

- Nallino, Carlo Alfonso. 1944. *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti*. Vol.V: Astrologia – Astronomia – Geografia. Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Neuvonen, Eero K. 1939. "Etimología de algunos arabismos del español". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 40.206-212.
- Neuvonen, Eero K. 1941. *Los arabismos del español en el siglo XIII*. Helsinki: Imprenta de la Sociedad de Literatura Finesa.
- Nykl, Aloys Richard. 1953. *Glosario preliminar de voces de origen árabe y persa en las traducciones hechas por orden del rey don Alfonso X el Sabio*, (inédito).
- Seco, Manuel. 2004. *Léxico hispánico primitivo (siglos VIII a XII)*. Proyectado y dirigido inicialmente por Ramón Menéndez Pidal, redactado por Rafael Lapesa con la colaboración de Constantino García. Edición al cuidado de M.S. Madrid: Fundación Ramón Menéndez Pidal/Real Academia Española

On *imāla* of medial and final *ā* in early Judaeo-Arabic

Simon Hopkins
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

§I Introduction

One of the acutest problems in the study of the Neo-Semitic languages is the lack of historical continuity of documentation between their ancient and modern forms. For most of them we have recent records only, hardly more than a couple of centuries old, so that we can see the present results of various linguistic processes, but are left rather in the dark about the genesis and development of the processes themselves. Thus, in e.g. the evolution of the Old Ethiopic type into Amharic or certain forms of classical Aramaic into the various Neo-Aramaic vernaculars the intermediate stages are not actually attested in any concrete form and can only be reconstructed. The old and the new ends of the time scale may be more or less known, but there is very little in between. By the time the documentation of Amharic or Neo-Aramaic really begins they are already fully fledged new languages, very different indeed in shape and structure from their classical prototypes.

To a lesser, though still very large degree this problem of time-depth besets the study of Arabic as well: while Classical Arabic (CA) has been intensively studied and many modern Arabic dialects are rather well known, the relationship between the Old Arabic and Neo-Arabic types remains a major difficulty of Arabic philology. The chronological and linguistic gulf between the language of the old written texts and that of the modern vernacular descendants is huge, and we often have no very clear picture of how the one evolved into the other. For this reason particular importance attaches to any Arabic source which may help us to bridge the gap.

Among such sources none are more important than the mediaeval writings of Arabic-speaking Jews, and among these Judaeo-Arabic (JA) sources none are more important than a number of ancient parchment documents from the 8th-9th centuries A.D. in which the Arabic texts are transcribed into Hebrew letters according to a phonetic principle. These texts reveal the pronunciation used by their writers in a way that no other early JA texts are able to do.

Most JA is written with Hebrew letters in an orthography which is a mere imitation of its CA model. This standard spelling, directly dependent upon CA orthography, is guided by the *eye* and is a *transliteration* of its written source. Over the last few years a number of old JA texts have come to light which do not use this system, or use it only partially. These are written phonetically, i.e. what is pronounced is written, what is not pronounced is not written. This spelling, independent of CA, is guided by the *ear* and is a *transcription* of the spoken word. We may call it "Early Phonetic Judaeo-Arabic Spelling" (EPJAS)¹.

To the Arabic linguist this EPJAS material is clearly of the highest significance, for it reveals a great deal of information which lies irretrievably concealed behind the conservative classical orthographies of Middle Arabic in general and standard mediaeval JA in particular. These EPJAS texts are particularly revealing in regard to the quality of vowels, both short and long, and hence one of the features for which they provide valuable early information is the occurrence of *imāla*. This important subject happens to be that with which our esteemed friend and colleague Federico Corriente, in whose honour these lines appear, began his book *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish Arabic Dialect Bundle* (Madrid 1977) 22-25. The *imāla* we are concerned with here involves the pronunciation in medial and final position of the vowel which in CA is long *ā*.

In standard JA, following CA orthography, the vowel -*ā*- when internal is marked by *aleph* (אָלֵף > קָאֵל *qāla*). This is found in EPJAS too, but here its use is not in the least obligatory. In these old texts (unlike standard JA and its CA model) there is no automatic relationship between vowel length and the use of *matres lectionis*. In this phonetic spelling (in the wake of Hebrew ~ Aramaic practice in which the scribes had been trained) long vowels may be unmarked by a *mater lectionis* and short vowels may be written plene. The long vowel *ā* in which we are here interested, may, therefore, in EPJAS not be marked at all (קָל). On the one hand, this *scriptio defectiva* of course hides from our eyes phonetic information which we should like to know, but, on the other hand, the philologist is amply compensated for this loss by a highly noteworthy feature of these phonetically written texts: the vowel corresponding to internal CA *ā* is here sometimes marked by the *mater lectionis yod*. Such a spelling

clearly indicates a shift of *ā* in the direction of *ē* (occasionally marked by *Sere*: §iii פִּדְיָא (sic); §iv אַלְכָּנִי, הָדָה, הוּלִי, §vi אִכְלוּהוּ) or perhaps even *ī*,² i.e. *imāla*.

Standard JA, again following its CA model, marks final -*ā* (*alif maqṣūra*) by either *aleph* (אָלֵף > דִּנְיָא *dunyā*) or *yod* (אֵלִי > אִלִּי *ālī*). Since דִּנְיָא and אֵלִי are merely orthographic calques of the CA forms, in both of which the final vowel in the received pronunciation is realized as [ā], it follows that no phonetic conclusions are to be drawn from the variation in spelling of דִּנְיָא with *aleph* as opposed to אֵלִי with *yod*. These spellings by no means imply a different Auslaut vowel. Things are quite different, however, in EPJAS, for when here we find *alif maqṣūra* spelled with *yod* (אֵלִי) we may be pretty certain that the final vowel was rather *ē* rather than *ā*, a conclusion strongly supported by occasional vocalizations of this ending with the Hebrew vowel *Sere* (אֵלִי), for examples of which see §iii אַלְכָּנִי, אֵלִי, חֲבָאִי. The non-fronted *ā* pronunciation of the ending is indicated indiscriminately either by *aleph* or (again in the wake of Hebrew ~ Aramaic practice) by *he*.

The marking in EPJAS of the vowel corresponding to CA *ā* may therefore be summed up as follows:

internal	א	ø	י
final	א	ה	י

It is the use of the *mater lectionis yod* that is of particular interest here. This points clearly to a fronted pronunciation of *ā* in the direction of *ē* and it is worthwhile to enquire after the factors that governed its appearance.

§IIIa *Imala* in *Halakhot Pesuqot*¹

In order to answer this question, let us begin with an analysis of the data provided by one of two EPJAS translations of the Geonic composition *Halakhot Pesuqot*. In the 18 extant leaves of the parchment manuscript the Babylonian Aramaic original is followed, section by section, by the Arabic translation. This translation (henceforth: HP¹) is one of the longest and best EPJAS texts available³. We may anticipate our conclusion and state here at the outset that the internal *imāla* revealed by this text is of the conditioned *i*-Umlaut type and that its final *imāla* largely corresponds to the CA nominal ending *alif maqṣūra*. This is the *imāla* known today especially in the Mesopotamian *qeltu*-

¹ For a provisional description of the phonetic spelling systems see Blau & Hopkins 1984; further details and sample texts in Blau 2002: 136-154. A general account of the material is to appear in the proceedings of the First International Symposium: Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic throughout History, held in Louvain-la Neuve in May 2004.

² Whether the degree of *imāla* was slight, medium or strong cannot be known with any exactitude. If the reading of the *ḥiriq* of אֵלִי (§iii a) is correct, the internal *imāla* may in some cases even have reached *ī*. For the sake of convenience *imāla* of *ā* is in the following conventionally indicated as *ē*.

³ For details of this composition and the manuscripts containing it see Danzig 1993: 64-70, 627/8 MS B; Brody 1998: 216ff. Text and translation have been prepared for publication by J. Blau & S. Hopkins; meanwhile, a specimen may be read in Blau 2002: 141-145.

dialects⁴ spoken in certain parts of Iraq, Anatolia and N. Syria⁵; it is also the type of *imāla* described for the early Islamic period by Sībwayhi⁶ and well-attested in Iraqi sources from the Middle Ages, in particular Šafiyy al-Dīn al-Hillī⁷.

The indication of CA *ā* by the mater lectionis *yod* occurs in HP1 in the following categories⁸:

a) Inlaut *ā-i* ~ *i-ā*

1. *fāʿil(a)* فاعل ~ فاعلة⁹

שׂוּחֵי יָדַי; 2a:32¹¹ الجانية = "the coarse one (f.)" אֶלְגִּיפִייה 2a:4¹⁰ بارد = "cold" בִּירֵיד "two witnesses" = 18a:28 شاهدین.

This spelling is especially frequent (and apparently without exception) in ordinal numerals¹²: אחינייה "the second (f.)" = الثانية 1a:19 and similarly 1a:26, 15a:5; לאחניי = للثان 3a:4 and likewise 3a:22, 28, 16b:12; חילית "third" = ثالث 14b:20 and similarly 16b:13; חילית באחניי "third on the second" = ثالث بالثاني 16b:11; אסידס "the sixth" = السادس 3a:25.

2. *fīʿāl* فاعل¹³

רִיגִיל "men" = رجال 9b:2¹⁴.

fīʿāl from III^{wy} roots corresponding to CA אנסי = النساء "the women" 4a:7, 11; garment" = كساء 6b:3 and with pronominal suffix כיסי "his garment" = 2b:9; כרע = "rent" כיירי (כרע is also attested) 6a:11, 12, 7b:1; similarly 8b:22, 27 and with pronominal suffix וכיירה "and its rent" = וכרע.

⁴ First identified and described by H. Blanc in a classic study, Blanc 1964: 42-50, supplemented especially by Levin 1971 and by Jastrow 1978: 65-77.

⁵ Subsequent research, e.g. by F. Abu-Haidar (Christian Baghdad), J. Mansour (Jewish Baghdad), O. Jastrow (N. Iraq, Anatolia), A. Levin, A. Sabuni (Aleppo), S. Talay and P. Behnstedt (Syria), has completely confirmed Blanc's analysis; see further below §vii. In order, therefore, not to overload the footnotes, reference in the following is made principally to Blanc 1964.

⁶ See already Blanc 1964: 48-50. Further details are to be found in Levin 1971, 1978, 1992, 1994a: 218-220, 222/3.

⁷ Levin 1975, 1994b.

⁸ Sometimes the spelling is inconclusive. As double *yod* (יי) may mark both consonantal *y* and *y+ē*, so that e.g. ואציביין "and the infants" = والصبيان 4a:8 may represent either *šibyān* with scriptio defectiva or *šibyēn* with *imāla*. The *qaltu*-dialects of Baghdad happen not to have *imāla* in this word (Blanc 1964: 86); for *fīʿlān* with *imāla*, see below n. 33.

⁹ For *fāʿil* with *imāla* see Blanc 1964: 42/3 (i) and (ii), 83/4, 93/4, where Jewish Baghdadi contrasts (a) nominal with *ḡimāṣ* "mosque" with (b) verbal *ḡēmāṣ* "having gathered", both < جامع. For the numeral *wāḥid* see ibid. 45 (v), 90.

¹⁰ Cf. Jewish ~ Christian Baghdadi *bīḡād* ~ *bēḡād* in Blanc 1964: 83.

¹¹ In vocalized cipher, later written over with square Hebrew letters.

¹² Cf. Jewish Baghdadi *ḥini*, *ḥibi* etc. in Blanc 1964: 45 (v), 93, as against the Christian dialect without *imāla* in the *fāʿil* of the ordinals. Ordinal numerals display phonological idiosyncrasies in a number of Arabic dialects.

¹³ Cf. Blanc 1964: 42/3 (i), 80/1.

¹⁴ Cf. Jewish ~ Christian Baghdadi *ḡḡīl* ~ *ḡḡēl* in Blanc 1964: 80 and for early *imāla* in this word ibid. 48.

¹⁵ These forms correspond to the Jewish and Christian Baghdadi *šēti* "winter" in Blanc 1964: 44 (iii). For *alif mamdūda* cf. below §iv b no. 11.

8b:27¹⁶; 16 פִּינִי (sic) "ransom" = فداء (or فدى) 14b:8. Closely related to this is the frequent ריבי "interest" = ربا¹⁷ always spelled with *yod* in both syllables and in 6a:3 vocalized רִבִּי.

Unclear is the status of אַמְעִיָּה 2a:14. If the reading is correct and if the meaning is "his intestines" (as opposed to "intestines" = أمعاء) we could interpret the word as a blend between *mīʿā*? (*fīʿāl*) and *ʿamīʿā*? (*ʿafīʿāl*)¹⁸.

3. Demonstratives

hāḡīhī هذه "this (f.)": הידיה 1a:26, 5a:15 etc.; הידי 10a:3, 15a:23, 17b:13.

ḡālika ذلك "that": דיליק 4b:26; 3a:9.

(hā)?ulāʾi etc.¹⁹ אֵלְ הוּלֵא "these": אורי 3b:1; הולי 7b:18, 12a:17; האולי 12b:19; הולי 16b:25; האולי 16b:12; הולי 3b:20; האולי 11b:8.

4. *yufāʿilu* يُفَاعِلُ²⁰

Only in לא יובילי "it doesn't matter" = 17a:11.

b) Auslaut *alif maqṣūra*²¹

5. *fūʿlā* فعلى

אולוי "the first (f.)" = الأول 12a:16; ואלאולי 15a:5 and vocalized אולוי 12a:14.

Here belongs the proper name למוסי "to Moses" = لموسى 1a:23.

6. *fāʿālā* فاعل²²

חבאלי "pregnant (pl.)" = حبال 14b:7²³. The interesting form יחימי "orphans" = يتامى is frequent²⁴, spelled everywhere with final *yod* except for אליחימה and with final *he* 10a:3.

7. Particles

matā متى "when?" 2a:16, 2b:12, 3a:4²⁵.

¹⁶ Cf. the Quranic orthography of e.g. اشتري + اشتري in Diem 1979b: 247 §56 and the spellings اشتريן below §iv b nos. 9-11; כִּבְאָה §vi no. 2.

¹⁷ On this problematical word and its Quranic spelling ربا see Spitaler 1960: 219/20, 225/6 = idem 1998: 197/8, 293/4; Diem 1979b: 240/1 §47.

¹⁸ Such blends are frequent in many varieties of Arabic; see e.g. Blau 1966: 228; Corriente 1977: 59 n. 84; Blanc 1964: 79-81.

¹⁹ Cf. Blanc 1964: 44: "the deictic words seem to make up a special category and the history of their vocalic ending is problematic".

²⁰ Blanc 1964: 43/4 (ii), 49, 95, 110 does not record cases of *imāla* for form III verbs in Baghdadi *qaltu*-dialects. It does, however, occur occasionally in the participle, e.g. *msēḡa* "travelling (f.)" (Abu-Haidar 1991: 22 - see on this word Levin 1975: 263), *mkīḡi* "muleteer" (Mansour 1991: 230 n. 114), and in the (apparently unique) finite verb *bēḡak*, *ybēḡak* "to bless" (Jastrow 1978: 175; Mansour, ibid. 134, 149 [form 3a]). In other *qaltu*-dialects *imāla* in form III of the verb is quite regular; Jastrow, ibid. 174-179 and cf. below n. 72. It may be relevant that the present instance יובילי is of III_y verb.

²¹ Cf. Blanc 1964: 44 (iii), 84.

²² This noun pattern regularly undergoes *imāla* in both Baghdadi *qaltu*-dialects: Blanc 1964: 44 (iii), 82/3.

²³ Cf. Jewish ~ Christian Baghdadi *ḥbālī* ~ *ḥbālī* in Blanc 1964: 83. For the irregular *imāla* behaviour of the singular *ḥublā* "pregnant" in various dialects, e.g. Jewish and Christian Baghdadi *ḥablē*, see ibid. 46, 50, 150, 191 n. 84.

²⁴ Cf. Jewish ~ Christian Baghdadi *yṭāmi* ~ *yatāmi* in Blanc 1964: 83. יחימי seems to represent a restructuring of *yatāma* > *yatāmi* (*fāʿālā*) as *yatēmi* (*fāʿālī*); cf. the Christian Baghdadi variant *ḥabēli* (ibid.) of the word mentioned in the preceding note.

In the light of the above data we may say that the JA text of HP¹ reveals a somewhat restricted, impeded variety of Umlaut- and final *imāla*. There is a largish number of cases in which the conditions for internal *imāla* obtain, but in which *imāla* nevertheless does not occur. And in final position too we find that *imāla*-prone *ā* was probably pronounced *-ā̃* just as often as *-ē̃*. Of the reasons for the non-occurrence of *ā̃* > *ē̃* – the blocking effect of emphatic and back consonants (*ḥurūf mustafliya*), morphological conditioning, stress, analogy etc. – nothing certain can be said. Even in the much better known *qaltu*-dialects the operative factors are unclear. Whatever the reasons may be, one has the impression that *imāla* in HP¹ is either in recession or, possibly, still under-developed (cf. below §vii).

36 For *ḥattā* with *imāla* see below n. 50.

"battle" = קִּיחַל Ps 68:31, 78:9 and similarly 144:1; מִזְיג
"mixture" = מִזְجָה 75:9; "for the screen" = לַחֲجָב 105:39; טִירָה
"lamp" =

⁴³ Cf. Jewish ~ Christian Baghdadi *ḡīhəl* ~ *ḡāhəl* "child" in Blanc 1964: 83.

119:105; "the contempt" = الحقرة 123:44; לגיזר "to (chopped) pieces" = (לגזרים) 136:13; "the weapons" = السلاح 140:8; לגביל "to the mountains" = للجبال Ea19; לעבדה "for the worship of" = b14; לעבדה "the book" = الكتاب b25⁴⁵; "difference" = Za6, 21; אלקחים "the kites" = الحدا ~ الحدا Ea24.

III *way* roots "the building" = البناء Ps 104:17; אלקחי "the kites" = الحدا ~ الحدا Ea24.

3. Demonstratives⁴⁶

hādīhī "there" Ea29; והידיה b26.

dālika: דילך 19, 23, 31; b20, 21; Za21; b32.

hāʾulāʾi: הולא Ea6.

4. *yufāl ilu*

לימרון "I dwell beside" = Ps 61:5; לימרון "that they disobey" = Ps 78:17 and similarly ימרון 78:40 and participle ימרון 78:47; ימרון "they meet" = 85:11.

b) Auslaut *alif maqṣūra*

5. *fūfālā*

אופלי "the lower" = السفلى Ps 86:13; ברזי "in a vision" = 89:20; אופלי "other" = أخرى Za27⁴⁸; "Moses" = موسى b24, 28.

6. *faʿālā*

עטאי "gifts" = عطايا Ps 68:18.

7. Particles⁴⁹

hattā: Za4, 12 חתי "until" = حتى⁵⁰.

§IVb Additional cases of *imāla* in Ps, E and Z

In addition to the above categories nos. 1-7 common to HP¹ (§iii a) and Ps, E and Z (§iv a), the latter three texts present cases of *imāla* in further morphological patterns in which the conditions for the shift are met, viz. internally with the sequences *ā-i* ~ *i-ā* and in final position with the ending *alif maqṣūra*.

a) Inlaut *ā-i* ~ *i-ā*

8. *faʿālil* ~ *faʿālīl*⁴⁴

⁴⁴ CA (حقارة ~ حقارة ~ حقارة).

⁴⁵ In Jewish Baghdadi *ktāb* is exempt from *imāla*, whereas in Christian Baghdadi (and other *qeltu*-dialects) it has the expected reflex *ktēb*: Blanc 1964: 43, 80/1.

⁴⁶ Ps contains no examples of demonstratives for the reason given in n. 40.

⁴⁷ The perfect was perhaps exempt from *imāla*: Ps 78:56. By chance no form III verbs occur in E and Z.

⁴⁸ Cf. Jewish and Christian Baghdadi *lax(x)i* as against Muslim *lux(ra)* in Blanc 1964: 21. For *uxrā* without *imāla* see n. 35.

⁴⁹ Ps contains no example of *hattā* for the reason given in n. 40.

⁵⁰ Cf. Jewish Baghdadi *hatti* (but Christian *hatta*) in Blanc 1964: and for earlier information on *imāla* in this word *ibid.* 49, 191 n. 79. For *hattā* without *imāla* see nn. 36, 60.

⁵¹ Although these two patterns do not trigger *imāla* in identical ways (Blanc 1964: 42/3, 47, 87-89), it seems neither necessary nor possible to distinguish them here.

68:16; (جبانة pl.) "plains" = "lush places" Ps 65:13; "paths" = مسالك 84:6; "my acquaintances" = معاير 88:9; "its breakers" = مكاسره 93:4; "the bees" = النشايب 120:4; "arrows" = نيشاب 127:2; "jewels" = جواهر Ea29; "to the exertions" = للمجاهد 127:2; "stars" = كواكب Za8.

9. *i-ā* infinitives of derived forms

III: for *fiʿāl*/see no. 2 in §§iii a; iv a.

IV: "making dizzy" = إسدار Ps 60:5; "the bestowing grace" = 92:8.

VII: "the gaping (of the mouth)" = الانفجار Ps 106:28; "the being inundated" = 140:12.

VIII: "commotion" = ارتجاج Ps 64:3; "bounty" = انجاب 77:11; "my imploring" = ابتهالي 68:10; "in strength" = 139:16.

From III *way* roots: "being equal" = استواء Ps 73:6; "your afflicting" = 104:24.

X: "standing on the threshold" = استكفاف Ps 84:11⁵²; "asking" = استفهام Zb11.

From III *way* roots: "investigating fully" = استواء Ps 95:4.

b) Auslaut

10. *faʿālā* etc⁵³

88:6; "the fallen ones" = الصرعى Ps 78:46⁵⁴; "locusts" = لاسكري 105:40; "quail" = سلوى 89:33; "and by the visitation" = وباللوى 106:14.

We should add here a few cases of radical *alif maqṣūra* (i.e. in CA with *tanwīn*) in the patterns *faʿāl*, *fiʿāl* and *fūfāl*: "hills" = ربي Ps 65:13⁵⁵; "youth" = 88:16; "and folding(?)" = 95:4; "and the (small) locusts" = 105:34; "the desires" = 106:14.

Particularly interesting is *maʿfāl-atun* "her mistress" = 123:2, which seems to show that *imāla* of *alif maqṣūra* was not limited to Auslaut⁵⁶; on the other hand, the defective spelling "his master" = مولاه Ea26 reveals nothing about the quality of the vowel involved.

11. *alif mamdūda*

In the wake of a process already discernible in CA (فدى ~ بكى ~ شفاء ~ شفاء etc.), in many Neo-Arabic dialects reflexes of *alif maqṣūra* and *alif mamdūda* may share the same fate and to a great degree coincide. For this reason, perhaps, we find that in Ps, E and Z the nominal endings which in CA appear as *-āʾu(n)* may follow the model of *alif maqṣūra* and accordingly be written with *yod*. Some cases of *-āʾun* spelled in this manner have already been

⁵² Apparently "threshold" formed on the pattern of X med. gem.

⁵³ Cf. Blanc 1964: 44 (iii), 84.

⁵⁴ *Aramaic* = سوكولوف 2002: 15b.

⁵⁵ Unless = ربي?

⁵⁶ Cf. above n.16.

But the *ā* of *alif mamūdā* (irrespective of *tanwīn*) may also shift to *ē* even when no preceding *i* is present to trigger the change⁵⁹: אֲדָמָה “her produce” = Ps 67:7; קִפְרִי “wilderness” = Ps 69:26; טָנִי “elevation” = Ps 141:2.

Although the Umlaut-*imāla* in Ps, E and Z operates much more freely than in HP¹, we are by no means witness here to a simple matter of phonetic conditioning operating blindly and consistently across the board. As we saw above for HP¹ (§iii b) the situation here too is not predictable in all its details and often rather complicated. The same is true of the modern *qaltu*-dialects, where the presence of conditions favourable to *imāla* is of itself no guarantee that *imāla* will actually occur. Here follows a classified list of exceptions and inconsistencies in Ps, E and Z, in which *ā* (including that of *alif mamdūda*) in conditions conducive to or compatible with the occurrence of *imāla* is nevertheless spelled with *aleph*, on occasion vocalized with *pataḥ*.

7. Particles

⁵⁹ At least no primary *i*. To account for some cases it is possible to posit a different underlying form e.g. **fi* *āl* for CA *fa* *āl*, for which cf. *hiqāra* above n. 44 and **ʕinās* below §v.

⁶³ Jastrow 1983: 74 n. 4; Behnstedt 1992: 41; Procházka 2002: 46 n. 118. *ʔunās* was perhaps avoided in favour of *ʔinās* as *fufāl* is normally associated with the plural, whereas *fifāl* is; initial *i* could have been favoured by the existence of *ʔins* and *ʔinsān*.

dadi⁶⁴ and is widespread (usually as *nēs*, sometimes as *nīs*) in Anatolia and elsewhere in the *qaltu* area⁶⁵, including a not insignificant part of Syria⁶⁶. It so happens that something very much approaching this very form has now turned up on a different leaf of the same ancient JA manuscript: אלאנינים “the people” Eb26, apparently spelled with two *yods*⁶⁷. This reading, if correct⁶⁸, clearly points to *al-ʿinās* = الإناس and, if so, the asterisk from the posited **ʿinās* may henceforth be omitted. אינאס itself occurs in MS Cambridge University Library, T-S NS 116.128.

This נס = נاس reappears in a number of EPJAS and ex-EPJAS texts. It survives as a relic also in an exegetical translation of Job contained in two large leaves of another old eastern parchment from the geniza, T-S Ar. 28.152⁶⁹: 1a:16, 1b:38 but אעניס with *imāla* 2b:22.

§VI *Imāla* in Job

By the time T-S Ar. 28.152 was written the old tradition of phonetic orthography was well in decline. This text still contains a good number of typical EPJAS spellings and vulgar features (including a fine *qaltu* form ודהישחו “and I was startled” = دهشت 1a:28) but already shows heavy influence of the conventional later orthography, e.g. in the spelling itself, which is likely to represent الناس rather than الإناس. Such texts are both orthographically and linguistically transitional: they are no longer pure EPJAS, but nor yet fully standard JA. Together with the recession of the phonetic spelling many substandard linguistic features receded too, among them the Umlaut-*imāla* which must at an earlier stage have been a systematic characteristic of this old translation of Job. As it is, cases of *imāla* in this text are now in a distinct minority. These are those that remain:

Inlaut

1. *fāʿil*: אכלה “he who eats it” = آكله 1a:8; תיבתי “firm” = ثابت 1a:30, but in the very next line תאבתן “holding” = ماسك 2a:25.

2. *fāʿāl*: כיבאה “his tent” = خبائه 1a:18, unvocalized כיבא 1b:31; בילאה “by (a) God” = ياله 2b:18.

⁶⁴ Blanc 1964: 46 (as against Jewish Baghdadi *nās*).

⁶⁵ In addition to the literature in n. 63 and Jastrow 1978: 66, see the documentation in Vocke & Waldner 1982: 19 and the references in Levin 1978: 187 n. 81; idem 1992: 86; idem 1994a: 220; idem 1994b: 320.

⁶⁶ Arnold & Behnstedt 1993: 24, 106 Map 12; Behnstedt 1997: Map 44.

⁶⁷ Cf. אגניש in Sokoloff 2002: 119/20. The word behaves idiosyncratically in various Semitic languages, while hovering between collective and singular; e.g. the initial *ʿ* is regularly lost in Syriac, less regularly in Arabic (Nöldeke 1896: §16) and אנש with unexpected *waw* occurs in several Western Aramaic dialects (Fassberg 1992: 58); for the dissimilation of Hebrew אנש see Brockelmann 1908: 255; Bergsträsser 1918: 151.

⁶⁸ The only other possibility is אלוניס, but this would be phonologically incomprehensible. The often invisible difference in old Hebrew manuscripts between a long *yod* and a short *waw* must frequently be decided by philology rather than palaeography.

⁶⁹ This text also will appear in the volume mentioned above n. 37.

8. *fāʿālil*: ודנאריה “and his descendants” = ذراريه 2b:24, apparently unvocalized ודנא <ריהום> 1a:30; ואלכוניב “and the stars” = والكواكب 2a:1, but וכוניב 2a:37.

Auslaut

10. Final *yod* corresponding to CA *-ā* in an orthographically hybrid text such as this is of uncertain interpretation. It is not possible to know whether “and the meaning” 1a:34 is a classical spelling of والمعنى and to be read *w-al-maʿnā*, or a phonetic spelling indicating something like *al-maʿnē*⁷⁰. Nor is “and the legal ruling” = والقيا 2a:4 quite straightforward. “the other (m.)” 1b:38, if it is correct, is curious; could it be a *nisba*-ending, i.e. *al-āxarī*?

In T-S Ar. 28.152 the old EPJAS tradition is on its way to oblivion and the Umlaut-*imāla* is residual only. In the later standard JA, which reigned throughout the Middle Ages, it had virtually vanished altogether; sporadic instances may indeed occur, but they form no part of a coherent phonological system⁷¹.

§VII Conclusion

The JA material studied here reveals, by virtue of its phonetic orthography (§ii), an internal *imāla* which is clearly of the *i*-Umlaut variety and a final *imāla* affecting nouns and particles terminating in *-ā*. Since the EPJAS texts are unlikely to be later than the 9th century A.D., we have here valuable testimony to the occurrence of *imāla* in the early period of Islam, supplementing the ancient and mediaeval data provided by e.g. Sībawayhi and Šafīyy al-Dīn al-Hillī and antedating by some thousand years the strikingly similar *imāla* of the modern Mesopotamian and Anatolian *qaltu*-dialects.

The *imāla* of medial *-ā* is conditioned by the presence of *i* or *ī* in a neighbouring syllable, while *imāla* of final *-ā* is closely connected to the *alif maqṣūra* ending which in CA is written with *yāʾ* (§§iii a; iv a-b). This does not mean, however, that in every case in which these conditions are fulfilled, *imāla* will necessarily ensue (§§iii b; iv c). The situation is rather as in the modern *qaltu*-dialects, where the *imāla* principle is very firmly established but not always consistently applied, so that the details constantly differ. This is true both within the same dialect and between one dialect and another. Sometimes *imāla* occurs even when the necessary historical conditioning seems to be absent; that EPJAS and the *qaltu*-dialects should agree in both having the highly exceptional נס = *nēs* (§v) shows just how intimate the historical connections between them are. Some texts originally written in EPJAS are today extant only in later copies influenced by the standard mediaeval JA orthography; in such texts *imāla* is residual only (§vi).

⁷⁰ Cf. Persian *maʿni*.

⁷¹ See the few isolated cases in Blau 1961: 19 § 5.

In conclusion, a few words should be said about the geography of this early Umlaut-*imāla*. In the light of modern Arabic dialectology the unmistakable presence in these EPJAS texts of the *i*-Umlaut points, it would seem, to an eastern, viz. Mesopotamian, origin for our texts. This tallies very well indeed with Ps, which bears upon it a heavy imprint of living Aramaic (and occasionally Persian) and may hence confidently be attributed to the east – it is unlikely that vernacular Aramaic could have played any such role west of Sinai on African soil. The same is very likely true of E and Z (§iv a). On the other hand, HP¹ (§iii) shows clear signs of a western origin, especially in its use of the imperfect *nfi*l – *nfi*lw, a feature not known to occur at all in the east. In terms of modern dialectology such a combination makes no sense at all; the Maghribi *nfi*l – *nfi*lw and the Iraqi Umlaut-*imāla* are an incompatible pair.

There would appear to be two ways to explain the dilemma presented by HP¹. (i) Since the Aramaic text *Halakhot Pesuqot* was in all likelihood composed in Geonic Babylonia, it seems possible to suppose that the original JA translation was likewise of eastern origin. If so, its Umlaut-*imāla* will belong to the earliest, viz. eastern, layer of the text. But HP¹ in its present form is of Egyptian or North African provenance. If the Aramaic text was first translated into Arabic in Iraq, we could well imagine that an originally freer Umlaut-*imāla* of the Iraqi *qeltu* type was arrested, contracted and reversed when the text travelled westwards and acquired a Maghribi overlay on African soil. The history of the *qeltu*-dialects shows several examples of a formerly widespread *imāla* receding under the influence of the *imāla*-less *gilit*-dialects⁷² and such a reversal may be represented by HP¹ as well.

Alternatively (ii) – and to this interpretation I incline – the translation may have been made in Egypt or North Africa in the first place, thus implying that the *nfi*l – *nfi*lw forms belong to the oldest, viz. western, stratum of the text. In this case, HP¹ would provide evidence for the ancient Umlaut-*imāla* in the pre-Banī Hilāl sedentary dialects of the Maghrib. This, of course, would imply that the *i*-Umlaut so characteristic today of Mesopotamia and Anatolia was formerly of much wider distribution. Perhaps significantly, in the last few years it has in fact emerged that the typically Iraqi Umlaut-*imāla* is still current further west, sometimes overlapping with the quite distinct spontaneous “Lebanese” *imāla* which appears in non-emphatic consonantal environments. The existence of the Umlaut-*imāla* in one form or another has been established in Aleppo⁷³ and a considerable number of other places in Syria⁷⁴, in Adana⁷⁵ and

the areas of Antioch⁷⁶ and Çukurova⁷⁷ in southern Turkey. The fact that clear traces of it occur in the Maronite dialect of Kormakiti in Cyprus makes it virtually certain that in the Middle Ages our feature was present in Lebanon too⁷⁸. From an earlier period we have indications (though not solid proof) in EPJAS papyri that the Umlaut-*imāla* occurred in Egypt as well⁷⁹. Moving further west still, our feature has been detected in Libya⁸⁰ and in Maltese⁸¹. Against this background the existence of the same feature in the Egyptian ~ North African EPJAS text HP¹ becomes rather more comprehensible. And if the *i*-Umlaut occurred in the ancient sedentary dialects of the Maghrib preceding the period of the Banī Hilāl, one might further wonder whether traces of the same phenomenon might yet be found in Spanish Arabic too⁸².

Adoption of interpretation (ii) implies the following picture: during the first centuries of Islam the Umlaut-*imāla* described by Sībawayhi and reflected in the EPJAS texts studied here was rather widespread, extending from Iraq to the Maghrib. Since that time it has been in a process of continual eastward recession, so that today it is preserved in something like its original form only in the *qeltu*-dialects of Iraq and Anatolia, especially in the speech of the Jewish and Christian minorities. In the Middle Ages it was still present in the Levant, as witnessed by its exportation to Cyprus and survival in the dialect of Kormakiti. Clear traces of it are today still to be found in certain Arabic dialects at the eastern end of the Mediterranean: in Aleppo, in pockets of *qeltu* (or ex-*qeltu*) speech in Syria and in several places in southern Turkey.

References

- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 1991. *Christian Arabic of Baghdad*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Arnold, Werner. 1990. *Das Neuwestaramäische, V. Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Arnold, Werner. 1998. *Die arabischen Dialekte Antiochiens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

tmēni “thirty, eighty” (Spitaler, *ibid.* §108f) and *qeltu* forms with *imāla* as represented by e.g. Jewish Baghdadi *tlifn*, *tmīn* (Blanc 1964: 46, 92).

⁷² In Abbasid Baghdad *imāla* was more widespread than it later came to be: Blanc 1964: 46, 48. For the “Rückgängigmachung der *Imāla*” = “Entimalisierung” of Jewish Baghdadi *faʿāl* in e.g. *bsatin* “gardens” see Jastrow 1978: 67 and for recession of *imāla* in Dēr iz-Zōr *ibid.* 67/8. Reversal of *imāla* in form III of the verb (cf. above n. 20) is discussed by Jastrow, *ibid.* 174/5.

⁷³ Levin 2002.

⁷⁴ Behnstedt 1990: 47; *idem* 1992: 41, 46, 49; *idem* 1997: Maps 43-62; *idem* 2000: 1, 96, 108, 193, 278, 308, 348; Arnold & Behnstedt 1993: 24, 25. Note also *teʿil* loaned into the Aramaic dialect of Maʿlūla, including *zēmī* “mosque” (above n. 9) and the special category of ordinal numerals (above n. 12) *teʿn(i)* “second” etc.: Spitaler 1938: §3f b; Arnold 1990: 331, 403; Arnold & Behnstedt 1993: 50. Such forms may have been loaned from an old *i*-Umlaut dialect of Arabic: Diem 1979a: 46 n. 141. Likewise noteworthy is the similarity between Maʿlūla *teʿli*,

⁷⁵ Jastrow 1983: 74.

⁷⁶ Arnold 1998: 65-68 and further e.g. 118, 121, 122/3, 220.

⁷⁷ Prochazka 2002: 40-50.

⁷⁸ Borg 1985: 54-67 and the important discussion there 155-157 (including *nēs* 62, 156).

⁷⁹ Blau & Hopkins 1987: 134 § 6 = Blau 1988: 448. The significance of the question was not clear to us when writing that article. We are now inclined to interpret the word for “man” there as אִינְסִי = *ʾinsēn* < *ʾinsān*; for *fiʿlān* as an *imāla* pattern see above n. 33.

⁸⁰ Owens 1993: 251-259.

⁸¹ Borg 1976: 191-223.

⁸² Cf. Ferrando 2004: 48. For *imāla* in Spanish Arabic see, in addition to Corriente 1977, the examples and bibliography in Martínez Ruiz 1991.

Arnold, Werner & Behnstedt, Peter. 1993. *Arabisch-Aramäische Sprachbeziehungen im Qalamūn (Syrien)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Behnstedt, Peter. 1990. "Maḏḏamīye: ein neuer qāltu-Dialekt aus Syrien". *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 22. 44-66.

Behnstedt, Peter. 1992. "Qāltu-Dialekte in Ost-Syrien". *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 24. 35-59.

Behnstedt, Peter. 1997. *Sprachatlas von Syrien. Kartenband*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Behnstedt, Peter. 2000. *Sprachatlas von Syrien II: Volkskundliche Texte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1918. *Hebräische Grammatik I*. Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel.

Blanc, Haim. 1964. *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Blau, Joshua. 1961. *A Grammar of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1980 [in Hebrew].

Blau, Joshua. 1966. *A Grammar of Christian Arabic I*. Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO.

Blau, Joshua. 1988. *Studies in Middle Arabic and its Judaeo-Arabic Variety*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Blau, Joshua. 2002. *A Handbook of Early Middle Arabic*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.

Blau, Joshua & Hopkins, Simon. 1984. "On early Judaeo-Arabic orthography". *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 12. 9-27, reprinted in Blau 1988: 381-400.

Blau, Joshua & Hopkins, Simon. 1987. "Judaeo-Arabic papyri – collected, edited, translated and analysed". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 9. 87-160, reprinted in Blau 1988: 401-474.

Borg, Alexander. 1976. "The imaala in Maltese". *Israel Oriental Studies* 6. 191-223.

Borg, Alexander. 1985. *Cypriot Arabic*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft/ Franz Steiner.

Brockelmann, Carl. 1908. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen I*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.

Brody, Robert. 1998. *The Geonim of Babylonia and the Shaping of Medieval Jewish Culture*. New Haven/ London: Yale University Press.

Corriente, Federico. 1977. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Spanish Arabic Dialect Bundle*. Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura.

Danzig, Neil. 1993. *Introduction to Halakhot Pesuqot*. New York/ Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America [in Hebrew].

Diem, Werner. 1979a. "Studien zur Frage des Substrats im Arabischen". *Der Islam* 56. 12-80.

Diem, Werner. 1979b. "Untersuchungen zur frühen Geschichte der arabischen Orthographie. I. Die Schreibung der Vokale". *Orientalia* 48. 207-257.

Elizur, Shulamit. 1999. "A contribution to the history of the Gaonate in the eighth century: an elegy for the head of the Academy in Palestine". *Zion* 64. 311-348 [in Hebrew].

Fassberg, Steven. 1992. "Hebraisms in the Aramaic documents from Qumran". *Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 3. 48-69.

Ferrando, Ignacio. 2004. "Andalusī Arabic in its linguistic setting". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 29. 41-54.

Jastrow, Otto. 1978. *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qāltu-Dialekte I*. Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft/ Franz Steiner.

Jastrow, Otto. 1983. "Beobachtungen zum arabischen Dialekt von Adana (Türkei)". *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 11. 72-79.

Kofler, Hans. 1940. "Reste altarabischer Dialekte (Fortsetzung)". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 47. 233-262.

Levin, Aryeh. 1971. *The Imāla in the Arabic Dialects*. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem [in Hebrew].

Levin, Aryeh. 1975. "The vernacular poetry of Ṣafīyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī". *Israel Oriental Studies* 5. 259-276, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. xvii.

Levin, Aryeh. 1978. "The 'imāla of 'alif fā'il in old Arabic". *Israel Oriental Studies* 8. 174-203, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. 14.

Levin, Aryeh. 1992. "The authenticity of Sībawayhi's description of the 'imāla". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15. 74-93, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. xiii.

Levin, Aryeh. 1994a. "Sībawayhi's attitude to the spoken language". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 17. 204-243, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. 12.

Levin, Aryeh. 1994b. "The rôle of the Mesopotamian qāltu dialects in the history of the Arabic dialects of Iraq". *Actes des premières journées internationales de dialectologie arabe de Paris, 1993*, ed. Dominique Caubet/ Martine Vanhove, 317-332. Paris: INALCO, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. 16.

Levin, Aryeh. 1998. *Arabic Linguistic Thought and Dialectology*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.

Levin, Aryeh. 2002. "The 'imāla in the modern Arabic dialect of Aleppo". "Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!". *60 Beiträge zur Semitistik. Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Werner Arnold/ Hartmut Bobzin, 431-446. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Mansour, Jacob. 1991. *The Jewish Baghdadi Dialect*. Or-Yehuda: The Babylonian Jewry Heritage Center.

J. Martínez Ruiz. 1991. "Nuevos ejemplos de la 'imāla hispanoárabe, en documentos árabes y en documentos castellanos de la Granada morisca (siglo XVI)". *Festgabe für Hans-Rudolf Singer ...*, ed. Martin Forstner, I 263-280. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

Nöldeke, Theodor. 1896. *Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wien: In Commission bei Carl Gerold's Sohn, Buchhändler der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Owens, Jonathan. 1993. "'Imāla in Eastern Libyan Arabic". *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 25. 251-259.

- Procházka, Stephan. 2002. *Die arabischen Dialekte der Çukurova (Südtürkei)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan/ Baltimore 2002: Bar Ilan University Press/ Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Spitaler, Anton. 1938. *Grammatik des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Ma'āla (Antilibanon)*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
- Spitaler, Anton. 1960. "Die Schreibung des Typus صلوة im Koran". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 56. 212-226, reprinted in Spitaler 1998: 190-205.
- Spitaler, Anton. 1998. *Philologica. Beiträge zur Arabistik und Semitistik*, ed. Hartmut Bobzin. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Vocke, Sibylle & Waldner, Wolfram. 1982. *Der Wortschatz des anatolischen Arabisch*. Erlangen.
- Zucker, Moses. 1959. *Rav Saadya Gaon's Translation of the Torah*. New York: Philipp Feldheim [in Hebrew].
- Vollers, Karl. 1906. *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Weiß Zähne (*drās bīḏ*). Über einige unregelmäßige Lautentwicklungen im Anatolischen Arabisch

Otto Jastrow
Universität Erlangen

Im folgenden möchte ich einige Unregelmäßigkeiten in der Entwicklung des Konsonantismus im anatolischen Arabisch diskutieren, die ich im Laufe meiner langjährigen Beschäftigung mit dieser Dialektgruppe gesammelt habe. Federico Corriente hat, ausgehend von seiner Erforschung des andalusischen Arabisch, eine Reihe von wichtigen Arbeiten zur Vorgeschichte der modernen Dialekte und damit auch zur Geschichte des Arabischen im weiteren Sinne vorgelegt. Mehrfach rückte dabei die Entwicklung des altarabischen *qāḏ* in den Blick, aber auch andere Besonderheiten des Konsonantismus wurden diskutiert. Ich hoffe deshalb, daß dieser bescheidene Beitrag das Interesse des Jubilars finden möge.

Schwerpunktmäßig stammt mein Material aus dem Dialekt von Kinderib (arab. *Kandērīb*), einer Mundart des Mhallami, welches seinerseits eine Untergruppe der Mardin-Dialekte bildet. Eine vereinfachte Übersicht über die Gliederung des Anatolischen Arabisch ergibt sich aus der folgenden Tabelle:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (1) | 1 | Mardin-Gruppe |
| | | Mardin-Stadt und Umgebung |
| | | Kōša- und Mhallami-Dialekte (Kinderib) |
| | | Āzax |
| | 2 | Siirt-Gruppe |
| | | Siirt-Stadt |
| | | Siirt-Dörfer |
| | 3 | Diyarbakir-Gruppe |
| | | Diyarbakir-Stadt |
| | | Diyarbakir-Dörfer (Kaṣbiye) |
| | | Diyarbakir, Siverek, Çermik, Urfa (jüdische Dialekte) |
| | 4 | Kozluk-Sason-Muş-Gruppe |