

- 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)*. Proyectoado 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.

§II Early phonetic Judaeo-Arabic spelling

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* (אָל > קאָל *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 (קל). 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

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.

clearly indicates a shift of *ā* in the direction of *ē* (occasionally marked by *Sere*: §iii פִּדְיָא (sic); §iv אַלְבָּגִי הַדְּרָה, הַרְלִי, הַרְלִי, אִיכְלוּהָ or perhaps even *ī*,² i.e. *imāla*.

Standard JA, again following its CA model, marks final -*ā* (*alif maqṣūra*) by either *aleph* (אָל > דּוּנְיָא *dunyā*) or *yod* (אָל > אָוּלִי *ʔūlā*). Since דּוּנְיָא and אָוּלִי 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 דּוּנְיָא with *aleph* as opposed to אָוּלִי 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* (אָוּלִי) 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* (אָוּלִי), for examples of which see §iii אַרְבֵּי, אִלוּלִי, אִלוּלִי, תְּבִאִלִי. 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 *Imāla* 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*-

² Whether the degree of *imāla* was slight, medium or strong cannot be known with any exactitude. If the reading of the *ḥiriq* of אִלְלִיפִיָּהּ = اَللّٰبِيَّة (§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.

These data are quite sufficient to reveal two very important things. What we have reflected here is a dialect in which (a) internal *imāla* is of the Umlaut type, viz. conditioned by the presence of an *i*-vowel in the neighbouring syllable (nos. 1-4), and in which (b) final *imāla* is closely related to the the *alif maqṣūra* ending of nouns which in CA is generally spelled with *yāʔ* (nos. 5-7)²⁶. In other words, we have before us a representative of the vowel-conditioned Umlaut-*imāla* which was described by Sībawayhi for the first centuries of the Islamic period and which survives today in the *qaltu*-dialects of Iraq, Anatolia and parts of N. Syria. This type of *imāla* stands in contrast to the spontaneous, consonant-bound *imāla* found in other parts of the modern Arabic-speaking world.

§IIIb Absence of *imāla* in *Halakhot Pesuqot*¹

The situation, however, is not quite straightforward and the parallel with the modern *qaltu*-dialects, while clearly valid in principle, requires a certain amount of commentary. In particular, beside the cases in which *imāla* does occur, it is also necessary to say something about the instances in which it does not.

As for the internal *imāla*, that it is the neighbouring *i*-vowel that was responsible for the fronting of *ā* in the Arabic dialect reflected here is shown by the fact that each instance of *ā* > *ē* written with *yod* in Inlaut is indeed accompanied by *i* in the preceding or following syllable. Conversely, if no *i*-vowel occurs in the neighbourhood, no shift takes place. For this reason *imāla* is liable to occur in the pattern *fīfāl*, but will never do so in the patterns *fāfāl* and *fufāl*. But this does not mean that each and every instance of *fīfāl* will produce *fīfēl*; on no account does every *i* adjacent to internal *ā* automatically trigger *imāla*. While cases of *scriptio defectiva* (פעיל) are obviously inconclusive, the use of *aleph* as mater lectionis (פאעיל) apparently allows us to see that in the dialect of HP¹ unshifted *ā* was quite compatible with *i* in the nominal patterns *fāfāl(a)* and *fīfāl(a)* and actually occurred in this environment rather often²⁷.

With the exception of the ordinal numerals, which form a special category (above n. 12), most instances of *fāfāl* in the text are actually written with *aleph* and hence will probably have retained the *ā* vowel, as strongly suggested by

²⁵ Cf. *ēmtī* in the Christian dialect of Baṣra recorded by Blanc 1964: 44, 190 n. 71 and for earlier evidence of the *imāla* in this word, *ibid.* 49.

²⁶ For this spelling (the implication of which for *imāla* cannot be discussed here) see Diem 1979b: 238-240 §§ 45/6 and cf. above n. 16.

²⁷ There is admittedly a potential pitfall in the assumption made here. While it seems beyond doubt that the use of *yod* indicates fronting of *ā*, it is not necessarily certain that *aleph* indicates its absence. It is possible that *imāla* had not (yet) been phonemicized into /ā/: /ē/ but (still) comprised a group of fronted variants of which the lower ones (/ā̄/) etc. were marked by *aleph* and only the higher ones (/ē/) etc. by *yod*. Perhaps some cases spelled with *aleph* were intended to be pronounced [ē], for which cf. §iv a and הולא §vi. ביבאה, כיבאה, ודראייה, ודראייה, ודראייה.

sporadic vocalizations with *pataḥ*: ענא[לם] “knowing(ly)” = 2a:17; ואלואסטא “and the middle one” = 6b:4; الواصلة 2b:1; אלואנג[ב] “the obligation” = 6b:4; האוב “able” = 8a:9; באטיל “for nothing” = 8b:21; האוב “the payer” = 9a:21; לאזם (sic) “occupied with” = 10b:21²⁸; גאוי “valid” = 11b:26; 13b:1 and similarly 15a:4, 5; אלכאין “the thief” = 18a:5. Note also ולאכין = “but” 1a:25²⁹.

Similarly, not every case of the pattern *fīfāl* involved the shift *ā* > *ē*. The defective writing of *ā* in תימרהא “its fruits” = 6a:9; אתגרה “the trade” = 7a:7 and גינן “garden” = 14a:7 leaves open the possibility of understanding these as *īmēr*, *tiḡēra* and *ḡinēn* respectively, but such an interpretation is made most improbable by the occurrence elsewhere of *plene* spellings of these very words with *aleph*: תימאר 15b:13; אתגרה 9a:3 and גינאן 15a:15. Further examples of unshifted *fīfāl(a)*: ציבאג “dyeing” = 8a:11³⁰; ארכע “the immovable possessions” = 12b:8; ארידא “the agreement” = 16a:27; כילאפה “power of attorney” = 18a:3. Clearly, then, not every case of *fāfāl* and *fīfāl* underwent *imāla*.

Nor was *imāla* necessarily intrinsic to the pattern *yufāfīlu* in the imperfect of form III of the verb, even when derived from roots III; beside the unique example לא יבילי “it doesn’t matter” = לא יבילי we find *ā* retained in the precisely comparable ליגאוי “that he recompense” = ליגאוי 4b:14. As for sound roots, there is no indication at all that in the dialect of HP¹ the presence of following *i* ever induced *imāla* in the imperfect of form III verbs. Cases of *scriptio defectiva* such as יטליבו “they demand” = 10a:17 of course prove nothing, but the spellings with *aleph* of the very same word do rather suggest retention of *ā*: יטאליב = 9a:25; יטאלב 9b:7, 10a:11 and similarly 15. There are further instances of *yufāfīlu* spelled with *aleph*: יגאוי “they overstep” = 7b:18; יכאליפ “that he transgress” = 8a:11³¹; יושאכיל “it matches” = 10a:1, 3.

Beside these fluctuations within the patterns *fāfāl*, *fīfāl* and *yufāfīlu* one notices the absence of *imāla* from certain morphological patterns in which one might expect it to have occurred. Very conspicuous indeed is the non-occurrence of *imāla* in the plural patterns *fāfālīp*² and *fāfālī*, categories which in the *qaltu*-dialects regularly trigger the shift of *ā* > *ē* (below §iv b no. 8). In all cases noted in HP¹, however, the vowel in question is written either with *aleph* or defectively: אפראיד “your ways” = 2a:31; אפראיד “the commandments” = 4a:10; מאקלוה “his weights” = 8a:11; סכאין “knives” = 8b:8. The vocalization with *pataḥ* of סכאין “knives” = 1a:20 seems to confirm absence of *imāla* from these plural patterns. Here too belong *fīfālān*³ and the infinitives of the derived stems VII *infīfāl*, X *istīfāl*

²⁸ *lāzam* is without *imāla* in Baghdad too (Blanc 1964: 43), but cf. below n. 42.

²⁹ Cf. for this word Blanc 1964: 155 s.v. *lāket*.

³⁰ Written in cipher with Tiberian vocalization.

³¹ This word is written in cipher.

³² Note, however, יחימי above n. 24.

³³ For *fīfālān* with *imāla* see Blanc 1964: 85, 86, 190 n. 69 (*ḏabbīn*, *ḏabbēn* “flies”). While cases such as גילינאן = ואלמייאן (above n. 8) are inconclusive, vocalizations such as גילינאן “its

119:105; "the contempt" = الحقايرة 123:4⁴⁴; "to (chopped) pieces" = لجزار (Heb. לגזרים) 136:13; "the weapons" = السلاح 140:8; לגבול "to the mountains" = للجبال Ea19; לעבודה "for the worship of" = b14; לעבודה "difference" = Za6, 21; אלכתיב "the book" = b25⁴⁵.

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

3. Demonstratives⁴⁶

hādihī: הרה Ea29; והידיה b26.

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

hā?ulā?i: חולא Ea6.

4. *yufā?ilu*

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

b) Auslaut *alif maqṣūra*

5. *fufālā*

אוכרי "the lower" = السفلى Ps 86:13; ברזיא "in a vision" = برؤيا 89:20; אחר "other" = أخرى Za27⁴⁸; מוסי "Moses" = موسى b24, 28.

6. *fa?ālā*

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. *fa?ālil* ~ *fa?ālīl*⁵¹

⁴⁴ CA (حَقَارَة ~ حُقَارَة ~ حَقَارَة).

⁴⁵ In Jewish Baghdadi *ktāb* is exempt from *imāla*, whereas in Christian Baghdadi (and other *qəltu*-dialects) it has the expected reflex *ktbēb*: 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*: ומרו = Ps 78:56. By chance no form III verbs occur in E and Z.

⁴⁸ Cf. Jewish and Christian Baghdadi *lx(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" = جباين "lush places" = نواضر Ps 65:13; "paths" = مسالك 84:6; "my acquaintances" = معيرفي 88:9; "its breakers" = مكاسره 93:4; "the bees" = كالتراير 118:12; "arrows" = نسايشيب 120:4; "jewels" = جواهر Ea29; "to the exertions" = للمجاهد 127:2; "stars" = كواكب = "stars" = كواكب 26; "to the dunghills" = للمزابيل.

9. *i-ā* infinitives of derived forms

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

IV: "making dizzy" = إسدار Ps 60:5; אלקביל "the bestowing grace" = 92:8; "in sprouting up" = بافراع 77:10; "the gaping (of the mouth)" = الانفتاح Ps 106:28; "the being inundated" = بالانهمار 140:11; "to be thrust away" = لانفادع 140:12.

VII: "bounty" = انتداب (Heb. דב) Ps 64:3; "commotion" = ارتجاج 68:10; "my imploring" = انتهالي 77:11; "in strength" = باقتدار 89:10; "my being folded" = ادراجي 139:16.

VIII: "your afflicting" = اعتراب Ps 73:6; "being equal" = استواء Ps 73:6; "your acquiring" = اقتناء 88:17; "standing on the threshold" = استكفاف Ps 84:11⁵²; "asking" = استفهام Zb11.

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

X: "asking" = استفهام Zb11.

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

b) Auslaut

10. *fa?ālā* etc⁵³

88:6; "the fallen ones" = الصرعى Ps 78:46⁵⁴; "locusts" = لاسقري "and by the visitation" = وباليلوي 89:33; "quail" = سلوى 105:40; "the dead ones" = الموتى Zb12.

We should add here a few cases of radical *alif maqṣūra* (i.e. in CA with *tanwīn*) in the patterns *fa?al*, *ff?al* and *fuf?al*: "hills" = ربي Ps 65:13⁵⁵; "youth" = "and folding(?)" possibly = وطوى 95:4; "and the (small) locusts" = والذئبي 105:34; "the desires" = المني 106:14.

Particularly interesting is *ma?al-atun* "her mistress" = مولانا Ps 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; بكاء ~ بكى; شفاء ~ شفا), 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 *-ā?u(n)* may follow the model of *alif maqṣūra* and accordingly be written with *yod*. Some cases of *-ā?un* 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 אסקרא; Sokoloff 2002: 15b.

⁵⁵ Unless = ربي?

⁵⁶ Cf. above n.16.

given above as instances of the Umlaut-*imāla* caused by preceding *i*: no. 2 in §§iii a; iv a (*fīfāl*); no. 9 in §iv b (*i-ā* infinitives) and cf. no. 3 in §§iii.a; iv a (*(hā)ʔulāʔ*). A possible case of *imāla* of *-āʔu* induced by preceding *f*⁷ is אלעזר “the powerful ones” Ps 59:4, which apparently = الأعراء. Here too perhaps belongs אלהי “Tuesday” = الثلاثاء Za16, whose ending may well have followed that of ‘Wednesday’ (**arbiʔāʔ*), in which *imāla* would have been quite in order⁵⁸.

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

§IVc Absence of *imāla* in Ps, E and Z

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 *qəltu*-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*.

Inlaut

1. *fāf il*

“roaring” = زار Ps 74:4; פארל “worthy” = 86:2; נאצל “to one who stretches” = [Heb. לרוקע] 136:6; טאמיה “unclean” = E27.

8. *faʔālil*

“his strongholds” = محاصنه Ps 89:41; “to the degrees” = للمعالي 121:1; גואמדי “my hidden parts” = غوامضي 139:15; אלאמץאייב “the tribulations” = المصائب Ea8.

9. *i-ā* infinitives of derived forms

“strength” = اقتدار Ps 93:1 (~ §iv b) אקתראר

IIIwy: אחצא “counting” = إحصاء 71:15.

Auslaut

alif maqṣūra

5. *fuf lā*

“the world” = الدنيا Ea1.

7. Particles

“until” = حتى Ea19⁶⁰.

10. Various cases of *alif maqṣūra*

faʔal: “vile speech” = Ps 75:6, 94:4; בורא “with the desire of” = بهوى (st. cstr.) 81:13.

maʔal: “refuge” = مأوى Ps 90:1.

Passive participles of IIIwy derived forms: מובחלא “afflicted” = مبتلى Ps 73:14; ומורופא “and dying” = وموتى 88:16; מצפא “purified” = مصفى 119:140.

11. *Alif mamdūda*

-āʔun

faʔal: “for distress” = للعاء Ps 88:1 and similarly 88:10; אשקא “the affliction” = الشقاء 107:41; וראחום “behind them” = وراءهم Ea32; “the heavens” = السماء Za14.

fuf āl: “the weeping” = البكاء Ps 84:7; Ea3.

-āʔu

fuf ālāʔ: “the prisoners” = الأسراء Ps 68:7; באומנא “with trusted ones” = بامناء 101:6; הולא צולחא אלאומה “these are the righteous of the nation” = هولاء صلحاء الأمة Ea6.

af ilāʔ: “faithful ones” = اولياء Ps 107:2.

That no examples of nos. 2 (*fīfāl*), 4 (*yufāʔilu*) and 6 (*faʔālā*) should appear in this list of forms apparently lacking *imāla* is probably due to chance only. The absence of no. 3 (demonstratives), on the other hand, may be significant (cf. above n. 20 and §iii b).

§V *Nās*

A form which has very special importance in demonstrating the intimate *imāla* connection between the old JA dialects of certain EPJAS texts⁶¹ and the modern *qəltu*-dialects of Iraq and Anatolia is to be found in אניס “the people” = الناس Za33, b12 and לניס “to the people” = للناس Zb11. This word, the anomaly of which had already been noted by Sībawayhi⁶², proves that the similarity between the ancient EPJAS internal *imāla* and the modern *qəltu* Umlaut-*imāla* is not merely a matter of general principle but extends also to the exceptions. In terms of CA there is no reason for *nās* “people” to undergo *imāla* at all, for the putative CA etymon *ʔunās* does not show the sequence *i-ā* necessary to trigger the shift *ā > ē*. For this reason we must posit **ʔinās*⁶³ as the origin of the singularly curious form which occurs as *nās* in Christian Bagh-

⁵⁷ Cf. Blanc 1964: 44 (iii), where *imāla* of the *mamdūda* ending *-āʔ* is conditioned by preceding *i* in the pattern of the noun.

⁵⁸ Note *ārpeʔi* “Wednesday” in Borg 1985: 66. Cf. the irregular behaviour of these words in Blanc 1964: 41/2.

⁵⁹ At least no primary *i*. To account for some cases it is possible to posit a different underlying form e.g. **fīfāl* for CA *faʔāl*, for which cf. *ḥiqāra* above n. 44 and **ʔinās* below §v.

⁶⁰ For *ḥattā* with *imāla* see above n. 50.

⁶¹ But not Ps for the reason given above n. 40.

⁶² Blanc 1964: 50, and for details Levin 1978: 178, 187; idem 1992: 86; idem 1994a: 219; idem 1994b: 320.

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 *fīfāl* 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 *qəltu* 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: אלאניניס “the people” Eb26, apparently spelled with two *yods*⁶⁷. This reading, if correct⁶⁸, clearly points to *al-ʔinās* = الإناس and, if so, the asterisk from the posited **ʔinās* may henceforth be omitted. אִינַס itself occurs in MS Cambridge University Library, T-S NS 116.128.

This נִיַס = نیس 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: אלנַס = النّاس 1a:16, 1b:38 but אַעניַס 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 *qəltu* form ודהישח “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 النّاس rather than الأناس. 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 standard 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. *fāʔil*: אִכְלוּה “he who eats it” = آكله 1a:8; תִּיבְחִין “firm” = ثابتين 1a:30, but in the very next line תִּיבְחִין מִיִּסִיק, תִּיבְחִין “holding” = ماسك 2a:25.

2. *fāʔāl*: תִּיבְאָה “his tent” = خبائه 1a:18, unvocalized תִּיבְאָה 1b:31; בִּילָאָה “by (a) God” = بالله 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. אִינַיִשׁ in Sokoloff 2002: 119/20. The word behaves idiosyncratically in various Semitic languages, while hovering between collective and singular; e.g. the initial ʔ is regularly lost in Syriac, less regularly in Arabic (Nöldeke 1896: §16) and אַנְיַשׁ with unexpected *waw* occurs in several Western Aramaic dialects (Fassberg 1992: 58); for the dissimilation of Hebrew אַנְיַשׁ see Brockelmann 1908: 255; Bergsträsser 1918: 151.

⁶⁸ The only other possibility is אִינַיִס, 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. *fāʔāʔil*: וּדְחָאִיָּה “and his descendants” = ذراريه 2b:24, apparently unvocalized <וּדְחָאִיָּה> 1a:30; וּדְחָאִיָּה “and the stars” = والكواكب 2a:1, but וּדְחָאִיָּה 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-maʔnā*, or a phonetic spelling indicating something like *al-maʔnā*⁷⁰. Nor is “and the legal ruling” = والقيا 2a:4 quite straightforward. אִלְפָתָי “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 *qəltu*-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 *yāʔ* (§§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 *qəltu*-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 *qəltu*-dialects should agree in both having the highly exceptional נִיַס = *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 *maʔni*.

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* – *nfiw*, 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* – *nfiw* 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* – *nfiw* 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.

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

- 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 אינסין = *insēn* < *insān*; for *fi lān* 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.

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 *faʿāfil* 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 Jstrow, *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 *ḥḥil* loaned into the Aramaic dialect of Maʿfūlā, including *zēmī* “mosque” (above n. 9) and the special category of ordinal numerals (above n. 12) *ḥḥn(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 Maʿfūlā *ḥḥi*,

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

Behnstedt, Peter. 1990. "M'aḏḏamīye: 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 Šafīyy al-Dīn al-Ḥillī". *Israel Oriental Studies* 5. 259-276, reprinted in Levin 1998 no. xvii.

Levin, Aryeh. 1978. "The 'imāla of 'alif fā'īl 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'ūla (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.

Weißer Zähne (*drās bīd*). 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 *dād* 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. *Kāndērīb*), 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
<i>Kōša</i> - und <i>Mhallami</i> -Dialekte (Kinderib)
Āzax |
| | 2 | Siirt-Gruppe
Siirt-Stadt
Siirt-Dörfer |
| | 3 | Diyarbakir-Gruppe
Diyarbakir-Stadt
Diyarbakir-Dörfer (Kaşbiye)
Diyarbakir, Siverek, Çermik, Urfa (jüdische Dialekte) |
| | 4 | Kozluk-Sason-Muş-Gruppe |