

MARIA LIPNICKA 

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 (Sibawayhi 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 Zahlé, 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 əw. Gozitan dialects, like in SM and Maltese dialects, exhibit a loss of emphatic consonants *ṭ, *ḏ, *ẓ (*ḏ), *ṣ 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 *tafxīm*) 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 *mustaflyā* consonants *q, *ġ, *x (Hassan 2013: 2). A separate morphophonological class with

regards to the application of *išmām* represent conjugated verbal forms, where the emphasis is either suspended or redistributed like in *əteyr#* ‘he flies’ (*tyr* < OA *tyr*), *əseyp* (*syb* < OA *šwb*), but *ədowr* (< OA *dwr*). In the few other exceptional cases, the original emphatic status of the root consonants (especially *ʔ) is from today’s perspective not certain, like **bʔr* (?) in *barranoyn#* ‘strangers’ or **ʔmʔ* (?) in *ummoy#* ‘my mother.’ Yet, the exceptions do not undermine the overall tendency to preserve the primary emphasis.

TABLE 1. Pausal diphthongisation of etymologically long *ū in closed syllables.

*CūC > CuC : CowC# [CawC#] (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	*CūC > CuC : CəwC# (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>maubowt#</i> ‘tied’ : <i>maubut bəl-ħbule^a#</i> ‘tied with the ropes’	<i>ʔləwp#</i> ‘hearts’ : <i>fil-ʔlup tan-n^oes</i> ‘in the hearts of people’
<i>asfowr#</i> ‘bird’ : <i>asfur w^eħəð kelle^a#</i> ‘she had one bird’	<i>ħanəwt#</i> ‘shop’ : <i>əl-ħanat ʔəgoy^u#</i> ‘the shop is small’
<i>stağown#</i> ‘season’ : <i>andam stağun ʔasoyr#</i> ‘they have a short season’ (Ital. <i>stagione</i>)	<i>ma nəkləwš#</i> ‘we are not eating’ : <i>ma nəklus ħələwš#</i> ‘we are not eating sweets’

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 *maubowt#* ‘tied’ (< OA *marbūt*), **sfr* in *asfowr#* ‘bird’ (< OA *šasfūr*) or emphasised loanwords like *əs-stağown#* ‘season.’ The pausal diphthong *ow* has an allophonic realisation [aw] as for example *ʔattaws#* ‘cat’ (< North African Arabic **qts* or Lat. *cattus*). In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of CuC < *CūC is consistently diphthongised as CəwC# as for the roots **qlb* in *ʔləwp#* ‘hearts’ (< OA *qulūb*), **ħnt* in *ħanəwt#* ‘shop’ (< OA *ħānūt*). 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.’ In the case of verbal conjugation, as already mentioned, the emphasis of the morphological root is preserved only in few cases and redistributed. The consistent and paradigmatic pausal diphthongisation of the conjugal suffixes in verbs still highlights the central role pausal forms are playing for the grammar of Gozitan dialects, as every conjugal paradigm for each verb is split into two patterns—pausal and contextual—respectively.

The examples given in Table 2 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of closed syllables of type CiC < *CiC. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as **šlb* in *saloyp#* ‘cross’ (< OA *šalīb*), **qsr* in *ʔasoyr#* ‘short’ (< OA *qasīr*) or emphasised loanwords like *əl-bamboyn#* ‘the baby.’ The diphthongisation of **i* to *oy*

TABLE 2. Pausal diphthongisation of etymologically long *ī in closed syllables.

*CīC > CiC : CoyC# (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	*CīC > CiC : CeyC# (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>saloyp#</i> 'cross' : əs-salip əz-zğoyr# 'the small cross'	<i>l-awčeyn#</i> 'the Gozitans' : l-awčīn kalle ^a # 'all the Gozitans'
<i>ʔasoyr#</i> 'short' : əl-ħabal əl-ʔasir ħafna 'the very short rope'	<i>əmbeyt#</i> 'wine' : lə-mbat tayyup# 'good wine'
<i>əl-bamboyn#</i> 'baby Jesus' : əl-bambīn ħələw# 'the baby is sweet' (Ital. <i>bambino</i>)	<i>sneyñ#</i> 'years' : duk ə-snen kalle ^a # 'all these years'

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 *ʔwl in *twoyl#* 'long' (< OA *ṭawīl*), *šğr in *zğoy.ɹ#* 'small' (< OA *šağīr*), *ndf in *nadoyf#* 'clean' (< OA *naḏīf*) as opposed to nonemphatic roots *xff in *ħafeyf#* 'light' (< OA *xafīf*), *ħzn in *ħazeyñ#* 'bad' (< OA *ħazīn*), *tql in *tʔeyl#* 'heavy' (< OA *ṭaqīl*). 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 < *CīC is consistently diphthongised as CeyC# as for the roots *ğwd in *l-awčeyñ#* 'Gozitans', *nbd in *əmbeyt#* 'wine' (< OA *nabīd*) and *snw in *sneyñ#* 'years' (< OA *sinīn*). Noteworthy are also the examples *əl-ħanət zğoy.ɹ#* 'the shop is small' and *lə-mbat tayyup#* 'good wine' where the contextual realisation of both *ī and *ū is centralised to ə. 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 (?), *n (?), 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 *rʔs in *rusow#* 'his head' (< OA *raʔsuhu*), *rʔn in *ommow#* 'his mother' (< OA *ʔummuhu*) and *ʔx in *uħtoy#* 'my

TABLE 3. Pausal diphthongisation of open syllables of type -Cu.

-Cu : -Cow# [Caw#] (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	-Cu : -Cəw# (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>rusow#</i> 'his head' : <i>rosu gbira</i> 'his head is big' <i>ommow#</i> 'his mother' : <i>ommu gbira</i> 'his mother is grown up' <i>bonḡow#</i> 'hello' : <i>bonḡu ḡoy#</i> 'hello brother' (Ital. <i>bongiorno</i>)	<i>idəw#</i> 'his hand' : <i>idu zayra</i> 'his hand is small' <i>ṡandəw#</i> 'he has' : <i>ṡandə l-fləws#</i> 'he has money' <i>laḡməw#</i> 'his flesh' : <i>laḡmu tayyop#</i> 'his flesh is good'

TABLE 4. Pausal diphthongisation of open syllables of type -Ci.

-Ci : -Coy# (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	-Ci : -Cey# (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>mutoy#</i> 'given' : <i>don muti məl-lə-sptor</i> 'this is given by the hospital' <i>dahroy#</i> 'my back' : <i>dahri yuḡaney#</i> 'my back hurts' <i>əl-funcyonoy#</i> 'functions' : <i>əl-funcyonə tas-səpt</i> 'functions of Easter Saturday' (Ital. <i>funzione</i>)	<i>ruḡey#</i> 'my soul' : <i>ruḡi soḡya</i> 'my soul is pure' <i>ḡəsmey#</i> 'my body' : <i>ḡəsmi nadoyf#</i> 'my body is clean' <i>awt twulidey#</i> 'homeland' : <i>awt twulidi ḡawdəṡ</i> 'my homeland is Gozo'

sister' (< OA *ḡuxtī*) and *ḡowk#* 'your brother' (< OA *ḡaxūka*). Analogically to closed syllables, Romanic loanwords exhibit pausal diphthongisation to *ow* in open syllables as in *bonḡow#* 'hello.' In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of -Cu is consistently diphthongised to *əw* as for the roots **yd* in *idəw#* 'his hand' (< OA *yaduhu*), **ṡnd* in *ṡandəw#* 'he has' (< OA *ṡindahu*) and **lḡm* in *laḡməw#* 'his meat' (< OA *laḡmuhu*).

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 **ṡṡw* in *mutoy#* 'given' (< OA *muṡṡī*), **ḡhr* in *dahroy#* 'my back' (< OA *ḡahrī*) or emphasised Romanic loanwords like *əl-funcyonoy#* 'functions.' In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, the pausal realisation of -Ci is diphthongised to *ey* as shown for the roots **rwḡ* in *ruḡey#* 'my soul' (< OA *rūḡī*), **ḡsm* in *ḡəsmey#* 'my body' (< OA *ḡismī*) and **wld* in *twulidey#* 'birth' (< OA **tawlid*).

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.

TABLE 5. Pausal diphthongisation of etymologically long *ā in closed syllables.

CoC : -Co°C# (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	CeC ~ C ^{ve} C : C ^{ve} C# ~ [C ^{ve} C#] (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>ar-rando^an#</i> 'the Lent' : <i>ar-randon əl-gbeyr#</i> 'the Great Lent'	<i>n^{ve}as#</i> 'people' : <i>ən-n^{ve}es ġew ~ ən-nes ġew</i> 'people came'
<i>erbaſ tətfo^l#</i> 'four children' : <i>ə-tfoł ə-twayba</i> 'the good children'	<i>ə-zm^{ve}an#</i> 'the time' : <i>fə-zmen-iləw#</i> 'in the old times'
but <i>əsmu ġuzze^ap^h#</i> 'his name is Joseph' : <i>ġuzzep kbeyr#</i> 'Joseph is grown up'	<i>meta m^{ve}at#</i> 'when he died' : <i>met w^{ve}eħəd</i> 'one has died'

The examples given in Table 5 show the opposition of pausal and contextual forms of closed syllables of type CoC/CeC < *CāC. The emphatic environments in the first column are either conditioned by the etymological and diachronic emphasis of the morphological roots as **rmđ* in *ar-rando^an#* 'the Lent' (< OA *ramadān*), **tfl* in *ə-tfo^l#* 'children' (< OA *?atfāl*) or emphasised loanwords like *ġuzze^ap^h#* 'Joseph.' In etymologically nonemphatic consonantal surroundings, CaC < *CāC is occasionally realised as a triphthong [C^{ve}C#] in prosodically prominent final positions. The type of pausal 'triphthongisation' is to be understood as an allophone to the rising diphthong *ve* (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 *n^{ve}as#* 'people' (< OA *an-nās*), **zmn* in *ə-zm^{ve}an#* 'the time' (< OA *az-zamān*) and **mwt* in *m^{ve}at#* 'he died' (< OA *māta*) respectively. The extraordinary case of the triphthong *ve^a* corresponds with the pharyngeal/laryngeal realisation of the final *imāla* in open syllables of type -Ce^a#.

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 6. Final *imāla* of open syllables of type -Ca.

-Ca : -Ce ^a # (in etymologically emphatic environments, loanwords)	-Ce : -Ce ^a # (in etymologically nonemphatic environments)
<i>molta(#)</i> 'Malta' ; <i>twayba#</i> 'good (f.)'	<i>ġilde^a#</i> 'leather'
<i>čukkuluta(#)</i> 'chocolate' (Ital. <i>cioccolato</i>)	<i>gzie^a#</i> 'island'
but	<i>zawġe^a#</i> 'her husband'
<i>basle^a#</i> 'one onion'	<i>alme^a#</i> 'water'
<i>təfle^a#</i> 'girl' : <i>ət-təflə ?eda l-awstralya</i> 'the girl lives in Australia'	<i>kalle^a#</i> 'she had,' 'all of her/them'

(corresponding with ʃ , see further 2.4) in syllables of type *-Ca still can be attributed to a form of diphthongisation. As Table 6 shows, this pausal form is not conditioned as it occurs in lexemes with etymologically emphatic consonants as roots **bʃl* in *basle*^a# ‘the onion’ (< OA *baʃla*), **tʃl* in *tafle*^a# ‘daughter’ (< OA *ʃifla*), but still does not in *molta*# ‘Malta’ (< **mlt*). Final *imāla* seems therefore to have transgressed the conditioning still reflected in the syllables of type -Cu and -Ci, and can be seen as an indication that the emphatic quality in the vowel system might be at gradual loss.

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 : ʎe [ʎe^a]

pausal form: *sneyn*# ‘years’ (< **ī* in OA *sinīn*) : *sn^ʎen* [*sn^ʎe^an#*] ‘teeth’ (< **ā* in OA *ʔasnān*)

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

snən ~ *snen* ~ *snin*

u > ow : o^a

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

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

əddər ~ *əddor* ~ *əddur*

Pausal diphthongisation of the etymological phoneme **ā* is realised as gliding vowels ʎe (*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/əw*) 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 ʃ rather than a ‘creaky voice,’ especially in that the phoneme ʃ is preserved in many

phonologically predictable positions in all Gozitan dialects (and even *ġ* as in Ġharb, Żebbuġ, San Lawrenz, Ġhasri; cf. Klimiuk and Farrugia 2022). The phoneme *ʃ* 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, ʃandə l-fləws#, lə-mbət tayyup#* show, all three vowels *a, u, i* regardless of etymological length can be realised as a centralised short *ə* 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 analogical processes on segmental levels (micro-pausal centralisation to *ə*). 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 -CâûC# as in *kṛâûm#* (*kṛūm*) 'vineyards' (Fleisch 1974b: 63);

ṭṛâûḥ# (*ṭṛūḥ*) 'she goes' (Fleisch 1974b: 87)

-CūC (nonemphatic environment)

GD -CəwC# vs. ZD -CaûC# as in *ma kàtābaûš#* (*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 *âû*, in which the more prominent vowel *â* is realised as 'a postérieur assez reculé' (Fleisch 1974b: 95) and *û* 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 *r* in *kṛâûm#* (**kṛm*; < OA *kurūm*) but also for the surrounding consonants as in *ṭṛâûḥ#* for the root **rwh* (< 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 kàtābaûš#*, Fleisch transcribes the pausal diphthong as *aû*, where the vowel *a* opposes the backed realisation *â*. In Gozitan dialects, this type of diphthongisation is even more centralised to *ə*.

-CīC (emphatic environment)

GD -CoyC# vs. ZD -CâiC# as in *mkâşşârâin#* (*mkâşşârīn*) 'broken (PL)' (Fleisch 1974b: 85);

â-ṭṭârâi# (*â-ṭṭârī*) 'on the street' (Fleisch 1974b: 87)

-CīC (nonemphatic environment)

GD -CeyC# vs. ZD -CēiC# as in *ktēir#* (*ktīr*) 'a lot' (Fleisch 1974b: 63)

For closed syllables of the type -CiC in emphatic consonantal environments, Fleisch notes a diphthongisation to *âi*, in which again *â* 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 *mkâṣṣârâin#* (< OA *mukassarîn*). Similarly, the emphasis of the root **trq* in the second example affects the vowel quality of the whole phrase *â-ttârâi#* (< OA *ṣala t-tarīq*), including the vowel in the preceding prefiggated preposition *â*-. Several examples in ZD texts exhibit the emphatic type of diphthongisation transcribed as *âi*, despite Fleisch not mentioning it in his description of pausal diphthongisation (Fleisch 1974b: 63).

In nonemphatic surroundings like in *kteîr#* (**ktr*; < OA *katîr*), the diphthongisation in ZD and GD are parallel in the forms -CiC ~ -CeyC#, as the symbol *ē* 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 analogical to closed syllables.

-Cu (emphatic environment)

GD -Cow# vs. ZD -Cq̄q̄# as in *tlō'tq̄q̄# ~ tlōtu* ‘you (PL) went out’ (Fleisch 1974b: 71)

-Cu (nonemphatic environment)

GD -Cəw# vs. ZD -Caû# as in *šau#* ‘what?’ (Fleisch 1974b: 64)

For open syllables of the type -Cu, regardless of the consonantal environment, Fleisch mostly uses the transcription *q̄q̄*, in which *q̄* represents for him an ‘o ouvert, comme dans *rosse*,’ *q̄* an ‘o fermé, comme dans *rose*’ and both together as *q̄q̄* 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 *tlō'tq̄q̄#* (**tl̥s*; < OA *ṭalaftū*) versus the nonemphatic *šau#* (< OA *ʔayyu šayʔin*) still indicate a rather split realisation of the diphthong.

-Ci (emphatic environment)

GD -Coy# vs. ZD -Câi# as in *šab^wâi#* ‘my child’ (Fleisch 1974b: 85)

-Ci (nonemphatic environment)

GD -Cey# vs. ZD -Ceî# as in *'alleî#* ‘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 *â* in *âi* as in *šab^wâi#* (*šbw; < OA *šabiyy*) in opposition to *ē* in *ēi* as in *'allei#* (< OA *qāla li*).

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Publication of this paper was made possible by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) under the programme 'Kleine Fächer – Große Potenziale,' grant no. 01UL1834X.

ORCID®

Maria Lipnicka  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0384-0203>

1 SemArch. Semitisches Tonarchiv. <http://semarch.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>.

References

- ABU FARAG, MOHAMED AHMED. 1960. *A Grammatical Study of the Arabic Dialect of Tahway (Minufiya Province, Egypt)*. Doctoral dissertation. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- AGIUS, DIONISIUS A. 1992. 'Morphological Alternatives in the Gozitan Dialects of Maltese.' *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques-Groupe d'Études de Linguistique et de Littérature Arabes et Sudarabiques. Nouvelle Série* 4: 111–161.
- AQUILINA, JOSEPH, AND B. S. J. ISSERLIN. 1981. *A Survey of Contemporary Dialectal Maltese. Vol. I: Gozo*. Leeds: Isserlin.
- ARNOLD, WERNER. 1998. *Die arabischen Dialekte Antiochiens*. 'Semitica Viva' 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2010. 'Pausalformen in den arabischen Dialekten Antiochiens.' In Hartmut Bobzin and Shabo Talay (eds.), *Arabische Welt: Grammatik, Dichtung und Dialekte. Beiträge einer Tagung in Erlangen zu Ehren von Wolfdietrich Fischer*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 227–235.
- ARNOLD, WERNER, AND PETER BEHNSTEDT. 1993. *Arabisch-aramäische Sprachbeziehungen im Qalamūn (Syrien). Eine dialektgeographische Untersuchung mit einer wirtschafts- und sozialgeographischen Einführung von Anton Escher*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BEHNSTEDT, PETER. 1987. *Die Dialekte der Gegend von Ṣa'dah (Nord-Jemen)*. 'Semitica Viva' 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BEYER, KLAUS. 2009. 'Die klassisch arabische Pausa.' In Werner Arnold, Michael Jursa, Walter W. Müller and Stephan Procházka (eds.), *Philologisches und Historisches zwischen Anatolien und Sokotra. Analecta Semitica In Memoriam Alexander Sima*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 9–16.
- BIRKELAND, HARRIS. 1940. *Altarabische Pausalformen*. Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos Jacob Dybwad.
- BLANC, HAIM. 1953. *Studies in North Palestinian Arabic: Linguistic Inquiries among the Druzes of Western Galilee and Mt. Carmel*. 'Oriental Notes and Studies' 4. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society.
- . 1970. *The Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- . 1973–1974. 'La perte d'une forme pausale dans le parler arabe du Caire.' *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 48: 375–390.
- BORG, ALEXANDER. 1977. 'Reflexes of Pausal Forms in Maltese Rural Dialects?' *Israel Oriental Studies* 7: 211–225.
- CAMILLERI, ANTOINETTE, AND MARTINE VANHOVE. 1994. 'A Phonetic and Phonological Description of the Maltese Dialect of Mġarr (Malta).' *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 28: 87–110.
- FLEISCH, HENRI. 1974a. *Études d'arabe dialectal*. Beyrouth: Dar El-Machreq.

- . 1974b. 'Notes sur le dialecte arabe du Zaḥlé (Liban).' In Henri Fleisch, *Études d'arabe dialectal*. Beyrouth: Dar El-Machreq, 53–95.
- GAIRDNER, WILLIAM H. T. 1926. *Egyptian Colloquial Arabic: A Conversational Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.
- GESENIUS, WILHELM. 1909. *Hebräische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Vogel.
- HASSAN, ASHRAF. 2013. 'Filling the Empty Space: The Low Back Vowel Phoneme /a/ in Cairene Arabic.' *Romano-Arabica* 13: 163–186.
- JASTROW, OTTO. 1984. 'Zur Phonologie und Phonetik des Ṣanʿānischen.' In Horst Kopp and Günther Schweizer (eds.), *Entwicklungsprozesse in der Arabischen Republik Jemen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 289–304.
- JIHA, MICHEL. 1964. *Der arabische Dialekt von Bišmizzīn. Volkstümliche Texte aus einem libenasischen Dorf mit Grundzügen der Laut- und Formenlehre*. 'Beiruter Texte und Studien' 1. Beirut and Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- KHALAFALLAH, ABDELGHANY A. 1969. *A Descriptive Grammar of Saʿī:di Egyptian Colloquial Arabic*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KLIMIUK, MACIEJ. 2012. *Arabski dialekt Latakii (Syria). Fonologia i morfologia [The Arabic Dialect of Latakia (Syria). Phonology and Morphology]*. Doctoral dissertation. Warsaw: University of Warsaw.
- . 2022. 'Vowel Length in the Maltese Dialects of Gozo.' In Maciej Klimiuk (ed.), *Semitic Dialects and Dialectology: Fieldwork—Community—Change*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing, 213–227.
- KLIMIUK, MACIEJ, AND RUBEN FARRUGIA. 2022. 'A Text in the Maltese Dialect of Sannat (Gozo) with Grammatical Remarks.' In Maciej Klimiuk (ed.), *Semitic Dialects and Dialectology: Fieldwork—Community—Change*. Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing, 381–396.
- KLIMIUK, MACIEJ, AND MARIA LIPNICKA. 2019. 'Dialectology in Practice: Notes from Fieldwork in Gozo.' In Arnold Werner and Maciej Klimiuk (eds.), *Arabic Dialectology: Methodology and Field Research*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 23–32.
- LANE, EDWARD WILLIAM. 1842. *The Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*. 3rd ed. Letchworth: East-West Publications.
- NESPOR MARINA, AND IRENE VOGEL. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- STUMME, HANS. 1904. *Maltesische Märchen, Gedichte und Rätsel in deutscher Übersetzung*. 'Leipziger semitistische Studien' 1,5. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- WINKLER, HANS ALEXANDER. 1936. *Ägyptische Volkskunde*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- WOIDICH, MANFRED. 1974. 'Ein arabischer Bauerndialekt aus dem südlichen Ober-ägypten.' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 124 (1): 42–58.