between Maltese, which functions primarily in written form, and the dialects used on a daily basis. A comparison of previous descriptions of Maltese vowel system(s) should show the diversity of approaches and lack of consensus among researchers in describing the vowel inventory of the language, which is assumed to be standardised. The few existing publications that deal with vowel systems in Maltese dialects are then described. The paper concludes with a polemic about the vowel system and the vowel length in Gozitan dialects. All considerations and analyses are based on field research which has been carried out on the island of Gozo since 2015 (Klimiuk and Lipnicka 2019), including research currently undertaken as part of the project ‘GozoDia: Gemeinschaftsorientierte dialektologische Studien zur Sprachdynamik der Insel Gozo (Malta)’ [‘GozoDia: Community-oriented dialectological studies on the linguistic dynamics of the island of Gozo (Malta)’] (2018–2021).

¹ During field research carried out since 2015, we have met no one who knows this word, as well as many others that seem to belong to the basic Maltese vocabulary. Some of the words that appeared in the questionnaires used by Aquilina and Isserlin (1981) were also not known to Gozitans. There are many questions here relating to Aquilina and Isserlin’s research. So did the Gozitan informants repeat the words of the interviewees?

² In the examples from quoted publications, I keep the original transcription.
2 SM vowel system(s): Different approaches

Linguists working on Maltese agree that SM includes short and long vowels. For example, Borg\(^3\) (1997: 264–265) indicates that there are five short vowels in SM: \(i, e, a, o, u\), and gives examples of minimal pairs. Unfortunately, three out of ten possible pairs (i : e, i : a, i : o, i : u, e : a, e : o, e : u, a : o, a : u, o : u) are examples of differentiation between only syllables and not whole words:

\[
\begin{align*}
i : a & \quad \text{wisa ‘breadth’ : wasal ‘he arrived,’} \\
i : u & \quad \text{siwi ‘value’ : suwed ‘black (pl.),’} \\
a : u & \quad \text{dawwar ‘he turned’ : duwwa ‘medicine.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

On the basis of the minimal pairs found, Borg raises an important issue in his article about the phonemic status of a short vowel \(u\). He writes the following:

[...] vocalic contrasts involving /u/ are systemically weak in SM. Though /u/ is formally part of the M[altese] short vowel system—note its fairly widespread occurrence in unstressed syllables [...]. The low functional yield of the \(u : o\) contrast in SM misled Cohen (1970 [1970a]: 140) into assigning the vowel [u] purely allophonic status in the SM sound system. However, there can be little doubt that the occurrence of stressed [u] in several well-integrated Italian terms of a learned nature and in certain recent loans from English justifies the assigning of full functional status to short stressed /u/ [...]. (Borg 1997: 265)

As far as long vowels are concerned, Borg lists six of them: \(i, i, e, a, o, u\) (Borg 1997: 268), and emphasises that Maltese has maintained the opposition between long and short vowels in open stressed syllables (Borg 1997: 266).\(^4\) He also gives three minimal pairs to confirm the vowel length in SM:

\[
\begin{align*}
i : i & \quad \text{nizel ‘he descended’ : ni:zel ‘descending (m.),’} \\
a : a & \quad \text{gara ‘it happened’ : gara ‘her neighbour,’} \\
o : o & \quad \text{omma ‘her mother’ : o:mma ‘sadness.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Following Borg’s concept of the occurrence of a long vowel \(i\): which is the result of the monophthongisation of a diphthong ie (ve), i.e. an \(imāla\) in Maltese, the word \(nizel\) should be transcribed as \(nui:zel\).\(^5\) A pair of words \(nizel : nu:zel\), would no longer be a minimal pair

\(^3\) Using only the surname ‘Borg,’ I quote Alexander Borg’s publications. In the case of Albert Borg, however, I systematically refer to ‘Alb. Borg’ in order not to confound my readers.

\(^4\) The same vowel system was presented by Borg (1978: 56–73) in his dissertation, in which he wrote long vowels as iy (in Borg [1997] as \(i\)), ii (in Borg [1997] as \(i\)), ee, aa, oo, uu.

\(^5\) See Borg (1976) on the \(imāla\) in Maltese.
if we assume, like Borg, that there is a phoneme \( i \) and phoneme \( \dot{i} \). Another solution would be to replace the vowel \( i \) in the system of short vowels with the vowel \( \dot{i} \).

However, slightly earlier Aquilina (1959: 18), in his grammar *The Structure of Maltese*, distinguishes five short (unpharyngealised) vowels \( a, e, i, o, u \) and five long (unpharyngealised) vowels \( a:, e:, i:, o:, u: \). He also listed the so-called pharyngealised vowels. Among the long vowels, therefore, no distinction is made between \( i: \) and \( \dot{i} : \) as in Borg (1978; 1997).

Aquilina, who continued to focus in his grammar on the description of quantity criteria and vowel positions, did not call the examples he provided explicitly minimal pairs, confirming the presence of the vowel length. However, they can readily be found among the words he referred to, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
| a : a | hali & \text{‘waste’} : ha:li & \text{‘prodigal (m.)’}, \\
| halya & \text{‘a waste’} : ha:lya & \text{‘prodigal (f.)’}, & (Aquilina 1959: 20) \\
| dara & \text{‘he got used to’} : da:ra & \text{‘her house’}, \\
| jara & \text{‘it happened’} : ja:ra & \text{‘neighbour’}, \\
| hara & \text{‘he evacuated his bowels’} : ha:ra & \text{‘a district’}, & (Aquilina 1959: 21) \\
| e : e | fena & \text{‘to accuse’} : fe:na & \text{‘scene’}, \\
| mela & \text{‘to fill’} : Me:la & \text{‘short for Kar’mela, a Christian name’}, & (Aquilina 1959: 26) \\
| i : i | mili & \text{‘filling’} : mi:li & \text{‘miles’}, \\
| fini & \text{‘languishing’} : fi:ni & \text{‘aim, ‘there is in me, ‘astute.’} & (Aquilina 1959: 31)
\end{align*}
\]

In their ‘question-answer’ grammar of Maltese, Alb. Borg and Azzopardi-Alexander state that there are five short and six long vowels, although they also omit one of them in their figures—\( u: \) (Alb. Borg and Azzopardi-Alexander 1997: 303). They present the Maltese monophthongs by showing orthographic and phonetic realisation, as shown in Table 1:

**Table 1.** SM vowels based on Alb. Borg and Azzopardi-Alexander (1997: 299).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>( e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic</td>
<td>( e )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e: )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon: )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not entirely clear why the authors write about phonetic realisation when they mean phonemes, which in any case have allophones. It should be made clear here that the allophones are a phonetic realisation of a phoneme, a basic unit of the phonological structure. Alb. Borg and Azzopardi-Alexander (1997: 303–304) even list various allophones in SM, but they do not give any minimal pair. The vowel inventory they have presented is equivalent to that described by Borg (1978; 1997).

In the context of these considerations, it is also worth quoting Ambros’s findings from his textbook on SM. He distinguishes five short vowels \( (a, e, i, o, u) \), noting...
that there is no opposition between $u$ and $o$ in words derived from Arabic (Ambros 1998: 23–24). However, he goes on to point out that among six long vowels, four come from Arabic ā, ī, ū, ie (< *ā) and two, ē, ō, are imported (‘mitimportiert’) from Italian or appear as a result of loss (‘Schwund’) of Arabic consonants:ʕ, ġ and h (Ambros 1998: 39). To confirm his deliberations, he gives some examples of minimal pairs:

$ie : i \quad$ liebsa ‘gekleidet (f.)’ : libsa ‘Kleid,’

$niežla ‘herabsteigend (f.)’ : nižla ‘Abstieg,’$

$gieneja ‘laufend (f.)’ : ĝirja ‘Lauf,’$


Ambros is also the only one to give two pairs of words in which, in addition to the vowel length, there is primarily the opposition of stress:

$(a : ā) \quad$ fahhar ‘rühmen’ : fahhâr ‘Prahler; Schmeichler,’


These two examples of pairs are significant for further consideration of the vowel length in Gozitan dialects. It is probably easy to identify further pairs with a pattern like CaCCaC : CaCCāC, where in the first word a vowel will be stressed in the first closed syllable and in the second word in the last closed syllable. As these two examples from Ambros (1998: 39) illustrate, much more attention should be paid to stress or intonation. Perhaps these suprasegmental features may play a much greater role than the vowel length in some Maltese/Gozitan dialects.

It seems, therefore, that in SM it is quite difficult to find such pairs of words with different meanings in which there would be a clear opposition between short and long vowels. At this point, I reject any opposition only between syllables and not whole words that would confirm the presence of a particular distinctive feature, which is the vowel length in this case. If this strategy were adopted in Maltese (dialects), we would probably be dealing with an extremely extensive vowel system, in which certain allophones would have to be considered as phonemes.

3 Maltese and Gozitan dialects and their vowel systems: Even more different approaches?

In this section three publications (Schabert 1976; Camilleri and Vanhove 1994; Puech 1994) are discussed, in which authors describe vowel inventories in some Maltese dialects. Unfortunately, there are simply no other publications that would provide reliable, strictly dialectological information on Maltese dialects.
In his description of Maltese phonology and morphology, Schabert uses language data obtained from two variants—the dialect of San Ġiljan and the dialect of Marsaxlokk (Schabert 1976: 9–11). As he explains, his choice is based on the supposition that ‘[…] sie etwa die beiden äusseren Enden der Bandbreite bilden, auf der sich die Mundarten Malts bewegen’ (Schabert 1976: 9). It is not entirely clear what the author means when he writes that Maltese dialects ‘move’ (‘sich bewegen’) between ‘two outer ends of the range’ (‘die beiden äusseren Enden der Bandbreite’). Schabert’s research assumptions sound exceptionally momentous and may imply that his grammatical description includes dialects stretching between San Ġiljan in the Central Region of Malta and Marsaxlokk in the South Eastern Region.

However, Schabert wrote primarily a comparative study in which he used language data from two different dialects, which should also be classified in two other dialect groups—San Ġiljan is an urban dialect belonging to Maltese port dialects, while Marsaxlokk is a rural dialect and shares a number of features common to Gozitan dialects, which are also rural. Schabert (1976: 10) among the characteristics of the Marsaxlokk dialect distinguishes an išmām (also known as tafxim) ā > ō > ĩ, a ‘strong’ diphthongisation and a ‘stronger’ pharyngealisation than in San Ġiljan. His grammar therefore presents data from two different dialects, but most importantly for our considerations, Schabert describes their vowel systems. San Ġiljan has four short vowels, three pharyngealised vowels and four (+ two?) long vowels, as shown in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pharyngealised</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>(ā)</td>
<td>ĩ</td>
<td>(ō)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The long vowels ā and ĩ appear only in borrowings and may be pronounced as long or shortened to æ and o, and in addition, the vowel æ is sometimes replaced by ĩ (Schabert 1976: 17). The author also quotes an anecdote concerning the long vowel ō, when the teacher of his informant’s daughter corrected the pronunciation of his speaker, who did not pronounce this vowel as long:

One of the users of the dialect of San Ġiljan had a different type of vowel system, as shown in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ɒ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharyngealised</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>æ̣</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels ā, æ and ō replace three pharyngealised vowels ə, æ, ɒ, respectively, while the vowel ō is also maintained among the long unpharyngealised vowels. Schabert argues his decision not to classify ā (< ạ), æ and ō among long ones as follows:

Diese /ǣ/, /ō und /ā/ verhalten sich aber insofern nicht wie die übrigen langen Vokale (bzw. nicht wie /ā/ < *ā), als sie der Kürzung bei Akzentverlust nicht unterliegen, so dass es auch bei diesen Sprechern gerechtfertigt erscheint, sie nicht der Klasse der Langvokale /ī, ū, î, ō, ǣ, ā/ zuzurechnen. (Schabert 1976: 17)

Unfortunately, Schabert does not give any minimal pair in his description to confirm the opposition between long and short vowels in the urban dialect of San Ġiljan.

As far as the Marsaxlokk dialect is concerned, its vowel system is characterised by four short vowels, three pharyngealised and two (+ one?) long vowels, as shown in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ɒ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharyngealised</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ɒ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>(æ̣)</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that any Arabic dialectologist who does not even have the knowledge of Maltese rural dialects is immediately conspicuous by the absence of the long vowel ā, which indicates the presence of the išmām in these varieties. Since the long vowel *ā in the dialect of Marsaxlokk has been replaced by the vowel ō, in order to prove the occurrence of long vowel phonemes, it is necessary to find minimal pairs for the pair ɒ : ō. However, the author does not give any examples of minimal pairs. My search for such pairs in his grammar and registered text has come to nothing. As for the long vowels ɪ and ā, they do not appear in the system, as Schabert (1976: 17) writes, due to diphthongisation. Apparently, the author did not recognise pausal forms in this case.
(Borg 1977; Klimiuk 2017; Lipnicka 2017a; 2017b; 2022), as illustrated by the examples quoted by him and a sample registered text (Schabert 1976: 226–233). It is curious and remarkable that not once during his fieldwork had he encountered contextual forms where no diphthongs would appear, as is the case with Gozitan dialects.6 Perhaps his questionnaire was not prepared to register contextual forms either, or he did not collect the relevant recordings.7 His description of the Marsaxlokk vowel system indicates that the length is only phonetic.

Another important piece of information on the vowel system of Maltese dialects is an article by Camilleri and Vanhove (1994) on the dialect of Mġarr on the island of Malta. The authors distinguish in this dialect, as shown Table 5, four short vowels and as many long vowels:

As in the case of the Marsaxlokk dialect, the lack of a long vowel ā is noteworthy due to the presence of an išmām in this dialect too which, just like the dialect of Marsaxlokk, is rural. However, Camilleri and Vanhove note that the long vowel ā appears in the recordings they have collected in three words. That is what they write about it:

We saw that /ō/ in Imġarri corresponds to /ɔ ̄ / or /ā/ in standard Maltese, and that whenever an [ā] is found it is due to the presence of the virtual phoneme / °/8 and has to be interpreter as a phonological short vowel. There are three exceptions to this rule in the corpus.

Two are borrowings from Italian: [brā́vu] ‘very clever,’ [kanadā́] ‘Canada.’

The third one comes from an Arabic word with a short /a/ (also short in standard Maltese): [mā́ra] ‘woman.’ (Camilleri and Vanhove 1994: 99)

It seems that it is difficult to draw any far-reaching conclusions without the context of speech, the place in the phrase of these words, the type of sentences or the emphasis with which they were pronounced. The pronunciation of the word māra ‘woman’

---

6 See for example a text from Sannat (Gozo) in this volume by Klimiuk and Farrugia (2022).
7 Klimiuk and Lipnicka (2019) draw attention to questionnaires in which data must be collected both in pause and in context.
8 Camilleri and Vanhove (1994) use the term ‘virtual phoneme’ under the influence of Cohen’s works, who used it to describe the phonology of the dialect of Tunis (Cohen 1970b: 166), and then also in his studies of Maltese phonology (Cohen 1970a: 131, 139). In his earlier work, he did not describe it as virtual (Cohen 1967: 166). Vanhove (1993) then uses this term also in her work.
with a long vowel may just indicate that once again the length is only a phonetic feature and not a phonological one.

The authors also point out that the difference in the smaller number of long vowels in the dialect of Mġarr compared to SM ‘may account for a lesser influence of Siculo-Italian on Imġarri than on standard Maltese’ (Camilleri and Vanhove 1994: 95). I think it is not so much the ‘influence of Siculo-Italian’ but rather of the people who influenced the development, formation and creation of the standard language, the dialects on which SM was based, their knowledge of Italian, their degree of education etc.

The article by Camilleri and Vanhove is, above all, crucial to the consideration here because of the ‘minimal pairs’ found by researchers to confirm the presence of length opposition in the dialect of Mġarr. The authors contrast four pairs of vowels (and a diphthong ĝe):

- ō : ő /dómna/ ‘medal’ : /tómna/ ‘land measure,’
- ū : ő /fū'/ ‘on’ : /fó’ra/ ‘poor,’
- ĕ : ĭ /ǧūḥ/ ‘hunger’ : /ḥóǧor/ ‘lap,’
- ĝe : ĭ /miĕt/ ‘he died’ : /mitt/ ([mit]) ‘hundred.’ (Camilleri and Vanhove 1994: 96)

In order to prove the presence of vowel length in the dialect of Mġarr, it would be necessary to find minimal pairs for two oppositions ĭ : ĭ and ō : ō. Unfortunately, all the pairs found by Camilleri and Vanhove are not up to the expected standard as far as the opposition between the two words is concerned. The pair dómna ‘medal’ : tómna ‘land measure’ is also the opposition between the voiced consonant d and the unvoiced consonant t. In fact, this pair may be used as confirmation of the presence of two consonant phonemes d and t. The juxtaposition fū’ ‘on’ : fó’ra ‘poor’ could be considered appropriate if the minimal pair is a syllable pair. However, it would be good if both words had the same number of syllables, in this case two. Another example of two words ġūḥ ‘hunger’ : ḥóǧor ‘lap’ is completely wrong and no argument is made for using it as any minimal pair. The opposition bīdu ‘with his hand’ : bīdu ‘beginning’ seems to be accurate at first glance, but bīdu ‘with his hand’ is a combination of words: the preposition b- ‘with,’ the noun ĭd ‘hand,’ and the pronominal suffix -u ‘his.’ There is also another question of whether the vowel ĭ in the word bīdu ‘beginning’ is by any chance not the vowel ĭ (also written here as a), as in Gozitan dialects. The last pair are the opposition of rising diphthong ĝe (which starts with a semivowel ġ and ends with a vowel e) and a vowel ĭ (i?, a?)

The minimal pairs mentioned by Camilleri and Vanhove may be barely the same proof that length is not a distinctive feature when it comes to vowel phonemes in the dialect of Mġarr. Also, three words with a long vowel ā (brávu ‘very clever,’ kanadā ‘Canada’ and māra ‘woman’) may prove that length is not a relevant feature in this case.
Puech (1994: 18–23) in the introduction to his book with Maltese ethnographic texts briefly discusses four types of vowel inventories of Maltese dialects. In the case of rural dialects—both Maltese and Gozitan—he distinguishes long diphthongised and undiphthongised vowels. As in the case of the dialect of Marsaxlokk, this is a phenomenon of diphthongisation in pausa.

As far as the vowel system of Gozitan dialects is concerned, Puech identifies four short vowels and five long vowels, two of which are diphthongised, as shown in Table 6:

**Table 6.** Gozitan vowel system based on Puech (1994: 18–20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>a / [ɑ]</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i :</td>
<td>u :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiphthongised</td>
<td>a :</td>
<td>e : / [æ :]</td>
<td>i : / [ɑ :]</td>
<td>u :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another vowel system discussed concerns the so-called quadrilateral (‘quadrilatère’) of Żurrieq, Safi, Kirkop, Mqabba and Qrendi, located in the Southern Region of Malta (see Table 7). Puech stresses that the system of short vowels is the same as in Gozitan dialects, there are also two diphthongised vowels, but the realisation of a vowel i : as a diphthong oi fades away. In addition, it is possible to list probably four (or three excluding u : ) long undiphthongised vowels and their allophones. The word ‘probably’ here stems from the fact that it is sometimes extremely difficult to say what Puech means because his analysis is at times ambiguous. The author simply does not make it clear which long vowels are phonemes:

**Table 7.** Żurrieq vowel system based on Puech (1994: 20–21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>a / [ɑ]</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i :</td>
<td>u :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiphthongised</td>
<td>a :</td>
<td>e : / [æ :]</td>
<td>i : / [ɑ :]</td>
<td>u :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third vowel system applies to Malta’s other rural dialects. Puech writes about four short vowels, two long diphthongised vowels and three undiphthongised ones, as shown in Table 8:

**Table 8.** Maltese rural vowel system based on Puech (1994: 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>i / [ɛ]</th>
<th>u / [ɔ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>a :</td>
<td>æ :</td>
<td>i :</td>
<td>u :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiphthongised</td>
<td>a :</td>
<td>e :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last vowel system proposed by Puech (Table 9) concerns urban dialects and SM, with five short vowels, specifying that vowel ʊ has acquired a marginal phonemic status, and five long vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undiphthongised</td>
<td>aː</td>
<td>eː</td>
<td>iː</td>
<td>oː</td>
<td>uː</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the same way as Schabert, Puech in his collection of ethnographic texts does not give any minimal pairs to confirm the opposition between short and long vowels. Another problem that may arise from his analysis is that the long vowels are not always sufficiently and clearly described, making it sometimes difficult to determine which long vowels, according to Puech, may be phonemes.

All the authors mentioned here agree, however, that there are four short vowels in Gozitan and Maltese rural dialects. As far as long vowels are concerned, the discrepancies are already significant, mainly due to the adopted description model, including the way in which the vowel *ā > SM ie is described, which can be implemented as a long vowel i or a rising diphthong ye. This raises a number of problems of interpretation.

### 4 Gozitan vowel system and vowel length

Puech (1994: 18–20), who in the vowel system for Gozitan dialects (see Table 6) distinguishes four short vowels (a, e, i, o) and five long ones (four undiphthongised aː, eː, oː, and two diphthongised iː, uː), does not give any minimal pairs to confirm his findings. Puech’s texts show that his approach to describing the Gozitan vowel system was strictly phonetic and not phonological. This is quite surprising because when studying spoken Semitic languages/dialects, phonology should be the starting point. A slightly different approach was proposed by Schabert in his research into the dialect of Marsaxlokk, and by Camilleri and Vanhove in their description of the dialect of Mġarr.

None of the authors of studies on Maltese dialects has so far attempted to question the existence of vowel length in Gozitan dialects or, as previous analyses have also shown, probably all rural dialects in which the ismām phenomenon occurs. The reason for this approach could be seen in the influence of standard language on research into Maltese dialects. Studies to date take for granted the occurrence of opposition between long and short vowels. The presence of vowel length leads, as Lucas and
Čéplô (2020: 273) write, to the fact that ‘Maltese has a much richer vowel phoneme inventory than typical Maghrebi Arabic dialects, with, among the monophthongs […] as well as seven distinct diphthongs.’ It is true that SM has more diphthongs than any Maghrebi Arabic dialects, but as research in Gozo also shows, the number of diphthongs may be lower.

Probably, the Maltese alphabet itself also has a great influence on the study of dialects. The way vowels are written may imply, for example, reading a short vowel $i$ only as a phoneme $i$ and not, for example, as $ǝ$ or $ɪ$, which may also apply to the example of $bіdu$ ‘beginning’ (Camilleri and Vanhove 1994: 96) already quoted. Another factor in this approach may be the methodology chosen by researchers, based, for example, on Roman or Germanic languages.

Field research carried out in the last few years in Gozo shows (Klimiuk and Lipnicka 2019) that it is not possible to find any minimal pair that would prove the opposition between long and short vowels in all sixteen Gozitan dialects studied. Attempts to find such pairs each time have failed. This is due to three basic characteristics of Gozitan dialects: the way of realisation of an $іm̩ala$, an $іsm̩m̩$ and pausal forms.

The $іm̩ala$ in these dialects is still realised as a rising diphthong $’e$ (‘$ǝ$ etc.) or as a vowel $e$. In none of the dialects examined was the $іm̩ala$ pronounced as a long vowel $i$ [ri:], as in SM. So it is impossible to find such minimal pairs as: $lіebsa$ ($lіbsa$) ‘dress,’ $nіezla$ ($nіzla$) ‘way down.’ In Kerċem, for example, the pairs of these two words would be as follows:

$P$epsa ‘dressed (f.)’ – $l$apsa ‘dress,’
$n${ezla ‘descending (f.)’ – $n$azla ‘way down.’

Another phenomenon—the $іsm̩m̩$ reduces the occurrence of the long vowel $a$, which is demonstrated by the two earlier studies of dialects of Marsaxlokk and Mgarr discussed here (see Table 4 and Table 5). The long vowel $a$ does not appear in these dialects. Assuming that examples of opposition between $a$ and $а$ would be found, it would then be worth checking whether the same syllable is stressed in both words, as was the case with Ambros’s examples (1998: 39). The stress can therefore be a distinctive feature.

Another key phenomenon for the vowel inventory of Gozitan dialects are pausal forms, which are characterised by the diphthongisation of vowels $u$ and $i$ in the last closed or open syllable (Lipnicka 2022). Their diachronic consonant environment—emphatic or non-emphatic, or a language of borrowings, in this case Italian—must be taken into account. Depending on whether a word is in a context or in pausa, it is...
realised in a different way. Nor is it the case that vowels u and i in the context, i.e. already as monophthongs, will be realised as long vowels. They can be articulated as short as other vowels. In this case, it is not only the word stress that plays an important role but above all the stress of the whole phrase or word clusters. Measurements of vowel lengths carried out so far have shown that even in the case of word stress, it is quite difficult to speak of any regularity. It is therefore worthwhile to look primarily at the entire phrase and clusters and their articulation, not just at a single word.

Based on field research, it should be considered that vowel length in Gozitan dialect is phonetic, not phonological. There are therefore no such minimal pairs that confirm the opposition between long and short vowels.

The vowel system of Gozitan dialects has fewer phonemes than the standard language inventory. There are six vowels: a, e, i, o, u and ǝ. Between these vowels, it is easy to find minimal pairs. As far as raising diphthong ye is concerned, if it is articulated as a diphthong, it is part of the diphthong inventory and not of the vowel system.

5 Conclusion

The analysis presented above shows that vowel length in Gozitan dialects is phonetic, not phonological. Moreover, studies of other rural dialects in Malta so far also indicate this, although their authors have always differentiated between short and long vowels. This was probably due to the influence of standard language on the way research is conducted. Arabic dialectology is also familiar with cases where researchers have reached for the literary language more than needed. Standard language should not be the main reference for dialectological studies.

Unfortunately, research into Gozitan dialects is a neglected part of Maltese linguistics, despite attempts such as the Aquilina and Isserlin study (1981). In fact, our knowledge of e.g. Maltese urban dialects is infinitesimal and limited. The statement that SM is based on the urban dialects of the port area is repeated like a mantra, but there is no specific, extensive study of these dialects except for the comparative grammar of Schabert (1976) and his data from the dialect of San Ġiljan. It seems that now is the last chance to carry out any such larger-scale research on the island of Malta as well. This will not only enrich the knowledge of Semitic dialectology but, above all, contribute to research into the history of the Maltese language and preservation of the cultural heritage showing the diversity of the Maltese and Gozitan dialects.
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Pausal Diphthongisation in Gozitan Dialects Compared to Zaḥlé, Lebanon

**ABSTRACT** Pausal forms, despite not treated as such so far, are a paradigmatic part of the grammar in the dialects of the island Gozo, Malta. Pausal diphthongisation in both closed and open final syllables represent the most striking pausal phenomenon occurring in Gozitan dialects and is described in this paper with consideration of the impact of the etymological vowel length and consonantal emphasis on the pausal realisation of the diphthongs in final syllables. Further, the Gozitan pausal diphthongisation is compared with a similar occurrence in the Arabic dialect of Zaḥlé, Lebanon, as captured by Henri Fleisch.

**KEYWORDS** field research, Gozitan dialects, Gozo, Lebanese Arabic, Malta, Maltese, Maltese dialectology, prosodic phonology, prosody, pausal form

**1 Introduction**

Pausal forms are a well-known prosodic phenomenon in Semitic linguistics that had been noted early on in Biblical Hebrew (i.a. Gesenius 1909) and in Classical Arabic (Sībawayhi 8th century AD; Beyer 2009; Birkeland 1940) but was mainly attributed to recitation of written language and poetry. As an object of modern dialectological study, pausal forms were detected in Arabic dialects relatively recently and imposed new methodological challenges on dialectological research itself. The term ‘pausal form’ circumscribes phonological changes that occur in the final syllable of an utterance and is therefore intersecting both phonological and syntactic levels of grammar. This is not only unusual but also even theoretically unexpected due to phonology and syntax being separate levels in the grammatical hierarchy. Pausal forms had therefore often been overheard by many dialectologists in the past, as can be observed in research outcomes of several expeditions undertaken in the 20th century in Gozo, Malta (see i.a. Stumme 1904; Aquilina and Isserlin 1981; Agius 1992).
Moreover, pausal forms do entangle the pause or absence of sound as a meaningful party in the construction of phonological rules, whereas usually such parties are constituted by sounds or phonemes stated by phonetic features and an opposition within minimal pairs of lexemes. In the case of a pause, all phonological features are absent due to the obvious nature of silence itself, and minimal pairs differ significantly due to context or the final position of a syllable or word in a phrase.

In the current paper, I will present the findings on pausal diphthongisation in Gozitan dialects that were gathered during joint dialectological field research with Maciej Klimiuk on the island of Gozo (Malta) in the years 2013–2017. Further, I will discuss a possible synchronic explanation of the occurrence of pausal forms in these dialects and compare the data to parallel forms found by Henry Fleisch in the Arabic dialect of Zaḥlé, Lebanon (Fleisch 1974b).

2 Pausal diphthongisation

The most significant type of pausal forms found in Gozitan dialects is the diphthongisation of etymologically and diachronically long vowels both in closed and open syllables. Synchronically, Gozitan dialects do not show an opposition of vowel length (Klimiuk 2022), but the distinction of etymological length is preserved in pausal positions. The occurrence of diphthongisation is not a random or facultative phenomenon but systematic and paradigmatic in its character. Its marginal treatment by previous researchers conducting dialectological research in Gozo is an outcome of methodological inconsistencies in the fieldwork, which was conducted through the mediation of standard Maltese (SM) and therefore induced the mixing of Gozitan and Maltese dialects in the data (Klimiuk and Lipnicka 2019).

2.1 Closed syllables with *ī and *ū

The pausal diphthongisation of etymologically long vowels *ī and *ū is split into two subtypes according to the etymological consonantal environment of the lexeme: *ī > oy or ey and *ū > ow or aw. Gozitan dialects, like in SM and Maltese dialects, exhibit a loss of emphatic consonants *ṭ, *ḍ, *ẓ (*ḏ̣) and *ṛ that have merged with their nonemphatic counterparts. The emphatic feature is still reflected in the vowel system through the split of the realisation of the etymologically long vowel *ā as e or i (imāla) in etymologically nonemphatic and as o or u (išmām, also known as ta’xfīm) in etymologically emphatic consonantal environments. This rule is not as consistent as in other Arabic dialects (Arnold and Behnstedt 1993: 24–26), especially in that the Gozitan vowel system does not reflect the etymologically secondary emphasis of musta‘īya consonants *q, *ǧ, *x (Hassan 2013: 2). A separate morphophonological class with
regards to the application of ḫismām represent conjugated verbal forms, where the emphasis is either suspended or redistributed like in ateyr# ‘he flies’ (tyr < OA tyr), aseyān (syān < OA šwān), but adowr (< OA dwr). In the few other exceptional cases, the original emphatic status of the root consonants (especially *r) is from today’s perspective not certain, like *bhr (?) in bār̄anāw# ‘strangers’ or *ʔmām (?) in ummāw# ‘my mother.’ Yet, the exceptions do not undermine the overall tendency to preserve the primary emphasis.

The examples given in Table 1 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of closed syllables of type CuC < *CūC. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as *rbt in maʃbowt# ‘tied’ (< OA marrison), *sfrr in asfowr# ‘bird’ (< OA ‘asfar) or emphasised loanwords like əs-staʔown# ‘season.’ The pausal diphthong ow has an allophonic realisation [aw] as for example ʔattaws# ‘cat’ (< North African Arabic *qṭs or Lat. qattus). In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of CuC < *CūC is consistently diphthongised as CawC# as for the roots *qlb in ʔləwp# ‘hearts’ (< OA qulūb), *ḥnt in ḥanəwt# ‘shop’ (< OA ḥānūt). The verbal conjugal suffix -u for the plural preserves its etymological length and is diphthongised when closed by the suffigated negation particle -š, as shown by the example ma nəkləwš# ‘we are not eating’.

The examples given in Table 2 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of closed syllables of type CiC < *CīC. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as *šlb in saloyr# ‘cross’ (< OA ṣalīb), *qsr in ʔasoyr# ‘short’ (< OA qaṣr) or emphasised loanwords like al-bamboyn# ‘the baby.’ The diphthongisation of *t to oy
in etymologically emphatic environments was coined ‘occasional’ by Borg (Borg 1977: 217), but the data gathered in Gozo in the current project proves otherwise. For example, in the case of adjectives, the split in pausal realisation goes along the emphatic roots *ṭwl in twoyl# ‘long’ (< OA ṭawīl), *ṣġr in zġoyɹ# ‘small’ (< OA ṣaġīr), *nḏ̣f in nadoyf# ‘clean’ (< OA naḏ̣īf) as opposed to nonemphatic roots *xff in ḥafeyf# ‘light’ (< OA xafīf), *ḥzn in ḥazeyn# ‘bad’ (< OA ḥazīn), *ṯql in tʔeyl# ‘heavy’ (< OA ṣaṭqīl). As these examples show, the emphatic realisation of the diphthongs as oy is conditioned by emphatic consonants only, not by ‘backed environment’ (Borg 1977: 213) and also is morphophonologically word class specific.

In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of CiC < *CiC is consistently diphthongised as CeyC# as for the roots *ġwd in l-awčeyn# ‘Gozitans,’ *nbḏ in ambeyt# ‘wine’ (< OA nabīḏ) and *snw in sneyn# ‘years’ (< OA sinīn). Noteworthy are also the examples al-ḥanat zġoyɹ# ‘the shop is small’ and la-mbHat tayyup# ‘good wine’ where the contextual realisation of both *i and *u is centralised to a. This type of vowel shortening in nonprominent accentual position in a phrase will be discussed further in 2.3.

2.2 Open syllables with -i and -u

In the case of pausal forms in open syllables with vowels u and i, the opposition of etymological length is suspended, which is common for Arabic dialects, and all open syllables of this type underlie analogical diphthongisation parallel to the closed syllables described in 2.1 (Tables 1–2).

The examples given in Table 3 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of open syllables of type -Cu. The emphatic realisation can be either attributed to the emphatic status of *r (?) , *m (?) or can be interpreted as a reflection of alif at-tafxīm (Hassan 2013), as this type of emphatic diphthongisation occurs in several monosyllabic lexemes containing an etymological *ʔ as in *ʔʔs in rusow# ‘his head’ (< OA raʔsuhu), *ʔʔm in ommow# ‘his mother’ (< OA ʔummuhu) and *ʔʔx in uḥtoy# ‘my
The examples given in Table 4 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of open syllables of type -Ci. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as *ṭw in mutoy # ‘given’ (< OA ṭuṭi), *ghr in dahroy # ‘my back’ (< OA ḡahr) or emphasised Romanic loanwords like al-funçyonoy # ‘functions.’ In etymologically non-emphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of -Ci is diphthongised to ey as shown for the roots *ruḥ in ruḥey # ‘my soul’ (< OA ṭūḥ), *gsym in ġasme # ‘my body’ (< OA ġism) and *wl in twulidoy # ‘birth’ (< OA *tawli).}

2.3 Closed syllables with *ā and open syllables with -a

Closed syllables with an etymologically and diachronically long *ā also exhibit pausal changes that can be understood as a form of diphthongisation.
The examples given in Table 5 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of closed syllables of type CoC/CeC < *CaC. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as *rmḍ in ar-rando‘n# ‘the Lent’ (< OA ramaḍān), *ṭfl in a-tfo‘al # ‘children’ (< OA ʔaṭfāl) or emphasised loanwords like ǧuzze‘p# ‘his name is Joseph’ : ǧuzzep kbeyr# ‘Joseph is grown up’.

In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, CaC < *CaC is occasionally realised as a triphthong [Cye#] in prosodically prominent final positions. The type of pausal ‘triphthongisation’ is to be understood as an allophone to the rising diphthong ye (that occurs both in pausal and prominent contextual positions) and is attributed to prosodic ratios that need to be further investigated. The etymological roots for examples in the second column of Table 5 are *nys in nye‘s# ‘people’ (< OA an-nās), *zmn in a-zme‘n# ‘the time’ (< OA az-zamān) and *mwt in mvte‘t# ‘he died’ (< OA māta) respectively. The extraordinary case of the triphthong ye corresponds with the pharyngeal/laryngeal realisation of the final imāla in open syllables of type -Ce#. In open syllables of type *-Ca, the etymological length and the emphatic conditioning appear to be suspended, final imāla occurs occasionally even in Romanic loanwords. The laryngalised or pharyngalised final gliding of the final vowel e to _a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5. Pausal diphthongisation of etymologically long *a in closed syllables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC : -CoC#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-rando‘n# ‘the Lent’ : ar-randon al-gbeyr# ‘the Great Lent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erbo‘ tatfo‘al # ‘four children’ : a-tfo a-twayba ‘the good children’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asmu ǧuzze‘p# ‘his name is Joseph’ : ǧuzzep kbeyr# ‘Joseph is grown up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CeC ~ C’eC : C’eC# ~ [C’eC#]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(in etymologically nonemphatic environments)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nye‘s# ‘people’ : an-nes ǧew ~ an-nes ǧew ‘people came’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-zme‘n# ‘the time’ : fa-zmen-ilaw# ‘in the old times’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meta mvte‘t# ‘when he died’ : met wеhah ‘one has died’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Ca : -Ce#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molta(#) ‘Malta’ ; twayba# ‘good (f.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čukkuluta(#) ‘chocolate’ (Ital. cioccolato)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basle# ‘one onion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taffle# ‘girl’: at-taffa ʔeda l-awstralya ‘the girl lives in Australia’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Ce : -Ce#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(in etymologically nonemphatic environments)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġilde# ‘leather’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gzüe# ‘island’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zawğe# ‘her husband’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alme# ‘water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalle# ‘she had,’ ‘all of her/them’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4 Avoidance of homonymy and tendency to gliding vowels

The split in the realisation of the etymologically long phoneme *ā, mentioned in 2.1, overlaps with the phonemic boundaries of etymologically long vowels *ī and *ū. Pausal diphthongisation in Gozitan dialects can be therefore attributed to the avoidance of homonymy. The hypothesis of contextual homonymy and corresponding pausal opposition can be shown by following minimal pairs:

\[ i > ey : \text{vey} \] (imāla)

pausal form: sneyn# ‘years’ (< *ī in OA sinīn) : snen [sneyn#] ‘teeth’ (< *ā in OA ?asnān)

context form (no opposition; variation due to prominence in a phrase):

\[ snan ~ snen ~ snin \]

\[ u > ow : o^{a} \] (išmām)

pausal form: addówr# ‘she goes around’ (*dwr; < *ū in OA tadūru) : addōr# ‘the house’ (*dyr; < *ā in OA ad-dār)

context form (no opposition; variation due to prominence in a phrase):

\[ addar ~ addor ~ addur \]

Pausal diphthongisation of the etymological phoneme *ā is realised as gliding vowels \( {\text{ye}} \) (imāla) or \( o^{a} \) (išmām) understood as rising diphthongs and are therefore opposed to the closing and falling diphthongisation of *ī and *ū.

The occurrence of pausal diphthongisation in Gozitan dialects can be also attributed to the tendency to glide etymologically long vowels towards semivowels \( w \) or \( y \) that both represent the articulatory edge of the vowel—namely labial edge of *ū (\( w \) in \( ow/aw/aw \)) and palatal edge of *ī (\( y \) in \( oy/ay/ey \)). The second element _a in the diphthongs e^a and o^a could represent the pharyngeal edge of articulation of both realisations of *ā and could correspond phonetically with what other authors call ‘creaky voice’ (Camilleri and Vanhove 1994: 91) which is described as a form of laryngealisation. The data gathered in Gozo in the current project suggest, however, that in this case it is a form of pharyngealisation that corresponds with the phoneme \( f \) rather than a ‘creaky voice,’ especially in that the phoneme \( f \) is preserved in many
phonologically predictable positions in all Gozitan dialects (and even ġ as in Gharb, Żebbuġ, San Lawrenz, Ghasri; cf. Klimiuk and Farrugia 2022). The phoneme ġ is not traditionally perceived as a potential glide, but could be further discussed as such, especially by linguists accustomed with the specifics of Arabic phonology.

Prosodic phonology and recognising the prosodic impact on the realisation of vowels play an important role in further investigations on the role and meaning of pausal forms in dialects. As the examples ət-təflə ʔeda l-awstralya, ʕandǝ l-flǝws#, ła-mbǝt tayyup# show, all three vowels a, u, i regardless of etymological length can be realised as a centralised short ǝ when occurring in least prominent syllables of a phrase. This would be plausible within the prosodic hierarchy, as proposed by prosodic phonology (Nespor and Vogel 1986), in which phenomena occurring on the suprasegmental level (pausal diphthongisation) is assumed to be linked to analogous processes on segmental levels (micro-pausal centralisation to ǝ). Another example for these cross-segmental dynamics in Gozitan would be the pausal devoicing of consonants (saloyp#) as linked to the assimilations occurring within phrases across lexemes or on syllabic level within single words.

3 Gozitan pausal forms compared to Zaḥlé, Lebanon

Pausal forms have been found and described in several Arabic dialects over the course of the last 150 years—i.a. in Lebanon (Kfar Sghab, Chim, Zgharta, Khirbet Salem [Fleisch 1974a]; Bishmizzin [Jiha 1964]); in Palestine (Druze dialects of North-western Galilee—Blanc 1953; Bedouin dialects in Negev [Blanc 1970]); in Syria (Latakia [Klimiuk 2012]); in Turkey (Alawi and Christian Arabic dialects of Hatay [Arnold 1998, 2010]); in Egypt (AbuFarag 1960; Blanc 1973–1974; Gairdner 1926; Khalafallah 1969; Lane 1842; Winkler 1936; Woidich 1974) and the Arabic Peninsula (Behnstedt 1987; Jastrow 1984). It is significant, though, that Gozitan dialects are the only one exhibiting pausal phenomena amongst the Western North-African dialect group, as documented so far.

With regards to pausal forms, striking typological similarities link Gozitan dialects with Lebanese dialects, which leads to a discussion about a potential historical connection of Gozo to the Middle East. As no clear historical evidence is available that would clearly state a relation between the two regions other than the Phoenician/Punic link, the synchronic explanation based on the hypothesis of avoidance of homonymy mentioned in 2.4 is more plausible until further evidence or data appear. The pausal forms of the village Zaḥlé (Lebanon) and its surroundings, as described by Fleisch (Fleisch 1974b), are typologically closest to the pausal phenomena found in Gozitan dialects, as only in these dialects does diphthongisation occur both in closed and open syllables.
3.1 Closed syllables

Henry Fleisch, as one of the first, has recognised and described pausal forms as a paradigmatic part of the grammar of the Zaḥlé dialect group (ZD). Both Gozitan dialect group (GD) and ZD exhibit important similarities in the phonological systems as *imāla/*išmām and the occurrence of prosodic element in pausal forms already noticed by Fleisch in the seventies as following:

Ce point fut plus difficile à déterminer. A la première enquête il n’avait pas été reconnu; il s’en est suivi de nombreuses confusions. La diphtongaison atteint la dernière syllabe du mot, mais elle ne se produit que s’il y a un arrêt de la voix, grande pause à la fin d’une phrase, ou bien petite pause à l’intérieur d’une phrase. (Fleisch 1974b: 64)

The transcription used by Fleisch to capture pausal phenomena is, from the perspective of time, not very coherent, but I chose to still cite the original transcription in the examples below.

-CūC (emphatic environment)
GD CowC# ~ CawC# vs. ZD -CåůC# as in kṛåům# (kṛūm) ‘vineyards’ (Fleisch 1974b: 63); ṭṛåůḥ# (ṭṛūḥ) ‘she goes’ (Fleisch 1974b: 87)
-CūC (nonemphatic environment)
GD -CəwC# vs. ZD -CaůC# as in ma kàtàbaůš# (ma katabūš) ‘he did not write it’ (Fleisch 1974b: 79)

For closed syllables of the type -CūC in emphatic consonantal environments, Fleisch describes a diphthongisation to åů, in which the more prominent vowel å is realised as ‘a postérieur assez reculé’ (Fleisch 1974b: 95) and ũ as the equivalent of w, or the less prominent vowel (semivowel), which corresponds well with the GD forms CowC# ~ CawC#. Strikingly, Fleisch also tends to transcribe the emphatic features not only for (rather synchronically than etymologically) emphatic consonants as ṭ in kṛåům# (*kṛm; < OA kurūm) but also for the surrounding consonants as in ṭṛåůḥ# for the root *rwḥ (< OA tarūḥ). Fleisch herewith makes a relevant point in the discussion on the phonological status of emphasis as attributed to certain morphemes and roots rather than to singular consonants. In nonemphatic surroundings like for the root *ktb in ma ktàbaůš#, Fleisch transcribes the pausal diphthong as aũ, where the vowel a opposes the backed realisation å. In Gozitan dialects, this type of diphthongisation is even more centralised to a.

-CīC (emphatic environment)
GD -CoyC# vs. ZD -CåĆ# as in mkåṣṣåṛān# (mkāṣṣāṛīn) ‘broken (PL)’ (Fleisch 1974b: 85); ʿå-ṭṭåråı̊ ʾ# (ʿå-ṭṭåṛīʾ) ‘on the street’ (Fleisch 1974b: 87)
-CīC (nonemphatic environment)
GD -CeyC# vs. ZD -CȩĆ# as in ktělr# (ktīr) ‘a lot’ (Fleisch 1974b: 63)
For closed syllables of the type -CīC in emphatic consonantal environments, Fleisch notes a diphthongisation to ål, in which again å is backed and rounded—the closest realisation of a pausal diphthong to the GD form -CoyC#. Noteworthy is again the r that affects the etymologically nonemphatic root *ksr insofar, that Fleisch transcribes it as mkāssārain# (< OA mukassarīn). Similarly, the emphasis of the root *ṭrq in the second example affects the vowel quality of the whole phrase ’ā-ṭṭārāl# (< OA ʕala ṭ-ṭariq), including the vowel in the preceding prefigigated preposition ’ā-. Several examples in ZD texts exhibit the emphatic type of diphthongisation transcribed as ål, despite Fleisch not mentioning it in his description of pausal diphthongisation (Fleisch 1974b: 63).

In nonemphatic surroundings like in ktęı̊r# (*kṯr; < OA kaṭīr), the diphthongisation in ZD and GD are parallel in the forms -CīC ~ -CeyC#, as the symbol ȩ used by Fleisch stands for ‘e ouvert, comme dans frais’ (Fleisch 1974b: 95).

### 3.2 Open syllables

In the case of open syllables, Fleisch describes a suspension of length and a paradigmatic pausal diphthongisation but does not mention the emphatic vs. nonemphatic split in the realisation of the vowels. Nonetheless, his transcription of the texts recorded in Zaḥlé mirrors a split analogous to closed syllables.

- **-Cu (emphatic environment)**
  GD -Cow# vs. ZD -Co ̧ ọ# as in ṭlöʿto ̧ ọ ‘you (PL) went out’
  (Fleisch 1974b: 71)

- **-Cu (nonemphatic environment)**
  GD -Coɔ# vs. ZD -Caų# as in šaų# ‘what?’
  (Fleisch 1974b: 64)

For open syllables of the type -Cu, regardless of the consonantal environment, Fleisch mostly uses the transcription ọ, in which ọ represents for him an ‘o ouvert, comme dans rosses,’ ọ an ‘o fermé, comme dans rose’ and both together as ọọ an ‘indiquent une diphtongue’ (Fleisch 1974b: 95). His reasoning in favour of this transcription is difficult to encode from the perspective of time, but the examples of emphatic ţlö’tọ# (*ṭlọ`; < OA ṭaḷaʕtū) versus the nonemphatic šaų# (< OA ʔayyu šayʔin) still indicate a rather split realisation of the diphthong.

- **-Ci (emphatic environment)**
  GD -Coy# vs. ZD -Cål# as in šabwåı̊ # ‘my child’ (Fleisch 1974b: 85)

- **-Ci (nonemphatic environment)**
  GD -Cey# vs. ZD -Cẹl# as in ’allẹl# ‘he told me’ (Fleisch 1974b: 63)
The split in Fleisch’s transcription is even more striking with regards to open syllables of the type -Ci, in which the more prominent vowels are represented by à in ḏī as in ṣabwåı̊# (*ṣbw; < OA ṣābiyy) in opposition to e in eī as in ’alalī# (< OA qāla lī).

4 Conclusion

The recognition of pausal phenomena in general and pausal diphthongisation in Gozitan dialects as presented in this paper specifically poses new challenges on research methodology of dialectology and requires further investigation both in Gozitan and other Arabic dialects. As the research in Gozo has shown so far, methodological inconsistencies in fieldwork as well as the bypassing of prosodic impact on the structures of natural language can lead to rather ambiguous or confusing conclusions. Further field research in Lebanon, especially in the region of Zaḥlé, also seems to be necessary as the encoding of transcription alone, without available recordings, is not up to date in nowadays’ dialectology. As could be shown in the example of Fleisch’s pioneering elaboration on pausal diphthongisation, the tradition of transcribing data can vary heavily due to the country of origin of the researcher or the current scientific fashion. Therefore, having the possibility to compare the published transcription with sound files available for example online as on the SemArch website (Heidelberg)¹ can make further scientific discourse more dynamic and interactive. The absence of findings on pausal phenomena in North-African Arabic dialects is striking and it would be important to investigate in future as well, especially in that it could be a consequence of outdated fieldwork methodology or a lack of awareness of the existence of pausal forms themselves.
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Part II: Texts
A Text in the Jibbali/Shehret Dialect of al-Ḥallānīya (Kuria Muria) with a Grammatical Commentary

ABSTRACT The present text and the additional comments that follow it provide examples of the characteristics which set the dialect of Kuria Muria apart from mainland dialects. The introduction consists of a brief literature review on Kuria Muria studies. Then follows a morpheme-to-morpheme glossed text recorded in 2017 from a prominent tribal leader of the Al Shahrī tribe branch native to al-Ḥallānīya. Each relevant item is then commented upon. It is argued that not only does Kuria Muria Jibbali/Shehret possess the much-debated shift of lateral sibilants to interdental fricatives but it also exhibits a few other features which cannot be found in mainland varieties.

KEYWORDS Modern South Arabian, Kuria Muria, Hallaniyat islands, Jibbali, Shehret, field research

The study of the Jibbali/Shehret dialect of al-Ḥallānīya, the only inhabited island in the Kuria Muria (KM) archipelago, officially called Ġuzur al-Ḥallānīyāt, is a recent endeavour within Modern South Arabian (MSAL) studies which, in turn, are relatively young in comparison with those concerned with other sub-branches of the Semitic language family.

Only a limited number of reports exist, widely scattered along the short line of MSAL studies. These studies shall be briefly reviewed here: the first report of the language of al-Ḥallānīya dates back to 1840, when the British naval officer J. G. Hulton published a description of the island and a word list containing 103 terms he had elicited personally from the islanders (Hulton 1840). He concluded that the language was essentially a form of ‘Shahree.’ Over a century later, Leslau analysed Hulton’s data in order to ascertain the reliability of Hulton’s assertion with regards to the
identification of the language, and concluded that the language is indeed a form of Jibbali/Shehret (Leslau 1947). T. M. Johnstone’s *Jibbali Lexicon* (1981) introduces the epithet ‘baby Jibbali,’ by which Kuria Muria Jibbali/Shehret is still known by scholars and mainland speakers alike, as ‘they pronounce the letters ś and ż as ṭ and ḍ, etc’ (1981: xii). Johnstone’s statements with regards to the above-mentioned sound shift became well known in MSAL study, but the first attempt at verifying it took place only a few decades later, in 2014. In 2002, an extremely valuable description of the flora, fauna and history of the island was published (Gallagher 2002). Regrettably, however, this description barely touches upon linguistic matters. Further analysis of Hulton’s data was carried out by Rubin (2014a). In this paper concerned with Hulton’s word list, Rubin draws a series of credible etymologies and parallels with other Modern South Arabian languages, and succeeds in making sense of some terms which are rendered obscure by Hulton’s amateur transcription and a number of dialectal forms not found in mainland Jibbali/Shehret. The scholar also attempts at ascertaining whether the shift of lateral fricatives to interdental fricatives actually took place in the language spoken on al-Ḥallānīya in the mid-19th century, by searching for clues of it in Hulton’s transcription. He concludes that ‘ṭ was a free variant of ś at this time. It is just as likely, however, that th was another attempt to write the sound ś. So, if Johnstone’s statement is true for the dialect as spoken in the 1970s, it was not true—at least not completely—in 1836’ (2014a: 483).

One of the main points of the present author’s doctoral thesis (Castagna 2018) is that this shift, along with a few other phonetic peculiarities, indeed takes place in Kuria Muria Jibbali/Shehret, as the following text, elicited from a native speaker of the dialect shows. Given the inconsistent nature of Hulton’s transcription, it is not surprising that its analysis may yield unreliable results, especially when one is looking for clues of a phonetic characteristic. Thanks to the analysis of recordings made in the 1980s and new recordings made in 2017, it was possible to describe, to a certain extent, the peculiarities of this dwindling dialect of Jibbali/Shehret (Castagna 2018: 105–235). The present sketch aims at summarising some of the contents of the above-mentioned doctoral thesis. The text presented below is glossed morpheme-to-morpheme and translated into English. Each item of interest is then commented upon.

---

1 The speaker, who is estimated to be about 70 years old, was born and raised in al-Ḥallānīya and is a retired fisherman. He has been living in Sadah (eastern Dhofar) for about 15 years now.

2 I am sincerely grateful to Professor Janet C. E. Watson and Dr Miranda Morris for giving me the chance to analyse their unique audio materials without which this study would not have been possible.
Text

(1) her ḏaḥɔ̃t³ ṣad b-gēdaḥ-ɔ́t
if come.PRF.3.F.SG sardines.COL and-come.ashore.PRF-3.F.SG
‘if the sardines come and are washed ashore’

(2) m-na-ḥɔ̃l⁴ b-ən-kọṭaʕ⁵
and-1.PL-take.IND and-1.PL-dry.IND
‘and we take them, and we dry them’

(3) m-an-šɔm⁶ ḋə dîrhem
and-1.PL-sell.IND for money.M
‘and we sell them for money’

(4) her ḏaḥɔ̃t ṣad
if come.PRF.3.F.SG sardines.COL
‘if the sardines come’

(5) wolla her ḏaḥám⁷ ṣoddǝ mɛ́kən
or if come.PRF.3.M.SG fish.M much
‘or if a lot of fish comes’

(6) ḏaḥám⁸ ṣoddǝ mɛ́kən
come.PRF.3.M.SG fish.M much
‘a lot of fish comes’

(7) na-ḥɔ̃l-šḥɔ m-an-kọṭaʕ-š⁹
‘we take it and we dry it’

---

³ ḏaḥɔ̃t for mainland Jibbali Shehret zaḥɔ̃t < *zaḥamɔt ‘come.PRF.3.F.SG,’ Proto-MSAL *vmv > Jibbali/Shehret ṽ (a nasalised long vowel), (Rubin 2014b: 30–33). In this case, an inherited voiced alveolar sibilant [z] shifts to its interdental counterpart [ð]. A few sparse occurrences of this phenomenon can be found in the analysed KM texts (Castagna 2018: 123–126).

⁴ m-na-ḥɔ̃l for mainland Jibbali/Shehret b-na-ḥɔ̃l ‘and we take.’ The coordinating conjunction b- is very often, but not invariably, realised as [m] in the adjacency of [n] (Castagna 2018: 171).

⁵ kọṭaʕ for mainland Jibbali/Shehret kʃ ̊ ɬ ‘dry’ (Johnstone 1981: 153). This is an example of lateral > interdental shift (Castagna 2018: 120–123).

⁶ m-an-šɔm for mainland Jibbali/Shehret b-an-šɔm ‘and-1.PL-sell.IND’ (see above).

⁷ ḏaḥám for mainland Jibbali/Shehret zaḥám ‘come.PRF.3.M.SG’ (see above).

⁸ Idem.

⁹ See (2).
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(8) m-ən-kɔtə̀-ʃ
   and-1.PL-dry.IND-3.M.SG
   ‘and we dry it’

(9) i-kín  xar
   3.M.SG-be.IND  good.M
   ‘it is good’

(10) nə-ḥɔ́l-ʃ m-ən-kɔtə̀-ʃ
    ‘we take it and we dry it’

(11) wolla  her  her  ġad-ən  gedḥ-an  ti¹⁰  ṣan’mbér
    or  if  if  go.PRF-1.PL  come.ashore.PRF.3.M.SG-1.PL  some  amber.M
    ‘or if we go and some amber comes ashore to us’

(12) gedḥ-an  ṣan’mbér
    come.ashore.PRF.3.M.SG-1.PL  amber.M
    ‘amber comes ashore to us’

(13) i-śim  i-śim  i-śim-ʃ⁹  bə  dirhɛ́m
    ‘it is sold, it is sold, it is sold for money’

(14) ṣan’mbér
    amber.M
    ‘amber’

(15) ţt-ʕarəf  ḍambar  ʔanta?¹¹
    2.SG-know.IMPV  amber  PRN.2.M.SG
    ‘do you know amber?’

(16) nə-tʃım-ʃ⁺¹²  bə  dirhɛ́m
    ‘we sell it for money’

¹¹ Here the speaker addresses the interviewer in Arabic.
¹² nə-tʃım-ʃ⁺ for mainland Jibbali/Shehret nə-sčım-ʃə‘we sell it.’ Cf. šʔm ‘to sell’ (Johnstone 1981: 244).
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(17) benhɛr* xɛr ɪnɛ? xɛr her betɛr-ək
‘and it is good, it is good what? it is good if you catch fish’

(18) her betɛr-ək a-nkaʃ bə şoddɛ mékən
if catch.fish.PRF-2.M.SG FUT-come.SUB with fish.M much
‘if you catch fish, you will bring a lot of fish’

(19) nɛ-btɛr-ən
1.PL-catch.fish.IND.PL-DLSTEM
‘we catch fish’

(20) ^baʃdɛn an-ʃɔm13 bə dirhɛm
afterwards 1.PL-sell.IND for money.COL
‘afterwards we sell it for money’

(21) ya-ḥɔ̃l-ʃ baʃl şḥɔr
‘people from Sohar take it’

(22) i-nukaʃ a-ʃrɔ
3.M-come.IND DEF-people.from.Sur.COL
‘people from Sur come’

(23) i-nukaʃ baʃl siƙ14
3.M-come.IND people.COL Mirbat
‘people from Mirbat come’

(24) i-nukaʃ baʃl šalɔlt
3.M-come.IND people.COL Salalah
‘people from Salalah come’

(25) kel i-iṭtɔ́m15 mən kin-ǎn16
all 3.M-buy.IND.T1STEM from from-1.PL
‘everyone buys from us’

13 an-ʃɔm with a lateral instead of the interdental, see (16). The shift of sibilants to interdental is not universal (see below).
14 Siƙ is the Jibbali/Shehret name of the town known as Mirbāṭ in Arabic.
15 i-iṭtɔ́m for mainland Jibbali/Shehret i-ištɔ́m ‘3.M-buy.IND.T1STEM.’ The fact the shift of š > t occurs in the adjacency of a homorganic sound [t] is noteworthy from an articulatory viewpoint.
16 mən kin-ǎn. This double preposition, whose two components both mean ‘from’ (Johnstone 1981: 132, 172), is previously unattested to the best of my knowledge.
(26) ya-ḥɔ̃l karkɔm ba dirhɛ́m
3.M-take.IND turmeric.COL for money.COL
‘they bring turmeric for money’

(27) h-ek het hen-i he b-hen iḏɔ́n17 ʌkul-kumʌ
‘for you, for me, and for those. For you all’

(28) her kererɛ́ her gad-ən a-šná mʃɔra18
if tomorrow if go.PRF-1.PL FUT-see.SUB then
‘if tomorrow we go, you will see then’

(29) her gad-ɛ́n t-kɔs ṣodd ǝ mɛ́kən
if go.PRF-1.PL 2.M.SG-find.IND fish.M much
‘if we go, you will find a lot of fish’

(30) i-ṯtom19 ba dirhɛ́m
3.M-sell.IND.PL for money.COL
‘they sell for money’

It is important to remark that the present text does not exemplify all the findings which arose from the analysis of 1980s and 2017 texts. For the sake of thoroughness, a few additional morpheme-glossed strings of text from the KM corpus follow which exhibit the peculiarities of KM Jibbali/Shehret and which were not encountered above, namely: the shift of /b/ > [f], prosodically motivated gemination, and the shift of /x/ > [h] ~ [ḥ].

KM recordings provide evidence for a non-systematic shift of /b/ (both etymological and < *w) to [f] in certain phonological environments (Castagna 2018: 116–118). At present, little can be stated about the patterns according to which this phenomenon occurs. At any rate, it can be surmised that it affects /b/ in C3 in triliteral roots, and /b/ < *w in the broken plural pattern with /b/ infixation (al-Aghbari 2012: 230). Here are a few examples:

her rətɔf-ən t-ɔš
when arrange.PRF-1.PL OBJ-3.M.SG
‘when we place it’

---

19 i-ṯtom, see (25).
The root in the above example is \( rtf < rtb \) (Johnstone 1981: 216–217):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{arbaʃ-ot} & \text{kerefsi} & \text{skɔf} & \text{ar} \quad \text{kerefsi} \\
\text{four.F} & \text{chair.M.PL} & \text{sit.PRF.3} & \text{on} \quad \text{chair.M.PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘four chairs, they sit on chairs’

The conditions under which gemination, which is neither productive nor morphologically significant in Jibbali/Shehret, may occur in KM are basically the same as in mainland varieties, namely in geminate roots, because of the attachment of the definite article to certain consonants, in the conjugation of guttural-prefixed verbs, and because of the so-called ‘transfer of gemination’ (Dufour 2016: 26, 108, passim; Johnstone 1980; Rubin 2014b: 39–40). However, in KM it can occur also in other circumstances (Castagna 2018: 118–120):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{arbaʃ-ot} & \text{ṣodɪ} & \text{kɔllɔb} & \text{i-tiw} \\
\text{four.F} & \text{fish.M.PL} & \text{dog.M.PL} & \text{3.M-eat.IND.PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘four fish, the dogs eat’

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{gaḥāt} & \text{ah-ḥoggόlt} \\
\text{come.ashore.PRF.3.FSG} & \text{DEF-ring.F.SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘it came to the ring’

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{nə-ḥáttal-ohom} & \text{ṭanūn} & \text{ʕaḳ} & \text{kɛd} \\
\text{1.PL-wrap.IND-3.M.PL} & \text{so} & \text{in} & \text{rope.M.SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘we wrap them up with rope’

The terms \text{kɔllɔb}, \text{ḥoggόlt} and \text{ḥáttal} in the above examples are attested in mainland varieties respectively as \text{kɔlɔb}, \text{ḥogúlət} and \text{ḥétəl} (Johnstone 1981: 130, 106, 119). The second root consonant in these tokens is perceptually longer than its non-geminate counterpart (Castagna 2018: 120).

The backing of the voiceless velar fricative [x] to a voiceless laryngeal or pharyngeal fricative [h] or [ħ], occurs sporadically throughout the corpora. It appears to be triggered by the adjacency of a low or mid vowel (Castagna 2018: 126–127):

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{šahar} & \text{ḥali} \\
\text{elderly.person.M.SG} & \text{empty.M.SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘the old man is empty (has nothing)’
In conclusion, documentary evidence shows that not only does KM Jibbali/Shehret exhibit the long-discussed shift of laterals to interdentals but it also features a general tendency to articulate all sibilants as interdentals, although the occurrence of these phenomena is far from universal. The present results can then be reconciled with Rubin’s statement that laterals and interdentals could have occurred in free variation at the time of Hulton’s visit to Kuria Muria (2014a: 483). Additionally, it is intriguing to note that these shifts in the articulation of the sibilants have a striking parallel in the central dialects of Soqotri (Morris 2017: 17). Similarly, the backing of /x/ > [h] ~ [ħ] and /ġ/ > [ʕ] is a well-known feature of the eastern varieties of Soqotri (Simeone-Senelle 2003: 7). The presence of a prosodically motivated gemination raises questions with regards to the role of prosody in Jibbali/Shehret: specifically, there remains to be ascertained whether some of the lexical items that are subject to be found in a prosodically strong position within an utterance might have acquired gemination as a stable feature, thus giving rise to gemination-based minimal pairs.
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Arabische Texte aus Südkhorasan (Iran): Arabkhane und Khalaf

ABSTRACT  The Arabic dialect of Arabkhane is spoken in the eastern part of Iran in South Khorasan province. It is the vernacular of about 35 villages of Nehbandan County in an area approximately 100 km south of the city of Birjand. Until my recent first fieldwork in Iran from August to November 2019, no extensive linguistic research had been conducted on this peripheral variety of Arabic, which belongs to the Central Asian Arabic branch. Beside the dialect of Arabkhane, Khorasan Arabic includes the dialect spoken in Khalaf and its neighbouring villages. In this paper, I give information about my PhD research in Khorasan alongside some preliminary linguistic findings on the strength of the evaluation of some 120 audio interviews, which I recorded.

KEYWORDS  Arabkhane, Khalaf, Khorasan Arabic, Central Asian Arabic, peripheral Arabic dialects, Iran, field research

1 Einleitendes


2 Bemerkungen zu Dahlgrens Veröffentlichungen

Während Dahlgrens Überlegungen zur Herkunft der iranischen Araber sehr interessant zu lesen sind, halten Teile seiner Sprachbeschreibung einer Überprüfung nicht immer stand. Ohne auf alle fraglichen Formen einzugehen, seien einige Punkte hervorgehoben.

kommen sie nicht vor. Selbst eine 76-jährige Greisin, die nie außerhalb Arabkhanes gelebt hat, verwendet rein persische Zahlen.


Einzelne bei Dahlgren zu lesende Bildungen wie reфиya „her friend“ (für rifīǧha), rōnak „there“ (für hūnak), asalās „the prayer“ (für as-salā), nusānit „pockets“ bzw. dessen Sg. nusnuta (für nusnuфа/musnufa, Pl. nusānif/musānif) und zāhāv „gold“ (für zahab, das allerdings nur als „Geld“ verwendet wird) sind falsch. Die kurzen Textproben zeigen außerdem viel Variation. Sie scheinen insgesamt mehr phonetisch niedergeschrieben worden zu sein. Offensichtlich hatte Dahlgren keine muthersprachlichen Helfer bei der Verschriftung seiner Aufnahmen. Sie sind nicht öffentlich zugänglich, so dass der genaue Wortlaut nicht nachvollzogen werden kann.


Andere Informationen, wie die beschriebenen Metathesen bei den Verbalwurzeln l-ʕ-b „spielen“ (nilbaʕ) und b-k-y „weinen“ (lā tičbi) und die positionsbedingte Entsonorisierung von /ʕ/ zu [ḥ], sind grundsätzlich richtig, wenn auch die Formen nicht korrekt wiedergegeben sind (z. B. bāḥta „you (masc.) sold it (fem.)“) für biḥtha) (Dahlgren 2005: 163). Sie sind in Arabkhanen und auch Khalaf verbreitet (vgl. unten Text 3 tičbi „sie weint“ und Text 1 usābīh „Finger“).

Dahlgrens ana ʔcťāb ač*tba (2005: 165) ist als ana ač-ʔṭāb ʔĉtibeh „ich schreibe das Buch“ zu analysieren, was auch die fehlerhafte Tabelle 6 (2005: 166) erklären mag, wo ʔcła als maskulines und ʔcěl als feminines Partizip aufgeführt werden. Falsch sind
Volkan Bozkurt

freilich auch åcla als Partizip der 1. Pl., åclīn als f. Pluralform, ʔāclāl als Perfekt der 3. m. Sg. und ʔdētan als 3. f. Pl. zu „laufen“.

Der unbestimmte Artikel lautet in Khorasan nie fārd (Dahlgren 2005: 164). Sowohl in Khalaf (Seeger 2002: 634) als auch den Dörfern Arabkhanes ist er davon abgeleitet und hat die Form fal-. Sein Auslaut wird stets an den folgenden Konsonanten assimiliert (faʕ-ʕurubi „ein Araber“). Ähnlich verhält sich das Relativpronomen al.


Bei diesen handelt es sich jedoch um Entlehnungen aus dem Persischen.

3 Dialektale Merkmale Arabkhanes


Phonologie


Der gerundete offene Hinterzungenvokal [ɒ] wird â geschrieben. Er kommt in Lehnwörtern aus dem Persischen ebenso vor wie in echt arabischem Vokabular (yâkul „er isst“).


Zwar ist der Halbvokal /w/ zu labiodentalem /v/ entrundet worden, doch erscheinen beide Laute in manchen Lexemen als Varianten (rawwan ~ ravvan „er sandte“).

Die Sibilanten wurden in Arabkhane, anders als in Khalaf, nicht zu den interdentalen Entsprechungen verschoben. Belege für den Erhalt der ursprünglichen Interdentale finden sich vor allem in den Dörfern Râmungān, Nawzād und Čišme Gāv, die
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Durch die Formen des Demonstrativpronomens (proximal m. Sg. ḏâ, zâ und dâ) lassen sich Isoglossen gut bestimmen. Ein wichtiges Merkmal für die dialektale Gliederung Arabkhanes ist außerdem die Verteilung der Affrizierung von k/g (< aar. q) zu č/q: čân ~ kân „er war“, yūṣîq ~ yūṣîq „er bewahrt“, ġaʃād ~ gaʃād (zur Bildung der Verlaufsform beim Verb). In Khalaf und seinen arabischen Nachbarorten ist ein solcher Variantenreichtum nicht gegeben.

Morphologie

Auch morphologisch gibt es Unterschiede. Während die Form des Partizips Pl. m. im II. Verbalstamm im südlichen Arabkhane, so etwa bei meinem Gewährsmann aus Tīḏar, als imčābrîn „großziehen“ erscheint, wird im zentral gelegenen Ḥasanābâd (arab. Ḥusnâve) minkābrîn ~ minčābrîn gebildet. Ein weiteres Beispiel ist die häufige Wurzel s-w-y „tun, machen“ (Perf. 3. m. Sg. savva ~ sayya): imsayy, imsayye, ımsîn, ımsayyāt vs. minsayy, minsayye, minsîn, minsayyāt. In Khalaf lauten diese Formen mičābrîn und miṭayy, miṭayye, miṭîn, miṭayyāt.

In Dūzingân und Bürgân konnte ich als Suffix der 2. m. Sg. -ok [ɔk] registrieren, während es in Arabkhane sonst -ak lautet: xāltok „deine Tante“, inšūfok „wir sehen dich“. Das Suffix für die 3. m. Sg. lautet in Arabkhane gröstenteils -eh, in Bürgân jedoch ist es ein deutlich zu unterscheidendes -ah und entspricht der Form des Khalaf-Arabischen. Ein von Dahlgren (2005: 165) postuliertes -u findet sich in Arabkhane nicht.


In einem großen Teil der Aufnahmen aus Arabkhane erscheinen Pausalformen mit Auslautdiphthongierung. Dies betrifft insbesondere die Kopula: -hu wird zu -how, -hi zu -hey. Dahlgrens Tabelle der Personalpronomina (2005: 164) mit den Formen ehey „sie“ und entaw „ihr (m.)“ lässt sich so gut erklären. Fragt man isolierte Formen ab, wird die Pausalform genannt: ihey# für ihi „sie (f. Sg.)“ und intow# für intu „ihr (m. Pl.)“. Derlei Formen sind in Khalaf unbekannt.
4 Weitere Unterschiede zwischen Khalaf und Arabkhane

Sehr auffällig unterscheidet sich das Arabische Khalafs von dem Dialekt Arabkhanes durch die, bis auf wenige Ausnahmen, ausbleibende Imala (\textit{ummā māmin vs. immā māmin} „es gibt kein Wasser“, aber \textit{lāh} „nein“). Es wird hier folglich zwischen à und â unterschieden (Seeger 2002: 632).


Besonders auffällig erscheinen mir in der Sprache Khalafs auch Geminationen, wie sie in Arabkhane nicht vorkommen, so im hier vorgestellten Text 3 (\textit{do mmâh} „zwei Monate“) und Text 4 (\textit{do ppiyâle} „zwei Glas", \textit{kaleppad} „halbgar“, \textit{liḏđatti} „schmackhaft“).

Eine fakultative Kopula wird bei den Khalafis auch für die Vergangenheitsform verwendet (Text 3: \textit{gâyul-hu} „er sagte“, \textit{čāyne-hi} „sie war“), was in Arabkhane wohl nie der Fall ist.


5 Texte

Die hier veröffentlichten Texte stellen meine ersten Transkriptionen aus Khorasan dar. Sie sind gleichzeitig die ersten längeren Dialektproben aus Arabkhane überhaupt. Da ich noch nicht in allen Punkten zu endgültigen Schlüssen gelangt bin, ist die Notierung der Texte eher „konservativ“. Die Artikulation von /S/ ist bei manchen

Spätestens nach Abschluss meiner Arbeit sollen die den Texten zugrunde liegenden Tondokumente auf den Seiten des Heidelberger Semitischen Tonarchivs veröfentlicht werden.

5.1 Arabkhane (Fireydūn)


Text 1: Mobiltelefone für Arabkhane

1. ana... ūrţ yisti² xidımtak³ in – ūrţ mà sët⁴ xidımtak in... fi sanat şast-o pang tã şast-o haft tã şast-o nuh sarbâz⁵ kunt. 2. tã sanat şast-o nuh. sanat şast-o nuh al xidımti⁶ tammat, min tirîq vâhid min rufgâni āšnâ istêt⁷, ġidêt id Dubey. 3. min Dubey be-istilâh⁸ zamân af fayyēt hanûz bass am-ûbâyl čân ġây il Îrânic. 4. rîftîgî gâl in âgâ⁹ inta gâm taqû faq-ûfît gûšîyyêt¹⁰ mûbâyl-hom yâ rûhak išîr ham ač-çrâyat¹¹ be-istilâh

---

2 Pers. ūrţ şodan „vorgetragen, referiert, dargelegt werden“.
3 Entspricht pers. xedmat-e şoma zur höflichen Anrede.
4 Pers. ūrţ kardan „vortragen, referieren, darlegen“.
5 Pers. sarbâz „Soldat“.
6 Pers. xedmat hier: „Militärdienst“.
7 Pers. āšena şodan „kennenlernen“.
8 Pers. be esţelâh „wie man sagt, sozusagen“. Floskel, die im Folgenden nicht immer übersetzt wird.
9 Pers. āqâ „Herr“.
10 Pers. ġâšî „Handy, Mobiltelefon“.
11 Pers. kerâye „Transportkosten“.
havâpeymâ[ak]¹² ... ičrǟyat darbak tutlaʕ¹³ al-Īrǟn, šift in āghā šaǧab¹⁴ xubzin ūyn fîhin. 6. ġēt-o gašt al-āxar al ġidêt pang tâ¹⁶ širēt, gašt as-suyyيمي² al ġidêt il Dubey fayyyet ū-yek māh¹⁸ ūsîb ġidêt dah tâ širēt.

agar itrīd itḡib, ana ḥāzir hast in afāwnak, ḡib. 15. bilāxara36 agar šift in ʕayn-hu ili-
hom faš-šītnin kun int37. 16. fay-yeki do sālīn38 be har ḥāl39 hal-. . . ṣuqī idāme intīt39, ḥamadulillāh, ʕayn-hom čān, bade41 mā čān. 17. fi Dubey ṭīf Allison mt-ʕurubīyye, ixīrtar ʕurubīti taṭrībān kamīl istat42. 18. va ʔlsānī al be-istilāh ʕurubīti ak kamīl istat, bāṣīs ista43 in tal al be-istilāh ḡāmiṣat44 af-ʃarab ixīrtar agdir rufgān ʔahav45, va ixīrtar agdir be-gowle maʃrūf46 ʕarzam be-huzūrak47 in faq-ʃūrāt48 masalān murāvid49 asāyy yāhūm-o agūl-o asmaʕ-o min hah-hināḡīm. 19. ʔassāf-hom ana rufgānīn ʔayli ʕayn ʻinni fi ʕIrāg, uhum yiḡūn il am-Mišhad ṭinni, ṣāyad bīst rūz yek māh yiḡfūn50, faš-ʃahr51 masalān yiḡfūn, bīst rūz yiḡfūn ṭinni, ana-hom ʔagādī aḥa hamāc. 20. masalan ana xudi avval am-Mḥarram ɡādī ʕIrāq va ḥudūd dah rūz ʕin ham ar-riʃfī ghāyīn. 21. bastigīyye [ʕinneh52 in] ʔinta bardâštak53 min ax-xalq ʔe yikūn. 22. ʔayli vāḥdīn min af-ʃirāgīyye yiḡūn in vāgeʕān54 be ʃ-xāṭir 55 fam-мāsāʕīl56 ˈuxra yiḡūn il ʕIrān, be-diṭlīn in ʔinna al-ʔān57 ixīsādana58 fam-miɡdār zīʃf misti va uhum be-gowle maʃrūf fam-miɡdārin ixīrtar minna zahabhum ravaɡ59 ʔinneh, ʔe-. . . yiḡūn be-ʃ-xāṭir ʃūʔistifāde 60 il ʕIrān 23. yaʃni assān61 be-ʃ-xāṭir ʕarz yisti xidimtak in assān fam-мāsāʕīl ɡānībīyye yiḡūn, lā be-ʃ-xāṭir

36 Pers. be-l-āxare „endlich, schließlich“. Wird wiederholt verwendet und bleibt oft unübersetzt.
37 Konditionalsatz. Das arab. kun int „gib“ der Apodosis ist offensichtlich dem persischen mī-dāde bāš (Durativform) nachgebildet. Meine Informanten glossieren pers. agar didī xūb ast be man ham čīzī mī-dāde bāš.
38 Pers. yekī do sālī „ein, zwei Jahre“.
39 Pers. be har ḥāl „in jedem Fall, jedenfalls“. Ist wie be-istilāh „sozusagen“ meist reine Füllphrase.
40 Pers. edāme dādan „fortführen, fortsetzen, fortfahren“.
41 Pers. bāṭī „Übel“.
42 Pers. kamel šodān „sich vervollkommnen, Vollkommenheit erlangen“.
43 Pers. bāṭes šodān „verursachen, zur Folge haben“.
44 Pers. ɡāmeve „Gesellschaft“.
45 Arabkhane ḭiva, yāhavi „finden“.
46 Pers. be qowl-e maʃrūf „wie man zu sagen pflegt“.
47 Pers. ʃarzam be hoʃür-e ʃomā ʾetwa „lassen Sie mich Ihnen mitteilen“.
48 Pers. yek ʃūrha-yi „gewissermaßen, auf eine Art, irgendwie“.
49 Pers. morāvade „freundschaftliche Beziehungen“.
50 Aar. w-q-f [ʔiyfūn] „sie bleiben“. Hierfür in Arabkhane üblicherweise die Lexeme burğ oder māh, wie in Satz 6.
51 Pers. bastegī dārad „es hängt (davon) ab“.
52 Pers. bārdāšt „Ansicht, Einstellung, Auffassung, Eindruck“.
53 Pers. vaqefan „wirklich, in der Tat, wahrhaftig, echt“.
54 Pers. be xāṭer „wegen.“
55 Pers. masʔale, Pl. masāʔel „Frage, Thema, Gegenstand“.
56 Pers. al-ʔān „nun, jetzt, sofort“.
57 Pers. eqteʃād „Wirtschaft, Ökonomie“.
58 Pers. ravāg „Umlauf, Verbreitung, Absatz“.
59 Pers. sūʔestefāde „Missbrauch, Ausnutzen“.
60 < pers. ʔaslān „überhaupt, eigentlich“.
az-zyāra. 24. va be har hāl kull minzil ādmin ʕayn hast, ādmin xāyis hast, dālū al ana āfarifhum, rufgāni al ana āfarifhum xalgin ʕayn-hum alḥamdu’llāh, muškil-hom yāhum mā ʕinni. 25. rūyehamrafte bardāšti dar mowrid al be-istilāḥ ūraqlīyye dā-hu in taḡribān haftād dar sadhum xalgin ʕayn-hum. 26. hast talhum bilāxara, fi kull minzil ... hap-panḡ tāt al- usābiʕ-hom yalham barābar māhin, kullhin yalham ʕayn māhin. 27. dā itchens-hu, dā akbar-hu, dā vāz akbartar-hu dā vāz asḡār-hu, kullāhid faš-šuql isayy. 28. age inta dā l-usbuʕ lā yikūn ʕinnak il as-sarbāziyye mā yivaddānak, yigūlūn āğā inta min as-sarbāziyye muʕāf yisūnak, durust-hu? 29. inta age ʕarzam be-ḥuzūrak in hal-usbuʕ lā yikūn ʕinnak gutt kār mā tigdir itsayy, hal-usbūʕ lá yikūn ʕinnak masalan ēş? kull usbuʕ fak-... hal-panḡ tāt usābiḥ kullāhid fak-kār yisān, kullāhid ... kullhin-hom be-istilāḥ yalham barābar māhinna. 30. kull minzil himāč-hu, kull īgtimāʕ, fi ham aḡ-ḡaryat xudna-hom inta itbahārīr kullhum ʕaynīn ʕayn mahum, kullhum xarābin xarāb māhum, ham ʕaynīn ʕayn, ham xāyis hast. 31. bilāxara aṭ-ʕIrāb-hom himāc-hum. fi xidmtak hast, fārmīn. [Frage V. B.: Verstehen Iraker das Arabische von Arabkhane?] 32. ʕarab ʕIr ʕanst, yufutnūneh ammā al-ân ʕurubiyatna yā l-ḥuzuriyye mutaʔassifān fam-miğdarin be-istilāḥ mixtalta va xayli ʕayn mutavvaqīt mā yistūn.

Ḥisan Nāderi, 19.09.2019

1. Ich ... es sei dir erzählt ... ich habe dir nicht erzählt, dass ich von fünfundsechzig bis siebenundsechzig, bis neunundsechzig Soldat war. 2. Bis zum Jahr neunundsechzig. Als mein Militärdienst im Jahr neunundsechzig endete, hörte ich durch einen meiner Freunde über Dubai und ging dorthin. 3. Als ich zurückkehrte, war das Mobiltelefon

---

62 Pers. ziyārat „Pilgerfahrt, Wallfahrt“.
63 Pers. rūyehamrafte „insgesamt, alles in allem“.
64 Pers. dar mowred-e „im Fall“.
66 Pers. barābar „gleichwertig, gleich“. 
67 Pers. ʕeyn „gleich“. 
68 Arab. Elativ mit pers. ʕarāb kontaminiert, vgl. oben Satz 17 u. 22 ixīrtar „besser“. 
69 < pers. agar „wenn, falls“. 
70 Arabkhane vadda, yivaddi (II tert.inf.) „führen, wegragen, hinbringen, hinschaffen“. 
71 Pers. motāf karden „freistellen, befreien“. 
72 Arab. fārmā, yifarmin zu pers. fārmīdan (fārmā-) „befehlen, gebieten, sagen“, be-firma(yid) „bitte sehr!“. 
73 Pers. motāʔassifān „leider, bedauerlicherweise“. 
74 Pers. motāvagheh šodan „verstehen, begreifen“. 

5.2 Arabkhane (Râmungân)

Der folgende Text ist wieder ein Auszug aus einer längeren Aufnahme, die noch nicht vollständig transkribiert ist. Sie entstand während meiner zweiten Reise nach Arabkhane. Das Dorf Râmungân hat, wie viele andere Orte Arabkhanes, kaum noch dauerhaft hier lebende Einwohner. Die in ganz Iran verbreitete Landflucht sorgte, verschärft durch anhaltende Trockenjahre, dafür, dass seine Bevölkerung in die größeren Städte Irans abwanderte.

Doch kehren viele Araber im Sommer oder zu besonderen Anlässen nach Arabkhane zurück. So verhält es sich auch bei diesem älteren Ehepaar, dem Tischler iMḥimmad Xazâʕipūr (74 Jahre alt) und seiner Frau Gulafrūz bint Karblǟ Ibrǟhīm (70 Jahre alt). Die Sommermonate verbringen sie in Râmungân, während sie das übrige Jahr mittlerweile in Birjand wohnen.

---

76 Gemeint ist die Prostitution in Mashhad, für die die Stadt ebenso bekannt ist wie für den Schrein des Emam Reza, der eine wichtige Pilgerstätte auch für viele Iraker ist.
Text 2: Broterwerb in Arabkhane

1. [Ehefrau:] agar čǟyin anşığ, anşığ gabbe kull aš-šav77 lël, lël va nahăr čǟyin alaggut, alaggut himǟc gabbe gabbe vâz... 2. [Ehemann:] al-lël kân tâʕalig78 ičrâġ79, zamânin kân ičrâğ dasti80, zamânin kân ičrâğ girşüz81, zamânin kân ičrâğ tür82, zamân al pišrafte ičrâğ tür. 3. ǧalâbat83 naft kân yîği masalan dik az-zamân kull ǧalâbat naft, polom pérdë84 kânân, maksüs il čûrg at-tûr. 4. kull ǧalâbat kân čâr tuman-o panğ ğeɾân, kull ǧalâbat čâr tuman-o panğ ğeɾân, maksüs il čûrgät at-tûr. 5. kân yinsǧán čand tâ masalan dušâyif gâvdaṭ himǟn-o al-lël nahär yinsǧân, yinsǧân yilaggtân gabbe. 6. baʕd ǧik ag-gabbât vâz kun nağa ihna kâsibiyye insayy, kun nağa Yazd, kun nağa Isfahân, kun nágadî masalan Tîhrân. 7. vâz hinɖîk aģ-ğâlicoṭ85 kun inbir[hîn. hom kâsibiyye kun insayy, vo-hom kun inbir mašalan dik af-farš maršâ86 ad ǧušayifna kâr yisân. 8. kun nágadî masalan do mäh se mäh, kun insayy kâsibiyye vâz kun infiyy niği. 9. ǧik az-zamân arzânîyye87 kân, kun nağa it Tîhrân, min Tîhrân min ab-bâzâr kun nurkab, yâ màşînät ad de tabağa, màşînät de tabağa kânân. 10. kân yâxdaṭ de ğeɾân, de ğeɾân bilît88 kân, kun nurkab fas-sâvâ fam-mâšîn kun innâm, mâ kun innahhe#11 kun innahhi iš Šimrân, kun insayy basât89 hânîkât, kun insayy basât-o kun inbir sâfît-o kun inbir mašalan iḥdam-o kun inbir mašalan zabt90-o hâk šîtnâṭ kun inbir-o 12. vâz min baʕd de mäh se mäh, kun niği, zindigiyatna91 idâme nîntîha, xarg-o maxârıţna92, 13. hân-hom kun nizraɾ, âş-şîṭa, kun nağa mašalan age93 taraktul kân yâ taraktul, zamân al gabl at-taraktul yâ huvâyiš, yâ huvâyiš, yâ ḥmîr, yâ bugar. 14. kun nizraɾ mašalan pinğâh ğast man, ēf faʃ-şibîl ēf fab-byâvân94. 15. vâz kun nağa l-ḥisâd, kun nağa l-ḥisâd, am-miriyy va ǧ-ʃyîl kullna. 16. al kân Ŧindeh mîtor mîtor, ab bîmîtor

77 Pers. šab „Nacht, Abend“.
78 Aar. ʃ-l-q für „(Feuer) anzünden“.
79 Pers. čerâq „Lampe, Leuchte, Laterne“.
80 Pers. čerâq dastî „Handlaterne“.
81 Pers. ġerd „rund, ringsum“, sūxtan (sūz-) „brennen, verbrennen“.
82 Pers. tûr „Netz“, eine Art Strumpflampe.
83 Pers. ǧalâbat „Blechbüchse, Blechkanne“.
84 polomb šode „verplombt“ ist ganz persisch ins Arabische entlehnt.
85 Pers. qâlîče „kleiner Teppich, Läufer“.
86 Pers. farš „Teppich“, marš ist Reimwort.
87 Pers. arzānî „günstig, billig“.
88 Pers. belît „Fahrerschein“.
89 Pers. basat „Verkaufsstand, Warenauslage“.
90 Pers. (râdio) žaḅt „Radiorekorder, Kassettenspieler“.
91 Pers. zendegî „Leben“.
92 Pers. xarg-o-maxâreğ aus xarg „Ausgabe, Kosten, Aufwendungen“ und maxâreğ „Ausgaben, Kosten“.
93 < pers. agar „wenn, falls“.
94 Pers. biyâbân „Wüste, Steppe“.

5.3 Khalaf


Ḥâmed arbeitet als Lehrer in Hendevâlân und begleitete mich auf meinen Reisen in die arabischsprachigen Dörfer Darmiyâns. Er ist junger Familienvater und der sehr engagierte Ortsvorsteher (pers. dehyâr) Khalafs, so dass er noch viele Wochenenden in seinem Heimatdorf verbringt. An seinem eigenen arabischen Dialekt zeigt er großes Interesse. Dank ihm konnte ich auch die ersten Aufnahmen mit weiblichen Sprechern anfertigen, was bei den konservativeren Arabern Khalafs schwieriger war als bei den Bewohnern Arabkhanes, wo dies problemlos möglich ist.

Sprecher des Texts ist der 70-jährige Ḥiṭēn Xaḏâʕi. Er stand mir nach der gerade eingefahrenen Berberitzenernte für Aufnahmen zur Verfügung und sprach neben dieser auch eine längere Geschichte über seine Zeit beim Militär auf Band.

Text 3: Der Tod meiner Mutter

1. ane xídmiti\(^{101}\) fi Ahvâḏ čānat, ġēt il muraxxaṭiyye\(^{102}\), min mût ummi xubar mà kun ﬁndi. 2. gutt vâḥid ili šītin mā ċān gâyul-hu, telefōnin-ham mā ċān in ḍâng yuṭurbûn\(^{103}\), nâmè\(^{104}\)-ham dir\(^{105}\) ċān yinahi, du mmâh tūl ċān yiḡirr\(^{106}\) in al-kâğaḍ\(^{107}\) yiği. 3. il muraxxaṭiyye ġēt, ġēt il Nûġâv, ġēt il Nûġâv, humû āxund\(^{108}\) aﬁ įindaḥ muṭḥaf kunt agrâ, il įindah aġ ċān gâl: 4. ilak fam-mōtorštiklet āxuḍ tā yivaddīk il Xalaf. ġaʕâde mà ċān in māšiyye\(^{109}\) yôgodi. 5. fam-mōtorštiklet ixaḍt, vare râṭah rukâb, min Hendevâlân

\(^{101}\) Pers. xedmat hier: „Militärdienst“.  
^{102}\) Pers. moraxxašt hier: „Heimatsurlaub“.  
^{103}\) Pers. zang zadan „läuten, klingeln, anrufen (Telefon)“.  
^{104}\) Pers. nâmè „Brief, Schreiben“.  
^{105}\) Pers. dir „spät“.  
^{106}\) Pers. tūl kešîdan „daubern, sich hinziehen“.  
^{107}\) Pers. kâgaḍ „Papier; Brief, Dokument“.  
^{108}\) Pers. āxund „(islam.) Geistlicher“.  
^{109}\) Pers. māšiin „Fahrzeug, Auto“. In Arabkhane wird die Form mâšiin verwendet.

---

110 Pers. ġā xordan „überrascht sein, zusammenschrecken, zusammensuchen“.  
111 Pers. magar „etwa, denn“.  
112 Pers. eštebāh „Fehler, Irrtum, Versehen“.  
113 Diminutiv zu dakke „Augenblick, Moment“.  
114 Pers. tašādof „Zusammenstoß, (Verkehr-)Unfall“.  
115 Pers. nārāḥat „unruhig, bewegt, besorgt“.  
116 Pers. qabūl šodan „angenommen werden; (eine Prüfung) bestehen“.  
117 Pers. mardūd šodan „abgelehnt, verstoßen werden; (eine Prüfung) nicht bestehen, durchfallen“.  
118 Ort 20 km südl. von Khalaf.  
119 Ort 16 km südl. von Khalaf.


Text 4: Aus der Küche Khorasans: ǧulûršîr

1. *ane Ganǧi haṭte* Mâḥganǧ-e Niʕmati bint ḥāǧi Ḏiyâddîn, vali be-mašfûr umm Aḥmad ili ṯūt yiṯūn. umm Aḥmad yigūlūn-o 2. tavḏîh faḡ-ğuđeʔin muḥalli antikum. 3. yiḏirʕūn ḥunte fi had-dašt ad-dašt al yahaṯdūn aḥ-ḥunte-vo yiǧībūnhe faš-shavanderūţxo fi nam yiṯūn aḥ-ḥunte. 4. baʕd yiṯūnhe fi

---

120 Kopula fem. *hasta.
121 Pers. šenāsnāme „Personalausweis, Geburtsurkunde“.
122 Mit Ezafe zwischen Vor- und Nachnamen wie im Persischen üblich.
123 Falsch für mašhûr.
124 Aar. ṣawt, nach pers. ṣedā kardan „rufen“.
125 Pers. maḥallî „örtlich, lokal, einheimisch“.
126 Pers. dašṭ „Ebene, Flachland, Steppe, Wüste“.
127 Aar. h-ṣ-d: ḥuṭad, yahaṭad „ernten“.
128 Pers. šabānerūţ „vierundzwanzig Stunden, Tag und Nacht“.
129 Pers. nam „Feuchtigkeit, Nässe“.
fağ-ǧidir\textsuperscript{130} o yiraččbūnhe\textsuperscript{131} vağğ aḏ-doww\textsuperscript{132}. 5. in xayli varpaḏ\textsuperscript{133}, in dād kalepaḏ\textsuperscript{134} yiṭṭi 6. hā m-muḥall vád fat-tāt\textsuperscript{135} ḥilībin muḥallā yiriššūn fi vaṭṭ\textsuperscript{136} hima ḥ-ḥunte-vo śur yintūnah. 7. milḥ-ham be-indāḏt\textsuperscript{137} al lāḏ-im-hu yiṭṭuňah. yiṭṭuňah, dāk am-muḥallāt ay yiyabṭūnāh vád yiḡūn yituḥūnūnah, ātyāb yiṭṭuňah\textsuperscript{138}. 8. yituḥūnūnah-o vád min fam-māxul yunxulūnāh. 9. an-narm\textsuperscript{139} ilah čān yigūlūn ġulūršīr, ad-duɾuṣṭ\textsuperscript{140} ūḏāvari. 10. dāk am-muḥallāt be-ĝūr ab-birinǧ ak-katte\textsuperscript{141}, at-šāvari himāč ppiyāle ummā čān yiṭṭuň. 11. al-ummā be-ğaš čān yiḡi\textsuperscript{143}, at-šāvari čān yiriššūnāh, vád čān yixallūnāh vağğ ač-čirāg in hima l-ummā čān yiḡūš. 12. dāk am-muḥall díhin čān yiṭṭuňah-o fi damm\textsuperscript{144} čān yiṭṭuňah tā vaxt ad dād dammah čān yiḏhar\textsuperscript{145} in vád il maṭrafiyye yīnāhī\textsuperscript{146}. 13. aḡ-ġulūršīr-ham dād tire čān yiraččbūnah yā ummā, dāk am-muḥallāt šuvā-ham fī čān yiṭṭuň, dároduve\textsuperscript{147}-ham milḥ-o tundiyye\textsuperscript{148} vo ḏardiyye\textsuperscript{149} čān yiṭṭuňah o be-ḡūr fāš\textsuperscript{150}. 14. dāk be-ḡūr fāš taṭavvur ūḏāvu\textsuperscript{151} aḡ-ġulūršīr čān yāklūnāh, xayli-ham xušmiḏḏe\textsuperscript{152} vo liḏḏatti\textsuperscript{153} čān. [Ḥâmed: tamām?] i:

Mâhganĝ Niʕmati Ĝâni, 27.09.2019

\textsuperscript{130} Aar. qidr „Kessel“.  
\textsuperscript{131} Aar. r-k-b im II. Verbalstamm.  
\textsuperscript{132} Aar. daw̱̱̱̱ ist im Arabischen Khorasans „Feuer“.  
\textsuperscript{133} Pers. var-poxtan (paż-), 3. Sg. var-pazad „dass es kocht, siedet“. Arab. ist hier yiḥtibiḏ oder yiḡūš zu erwarten.  
\textsuperscript{134} Pers. kaleh „kurz“, poxtan (paż-) „kochen, sieden“.  
\textsuperscript{135} Vgl. pers. fāš „Schale“.  
\textsuperscript{136} Aar. waṣṭ.  
\textsuperscript{137} Pers. andāže „Menge, Maß, Größe“.  
\textsuperscript{138} Pers. āsyāb kardan „mahlen“.  
\textsuperscript{139} Pers. narm „weich, zart, fein“.  
\textsuperscript{140} Pers. dorošt „groß, groß, massiv“.  
\textsuperscript{141} Pers. berenĝ-e kate, im Ggs. zum dampfgegarten boxārpaz.  
\textsuperscript{142} Pers. piyāle „Becher, Tasse“, in Khalaf laut Informant „Trinkglas“.  
\textsuperscript{143} Pers. be ǧūš āmadan „sieden, kochen“.  
\textsuperscript{144} Pers. dam „Dampf“, dam kardan „aufbrühen, aufkochen“.  
\textsuperscript{145} Khalaf duḥar, yiḏhar „aufsteigen“.  
\textsuperscript{146} Pers. be maṣraf rasidān wörtl. „zum Verbrauch gelangen“, khorsanarab. n-h-y „erreichen, gelangen zu, ankommen“.  
\textsuperscript{147} Pers. dārū „Arznei, Spezereiwaren“ und davā „Arznei, Heilmittel“ (Pl. adviye „Gewürz“).  
\textsuperscript{148} Pers. tondī „Scharfe“.  
\textsuperscript{149} Pers. zarđî „gelbe Farbe“, gemeint ist zar(d)čūbe „Gelbwurz“.  
\textsuperscript{150} Pers. ?āš „Suppe“.  
\textsuperscript{151} Pers. taṭavvor kardan „sich vorstellen, sich denken“.  
\textsuperscript{152} Pers. leẓzatī „Genuss, Geschmack“.  
\textsuperscript{153} Māhganĝ Niʕmati Ĝâni, 27.09.2019
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Conversations Among Women: A Text in the Arabic Dialect of Khuzestan (Southwest Iran)

ABSTRACT This paper presents the transcription and translation of a recording made 2016 during fieldwork in the city of Ḥamīdiyya, in Khuzestan, located about 25 km to the north-west of the region’s capital city Ahwāz. The text is introduced by a brief discussion of some of the characteristic phonological, morphological and lexical features of Khuzestani Arabic in general, and some peculiarities of the Hamidiyya dialect in particular. Language contact with the country’s official language, Persian, of course is also significant, but will not be the focus of this discussion.

KEYWORDS Arabic dialectology, gələt dialect, Bedouin-type, Khuzestani Arabic, minority variety, field research

1 Introduction

Khuzestani Arabic (KhA) is an Arabic variety spoken in the southwestern Iranian province of Khuzestan. It belongs to the southern group of the Bedouin-type Mesopotamian gələt-dialects.

The text is preceded by some notes on characteristic features of KhA discussed in relation to their occurrence in the following text. Most linguistic features described below are found throughout Khuzestan. Some features characteristic of the north-western area of Ḥamīdiyya or Ḥuwayza will be highlighted. Ḥamīdiyya is a town of approximately 20,000 inhabitants and the centre of the district that bears the same name.

As can be seen in the following discussion, the dialect of Hamidiyya shows several typical rural or ʕarab features (cf. Ingham 1973; 2006), such as the application of the
The majority of the features described below appear in the following text and wherever possible, there is a reference to an example in the text via the respective sentence number within brackets.

2 Grammatical and lexical notes

Phonology

- Besides the two short vowel phonemes a and a, there are five long vowels: ā, ē, ī, ō, ū.
- Long ē is in most cases pronounced as a central glide īə; in the area of Ḥamīdiyya, we often hear ī instead of ē, e.g. ʕalī-ha ‘on her’ (in contrast to Aḥwāzī ʕalē-ha).2
- Word-final a tends to be raised (whether originating as a feminine gender marker, pronominal suffix or other) to a mid-front vowel varying between [ɛ] and [æ] in non-emphatic, non-guttural contexts.
- The interdentals t, ḍ and ḍ are generally retained, although sometimes ḍ is pronounced d (cf., for example, hāda ‘this’ < hāda in sentence 26).
- The Old Arabic (OA) affricate ġ has shifted to y, e.g. əḥyār < ?ahḡār ‘stones’ (sentence 99).
- k and g have been affricated in front vowel environments, e.g. ?ačəl < ?akl ‘food’ (sentence 50); yḏīg < *yḏīg < yaḍīqu ‘to distress (sb.)’ (sentence 77).
- The dialect exhibits the so-called gahawa-syndrome: Stage 1: in a non-final syllable of the structure C1aC2, a short vowel (a) is inserted after C2 when C2 is a guttural, e.g. OA ʔaxḏ̣ar > ʔaxaḏ̣ar ‘green’ (sentence 9). The rural/ʕarab dialects also show the gahawa-syndrome in the imperfective verbs of Form I, e.g. yʕərəf < OA yašrifu ‘he knows’ (sentence 113).

Morphology

- Gender distinction in the 2nd and 3rd persons of verbs and pronouns is a feature of all KhA dialects.
- The independent pronouns of the 3rd persons possess two variants, vowel-initial (i.e. of the structure ?vCCv) versus consonant-initial: MSG huwa (sentence 52) vs. ʔəhwə; MPL huma ~ humma vs. ʔəhma (sentence 115); FSG hiyye (sentence 100) vs. 1

---

1 Note that the terms ʕarab and haḏar only roughly correspond to the terms rural and urban, cf. Leitner (Forthcoming: 18–29) for a detailed discussion of these terms.

2 Cf. Ingham (1976: 68), who describes this feature as typical of the ʕAmāra and marshland region as well as of the northern and eastern areas of Khuzestan.
ʔəhye; and FPl ʔənna (sentence 91) vs. ʔənna. Ingham describes the vowel-initial forms as typical of the Šaṭṭ al-ʕArab and southern KhA dialects as well as the dialects of the Bani Lām north and east of ʕAmâra (Ingham 1976: 70, fn. 29; in Ingham 2007: 574 only the forms with initial vowel are provided). Except for the FSG forms, in the text from Ḥamīdiyya the consonant-initial forms of the 3rd person pronouns prevail.

– A typical urban feature within this geographical region (Ingham 1973: 544) found in the area of Ḥamīdiyya is the extended use of -ē- in the inflectional suffixes of the PFV.3 Thus, in this dialect, the form is not restricted to geminated and defective verbs. For example, kabbarēt ‘I raised (sb.)’ (sentence 17), ʔənuṭlēt ‘I lay down’ (sentence 32), or ʔḥagīəna ‘we lived to see’ (sentence 124; in Aḥwāz the respective form is laḥagna).

– Optional suffixation of -an after 1st person singular imperfective verbs of the hollow (i.e. medial weak) and geminated type: e.g., ʔaḏ̣ullan ‘I stay,’ and ʔəmūtan ‘I die’ (sentence 86). This South-Mesopotamian feature is a contraction of the verb and the postponed 1st person singular pronoun ʔāna (Ingham 2000: 127).

– The genitive marker is māl (sentence 33), which is subject to gender and number agreement (FSG mālat, MPL mālin, FPl mālāt).

– In KhA, there are two forms of the verb ‘give’: nəṭa, yənṭi (sentence 47) (cf. Behnstedt and Woidich 2014: 409). In the following text, only the second form is found.

– KhA has four forms to express non-existence: māku (most common form), məman (sentence 85), məmas and, in some cases, mā bī. Existence is expressed with the particles ʔaku, hassət or, in some cases, bī.

– The prefix ta- of the Form V verbs: e.g., tačabbašət ‘I have learnt’ (sentence 72) is another rural feature found in the dialect of Ḥamīdiyya (cf. Ingham 1973, 197: 541–542). The corresponding urban form shows no vowel in the prefix (tčabbašət).

Lexis

The lexical items that KhA shares with most other Mesopotamian dialects (cf.e.g. Erwin 1963 on Baghdadi Arabic; cf. also Ingham 1973: 546), are e.g hassa ‘now’ (sentence 19), kəlləš ‘very, totally’ (sentence 125), ʔaku ‘there is’ and xōš used as an attributive adjective preceding nouns as in xōš walad ‘a good boy’ or as an adverb as in hiyye xōš tasʔal ‘she asks good questions’ (sentence 39).

---

3 This feature is also common in southern Iraq, including Baṣra (Ingham 1974: 16, fn. 1; Jastrow 2007: 421), in several Gulf Arabic dialects (Holes 2016: 33–34) and even in some dialects in Sudan and North Africa (Holes 2016: 33–34).
Lexical features that are only shared with southern Mesopotamian dialects, or even found only in KhA (cf. Ingham 1973: 547 for more southern Mesopotamian and distinct KhA items), are e.g. the conjunction čā ‘because’ (sentence 59), the discourse particles ča (sentence 28) and xō (sentence 67), farax ‘child’ (sentence 44) and the interrogative yāhu (MSG) ‘who?’ (sentence 125; its FSG form yāhi occurs in sentence 30) (cf. Ingham 2000: 127).

Borrowed items from Persian are e.g. dehdār ‘village mayor’ (sentence 117) and zendān ‘jail’ (sentence 82).

3 Text

The following text is a dialogue which I recorded during my fieldwork in Khuzestan in September 2016. The two women were interviewed while sitting on the sidewalk in front of their houses in a quiet street in Ḥamidiyya, Khuzestan. Both are aged around 50 and come from poor families. The topics of their conversation are: family, former times, tattoos and childbirth.

The transcription of the text is not consistently phonemic because it indicates, for example, the allophones i and u of the phoneme a. Also noted is the raising of final -a# to -e# and assimilations such as ln > nn and št > šš.

There are various forms of address, most often bi-polar kinship terms (cf. Yasin 1977), used by the elderly woman to address their listeners, e.g. yumma ‘(lit.) oh mother’ (sentence 2), yadde ‘grandmother’ or ʕamma ‘(lit.) uncle’ (both in sentence 8). As there exist no real equivalents for such forms of address in English, they will not be translated.

The speakers in the following texts are:

A: Aḥmad, a young journalist from Aḥwāz
B: First elderly woman from Ḥamidiyya
BL: The author
C: Second elderly woman from Ḥamidiyya
D: A young man, friend of Aḥmad

A: 1. awlād-əč, ʕad-hum əfrūx?
B: 2. ēh, ʕad-i yumma, frēxāt4 ʕad-i...
A: 3. ham assōlfīn-hum səwālf, maṭal ətgəlī-lhum: ‘əgəʕdu xall asōlf-əlkum!’?
B: 4. ēh, ča waḥ(ad)!
A: 5. š-assōlfī-lhum?
B: 6. asōlf-əlhum, zamān gabul, yadde, hēč šəfət, hēč šəfət...
A: 7. ʃənhu? ēh l-hēč šəfət w l-hēč šəfət w-əḥna rrīd-hən.

4 farax ‘child,’ PL əfrūx, has the commonly used diminutive form frēx, PL frēxāt.
B: 8. ها، أغل-حم، يادد، زامن ألم-يوم أبوعيمما يادد-يامك-حم ألم-يوم مات راكدات
l-ن-نيسان، ام حsdننا، ام اثاثنا، ام لاملمنها ام فلا ایسها، ياممما.
9. یمنا ألم-اكسدأر ألم-یابس، حضنها، اساس ماهت یلمح امم ااوى امم ااوى
frخات ام ااوى حاد، يامم، امم ااوى ااوى ام ااوى ام ببیت لیتخًا ... کدغت-لی وکات،
ما هد. 10. و-نوب، اموذ اکبرم، یوووژت-حم، ان-نوب شرط یاد-حم
أفرخات. 11. و-ؤلوف، ولوف الم-ما گارا یال-یاد وکات، یال الد-зд الد-وات.
A: 12. ؟انتی دک الد-وات گنحی یدان ماهنت-ث؟ سغلد-ث؟
B: 13. ماهنت-ی؟ سغلد-ی؟ یاد راک-ی ام-یاسن-ی ام-یاسن اماحاین
د-دارب حاد کالا، ها؟ کل ام یالیا. 14. ل ام یامم، ام یامم ام مات – یاو مئ
خر الم کدیاک ام یامم حاد اهنا ام الم-حمب اچتیع-ی – دا-خالی 8
اوولاف خایی– عر الم-حمب اچتیع-ی. 15. وایر ام-یاینت-ی، اماح یالی-ها خاتار.
16. ام-یاینت-ی حتیاک-ی، اماح یالی خاتار – تسماه-ی نی یامم؟ 17. ها، ام یامم
مکبارت-هم ککبارت-یم ایلاح یکسما-اگم ایسینیکت، الم-همدیلیح وا
sکر. 18. ان-نوبا، سرار واد-حم افرخات. 19. حساس، شرط یاییز باسد ما بی-یا
حئل. 20. گامو مئال ام ای بیرت-یم ملی اهنا یامم بارو-نی. 21. سکف یامم حاد ات-
تووالیه، یزیز گلبه، کل ای یامم یالشا. 22. حسدنا، لاممیا توبن، لاممیا –
گننها یوایوان، کل ام ساکسها یا یزیز گلبه. 23. و-دابنارا وهیت-نا، حد
ال-وات یلم حایی-نا، ها ها. 24. حساس یامم ما شرط یاییز 11 حساس حاتتا
ما بیو یالشا ایسی...
A: 25. هیذد د-داجگه د داجگه یالی-ک...؟
B: 26. هیذد یامم، هیذد یامم مدادگج هیذد یود مئ-12-سیر الم-مارا تاخید راییوال،
اتحیت اهنا نیماسن، یود اسییر هولوا.
A: 27. هاک مئن خادگی د ابگال لای تاخید داجگیتی...؟
B: 28. یا، یالشا یا، باضاد شرط ایماییه یخیت-یا یامم-ی: یویمما، یا دیچ د-دیگج د یام
داجگ، یادگه یامد حا دا – ها این(ه) ام ساکسها-لی! – اچگل الم، ل-ن نسیسن المدیگمگان،
گامن یسکسها-لی. 29. یدیگم، ییه! یا اس-حالا-هان حادانی یا؟13!
A: 30. یاهی یدان اددگی؟
B: 31. یاییز یام یاییز یاد-نا، یامم – ام تاشیلی یامم یاییز یادوا-لواچ. 32. انمیللت
د داجگه یواییب-ی، انمیللت، داجگت یاکنن، یا کیف اس-حالا-هان! تسیف-هان?

5 The more common plural of چتاف ‘shoulder’ is چتافات not چتیف.
6 On the prefix د- used for emphasis in Iraqi Arabic, see Blanc (1964: 117).
7 Cf. Behnstedt and Woidich (2014: 233) on cognate forms with the same meaning in Chad, Nigeria
and Kuwait.
8 Diminutive plural of نسیسن ‘women.’
9 ان-نوب ~ ان-نوبا is a conjunction meaning ‘then.’
11 Diminutive of یاییز ‘elderly woman.’
12 &oman ‘when.’
13 Particle used for expressing astonishment or obviousness, like ‘well, what do you think?!
Of course, they were stunning!’
A: 33. ēh, wāyəd ẖəlwa, bass had-ēs-šəkəl māl-hān ūdšənhi, māṭəl hassa ẖād al-etrofit?
B: 34. ūd háy ūd háy hamāma-yā mān xēr əl ẖafā-k, w ẖāda ẖəlal... [laughs].
D: 35. saqəd?
B: 36. waṭla, ḥazīza tʃṭəyən dala-y yā ḥazīzt-i.
A: 37. háy ṭafəhm-əč. saʔli-ha suʔil!
BL: 38. aku şi akla xāsssa l-əl-mara əl yāybe?
D: 39. hiyye xōš təsʔal!
B: 40. lō asələf-əlkum háy, yadde – taʃəl, taʃəl, əṯəfəd, əskət əskət! 41. 怵f, āne, mən baʃəd rayl-i ʿadal, mən zamān dāk əl-wəkət, baʃəd aʃəmt-i ʿadal. 42. ynaʃdhan-ni an-nəswān al-muʃaʃaygāt ʿaʃəl əh əh ūd-hān ẖaməl. 43. yḡulan ʿtaʃayʿ yʃaʃaʃaʃn-ni āne adənənni, əl-marāt16, baʃəd ṭazīz gaʃəl-i ʃlōn məmāt mālt əl-hawāz?! ḥa. 44. ynaʃdhan-ni w-amṣī, arūḥ lə-ṯ-ṯuwāb l-əṯ-ṯuwāb – əʃəl əl-hāy əl-ḥərma w _tyib, ətyib əʃərəf amahhd-a əl-fərəx, əʃərəf agəʃəs əs-sərəf, əʃərəf agamənə, wa əʃərəf ṣənhi šəkəl əl-mara háy əl tərīd ətyib, əʃəhəm bi-ha, əʃ-yawəf-əč, gaʃli-li!
A: 45. saʔlaʃət-əč, ətəgəl-lič, l-əl-yāyba ham ūd-əč ačla xāsssa? əl-mara tərīd ətyib, ʃ-təʃət-ha?
B: 46. ət tərīd ətyib? hā, tərīd ətyib, yumma, assaww-əlha – əl-ḥaywāna nəhləb-ha, w-nsawwii baʃət w dahan māl ṭawān w-anhuʃtta həda ṭalū əb-bətn əl-marə al-yāyba. 47. nəhləb háyša, w nsawwii, ṭazīzt-i, w naʃti. 48. naʃti l-hāy əl-mara əl-ŷayba ʃway yʃir ṭalū, lōʃ-ha ṭalū, ṭaḍrət-ha, kəll ʃi yʃir ūd-ha ... 49. ət-taʃəl mə yəndərər, ət-taʃəl. 50. əla ḥaʃṭaʃt-ta hēć ťala ʃidər-ha w məcša həda əl-əcəl, mə yəドレス-ha, mə yəドレス tʃəʃəl-ha.
A: 51. w mən ətyib əʃ-təʃət-ha?
B: 52. ēh, huwa ḥāda, ḥazīz gaʃli-i.
A: 53. nəfəs ẖāda?
B: 54. ēh, huwa ḥāda al-ḥurūrāt ʿaʃəl.
C: 55. əs-ʃəmaʃ, w ad-diyāy.
B: 56. faʃəl, mā-ʃənhi17. 57. b-hāy ūd, háy əl-mara tiyib. 58. bass āne, yadde, kəməları yadde. 59. w rədaw, w tō-ni kərət18 bass āne ʃaʃi mə ʃadi s-ʃəʃən19 xāla awwal mə

14 Discourse particle expressing uncertainty.
15 Cf. Ḥassūnizadeh (2015: 470) on CA ḏ̣-ʔ, I. stem: ‘to increase the number of one’s offspring’ [here and in the following, the translations of the Arabic originals given in Ḥassūnizadeh’s dictionary are my own]; (Holes 2001: 313) ‘dāna “foetus, confinement, newly born child, small child.”’
16 Generally, the plural of KhA mara ‘woman’ is nəswān. The usually uncommon external plural form marət used in this sentence might be influenced by the form məmət ‘midwives,’ which is also an external plural and appears in the same sentence.
17 Elliptical for mə ʔadri šənhi ‘I don’t know what (F).’
18 < P kərt.
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---

20 < P behdāšt ‘hygiene, healthcare’ (Junker and Alawi 2002: 108).
21 Ḥassūnizadeh (2015: 386): ‘səalf “district, faʃra.”’
23 This phrase appears to have a different meaning in Baghdadi Arabic, cf. Woodhead and Beene (1967: 126): ‘ʃfəl ʃalə! “What a pity! Too bad!”’
24 Also ayayyəyə-ha.
25 Diminutive of ʃaʃla ‘daughter.’
26 Diminutive of the proper name Ḥassan.
27 < ʃəh ‘power, position.’
30 ʃərəs PL ʃərūs is the normal word for ‘tooth’ in KhA, cf. Holes (2001: 311) on Bahraini Arabic: ‘ʃdirs PL ʃdrūs “tooth”; contrast Baghdadi Arabic, Woodhead and Beene (1967: 279), which has kept the CA meaning ‘molar (tooth).’
BL: 89. w-ən-nawwān ham čānan yəšṭaqṬan b-az-zərāʕa?
B: 90. ēh nəṭləʕ ham b-əz-zərāʕa lō ḥəlm nənəswān ham čānan yəštəġlan b-əz-zərāʕa?
91. ēh, ʕazīzt-i, halla bī-hən, halla halla bī-hən banāt-na nanna ḥaḍan yəḥčan ṣaṭarab. 92. lō ʕaləʕ zalme yəḥšad nruḥ enləmm al-baṭ (?) w-enləmm-a w-ənḏərrī w-enləmm-a nəḥərz-a b-əl-biət, angūl xāf əs- marär – murūr al-wakat, xāf anqulul ab-ɡēr zād mā ʕad-na ʔinn, w-ənḏərrīm-a. 93. nəqdo l-makīnə l-ḥənta nəṭləʕ ham b-əz-zərāʕa lō nəḥṣəd, lō nləmm ḥənṭa, taʕay ʕazīzti taʕ(ay) – wa’lla ʔāne əyēt b-ɡēr ʕabāye!

---

32 Invariable expression with the meaning 'perhaps, possibly, maybe,' cf. Woodhead and Beene (1967: 149) for the same meaning in Baghdadi Arabic.
33 She probably means 7trāb ḥərri or tin ḥərri, which denotes earth that is found in the deeper layers of the ground, is not mixed with stones and is used for building houses, cf. Ḥassūnizadeh (2015: 229).
34 Cf. MSA naqaʕa ‘saturate (s.th.)’; in Baghdadi Arabic naggaʕ (Woodhead and Beene 1967: 470).
35 < ̣ʕadəlna ‘we repaired.’
36 < ̣ʔīd ‘hand’ PL ʔīdēn, which becomes ̣ʔīdē-[ʔīdīə] in construct state when suffixes are attached.
37 < nəggalna ‘we carried.’
38 Cf. Cohen (1970: 4) on the root ʔ-b-n with the meaning ‘stone’ in various Semitic languages.
39 < yaʃall ‘to revere, venerate, esteem highly, exalt’ (cf. Woodhead and Beene 1967: 75). This is an expression of apology for mentioning a taboo word or a distasteful topic (for example, certain animals).
40 Above ndəwwəs.
D: 114. inšalla əl-əyāwīd 42...
C: 115. la, əhma əl-əyāwīd kalman ab-məkān-a. 116. ëh, bass əhna gabul riǧǧat-na ḥəlu, ḥəlu. 117. hassa ham našma mən aļḷā, yfaddi hāda l-xër w hāda l-dehdār 43 məl-na w-əs-salaf məl-na, našma, rəğǧat-na ḥəluwa.

BL: 118. w malābəs-kum? čān ətʃl əl-yōm?
C: 119. malābəs-na hāy malābəs, əy mən gabul əhna: tōb, ətʃlə, əl-əḥdīətət la, ylnbsan...
A: 120. gabul tōb məl ələn-əm w-yhūkũn-a ysawwwi əhdūm, yʃir xaʃən bass məku əhdūm ysawwwun-a.
C: 121. dh bəʃət bəʃət. xō, dōlək əlahagaw w-əhna mə laḥagna əl-əwvawliyin.
B: 122. la, la ṣamma, hassa əhna nəmsi nəlbəs ət-tiyāb, ha-t-tōb.
C: 123. našma, hassa našma.
B: 124. gabul mə šəfə, mə ɬəgənə ɬələ, gabul la. 125. hā ydūdat 44-na gabul əssələfygül nsawwwi, əl-bəʃət w-nsawwwi məʃl diʃdāšə w nələbs-a, ʃiyyāb-na gabul l-əwvawliyin, uuuhh, kallas hēc gaylin, yāhə nəʃal mən ʃad-hum, hēc ʃazizt-ī.

BL: 126. w malābəs əʃ-ʃətə?
C: 127. ḥənna hādanni hna yā ʃazizt-i əy waʃla, hādanni əl-hədūm lə abaddəl-ha, ʃazizt, hāy malābəs əʃ-ʃətə.

A: 1. Your children, do they have children?
B: 2. Yes, I have of course, I have children.
A: 3. Do you also tell them stories, like, you tell them: ‘Sit down and let me tell you a story!’?
B: 4. Yes, but of course!
A: 5. What do you tell them?
B: 6. I tell them, in former times, I have seen this and that...
A: 7. What (exactly)? Yes, this ‘this and that’ is what we want (to hear).

---

42 Cf. yūd  < ḡūd ‘favour, generosity’ (cf. Ḥassūnizadeh 2015: 925); ʔəyāwīd means ‘good, generous people.’
43 < P dehdār ‘village mayor’ (Junker and Alawi 2002: 335).
44 Plural of yadd ‘grandfather,’ i.e. the plural pattern C₁C₂ūC₂, which is very common in KhA and sometimes is combined with an external plural suffix -a, e.g. ydūd ~ ydūda, or bṭūṭ ~ bṭūṭa ‘ducks’ (SG baṭṭa).
B: 8. Aha. I tell them, dear, the time, the day(s) of (the) father, dear, grandfather, your grandfather; the day he died, I ran to an-Niasan, or we harvested, or we gathered (the harvest) or we collected (crops), everything we did. 9. We brought the green and the dry (i.e. we did everything). We put the, I made food for them, first for the children, first this, first I, first I raised orphans... it took me time, nobody (is like me?). 10. And then, the children grew up, I married them off, then they had children themselves. 11. And I tell, I tell what happened to me during that time, everything about that time.

12. What was your profession during that time? Your job?

B: 13. My profession? My job? I know, this day my husband fed me and I fed him and so and so and that was the way of life, right? He did not have any (troubles). 14. And when, when he died—may the good surround you Muḥammad—then the rope was here, I was the one responsible (lit. the rope was on my shoulders)—well let me tell sister—I was responsible. 15. I started to take care of my daughter, I was afraid something could happen to her [especially a sexual relation]. 16. I watched my son, I was afraid something could happen to him—do you listen to me? 17. So, after I had raised them and raised them (until they were grown-ups), God gave them (good, modest) women; thanks and praise be to God. 18. Then they had children. 19. Now, I have become an old woman; I no longer have power. 20. They started—As I had taken care of them, they (now) take care of me. 21. See, this toilet [they, my children, help her, to go to the toilet, now that she no longer has the strength to do so on her own]; Everything dear, by God.

22. We harvested, gathered straw, we gathered—we bred cattle, we made everything. 23. And we handled our life. That time that has passed quickly. 24. Now, that I have become an old woman, I can’t even walk anymore, by God.

A: 25. And this tattoo, has she tattooed you...?

B: 26. This, this is tattooed, this shall—When a woman is about to take a man (to marry), she puts symbols here hoping to become (even more) beautiful.

A: 27. This (tattoo): After you took someone or before you married, did you get the tattoo?

B: 28. No, but no, when I became a young woman (of about 16) I started (to say), ‘Look at this tattoo and that tattoo and that—please make me one as well!’—I told the, the women who were making the tattoos, and they (rose and) made me one. 29. They tattooed, yes! But how beautiful (they made them)!

A: 30. Who made the tattoo?

B: 31. Elderly women, some elderly women among us—[towards the second elderly woman] Come here, my beloved (lit. I would sacrifice myself for you). 32. I lay down, and she tattooed my eyebrows; I lay down and she made these tattoos; Look how beautiful they are! Do you see them?

45 This phrase probably also has a sexual connotation.
A: 33. Yes, very beautiful. But their shape, what is it supposed to be? Like now this: A crescent?
B: 34. I think, I think this should be a pigeon—may the good embrace you—and that a crescent.
D: 35. For real?
B: 36. By God, she is looking at me.
A: 37. She understands you. Ask her a question! [talking to me].
BL: 38. Is there any special food you give to the women who have just given birth?
D: 39. She asks good questions!
B: 40. If I tell you this—come, come, sit and keep silent! 41. See, I, when my husband was still alive, at that time, when my man was still alive, the women who felt uneasy (here: with their pregnancy or delivery) woke me up like when they were pregnant. 43. They said ‘Come!’ They knew that I aided (women) during childbirth, the women, just like the midwives in Ahwāz! Yes. 44. They woke me up and I went (to help). I go in the name of God, to guarantee divine recompense. I arrive at that woman’s and she gives birth, she gives birth. I know how to put the child into the cradle, I know how to cut the umbilical cord, I know how to swaddle the child, and I know how a woman who is about to give birth looks like, I understand her: ‘What hurts you? Tell me!’
A: 45. She has asked you, she says, ‘The woman that has just given birth, is there also a special diet for her? The women who is about to give birth, what do you give her?’
B: 46. The women who is about to give birth? Well, (if) she is about to give birth, I make her—I milk the cattle, I make rice pudding and clarified animal butter and we give (her) this: (it does) good in the pregnant woman’s belly. 47. We milk the cow, and we make (this), and we give (it to her). 48. We give (this) to the woman who has given birth and it all goes well. Her pain is gone (lit. good), her strength, everything about her becomes (fine). 49. The child is not injured, the child. 50. If she puts it like that on her breast and she has eaten this food, he is fine, he comes to no harm.
A: 51. And when she gives birth, what do you give her?
B: 52. Well, this is it.
A: 53. This same thing?
B: 54. Yes, this is it, like warm things.
C: 55. Fish, and chicken.
B: 56. Pepper. I don’t know (what else). 57. With that this woman hopefully gives birth. 58. But me, I have finished (my apprenticeship as a midwife). 59. And they wanted to give me a licence [official certification for being a midwife]. But since I did not have a citizenship at that time, I hindered this story. 60. And I—He came to me, (from) this healthcare centre of my district, it was decided (?) against me and they told me: ‘stop this work (lit. story)!’ 61. I asked them: ‘How can I stop?’
62. I won’t stop: the woman is poor who has problems (and is)—you are my children⁴⁶—like, she is running and running. She said, ‘Dear come to me.’ Where is this carer who wants to prevent me from seeing you? No, that is not nice of him.
63. The woman [i.e. herself] runs to (see) her [i.e. a pregnant woman]: ‘I have come to (help) you, I have come to (help) you, even if, even if they imprisoned me! 64. I have come, don’t worry.’ 65. I take the woman and enwrap her, and cut her umbilical cord, and so. And I help her to give birth to her daughter and I swaddle (it) and I do this and that. And in the end they took me (and) they said: ‘The wife of Ḥassūni, helped us to give birth.’ 66. I told them [the people from the health care centre]: ‘Well do you really think I am afraid?’ Let—The guy from the health care centre took me and let me take an exam, [he was] from my area. 67. He, here, well in the area of the health centre, of the [my] district. 68. Then they took me to Ḥamīdiyya, in Ḥamīdiyya a midwife took charge of me. 69. How beautiful was her way of speaking! 70. She said to me, ‘My dear! How do you attend women’s childbirth?’ 71. I told her ‘By God, I attend the women’s childbirth, by the power of Fāṭima Zahra [wife of Ali, daughter of Muhammad], mother of Ḥasan, Fāṭima. 72. I, my grandmother, the mother of my father, she was a midwife, I have learnt (it) from her (lit. under her hand). 73. Studying is training. 74. Yes, I learnt (it). This woman attended women’s childbirth, my grandmother, my father’s mother, an old lady, right. 75. The way she did it, I did it. 76. And then, well like this, this child that has a problem, I understood what is what, like that. 77. The child that has a problem, I understand him, what is (wrong) with his belly, what, what hurts him, causes him to feel uneasy. 78. I run to him, I boil water, I cook it, cook it, cook it, and pour it into a vessel. 79. Let us make him drink hot (lit. boiling) water, that makes him feel good (lit. cleans his breast)—by the power of God. 80. This, what I make, makes (him feel) good, like that. 81. Well that is the story and it is a blessing. He, I did not see a miracle, father of Aḥmad, I haven’t seen a miracle [I have rather learnt this profession by training]. 82. They said then, ‘You stop now so they won’t shave your head and put you in jail.’ [laughs] 83. Let’s get up, I don’t have teeth anymore (lit. they have fallen down) [She is tired from all the talking and laughing]. 84. By God, they told me, ‘Stop it now!’ Enough now of your work (lit. this is your limit).’ 85. I told (them), ‘Well alright.’ All good things that have happened, see, there is nothing, I am not—I go to the afterlife… 86. When I will die, I say, I look for—my grave shall be big. [She does her work for free and expects in exchange—from God—only a large tomb]. 87. The women don’t give (me) anything, I work (lit. sit) from evening till morning. 88. Like that, ‘What hurts you? [to a pregnant woman] Tell me, what can we do for you?’ Like this, that is all I can say (lit. this is my limit).

⁴⁶ Expression commonly used with the meaning that one can be sincere and go on telling his/her personal story since the listeners are like family to him/her.
BL: 89. Have the women also worked in the fields?

B: 90. Yes, we also went to the crops. We harvested or gathered grain. Come my dear, come here, come—My God, I came without my Abaya! 91. Yes, my dear, welcome. They are very welcome: they are our daughters, they speak Arabic. [Speaking about us] 92. When the man went out to harvest, we went to gather (crop?). We harvested it and thrashed it and winnowed it and gathered it and stored it at home. We say maybe, one time, maybe we are left without food, without flour, and so we store it. 93. We take the mill (lit. flour machine), we mill it and eat it. 94. Like this, like this we had courage from God. 95. We harvest—we are houses’ owners, we are working hard (lit. moving), now that we have become weak, God accepts that (lit. the apologising). 96. Yes, we have done everything, by God, my dear. 97. See, I harvested, I harvested—what, my dear [to the other woman]? My husband died, well he died, well my husband died—May God have mercy upon your parents and everyone!—he died. I have a daughter. [As if to her daughter]: ‘Come here—What?—Let us take the washbowl and we take this on the streets in our district, like this. 98. No, these are enough, these, let us take the washbowl and we go around like that in the area.’ 99. What did we do? We pick up the good stones, the good ones, we pick it up and soak it in water, in a vessel, in the washbowl. We do not put it like this on the floor where it goes bad. 100. We soak it in water and then we mix it and we build it and we make an oven—How beautiful!—and we bake bread with it, right? That is all. 101. [To the second elderly woman] Now it is your turn, my dear.

C: 102. We also had much trouble my son, at home. My offspring are all girls. Our old man is sick, we also went to the palm groves, we went to the rice fields... 103. ... like you say, we harvested with our (bare) hands, we carried stones, we faced a lot of inequities, many. 104. Thank God now if God keeps things going like that it would be very good.

A: 105. The stones, what did you do with it?

C: 106. The stones. Well, we harvested with our hands, the harvest, and then we put it on the packsaddle—pardon the expression (lit. the one who listens shall be venerated)—we carry it on the animal, it is strapped to the packsaddle. 107. So here me being short and there—pardon the expression, pardon the expression—the donkey being tall, I hang onto it. I bring it [the harvest]; I cast it onto the ground, the load. 108. We staple this, here. We make the threshing ground. In former times, there were no tractors—pardon the expression, pardon the expression—we trod it on donkeys. 109. We dropped the dung, we threw it from the, from the thing, from the threshing ground. 110. They winnowed it with their hands (like) ventilators. We went to the palm groves, we went to the rice fields, we worked very hard.

---

47 Hassünizadeh (2015: 131): ‘banna “timber fixed with a rope like a net thrown onto an animal’s back and packed with the harvest(ed spikes) to bring it to the threshing place.”’
111. But it was (also) a good time: kindness, cleanliness and security. 112. (Even) if someone made māy huwa⁴⁸ he shared it with his neighbour, with his brother. 113. Now not, nowadays no. Does a brother know (even) his brother any more?

D: 114. Hopefully (there are still) good people...

C: 115. No, they, the good people, each one has his place (let’s stick to the past). 116. Yes, but in the past we had good relationships, good, good. 117. God is also kind to us now. He keeps (giving us) this good (life) and this village headman of ours and our district: it is a blessing, we have good relationships.

BL: 118. And your clothes? Were they like today?

C: 119. Our clothes, these clothes. Yes, in the past we (wore) a ūṯāb, (that) protected her, an Abaya. The young girls not: they wore...

A: 120. In the past (they made) dresses from sheep (wool). They wove it to make clothes: they were rough, but there were no (other) clothes, they made them.

C: 121. Yes, bašāt, bašāt [traditional cloak]. Well, those (still) lived to see (that). But we did not live to see (the days of) the past.

B: 122. No, no, dear: now we go and wear dresses, this dress.

C: 123. A blessing; nowadays it is a blessing.

B: 124. In the past we did not see, we did not live to see it, in the past not. 125. Our grandfathers told (us): they say, ‘We made, the bašāt, we made like a dišdāša and we wear it.’ Our old men, in the past, the ancestors, uuuuh (How long ago these days are!), just like this they said, those that we asked [about the past], like that.

BL: 126. And the winter clothes?

B: 127. These are these here. By God, these clothes. I don’t change them. These are the winter clothes.
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⁴⁸ Lit. ‘air water,’ a very simple dish, red marag ‘sauce’ without meat.


Zwei Texte aus Sarāb (Südchorasan)

**ABSTRACT** Sarāb is a small village in South-Khorasan (Iran), where about half of the inhabitants are Arabs and the other half are Persians. This article presents two new texts in the dialect of Sarāb, translated into German. These are the last unpublished recorded texts from this village by the author.

**KEYWORDS** Arabic dialectology, Central Asian Arabic dialects, field research, Khorasani Arabic, Sarāb


Sarāb war der erste Ort in Chorasan, an dem ich Araber ausfindig machte; ein sehr kleines Dorf, nur zur Hälfte arabisch, der Rest der Einwohner waren Perser. Mein Aufenthalt war kurz, vielleicht nur ein bis zwei Stunden lang, dafür umso aufregender. Ich stolperte mitten in eine Festversammlung hinein, die männliche arabisch Bevölkerung saß auf dem Boden nebeneinander an den vier Wänden eines großen Saales entlang. Man machte mir Platz und ließ sich von mir in gebrochenem Persisch erklären, dass ich mich für ihre Sprache interessiere und gerne Tonaufnahmen machen möchte. Es fanden sich tatsächlich fünf Sprecher, die mir etwas auf Tonband sprachen, was nun hiermit vollständig dokumentiert ist. Die Audioaufnahmen sollen in SemArch, dem Semitischen Spracharchiv der Universität Heidelberg, veröffentlicht werden.¹

Da das ganze Unternehmen ziemlich turbulent verlief, war ich nachlässig was die Aufnahme der Daten der Sprecher betrifft. Leider habe ich auch keine Fotos gemacht

---

¹ SemArch. Semitisches Tonarchiv. [http://semarch.ub.uni-heidelberg.de](http://semarch.ub.uni-heidelberg.de).
und kann mich nicht mehr an die beiden Sprecher erinnern; insbesondere weiß ich nicht zu sagen, wie alt sie ungefähr waren. Vom zweiten Sprecher fand ich noch nicht einmal mehr seinen Namen in meinen Aufzeichnungen.


Text 1

1. aʕūzu billāh min aš-šeytāni r-raǧīm bismi llāhi r-raḥmāni r-raḥīm. 2. ane ʕabdillāh Iḥrāri, vuld-e ṯultān fī ṯzamân al-..., ṭad o ṭpanḡâh ṭtāl, ṭdo ṭhezār o ṭpunṭad ṭtāl ṭḡabl, min ṭArabeṭṭān min hūl al-kufr o ṭeṭlām, ṭfarār, ft ṭIrān ṭākin hānāt, ıtṭēne. 3. ṭmošaḡatātīn čān, xubaḏ mā čān, baʕḏe ṭṭoḡandar o ṭṭalḵam3 čān yixabḵūn, va il ar-ṛeißān čān yintūn. aḥne xamsa uxe, uxt la, ubūnne čān ṭzahme yiḡirrūn, 4 xubaḏ lā, baʕḏe ṭkam ṭkamak okbūbarne6 o ar-ṛjadi ṭmadḏārī7 o ṭfarār il aš-ṣahrāt. 4. min hāne ṛeißān ṭoḡār kunne ṭgīdēne il ṭTehrān. ṭTehrān, maṯḏig-e ṭbe ṭnâm-e Maṯḏig-e Aʿḏām 9kār kun niṭey, baʕḏe ṭṯar ṭṯarḵār hānāt xallūnne9 ṭtā ham-maṯḏig ıččāmčam10 hānḵāt. 5. va baʕḏe iy yōm ṭdavāzdah ṭtūman ṭmoḏ 16čān yintūn. hānāt ṭdo ṭtūman ṭmoḏ čān. baʕḏe ṭkam kam ṭoḵstāl ṭgē, xalgin kullhum ṭfarār il aš-ṣahrāt.12 at-ṯāf, al-ḥamdu lillāh rabbu l-ʕālamīn, xubaḏ ṭziyād, ad-dinīy vaṯīʕ13 o niʿma, bašar yiradin šukrat be ǧây yiḡīb. 15 6. ad-dinīy ṭfarāvān, ṭpiyāde ṭravīye ṭtad ʿFarṯax16 darb ṭpiyāde ṭtey kun niṭey noḡodi, il aš-ṣahr min aš-ṣahr il aš-ṣahr. aṯ-ṯāf al-ḥamdu lillāh rabbu l-ṣafālmīn, min hānāt sayyārātin17 ṭḥaṭṭin min hāne, il Kaʿabat aš-šarīf bi ṭtū ṭtāf at ṭtey
yiṯan yoḡodan va yiḡan. 7. va hānāt, ūrubīt hāne gâl o ġūli ūrubīt al- ʿatl gâl o ġūli. ʿat il ab-bāḡir baqāru, aḥne nugāl bāḡir, ūrabiṭnā ġâti, gâl o ġūl, ġâlar ġâl o ġūl.

Yaḥdillāh Iḥrāri, 18 16.09.1996


Text 2

1. fit zamān-e ḡidīm xuḫuḏ ḭuyxt,19 mā čān. xuḫuḏ šafīr ṭā ṭī ṭālgīye, xuḫuḏ ḡunta ane mācīl. bašd ḡunta min hāne čān yivaddān raḥat20 ṭābiye, fit ṭā Farṭax21 ṭāraḥ raḥat am-mā yā ḡiḥar. Yašrēn22 ayyām kun noḡodi hünkāt, nigif23 ṭā ṭavxt an-nūbe

---

18 Dieser Sprecher spricht fit nur sehr schwach aus, außerdem gehen ā und ā regellos durcheinander und seine Interdentale hören sich mangels Zähnen oft wie Sibilanten an oder gehen ganz unter.
19 Vgl. türk. yok „nein“.
20 HA raḥan (رح) „Mühle“.
21 Vgl. Fußnote 16.
22 Vermutlich bringt der Sprecher in seinem Bemühen arabische Wörter zu verwenden hier und unten in Absatz 5 die Zahlen durcheinander und meint Yašrēn heißt „zwei“.
23 vigaf / yigif „stehen“. 
1. In alter Zeit gab es kein Brot. Brot aus Gerste, Weizennbrot habe ich bis zum Alter von dreißig Jahren nicht gegessen. Dann haben sie Weizen von hier in eine Wasser-
mühle gebracht, in zehn Farsang Entfernung (ca. sechzig km) war die Wassermühle
mit Mühl-Stein. Zwei Tage sind wir nach dort gelaufen, wir warten bis die Zeit
der Reihe für die Mühle an uns kommt, die Reihe für die Mühle an uns kommt und
Weizen Mehl wird, und dann kommen wir wieder, Brot. 2. Jetzt gibt es Anneh-
mlichkeiten, in zwei Stunden drischt ein Mähdrescher den Weizen, und es gibt auch

24 Pers. bāz (باز) „wieder“. 
25 tuḥan/yithan (تن) „mahlen, dreschen“. 
26 Pers. dialektal für „ebenso, genauso, doch“, auch adversativ „aber“ (Blanc 1963: 150). Partikel
zum Ausdruck von Hoffnung oder Überzeugung, versucht Zustimmung zu erheischen (engl.
„ ... didn’t you?“). 
27 Pers. dar-raftan (دروفتان) „herausgehen, -fliegen“. 
28 Pers. kešt (کشت) , dialektal jetzt keš gesprochen „Saat, Aussaat, Anpflanzung“. 
29 Variante zu ham „auch“. 
30 Vermutlich persisch, vgl. HA sikka (سکه) „Pflug“; wie dieser persische Plural zustande kommt ist
mysteriös. 
31 Man beachte wie das arab. Suffix der 3. m. Sg. an ein als feminin interpretiertes persisches Wort
mit Ezâfe angebunden wird! 
32 Vgl. pers. bağal (بغل) „Achselhöhle, Umfassung“, miz (میز) „Tisch“. Die Zusammensetzung im Sinn
von „Abhang“ scheint jedoch im heutigen Persisch nicht mehr bekannt zu sein. 
33 In vielen persischen Dialekten wechselt k mit č, wobei sich letzteres durchzusetzen scheint. 
34 Die gleiche Bedeutung wie farāwān (فروان) „reichlich, üppig“. 
36 Vgl. Fußnote 15. 
37 < HA qaṭṭu (قاطع) „jemals; niemals“, gutt oder guttaš wird benutzt wie pers. hič (هیچ) „keinerlei, nichts“. 
38 Pers. man (مان) (Gewichtsmaß, ca. 3 kg). 
39 Pers. ġerān (گران) „Kran“ (alte Münzeinheit, durch den Rial abgelöst). 
40 Verkleinerungsform. 
41 Die wegen s > ṭ und z > ḍ zu erwartenden Interdentale sind bei diesem Sprecher mangels Zähnen
oft Sibilanten geblieben.
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Letizia Cerqueglini

The Golden Season of Olive Harvesting and Weddings Without Limousines: A Text in the Central Traditional Muṯallaṯ Arabic of Ṭaybe

ABSTRACT The text represents an excerpt from an intergenerational conversation in the Muṯallaṯ Arabic of Ṭaybe between a 73-year-old grandmother and her grandson, a student at Tel Aviv University. In the introduction, I describe the loss of the emphasis on */q/ and the affrication of */k/, highlighting the differences between the generational varieties of both participants. The variety spoken by the elders shows interesting pausal forms at the ends of both speech units and speech turns. The conversation focuses on two traditional themes of rural life in Palestine, the olive harvest and a wedding celebration.

KEYWORDS affrication, Arabic dialectology, loss of emphasis, Muṯallaṯ Arabic, Muṯallaṯ dialectology, Palestinian anthropology, Rural Palestinian Arabic, Ṭaybe Arabic, field research

This is a passage taken from a long interview conducted by a student from Tel Aviv University with his grandmother. Over the last two years, Amir Ağmal has extensively recorded family members, all native to the area of Ṭaybe. In his interviews, the old lifestyle is the focus. Marriage, food and traditional medicine are the most common topics. In this interaction between Amir and his grandmother, one can notice that Amir pronounces */q/ as /q/, and only rarely deemphasises it (only twice in this text, in kulli, ‘tell me’ and in ndukk, ‘we beat’). He also makes an extensive use of /Ɂ/, especially at words’ onset. The use of initial /Ɂ/ is quite rare in Traditional Muṯallaṯ Arabic (TMA), with some exceptions (see below: Ɂilna ‘to us’). Furthermore, Amir never uses [č].
In general, Amir’s pronunciation is thus quite different from that of his grandmother. In her speech, a phenomenon quite widely spread among the speakers of central TMA of her generation is evident, i.e. the use of /k/ for both */q/ and for most of the occurrences of */k/. Central TMA is characterised, especially among women, by a very high level of overlap of [k] and [č]. That is, */k/ is pronounced both [k] and [č], according to the preference of each speaker, or even in both ways in the same words by the same speaker, apparently fully interchangeably. Furthermore, as shown in this text, women pronounce */q/ as the fully deemphasised [k]. As a result of the entire system of shifts, in the speech of many women of the central Muṭallaṯ, [k] can express both */q/ and */k/, which is the case of Amir’s grandmother, reported here. In this text, the elderly woman pronounces */k/ as [č] only once, in hīči, the modal adverb ‘so, this way’, where the phoneme /k/ is found in a fronted environment.

Thus, as this excerpt shows, the phonological profile of central TMA is difficult to define. The situation of Ṭaybe and the central Muṭallaṯ has also been complicated by the wave of immigration from the coastal villages and, more markedly, cities (especially Jaffa) after 1948. Amir’s family claims to be native to Ṭaybe and not to have hosted foreign elements. Nonetheless, the contact with Western varieties could have caused internal changes even among the local native population. The absence of the affricate pronunciation of */k/ could also be the outcome of school training that this woman received before marrying, even though it was restricted to elementary classes. Despite her age, she may have been influenced by the literary language and even by contact with Hebrew, which is quite a rare finding among the elderly women of the Muṭallaṯ. Indeed, Amir uses the Hebrew word hitpatxuti ‘evolutionary, developed’, meaning ‘modern, up-to-date’.

A further interesting phenomenon observable here is the lowering of */i/ in a pause in TMA, not observed in the speech of Amir and his generation. So, in a pause, while his grandmother says: *tisʕa w-sittēn… sabʕēn ‘sixty-nine, seventy-nine’, Amir says: *tisʕa w-sittin ‘sixty-nine’. The effect of the pause position is evident in this text in the word iši, ‘thing’, which is short within speech unit, long at speech unit borders (išī), and lower at the end of a speech turn (išē). Also the word kbīri, ‘big’ (FSG), is pronounced kbīre, with a /the lowering of the final -i at speech unit border.

The form lalli, ‘to those who...’ is the development of la-illi.

The TMA represented here has the imāla of the feminine singular ending as [-a] in emphatic context, as [-e] and [-i] in other cases, not according to systematic rules.

In the transcription, the vowel length and high represent the actual way in which the speakers pronounce the sounds. This kind of transcription enables the reader to notice the difference between the pronunciation of TMA in the younger generations; in TMA, long vowels within the same word are pronounced long, while young people pronounce length only in the last long and accented vowel (Amir pronounces zamamīr, instead of zamāmīr, ‘klaxons’).
The Golden Season of Olive Harvesting and Weddings Without Limousines

**Text**

Interviewer (A): Amir Ağmal, age 21, Muslim, born and currently living in Ṭaybe, BA student at Tel Aviv University in Arabic and Islamic Studies
Speaker (B): Woman, Muslim, age 73, born and currently living in Ṭaybe

A: 1. *bima innu ihna bmawsim izzatün ibtiqdarī tišraḥīli lān qaft izzatün biṣūra baṣīta?
B: 2. ā, *bakēna lamma nrūḥ ʿazzatūn zmān niṣfriš tiḥt izzatün šarāṣif aw nāylūn miṣān wiḥna nuxrut izzatūn, nuxrūt miṣān mā yitbaṣṭariš. 3. nimsik furraʃ furraʃ, wilwāḥad yuŋud wyinzil ʿala šsarāṣif illi jardīna. 4. *wṭabʿan lamma nxalīṣ xīlāl innhār bitšabba bišwalāt wkānu yiḡamuš źīnd ahli li-anu źīndhum saḥāt ikbīre. 5. *whunāka ʿnburrū yaʃni nṭallīʃ ilaxʃar lārʃeʃ laʃal willi la-azzit laʃal źabīn mā yixalṣu mawsim izzatūn.
B: 7. *łaɁbakat ṭarikit iʃṭiʿāra šraḥīli yumha baṭṭallaʕ lemuzīn wmarṣīdis biṭlaʃu wbirkabu. 13. wbaʃāf yaʃni manādīr ɡarībi wʃaḡi biṣṣiyāra ṭabʕan hu illi biṣṣiyāra wbwiṣal iluīl, ayyām ma iḥna kunna ḥaḏīz fī ṭabariyya kant iddinya šatawiyye.

**15 November 2019**
A. 1. Since we are in the olive picking season, can you explain to me about picking the olives in a simple way?
B: 2. Yes, when we went to pick olives in the past, we would put mattresses or plastic sheets under the olive trees because when we harvested the olives, we harvested them so that they would not scatter. 3. We caught branch after branch, and each one was picked and fell on the mattresses that we had put (under the trees).
4. And of course, while we were completing the harvesting towards the end of the daylight hours, the harvest was collected into sacks that people collected at my family’s house because there they had large yards. 5. And there we would separate, chose, the olives into two types: the first type is the green olives and the second type is the black olives, and we put it aside until they would finish the season of the olive harvesting and that was the way we harvested the olives.
A: 6. And how would you harvest the olives? Because today there are modern squeezer...
B: 7. No, the method of harvesting was very, very beautiful, and also simple. 8. We used our hands a lot, pit by pit, for this we did use stones, this like, pointed, like small narrow, narrow stones and also wood, leaves, until the pit split into two parts. 9. We took buckets with plenty of water or whatever else and we put the harvest in there so that it did not turn into black. 10. And then, when we wanted to, we put it into jars using lemon, we used the salt, and everything. 11. And so we took the olives to the press, the press. There was a press in the old country, a old one. Some trusted people took the olives there for fifty percent, for example if the olives would give ten tanks [of oil], five were for them and five for us.
A: 12. Okay! Another question. Today we are also in the wedding season. Today I see people traveling and riding limousines and Mercedeses. 13. I see wonderful and strange visions, klaxons and parties and DJs and songs in the cars, i.e. something more modern, technological and developed, let’s say, in a way that you haven’t experienced. In what year were you born?
A: 15. So, tell me... until you married...
A: 17. Nine, sixty-nine. Can you tell me how you went out to the wedding party? In a limousine? There was no limousine...
B: 18. No, no. No limousine at all.
A: 19. Tell me how you got engaged and married.
B: 20. And even the groom who had a car would not decorate it and not do all kinds of things. Back then, there was a car in your grandfather’s family, a Volkswagen station wagon, and we used to travel in it. 21. And we (the brides) did not always appear in a white suit, we used to go to the seamstress to have a dress or a suit made, no matter if it was summer or winter, and we would go to the hotel in that dress and not a white suit. 22. And the gold he had given her the day of
the engagement, she would keep wearing the evening of the party, but when she would go on the honeymoon, as we call it, she would take it off, so that it wouldn't get stolen. She would leave only the ring on her hand, as a sign, and if the groom drives, then he is the one who drives the car to the hotel. Back then, we were guests in Tiberias and the season was cold.
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Living in Bab Tuma: Two Texts in Damascene Arabic

ABSTRACT Damascene Arabic belongs to the group of Syro-Palestinian dialects. The following presents two texts in this dialect that were recorded in 2008 in Damascus, and found a few years later among other recordings from Syria from that period. The author of the stories is Maysāʔ Šanāʕa, a Maronite Christian living in the district Bab Tuma in the Syrian capital. The texts presented here are unrelated to each other. The first of them tells of Palm Sunday, as well as Easter holidays in Damascus, while the second is a fairly loose story about spending time with her sick friend.

KEYWORDS Arabic dialectology, Christians, Damascene Arabic, Damascus, field research, Syria, Syrian Arabic

1 Introduction

Damascene Arabic is one of the best-described dialects of the Arabic language at selected stages of its development over the last hundred years. In recent years, successive publications have appeared, among which the most noteworthy are Berlinches (Ramos)'s articles with texts and her grammatical description in Spanish (Berlinches 2011; 2013; 2014; 2016; 2017). In addition, Viennese dialectologists, under the guidance of Stephan Procházka, have published an excellent two-volume textbook for the Damascene dialect, the first volume of which has even had its second revised edition (Aldoukhi, Procházka, and Telič 2014a; 2014b; 2016). We can only regret that this textbook is still not available to English-speakers and they have to use English textbooks of a debatable level.

1 See, for example, the description of the state of research on Damascene Arabic in Klimiuk (2013: 19–25, 127–137).
Unfortunately, in recent years, apart from the texts by Berlinches (2011; 2013; 2014; 2016; 2017) and Klimiuk (2013), no other transcriptions have been published which record natural speech and are not prepared, as is the case with dialectal textbooks or publications based on television series. This is a negativum in recent years, in which strictly dialectological conclusions are drawn on the basis of, for example, soap operas and literature in dialects. In 1964, Bloch and Grotzfeld published earlier texts from Damascus. The latter also included an extensive text in his German language grammar of Damascene Arabic a year later (Grotzfeld 1965). Alas, there are not many publicly available and previously scientifically developed recordings in the dialect of the Syrian capital either.

The following two texts were found among my various recordings from Syria from the years 2008–2011. Both texts were recorded in 2008, and their author is Maysāʔ Šanāʕa, a Maronite Christian living in the district Bab Tuma in Damascus, whose other texts were published by me in 2013. In her stories, the author focuses on everyday life. The first text may be valuable from the point of view of typically Christian lexis because it concerns Palm Sunday and to a small extent Easter holidays. In the second story, she talks about her friend and her health problems, as well as spending time together in the absence of her friend's family.

The texts are transcribed in a transcription used in the Arabic dialectology and translated into English. In addition, a short commentary on assimilation, pronunciation, diphthongs and lexical borrowings is included. Major prosodic breaks are noted each time by a vertical bar ( | ).

2 Texts

Text 1: ʕīd aš-šaʕnīne ‘Palm Sunday’


---

2 Only my recordings from Damascus are available in the SemArch of Heidelberg University (http://semarch.ub.uni-heidelberg.de). It is not clear whether anyone still has recordings from Damascus that were transcribed by Bloch and Grotzfeld (1964). Some of the cassette tapes with recordings belonging to Grotzfeld (among them probably also Michael Jiha’s recordings) were submitted to the Department of Semitic Studies of Heidelberg University in 2020. However, they need to be processed and elaborated. A cursory glance at them indicates that there are no recordings from Damascus among them.

³ nrūḥ > rrūḥ ‘we go.’

⁴ bətzūr > bədzūr ‘she visits.’
5. **ǝl-ʕīd | b-sabaṭaʕ's nīsān | ǝid ǝš-šaʕnīne | bikūn ǝt-ṭaʔ ǝṣ**

6. kamān ǝktīr ḥǝlu | yōm al-ʔahad bikūn | w-ǝt-ṭaʔ's | ktīr ǝktīr ḥǝlu | 6. ǝddarna koll šī ḥaddarna l-tyāb ǝddarna l-...


---

5 < *ṭaʔǝ | 5′ 'weather.'

6 The verb haḍḍar/yhaḍḍer 'to prepare, to ready' is realised as haḍḍar/yhaḍḍer. The long emphatic consonant  долг от  звука не произносятся в этом случае. There is a loss of emphasis here. Cf. haḍḍar/yhaḍḍer 'vorbereiten, zubereiten' (Aldoukhi, Procházka, and Telič 2014a: 158–159, 163, 210; Aldoukhi, Procházka, and Telič 2014b: 22, 44, 46, 83, 85, 87, 166). In the recent Spanish grammar of Damascene Arabic by Berlinches (2016: 448), this verb does not appear.

7 Here pronounced with  instead of  ʒ.

8 Berlinches Ramos (2020: 86) writes ‘[i]n our [Berlinches Ramos’s] research 34 informants used hǝnnen 161 times, whereas only two informants used hǝnne (3 instances), and then just in combination with hǝnnen. No informant used hǝnne exclusively.’ In a footnote, however, she refers to my earlier transcriptions in which the variant hǝnne appears (Klimiuk 2013: 100), and writes ‘[s]urprisingly, Klimiuk’s informant does [i.e., uses hǝnne exclusively].’ In both texts included in this article, only the variant hǝnne appears twice. It seems to me very appropriate to carry out detailed field research on this subject in the future, if only there is an opportunity to return to Damascus. Cf. Behnstedt (1997: map 257).

9 The plural is borrowed from Standard Arabic ʔumūr ‘affairs’; Damascene Arabic ʔmūr. Cf. ʔumūr ‘asunto, tema’ (Berlinches 2016: 439).

10 bǝtdarrǝson > bǝddarrǝson '[the church] teaches them.'
1. Tomorrow is Palm Sunday. We must go to church. The mass in the church is beautiful.
2. Today, we have to make ready everything from food to cleaning the house. That means everything. The house must be perfect.
3. All the things to eat must be brought because tomorrow is a holiday. All people are in churches.
4. They go to visit each other or maybe we will go to a restaurant where we have lunch.
5. The holiday is 17th April, Palm Sunday. The weather is also very beautiful. It is Sunday. The weather is very beautiful.
6. We have prepared everything. We have prepared the clothes. We have prepared the food. We have cleaned the house. We have made ready everything that is necessary for this holiday.
7. This is because, after that, all the holidays are also around this whole week after Palm Sunday.
8. They are Christian holidays, that is, for Christians. Christians celebrate the most during these holidays.
9. It became Sunday, the 17th of April. We got up in the morning. We ate breakfast. We washed ourselves. We dressed our new clothes.
10. And now we have to go to church first because the church is very beautiful. There will be many children.
11. There will be a lot of children in it. And all (children) hold a candle and celebrate on that occasion. This (holiday) is Palm Sunday, they call it that.
12. Around ten o'clock, we left home. We went to church. The mass began. There were a lot of people in the church.
13. There were also very young children in the church. There outside filled the churchyard.
14. All the people were holding these phones, these mobile phones. There is a camera in them and they are taking pictures.
of their children. 15. Every small child, for example, one year, two years old, that is, up to a maximum of three years old, has a candle. (The child) likes to hold it, a candle. 16. We spent two hours in the church. Two hours and a little bit until around 12 o’clock, until the mass is over. Immediately at nine o’clock mass began. 17. They went out. We went out, after the mass was over, to the churchyard. They were having a sort of small party. 18. There were scouts and they were drumming a little. And priests with children with candles were walking around. 19. There were even orphans in the church. They were, because the church makes a provision for their affairs. It teaches them. They feed them. They dress them. 20. There was a very large number of these children in the church. These children also held a candle. 21. With them, every one of them, there was a nanny or—it means, as they say—she is a servant to them, or somehow so.

22. At around twelve o’clock, after we attended mass and saw the scouts, it was over. Everyone went to his home. 23. After people have gone to their homes. People went to their homes. People went to a restaurant to have lunch. People went to their relatives, to visit each other, to have dinner together perhaps. 24. We had a very beautiful day. As for me, I came home because I made the food at home. 25. I do not like eating lunch outside the house. I came home. I ate dinner at home. We enjoyed it very much and the day was very beautiful. We ate dinner. 26. Somehow or other, we rested a little at home because we were tired. Of course, we could not sit in the church because of many people. 27. In the evening, we may have gone for such a small walk. We visited relatives and friends on that occasion. 28. That is how the day ended. I mean, naturally, this whole week is a holiday.

29. After Palm Sunday we have Maundy Thursday. After three or four days, it is Maundy Thursday. 30. Good Friday, Easter, Easter Saturday, Easter Monday—these are all holidays. 31. And all the people are celebrating during them. That is, these days. And the day was very beautiful.

Text 2: rfiʔti ‘My friend’

1. ţtaslet⁴ ʕiyyi mbårēḥ rfiʔti | w-ʔāl-at-li ḡāzi la-ʕanda ṭaḍdi n-nhår | ṭanâ w-hiyye mā ʕanda hada b-ǝl-bēt | 2. zhôza⁵ | râyeh ʕa-mašta l-ḥalu huwwa | w-ḥenta | fi sândon munåsabe | w-l-munåsabe hiyye ṭanno ʕaxū baddo yâgğawwaz¹⁶ buкра | 3. la? mû buкра yaʕnī ṭanno xîlâl ǝl-ʔøsbuf bâf’d śi ʔarbaʕ xam’s tiyyâm w-lâzem yaʕnī ʔaxû ykûn b-ǝl-ʕør’s |

⁴ < ţtaslet ‘she called [me].’
⁵ Here pronounced with ḡ instead of ź.
⁶ yodžawwaz/yøtɡawwaz > yâgğawwaz ‘he gets married.’ In this case, I leave the original pronunciation with the consonant ḡ.
4. \(\text{فَاتَّشَلَ فِي يَّ بَن ُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | | 5. \(\text{أَلْلَوْلَيْنُ ِبِكَٰنُ بِنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | 7. \(\text{وَهَلِينَ ُلْرُهُبُحُ ِبِنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | 8. \(\text{الْحَيْكَ ُلْرُهُبُحُ ِبِنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ}
\)

9. \(\text{تَرَحِيمَ ٌتَحْرِيمَ ٌتَحْرِيمَ}
\) | 10. \(\text{الْحَيْكَ ُلْرُهُبُحُ ِبِنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ}
\)

11. \(\text{نُبُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | 12. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

13. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | 14. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

15. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\) | 16. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

17. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

18. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

19. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

20. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)

21. \(\text{مَا ِبُنُوْلَا َيَّنًَو ُرُّيْنُ َالْحَيْكَ ُلْرَيِّسْ َسُرُّ}
\)
25. [s...] ?ammanna sayyāraštīna [s...]

26. Here pronounced with a vowel i as siyyāra ‘car.’ It is a phonetic realisation, perhaps resulting from the rapid pronunciation of a word and a consonant environment with a semivowel y. A little further, the word is pronounced as sayyāra.

27. Here pronounced with a vowel i as siyyāra ‘car.’

28. Mashta al-Helu (Mašta l-Ḥelu) it is a town situated in north-western Syria, belonging to the Tartus Governorate. Because of its mountain location, it is a popular tourist destination. The town is inhabited mainly by Christians.

29. The speaker tries to explain herself here from the word bukra she used, which dictionary means ‘tomorrow.’ However, the expression of time with this word is too inaccurate and means more like ‘in the near future,’ ‘for days,’ ‘soon,’ but it certainly does not refer to ‘tomorrow.’
I went to her. I like this friend. I mean, she has been my friend for more than ten years. She and I were very much friends, I mean, more than siblings.

I went to her. I spent the day at her place. Of course, she and I sat for a while. We had fun. Her husband left very early in the morning. He and (her) daughter went. They went to the wedding. I mean, the wedding is on Friday. We, this conversation was on Tuesday, Wednesday. We spent. I spent a very beautiful day with her. And I slept at her place. On the second day in the morning, I mean, I came home with her. I brought her with me to her family. Her family lives here in front of us, I mean, in front of our house. We sat, me and her. We were happy. I mean, there was nothing very entertaining. She was really sick. But terrible! I helped her a little (because) she wanted to stand on the toilet. For example, she wanted to eat. (I helped her) because she could not. Her husband has served her. He and his daughter. But they had to, they had an obligation, because there is a wedding and they had to be at the wedding. She called and apologised to the bride that she could not and was ill. And that she has many problems. Her husband called when they got to Mashta al-Helu. He greeted us and calmed down about his wife that how she is doing, what she is doing and ... And he is now going for something. Whether I came to her or not. They, their house, is a bit far away, in Jdeidat Artouz.

We laughed. Yes, he talked to us, I mean, we were happy and we told him that, thank God, everything is fine, and so on. Of course, she and I sat, we enjoyed watching a little TV, we remembered a little. Then we were telling a story from the old days, where we were going, where we were coming. What we do, who I help, for example, when, what, where we go. And we were telling a very beautiful story and it (that story) was when she and I went to Beirut. One day we decided the day before that we would go to Beirut tomorrow. She said to me, ‘Are you going?’ I said to her, ‘I am going!’ The next day we went. We provided us with a car. Naturally a private car. It means, it took us. No, I mean we did not need something else, like a bigger car. Then we brought the story that we enjoyed it and what we visited afterwards. We watched some television. We ate dinner, we cooked together. Well, we were happy. We passed the night awake. It came to my mind that we would only drink beer at her place. But I did not drink, I mean, oh, she told me, ‘Drink!’ I said to her, ‘I do not drink.’ Why, actually, because I do not drink alone. If she drank with me, yes. And that is how we enjoyed it. We spent a very beautiful night, her and me. We went to sleep around four o’clock at dawn. The house is very nice, big. There is a garden and a balcony, which means it is suitable for a party. It is in an area like a village.

Jdeidat Artouz (Ždaydet ŠArťüz) is a town situated in southern Syria, about 20 km west of Damascus, belonging to the Rif Dimashq Governorate. Druze, Christians, and Sunni Muslims inhabit the town.
31. The next morning, we got up. We ate breakfast. We put on our clothes and washed ourselves. And we arrived, me and her to Bab Tuma. She went to her family, and I am visiting my family's house. 32. It was a very nice day. Our memories were very beautiful.

3 Remarks

The following types of assimilation appear in the texts:

a. left-to-right (progressive):

| nl > nn | ?əlnā-lo > ?ənnā-lo ‘we told him,’ |
| ūr > šš | ʕašr ʔsnīn > ʕašš ʔsnīn ‘ten years’ |

b. right-to-left (regressive):

| nr > rr | nrūḥ > rrūḥ ‘we go,’ |
| dt > tt | sāʕadta > sāʕatta ‘I helped her,’ |
| td > dd | baddarrason > baddarrason ‘[the church] teaches them,’ |
| tū (dž) > ğğ | yadžawwaz > yægβawwaz ‘he gets married.’ |
| tz > dz | bətdarrǝson > bəddarrǝson ‘[the church] teaches them,’ |
| ʔʕ > ʕʕ | nəʔʕod > naʔʕod (nəʕʔod) ‘we sit.’ |

Only one example of external sandhi occurs in both texts and concerns a word ending in ḥ (rāḥ ‘he went’) and a word beginning in ʕ (ʕala ‘to’): rāḥ ʕala … > rāʕ ʕala … ‘he went to …’

The issue of pronunciation of the preposition/pseudoverb ʕand seems interesting, which I did not pay so much attention to before. The informant pronounces this word once as ʕand (ʕand, ʕanda, ʕandon, la-ʕand, la-ʕanda) and another time as ʕǝnd (ʕǝnda, ʕǝnna, ʕǝndon).

There are also diphthongs which appear either in monosyllable words or borrowed from standard language:

a. a diphthong aw:

| ?aw ‘or,’ |
| law ‘if,’ |
| nawʕan-ma ‘somehow or other.’ |

b. a diphthong ay [ey]:

| ždaydet ʕarṭūz ‘Jdeidat Artouz,’ |
| ʔaytām ‘orphans.’ |
Three forms of plurals are worthy of note which retain a prefix ʔa-: ʔaʕyād ‘feasts,’ ʔatfāl ‘children’ and ʔaytām ‘orphans,’ instead of expected plurals such as: ʕyād, tfāl, and ʔītām. Plurals such as ʔaʕyād and ʔatfāl are also included by Berlinches (2016: 467, 471) in her grammar.

Words borrowed from Standard Arabic may retain vowels u or i in the first syllable: munāsabe ‘occasion,’ murabbīyye ‘nanny, nursemaid,’ xuṣūsan ‘especially’ and xilāl ‘during.’ The consonant q is also pronounced in borrowings: qarrarna ‘we decided,’ ʔaqāreb ‘relatives’ and ʔaẓdiqāʔ (< OA ʔaṣdiqāʔ) ‘friends.’
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Bags, Liquorice and Traditional Cereal Products: Three Texts in the Arabic Dialect of the Harran-Urfa Region of Southeastern Turkey

**Abstract** The three texts presented in this article were recorded in the Turkish city of Şanlıurfa and reflect an Arabic minority variety that belongs to the so-called Shawi dialects. Due to its isolation from other Arabic dialects, this variety has retained many features typical of the Bedouin-type dialects of the Syrian Desert and North Arabia (e.g. the consistent use of the dialectal tanwīn). Text 1 explains the different kinds of bags that are used for wheat, cotton, etc. Text 2 is about the production of a liquorice drink which is especially popular during Ramadan. Text 3 is a rather long description of how, in former times, the women of the region prepared various kinds of crushed wheat (bulgur) and how traditional bread is baked.

**Keywords** Arabic dialectology, Bedouin-type, field research, Harran-Urfa Region, Şanlıurfa, Shawi dialects, Southeastern Turkey

**1 Introduction**

The term ‘Shawi-Arabic’ refers to a bundle of closely related dialects spoken in various regions of the Fertile Crescent. Typologically similar dialects are found in many rural parts of Iraq, which is why the Shawi and the rural Iraqi gilit-type dialects are often grouped together as ‘Syro-Mesopotamian (fringe) dialects’ or pre-ʕAnazi⁴

---

⁴ This label indicates that the Shawi tribes entered the region before the large camel-breeding tribes like the ʕAnaza (and Šammar).
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dialects (Fischer and Jastrow 1980: 24; Palva 2006: 606). The presence of an Arabic-speaking community in what is today the Turkish province of Şanlıurfa may go back to the 11th century or even earlier (Oppenheim 1939: 226 f.). The semi-nomadic sheep and goat herders elsewhere called Shawi² have been present for centuries in the Plain of Harran, south of Urfa, between the city and the Syrian border. Today, these Anatolian Shawi dialects are spoken in Urfa itself, in the historical town of Harran, and in numerous small villages scattered over the plain. Due to the lack of official statistics, the number of Arabic speakers in that region can be only roughly estimated to be between 200,000 and 300,000 people. For almost a century—since the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923—this Arab minority has been rather isolated from other Arabic speakers because the border to Syria was difficult to cross for ordinary people. Since Turkish is the only language of education and media used in the region, for decades the Shawi dialects here have been virtually isolated from any influence of Modern Standard Arabic. Because of this linguistic isolation, several linguistic changes that have recently been observed in the Bedouin-type dialects of Syria and the Gulf have not taken place in Harran-Urfa Arabic.

2 Grammatical notes

In the following, several characteristics of Harran-Urfa Bedouin Arabic will be briefly described. Only features that are present in the texts are discussed: the examples are referred to by section number.

Phonology

- The Old Arabic diphthongs have been monophthongised: ay > ē (xēṭ ‘cord’), aw > ō (fōg ‘above’).
- Word-final -a# tends to be raised, particularly in non-emphatic, non-guttural contexts: e.g. ʕalīǧe ‘sack,’ but ḥunṭa ‘wheat’ (1.1). There seem to be, however, other factors involved because the pronominal suffixes 3FSG and 1PL occur both as -ha and -he: e.g. xām-ha ‘its cloth’ (1.4) vs. nsammī-he ‘we call it’ (1.1), and -na and -ne: bēnāt-na ‘among us’ vs. ʔīdēn-ne ‘our hands’ (2.9).
- The interdentals ṭ, ḏ and ḥ are generally retained in all positions.

² The term Shawi is an exonym used for sheep and goat breeders by other Arabic speakers in Syria and Iraq. In the Harran-Urfa region, people who do not belong to the community speak Turkish or Kurdish and therefore the term Shawi is not known there.
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- Old Arabic (OA) ġ has shifted to q: e.g. ītifarraq < yatafarraq ‘it opens (intr.)’ (1.8), yqassil < yuğassil ‘he washes’ (3.3), qirbāl < ġirbāl ‘sieve’ (3.24).
- g (< q) and k have been affricated in front vowel environments: e.g. ġarye [dʒɛrye] < garya ‘village’ (1.2), ywaġgīf < yuwaqqīf ‘it removes’ (2.7); but guṭn < quṭn ‘cotton’ (1.6). The affricated g has completely merged with original ġ that has been retained as an affricate (e.g. ġurn ‘stone basin’). Examples for k > č: čibīre < *kibīra ‘big’ (1.5). In wuruč ‘side’ (1.8), the vowel shift to u (OA wīrk ~ warīk ‘hip’) under the influence of the initial w has apparently happened after the shift k > č.
- The dialect exhibits the so-called gahawa syndrome: e.g. in elatives ?ahala < ?ahlā ‘better’ (2.8), and in the imperfective verbs of Form I: yʕazil < OA yaʕzil ‘it separates’ (3.24), yqadi < OA yaġdī ‘to become’ (3.37), ?axbiz < ?axbiz ‘I bake’ (3.44).

Morphology

- Gender distinction is consistently made in the 2nd and 3rd persons of verbs and pronouns. The suffix 3FPL is subject to a kind of vowel harmony: b-gaḷəb-hin ‘inside them’ (3.11), but nṣuff-hun ‘we put them in rows’ (3.10).
- The numeral ‘100’ is usually ?imye (1.3/1.6).
- Conjunctions: ʕaman + pronominal suffix ‘because’ (2.10/3.5), ʕugub-ma ‘after’ (3.17), čan + pronominal suffix ‘if’ (3.46).
- Compound prepositions: b-gaḷb ‘inside,’ e.g. b-gaḷb al-ḥunṭa ‘inside the wheat’ (3.7); ‘b-sāgit ‘together with’ (3.28).
- The existential particle is šī (3.7/3.19), NEG māmiš or māmin.³

Syntax

- The dialectal tanwīn is consistently used as a nominal linker between indefinite nominal heads and adjectival attributes, e.g. ʕirǧ-in qalīḏ ‘a thick root’ (2.1). The tanwīn is also used for linking two identical nouns to express repetition, e.g. nṣīl-hin ġidir-in ġidir ‘we pull(ed) it up pot by pot’ (3.13), nimli w-ŋfarraq w-ŋdall ġurn-un ġurun ndugg ‘We fill and empty it and thrash (the wheat) basin by basin’ (3.21). Another of its functions is to link indefinite heads with a following relative clause, as in šīla maṭraḥ-in ndugg-u ‘to a place where we thresh it’ (3.19) and nahār-in šī hawa ‘the day there is wind’ (3.24).
- The feminine ending -t is retained in (1) definite attributive phrases and (2) in the heads of relative clauses:⁴ al-ḥunṭit al-ġidīde ‘the new wheat’ (3.47), ?arīd aš-šakilt

⁴ For this phenomenon, cf. also Procházka (2021) and Retsö (2009: 21–22).
Plural heads that do not denote humans usually exhibit agreement with feminine plural: e.g. haḏannīč yiṣnaʕūn-hin yxayyṭūn-hin ʕala baʕaḏ̣-hin ‘they produce and sew them (viz. the sacks) up together’ (1.5), ‘nhuţţ-hun ʕa-l-ɦaɣar ‘we put them (viz. the cauldrons) on stones’ (3.10).

3 Lexical notes

Here, only lexemes found in the texts are explained; for an overview of the most important lexical features of Harran-Urfa Arabic, see Procházka (2014).

- To express ‘in the language X,’ the preposition b- plus the ethnonym is used: e.g. b-at-turuk ‘in Turkish’ (2.1); b-al-ʕarab ‘in Arabic.’
- šuše PL šuwaš ‘bottle’ (2.9) is a loan from the local Turkish dialect word šiše (vs. Standard Turkish şişe).
- The noun fāl ‘time’ is typical for this and some other Shawi dialects, e.g. awwal fāl ‘first time’ (3.1).
- The noun gāʕ ‘land’ (3.2) is feminine and has replaced ʔar缬 in this meaning. The latter is used only in the sense of ‘place.’
- For ‘roof,’ the compound noun fōg ad-dār is used (3.9).
- Adverbs: b-sāʕ < *bi-sāʕatihi ‘immediately’ (3.17), guṭma ‘a little’ < OA qaṭma ‘piece’ (3.45).
- As can be seen from Text 3, the word ʕēš < ʕayš ‘life’ is used for bulgur, which has long been the staple food in the region (cf. Egyptian and Khuzestan Arabic ʕēš ‘bread,’ Gulf Arabic ʕēš ‘rice’).
- Sometimes the meaning of the Turkish equivalent influences the semantic range of Arabic words. Because the Turkish verb sürmek means both ‘to drive’ and ‘to last,’ the Arabic verb sāg is also used in both meanings, though only the first is attested in other Arabic varieties: ysūg-illu nahārēn ṯalāṯ w-yibas ‘It takes only two or three days until it dries.’ (3.17).
- Under the influence of Turkish, light verb constructions can sometimes be found, particularly with Turkish loans as the nominal element: ɦazəm ysāwi ‘it digests’ (2.6)<sup>5</sup>; ṭaxallī ysāwi dinlenne ‘I let it rest’ (3.43).

---

<sup>5</sup> The noun ɦazəm is used here in the word’s Turkish meaning ‘digestion’ (hazım).
4 Texts

The transcription is mostly morpho-phonemic with some exceptions: the glottal stop /ʔ/ is indicated after a pause or between two vowels if clearly articulated; and the allophone [a] of the phoneme /i/ is consistently noted.

Epenthetic vowels inside the word are not specially marked as such; but the epenthetic vowel at the beginning of a word (and also after the definite article) is indicated by a superscript ə.

Text 1: Bags and sacks

The recording was made in Urfa on 7 May 2010. The speaker is the second author of this article, Ismail Batan. He was born in a poor neighbourhood on the edge of the city in 1969. He belongs to the Bani ʕIǧil tribe and his family is originally from the village of Qōran (Turkish Uzunyol), situated 9 km southwest of Ḥarrān. The speaker is fluent in Turkish, but has only a basic education. Because for a while he worked as a truck driver to neighbouring Arab countries, he is somewhat familiar with Iraqi and Syrian dialects and sometimes uses forms he learned there (e.g. miye instead of the local ʔimye ‘100’; see below 1.3).

1. ʔiḥna hēne, ʔal-ʕalīǧe⁶ ta-ngūl, ʔal-ḥunṭa wēya ʔaš-šiʕīr wēya⁷ kull šakle nḥuṭṭ-u b-al… ʔat-tōrba nsammī-he, tōrba, ćwāl ta-ngul-il-he bi-de⁸ ngul-l-he ʕalīǧe. 2. riḥit Šala xālt-i Ša-g-garye w čān tiņti-ni ʕalīǧiḥt ḥunṭa, ʕalīǧe. Sind wurč al-ʕarab, duwal al-ʕarab, ʔal-ʕIrāg as-Sūrīye ygūlūn kīse. ʔiḥna nsammī-he ʕalīǧe. 3. ʔasgar min ʕalīǧe ngul-l-he pōšēte, pōšēt, pōšēt xubuz, ṭakbar m-al-pōšēte ʕalīǧe, ʔakbar m-al-ʕalīǧe ngul-l-he farde,⁹ farde, farde, farde, ḥunṭa. ʔal-farde fōg al-miymît kīlo, fōg al-miye, min ʷtfūt al-imye, ʷnsammī-he ʷawwali b-al-ʕaṣra ṭanīḥt ʕanātī,¹⁰ yswawwūn-he min šaʕr al-maʕaz. 4. m-aš-šaʕar yswawwūn al-fardāt al-fa… ʔal-awwallyāt al-awwalliyin alḥaz gāmat. ḥadīć ʷnsammī-he farde. yaʃī ḥitt xām-ha m-aš-šaʕar al-ma… al-ʕaniz miṭil as-šaʕar, yaʃīn t-turki ygūl keči klīndan. 5. miṭil bēt aš-šaʕar ḥadānnīc yiʃnaʃūn-hin yxawyṭṭ-hin Ša ʔal-ʕaʃq-hin w ċibīre hiyye ssīr, ʷnsammī-he farde, farde. 6. w-al-guṭu, ʔal-guṭu al yḥuṭṭūn-u bi-…

---

⁶ This term is derived from the root ʕ-l-q ‘to hang’; it is also attested in other Shawi dialects (Lentin 2013: 165). Cf. also Iraqi Arabic ʕillāgā ‘basket’ (Woodhead and Beene 1967: 320).
⁷ Turkish veya ‘or.’
⁸ Local Turkish for bir de ‘also.’
⁹ Cf. Iraqi farda ‘heavy cloth sack usually used as a packsaddle on beasts of burden’ (Woodhead and Beene 1967: 348).
¹⁰ Plural of ḥunṭa in the sense of ‘kinds of wheat, kinds of cereals.’


1. Here, let’s say, we have the sack and we put wheat, barley and everything (like this) in it. We call it **ṭōrba**,¹⁴ sack; and we also call it **ʃaliجة**. 2. (In the past) I went to my aunt in the village and she used to give me a sack of wheat, a **ʃaliجة**. With the Arabs, in the Arab countries, in Iraq and in Syria, they say **kīse**. We call it **ʃaliجة**. 3. [SP When it is smaller than a **ʃaliجة**?] When it is smaller than a **ʃaliجة**, we call it **pōʃēte** or **pōʃet**, like a bag of bread. A **ʃaliجة** is bigger than a **pōʃēte**, and what is bigger than a **ʃaliجة** we call **farde**, large sack, like a sack of wheat. The **farde** contains more than 100 kilos, more than 100. When it exceeds 100, we call it like this. Formerly, they sold different kinds of wheat in it at the corn exchange. They used to make it from goat hair. 4. The people in former times made the large sacks from hair and these we call **farde**. Even their cloth is made of goat hair, like the hair. The Turks say it’s from keçi kilt. 5. They (i.e. the big sacks) are like the black tents: they produce and sew them up together. And they become big. We call them **farde**. 6. As for the cotton, we put the cotton in things we call **bandağ**, a sack of cotton which also contains 100 kilos. When it is for cotton, we do not call it **ʃaliجة** or **farde** or **kīse**, we call it **bandağ**, a sack for cotton. 7. There is a production for it. They grow it and it comes from China and Bangladesh. From Bangladesh it comes in panels (lit. in metres) and here they cut it into size. Its length is 160 cm, 160 cm, and then they sew up its side. 8. They leave one side open; this side is later sewed up with a cotton string. They fill it with cotton and we call it a sack of cotton. When the cotton and its seeds are brought to the factory, they tear the cord from the sides and from above and open it like this. The sack of cotton opens immediately.

9. Many types of sacks have come up: the sack of cotton, the bag, the middle-sized

---

¹¹ The word **hnīye** ‘thing’ is used as a substitute for any noun which does not come to the mind of the speaker at the moment (like thingamabob, thingummy etc.). There is also a verb **yiḥnī** that is often attested in the texts.

¹² This word is a loan from the local Turkish dialect: **bendek** ‘large sack’ (*Türkiye’de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü* 1963: 626).

¹³ Turkish **kenar** ‘margin, side.’

¹⁴ The word **ṭōrba** is a loan from Turkish **torba** ‘sack, bag.’
sack, the (normal) sack, the large sack. We call them sacks. The small one is called pöšete. The Iraqi Arabs say ʔillāga. They say ʔillāga: we (also) say kīse to the čwāla. We call it pöšete, which is actually a Turkish word; it's not Arabic.¹⁵

Text 2: Liquorice

This text was recorded the same day from the same speaker as Text 1.

1. hāda ʔiḥna nsammī ʔirg as-sūs, ʕala... ʔirg as-sūs – ʔirg as-sūs – ʔirg as-sūs, hāda ṭas-sūs yḥafrūn-u m-al-asfal, min ʔirg-u yiṭluʕūn-u w b-al-makīne yi-yi... ykasrūn-u miṭil ta-ngūl press gīb.¹⁶ hāda ʔaslando¹⁷ ʔirg-in qalīq w b-at-turuk insammī ʔiḥna ṭeḥne ygūl-l-u yambali, yambali.¹⁸ 2. ʔiḥna ʕa-l-ʔirg as-sūs nāxūd hāda kilōw hāda kilō ʔirg as-sūs, kilōw, ṭarbaʕ līrāt al-kilōw, insawwi bī ʔiḥna ʕasǝr marrāt hemen hemen, mayy as-sūs ʕasǝr marrāt b-al-bēt. 3. al-muqrīb b-irmaqādān miyyit ṭrām ʔirg as-sūs ?ā... yṣīr – ʕAyše, uskuti bāba,¹⁹ ʕAyše uskuti! ʕAyše uskuti, uḡṣudi, uḡṣudi, Ḥalīme zād uḡṣudi!

4. b-irmaqādān miyyit ṭrām yhuṭṭūn-u b-al-maṭūbiyye w-yhuṭṭūn ʕalē ṭaliq, ṭāsit būz²⁰ onsammī būz, yhuṭṭūn al-būz fōg as-sūs, yḍall ymāʕ ymāʕ fōgu, fōg hāda ymāʕ al-būz t-al-maqrīb. 5. lummun-ma yiṣīr al-būz ymāʕ min fōg-u, w-insaffī b-as-süzgāǧe, inṣaffī, w-inḥuṭṭ ʕalē ʕādīnḍān miyyit ġrām ʔal-yumawwiʕ al-būz, ymawwiʕ al-būz l-al-maġrib. 6. ʕugub-ma nṣaffī b-as-süzgāǧe niṣrāb-u ʔa-l-maqrīb inḥuṭṭ ʕalē wuxra būz, – ʕAyše, uskuti ʔaḥay! – b-al-maqrīb niṣrāb-u b-irmaqādān, hāda, ʕugub... baḏīn-ma niṯfar yōmn niṣrāb-u ymawwiʕ al-aččil, yaʕnī ʔażem²¹ yṣāwī. 7. w miššān ač-člē, ač-člē, al-bōbrek yaʕnī, al-ḥaǧār²² b-ač-člē ywaǧǧiʕ al-ḥaǧār, ywaǧǧiʕ al-ḥaǧār, ymawwiʕ al-ḥaǧār al-mayyt as-sūs hāḍi, w-šifāt-he čiṯīre yaʕnī, iš-ma tʕidd mā txalas. 8. Urfa kull-u b-irmaqādān yṣīr hāda ymawwiʕ al-aččil, yaʕnī ʔaẓem yṣāwī. 9. w b-at-turuk zād ysammi-l-u yambali. 9. b-as-sūg yḥaḍdrūn-he ybiʕūn-he b-as-sūwaš, ḥaqre. bāsaq, bāsaq maʃmālčiyye b-al-bēt yhuṭṭ-l-u, hičiq ysamwi dabaw-in čibīr yhuṭṭ ʔasǝr kilawāt min hal-mayy as-sūs, msawwi ybiʕ min-he, yaʕnī maʃaʕ xubuz, ʔiḥna, ʔiṭnī... ¹⁵ He is right insofar as the Arabs of Urfa have taken it from the Turkish word poşet, which in turn is a loan from the French pochette.
¹⁶ Turkish postposition gīb ‘like.’
¹⁷ Turkish aslīnda ‘actually.’
¹⁸ In standard Turkish it is called meyan kōkū.
¹⁹ He addresses his daughter by calling her ‘daddy’; this is very common.
²⁰ Turkish buz ‘ice.’
²¹ See ‘Lexical notes.’
²² Usually the word is pronounced ḥāra.
This we call liquorice, liquorice – liquorice. They dig this root from beneath (the ground). They get it from (the plant’s) root and then they grind it with a gadget, something like, let’s say, a press. Actually, it is a thick root; in Turkish we call it... here they say yambalı. 2. We buy one kilo of liquorice. From this one kilo of liquorice, which costs four lira, we can make a liquorice drink about ten times, ten times (we can make it) at home. 3. In Ramadan, at sunset, (we take) one hundred grams of liquorice and it becomes... Aicha, shut up, Aicha, shut up! Shut up, Aicha, and sit down! Halime, sit down too! 4. In Ramadan they take a hundred grams, put it on a tray and put ice on it; a cup of ice. We call it buz (in Turkish). They put the ice on the root and it slowly melts on it; the ice melts on it until sunset. 5. When the ice has melted upon it, we drain it through a strainer and, according to its thickness, put a little bit of water on it and it becomes syrup. We add another half litre of water, pour it on it, and it becomes one litre and a half. Out of hundred grams (of root) one litre and a half (of syrup). 6. After we have drained it through a strainer, we again put ice on it and drink it at sunset. – Aicha, shut up! – In Ramadan we drink it at sunset. When we drink it after breaking the fast, it softens the food, it (helps) digest it. 7. It’s (also good) for the kidneys, the kidneys, kidney stones; it removes nephroliths. The liquorice syrup removes the stone: it makes the stone melt. It’s a cure for many things; many things are cured by it—as many as you list; you could not finish (listing all its cures). 8. The whole of Urfa drinks liquorice syrup; we don’t drink Pepsi Cola. Never! We regard liquorice syrup better than Pepsi; we like it more. In Turkish they call it yambalı. 9. At the market they prepare it and sell it in bottles, readymade. Some people, who know it well, take large amounts (home), ten kilos of liquorice, make (syrup) and sell it, just to make some extra money. We do not buy it from the market; we make it at home with our own hands. 10. We prepare it at home. It’s better to do it with your own hands, so we can see with our own eyes what is in it. Actually, we Arabs (have reservations against) everything... even for Pepsi Cola. Because I don’t see how they make it, I do not like it. 11. I want to see with my own eyes how things I drink and eat are prepared. Therefore I like that we do it ourselves. Enjoy it! – Thank you! – You’re welcome.

23 Literally: it makes the food melt.
24 Literally: income for bread.
Text 3: All around the wheat: on bread and different types of bulgur

The recording was made in Urfa on 23 November 2014. The speaker is Amīna who was born 1974 in the town of Tall Abyaḏ (Turkish Akçakale) on the border of Syria. She also belongs to the Bani ʕIǧil tribe. Amīna finished eight years of primary school and is fluent in Turkish.

26 Used in Iraqi Arabic in the more restricted sense of ‘to use for the first time’ (Woodhead and Beene 1967: 158).
27 In Harran-Urfa Arabic, čōl < Turkish čöl ‘steppe,’ means ‘open land’ and even ‘outside.’
28 Cf. Lane (1863: 1749): ṣawwala ‘to extract a thing by means of water; to soak a thing to extract the juice or bitterness.’
29 Turkish gevešk ‘soft, elastic.’
30 Turkish yabancı ‘strange(r).’
31 The form burqul suggest an origin in the local Turkish burğul rather than Standard Turkish bulgur.
32 Cf. Mayadin (E Syria) geşš ‘whole straw’ (Lentin 2013: 166).
33 Derived from the root s-l-g < s-l-q ‘to boil.’
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32. yaśni nsaw-i-hin şest şestam. tayı-al-uxra šabbi b-al-falayiş, hudâl aç-çeke w-hudâa ta-ngûl a-al-
şeş, ʃal-burqul hudâa l-al-burqul w- aş-şersêrit at tu-luşûf yünţi-he l-al-şalâl. 33. haçiçek an-
nuwaşaţim at tu-luşûf, ʃaş-şersêra yûlû-l-he, haçiçek an-nâşme nişti-he l-al-şalâl yaşni, ŋe
hnûye yaşni mişsân a-al-şîl. tâ hûye w-ğûwâş-he w-balâ-ha w-qâdâb-ha w-balâ-ha kull-ล
l-al-şalâl hudâa. 34. şâha, w-tuľulş al-şunûta haçiçek şad al-şunûta ʃal... ad daggêna-ha b-ağ-
ğûrun al wâhâd-he yaşni ʃal-şunûta al mi maţûbûxâ. 35. haçi zâd ʃngûl xaye ta raşal-
şaţîşe hûdî basş nsawî şaţîşe, şal-şâlîşe haçiçek şad zâd tara hî şirî, şirî şunûta ngûl-il-he
haçiçek zâd şteţ-ha wâhâd-he w-tuľruş-he. 36. haçi zâd mişsân al-baştîrma w-al-kbab,
şôg-he şad şa-l-bêt zâd tu-nxul-la ŋumm-i, w-shabbi-he b-shalîŞe, hûdî şsîl mişsân al-
burqul. 37. haçi zâd burqul ᵇhâmab abû-y yiştâhî mâ-şawî ta-ngûl wişaî mişde şeş
al-burqul yqadî zîn, mâm-yûgî şîlî-şîde. 38. şaman şa-l-fûd şayîr aç-çege b-sâş tisîwâi,
şaman-he şa-l-fûd şâyîr mû mişîl al-şahîr, qişmitel yaşni. 39. şaş-şirî şîdîne baştîrmaţ-he
zîd şşîr zînne w-kbâbê-ha şşîr zînne, hûdî, w-al-şîzâma şad l-al-xubuz, haçiçek zâd ta-ngûl
b-al-bêt şala şodar al-Şele. 40. yaşni al-yâm. ʃrîd ʃnûrî niştân, nxûdîn-ne şaţîşe
w-şnûrî niştân-he şa-ʃ-şâmîne yîştânîn-ne w-yûbîn-ne. 41. şuğub-ma yişbîn-he ta-ngûl
nuş-şâ-şarîd axabîz-ha ŋânî ʃarûd-he b-şîm-ha b-şîm, nxûs-ha w-ałuţ şalê-ha ništân. 42.
malât ʃhâfîn-i şala hûnt-ha şala qwâm-ha hûye ʃaşqîn-he ʃaşqîn-he zîn, lumnun şawî şêmî-
ţîdha al-şalîq-ha w-şalîq-ha al-şalîq-ha. 43. ʃaş-şâş yîstâwî yîrd hêl yîrd taʃab,
lumnun yîstâwî ʃaxalî şawî dinlênme, ʃaşqîr şag-i ʃaşqîr... şahnîn-i w... ʃâha, w-aqîb-nîr-i kûl ʃakîl-hin.
44. yaşni ʃaşqîr-he, w-aqâm şad axabîz, axabîz şqall şasîtî şad al-şawîz awwal fîl asawî yûmâq. 39 aha,
w-aqîb şahnî adarîr ʃalê ʃat-ʃahîn w-aʃawîz. 45. w-şgênt-ha şad axallı ʃûntîni mi-şat-şahîn
w-şsa-şag ânî ʃaşqîl asawî w-hûda şad şesîl-ha ta-ngûl şala şodar al-bêt. 46. cîn-ni
msawîye al-şîm-lan hudâa yûzînt40 hemen hemen fîg aş-şahrên, ʃal-şîm, nxûs-şalîğe
âni tîştîni şahrên şaman-ne niştari m-al-fîrîn hâmî. 47. w-alhaz şad al-şunûtî al-şîdîde
ʃalhaz mä ʃall hada ybarqîl. kull-an-nas trûh tiştari l-şûntî haçiçek al ʃîd heş yîştari şeş.
48. ʃar-şarîd yâxuʃ b-al-şarîd, ar-şarîd yâxuʃ b-şusîl-yat şad si yinbût, ahl al-ghoşîe
zad şayîn alhaz mitmaddînî 41 şayîn-ma şad hada ybarqîl. 49. mä şad hada ydugg, mä
şad hadanîc kull-hin yiñîn, ân-nas alhaz ʃtrûh hemen fêşin tiştari Şalîșît burqul
w-şalîşît şege. 50. şahaw Şalîşît hitt şahîn-he şad haçiçek al-şahîn yûlûn ʃlan marqa zên
yrûhîn yûbîn-ma ʃallat at-şmûwîn. 51. ʃawîl b-al-şawîl an-nas gâmat ʃgûb, ʃal-
arwâlîn yaşni barakt al-arwâlîn râhat an-nas gâmat awwal b-al-şawîl ʃgûb. 52. šamâ l-šarîm zîd mişsân ʃarâtîlîq Şal-šarîm, ʃal-šarîm zîd râhat mû mişîl awwal
w-at-şab zîd zên yaşni.

39 The verb yâzi ‘to be enough (for)’ is very typical, cf. Procházka (2014: 345).
40 The verb yâzi ‘to be enough (for)’ is very typical, cf. Procházka (2014: 345).
41 Cf. Turkish medeniyet ‘civilisation.’
42 Turkish rahatlîk ‘convenience.’
1. How do you make the bread?—Look, for the bread we first bring, let’s say ... Should I talk about the past or about today? (2x) I will talk about the past; the past and also the present. First, let us start with the past. 2. In former times, let’s say in my family—I will talk about my family—we used to bring four, five sacks. We bought wheat, we buy the wheat. The one who owns land has wheat anyway from the fields; 3. the one who hasn’t land stores up provisions and buys four, five sacks of wheat. Then we bring the wheat. One who wants to sift it to remove the chaff does not wash it. 4. (But) the one who also wants to soak it; the soaking means ‘washing of the wheat.’ We call it $suwal$. We soak two to three čēls of wheat. 5. The bread made of wheat that has been soaked becomes soft because it has been washed (and therefore is moist). The bread made of wheat that has not been soaked becomes hard because it has not come in contact with water. 6. This (wheat), because it has been washed, becomes smooth and (likewise) the bread (made from it). My family, let’s say, soak it. We soak four, five sacks. 7. It stays in the water and the black seeds float: they come out. The name of this means there is something in it that is not part of it; it is inside the wheat. 8. Let’s say, the barley comes out, and the barn also comes out. We wash and sieve it well. We wash and sieve the whole wheat. 9. We put it on the roof and spread it in the sun; in summer we do that. When it has been dried, we take one or two čēls for the bread. And there is also one čēl for the $kbab$ (made of) fine wheat flour (called $giriš$). 10. And also for the wheat used for eating, the bulgur; bulgur for cooking and bulgur for (making) $çīge$. 11. We bring the cauldrons, the iron cauldrons. We bring, each family, about twelve cauldrons, some bring fifteen cauldrons. And we put them on stones in rows. 11. Then we fill them with the wheat that we have washed. We funnel the rinsed (wheat), pour water on it, and put it on the fire. 12. We heat it with the straw or stalks of cotton, whatever we find as heating fuel. And when the wheat is done, after it is cooked, it is called $silīǧe$. And even the neighbours come and ask for the $silīǧe$. They bring vessels and say, ‘Won’t you (F) give me $silīǧe$?’ 13. Look, in former times we had no stairs to the roof like now. We climbed onto the roof with a wooden ladder and then took a rope and a bucket and, by passing it on from one to the other, pulled it up pot by pot. 14. We pulled it up pot by pot. They (F) brought it—let’s say it was cooked there—from twenty metres they brought it here in front of the door of the house.

---

43 čēl is a local measure of capacity: 1 čēl of wheat is 184 kilos. Cf. Iraqi Arabic čēla ‘a container of no standard size used by merchants to measure out grain, etc.’ (Woodhead and Beene 1967: 88).
44 Actually, not the bread itself, but the wheat from which the bread is made is washed.
45 Literally: it has not seen water.
46 Called $kibbe$ in the Levant, $içli köfte$ in Turkish: balls made of bulgur, onions and minced meat.
47 This word comes from Turkish $çīğ köfte$ ‘raw kofta’; originally a kind of beef tartare, the local dish is usually vegetarian and made from extra fine bulgur. The region of Şanlıurfa is famous for $çīğ köfte$ which are usually served rather spicy.
48 Literally: to the mouth of the door. Reflexes of $famm$ > *$tamm$ with an initial vowel are characteristic of the Shawi dialects, see Behnstedt and Woidich (2011: map 47).
15. Let’s say one has climbed up to the roof and passes the rope over to her friend, and in the bucket we pull the *silīǧe* up to the roof. We then pull it up (when it is) still hot. And we spread it in the open air and its aroma spreads and fills the village. 16. When the wheat is cooked, it smells very nice. Yes, it really gets a (good) fragrance. Therefore the people smell it and come to ask for *silīǧe*. And we distribute some of it to secure a blessing. 17. Yes, we spread it and after it has dried… We still keep turning it over in the sun for two or three days. It’s summer and the weather is hot and so it dries immediately. It takes only two or three days until it dries. 18. After the *silīǧe* has dried, we take something from the soaked wheat. We put aside one sack of the soaked wheat, the one which we had made. It is done and dry and we take it. 19. We take this and bring it to this… to a place where we thrash it. There was a basin in former times, a basin. (They bring it) to the basin made of stone where there is also the large wooden hammer. 20. And we keep hitting it until this thing comes out, until the chaff comes off. When its chaff comes off, when it peels off the wheat, then the chaff comes off. 21. We say, ‘It’s finished!’ and start to empty this pile of chaff with our hands. And they (the hands) become like this from the chaff. We fill and empty it and thrash (the wheat) basin by basin until we have finished all this wheat—twelve cauldrons! 22. And we spread all this again (in the open air). My mother used to spread it at once—let’s say she spread it on mats, on carpets, on kilims until it again dried. 23. Then she winnowed it in the wind. She winnowed it when she saw that it was windy and then said, ‘Today I will winnow my wheat.’ 24. The day there was wind, she winnowed the wheat by standing like this. And she filled the sieve or she filled the large basin and standing in the wind, she winnowed. And the wind separated the wheat from the chaff, from the husk. *ǧuwāš* means husk. 25. Then she fills it again and when everything is fine, she spreads it again. And when it is crushed again, she wets it with water. 26. After it has dried, we throw it from the roof; and when we hit it again in the stone basin, we wet it with water so it becomes soft. 27. Yes, and then we spread it again. After we have spread it again and after it has completely dried, we fill the sacks with it. This (kind) is not cooked, the wheat that is not cooked, only washed. 28. It is also crushed for making *kbab* and *baṣṭirma*. It is crushed extra in order to be mixed with the other. 29. Then we send it to the mill which shreds the bulgur, shreds it. Let’s say we want to make (rough ground) bulgur for cooking; (they say) ‘How much bulgur do you want, sister?’—‘I also want to leave eight cauldrons to get fine ground bulgur.’ The fine bulgur needs more (wheat) than the rough ground bulgur for cooking. 30. And what comes after also becomes bulgur for cooking.

---

49 She wants to say that their hands get very dusty.
50 She fills the sieve with wheat.
51 This is a local dish made of bulgur and meat which is roasted in ghee (local Turkish *baṣtırma*). The word is thus not related to Standard Turkish *pastırma* that is a seasoned, air-dried cured beef.
woman shreds it, she makes both rough ground bulgur and fine bulgur for the čīge. 31. Yes, then we bring it home and again my mother sieves it: she divides it, she divides the wheat into the bad quality, the fine bulgur, and the more rough one, the bulgur for cooking. 32. We make three types (of bulgur). She separates them and fills sacks: this is bulgur for čīge, and this bulgur for cooking, and this bulgur for fodder that she gives to the animals. 33. These small little things which come out, they call it šrēsre; we give these tiny grains to the animals, yes, for eating. This and the chaff, all the bad things which are in it are for the animals. 34. And the (pure) wheat remains, the wheat which we have crushed in the stone basin. This alone, the uncooked wheat. 35. We say, ‘My sister, only this sack, we make only one sack; this sack is only for ğirīš.’ We call it ğirīš wheat. This we put aside and crush it. 36. This is also for baštirma and for kbab. We take it home and my mother sieves it and fills it into the sack. And she takes this out for the bulgur. 37. This is also bulgur; my late father liked it very much because it does not cause pain in the stomach. The bulgur dish is digestible and does not cause stomachache. 38. But the čīge was made only on holidays; on holidays it was made because, unlike today, it was precious. 39. The ğirīš and the baštirma which was made of it were also good; and likewise the kbab. This and also what we had separated for the bread. This (wheat) was also (kept) at home in an amount the family could afford. 40. We said, ‘Today we want to go milling: we will take one sack and let it be ground at the mill.’ They ground it and brought it (home). 41. After they had brought it home—let’s say I want to make bread from half of it. I put (one half) back into the plastic vessel and put salt into the other half. 42. A handful (of salt) for this amount; then I make the dough. I knead it well until I see that it has become this size. Like a balloon, like this it raises (because of the yeast). 43. The dough needs strength, it wants effort. When it is done, I let the dough rest. I prepare my baking iron, I prepare my flour, and I make (lit. bring) my fire, all this. 44. I prepare (everything) and then I start baking. I bake (but) first I cut off (chunks) and make pieces of dough, I make dough balls. Then I take flour; I dust it with the flour and bake it. 45. I remove the dust and let it remain (lit. wait) a little bit with the flour. And then I bake it on the baking iron and we make as much as the family needs. 46. If I make (all that is in) this vessel, it is enough for me for two months. This vessel equals half a sack and it suffices two months because we also buy (bread) from the bakery. 47. Today, nobody makes bulgur out of the new wheat. Everyone buys the wheat (i.e. flour) ready (for baking) and those who want bulgur buy bulgur. 48. There are those who want to buy it from the supermarket and those who want to buy it in sacks (i.e. from the wholesaler). It is sold (as they like it). Even the village people have become civilised and no longer make bulgur. 49. Nobody crushes (wheat): all this is gone. Now the people go and just buy a sack of bulgur and a sack of čīge. 50. Even a (whole) sack of flour is always available.

52 The word also means ‘cricket.’
53 She wants to express that modern life has even reached the villages.
The flour, they say this or that brand is good and they go and bring it. There is no storage any longer. In former times the people started to bring it (from the village). In the blessed days of the elders, the people went (to the village) and brought it. But now the woman (does not do it) out of laziness; the (life of the) woman has become comfortable and is not like it was in former times. But the effort itself was also a good thing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article was written in the framework of the project ‘The Shawi-type Arabic dialects spoken in South-eastern Anatolia and the Middle Euphrates region,’ financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, number P 33574-G).

ORCID

Stephan Procházka @ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9421-1404

References


Stephan Procházka and İsmail Batan


ABSTRACT My paper presents the transcription and translation of two texts in the dialect of the northwestern Tunisian town of il-Kāf (el Kef). The texts were recorded during fieldwork carried out for the TUNOCENT project. The speaker gives the recipes for traditional dishes and the various kinds of bread typical of the il-Kāf region. Linguistic notes are given in section 3 to show the local linguistic peculiarities of the dialect. Some final remarks will summarise the differences and similarities in linguistics between the featured texts and other Bedouin-type dialects in Tunisia.
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1 Introduction

The town of il-Kāf (el Kef) is the administrative centre of the same-named Tunisian governorate in the northwestern part of the country. A short description of il-Kāf and other important towns in the governorate can be found on our project’s website: https://tunocent.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/. To the best of our knowledge, nothing has been previously published on the dialect of il-Kāf.1 The following two texts were recorded during fieldwork for the TUNOCENT project by Franziska Schwemmer in August 2019. The speaker is a 45-year-old woman from il-Kāf (Kef/f/45). In the texts, she describes the traditional Kefan dish burzgân and the different kinds of bread

---

1 The linguistic material collected during the project of the Atlas linguistique de Tunisie is still largely unpublished: ‘For the “Atlas linguistique de Tunisie” data have been elicited in 250 localities but, unfortunately, apart from some theoretical articles, nothing has been published so far.’ (Behnstedt and Woidich 2011: XVIII, in the footnote).
that are traditionally baked in the governorate of il-Kāf. There are some major differences between the kinds of bread described by our speaker and those listed in Ritt-Benmimou (2005) for the South Tunisian region of Douz. In il-Kāf, there is no *xubzat malla*, a type of bread traditionally baked in the sand of the desert, a procedure which, due to the different climate and geology, is not possible in Northern Tunisia. In Ritt-Benmimou (2005), *xubzat ṭāžīn* is characterised as one of the most important bread types in Southern Tunisia. Though a tableware for baking bread called *ṭāžīn* is described by the Kefan speaker, the bread itself is called *mṭālīʕ*. On the other hand, *xubz ‘mlāwi* and *xubz abrāž* are not known in the region of Douz. Other kinds of bread, such as *ruggāg* and *ṭābūna*, as well as the dishes *rfīsa* and *ʕṣīda*, are known in both regions. It is remarkable, however, that in il-Kāf, fine semolina (*smīd*) is used for almost all types of bread.\(^3\)

The dish called *burzgān*, a variant of couscous described in the first text, is typically Kefan. Gobert (1940: 509) described a dish called ‘Bazergan’ as follows:

\[
Kouskous spécial au Kef. C'est un kouskous dont la sauce est faite de lait, de smen, d'oignons et d'épices. La viande préalablement épiciée a été cuite à part, à la vapeur, au-dessus d'une marmite remplie d'eau et de romarin. [...] Quand le lait bout, il est versé sur le kouskous, que l'on décore de morceaux de viande déjà cuite, d'œufs durs et de fakia. Pas de légumes.
\]

2 Transcription and translation

Short vowels: \(a, i, u\).
Long vowels: \(ā, ĩ, ū, ē, ō\).\(^4\)
Epenthetic vowels: \(a, i, ū\).

Important linguistic peculiarities of the dialect are explained in section 3.

---

\(^2\) The relevant literature concerning the types of bread in the South Tunisian region of Douz is cited there.

\(^3\) Alonso et al. (2014: 26) distinguish between the fine semolina (*smīd*) used for baking bread and the coarse semolina (*zdř* or *glūb smīd*) for preparing couscous.

\(^4\) The phonemic status of \(ā\) has not yet been established, but its presence or absence in certain words under certain phonological conditions is a very important criterion for Tunisian dialects. For this reason, though the transcription here is otherwise mainly phonemic, \(ā\) is used. All other relevant information concerning transcription can be found in Ritt-Benmimou (2014a). Most previously published scholarly work on Tunisian dialects, and especially Bedouin-type dialects, can be found in the reference section of Ritt-Benmimou (2014a).
The famous food of il-Káf is called *burzgân*. It is made in... we cook it in the month of May, on the fifteenth of May. We call it “the feast of May.” 2. At that time we have a lot of green salad. At the same time the people of il-Káf, (the people of) all the (other) governorates know that, whenever we say *burzgân*, (we mean) the Kefi *burzgân*. It is eaten in May. 3. In order to prepare and cook *burzgân* in il-Káf, we buy dried fruits, dry fruits which are almonds, pine nuts, walnuts, hazelnuts and *dagla* dates. And we buy lamb meat. 5. Of course, all the Kefan people have couscous at home and everything that is needed to cook it, and milk and butter. And sugar. 6. In order to prepare the dish *burzgân*, we fry the dried fruits, we roast them. We cut the *dagla* dates into four, boil the milk, and let the butter melt. 7. We let the sun-dried couscous...
steam. At the same time, we place the meat that, after washing, we have spiced with a pinch of salt and rosemary. 8. It is green rosemary that (grows) in the mountains and sends forth a nice aroma. We place it (i.e. the meat), let it steam, and we call it knāf. 9. After we have let the couscous steam, we open (the couscous chunk) slowly and dissipate it with some butter. We make a layer of couscous. 10. We garnish (it with) the dried fruits that we have roasted, which are the almonds, the hazelnuts, the pine nuts and the walnuts; 11. and at the same time, the pieces of dagla dates that we have cleaned and quartered. 12. We arrange it as decoration in (different) sections: a field like this with almonds, (another with) walnuts, (another with) hazelnuts, (one) with pine nuts and (one) with dagla dates. 13. Like this, it shapes a rose. We continue with the couscous. We make one more layer of couscous mixed with sugar and butter. 14. After that, we make the last (thing), the decoration of the couscous. We make different sections with those dried fruits that we have roasted and with which we made the first layer. 15. Different sections of dried fruits and dagla dates at the same time, we have the milk that has become hot, and we have the piece of butter that we put in a pan and that has melted. 16. At the same time, we have the pieces of meat that are called knāf, that are steaming in the couscous steamer with the smell of rosemary, the smell of which spreads fragrance. 17. We pour that milk, we pour a layer of butter and then a bit of milk, not too much. 18. And then we place those pieces of meat that are cooked, they are cooked very well. We put one piece of meat next to the other. 19. Its beauty lies in its form (which is like) a rose and (in its arrangement) in (various) sections with those dried fruits. 20. And in those pieces of meat that were cooked with rosemary and called knāf. That is the dish of il-Kāf [...]. 21. Eat (it) and bon appétit! 22. Of course, there is green salad on the table; there is sour milk; there is an earthen plate because when we serve the burzgān, we put it on an earthen plate. 23. It has the form of a decorated earthen plate. That can be called a Kefan dish, the burzgān. 24. It is eaten in the month of May, beginning with the fifteenth of May. It is a big celebration in the governorate of il-Kāf.

Text 2: Bread in il-Kāf

1. f-il-kāf fanna xubrz ruggāg w-fanna xubz abrāž, xubrz ruggāg w-xubz abrāž w-fanna l-mṭālīf. w-fanna il-xubrz l-mṭabbīg b-iz-zīʔt. 2. hāḍūma anwāf il-xubrz illi mawżūda fi-wildāt il-kāf. 3. biš naḥku ṣlā xubz ir-ruggāg. xubz ir-ruggāg yżī m-is-smīd w-zīt w-śwayy milh muš barṣa biš mā-yżī‐š mālah w-mā. 4. nufrku il-xubrz b-il-gdā b-il-gdā twalli żīna façon ‘ntāf “Żīna nxallōha tirtāh. 5. w-nabdu ṣrāknāha lilli twalli bāhya barṣa w-nḥuṣtu t-tāžīn fōg il-gāż nxallāḥ yusxun. 6. w-ţamma illi fi… nṭayybu b-īt-ţāžīn il-ʕarbi nṭayybih ġa-l-ḥṭab. hāḍāy illi mawżūd f-ir-rīf. 7. āma f-il-blād f-il-village nṭayybu ġa-l-gāż. illi tawwa fanna mawżūda fanna tāţin “ḥādī, façon “ḥādī. bāh. […] 8. īrtāḥt āk il-xubza nasmālōha xubza hāka sghra muš kbīra l-żīna nōxdu nsammu ngūlu guṛṣa.
9. nub\textsuperscript{a}šṭūha nub\textsuperscript{a}šṭūha b-\textsuperscript{b}šwāba\textsuperscript{a}na ḥatta twallī lāhi xšīna w-lāhi rhīfā. 10. b-\textsuperscript{c}ṭ-ṭbī\textsuperscript{d}a āk il-\textsuperscript{e}ṭāzīn il-maḥtūt fōg il-gāz yabda sxūn. 11. w-nhuṭṭu āk il-gurṣa nṭāš il-xub\textsuperscript{e} w-nabadu bēn nṭayybu fāhā nharrku ḥāfā b-idīna b-īš-šwayy b-īš-šwayy ḥatta tīمخār. 12. hāḏāy illi-tsamma xub\textsuperscript{f} ruggāg.


16. ūanna ṭāni xub\textsuperscript{f} illi nsammūh l-κmtāliš mā-yīziš b-is-smūd. 17. yīzi smīd w-fārīna walla yīzi b-il-smīd nτāš il-gam\textsuperscript{f} walla yīzi b-il-fārīna illi hiya maʃnāha dzī fārīna rušu maʃ kīma s-smūd. 18. w-dīzi b-il-ṣxmīra illi dzī fārīna w-esxmīra b-īt-ṭbī\textsuperscript{d}a ʿswayya mīl\textsuperscript{f} w-mā mlaḍīd. 19. w-nxaḥtū āk l-esfīnī illi twalli hiya ʿṣīna w-naʃmlūha ḡrūs ḡrūs w-nxaʃmlūha tirtāʔīh. maʃ kīma r-ruggāg. w-ṇṭayyūbōhā ṭāl t-ṭāzīn.

20. ūanna illi talgāhā f-il-blād w-talgāhā f-ir-rīf illi yguļ xub\textsuperscript{f} ṭābūna. 21. xub\textsuperscript{f} ṭābūna illi hiya ʾdzī b-il-smīd w-dīzi b-il-fārīna w-dīzi b-il-xub\textsuperscript{f} il-gam\textsuperscript{f} illi yguļ xub\textsuperscript{f} asmaʃ. 22. w-ṇṭayyūhu il-gūzā ki ngūl gūzā maʃnāha faqon illi naʃmlūhā b-īt-tīn w-yabda... 23. w-nṣaxxūnōhō biʃ twalli four barṣa ḥṭab lil ywalli ʾāk l-ḥṭab hāḏāka rmād w-llassgu kull gūzā nτāš xubzx ʾt-ṭābūna ṭāl ṣnaab āk ʾt-ṭābūna. 24. hāžēkā illi naʃna nsammūh xub\textsuperscript{f} ʿʃarbī w-xub\textsuperscript{f} ṭābūna, vrāi vrāi ṭābūna. 25. illi\textsuperscript{f} tawwa tqaḍdīm ʿswayy maʃnāha id-dīna wallit maʃnāha il-ḥāžāt iẓ-ẓdīda w-il-1kwiš is-sūrī, 26. illi ūanna kōša sūrī yṭayybu bāhā xub\textsuperscript{f} yguļu xub\textsuperscript{f} ṭābūna, illi hiya maʃrūfā il-ʃakṣ abann xub\textsuperscript{f} w-ʔaʃsan xub\textsuperscript{f} illi ṣuwa xub\textsuperscript{f} ʾt-ṭābūna. 27. illi ūanna ʾnsā ngūl gūzā. hiya l-kōša illi nṭayyūbū bāhā. 28. maʃnāha ūanna ʾt-ṭābūna ūanna r-ruggāg ūanna ʾmlwī illi...

29. xub\textsuperscript{f} ʾmlwī yīzi b-is-smūd. illi kunte inti klīti fiḥ gbīlikā w-nṭabbgūh b-iz-zīt w-ṇṭayyūbū ʾʃa-l-gūz ū ṭ-ṭāzīn illi ḡaṭṭīnāh fōg il-gūz. 30. fi-nafs il-waqq̱t l-abrāẓ. bāh. āḥāy anwāʃ il-xub\textsuperscript{f} illi mawūḏāda fi-wiʃlāy il-kāf illi l-ḥāžāt ngūluha naʃna l-ḥāžāt il-ʃarbī illi kull dār ṭṭayyībā. bāh.

31. biʃ ngūlu ʿʃa l-rfīsā. biʃ nahku ʿswayya ʾʃa-l-rfīsā. 32. ir-rfīsā ṇṭayyūbōhā fi-ʃayūr l-ayyām ʾĀma ʾl-aškaratī il-kāfīya ṭṭayyīb xub\textsuperscript{f} ir-rfīsā yaʃnī naʃmlu ir-rfīsā kt ṭsubb ūanna ʿbārsa mṭar w-yṣubb ūanna l-t-ulż. naʃmlu rafs. 33. akṭarit il-kāfīya ṭalgi f-īʃ-šṭā dima ūanna rafs. 34. yaʃnī s-smīd w-tzt w-mīl\textsuperscript{f} w-mā w-ttaʃrāk āk l-ṣfīnī illi twalli ʿṣīna w-kīf kī xub\textsuperscript{f} yiṭṭabbag ʾʃa-z-zēt. 35. w-ngūlu ʾrrayyūʃi yaʃnī ngusṣūh ʿswayy murabbāʕāt ʿswayy ḥākā ʿswayy ʿswayy ʿswayy šgīr murabbāʕāt šgīrā. 36. w-nīʃru d-dagla naʃslōhā ngusṣūhā murabbāʕāt w-ʔaʃd f-il-gaʃtā maʃrīt\textsuperscript{f} walla gaʃtā lōh nṣubbu āk

---

5 Besides its function as a relative pronoun and conjunction, illi seems to play an important role as a discourse particle, the function of which needs further investigation.

6 The article preceding this word seems to be a lapsus linguæ. This is corroborated by the fact that it is not found in sentence 33.

7 In the TuniCo dictionary, citing Singer (1984), maʃrīd is found. The t in our text may be caused by final devoicing.
In il-Kāf, we have the type of bread called ruggāg and we have abrāž bread. The bread ruggāg, the bread abrāž, and we have mṭālīʕ. And we have the bread that is folded with oil. 2. These are the kinds of bread that exist in the governorate of il-Kāf. 3. We will talk about ruggāg bread. The bread ruggāg is made of fine semolina, oil and a little bit of salt—not too much, so that it does not become too salty—and water. 4. We knead (the ingredients of) the bread very thoroughly (until) it becomes dough, the consistency of dough, and we let it rest. 5. We have kneaded it until it becomes very good, (then) we put the ṭāžīn on the gas stove and heat it. 6. There are those who… When we bake bread with the traditional ṭāžīn, we bake it (directly) on firewood. This is how they do it in the countryside. 7. But in the village we bake it on the gas stove. What we have nowadays is the ṭāžīn of iron, it is of iron. Okay. […] 8. After the (dough of) the bread has proved, we make a small bread (of) the dough, like this, not very big. We call it guṛṣa, a flat bread. 9. We flatten (the dough) with our fingers until it becomes neither too thick nor too thin. 10. Of course (meanwhile) that ṭāžīn that is placed on the gas stove has become hot. 11. We put that flat bread (in it). While

---

8 For the suffix -āt/-ǟt as ‘individuation marker,’ see Brustad (2008).
9 For a description of the bread ruggāg in Southern Tunisia, see Ritt-Benmimoun (2005: 52, 58, section 72–73).
10 For a description of the ṭāžīn and an illustration of it, see Ritt-Benmimoun (2005: 51 f., 56, section 35–36) and Louis (1979: 130).
we are baking it, we move it carefully with our hands until it becomes brown. 12. This is the bread called ruggāg.

13. Also we have the bread abṛāž. But abṛāž bread is soaked in oil and has...

14. There are people who like it with sugar, and there are those who don’t like it (that way), (they prefer it) without sugar. 15. We cut it into squares, into quadratic pieces. It is soaked (in oil), and we also bake it on the iron ṭāẓīn.

16. We also have the bread that we call mṭālīʕ, it is not made of fine semolina.

17. It is possible with fine semolina and flour, or with fine wheaten semolina, or it is possible with flour that is..., it can be made of cake flour, which is not like fine semolina. 18. It is made with yeast, with flour and yeast, of course a bit of salt, and lukewarm water. 19. We mix those (ingredients of) the dough that become a dough, and make flat loaves of bread out of it. Then we let it prove. (It is) not like the ruggāg. And we bake it in the ṭāẓīn.

20. You find people in the village and the countryside who (have what) they call ṭābūna bread. 21. The ṭābūna bread is made of fine semolina or flour, and it is possible with bread, with wheat, which is called a brownish bread. 22. We bake (the bread in the oven we call) a gōža. When I say gōža, I mean the way we make it with clay and it is... 23. We heat it with a lot of firewood so that it becomes an oven, until that firewood becomes ash. (Then) we attach every flat loaf of ṭābūna bread to a side of the ṭābūna stove. 24. That is what we call traditional bread, the ṭābūna bread, this is the real ṭābūna. 25. Nowadays, the world has developed: there are new things (now) and modern bakeries. 26. There are even modern ovens (in the bakeries) with which they bake bread which they call ṭābūna. But the opposite is well known: the most delicious bread and the best bread is the (real) ṭābūna bread. 27. Some of us women say gōža. It is the oven in which we bake it. 28. We have ṭābūna, we have ruggāg, we have mlāwi bread which...

29. Mlāwi bread is baked with fine semolina. It is the one you have eaten before. We fold it with oil and bake it on the gas stove, in the ṭāẓīn that we have put on the gas stove. 30. At the same time (we have) abrāż. Okay. These are the kinds of bread that exist in the governorate of il-Kāf, the ones that we call traditional, which every family bakes. Okay.

31. We will tell (you) about rfīsa. We will talk a little bit about rfīsa. 32. We can make rfīsa on all the days (of the year), but most of the Kefan people bake the bread

---

11 The word abrāž (SG buṛž ‘slice [of a melon, of a cake]’) refers to the form of the bread that is cut into square pieces.

12 Cf. Louis (1979: 131), Saada (1981: 27), and Gobert (1940: 567), where this bread is called maṭlūʕa.


14 For a description of rfīsa in Southern Tunisia (where they have rfīsa and marfūsa), see Ritt-Benmimoun (2005: 52, 59, section 90–93).
rfīsa... we make rfīsa when it rains a lot and when it is snowing. (Then) me make rfīs. 33. Most of us Kefan people have rfīs all the time in winter. 34. (We need) fine semolina, oil, salt and water. (The ingredients of) that dough, that will become a dough, are kneaded. It is also a bread that is folded with oil. 35. We say we pluck it—that is, we cut (the bread) into small pieces, small like this, very small, small squares. 36. We buy dagla dates, wash them and cut them into squares. Then we pour that rfīs which we have cooked, into a bowl, an earthen one, or in a wooden bowl. 37. The dough, the bread that we have crumbled, we pour sugar, we pour butter on it, and we pour some milk and those dagla dates on it and mix it. 38. You can eat (it now) and bon appétit! This is rfīs.

39. We have what we call ḥṣīda. Spicy ḥṣīda, spicy ḥṣīda or sweet ḥṣīda. 40. We cook the fine semolina, we put the water (until) it becomes lukewarm, and (then), little by little, we pour the fine semolina (into it) until we make ḥṣīda [...]. 41. Okay. After we have cooked that ḥṣīda in the lukewarm water, it must not form lumps, it must not be too dry, and it must not be too runny. It must be well cooked. 42. Why must it be cooked? So that [...]. 43. Okay. When that fine semolina or the flour is cooked... Because it can be ḥṣīda made of flour or it can be ḥṣīda made of fine semolina. 44. Is is well cooked. It must be well cooked so that, when someone eats it, he does not get a bellyache. 45. When we say sweet ḥṣīda or spicy ḥṣīda [...]. We have sweet ḥṣīda and spicy ḥṣīda. 46. The people who like the sweet ḥṣīda, (then) add butter and sugar or butter and honey. 47. Honey... When I say honey, I mean natural honey—that is, bee honey. 48. When we say spicy ḥṣīda... Spicy ḥṣīda is cooked with sausages called mirgǟz. 49. Most of us Kefan people mean by spicy ḥṣīda (that which) we cook with corned sun-dried meat [...].

49. Okay. We have talked about burzgǟn, about the (different) kinds of bread, and we have talked about the spicy and the sweet ḥṣīda, (dishes) that are known in the governorate of il-Kǟf. 50. And the most... The indigenous Kefan people who are the original residents of il-Kǟf, we cook the ḥṣīda especially when it snows: when it is very cold, we make ḥṣīda and rfīs.

3 Linguistic notes

Phonology

- **g**: ygūl ‘to say’, gāʕid ‘sitting; staying (in a certain place)’; (four q-words in the texts: waqtha ‘at that time’; bunduq ‘pine nuts’; nfarrqu ‘we separate’; tqaddmit ‘it developed’).

---

15 See Gobert (1950: 547 f.) for an ethnographic description of ḥaṣīda; al-Marzūgī (1984: 152), and Marçais and Guiga (1925: 184 f., 193 f.).

16 See Gobert (1940: 501 f.) for an ethnographic description of mirgǟz.

17 See Gobert (1940: 499 ff.) for an ethnographic description of giddîd.
Traditional Recipes from il-Kǟf (Northwestern Tunisia)

- ź: źīna ‘dough’; yź ‘to come’; ṭalź ‘snow.
- Interdentals are retained: ṭalź ‘snow’; ṭamma ‘there is’; ‘nḏawwbu ‘we let melt’; naḏḏafnǟha ‘we cleaned it.’
- Monophthongisation: aw is generally monophthongised as ŏ; ay more frequently as i than ē: lōz ‘almonds’; zōz ‘walnuts’; lōḥ ‘wood’; bīt ‘field’; kīf kīf ‘the same, also’; zīt/zēt ‘oil.’
- Influenced by a certain vowel harmony caused by the suffix -ha, the long vowels ī and ū are realised as ā and open ŏ respectively: nṭayybōha (< nṭayybůha) ‘we cook it’; nubståha ‘we flatten it’; fīha (< fiha) ‘in it’; bīha (< biha) ‘with it.’
- Imāla of stressed word final ā: mā ‘water,’ b-il-gdǟ ‘thoroughly, well’; nsǟ ‘women’ (whereas the imāla has developed in a step further in the South Tunisian Bedouin-type dialects, resulting in mé, b-il-gdē and nsē).
- No traces of a short a in open pre-stressed syllables: “hlib ‘milk’; smūd ‘fine semolina’; “htaţab ‘firewood.’
- The distribution of short vowels does not follow the Classical Arabic pattern but is subject to consonantal influence, as seen in the passive participles mbassīs ‘soaked,’ mzayyin ‘decorated; mṭabbīg ‘folded;’ in the perfect forms fatfitnǟh ‘we crumbled it’; ṭayyibna ‘we cooked’; and in the adjective mǟlaḥ ‘salty.’
- Epenthetic vowel between two word final consonants: xubēz ‘bread; milēh ‘salt’; gamēh ‘wheat.’
- Pausal forms: glottal stop between a long vowel and a final consonant, e.g. gāʔz (context form: gāz); tirtǟʔḥ (context form: tirtǟḥ); ziʔt (context form: zīt). In pausa final -h, the suffix of the 3MSG following a vowel, is pronounced very clearly (e.g. w-nfawwṛu l-kusksi illi hūwa šamsi nfawwṛū), whereas it is pronounced very weakly or not heard at all in context, when only the stress which shifts to the final vowel makes the form recognisable (e.g. biš nḥaḏḍṛu l-burzgân w-nṭayybū f-il-kǟf).

Morphology

- Personal pronouns: inti ‘you (F); hiya ‘she’; hūwa ‘he’; naḥna ‘we’; hūma ‘they’; (no feminine plural forms in the texts).
- Gender distinction in 2SG: talgi ‘you find (F)’ (M: talga); tōkli ‘you eat (F)’ (M: tōkul); kūli ‘eat (F)!’ (M: kūl); kunti ‘you were (F)’ (M: kunt); inti ‘you (F)’ (M: inta).18
- 3MSG pronominal suffix after -(C)CC or -VC is u: yḥibbu ‘he wants it’; kirṣu ‘his belly’; ŋgūlū-lu ‘we call it.’

18 The respective masculine forms are not found in these two texts but in questionnaires recorded in il-Kǟf.
3FSG of verbs in the perfect is -it: ḏǟbit ‘it melted’; ṭǟbit ‘it is well cooked’; wallit ‘she became.’ This vowel i is prone to omission, resulting in forms like ‘rtǟḥt ‘she/it rested, proved.’

Status constructus of -a is -it: rîḥitha ‘its smell.’

3Pl of III-weak verbs of the I. form in the perfect is -ū: klū ‘they ate’; žū ‘they came’ (as opposed to žǟw in sedentary dialects).

Plural forms of III-weak verbs in the imperfect are formed with -u: naḥku ‘we talk’ (as opposed to naḥkīw in sedentary dialects); niẓru ‘we buy’; niglu ‘we fry.’

Irregular verbs ‘to take’ and ‘to eat’: yōxuḏ and yōkul.

Passive verb forms: prefixed t (in the imperfect occasionally tt) as in sedentary dialects: yittaʕmal ‘it is made,’ yitkîl ‘it is eaten;’ ttaʕrîk ‘it is kneaded.’

Prepositions: kîma ‘like’; ḡǟ ‘next to’; ūm ‘at’ (ūmna ‘we have’).

Adverbs: tawwa ‘now’; tampa ‘there is’; barṣa ‘very; a lot’; b-il-gdā ‘thoroughly, well;’ hāka ‘like this;’ ūm ‘also;’ gbiṭika ‘previously, before.’

Subordinating conjunctions: biš ‘so that, in order to;’ kî ‘when(ever);’ baʕd-ma ‘after’; illi ‘that’; lil, lilli ‘until’; šal-xāṭir, xāṭir ‘because.’

Interrogative pronouns and adverbs: škūn ‘who’; šlâs ‘why.’

Demonstrative pronouns: (h)âḏǟy ‘this (M);’ hâḏîy ‘this (F);’ hâḏûma ‘these;’ âk (invariable) ‘that,’ âk l-ʕîṭ tab hâḏâka ‘that firewood.’

Relative pronoun: illi: kašbât id-dagla illi maʃnâha naqḍafnâha ‘the pieces of dagla dates that we have cleaned.’

Genitive marker: ntâś (ntâḥha ‘her(s)’) (no gender distinction): šal ntâś nahla ‘bee honey’; w-nhuṭṭu âk il-gûrṣa ntâś ‘we put that flat loaf of bread.’

Future marker: biš: biš naḥku šwayya ša-r-rfîsa ‘We will talk a little bit about rfîsa.’

Negation: mà-yḥibbū-š ‘he doesn’t want it; they don’t want’; mà-yilzîmḩǟ-š ‘she must not’; lâhi xînâ láhi rhîfa ‘neither thick nor thin’; muš kbîra ‘not big (f).’

Syntax

Progressive with gāʕîd: illi gāʕîn yfūṛu šlâ l-kaskâs ‘which are steaming in the couscous steamer.’

Agreement with plural heads: w-škîna šlâ l-ṣâṣīda l-hârâ wa-l-ḥîlîwa illi maʃrûfîn fi-wîlîyṭ il-kâf ‘and we have talked about the spicy and the sweet ṣâṣîda, (dishes) that are known in the governorate of il-Kâf’; w-b-iṭ-tbîsa l-kull l-kâfîya ṣandha kusksi f-id-dâr ‘of course, all the Kefan people have couscous at home.’

Lexis

French words: façon; couche; four; vrai; le quinze; village.
4 Final remarks

The voiced realisation of $q$ as $g$, gender distinction with independent pronouns and with verbs and the conjugation of III-weak verbs (*nahku* as opposed to *nahkiw* in sedentary dialects) clearly mark the dialect of il-Kǟf as a Bedouin dialect (W. Marçais 1950: 212). Within W. Marçais’ categorisation, it forms part of the so-called Tunisian Hilāl dialects (H-dialects) that are spoken in Central Tunisia. Certain phenomena, as the ‘lighter’ *imāla* of word-final *ā*, as in *mǟ* ‘water,’ distinguish them from what Marçais called the Tunisian Sulaym dialects (S-dialects) in which the word is realised as *mē*.19 Further differences are the use of the suffix -*u* for the 3MSG in the dialect of il-Kǟf (e.g. *kiršu* ‘his belly’), whereas the suffix is -*a* in the S-dialects; and the realisation of the verbs ‘to take’ and ‘to eat’ as *yōxuḏ* and *yōkul*, which correspond to *yāxiḏ* and *yākil* in the S-group. No traces are found in these two texts of the VII. form for the passive that is used in the S-dialects; but we do find some examples with a prefixed *t(t)*- (e.g. *yittaʕmal* ‘it is made’), the so-called T-stem, that is also found in Tunisia’s sedentary dialects.

Thus, some linguistic Kefan features mark the dialect as clearly different from both urban dialects and the Bedouin dialects further south. These features will be crucial for achieving a re-classification and re-naming of the Northwestern and Central Tunisian dialects.
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New Texts in the Arabic Dialect of Essaouira
(Jewish and Muslim Varieties)

ABSTRACT This paper consists of a collection of oral texts in the Arabic dialect of Essaouira (Mogador), providing updated linguistic data on the Jewish and Muslim dialects of the Moroccan town and the Chiadma territory. The transcription and translation of the texts are followed by comments which highlight salient features of these communal dialects, including linguistic variants registered for the first time in southern Morocco. The texts comprehend personal experiences, memories of the old times of religious coexistence and popular local stories. The interviewees present a wide range of backgrounds: Jewish and Muslim, urban and rural, young and elder, male and female. In this way, these oral texts are a first step to understanding how the Muslim dialect and the Judeo-Arabic of Essaouira have evolved and interacted through time.

KEYWORDS Arabic dialectology, Chiadma, communal dialects, Essaouira, field research, Judeo-Arabic, Moroccan Arabic

The oral texts below provide an overview of the current situation of the Arabic dialect of Essaouira (Mogador), representing the speech of a relatively wide range of speakers through time. Despite well-known studies on the Jewish dialect—or Judeo-Arabic—of Essaouira (Lévy 1994, 2009; Heath 2002; Chetrit 2012), there remained a paucity of descriptions on the speech of its Muslim population, except for the pioneer work of Socin (1893). Therefore, more than a century later, I attempt to contribute with updated linguistic data for the linguistic reality of the town and its surroundings—inside Chiadma territory—, documenting both Muslim and Jewish communal dialects. Some of these texts appear partially in my unpublished doctoral dissertation O dialeto árabe de Essaouira: documentação e descrição de uma variedade do sul do Marrocos [The Arabic dialect of Essaouira: documentation and description of a southern Moroccan variety] (Francisco 2019).
Text 1: Childhood memories of a Judeo-Arabic speaker

The family

1. s-slām ʿlık ya ḥbībi, āna gūtt lak bās ḥāba kān yīxdām ʕān Cartier, Cartier kān wāḥd n-nāṣrānī 1 lī kān ṣāndu bīs u-s-sra kbār bāzzāf, 2. kānu zūz d-əl-xwān Cartier, ə-hāba kān xdam ʕāndūm tītīn ʕām,ū-āna ta-nōṣrāf... kīma ṣkālt 2 ʕla ẓāddī di ḥu ḥāba, 3. ən-skəl ʕla mṛt ẓāddī, ṭāma Ḍūna, u-ən-skəl ʕla ẓāddī u-ẓāddātī m-ziḥt 3 ʕmm ṭāma, 4. ma ṣərttīm bāzzāf, əmma 4 xlāku 5 f-Ūfrān, Ūfrān ila ta-taγrāfha ūyīn ḥīyya Ūfrān.

1. Hello dear, I told you that my father used to work with Cartier, Cartier was a Christian who had a very big ‘commerce’ [store], 2. they were two brothers, the Cartiers, and my father had worked for them for thirty years, and I know... And I remember also my grandfather who is my father’s father, 3. I remember my grandfather’s wife, grandma Ḍūna, and I remember my grandfather and my grandmother from my mother’s side, 4. I didn’t know them very well, they were born in Ifrane, Ifrane [I am not sure] if you know where Ifrane is.

The Port

1. āna nōṣkəl ʕla l- márṣa d-əs-Šwīra, kānīt 6... kānu fiha leś dépots, 2. l-xnāsî, kānu izīw f-əl-ḥābūrāt, kānu ḥnāk xnāsî d-lūz, u-d-kāwkāw, les cacahuètes, u-d-xarṭūb məṯhūn, 3. u-kūnna nziw nḥālu si... f-al-xansa u-[...] ṭān ḥnāk, kāwkāw u-l-lūz, məddī kūnna ʂgār. 4. u-kānu... u-kūnna namsīw ʕāl-l... kūnna nṣyyyu ḥnāk f-al-mərṣa ən ʕla bərəra 5. u-kūnna namsīw ta-tntsənnaw məddī izīw s-ṣərdīl kūll nḥār f-ə-ʃ-ʃbāh... 6. kānu izīw l-ḥābūrāt b-əs-ṣərdīl u-kūnna nziw b-wāḥd l-xansa f-idīna kūnna... 7. iṣṭiwna s-ṣərdīl b-fābud, bābl flus, 8. ḥādsi ta-nōṣkəl ʕla... ʕāl-l-mərṣa.

---

1 Asher, 84 years old, is a Jewish speaker who lived in the medina of Essaouira until the age of 16. He is of Jewish Berber descent from Ifrane. He accomplished his elementary studies in a Torah school in Essaouira and in the school of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. Later, he immigrated to Israel where he has been living most of his life until today. Our communication has been carried out via WhatsApp audios recorded by himself.

2 Predominates /q/ > /k/ in his speech. Lévy (2009: 367) attests this phenomenon, known as l-haḍra ʂ-ṣgītra, in Essaouira—as a peculiarity of Mellah speakers—and also in the neighbouring cities of Safi and Azemmour.

3 < ṭān ùiḥt ‘from the side of.’

4 < ḧamma ‘they.’ Very frequently the /h/ is not heard in Muslim and Jewish varieties.

5 < xlāku ‘they were born.’

6 -it (3FSG perf.) occurs sometimes in hollow verbs and frequently in strong ones.
1. I remember the port of Essaouira, it was... there were *les dépôts* [warehouses] in it, 2. the bags used to come in the steamships, there were bags of almonds and of peanuts, *les cacahuètes* [peanuts], and of milled carob, 3. and we used to come and open some... in the bag and [...] from it, peanuts and almonds, when we were kids. 4. And they were... we used to go... to fish there in the port from the outside 5. and we used to go wait for the sardines to come every morning, 6. the ships used to come with the sardines and we used to come with a bag in our hands, we used to... 7. they used to give us the sardine for free, no money for it, 8. this is what I remember of... of the port.

A Moroccan Jewish story

1. *smâf a šāhbi, āna ktābt bâzzāf d-ǝl-mǝšâf, wâḥad mǝšâf fih ‘l-ḥdāy’t d-ǝl-ihûd d-ǝl-Mârûk,* 2. *u-āna tǝṛzǝmt wâḥda b-ǝl-ʕăṛb... si wüḥdāt b-ǝl-ʕârbiyya ila... ḥkī, nǝkra lǝk wâḥda mannûm.* 3. *l-ısǝm dyâlha hûwwa ‘sett l-bâb’:*


1. Listen my friend, I wrote many books, in one of them there are stories of the Jews of Morocco. 2. I translated one of them into Ar... some of them into Arabic and if you want13 I will read one of them to you. 3. It is called ‘close the door.’

4. Never say no to the invitation. People tell you ‘If you say no, you end with nothing.’ Mǝsʕūd was guest at his friends. 5. They spent time together, talked and got drunk and when they brought him the food, he stood up and told them ‘Bye my

---

7 The informant reads a text written in his own dialect by himself.
8 /k/ < /q/.
9 The use of the auxiliary ḥdâz (< ḥtâţ) ‘need’ in the sense of ‘must’ agreed with the main verb (Heath 2002: 501; Prémare et al. 1994 3: 263).
10 < hûwwa.
11 It seems the informant pronounces an intermediary consonant between /z/ and /ʒ/, maybe [ź].
12 The verb ‘to go out’ in the Jewish dialect of Essaouira. Another informant also told us the expression: *dǝzbâd m-ʃlīyya ‘go away!’*
13 Lit. if... tell.
brothers.’ 6. They told him ‘Why are you leaving? Sit with us.’ He told them ‘I have to go, I’m on a hurry.’ 7. They said ‘The meal is here, eat with us oh Merchant Mǝsʕūd.’ 8. ‘No, excuse me this time, I will eat with you other time.’ 9. He left, greeted those people and outside he thought ‘Am I stupid, or what? I am hungry and there was a meal for me and they invited me with kindness and I said “no” to them, what is that? What a gaffe!’ 12. he thought and said to himself ‘I will go back there as if I had a question to make, so they will say “Mǝsʕūd sit with us,” and I will sit without saying anything.’

Text 2: Memories of a Muslim baker in the Mellah

14 Informal interview carried out by Hafid, 55 years old (indicated above by H), with an old baker of the city, known as Mʕǝllǝm Fātǝḥ, 87 years old (indicated by F), both from Essaouira.

---

1 Informal interview carried out by Hafid, 55 years old (indicated above by H), with an old baker of the city, known as Mʕǝllǝm Fātǝḥ, 87 years old (indicated by F), both from Essaouira.

H: 15. āš ʕām, āšmǝn ʕām tǝqṛībān nta ʕāqǝl ʕlīha, š-mǝn 20 ʕām?
F: xǝmsa u-xǝmsīn.

H: 1. Where did you use to work when you were young?
F: Mǝṛdūx street.
H: 2. It was the bakery of Mǝṛdūx street. There were Jews and Muslims in the Mǝṛdūx street?
F: No, a few Muslims.
H: 3. Who was there in the Mǝṛdūx street?
F: The Jews, it was full of Jews only, [...] full of Jews.
H: 4. How was the relation between the Jews living in the Mǝṛdūx street in the Mellah and you in the bakery, Mʕăllǝm F?
F: Fine, fine, good, they used to bring... how is it called, every day, they used to bring the tasty one, Sunday, on Saturday they didn't use to do anything at all, how is it called...
H: 5. They don't cook.
F: They don't cook.
H: 6. They don't light the fire.
F: There was the skhina in my place, they cooked the skhina on Friday, in the evening, 7. on Wednesday, they used to make their skhina, all of them Jews, 8. used to make their skhina, some of them used to make it with meat, some of them used to make it with lamb feet, some used to make it with...to make it... 9. some used to make it with chickpeas, some of them used to make it with rice, some of them used to make it with... so... how is it called... that thing that is forbidden [...] 10. and to make their skhina the number one, good, the skhina is good, everything is good, how is it called, 11. and on Saturday they used to come by midday carrying their skhina on boards, 12. at that time they used to prepare their skhina and this used to become their lunch and their dinner. 13. They used to make that... how is it called? The people used to come to their place, the Muslims, they [the Jews] used to take skhina to them. 14. To the people they knew, they used to take a plate of skhina, they used to take a plate of skhina to them.
H: 15. Which year are you remembering more or less? Which one?
F: Fifty-five.

20 < āš mǝn ‘which?’
Text 3: The Jewish neighbours

1. When I used to go up to the second floor where we lived, in one of the three houses, two families lived with us on the same floor, Nissim and Esther with his kids, who were our friends, Salomon and Haim were my friends. 3. And on the first floor there were next to us a man and his wife, their children weren’t with them, their children grew up, but went abroad. 4. His name was Monsieur Nissim, l’horloger, the clockmaker, they called him the clockmaker. He was specialised... he repaired (made) clocks, big clocks, 5. at that time people used to have big clocks. 6. I told him: at that time I used to enter from time to time into his place and he gave us food, jam and that kind of thing, 7. when I came he would say to me ‘Come, did you study a little bit or not? Did you go to the mosque or not?,’ 8. I mean, he was asking me if I had gone to the mosque or not, and I... He used to say ‘You are not studying at all, bring your books, come sit on this table here.’

21 Interview with Ahmed Harrouch, 63 years old, plastic artist, researcher on the material and oral cultural heritage of the city. He is Muslim and spent his childhood in the Mellah, in a time when Muslims and Jews were still living in the same buildings.

22 < CA lamma (adverbial) when.’

23 He tries to imitate the speech of the Jewish neighbour, using the pronoun ntīna ‘you,’ which was in fact very frequent in the Jewish dialect of the city.

24 The informant was telling a story he had told another person before.
Text 4: The childhood in the countryside


Interview with a 30-year-old woman, dweller of the Sqāla ž-Ždīda, a poor neighbourhood of Essaouira built in the 80s, outside the medina walls. Her family is originally from the Aquermoud zone, rural outskirts of Essaouira, in the Chiadma territory. The text was collected during the evening in a village where her relatives live, near the Bhibeh (Bḥăybǝḥ) beach in Aquermoud.

26 The preverb ka- is predominant in her speech as it happens in the Chiadma territory, the rural area of Essaouira, ta- being an urban feature. However, in the city, many speakers alternate between both particles.

27 < CA qamar ‘moon.’ It alternates with gǝmṛa, but it is quite frequent in the city, among Muslims and one Jewish speaker, and in the rural zone (Aquermoud and Sidi Ishaq). It seems to be associated normally with the full moon or the light of the moon. The word was obtained through oral texts and elicitation as well. It is found also in Fez (Prémare et al. 1998 10: 422).

28 < hūma ‘they.’

29 This is one of the Bedouin features which demonstrate the presence of Maʕqil tribes among the first settlers of Essaouira—such as Šbānāt and Mnābha—and also in the origins of the Chiadma tribe. For more details on the origins of the settlers of Essaouira, see: al-Kānūnī (1932), ar-Ragrāgī (1935), aṣ-Siddīqī (1969). For instance, this conjugation is found in hassāniyya: našru (1PL imperf.), tašru (2PL imperf.), yəšru (3PL imperf.) (Cohen 1963: 103). On the other hand, the suffix -īw alternates with -u, as we can see in the text where both variants are found: k-isəmmīw ‘they call/denominate.’

30 < šǝfti ‘you saw.’

31 The use of bāḥa and māma is a northern feature (Heath 2002: 574, map 6–17, 575 map 6–26), also found in the Jewish dialect of Essaouira.

32 Presence of an ultra-short epenthetic vowel in open syllable.

33 < CA wulidna ‘we were born.’

34 A passive form ttzād > dzād ‘to be born’ (Prémare et al. 1995 5: 434). It has a double conjugation in the perfective: dẕāt ~ dẕādit (1SG), dẕādna ~ dẕādīna (1PL), dẕātī ~ dẕādíti (2SG), dẕāttu ~ dẕāditu (2PL), dẕādat ~ dẕādāt (3SG), dẕādu ~ dẕādad (3PL). The augmented conjugation of the verb with
1. We used to come to the countryside when we were kids, there was no light (electricity) yet; they used to put on candles, la bougie, d'accord? 2. They used to put it in the middle of the house in order to illuminate and there was no lamp like this one there wasn’t, 3. that’s it, inside the house there was no light, there was the candle. [F.B.F.: There was no electricity?] 4. No! We used to go out like this, they kept playing, us the children, and there was the moonlight only, like this: 5. they kept playing and playing, always here in the evening. I used to be afraid, so I preferred not to move, 6. I always did this way and stayed firmly at my place and they kept running and playing [...] 7. now... you saw the house where we went to? My uncle Hasan’s house? And the house of my uncle; God’s mercy be upon him, who died... 8. That is the house where my father grew up, not where I grew up, this was my grandfather’s house, 9. it is called ḍūwwār, what’s a ḍūwwār? A ḍūwwār is a house side by side with another house, 10. those ones by two, three or four, it is called ḍūwwār. A ḍūwwār gathers a house with another house, and another one, ok? 11. Now, there is... that house there, this all is called ḍūwwār, right? [...] 12. Shall I finish the histoire [story] to you? My father when he grew up, when he became a young man, he moved to Essaouira, 13. he went to work with the boat, so he went to Essaouira, he lived there and came home and married my mother, 14. mom was here, he married her and took her to Essaouira, ok? We were born, here we were born and we grew up there.

Text 5: The miracles of Rabbi Haim Pinto

1. Ḥāym Pīnto, rǝbbi Ḥāym Pīnto, hūwwa ḥāxām36 kbīr lli twūffa f-ǝṣ-Ṣwīra hādī tǝqribān mya u-sab’ā u-tmānin ūmān. 2. u-rǝbbi Ḥāym Pīnto ārāv a-šārōm37 medfūn f-ǝr-ṛūḍa dyāl l-ihūd d-bāb Dūkkāla, r-ṛūḍa lli ta-tǝʕtī38 ʕāl-la-bḥār smīyytha b-ǝl-frānsāwīyya le cimetière marin. 3. kāyǝn ḍǝṛbūž39 t-iʕtī ʕăl-lǝ-bḥār, u-hŭwwa dzād fǝ-mdīnăt Agădīr u-ža l-ǝṣ-Ṣwīra bās iqrā, 4. ḥall wāḥǝd la-mdrāsa dyāl t-tālmūd smīyytha ha-yīšīva,
New Texts in the Arabic Dialect of Essaouira (Jewish and Muslim Varieties)

1. Haim Pinto, Rabbi Haim Pinto is a big hakam who passed away in Essaouira approximately a hundred and eighty-seven years ago. 2. And Rabbi Haim Pinto alav ha-shalom (the peace be upon him) is buried in the Jewish cemetery of Bab Doukkala,
the cemetery looks out onto the sea, it is called in French le cimetière marin (the maritime cemetery). 3. There is a balustrade looking out onto the sea. He was born in Agadir and came to Essaouira to study. 4. He opened a Talmud school, it is called Ha-Yeshiva, Ha-Yeshiva Rabbi Haim Pinto. 5. In the superior part there was a synagogue and this hakam is special, there is no one like him. 6. This one had a... a strong power, he used to foresee and say something before [...]. 7. If a woman is going to have a baby, he says if it is boy or girl, if she is going to have it or not, I mean he has a pouvoir (power), a strong power, a spiritual one. [F.B.F.: What do you mean by fūṛṣa (power)?) 8. For example, he goes out in a street, looks at the people [and says] ‘You have a little money in your pocket, give it to the poor, do this...,’ just like that. 9. I tell you a story, Rabbi David Pinto who is responsible for the Hillulah in Essaouira and comes to it, today he is over sixty years old, a man, God bless him, with the beard and respectful and respected by the people obviously. 10. This story was told to us by his own mouth. He was coming from Paris to Essaouira by plane, 12. He said: the plane barely took off, a very young child, who had around a week or ten days, 13. he was crying and crying, and that cry was not normal, he cried so much to the point the child became blue, la mamam (the mom) of the child got frightened, she called the hôtesse de l’air (flight attendant) 14. and told her ‘the baby is not going to... isn’t there a...,’ the stewardess got the microphone ‘We ask les passagers (the passengers) if there is a doctor,’ 15. no one answered, if there was anyone who was infirmier (nurse), no one answered, was there someone who [...], no one answered, 16. so the hôtesse de l’air (flight attendant) turns this way and glances at the Hazzan Rabbi David, and says 17. ‘Look, I am going to bring this child to you, we believe in your saints, look, do..., we tried everything and nothing...,’ 18. He told her ‘I am sick, is it necessary to be me?’, 19. she said ‘We won’t accept these words we will bring him to you.’ She came with the baby who was crying and crying and 20. he says to him ‘Oh Rabbi Haim, do not let me in this shameful situation with these people, show your miracles.’ 21. He just said these words and the child slept on his hand. This is one of many stories.
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**Abstract**  The four dialect texts were recorded with the Mauritanian poet Ahmedou Ould Abdel Kader. The first two texts are fables, the other ones ethnographic texts. The dialect is very elaborated since our narrator had prepared himself one day before the recordings by thinking about the subject and making a choice of typical and sometimes rare dialect words, for instance *aḏru* ‘elephant,’ glossed by the more common *vīl*. In a short introduction we deal with the anaptyctic vowel and accentuation.
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---

Peter Behnstedt und Ahmed-Salem Ould Mohamed Baba


**Verbum**

yǝktǝl: tǝˈkǝtli, nǝˈkǝtlu, tǝˈkǝtlu, yǝˈkǝtlu „töten“
yǝktǝb: tǝˈkǝtbi, nǝˈkǝtbu, tǝˈkǝtbu, yǝˈkǝtbu (Cohen 1963: 87 yǝktbu) „schreiben“
yadǝvli: tǝˈdǝvli, nǝˈdǝvlu, tǝˈdǝvlu, yǝˈdǝvlu „spucken“
yǝldǝt: tǝˈlǝdətli, nǝˈlǝdətlu, tǝˈlǝdətlu, yǝˈlǝdətlu „sammeln“
yǝrǝkb: tǝˈrǝkbli, nǝˈrǝkbu, tǝˈrǝkbu, yǝˈrǝkbu (Cohen 1963: 87 yǝrǝkbu) „besteigen“
tǝˈnǝʕgǝḷ „ihr (der Kamelin) wird der Fuß festgebunden“
tǝˈnǝḥlǝb „sie wird gemolken“ (Cohen 1963: 128 tǝnžṛaḥ)
sǝˈgablualu (Cohen 1963: 130 sǝgblu) „sie sind nach Süden gegangen“, entsprechend das feminine Partizip musǝˈgablal.

Bei einer Reihe von Formen wurden jedoch Schwankungen festgestellt, so etwa yanxbált „er wird geschlagen“ ohne Sprossvokal oder bei stǝkǝṭrul “sie erachteten für zu viel“,

2 Dieser sollte eigentlich in EDNA (Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusía) erscheinen.
stágǝblu „sie gingen nach Süden“. Dies zeigt sich auch bei den Vierradika-
ligen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stágǝblu „sie gingen nach Süden“</th>
<th>aber: maʃǝmsu „sie spülen den Mund aus“</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ħáną distingu „ie wiherten“</td>
<td>raʃǝṛsu „sie bespritzten“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dánadnu „ie trommelten“</td>
<td>dǝgǝdgu „sie zerbrachen“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>támtǝmu „ie grummelten“</td>
<td>daˈkǝmru „sie stießen heftig“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sánkru „ie schabten einen Knochen ab“</td>
<td>gaˈrǝmsu „sie zwickten“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nomen

madvaʕ „Gewehr“: maˈdǝvʕi, maˈdǝvʕak, maˈdǝvʕu, madvāʕha usf.

tengruppe sich ein voller Vokal entwickeln kann und zitiert dazu die Beispiele: mṭarga „petit marteau“ und mgǝt-da „siège“: Aber: maržan „Kochtopf“: maržni, maržnak, maržnu ohne jeglichen Sprossvokal. Enthält das Nomen /w/ oder /y/ in einer Dreier-
konzonanz, so ergibt der betonte Sprossvokal mit diesen die Längen /ū/ und /ī/:

dalu //dalwi// „Eimer“: dalwi, dalwak etc., aber: dalūti, dalūna etc.
kolwa „Niere“: kalūti, kalūtak etc., aber: kolwatha etc.
mǝrwǝd „kuḥl-Stab“: marudi, marudak, marudu, aber: mǝrwǝdha etc.
maʃi //maʃy// „Gehen“: maʃyi, maʃyak etc., aber: maʃiha, maʃina usf.

Auch hier hat unser Sprecher bisweilen geschwankt, etwa in Formen wie gálbha ~ gaˈlǝbha „ihr Herz“, ʕǝlkha vs. ʕǝˈlǝkhum „ihr Gummi Arabicum“. Der Unterschied war ihm nicht bewusst, als er darauf angesprochen wurde.

Eine weitere Abweichung beim Akzent stellen wir bei Endbetonung von auslauf-
tenden Vokalen fest und bei einfach geschlossenen Auslautsilben, nämlich in Formen wie yǝntsá „er wird vergessen“, yǝnsma „er wird erwähnt“, yǝnthá „er wird beendet“, yǝnxbát „er wird geschlagen“.

Die Allophone a – ä und ä – ā, die in anderen Arbeiten zum Ḥassānīya unter-
schieden werden,5 bleiben hier unberücksichtigt, es wird nur /a/ und /ā/ geschrieben.

---
3 In Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 34) /dagdgu/.
4 Vgl. auch in der Bibliografie mahadra (Ould Maouloud 2017).
5 Taine-Cheikh schreibt das {ä} von Cohen (1963) als {e}, also etwa für unser tamtam in Band II (1989 II: 234) temtem.
Auslautendes -a in vorderer konsonantischer Umgebung in Pausa wird von unserem Sprecher meist als -ǝ und nur selten als -e realisiert; oft durch einen Glottisschlag geschlossen.

Text 1: .reward lmahr w alkalb, w ann-e'reb, w addik w albxanis, da'ifin

1. gllak ma gllak w ol bàn anna w ol bàn lūlaydāt ałmāsālmīn. 2. xālq w huwwa ḥmār, ḍaqalu ṣīḥ ahlal w warrrtu w ḍamlu ṣīḥ lagrab wahmulu ṣīḥ azzraš mān ṣamāna šor l-bādiya ṣṣahrawāyiya. 3. w tšāb w ċndbār ẓahru w mše?, ylawwad lāl-ḥorrīya, v blād ma vih arwaģīz. 4. w f trīgu ẓbar kalb. 5. sawwlu ḥlmār: anta xbārak? 6. gllu lkālb: āna kant omša māyāngalālālā umādām. 7. nasrāḥ λqānmām mša rāšīthom w nbāt ḥārāsha w nqāl ḥārāsha w la yaftūni māhu ṣswāy mān assfrāb lumānassax v gdeńa ysammuha lmaylaq. 8. w mša ḥāda lli kāfawli bih ʾenn wāḥad mnhām lāhī yṣayayb lowxar yglālu: ya kalb, yka kalb! 9. w āna ma tlejt ẓabar ašla ḥāda. 10. w mšā nlawwad lāl-ḥorrīya v blād ma vih ḥadd ydaqqal ašliya w la ḥadd māškīni. 11. gllu lkmār: ḥatt āna mša wāḥdeyn umādādām ygwadu ʾṣliya w ydaqqtuini w la bāgi šī, ma yfaddālūli w nm ġor blād vih lhorrīya w mšā ʾši umādām. 12. gllu: tšāla nattavgul. 13. w mšaw hūma lāndneyn w f trīghom ẓaboru? dīk. 14. gllušu: anta xbārak? 15. gllhmː āna kant omša wāḥdeyn ymgalālām umādām, naddān alhm fgāb alleyl awnaqīthom ʾašla ššleš?. 16. w tīši zeyn w ṣfrī lkmār yzaqynu bih ṣwyāmām w mša ḥāda ngANNilib. 17. mneyngyuf yām ʾlādīyowklu lkmām w ylawbsu illbās azzeyn w y̱wwrku w āna ndnbāh, w ṣhābi ṣyahdun. 18. w mneyng naqlat w naddān sābāg mša ʾsbbāh v ley ṣydbāhūni. 19. gllulu: tšāla mši mšaṇa! 20. nu ʾlādbšu ʾlān blād ma vih umādām, ya ḫāna nwār vih ʾalhorrīya, ma yšiy ḥadd mwarqatna. 21. tammū māšīn ṣzōr nērāb 8 galtlhom mnhālī sanha w mwarqatna lbnxānis w tōdr alhorrīya w mšāt mšāhom. 22. zāw lablād wnst ʾlāgbāa w ṣaddu vih zrib a ḥrdū vih yāśw mān azzraš w ḥrd lḥdeyž. 23. w ṣaḥd lkmār yāṣar. 24. w ṣāndham ḡāya w ṣāndham ṣawd w mhariyom zeyna w ṣnawwlu w trahhmu w ṣawd ma mdqqal alhīhom šī, w mstāšmāhom šī. 24. bāsad sana gllhm ʾlkmār: āna leyya naxtār 9 ṣyngani! 25. glluluː ya lkmār, la ṣtgani! 26. ʾšhna ḣbarna ḥorrīyatna mn umādām. 27. ya ġyrr la ḡannayt yqqdd yasmašna šī ṣmn ʾšh ṣlāgbāa, w yžina šī ʾyaqlam̄na qaʃlā hwarqatna. 28. gllhmː āna lli māššāni ʾʃan umādām omhm ydaqqal ʾṣliya wwarqtuini. 29. ʾntūmā ṣmālī ila ṣadtu lāhī

6 Mit /ḍ/ und nicht mit /ḏ/. Siehe Cohen (1963: 16) „ḍʕ·f ‘il s’est affaibli’ (toutes les formes de la racine de ce verbe comportent d’ailleurs un ḍ en ḥassaniya“. Auf Seite 17 erklärt er Formen mit /ḍ/ anstelle von /ḏ/ als „formes empruntées à la langue littéraire“.


8 In Taine-Cheikh (2004: 89) ist neyreb maskulin.

9 In Taine-Cheikh (1989 III: 587) xtār „(pour xtār) ... désirer, vouloir“ und Imperfekt yxtēyr neben yxtār.
twarṣṭu in tdaqqul ʕilya, lāhi nəmši ʕankǝm! 30. w tǝmmu f ħada ilin gām ʕyanni. 31. mneyn ʕanna in żāʔ ʕwayy mal-waqt10 żāhǝm ʕabun, dabb. 32. gālhǝm ʕabun:11 ġantumǝ xǝbarkǝm? 33. gāluːluː ʕna allen ʕeyna hūn. 34. walla tǝmm yǝtkładam mʕi̇hǝm ilin ʕaf ɫaḥmār w raṣṣav gayyu12 ġumah yowklu. 35. gām ɫaḥmār xyaṭbu bkarʕāyh ʕla ṣlaːm. 36. raṣṣav əddik w nkt ʕaʃynin ʕabun. 37. raṣṣav əlkalb w ʕatʃ afɾāq ʕabun. 38. w bga ʕabun ʕišma w mʕaṛgab. 39. ġaʃtu w ʕal laḥmār: ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 40. gāllhǝm ɫaḥmār: asməhli ġaʃda ilin ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun in ndoɾ nəgbǝl nidaʃkǝm w nəsmaʃkǝm. 42. baʃad sana kān ɫaḥmār yǝxtǝr yww.: 44. gāllhǝm ɫaḥmār: ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 45. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 47. gālūluː ʕtǝbqī? 48. gāllhǝm: mna nəbgi ʕiʔ! ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 49. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 51. raʃṣav əddik w ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, raʃṣav əlkalb w gṭaʕ aʕrāq ʕanbun. 52. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 54. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 56. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 58. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 60. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 62. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 64. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 66. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 68. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 70. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 72. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 74. ġaʃda slǝkm ʕeyna ʕaʃtu nǝmši ʕanbun, yww.: 76. wāḥad

12 Vgl. Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 241) gās, ġigis „dirigirse a“.
13 In vorliegenden Glossaren und Wörterbüchern nicht nachweisbar.
vwog wāḥǝd ydōṛ iyyāk ḏāk mǝnḥam ǝlli huwwa lvowgāni mǝn ǝddfładīn yalḥag rās āttaydūma w yagбалhım b-e-ydu, yaṭrahḥım v ǝtrāb w yaktaḥlhm ǝlvīl ǝldmahrūg. 77. mneyn ʕād ǝlvīl ǝlli huwwa ǝddfładīn hvwa lvowgāni ǝlāhi yalḥaghǝm, ġām ǝddik w tkallam malvwog ǝrayya b-l-뇌reb, ǝl-και: ya m ǝnt mizzhūra16 ʾlāh ǝnnāṛ naḥrag ǝld ṭālifūn! 78. ǝsmaʿ ǝlvīl ǝttahṭāni ǝlli kān mahrūg sābog ḏāk, ǝsmaʿ ǝxbāṛ ǝnnāṛ w ǝntk ǝlwīl ǝlmaḥrūg. 79. tāḥu ʾl-ṇuḥayl ǝlavreyn w ǝ strSQL. 80. w hrawler mahrūg waḥdu. 81. w salk, slk ʾalkarb w slk ʾl-ḥmār w nnēṛb w ṣhābu ddařif in w rāf ʿl-harṭhom, ḥawāṭhom azzayna. 81. w ʾl-ḥmār ṭar ʾl-tīhām, ʾm ʾṣāfūh. 83. ʾm ʿarvu ya kān kālūḥ ʾl-bxānūs ʾnkal ʾrāʾ ʾl-lāḏām. 84. w hakaḍā fit-τašawun quwwa w ʾl-hurrīya mahkūmatun bin-niqām liʔannaha nisbiyā.

Text 1: Die Geschichte vom Esel, vom Hund, vom Hasen, vom Hahn und den wilden Tieren, den armen


17 Stereotype Einleitung bei Märchen und Erzählungen.
18 Šaṃāma heißen die fruchtbaren Ufer des Senegal-Flusses, wo Getreide, darunter vor allem Hirse, angebaut wird.
19 Es ist ein hölzerner Trinknapf für Hunde.

20 ḏâyâ Taine-Cheikh (1998 VII: 1369) ḏâye „mare, marigot ... mare temporaire“.

21 Da hat er wohl etwas verwechselt.
dass er sang. 45. Bis er ihnen vorsang. 46. Als er sang, kam zu ihnen ein Löwe. Er sag-
te zu ihnen: Wer hat euch von meinem Wald erzählt, dessen König ich bin? Ihr habt
mich nicht gefragt und ihr habt mir nicht Bescheid gesagt. 47. Sie sagten zu ihm: was
willst du? 48. Er sagte zu ihnen: Ich will nichts! Ich werde den Hahn zum Frühstück
fressen, ich werde den Hund zum Mittagessen fressen, und ich werde den Esel zum
Abendessen machen, und den Hasen und die anderen esse ich zu einer anderen Zeit.
49. Sie verblieben so bis der Löwe den Esel angreifen wollte. 50. Da schlug der Esel
ihn mit seinen Füssen auf das Maul. 51. Da sprang der Hahn los und hackte dem
Löwen die Augen aus, da sprang der Hund los und biss die Flechsen des Löwen durch.
52. Da blieb der Löwe mit durchgebissenen Flechsen und sah nichts mehr, er war
blind. 53. Und sie töteten ihn und begruben ihn. 54. Sie versammelten sich ein weite-
res Mal und sagten zum Esel: lass uns in Frieden, lass uns in Frieden, wir sind fertig
mit dir, wir sind fertig mit dir! Lass uns in Frieden! 55. Er sagte zu ihnen: So Gott will,
werde ich nicht mehr die Absicht haben zu singen. 56. Dieses Mal verzeiht mir, ich
habe die Absicht nie wieder zu singen. 57. Als zwei Jahre um waren, da hatte der Esel
wieder Lust zu singen, aber er wusste, wenn er das seinen Freunden erzählen würde,
würden sie ihn nicht lassen. 58. Er fing an zu singen ohne ihnen Bescheid zu sagen.
59. Als er sang da blieben sie, bis ein Dickhäuter, also ein Elefant, diesen Pferch hoch-
hob und ihn auf seinem Hals trug. 60. Er sagte zu ihnen: Was ist mit euch hier, ihr
kommt hierher und habt mir nicht Bescheid gesagt, und wann seid ihr hierher ge-
riges Kinder, ich werde euch mitnehmen und euch werden meine Kinder zum Abend-
essen verspeisen. 63. Sie sagten zu ihm: Nur das willst du? 64. Aber wir haben von dir
gehört, dass du kräftig und stark bist, wie man weiß. 65. Vielleicht kannst du diese
stand mit ihr auf und ging los mit der Laube auf seinem Rücken. 68. Da banden sie die
Laube an seinem Bauch fest und zündeten sie an. 69. Und er flüchtete vor ihnen und
der Elefant wurde ordentlich verbrannt. 70. Als es Morgen wurde, da wussten sie,
dass der Elefant versuchen würde zu ihnen zurückzukehren. 71. Der Esel floh und
seine Freunde stiegen auf einen großen Affenbrotbaum. 72. Der Elefant kam und
band sie auf dem Baobab, aber es konnte sie nicht erreichen. 73. Und er ging weg und
kehrte zurück und bereitete sich vor, um sie zu erreichen. 74. Er brachte dreißig Elen-
fanten mit. 75. Er kniete sich nieder, und er war der unterste, dann kam ein zweiter
Elefant, der kniete auf ihm, und es kam ein dritter Elefant, der kniete auf jenem, und
es kam ein vierter, der kniete auf jenem. 76. Einer auf dem anderen versuchte, dass
derjenige von ihnen, der der oberste von den dreißig war, die Krone des Baobab-Bau-
mes erreichte und ihn mit seiner Hand packen könnte. 77. Als der Elefant, der der
dreißigste war, der der oberste war sie fassen wollte, da sprach der Hahn von oben
und rief dem Hasen zu: Tochter des Baus, 22 her mit dem Feuer, ich will diesen

22 Epitheton für den Hasen.
verfluchten Kerl verbrennen! 78. Der untere Elefant, jener der vorher verbrannt worden war, hörte das von dem Feuer, machte sich aus dem Staub und floh. 79. Da fielen die anderen Elefanten hinunter und starben. 80. Und der Verbrannte floh allein. 81. Und sie kamen davon, der Hund kam davon und der Esel kam davon und die Hase und seine armen Freunde, und sie gingen zu ihrem Acker zurück und ihrem schönen Leben. 82. Und der Esel verschwand aus ihrem Leben, sie sahen ihn nicht mehr. 83. Sie wussten nicht, ob ihn die wilden Tiere gefressen hatten oder ob er wieder zu den Menschen zurückgekehrt war. 84. Und so ist in der Zusammenarbeit Stärke und die Freiheit ist bedingt durch Ordnung, denn sie ist relativ.

Text 2: Ṣwây al-xaṭṭār al-ḥukamāʔ

1. gâllak ma gâllak w al bân ŏnna w al bânãlak, w al bân lûlaydât almâsîlnîn. 2. xâlak w huwwa salṭân, vad-dahaɾ lowwal. 3. râhûlu gdat xaṭṭâr. 4. bayyâtham w beyt mân dârû w mneyn ŏôd waqât aî ôfîs, maâssâhâm lafâsâ]? w kân kâsâs âllî slîh alhâm. 5. w huwwa mîsâlîn ma gîd mîxâ xaṭṭârû w la t'âssâ mîâhâm. 6. yâ yèy agbadâ wàhêd barrku ẖâhâm ma y'râsû vîh. 7. gâllu mîsâlîn lamnâmâm hâdâ lmubarrak: âsâf li, dâk âllî lâhî yôglû. 8. ânâthâw alxaṭṭâr alfaśâw, w šâkkîn ūnham ma ẖâhâm âhâd. 9. gâl wàhêd manhâm: hâdâ lîhâm âllî slîh ḏa? kâsâs rûḏâq ibân >`bâxânîs! 10. gâl âṭṭâni: ḥatta hâdâ kâsâs múlûtu li bârêmûntu w mûfàdâltu ma ŏôd tôsâlî lwêqât âllî kànt t'âddûtû vîh qâfûn ūnham ma ūnham. 11. gâl âṭṭâbât: ḥatta mîsâlîn âllî ŏnna bâyyât ūndû blăbu, ma ūndû-bu. 12. rûḏâ alzaâsîs âssâlîn, gâllu dâk âllî gâlu laṭṭâr aṭṭlâdá. 13. gâm âssâlîn w mûsâ laqâsî li sârêh lâgınm âllî mînhâ sâsât, ūlmâdûbûhá. 14. gâllu: hâdî sâsât, bâs rabbeytha? 15. gâllu: hâdî sâsât, mneyn kànt axtâlga s'gâyare, mätât amôhî. 16. w kânát ūndû kalbe, ūlbanha yásâr w xalleytha tar'dâshá. 17. w rbât bôlânha. 18. gâm âssâlîn ūm'mâlî w mûsâsâ]: lamôrû lî mûfâddî kâsâs. 19. gâllha: mân dà ra yâ kànâk wîl-waqât dîk âllî kànt t'âddûtî hâdâ kâsâsâ ali kàlû laṭṭâr mûn dà ra kànâk dàk wîl-waqât mûn tôsâlî? 20. gâl'tlu: šâhîh! ma kànt nûsâllî! 21. gâm âssâlîn, ūm'mâlî wîyad ënnû n w ŏza hâdâha? w gâl as'lîha dd'îr w gba'd xânzâr w gâllhâ: yâmînî gûlîî bîyâ mânhû! gûlîî bûyâ ẖaqqîqî âdâ na'l hânnû! 22. âssâlîn âllî tûdâlî ūnnû bûyâ mâhû huwwa bûyî. 23. dâf, dâf ënnû âssâlîn wàlîn tûdâlî yakhâltû, w gâl'tlû: yà wleydî, ẖâqîqîa, ìn bûy mà yûlît, kàn ẖâqîm. 24. w xâf ënn âssâlîṇa tûsîî, ìn beytû, ìn xêmîtîkûm. 25. w gba'dît leylà, rûdî lîbîl w daxxâltu fîlîyà, w ḥmâtîn mànûn dâk álhamal kàn w huwwa li ŏôd mànûn wàlîl li huwwa ântû. 26. w ḡagg bûk âssâlîn âllî yàngûl ūnnû bûk mâhû huwwa bûk álhaqqîqî. 27. gâm âssâlîn aṣṣâ], 25 w mûsâsâ]: lâl'kâmâbî lâdîyîvî, alxaṭṭâr aṭṭâshà, gâllhâm: âná


25 Ohne Artikel!

25 Taine-Cheikh (1988 I: 21) aṣṣâ ~ ᵇsa „donc“. 
smaʕtkǝm mneyn gǝltu ʕan kǝskǝs, w mūlātu ma tǝsalli, ǝlli mfaddǝltu. 28. w ʕan aʃša?, ǝlli maɬbūha rāḍa lban ǝbxǝnīs. 29. w smaʕtkǝm mneyn gǝltu ʕanīn āna blābu. 30. naxtǝr kǝll wāḥǝd ǝlkǝm ygǝltu hāḍa š waʃsāh ygǝltu, bās gǝltu! 31. gām dāk ǝlli gāl ʕan aʃša?, ʕlīha rāḍaʃa lban ǝbxǝnīs, gǝltu: hāḍa aʃraʃ ǝnnha rāḍa bâr bâl ǝbxǝnīs biya alli ʃāmha yanʃaf beyn ǝllhǝm w lǝʃḍam. 32. hāḍa ma yaʃxlag ykün ǝlbxǝnīs. 33. gâllaq ǝlkwxar, ǝlli gāl ʕan mülât kǝskǝs ma tǝsalli, gâl: kǝskǝs bârǝmtu māhi zeyna, mistaxsar ʃwayy bih ǝlli mfaddǝltu ma tǝsalli, taʃrah bâḍa ǝfla gwâmymha tǝtḥarrak mâṛrāt dāk ātaʃrak, ǝst ǝʃrǝm말 huwwa lli ʃxǝrǝs barmat kǝskǝs. 34. gâm ǝlkwxar ǝlli gāl ʕan ǝssǝltǝn ǝblâbu, gâllo: āna gǝlt ʕanni āna blâbu. 35. nǝxtǝr kǝll wāḥǝd mǝnkǝm ygūlli hāḍa sh waʃṣaḥ ygūlu, bâš gâlu! 36. gâm ḏâk ǝlli gâl ʕan mülâtu ma tǝsalli, gâl: kǝskǝs bârǝmtu māhi zeyna, mistaxsar ʃwayy bih ǝlli mfaddǝltu ma tǝsalli, taʃrah bâḍa ǝfla gwâmymha tǝtḥarrak mâṛrāt dāk ātaʃrak, ǝst ǝʃrǝm말 huwwa lli ʃxǝrǝs barmat kǝskǝs.

taʃliq

1. ɾaʃyəb, hāḍi lqǝssə ǝna vâhəm ǝntη, ʰikam 26 ʃaʃbiya mustayyana. 2. ǝlḥǝkma lowwla maqalən: ǝn barʃramət kǝskǝs mneyn ǝtkaʃtər ǝlhaɾaka, ǝtkaʃtər ǝlhaɾaka v waʃt ǝmahl lǝbrǝyem, ygaʃdǝu yʃzı ɫbarmât maʃkabrǝt, wâḍa ʔaʃkǝr ǝna lʃxra. 3. mneyn tʃu ǝldəhâd ǝkbar ǝna lʃxra, tgaʃd ɗik ǝʃʃgayra ʃtiʃ ɂabag ɗik lɛkbiɾa, tʃu ʃhâd ǝsəra. 4. ǝʃbixət, ǝʃbixət alkǝskǝs, ɬdǝn nəvǝhmu hawn 27 ǝna hâd ɬhǝkma ǝntə ɬhâka, ǝntə ɬhâka v maʃdǝn əʃtabx. 5. ǝnnen ʃás ǝbrǝyem kǝskǝs, mülâtu yallaθa 28 ma tǝʃharrək. 6. iyaykəʃz maʃbūt v mutgaddyin bəṛmətu w malas w ləviθom wâḍa кова mən lʃxra. 7. nəvəhmu ǝna məsʔal təsslǝn ʔəʃah, ɬhâka ʃaʃbiya ma ǝnasərvu 29 ʃahkan ʃahiθa wəlła kâḍa. 8. ǝnnen ləbxǝnīs yəṇẓbəɾ ʔəʃhǝm ɓeyn ǝʃḍəməh, w ɬəhna lənasərvu ɬhayawən ǝnnen ʃəʃhəm viθ yʃu əvəg ɬəhəm, w lə nasərv ǝna ɬəl ɬələt ɬhəkma ʃaʃbiya kənəhən ʃaʃḍa wəlła kâḍa. 9. maʃsəltən ǝssəltən ǝnasərvu ɬahkan, ǝnnen ʃayb ɬand ɬəməɾɨtənən ləwwən lə ʃayb ɬand ɬu lə liθom, rəʃəl yμ̣tən ma xalləf awləd. 10. hâḍa kân ʃayb w ma zâl ʃayb. 11. w ɬəndu əʃbəb xuʃusən ǝna lənasərvu ɬəniθə, ɬənə ɬəhəd ɬaʃ, ma ɬəndu ɬawləd ɬəʃəbəlu "Alλhə nəɾɾəhma!", w yʃəddəg ɬuʃ ʃu ʃuʃaʃ ɬəsad mawtəwə, yʃu maʃrəm, ɬəsad mawtəw. 12. w ɬəhəd ma xalləf awləd ɬənə tɔwə, w lə tɔwə, ɬədəd yaʃrəv ɬəʃmu. 13. w lə ʃəd b ɬawləd w awlədəu b awlədəhəm, ytamən yəṇsməʔ, w ytmən maʃrəf ʃagəb mawtəw, w yʃu dəʔ, ɬəmtidəd ɬəʃhəyətu. 14. hâd ɬiaqliya ǝna ʃəzəzət lawləd w ɬəbəhəm ɦiyya li lı davaʃt zawzet əssəltən ɬəkbər lənuhəʔ, mneyn ʃəd zawəশə ɬəʃqim ǝnnə ma txallli

26 Er spricht nicht immer ein Schwa aus, wo man es erwarten müsste, was schlicht eine Angleichung an das Hocharabische ist.
28 Taine-Cheikh (2004: 67) „yallə/yallət“ (+ pron. affixe commençant par une voyelle) + v : ex. il faut que je parte demain ... yallə-t i namši subh [sic!].
29 Beim Abfragen auch als nasārvu realisiert.
ssǝlṭān yʕūd ʕāqīm w dvaʕha hāḏi l tʕaddǝl üld māhu mašrūʕ. 15. w nǝvǝhmu ẓadǝl man hāḏi laḥkāya, ʕand ǝlmūrītānīyīn ma zeyn ʕandhǝm ḥadd yxalli xǝṭṭāru ḥwādhǝm ma tkallǝm ǝmʕāhǝm w la gʕad ǝmʕāhǝm.

Text 2: Die weisen Gäste


Kommentar

1. Gut, ich verstehe aus dieser Geschichte, dass es sich um bestimmte Volksweisheiten handelt. 2. Die erste Weisheit zum Beispiel [besagt]: Wenn die Frau, die das Kuskus zerkrümelt, sich zu viel bewegt, wenn sie sich zu viel bewegt, wenn sie es zerkrümelt, dann können die Krümel größer werden, eines größer als das andere. 3. Wenn ein Körnchen größer ist als das andere, dann kann dieses kleine vor dem großen gar werden, dann ist dieses ein Verlust. 4. Es geht um das Kochen, das Kochen des Kuskus, folglich verstehen wir hier von dieser Weisheit, dass es sich um eine Weisheit aus dem Bereich des Kochens handelt. 5. Nämlich dass, wenn man Kuskus zerkrümelt, die Frau, die es macht, sich nicht bewegen soll. 6. Damit es richtig wird und die einzelnen Körner gleich groß sind und glatt und dass unter ihnen keines größer als das andere ist. 7. Wir verstehen von der Angelegenheit mit dem Schaf, dass es sich um eine Volksweise handelt, von der wir aber nicht wissen, ob sie richtig oder falsch

30 Ahmed-Salem merkt an, dass es in 1001 Nacht ein Sprichwort gibt, wonach nur der uneheliche Sohn nicht mit seinen Gästen isst: man lam yaʔkul maʔla dayfihi fahuwa waladu zinā.

31 Des Dichters Höflichkeit verschweigt, dass die Frau, die das Kuskus zerkrümelte, ihre Tage hatte und deshalb herumgerutscht ist. Das deutet er an durch „sie hat nicht gebetet“.

Text 3: ǝlxǝṭba w ǝzziwāž

1. ǝlxǝṭba lli hiyya, ǝlli hiyya lwåtya lowwla?, ǝf-ṭrīg ǝzziwāž ǝtxlaŋ aʃla keyvīyət šaadat almūrītānyin lowwlın, ǝb-ṭrīg, ba-ṭrīg alli lāhi ngulu  šaark. 2. ǝv-zaman ǝddahar lowwəl ǝlxǝṭba ma tsūd ǝtwiliθ, ya ǧer xaląg nōʃ mǝl-ʃaxba yaṭaawwaʃ, w huwwa nnōʃ allı yangāllu  ﻟﺍﺣﺯ, waʃla ttrāk. 3. w ḥaḍa  yaxlaŋ mneyn  aṭgul uṃn  aṭṭfal, walğa  avgeylîs, 33  Sanha  ḥayzulu,  aṭṭuva  lvulānīyəʔ,  allı tgadd  aṭṭūd mənt  ṣamm  ḡaḍa  ʧffal,  man  aŋgrayyaʃ  walğa  man  abûd. 4. ḥaḍa  nnōʃ  mǝl-ʃaxba  yaṭawwəl. 5. ya ǧer  aɬxǝṭba lli ma yaṭawwaʃ, diʃ hiyyaʔ, allı tʃaddal al-wāḥad əkbīr, avuɡrâš, yabgi yazzawwaʃ  šabbê  kביר. 6. xalęg  ʈrɪgə xra  lal-ʃaxba, walğa  găʃ  əṭrəɡ yəsraʔ. 7. ya ǧer  tæxltʃ kiv  ihitilaʃ  laŋdaʃal w əzzīhah, kiv  aɡbūyəl azZwāya, w aɡbūyəl Awlād  Ḥassān, w aɡbūyəl Ẓnāga  w əlMʕallmîn, w əlḤaʃrādəʔ, əlḤaʃrāʔtîn, w ələʃbîd. 8. ḥaḍu  šaadatham yäsr  mənaʃ maḥu wāḥad. 9. ya ǧer allı maʃi ʾiʃ  yäsr  mən  nās  kāmlaʔ, əv-dahar  lowwəl, huwwa  nnu  uʃm  aṭṭfal, walğa  ɾrāʃəl, walğa  bûh, huwwa  lli  yørwəd  ǝlхаṭba  sîr  əhəl  ləmra, allı lāhi yazzawwaʃ biho. 10. yuglulham: əhraʔ, lāhi nnāsbūkəm, waʃla  nəbgu  nnāsbūkəm, waʃla  nəbgu  nʃayvʁukəm! 11. ənʃayvʁukəm καλμα, əsəlaʃ  bəbiri, w əlkołma  lfaʃiθa  lbaarəbiya:  təʃifəɾt, əb-məʃna  tʃawwir, ənʃawwʁukəm. 12. w mneyn yənθəʔ, w mneyn yənθəʔ, yaxłaŋ

33 Nicht in Taine-Cheikh.
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العقد الأذى، يخض يعطى العادة العقدة في الأمة.

13. ماذا يكون له الزكاة الديبية.
14. في الزكاة أدى تعذيب في نهاية الوالد.
15. في بالإفطار أكل لحم الأمة.
16. في الأشياء الديبية ينادي للأمة.
17. في المائدة لم يذكر الأسرة.
18. في القضاء لم يذكر الأسرة.
19. في العقيدة لم يذكر الأسرة.
20. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
21. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
22. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
23. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
24. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
25. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
26. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
27. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
28. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
29. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
30. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
31. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
32. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
33. في الإ-Juliana، يخض يعطى الأسرة.
34. في Taine-Cheikh (1990 V: 1048) mit /s/. In der Übersetzung von Ould Mohamed-Baba mit /ṣ/.
36. Er schwankt bisweilen zwischen /a/ und /u/.
Text 3: Verlobung und Heirat

1. Die Verlobung, die, die der erste Schritt auf dem Weg zur Hochzeit ist geschieht nach den Sitten der Mauretanier von früher, auf die Art, die wir nun erzählen werden. 2. Früher dauerte die Verlobung nicht lange, aber es gibt eine Art Verlobung, die lange dauert, und diese Art nennt man ḥāz\textsuperscript{37} oder ṭrākīn.\textsuperscript{38} 3. Und dies geschieht, wenn die Mutter des Jungen, oder des jungen Mannes von ihr sagt, sie sei ihm reserviert, das Mädchen Soundso, die die Kusine dieses Jungen sein kann, aus der näheren oder entfernteren Verwandtschaft. 4. Diese Art von Verlobung dauert lange. 5. Aber die Verlobung, die nicht lange dauert, die ist diejenige, welche ein Erwachsener macht, ein junger Mann,\textsuperscript{39} der ein erwachsenes Mädchen heiraten will. 6. Es gibt noch eine andere Art von Verlobung, oder es gibt sicher viele Arten. 7. Sie unterscheidet sich aber [auch] wie sich die Stämme und Gegenden unterscheiden, wie die Stämme der Zwāya, die Stämme der Awlād Ḥassān, die Stämme der Zenaga und der Handwerker, der Bauern, der freigelassenen Sklaven und der Sklaven. 8. Diese haben viele Sitten, die sind nicht alle gleich. 9. Aber was am häufigsten bei den meisten Leuten ist, früher, ist, dass die Mutter des Jungen, oder des Mannes, oder sein Vater die Verlobung der Familie der Frau anträgt, die er heiraten will. 10. Er sagt zu ihnen: Wir wollen mit euch durch Heirat verwandt sein, oder wir wollen uns mit euch verschwäger, oder wir wollen euch nahe sein. 11. ṣayvrūḳe is ein Wort berberischen Ursprungs, und das \textit{hochberberische} Wort ist \textit{tesifārt},\textsuperscript{40} das bedeutet „Nachbarschaft, wir sind eure Nachbarn“. 12. Und wenn er beendet wird, wenn er zu Ende geht, der Heiratsvertrag wird gewöhnlich gemäß den Regeln der malekitischen


\textsuperscript{38} Taine-Cheikh (1989 IV: 829) „fait de fiancer, de se fiancer avec“.

\textsuperscript{39} avugrāš „joven“ in Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 195).

\textsuperscript{40} Ḥām-Saḥim hat ṭesifārt in ṭāšāvāṛat korrigiert. Taine-Cheikh (1988 VI: 1190) teševāṛat „(probablement du zén.)“.

\textsuperscript{41} Taine-Cheikh (1990 VI: 1190–1191) šeyver „habiter, être du même campement que qqn.“.

42 yuxarrras in Taine-Cheikh (1989 III: 523) „être regardé, être vu ... être jauge, examiné, analysé“.
43 D. h., die mauretanischen Araber.
44 ʕrab bezieht sich normalerweise nur auf die Kriegerstämme. Hier sind aber generell die Araber Mauretanis gesemt.
46 Wohl zu Taine-Cheikh (1990 IV: 804) rǝvq „bonté, bienveillance, humantié, douceur“.
47 eywa ist nicht „ja“. Vgl. Taine-Cheikh (1988 I: 42) „eh bien! bon!“.
48 Taine-Cheikh (1990 IV: 842) tǝrwāḥ „fait d’amener chez soi sa nouvelle épouse – cela se passe toujours le soir“.
49 ǝskǝ Taine-Cheikh (1990 VI: 1236) „‘cri, bruit, tapage, brouhaha,’ ‘convesation bruyante, bavar-dage bruyant,’ ‘dispute verbale’; par ext. (au S.-O, pop.) ‘mariage’“. 
etwas Geld als Brautgeld. 32. Dieses Geld kann bezahlt werden für den Preis eines Tieres. 33. Nun, am Tag der Hochzeitsfeier, da gibt es viele Versammlungen, und Feiern und Festlichkeiten. 34. Die jungen Männer machen ihre sportlichen Spiele, und die Kamele versammeln sich, und es gibt Trommeln und Tanz, und einige Stämme schießen mit ihren Gewehren. 35. Zu den Sachen, die bei der Hochzeitsfeier geschehen, gehört der Wettstreit der Altersgruppen. 36. Was sind die Altersgruppen? Was sind sie? 37. Wir werden ein bisschen über die Altersgruppen reden. 38. In der alten mauretanischen Gesellschaft werden die jungen Männer in Gruppen aufgeteilt nach dem Alter. 39. Diese Gruppen nennt man lasṣār. 40. Der ṣaṣr sind, die im selben Jahr geboren sind oder in zwei Jahren hintereinander. 41. Und die jungen Männer die älter als sie sind um drei Jahre bilden einen anderen ṣaṣr, und sofort. 42. Diese Altersgruppen bei der Hochzeitsfeier, die wetteifern kräftig miteinander mit Ringkampf den wir dǝzz oder rāḏx nennen. 43. Sie wetteifern miteinander in Ḥassāni-Dichtung, mit Liedern und mit hocharabischer Dichtung. 44. Und gewöhnlich am Tag der Hochzeitsfeier, die Altersgruppe, aus der einer heiratet, da kommt es zu einem heftigen Wettstreit zwischen ihr und der Altersgruppe, die älter oder jünger als sie ist. 45. Jede Altersgruppe verspottet eine Altersgruppe mit Gedichten, oder die beiden Altersgruppen kämpfen miteinander, sie schlagen sich mit den Händen, und diese Art Sport artet zu einer regelrechten Schlacht aus, sie schlagen sich mit den Händen auf harte Art. 46. Gut, die Tage des Brautzuges sind sieben an der Zahl, das nennt man sbaʕ, und an diesen Tagen bleibt die Altersgruppe des Ehemannes bei ihm, in seinem Zelt, im Zelt des Bräutigams. 47. Und die Familie der Frau, der Braut also, die schicken ihnen das Essen und Trinken tags und nachts. 48. Die Altersgruppen, aus der einer geheiratet hat, bringen, wenn es geht, Musikanten mit sich, die bleiben mit ihnen. 49. Das Wort īggāwǝn bedeutet „Sänger“, und dieses Wort nennen „die Weißen“ īggāwǝn, und die Toukouleur nennen sie gāwlu und die Wolof gēwal. 50. Nun, nach den sieben Tagen zerstreut sich die Altersgruppe, da bleibt der Bräutigam allein mit seiner Verwandtschaft. 51. Wenn die Frau vorher schon einmal verheiratet war, dann ist die Hochzeitsfeier, dann ist die Heirat anders als das was wir gerade erzählt haben. 52. Wenn die Frau zum Beispiel die Sache in der Hand hat, wenn sie die Sache in der Hand hat, dann kann sie ohne Vermittlung gefreit werden, und normalerweise ist ihr Brautgeld geringer, und die Zeit zwischen Verlobung und Heirat dauert nicht lange. 53. Wenn der Mann, der Bräutigam mit seinen Freunden kommt, dann dauert das Festessen drei Tage und nicht sieben.

50 tbāhir zu Taine-Cheikh (1988 I: 148) bāhǝr „rivaliser (en polémique)“.  
53 Plural zu īggīw “cantante” (Ould Mohamed-Baba 2008: 195).  
54 Dem (1995: 14) géwël „griot, praise singers“.  
55 Taine-Cheikh (2004: 69) grān „fiancailles officielles“.
1. eywa, mneyn yaxlag iššir, val-xayma lmüritinya lowwla, hāda iššir axlāgту awwalan atži aš’a eyd algabbāda. 2. algabbāda hiyya lli taqta’s saṛrtu b-mūs. 3. w hiyya lli ta’ṣəḥmu, laḥsūm ašli yangāllu shūm laxlāga. 4. w hādi lamra nnafse, taši sbašt ayyām, w hiyya lvi ‘fādāt garbīb. 5. annhār lowwal tāsbaḥ amḥamma wžīha, ygūlu nnās fān dīk alḥammārī?: atšūf lanha ‘zān. 6. ūgabd dāk taši nmallī sbašt ayyām dā’imān gā’ad aragāż sāḥelha. 7. hāda yṣūf aššayātīn v-ṣṭiqād aššaṭ. 8. ygūlu nmallī fān omrā nafṣa?, ma ḫadd ḥād saḥalha, ygadd išširha yubaddal. 9. maʃina yubaddal ǝnnu yǝmsū bih al-‘avārīt, w xallilī v-ballī wāḥad ma anavlāhīm. 10. ayy aḥmaq sāḥ almüritānīyīn lowwil ygūlu ǝnn sabab ḥammāq huwwa ǝnnu ubaddal v-šwālal. 11. eywa, annafṣa, layyām assabba ǝbaʃ axlāg tīṣir, yatamn ‘andha dā’imān musḥa, marṣug ‘and rās iššir, bihallī b-ṣṭiqād aššaṭ ann al-ṣavārīt xāyīn man ləḥdīd. 12. maḏalan ṣṭa waḥad yīf maraq kīv ṣaddowṣa, w ygūlu lḥukamā? aššaṭbiyyīn al-dāk amnām ’andnu yasamal silāḥ, kif seyf, w'allī sakkin w'allī xanžar w'allī madvwa, maṭtaqīdīn ǝnn yasamal yṣūf ’andnu lḥavārīt. 13. ūgabd layyām assabba, atži assimiyaw, yaxlag losom. 14. w v-dāk alḥīn yīfūd varah ah al išṣir akar ǝnn yīfūd iššir iṭṭal dākār, w ǝṭṭuvla ma yonvrah biha dā’imān. 15. w ǝl‘ādī ǝnn išṣir yussama b-ṣa?, waḥda, yngāllha šat assimiyaw. 16. mneyn yīfūdu xālgin tāḥmu lāḥmād‘a tronatālahm dīk aššaṭ. 17. aṭṭūd šądad ǝlhiom. 18. w tʒeqd ǝlχayma tmaṛrag šatayn, waḥda lat-tlāmid, w waḥda tāḥbaḥha lxayma lamsamminya. 19. ǝl‘ādī ǝnn ǝḥsīsr ǝṣaṣṭa ɬa-sannāf, lṭ任命min. 20. šat assimiyaw, ǝṣṣalha, w ġaḥraḥa yəṣṣaṣṭa ɬa-gabbāda, mneyn yīfūdu tlāmād māḥom hādri. 21. mneyn yīfūd ǝṭṭfəl ǝmsayṭar val-xayma, huwwa lli yxtar ǝsəm l-tʃaf. 22. mneyn yīfūdu ǝṭṭfəl ɬaʃdu ɬadd raviʃ bəl-ʃəm, waʃła bəʃ-ʃażaʃa, yussama ɬilīh, blā ɬiləf. 23. eywa mneyn tʃəd lamra msayṭra val-xayma, yvadd ǝṭṭfəl yussama ɬa būha ɬaʃla bəl-əʃəm, əlli təbgūlu hiyya. 24. vih hālāt əʃra, kif hālāt zarg ǝṭṭfəd, yngābdə əxmas şudān waʃła ɾəbā, w yugamąq aragąz w kall wāḥad məl-tʃudān yəzməl əʃəm, w yζi amnāmam ləmʃañmaʃ w yxtar ɬuʃ. 25. yīfūdu əʃəm ɗak əṭṭfəd huwwa sm əṭṭfəl: Muḥammad, ɬeq Bakkār, Ḥamdī, Ḥabīb w hakaʃa. 26. eywa əṭṭfəl, mneyn yīfūd əgəli, ɬaʃu səbgu xūtu, waʃła huwwa lowwal, waʃła awląd ɬannu ɬayyıʃin rəţəłəm, hāda əṭṭfəl yuʃəddallu əʃt, yngāllu əṃrūg əṭṭuʃa. 27. maḏalaŋ ɬaʃhurdu wəʃhın, kif əṭṭuʃa, w ydīrə ɬiʃa xəra, waʃła yasaməh əʃəm ərəbi, yasaməh ɬəʃaʃam, ənʃəni, waʃła yasaməh əʃəm lkwər, ɬənu maŋ əʃəm? aqəɾbu, w ɬənu maŋ ɬasəmi lmaʃrəva ɬəndəm. 28. ygūlu ɬan hāda maʃlüm əṭṭfəl. 29. yowm əʃəm yumaqqaʃ 59 rəs əṭṭfəl,


w artisan, w tuzayyan artisan, shinn alqibay almah kamlat.
30. w alli huwwa tafs falagh kaur ma yuzayyan sabg alsham alxams man yamru. 31. tawkal assima, attazyan yshaddl latibba, attaqalidiyyin walla wahefey moham atibba, ya ger matxaquin vat-tazyyn. 32. lalat alli yastaxadmu latibba, vat-tazyyn, hiyya, mous madalaan l-aggel azzzella. 33. w yastaxadmu nmali abuuzaz. 34. shnho abuuzaz huwwa shinn abtar alball walla laqnam, hada yanhrag w yandagg val-mahrasa, w yansabballa walla ball azzzr, yraggi ddamn. 35. abuuzaz yandar afla zor khami, eywa shfa lafitibba, yaqaslu zor r abowl allam annhaz. 36. w bowl annhaz yussaxdam sand almurtiyanin lowlwin ddad azzzruha, emzarrbin snunu mutahhir, yaqoslu zor r abowl abowl annhaz. 37. eywa sand�amaam yatazayyan wa-lyada, ath tafs ysaaffu yttalh, yqulululul maalalen: anta, lahi tfud raaz. 38. w v-lafrada sand waqat�amaam, yafrini v-alalhada lli tantaf zalit aqafa tafal yhuz masl, man hayaaw alhu, w tfud, tfudlu malku, maalalen yam lakhya; yqulululul annu hayzha. 39. w sasha lli yug alwalad: hawli b-azzmal kaar, walla hawli b-albagra lwulane. 40. w basf alawqat yugul tafal: hawli b-burur waldayya. 41. w hadi nasya taasiffi yaffa, iyayak yasfa dad azzzr afla ibari. 43. maalalen attazyyan ma yuqaddal ma huw yaddal mahu zzaman alhaar, iyayak yasfa dad azzzr afla ibari. 43. maalalen attazyyan ma yuqaddal v-aash, w v-alawqif, ya ger yuqaddal v-qaxar tiviski w aassayf. 44. yafti tafs fagb attazayyan madal usnafat, walla shar muqaddallu giftam xass l-uulul w yzhu. 45. maalalen yowkal tafam zayyad, mudassam alhsan amn-ukil laxxra. 46. w yafrab v-amnhar farba wahefey, walla donteyn ila yad annhar hami hatta. 47. bihim alli ummasyin fan kazer alma, w essraw atabl azzzr, w la ttall yibas ba-alwaza. 48. av-huada zzaman amn-alshada, ann tafal yshaddal shmin arriyyada, maalalen yfud sandu gows nassaba, w yrug yastad ayyur.

Text 4: Geburt und Beschneidung

1. Nun, wenn ein Kind geboren wurde, früher im mauritanischen Zelt, so fand die Geburt des Kindes mit Hilfe der gabbadh statt. 2. Die gabbadh (Hebamme) ist die, die seinen Bauchnabel mit dem Messer abtrennt. 3. Und sie ist es, die ihn badet, ein Bad, das „Geburtsbad“ heißt. 4. Und diese Frau, die geboren hat, praktizierte sieben Tage lang seltsame Sitten. 5. Am ersten Tag musste sie mit rotem Ocker gefärbtem Gesicht aufstehen, da die Leute meinen, dass dieser rote Ocker die bösen Geister von ihr entfernen kann. 60

60 < sh man.
61 In Taine-Cheikh (1998 VII: 1528) faye „modal toujours suivi d’un v. à l’inacc., ‘il arrive parfois, il est parfois”.
63 In Taine-Cheikh (1989 III: 465) hammayr „pierre sanguine, hématite rouge, ocre rouge, variée de terre ferreuse”, Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 207) hammayr „almagre”.

64 Vgl. Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 92) mubaddal v-š-wala „es tonto de nacimiento“. In Fn. 61 dieselbe Erklärung wie in unserem Text.
66 Taine-Cheikh (1989 III: 563) yxbg „exister, arriver, se produire“.
67 Taine-Cheikh (1989 III: 430) mahādra „école coranique, classe d'enseignement (traditionnel)“; Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 205) xaymat al-mahādra „la jaima de al-mahādra (escuela de enseñanza tradicional de los beduinos)“. Ould Maouloud (2017: 20): „La mahādra est une institution d'enseignement spécifiquement mauritanienne, qui date de plusieurs siècles. Ennahoui (1987) la définit comme l'une des institutions éducatives authentiques du monde arabo-musulman‘: La mahādra est une université populaire, nomade, scolaïste, avec un enseignement individualisé et est basée sur le volontariat. Pour lui, c'est une université car elle dispense des connaissances encyclopédiques : le Coran, le Hadith, la foi (les sciences religieuses et le soufisme, le Fiqh, la Sira (vie du prophète), la morale et les règles de la bienséance, la langue et la littérature (poésie, grammaire, conjugaison, rhétorique), la logique, les secrets des lettres (esotérisme), l'arithmétique et la géométrie, la géographie, l'astronomie, la médecine, etc.). Elle est populaire car 'elle reçoit celui qui demande à l'intégrer, quel que soit son niveau intellectuel, son âge, son sexe ou son origine sociale' (Ennahoui, 1987)“.
68 Taine-Cheikh (1990 VI: 1213) ṣadège „cadeau à une personne religieuse“.
69 marrag „sacar“ in Ould Mohamed-Baba (2008: 247), also „herausholen“.

71 Dieses Abweichen von den Normen hat den Zweck, die bösen Geister in die Irre zu führen und den bösen Blick zu vermeiden.
72 maʕlūm Taine-Cheikh (1989 VII: 1487) „bon (pour une personne, une chose), louable“.
73 tadxāḷ assīma „die Einführung des Kennzeichens“ bezieht sich darauf, dass erst die Beschnei-dung aus einem Jungen einen echten Muslim macht.
der Junge sagt, ist „ich suche mir das und das Kamel aus“, oder „ich suche mir die und die Kuh aus“. 40. Und manchmal sagt der Junge: „meine Wahl ist es, meinen Eltern zu gehorchen“. 41. Das waren alles psychologische Sachen, um ihm Mut zu machen mit dem Ziel ihm zur Geduld zu verhelfen, um den Schmerz einer schmerzhaften Operation mit primitiven Instrumenten zu ertragen. 42. Die Beschneidung wurde nur zu heißen Jahreszeiten durchgeführt, da dies der Heilung der Wunde behilflich war. 43. Zum Beispiel die Beschneidung wurde nicht im Winter oder im Herbst gemacht, sie wurde nur im Frühjahr und im Sommer gemacht. 44. Drei Wochen oder einen Monat nach der Beschneidung hatte der Junge eine spezielle Diät was Essen und Trinken betrifft. 45. Er aß zum Beispiel nur gutes Essen, fetter als sonstiges Essen. 46. Und er trank nur einmal am Tag, oder zweimal, wenn es ein sehr heißer Tag war. 47. Denn sie empfahlen, wenig Wasser zu trinken, denn das Trinken befeuchtete die Wunde und ließ sie nicht schnell trocknen. 48. Während dieser Zeit betrieb der Junge etwas Sport, er nahm einen Bogen und einen Pfeil und ging Vögel schießen.
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A Text in the Maltese Dialect of Sannat (Gozo) with Grammatical Remarks

ABSTRACT The text presented in the following was recorded in 2019 in Sannat, a village situated on the island of Gozo (Malta). It concerns the way of cooking one of the Gozitan/Maltese dishes—turta ta-l-lampuki, ‘lampuki pie.’ The recording is written in the transcription used in the study of Semitic dialectology, and it is followed by a translation into English and standard Maltese (SM). The final part of the article contains short explanations of selected grammatical issues, the most characteristic features of the dialect of Sannat. Issues such as pausal forms, an išmām, an imāla, realisation of consonants such as *gh (< ġ and ʕ), r, ġ, and š, a sandhi and a modal verb ‘have to’ are discussed.

KEYWORDS the dialect of Sannat, field research, Gozitan dialects, Gozo, Malta, Maltese, Maltese dialectology, Sannat

1 Introduction

Sannat (SM Ta’ Sannat) is a village located in the south of Gozo, the second inhabited island of the Maltese Archipelago. The population is estimated at less than 1,900 people. It should be stressed that the number of inhabitants does not correspond to the number of speakers of the dialect of Sannat, and it is impossible to determine this data accurately.

Gozitan dialects are considered to be rural dialects of Maltese in the publications to date (e.g. Aquilina and Isserlin 1981; Borg 1976; Puech 1994: 17–23). Schabert writes about two basic groups of Maltese dialects as follows:

Es ist einerseits geographisch differenziert, wobei die eine der beiden Hauptgruppen die der Städtekonzentration um den Grossen Hafen und den Marsamjetthafen ist. […] Die andere Gruppe ist die der ländlichen Išmām-Dialekte, die den ganzen Rest der Insel sowie die Nachbarinseln Gozo (“Għawdex” /ạwdæʃ/) und Comino (“Kemmuna” /kæmmūna/) umfasst. Beide Gruppen weisen Untergruppen auf. (Schabert 1976: 3–4)

The term išmām (also known as tafxīm), as a characteristic used by Schabert to describe Maltese rural dialects (Išmām-Dialekte), was introduced by Stumme (1904: 99–100) in his Erläuterungen ‘explanations’ to the book Maltesische Studien. No detailed classifications within Gozitan dialects have been published so far.

As regards the dialect of Sannat, limited data are available. Puech (1994: 39–58) includes seven texts out of 25 from Gozo in his collection. Unfortunately, recordings of these texts are not available anywhere, which hinders a factual dialectological discussion. Even the first comparison of the text in this article with the transcription of Puech’s texts raises key questions, the answers to which should be sought in the recordings. Farrugia, on the other hand, is the author of two theses in Maltese (Aspetti sociolingvistici tad-djalett ta’ Sannat u s-sistema vokalika tieghu, 2010; Analлизи akustika u komparattiva ta’ żewġ djaletti Għawdxin, 2016), in which he deals with circumstantial and detailed issues of Gozitan phonetics based on language data from Sannat. This volume also contains an article, entitled ‘The Acoustic Vowel Space of Gozitan Naduri and Sannati Dialects,’ synthesising Farrugia’s research to date on this subject. Between 2018 and 2021, Klimiuk conducted field research in Sannat, and assembled dialectological material in the form of questionnaires and audio recordings. Earlier, between 2015 and 2016, he and Lipnicka made several recordings in the village (Klimiuk and Lipnicka 2019).

Klimiuk recorded the following text in Sannat on 28 September 2019. The author of the text is Doris Farruġia, at the time of a recording session a 63-year-old woman. She has lived in the village since birth, where her parents also come from.

The text is a recipe and concerns the preparation of one of the popular dishes of Gozo and Malta—turtta ta-l-lampuki, ‘lampuki pie.’ The fish mentioned is known by many names, such as in English: common dolphin fish, dorado, mahi-mahi, in German: (Gemeine/Große) Goldmakrele, in Italian: lampuga, corifena etc. In Maltese, the name lampuka, pl. lampuki, is used.

2 Other texts come from the following locations: Għarb (8 texts), Kerċem (2 texts), Xewkija (1 text), Nadur (5 texts) and Qala (2 texts).
We first present a transcription of the text in the dialect of Sannat, its translation into English and SM. Then, we provide a grammatical commentary on the text together with explanations which should facilitate the reading of the dialectal text, especially for dialectologists and linguists who can easily understand written standard Maltese texts, but not spoken.

The transcription is consistent with use in the dialectology of Semitic languages, especially Arabic. The transcription system was developed as part of the project ‘GozoDia: Gemeinschaftsorientierte dialektologische Studien zur Sprachdynamik der Insel Gozo (Malta).’ In the course of further research, especially the extension of the studies to include the dialects of the island of Malta, the transcription may be slightly modified. At this stage of research, we have decided that:

- a glottal stop ʔ is only noted if it comes from *q, e.g. tʔattahha (SM tqattaghha) ‘you cut it (f.),’
- if a word begins with a vowel, and thus a glottal stop ʔ is not realised in a word initial position, it is attached to a preceding word with a tie ( ͜ ) which refers to a continuous sequence of sounds, e.g. bbat ʔatfa-la (SM imbagħad titfagħlha) ‘then you pour into it (f.),’
- if a glottal stop ʔ is realised in a word initial position, but does not diachronically comes from *q, it is not noted and a word is not attached to a preceding word with a tie ( ͜ ), e.g. kilo u nufs ek (SM kilo u nofs hekk) ‘so a kilo and a half.’

A vertical bar (|) appears in the text each time to indicate major prosodic breaks, whereas pausal forms are marked with the number sign #. Punctuation marks are not used in the transcription.

The length of vowels in the Maltese dialects of Gozo is entirely phonetic, as there are no minimal pairs in the phonological systems confirming the presence of long and short vowel phonemes (Klimiuk 2022). For this reason, vowel length notation is omitted in the transcription.

The sign ḥ used in the transcription may correspond in the dialect of Sannat to three allophones: [h], [x] and [h]. However, the use of the sign ḥ in the context of Gozitan dialects requires further clarification. Namely, the phoneme ḥ is still preserved in some dialects. It appears in positions where it is not realised in SM. However, the Maltese alphabet, which is diachronic in nature and therefore does not reflect the phonetic and phonological realisation of the language, has the consonant ʰ in its letter set. The transcription system for Gozitan dialects therefore foresees two separate characters: ʰ (< OA ḥ) and ḥ (< OA ḥ and x). As regards the phonetic realisation of the phoneme ʰ, it is pronounced most often as [h] or [x]. The same language speaker can pronounce one word in several ways, e.g. [ħawħa], [ħawxa], [xawħa], [xawxa] ‘plum.’ During

---

3 See for example the transcription guidelines used in Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik.
the fieldwork, no minimal pair was found to differ these sounds. It also happens that
the phoneme ḥ is realised as [h]. However, these are still only allophones of the same
phoneme ḥ. In the dialect of Sannat, the consonant h has not been retained in any
position, so the usage of ḥ could be abandoned in favour of h. However, we have
come to the conclusion that, in this case, it is necessary to be consistent and develop
a system that allows the characteristics of all spoken dialects on the island of Gozo to
be included.

2 Text
turta ta-l-lampuki

1. ǝmma ʔat yaʔbudə_ǝssa da-zm'enn# | 2. rayta ši darba#: | ḥuta rayta rayta:# | tayba
hafne# | 3. namlu turta ta-l-lampukoy# | 4. l-awwil tat ṣḥtrey# 4 lampuka gbira#: | w_ǝkun
fiya#: | kilo#: yaw kilo u nufs ek |

5. u tʔatātahša#: | bbat5 | tamle#: ǝtuqon bə-ftype# almə#: | fteyt# | 6. u mbat taʔalliya
neydul-ə_əmlna#: | ǝyəqifirey# l-əlma ǝkwən# | boylink# | yaley# |
7. u mbat halliya ek
_ǝll-tfat minuti fursey#: ǝthaliya ǝsar minutey# | u tatfiya |
8. bbat ǝgbor_əl-huta#: | u tnahhi-la š-šewk | aš_alek naʔalluwa beš_nnenhu-la š-šewk | ǝnsumma |

9. bbat_əmla#: | ek | ǝgo7 bavl_ə?aliya | 10. u#: tat tamal_əl- l-əğina | beš tamal
turta t tamal l-əğina | 11. ǝkəllik barezampyew# | nufs kilo t?e9# |
12. bbat_əfta-la taccə
əlma#: | 13. u mbat ǝbda thallat_ə-t?e9# | l-əlma flamk'e:n# | u fət milh | k_ʔt̠kon tridew#
ənsumma#: | 14. u mbat yek yek [ə] l-əğina#: | tkun_ada šutta | kon tat əzit əlma
u tatfa-la fteyt#: ǝhur | 15. sa ə Seyn# | takumpli8 əgənə#: | ǝyəqifirey# | tafas ek | [b-]

b-ədeyk ek | tafas ek sa ənən təğiə_əğina |

16. u mbat l-əğina thaliya taʔat | ye-neydul-ə9 təstrye#: | tamən_nufs_iya10 |
17. u mbat wara nufs_iya tarə ʔatfaʔa#: | l-əğina bə-l-lambuba#: | 18. taʔsama
fə-tneyn l-əğina beš əkəllik baččə l-ʔe9#: | u bačča al-wač | fə-τ-turt`era | 19. u mbaʃt# |
phans_et-lik | wara nufs_iya təstrye#: | ətaʔhə#: | bə-l-lambuba#: |

20. u tamal-la l_-əl- | əl-margerina neydul-la _hna | ǝnsumma | 21. u mbaʃt# | tarə
taʔalaʔa#: | l-əğina | u taməla#: | taməla ʔisa#: | əhəl ek twuyl# | u dawwara |

4 *trid ətštiri > *trit ətštri > *tit ətštri > tat ətštri > tat ətšstrey# ‘you have to buy.’
5 mbat > bbat ‘then.’
6 Eng boiling.
7 This preposition is realised as ǝga and ǝgo, probably under the influence of SM ǝgo ‘in.’
8 An anaptyxis ǝ is inserted between two consonants tk, which are a cluster difficult to pronounce:
takumpli (SM tkompli) ‘you continue [kneading it].’
9 yaw neydul-la > ye_neydul-la ‘or we call it (f.).’ The conjunction ‘or’ (SM jew) is realised in the
dialect of Sannat as yaw and yew.
10 tamal nufs siya > tamən_nufs_iya (SM tagħmel nofs siegha) ‘it takes [about] half an hour.’
22. taği ?isa ?isa kaške# ek | u tarğa [ta] thalliya tạstr’e:# | u thalliya nufs_ iy_uhra perezampyew# | 23. u mbašt sadattant šan1 ha tkon_al-ağina ?at_astr’e:# | t’atta l-basal | 24. akallik fursey # gie12 basl’et gbo:r# | t’attaḫțim zo:r# | u tamalim ga ftat zeyt fuž.at-tuğon |

25. w_’talliym neydu-lu” ahna | *t’aliiyim fu? nor | bašš ek | sa šhin yaḥmuraw# | 26. deyyim yehdu” asar minutey# | *t’aliq | u don | onsumma | 27. u mbašt# | akallik fursi ḥamis tawm’et ek | *gbor | yek_akunu zor tamal_ašra:# | 28. u tafṭaḫțim ga tu-tuğon ukit ma-l-basal | 29. u mbašt# | šan šan_akun lest onsumma dok | tnaḥheyy# |

30. tamlu ga bawl gbira:# | u tafta l- al-hawt# al-lampuka yaṣfiyey# | u tafta ftey# wara? ta-l-mēṛ awš# yaw ḭabu”# la yakallik | onsumma | 31. t’attaḫțim | fat_szor | u ftat milik | w_akallik l-affariyeyt u patuta | 32. t’atta l-patuta | bøč’et zor u thalla kalliš14 ma šulseyn# | onsumma | 33. u mbašt# | šan kon15 lest del_l-affariyeyt16 kalla | akallik_ al-al-ağina | 34. tafṭah wāda månnim aš_akun zewc bøč’et |

35. waḥda | al-ře# ta-t-turt’e# | taṭṭaha u tamal fa-t-turt’e# l-ağina | 36. u tafal al- dal_ le17 yat neydi-lak at-ṭahlita ta-l- ta-l-hawt# | ta-l-patuta | ta-l-basal | at-tewm | u ftat wara? ta-n-naʃn# | 37. w_”nseyt neydi-lak | šan kon asseyr# al-balsla:# | 38. tat tamal marfa kunserva | asser maḥțim beʃ# [a-] | l-aff’et18 yağaw# ṭsim ba-š-l-kunserva | onsumma | 39. u mbat taḷ maš ta-t-turt’e# | u mbat tarğa tafṭah al-bøčča l-ufra:# ta-l-ağina |

40. u ṭabil tafṭa ftat zeyt ukill ek | fu_ al-fu_ al- | fu_ al-maley # la tkon amalt fa-t-turt’e# 41. tafṭa ftat zeyt | bbat | tafṭa l-ağina u taʔalaʔa | u tal-ala l-ɲawp# ek | *ddawwarum | onsumma | 42. u mbašt# šan kon lest# | at-turt’a ek al ǧa l-furn | 43. tamal-la zewc ṭasmyet | fu_ l-ağina | beš al-fwoʃ šan kon19 | at asser fa-l-furn | yoḥruč man dawk al- al-gyeš # asmymet | 44. u tafṭahha fa-l-furn | u tamal-lik siya u nufs fa-l-furn | yaw fursi kwart āktar | 45. tattawl-ala wara siya u nufs | u mba K “tko ḥmorut20 | 46. tafṣiya u k ma21 tkonš ḥmorotmålhiya kwart uhra | w_akallik at-turt’a leste:# |

---

11 šheym # > šḥen/šhin (SM xhin) > šon ‘while.’
13 fta bзор > *ftab bзор > fta bзор ‘a little pepper.’
14 thallat kallisi > thallak kallisi > thalla kallisi ‘you mix everything.’
15 šhin tkun > šon nkun > šon kun > šan kon ‘when you are done [with this].’
16 den l... > del_l... ‘these.’
17 den le > del_le > dal_le ‘the one which.’
18 l-affariyeyt > l-aff’et ‘the things.’
19 beš al-fwɔɾ šan kon > beš al-fwoʃ šan kon ‘in order to the steam when [the pie] is ...’
20 u mba k atkon ḥmorut (SM imbaghad jekk tkun ḥmar) > u mba_k atko ḥmorut ‘then if it is golden.’
21 yek ma > k ma ‘if [it is] not.’
Lampuki pie

1. But they are catching [it] now nowadays. 2. Did you see it once? Fish. Did you see it? Very good. 3. We make lampuki pie. 4. First you have to buy a big dolphin fish and it has to be a kilo or so, a kilo and a half.

5. You cut it. Then you make it in a pan with a little water. A little bit. 6. Then you boil it. We say it like that. This means that the water is yaley boiling. 7. Then you leave it for a few minutes, maybe you leave it for ten minutes and you turn off [the fire under] it. 8. Then you collect it and you remove its\textsuperscript{22} bones. That is why we boil it, in order to take its bones off.

9. Then we do it like this, in a bowl, for it. 10. And you must make the dough. To make pie, you have to make dough. 11. You have—for example—half a kilo of flour. 12. Then you pour a glass of water into it.\textsuperscript{23} 13. Then you start mixing the flour and water together and a little salt if you need it. 14. And then if, if the dough is still dry, you must [add] more water and pour a little bit of another [glass of water] into it. 15. Until you continue kneading it. This means that you press so, with your hand, like this. You press so until dough comes out.

16. Then you leave the dough to stand, or we call it ‘to rest.’ It has to rest for half an hour. 17. Then after about half an hour you open it again, the dough, using the rolling pin. 18. You divide the dough into two [pieces] so that you have a portion for the bottom and a portion for the top in the cake tin. 19. Then, as I told you, it [the dough] rests for half an hour, [after which] you open it with the rolling pin.

20. And you make margarine for it. We say it like that. 21. Then you close it—the dough—again, and you do it like so long rope, and you turn it. 22. It takes the shape of a ring-cake and you repeat [the same procedure] ... You leave it to rest, you leave it for another half an hour for example. 23. Afterwards, while the dough is resting, you cut the onion. 24. You can use two big onions, cut them [two big onions] into little pieces and put them inside a pan greased with a little oil.

25. And then you fry them, that is the way we say it, you fry them over a low flame until they become golden. 26. It always takes around ten minutes of constant stirring [until they are cooked]. 27. Then you take five cloves of garlic, like these, big [ones], if they are small, then you use ten. 28. And you put them in the pan along with the onions. 29. And then, then when everything is ready, you remove it [from the flame].

30. You put it in a big bowl and put the fish, meaning the dolphin fish and some marjoram leaves or basil, if you have some. 31. You cut them ... [you put] a little pepper and a little salt and you would have everything done [all things] ... and potatoes. 32. You cut the potatoes into small pieces and mix everything together, that is. 33. And

\textsuperscript{22} Feminine in the original text.
\textsuperscript{23} Lit. ‘Then you throw a glass of water into it.’
then when you are done with [all] these things, you take [have] the dough. 34. You open one of them because it is made up of two pieces.

35. One to put it at the bottom of the baking tray. You open it and you put the dough in the baking tray. 36. And you put the ... the one I am talking about, the fish mixture, the potatoes, the onions, the garlic gloves and some mint leaves. 37. And I forgot to tell you ... When the onion is in the pan [while it is cooking]. 38. You have to put a spoonful of tomato paste with them [with the mixture] so that they [absorb] the tomato paste flavour that is. 39. Then you fill the baking tray [with the mixture] and then you open the other piece of the dough.

40. And before that you put a little oil, like this, on the, on the, on the mixture which you had put inside the baking tray. 41. You put a little oil and then you open the dough and close it and close the edges, like this, you round the edges that is. 42. Then when the pie is ready, like this, to put it inside the cooker.

43. You make two cuts in the dough so that when the pie is cooking inside the cooker, the steam goes out from those two cuts. 44. And you put it inside the cooker, and it should take around one and a half hours or maybe 15 minutes more than that. 45. You check on it after one and a half hours. Then if it is golden. 46. You switch off the cooker and if it is not golden yet, you leave it for another fifteen minutes and you will have the pie ready.

Torta ta-l-lampuki


30. Taghmlu ġo bowl kbira u titfa’ l-hut, il-lampuka jiġifieri u titfa’ fitt weraq tal-merqtx jew ġabaq, li jkollok insomma. 31. Tqatthaghom... fitt bżar u fitt melh u jkollok l-affrihijiet... u patata. 32. Tqatta’ l-patata biċċiet żghar u thallat kollox ma’ xulxin, insomma. 33. Imbaghad xhin tkun lest(ejt) dawn l-affrijiet kollha jkollok l-ghaγina. 34. Tīfaħ wahda minnhom għax ikunu żewġ biċċiet.


40. U qabel titfa’ fitt żejt ukoll, hekk, fuq il- fuq il-, fuq il-miλ li tkun għamilt fit-turtieta. 41. Titfa’ fitt żejt u mbaghad tīfaħ l-ghaγina u taghlaqha u taghlqilha l-γnub, hekk iddawwarhom insomma. 42. Imbaghad xhin tkun lesta t-torta, hekk, għal ġol-forn. 43. Taghmlilha żewġ qasmiet fuq l-ghaγina biex il-fwar, xhin tkun qed issir fil-forn, johroγ minn dawk iż-żewġ qasmiet. 44. U titfaħha fil-forn u tghammillek siegha u nofs fil-forn jew forsi kwarta iktar. 45. Tittawliilha wara siegha u nofs imbaghad jekk tkun hmaret. 46. Tififiha u jekk ma tkunx hmaret thalliha kwarta ohra u jkollok it-torta lesta.

3 Grammatical remarks

3.1 Consonants

The consonant r is realised as a voiced trill [ɹ] or a voiced approximant [r]. However, these are only allophones of the phoneme r.

The affricate ġ has two phonetic realisations: a voiced palato-alveolar sibilant affricate [d͡ʒ] (ġ), and a voiced alveolo-palatal sibilant affricate [d͡ʑ] (ǵ). The same applies to the fricative š, the allophones of which are as follows: a voiceless postalveolar fricative [ʃ] (š) and a voiceless alveolo-palatal sibilant fricative [ɕ] (ś), e.g.
During the fieldwork, Klimiuk and Lipnicka noticed that this is a characteristic of at least two dialects—Sannat and Munxar. The two villages lie side by side in southern Gozo.

The sound written in Maltese as gh corresponds in Arabic to two phonemes—\( \dot{g} \) [\( \gamma \)] and \( f \) [\( \delta \)]. It is not pronounced in SM as a consonant, however, together with an adjacent vowel in stressed positions in which gh diachronically occurs, a compensatory lengthening takes place. In Maltese dialects this is not always the case. There are still dialects in Gozo, in which most of the oldest inhabitants articulate, distinguish and separate \( g \) and \( f \). Both sounds appear exactly in the positions where they are present in Arabic and its dialects. This means that in the word in which the \( \dot{g} \) occurs diachronically, a speaker who has a sound \( \dot{g} \) in her/his consonant system will neither lengthen an adjacent vowel nor pronounce \( f \) in place of the consonant \( g \). With one exception—‘mint’ (SM naghniegh), which in dialects with the remaining consonant \( g \), it can be pronounced, e.g. as na\( \acute{g} \)nej (Gharb) or na\( \grave{g} \)n\( \acute{e} \)h (Ghasri and Żebbuġ), and not as we would expect in Arabic with the consonant \( \dot{f} \)—na\( \grave{f} \)na\( \grave{f} \) ‘mint.’

Another essential question arises here, namely the status of the consonant \( f \) and its articulation. Stumme introduced the term ‘der ‘ain-haltige Vokal’ to describe a vowel adjacent to gh, which he described as follows:

Der ‘ain-haltige Vokal gibt sich auf folgende Art und Weise: es wird während der ganzen Dauer des Vokallautes starke Kehlpressung beibehalten; der a-Laut klingt hierbei fast unangenehm hell (ähnlich ungar. \( \acute{a} \)), der o-Laut, wie der e-Laut und der \( \delta \)-Laut sind hierbei immer offen. (Stumme 1904: 79)

Let us note, however, that Stumme had not met anyone in Malta who pronounced and distinguished between the phonemes \( g \) and \( f \), as he writes:

Ferner habe ich niemanden auf Malta und Gozo einen Unterschied zwischen altem \( f \) und \( g \) machen hören; für beide Laute war deren gemeinsame Aussprache als ‘das Übliche, und es entwickelten sich Modifikationen des für \( f \) und \( g \) gemeinsamen ‘ganz analog, – mochte \( f \) oder \( \dot{g} \) im Etymon vorliegen. (Stumme 1904: 79)

In this short paragraph, however, he states that gh was then articulated as ‘, a sign which corresponds to \( f \) in the transcription used here. Later publications began to omit information about \( f \) (is it under the influence of standard language?) and focused on ‘der ‘in-haltige Vokal,’ which was replaced by the English term ‘creaky voice.’ If it is really creaky voice in SM, it is worth considering its phonemic status. After all, there would be minimal pairs such as ša\( r \) (SM xahar /ʃəːr/) ‘month’ and ša\( r \)
Maciej Klimiuk and Ruben Farrugia

(SM xagħar /ʃə ːr/) ‘hair.’ So here we are dealing with more vowel phonemes. Only further studies of dialects, not standard language, may give us answers.

However, research on Gozitan dialects shows that ŋ is still preserved, although sometimes its articulation is weak (as Stumme already pointed out) and only in some positions, e.g. in pause, as in the text from Sannat:

\[mbaʕt\# (SM imbagħad) ‘then,’ \]
\[kaʕke\# (SM kagħka) ‘ring-cake,’ \]
\[naʕn\,ḥ\# (SM nagħniegħ) ‘mint.’ \]

Another proof of the preservation of the sound ŋ is that the glottal stop ʔ can also be articulated in positions where gh has diachronically occurred:

\[taʔalliya (SM tḡollhiha) ‘you boil it (f.),’ \]
\[naʔalluwa (SM nghalluha) ‘we boil it (f.),’ \]
\[bawl_ aʔaliya (SM bawl għaliha) ‘[in] a bowl, on it (f.),’ \]
\[taʔalaʔa (SM tagħlaqha) ‘you close it (f.).’ \]

The similar phenomenon also appears, e.g. in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Hertevin, in which the consonant ŋ > ʔ: *fena > ?ena ‘eye’ (Jastrow 1988: 6–7). In the case of the dialect of Hertevin, the shift ŋ > ʔ only applies to the consonant ŋ, and not to *c or *g as in the dialect of Sannat.

Between two words, when the first one ends in a vowel and the second one diachronically begins with *c, there may also be an external sandhi:

\[bǝčča_ ʔeː #: (SM bičċa għall-qiegħ) ‘a portion for the bottom,’ but bǝčča al-wǝč [bǝčča ʔal-wǝč] (SM bičċa għall-wiċċ) ‘a portion for the top,’ \]
\[pḥalm_ et-lik (SM bhalm għidtlek) ‘as I told you.’ \]

3.2 Vowels and pausal forms

Characteristic features of Gozitan dialects include pausal forms, the most noteworthy of which is diphthongisation (see Lipnicka 2022). Vowels u and i, which diachronically were long, can be realised in the last open and closed syllables as diphthongs. The presence of the diphthong in pause depends on the consonant environment. If diachronically in the Arabic word there was an emphatic consonant (including also the consonant r), the diphthong is opened by a vowel o (u, a). If, on the other hand, there was no emphatic consonant, the diphthong consists of a vowel e (a). Naturally, there are some exceptions to this rule, e.g. ummoy# ‘my mother’ or uħtoy# ‘my sister,’ and subsequent lexical borrowings. The following are selected examples from the text:
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emphatic -Cu → -Caw# / -Cow#

*yaħmuraw# (SM jiħmaru) ‘they become red [golden],’

nonemphatic -Cu → -Cew#

*parezampyew# (SM pereżempju) ‘for example,’
	*tridew# (SM tridu) ‘you (pl.) want,’

emphatic -Ci → -Cay# / -Coy#

*lampukoy (SM lampuki) ‘lampuki fish,’

nonemphatic -Ci → -Cey#

*yaley# (SM jagħli) ‘[it is] boiling,’
	*fursey# (SM forsi) ‘maybe,’
	*minutey# (SM minuti) ‘minutes,’
	*yǝġifirey# (SM jiġifieri) ‘therefore,’

nonemphatic -CuC → -CewC# / CǝwC#

*aawkwn# (SM jkun) ‘it is,’
	*hǝwt# (SM ħut) ‘fishes,’
	*merʔǝwš# (SM merqtux, mertqux) ‘marjoram,’
	*ġnǝwp# (SM ġnub) ‘sides,’

emphatic -CiC → -CuyC# / -CoyC#

*twuyl# (SM twil) ‘long,’

nonemphatic -CiC → CeyC#

*fteyt# (SM ftit) ‘a little,’ but *ftat milḥ ‘a little salt,’
	*tnaḥḥeyḥ# (SM tneħħih) ‘you take it (m.) away,’
	*šulšeyn# (SM xulxin) ‘each other.’

A vowel a in pausa may be lengthened. In addition, the vowel a can turn into a vowel e, e.g:

-Ca → -Ce#

*tamle:# (SM tagħmilha) ‘you make it (f.),’
	*ḥafne# (SM ħafna) ‘many,’
	*kaʕke# (SM kagħka) ‘ring-cake,’
	*leste:# (SM lesta) ‘ready (f.).’

---

*merʔuš > *merrʔuš > merʔuš ‘marjoram.’
If the word ends in a glottal stop ؕ, there is a burst of breath in pausa. An aspirated consonant ؕʰ is an allophone, occurring only as a pausal form:

\[-Vʔ > -Vʔʰ#\]

tʔeʔʰ# (SM dqiq) ‘flour,’
ḥabaʔʰ# (SM habaq) ‘basil.’

A vowel breaking may occur in the last closed or open syllable of the word in pausa: \(e > e^{a}, o > o^{a}\), e.g.:

tʔeʰ# (SM dqiq) ‘flour,’
ʔeʰ#: (SM qiegh) ‘bottom.’

### 3.3 Išmām and imāla

Features of Gozitan dialects include an išmām: \(a > o\) or \(a > u\). For example, in the dialect of Sannat:

- gbor (SM kbar) ‘big (pl.),’
- zor (SM żgħar) ‘small (pl.),’
- nor (SM nar) ‘fire,’
- yahmuraw# (SM jiħmaru) ‘they become red [golden],’
- don (SM dan) ‘this,’
- dok (SM dak) ‘that,’
- bzor (SM bżar) ‘pepper,’
- patuta (SM patata) ‘potatoes,’
- fwor (SM fwar) ‘steam,’
- ħmorut, ħmurot (SM ħmaret) ‘it (f.) became red [golden].’

Imāla, a term used in Semitic linguistics to describe the raising of the vowel \(ā\) towards \(ī\), \(ā > ē > ī\), is present in both SM and its dialects. The Maltese alphabet notes the imāla as ie, and its pronunciation in the standard language corresponds to a long vowel \(ī\) [ɪː]. In the dialect of Sannat, as in the other dialects of Gozo, a rising diphthong \(əe\) or a vowel \(e\) (especially in context form) is preserved, e.g.:

- zmən# (SM żmien) ‘time,’
- beš (SM biex) ‘in order to,’
- flammən (SM flimkien) ‘together,’
- ţəš (SM ġiex) ‘a couple of s.th.,’
- baslət (SM basliet) ‘onions.’
3.4 Sandhi

In Maltese, two vowels are avoided in the immediate proximity. In the case of two words, where one ends in a vowel $u$ or $i$ and the next word begins with another vowel, a semi-vowel is inserted between both vowels, $w$ or $y$ respectively:

$$-Cu\_VC- \rightarrow -Cu^w\_VC-$$

- $\texttt{ʔat yaʔbdw}_\text{ossa}$ (SM qed jaqbdu issa) ‘they are catching [it] now,’
- $\texttt{neydu-lu^w}_\text{aħna}$ (SM nghidulu ahna) ‘we say it (m.) [like that],’
- $\texttt{yeħdu^w}_\text{ašar}$ (SM jieghdu għaxar) ‘it takes ten [minutes].’

$$-Ci\_VC- \rightarrow -Ci^y\_VC-$$

- $\texttt{taġi^v}_\text{ağina}$ (SM tigi għagina) ‘[until] dough comes out.’

If there are two vowels $a$ on the word boundary ($-Ca\_aC -$) then one of them is elided:

$$-Ca\_aC- \rightarrow -Ca\_C-$$

- $\texttt{thalliya}_\text{šar}$ (SM thaliha għaxar) ‘you leave it (f.) for ten minutes,’
- $\texttt{neydu-la}_\text{ċna}$ (SM ngħidulha aħna) we say it [like that].’

If there are two identical consonants on the word boundary, there is also an elision of one of them. The elision of one of the consonants is also noted between the words, the first of which ends in the consonant $t$, e.g.:

- $\texttt{tat}_\text{aštrey}#$ (SM trid tixtri) ‘you have to buy,’
- $\texttt{u mbat}_\text{halliya}$ (SM imbaghad thalliha) ‘and then you leave it (f.),’
- $\texttt{bbat}_\text{aġbor}$ (SM imbaghad tigbor) ‘then you collect [it],’
- $\texttt{bbat}_\text{amela}$ (SM imbaghad tagħmilha) ‘then we do it (f.),’
- $\texttt{bbat}_\text{atfa-la}$ (SM imbaghad titfagħlha) ‘then you pour [water] into it (f.),’
- $\texttt{u mbat}_\text{abda}$ (SM imbaghad tibda) ‘then you start,’
- $\texttt{ʔat}_\text{astr}y#$ (SM qed tistrieħ) ‘[the dough] is resting,’
- $\texttt{ḥmurot}_\text{halliya}$ (SM ħmaret thalliha) ‘it is [not] golden you leave it,’
- $\texttt{nufs}_\text{iya}$ (SM nofs siegħa) ‘half an hour,’
- $\texttt{ftat}_\text{bzor} > *\texttt{ftob}_\text{bzor (?)} > \texttt{fta}_\text{bzor}$ (SM fit bżar) ‘a little pepper,’
- $\texttt{tħallat}_\text{kalliš} > *\texttt{tħallak}_\text{kalliš (?)} > \texttt{thalla}_\text{kalliš}$ (SM thallat kollox) ‘you mix everything.’
### 3.5 Other features

The modal verb *treyt*# (SM trid) ‘you must’ in 2 sg. has the following three forms: *tat*, *ta* and *t*, e.g.:

- *tat_ aštrey*## (SM trid tixtri) ‘you have to buy,’
- *tat tamal* (SM trid tagħmel) ‘you have to make,’
- *turta t tamal* (SM torta trid tagħmel) ‘[to make] a pie, you have to make.’

The double consonant (*C1-C1*) resulting from the assimilation of an article (*aI*) to a word starting with two consonants (C1C2V-) is shortened:

- *aI- + C1C2V- > *aC1-C1C2V- > a-C1C2V-
- *aI- + tʔeʔ > *a-tʔeʔ > a-tʔeʔ* (SM id-dqiq) ‘the flour,’
- *aI- + tfol > *a-tfol > a-tfol* (SM it-tfal) ‘the children,’
- *a-zm’en* (SM iż-żmien) ‘the time’ and *da-zm’en* (SM daż-żmien) ‘this time, nowadays.’

The vowel *e* occurring in the last closed syllable in SM turns into the vowel *i* in the dialect of Sannat, e.g.:

- SM -CeC > -CiC
- *l-awwil* (SM l-ewwel) ‘first,’
- *ḥabil* (SM habel) ‘rope,’
- *deyyim* (SM dejjem) ‘always,’
- *ḥamis* (SM hames) ‘five.’

The vowel *o* occurring in the last closed syllable in SM turns into the vowel *i* or *u* in the dialect of Sannat, e.g.:

- *yeħur* (SM ieħor) ‘another,’
- *kalliš* (SM kollox) ‘everything,’
- *ukil* or *ukill* (SM ukoll) ‘also.’

This also applies to the 3 pl. pronominal suffix, which appears in the text as *-im < SM -hom*, e.g.:

- *tʔattaḥḥim* (SM tqattagħhom) ‘you cut them,’
- *tamǝlim* (SM tagħmilhom) ‘you make them.’
SM nouns with the pattern CaCeC have in the dialect of Sannat the pattern CuCoC:

\[
\text{SM CaCec} \rightarrow \text{CuCoc}
\]

tuğon (SM taġen) ‘pan,’
ruğol (SM raġel) ‘man.’

The particle SM qed used together with verbs to express continuous or progressive aspects is pronounced more often as ?at than ?et.
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