



Title	An attempt at a Sub-Classification of Arabic Dialects of the Maghrib
Author(s)	Yoda, Sumikazu
Citation	関西アラブ・イスラム研究. 2002, 2, p. 107-135
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/105822
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

An Attempt at a Sub-Classification of Arabic Dialects of the Maghrib

YODA Sumikazu*

マグリブ諸方言の下位分類のための試み

現代アラビア語方言は大きく東部方言と西部方言(マグリブ方言)に分類される。東部方言は更に半島方言、メソポタミア方言、シリア・パレスチナ方言、エジプト方言などの下位分類がなされるが、マグリブ方言についてはこのような明確な下位分類はなされていない。マグリブは全体として共通した文化的・歴史的背景を持つとは言え、そこで使用されているアラビア語方言を観察してみると予想以上に多様な姿を見ることが出来る。

本稿ではこのような言語的多様性、即ち各方言に見られる言語的特徴に基づき、マグリブ諸方言を下位分類するための基準(主に音韻論的・形態論的基準)を整理する。

Introduction

Arabic is presently spoken by more than two hundred million people, mainly in the Middle East and North Africa. It is well-known that everywhere Arabic is used (except for Malta) there exist two different language variants, i.e., the Classical Arabic (henceforth CA) and dialects.¹⁾ While the former gives a homogeneous form to all Arabic speakers, the latter varies according to geographical or social factors. As for the geographical domain, the Arabic dialects are classified into two main groups: the Eastern dialects and the Western dialects (henceforth Maghribi dialects). The Eastern dialects are further sub-classified into several dialectal groups; Peninsula dialect, Mesopotamia dialect, Syro-Palestina dialect and Egyptian dialect. Although such a sub-classification has also been carried out for the Maghribi dialects, it is restricted to the bedouin dialects of Algeria and Tunisia²⁾. For the Maghribi dialects as a whole, including bedouin dialects and sedentary dialects, no such attempt at sub-classification has been made.

* 依田純和 大阪外国語大学 非常勤講師

1) We are not concerned here with the strict definition of these two variants.

2) Cantineau (1936, 1937, 1938, 1940, 1941) and Marçais (1950) p. 214 ff.

In this study we will try to construct a sub-classification of the Maghribi dialects. For this purpose we need fixed criteria according to which isogloss can be determined. Until now there have been three works that have drawn the outline of the Maghribi dialects.

- (1) Willms (1972) tried to compare three Maghribi dialects, i.e., Tunisian, Algerian and Moroccan, from both the phonological and the morphological point of view. However, his classification into three groups is based on contemporary political boundaries, not on linguistic grounds: for the Tunisian dialect he fails to take account of differences between sedentary and bedouin dialects, and he takes a bedouin dialect of south Tunisia as representative of “the Tunisian dialect”.
- (2) Marçais (1977) provides the most detailed grammatical sketch of the Maghribi dialects. The data for his work were collected from all the articles and books that had been published until his time, in addition to his own data. For each grammatical topic examples are cited from dialects, but in many cases he does not make clear the location of the examples.
- (3) Finally, Singer (1980) presents phonological and morphological characteristics of the Maghribi dialects in a simple but explicit way.³⁾

In the present work the criteria for classification are based on Singer’s work. Thus the linguistic data will be collected according to linguistic topics detailed by Singer.

Although the sub-classification of the bedouin dialects in Algeria and Tunisia has, as already noticed, to some extent, we will include these bedouin dialects in the classification. This work is naturally provisional; indeed it is likely, according to the future progress of the research of the Maghribi dialects, that more linguistic topics will be added as sub-classification criteria.

1. Maghribi dialects

1.1. Linguistic peculiarities of Maghribi dialects

The following features have been pointed out as characteristics distinguishing the Maghribi dialects from the eastern dialects.

- (1) Reduction of short vowel phonemes.
- (2) Frequent elimination of short vowels.
- (3) Conjugation affix for the 1st person of the prefixed conjugation: *n-* for the singular, *n-* ... *-ū* for the plural.

As for (1), it is sometimes said that the Maghrib dialects have only one short vowel phoneme *a*. This opinion is indeed correct for very few dialects [Yoda 2000:35], but the majority of the Maghribi dialects have two or three short vowel phonemes, and Maltese even has four short vowels (*a, e, i, o*).⁴⁾

Furthermore (2) is not a phenomenon monopolized by the Maghrib dialects. A form

3) Singer (1980) pp. 249-265.

4) Cohen (1970) pp. 172-178.

such as *ktāb* “book” (<CA. *kitāb*), where the ancient short vowel *i* is eliminated, attested broadly in the Maghrib, is also attested in Damascus *ktāb*. Even in the Maghrib the frequency or the degree of the elimination differs according to dialects; in Benghazi dialect we find *kitāb* “book” (<CA *kitāb*-) where the ancient short vowel in an open syllable *i* still remains, while in Skūra the form is *ktāb*.

The third point is indeed the decisive feature which distinguishes the Maghrib dialects from the eastern dialects.

	“I write”	“we write”
Damascus	<i>ʾaktāb</i>	<i>nāktāb</i>
Tunis-Muslim	<i>niktib</i>	<i>niktbu</i>

1.2. Complexity of the Maghribi dialects

The Arabicization of the Maghrib was carried out by two great streams from the east; the first stream came in the 7th century with the arrival of Arab conquerors from the Arabian Peninsula, and the second one began in the 12th century when bedouin tribes (Hilāl, Maʿqil and Sulaym), first penetrated into the Maghrib. In the first stream the Arabs settled down in cities along the Mediterranean coasts, such as Tripoli, Kairouan, Sūsa, Tunis, Bizerte, Constantine, Elmilia, Annaba, Oran, Tlemcen, Fez, Tangiers and Rabat.⁵⁾ At this time the populations of these cities began to use Arabic as their native vernacular, while the population of the inland area remained Berberophone. Nowadays, Arabic dialects of these cities are mostly sedentary dialects. On the other hand, in the second stream the greater part of North Africa underwent Arabicization. Arabic dialects of this area are nowadays bedouin dialects. The second stream of Arabicization was so comprehensive that no sedentary dialect of the Maghrib could escape the influence of the bedouin dialects, and thus most of the sedentary dialects have a certain number of words containing *g* corresponding to CA *q*. In this respect Maltese is an exceptional dialect; here the bedouin factor is almost absent, since Malta had cut off all relationship with North African Arab states before the invasion of the Hilāl tribes.

2. Dialects referred to in this study

The following dialects are taken as representative of the Maghribi dialects. These are dialects the textual description of which can provide a certain amount of data. However, because of the differences in research methods and interests of various authors, not all literature provides data that is useful to the present study. Therefore in some cases data for certain dialects may be lacking. The data is cited without any alteration of original transcription.

Libya:	Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish.
Malta:	
Tunisia:	Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Marāzîg, Tozeur.

5) Fischer & Jastrow (1983) pp. 33-34.

Algeria:	Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Bou-Saâda, Mzâb, Cherchell, Saida, Tlemcen.
Morocco:	Fes-Jewish, Ulād əl-ḥažž d-əl-wād (henceforth UH.), Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra.
Mauritania:	Ḥassāniya.

3. Criteria for the sub-classification of the Maghribi dialects

The criteria for the sub-classification are fixed based on the phonological and morphological topics described by Singer.⁶⁾ We add a reference number to each feature, such as [PV1] (=“phonology-vowel no. 1”) or [AD2] (=“adverb no.2”), etc. The data from the dialects will be given for each topic, and then will be arranged according to formal variations. In the last part of this work is appended a comparative table where the distribution of the formal variations of each topic will be shown.

3.1. Phonology

3.1.1. Vocalism

3.1.1.1. Short vowels

3.1.1.1.1. Number of short vowel phonemes [PH1]

Four systems are attested in the Maghrib:

- (1) **One-short-vowel system:** ə (Tripoli-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish). In these dialects there exists only one short vowel phoneme. On the comparative table one-short-vowel system is indicated as 1.
- (2) **Two-short-vowels system.** This system is divided into two sub-systems:
 - (a) *a* : ə (Benghazi⁷⁾, Mzâb, Saida, Ḥassāniya).
 - (b) *a* : *u* (Tunis-Jewish, Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Jewish, Skūra).

On the comparative table (a) is indicated as 2a and (b) as 2b.

As for Djidjelli and Cherchell, the situation is rather complicated. While Fischer & Jastrow (1980) states that Djidjelli has one short vowel phoneme⁸⁾, Marçais (1956) does not explicitly concur.⁹⁾ In addition there are several examples showing minimal pairs: *ʿumt* “I swam”: *ʿimt* “I woke someone up”, *silt* “I flowed”: *salt* “I asked news” (<CA. *saʿaltu*).¹⁰⁾ From these examples the opposition *i* : *u* and *a* : *i* is obvious, thus it seems difficult to claim that Djidjelli is a dialect of one short vowel

6) Singer (1980) pp. 253-265.

7) As for the two-short vowels system of Benghazi, see Yoda (2000a) pp. 100-103.

8) Fischer & Jastrow (1980) p. 32.

9) Marçais (1956) p. 35 states, “... la voyelle brève le (= le timbre) perd. Le voisinage consonantique prend, dans la coloration des voyelles au contact, une importance considérable : c’est lui qui, dans le cas des brèves, la détermine”.

10) Marçais (1956) pp. 165-166.

phoneme. Versteegh says the same thing for Cherchell¹¹⁾, but also in this dialect some words are opposed by the difference of short vowels; *a : u* in *ḥaṭṭ* “he put”: *ḥoṭṭ* “put (m.sg.)!” and *a : i* in *‘ass* “he guarded”: *‘iss* “guard (m.sg.)!”.

(3) Three-short-vowels system. This system is divided into two sub-systems:

(a) *a : i : u* [*a : i / u*] (el-Hāmma, Marāzîg, Tozeur, Saida, Bou-Saâda).

In this sub-system, the opposition *i : u* tends to be neutralized, whilst *a* is stable. For example, in Marāzîg the distribution of *i* and *u* are in many cases determined by phonological conditions; broadly speaking *u* appears in the neighbourhood of emphatic or pharyngeal consonants (=EP-environment), on the contrary *i* appears in another environment (=Plain-environment).¹²⁾ This system seems proper to bedouin dialects.

CA	Marāzîg	
<i>miftāḥ-</i>	<i>miftāḥ</i>	“key”
<i>miṣbāḥ-</i>	<i>muṣbāḥ</i>	“lamp”

(b) *a : i : u* [*a / i : u*] (Tunis-Muslim, Sūsa).

In this sub-system, the opposition *a : i* tends to be neutralized. For example in Tunis-Muslim the stem vowel of verbs and participles of derived forms may be *a* or *i* according to consonantal environments, i.e., *a* appears in an EP-environment¹³⁾ and *i* in a Plain-environment.

Stem vowel		<i>a</i>	<i>i</i>
		EP-environment	Plain-environment
Tunis-Muslim	Verbs	<i>xallaṭ</i> “he mixed”	<i>‘āwin</i> “he helped”
		<i>yxallaṭ</i> “he mixes”	<i>y‘āwin</i> “he helps”
		<i>mxallaṭ</i> “mixed”	<i>m‘āwin</i> “helping”

In addition in this sub-system the opposition *i : u* is neutralized in some cases; for example, CA nominal pattern *miC₁C₂āC₃* corresponds to Tunis-Muslim *miC₁C₂āC₃* or *muC₁C₂āC₃* where the choice of *i* or *u* of the preformative depends on the quality of *C₁*, i.e., when *C₁* is an emphatic or pharyngeal consonant *u* appears, and in other cases *i* does. The same is applied to patterns corresponding to CA *maCCi* (passive participle of the third radical weak verb in the 1st form) and CA *CaCCān* (ad-

Tunis-Muslim	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>
	<i>miftāḥ</i> “key”	<i>muqḍāf</i> ¹⁴⁾ “oar”
	<i>mibni</i> “built”	<i>muqli</i> “fried”
	<i>guḍbān</i> “angry”	<i>milyān</i> “full”

11) Versteegh (1997) p. 166.

12) A similar situation is also found in Baghdad-Muslim, see Blanc (1964) p. 36 ff.

13) Therefore for dialects of this sub-system, no distinction is made between active and passive participle in the derived forms. The function of the participle depends on the transitivity or the meaning of the verb.

See also Yoda (2000b) pp. 160-161.

14) Yoda (2000b) p. 106.

jective pattern)¹⁵⁾.

The sub-system (b) seems proper to sedentary dialects. On the comparative table (a) is indicated as 3a and (b) as 3b.

- (4) **Four-short-vowels system: *a, e, i, o*** (Malta). This system is found only in Maltese. Indeed the fifth vowel *u* exists in the Maltese orthography, but it is a positional allophone of *o*.¹⁶⁾ On the comparative table this system is indicated as 4.

3.1.1.1.2. Degree of the elimination of short vowel [PH2]

The frequent elimination of a short vowel in an open syllable is considered as one of the characteristics of the Maghrib dialects. Indeed the ancient *i* and *u* in an open syllable are unanimously eliminated in all dialects, but as for the ancient *a*, the elimination does not take place in the same way for all the Maghribi dialects. There are three degrees of the elimination as follows:

- (1) CA *a* is mostly retained in various timbre and can bear the stress (Malta). But in some cases the ancient *a* is eliminated.

CA	Malta	
<i>katab-</i>	<i>kiteb</i> [kítep]	“he wrote”
<i>ḥalīb-</i>	<i>ḥalib</i> [ḥalíp]	“milk”
<i>waraq-</i>	<i>weraq</i> [wéraʔ]	“papers”

- (2) CA *a* is in many cases preserved as a vowel but has undergone a sound change (Marāzīg, Bou-Saâda). In Bou-Saâda the ancient *a* is mostly reflected as *i* in a pretonic open syllable. But in some case the ancient pretonic *a* has been eliminated. In

CA	Malta	
<i>kabīr-</i>	<i>kbir</i> [gbír]	“big”
<i>talātat-</i>	<i>tlieta</i> [tlíəta]	“three”
<i>mafātīḥ-</i>	<i>mfietah</i> [mfíətaḥ]	“keys”

Marāzīg, the ancient *a* in a pretonic open syllable is mostly retained as an ultra short vowel ^ʔ, which is in fact realized in various timbres.

CA	Bou-Saâda	
<i>naxal-</i>	<i>nixál</i>	“palm tree”
<i>qaʕad-</i>	<i>gʕád</i>	“he sat”
<i>ḥalīb-</i>	<i>ḥilīb</i>	“milk”

CA	Bou-Saâda	
<i>qadam-</i>	<i>gdəm</i>	“foot”
<i>taqīl-</i>	<i>tgīl</i>	“heavy”
<i>baʕīr-</i>	<i>bʕīr</i>	“camel”

CA	Marāzīg	
<i>katab-</i>	<i>kʔtáb</i>	“he wrote”
<i>waraq-</i>	<i>wʔrág</i>	“leave”

CA	Tunis-Muslim	
<i>qadam</i>	<i>gdəm</i>	“foot”
<i>taqīl-</i>	<i>tqīl</i>	“heavy”
<i>waraq-</i>	<i>wraq</i>	“papers”
<i>kabīr-</i>	<i>kbīr</i>	“big”
<i>talātat-</i>	<i>tlāta</i>	“three”
<i>mafātīḥ-</i>	<i>mfātīḥ</i>	“keys”

15) Here we are not concerned with the vocal shift from

CA *a* to Tunis-Muslim *i* or *u*.

16) Cohen (1970) p. 133.

- (3) Every CA short vowel in an open syllable has been eliminated (in dialects other than Malta, Marāzîg and Bou-Saâda). This is the predominant situation in the Maghrib.

On the comparative table these three degrees (1), (2) and (3) are indicated by 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

3.1.1.2. Long vowel system [PH3]

Two long-vowels systems are attested in the Maghrib:

- (1) Three-long-vowels system. This system is divided into two sub-systems [Yoda 2000^a].

- (a) $\bar{a} : \bar{i} (< \text{CA } \bar{i}) : \bar{u} (< \text{CA } \bar{u})$ (Malta, Tunis-Jewish, Bou-Saâda, Mzāb, Saida, Ḥas-sāniya). In this case the ancient diphthongs *ay* and *aw* are preserved.
 (b) $\bar{a} : \bar{i} (< \text{CA } \bar{i}, ay) : \bar{u} (< \text{CA } \bar{u}, aw)$ (Tripoli-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalet-Jewish, Skūra.).

On the comparative table (a) is indicated as 3a and (b) as 3b. Most of the sedentary dialects of the Maghrib belong to this category, where CA diphthongs are reflected as monophthongs, CA *ay* is realized as $\bar{i}$ and CA *aw* as $\bar{u}$, so that these are merged into $\bar{i}$ and $\bar{u}$ originated from CA $\bar{i}$, $\bar{u}$.¹⁷⁾

CA	Tunis-Muslim	
<i>bayt-</i>	<i>būt</i>	“room”
<i>kabīr-</i>	<i>kūr</i>	“big”
<i>mawt-</i>	<i>mūt</i>	“death”
<i>tūl-</i>	<i>tūl</i>	“length”

- (2) Five-long-vowels system: $\bar{a}$, $\bar{e} (< \text{CA } ay)$, $\bar{i}$, $\bar{o} (< \text{CA } aw)$, $\bar{u}$ (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, el-Ḥamma, Marāzîg, Tozeur). On the comparative table this system is indicated as 5. In this system CA *ay* is reflected as $\bar{e}$ and CA *aw* as $\bar{o}$. In the Maghrib the five-long-vowels system is almost proper to bedouin dialects.¹⁸⁾

CA	Marāzîg	
<i>bayt-</i>	<i>bēt</i>	“room”
<i>kabīr-</i>	<i>k^ebīr</i>	“big”
<i>mawt-</i>	<i>mōt</i>	“death”
<i>tūl-</i>	<i>tūl</i>	“length”

3.1.1.3. Umlaut [PH4]

In some dialects a short vowel in words of the pattern *CCvC* undergoes Umlaut when any suffix beginning with a vowel is added to it (in this case the syllable structure is altered into *CvCCv*).

- (1) Dialects where the Umlaut takes place (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, el-Ḥamma, Marāzîg).

17) Also in bedouin dialects of northwest Algeria on the Mediterranean coast (B of Cantineau) the ancient diphthongs are realized as $\bar{i}$, $\bar{u}$; see Cantineau (1937) pp. 706-707.

18) In Mahdia (Tunisia) CA *ay* and *aw* are reflected as $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$ respectively; see Attia (1969) p. 130.

	$a > I$	$a > u$	$u > i$
el-Ĥamma	<i>bdan</i> “belly” <i>bidnah</i> “his belly” <i>bhat</i> “he astonished” <i>bihtu</i> “they astonished”		<i>žful</i> “he took fright” <i>žiflit</i> “she took fright”
Marāzīg	<i>ž^ebad</i> “he pulled” <i>žib^adat</i> “she pulled”	<i>rfa^c</i> “he lifted up” <i>ruf^cat</i> “she lifted up” <i>w^arag</i> “papers” <i>wur^oga</i> “a paper”	
Tripoli-Muslim	<i>rža^c</i> “he came back” <i>riž^cat</i> “she came back”	<i>dxal</i> “he entered” <i>duxlit</i> “she entered” <i>bgar</i> “cows” <i>bugra</i> “a cow”	

(2) Dialects where the Umlaut does not take place (dialects other than those of (1)).

On the comparative table, (1) (= dialects where Umlaut exist) and (2) (= dialects where Umlaut does not exist) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

Tunis-Muslim	<i>q¹tal</i> “he killed” <i>q²atlit</i> “she killed” <i>ktib</i> “he wrote” <i>kitbit</i> “she wrote” <i>bqar</i> “cows” <i>baqra</i> “a cow” <i>bdan</i> “belly” <i>badnu</i> “his belly”
--------------	---

3.1.2. Consonantism

3.1.2.1. Reflection of CA interdental fricatives ط, ذ, ث [PH5]

The CA interdental fricatives are reflected as: ط, ذ, ث

- (1) Interdental fricatives *t*, *d*, *ḏ* (Benghazi, Tunis-Muslim, Sūsa, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Bou-Saāda, Mzāb, Cherchell, Saida, Ḥassāniya).
- (2) Correspondent stops *t*, *d*, *ḏ* (Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Tunis-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Constantine-Jewish, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, UH., Skūra).

On the comparative table, these two cases (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.1.2.2. Reflection of CA ت [PH6]

In some dialects the ancient ت is for many cases realized as affricative *t* [ts] or *č* [tʃ]. CA ت is reflected as:

- (1) Affricative *t̪* (Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tlemcen, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish ¹⁹⁾, Fez-Jewish, Skūra) or *č* (Tripoli-Jewish ²⁰⁾).

However not every ancient *ṭ* is realized as affricative; broadly speaking, before alveolar stops or fricatives, i.e. *t, d, s, š* etc, they are not affricated (phonological conditions differ from dialect to dialect, see Yoda (2000^b) pp. 11-12 for details).

- (2) *t* (dialects other than those belonging to (1)).

On the comparative table, these two cases (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.1.2.3. Reflection of CA ج [PH7]

CA ج is reflected as:

- (1) Fricative *ž* (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Djidjelli, Mzāb, Saida, Bou-Saāda, UH., Skūra, Ḥassāniya).
 (2) Affricative *ğ* (Malta, Constantine-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Tlemcen).
 (3) *z* (Fez-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish).

In Fez-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish and Tafilalt-Jewish, the ancient ج is reflected unconditionally as *z*, and the ancient ش as *s* (see below 3.1.2.6.).

On the comparative table, these three cases (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as *ž, ğ* and *z* respectively.

3.1.2.5. Reflection of CA غ [PH8]

CA غ is reflected as

- (1) *q* (Bou-Saāda, Mzāb).

In Mzāb and Bou-Saāda CA غ is reflected as *g*, therefore there is no conflict between the innovated *q* and the ancient *q*.

CA	Mzāb	
<i>qanādīr</i> - ²¹⁾	<i>gnādīr</i>	“gandoura (a kind of cloths)”
<i>ganādīr</i> - ²²⁾	<i>qanādār</i>	“vagas”

- (2) *g* (dialects other than Bou-Saāda and Mzāb).

On the comparative table, these three cases (1) and (2) are indicated as *q* and *g* respectively.

19) In Tafilalt-Jewish non-affricative *t* is attested in French loans as *tambr* “postage stamp”, *tilifun* “telephone”, see Heath & Bar-Asher (1982) p. 36.

20) This affricative *č* is also attested in dialects around Constantine, see Ostoya-Delmas (1938) p. 67.

21) Dozy (1881) I, p. 418.

22) Ibid. p. 229.

3.1.2.6. Alteration of CA *chuintants* (š, ž) and *sifflants* (s, z) ²³ [PH9]

In the Maghribi dialects the alteration of CA *chuintants* and *sifflants* is a well-known phenomenon. Until now three systems of this alteration have been attested (see Yoda (forthcoming) for details).

- (1) CA *chuintants* are reflected as *sifflants* (Fez-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish).

In these dialects CA ش and ح are usually reflected as *s* and *z* respectively. But they are reflected as emphatic *sifflants* š, ž when an emphatic consonant or *q* is found around them.

CA	Fez-Jewish	
šahar-	shâr	“month”
mašâ	msa	“he went”
ğarâ	zra	“he arrived”
dağāğ-	mzâz	“hen”

CA	Fez-Jewish	
sūq-	šoʾ	“market”
raʾs-	rāš	“head”
ṭanğah-	ṭânza	“Tangier”
rāğil-	rāžl	“man”

- (2) CA *chuintants* and *sifflants* may be altered by consonantal environment when they co-exist in a word (Tunis-Jewish). In Tunis-Jewish CA *s*, š, *z* and ḡ are reflected according to the following rule.

- (a) CA *s*, š and CA *z*, ḡ are realized as š and ž respectively before an emphatic consonant or *q*.

- (b) CA *s*, š and CA *z*, ḡ are realized as *s* and *z* respectively before *r*.

- (c) CA *s*, š and CA *z*, ḡ are realized as š and ž in environments other than (a) and (b).

CA	Fez-Jewish	
sūq-	šūq	“market”
šayṭān-	šiṭān	“devil”
zanaqah-	zanqa	“narrow street”
ğār-	žār	“neighbour”

CA	Fez-Jewish	
yāsir-	yāsar	“very, much”
šarâ	srâ	“he bought”
zarībah-	zrībâ	“hut”
ğarâ	zrâ	“he ran”

CA	Fez-Jewish	
tisʿah-	tāšʿa	“nine”
mašâ	msâ	“he went”
zubdah-	žābda	“butter”
dağāğah-	džāžā	“hen”

- (3) CA *chuintants* and *sifflants* are altered according to the order of these consonants when they co-exist in the same word (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Sūsa, el-Hamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Constantine-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Bou-Saâda, Saida, Tlemcen, Ḥas-

23) *Chuintant* is a term borrowed from French to denote š and ž, and likewise *sifflant*, s, š, z and ž. We venture to use these French terms for in English there exists no parallel terms distinguishing š, ž from s, š, z, ž. CA ḡ is in fact not *chuintant* but is reflected as ž in the dialects we are concerned with here, thus, as a working hypothesis, we will consider it as one of the *chuintant* consonants.

sāniya).

When a chuintant and a sifflant coexist in the same word, they are realized in various manners, for example, one of them assimilates or dissimilates another. The condition of these sound changes differs from dialect to dialect; see Taine-Cheikh (1979-84) for details. On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

3.1.2.7. Reflection of CA ʕ [PH10]

CA ʕ is reflected as

(1) zero (Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Algiers-Jewish)

These dialects do not have glottal voiceless fricative sound, IPA [h]. In order to compensate for its absence, various sound changes may take place, for example compensative lengthening of a short vowel preceding or following the CA ʕ; see Yoda (2000^b) p. 84-92 for details.

CA	Tripoli-Jewish	
<i>ḍahrī</i>	<i>ḍārī</i>	“my back” (compensative lengthening).
<i>mutafāhimīn-</i>	<i>məčfāmīn</i>	“understanding (pl.) each other” (substitution of <i>h</i> by a short vowel <i>a</i>).
<i>fahimtu</i>	(* <i>fhimt</i> >) <i>ffəmč</i>	“I understood” (compensatory germination of a consonant around <i>h</i>).

(2) *h* (dialects other than Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Algiers-Jewish)

On the comparative table, these three cases (1) and (2) are indicated as *h* and Ø respectively.

3.1.3. Syllable structure

3.1.3.1. Variations of Aufsprenge[n] [PH11]

Aufsprenge[n] is a phenomenon pointed out by Stumme, such that when a sequence $\check{V}CCCv$ triggered by any morphological operation takes place in a word, a consonant cluster *CCC* (where no geminated consonant is included) may be broken by a certain phonological process²⁴⁾. For example in Tripoli-Jewish when a plural suffix *-ū* is added to the verb *yākčəb* “he writes”, the following process takes place: *yākčəb* + *-ū* > **yākčəbū* > **yākčbū* (elimination of a short vowel in an open syllable) > **yākəčbū* (Aufsprenge[n] = in this case insertion of a short vowel between *k* and *č*) > *yəkəčbū* (once more elimination of a short vowel in an open syllable) “they write”.

The following kinds of Aufsprenge[n] are attested for the dialects involved in the present work²⁵⁾.

24) Stumme (1896) pp. 5-6.

25) In Fischer & Jastrow (1980) p. 255, other patterns are presented.

- (1) $\check{v}CCC + -v > \check{v}CCCv$ [no Aufsprenge (Tunis-Muslim *yiktib* “he writes”: *yiktū* “they write”)] (Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Algiers-Jewish, Ḥassānīya).
- (2) $\check{v}CCC + -v > \check{v}CvCCv$ [a short vowel is inserted between the first and the second consonants (Benghazi *yiktib* “he writes”: *yikū* “they write”)] (Benghazi, Mzāb).
- (3) $\check{v}CCC + -v > vC_1C_1\check{v}CCu$ [gemination of the first consonant and insertion of a stressed short vowel between the second and the third consonant (Cherchell *yēktēb* “he writes”: *yēkkēṭbu* “they write”)] (Cherchell, Saida).
- (4) $\check{v}CCC + -v > \check{v}C_1C_1vCCu$ [gemination of the first consonant and insertion of a short vowel between the second and the third consonant (Tlemcen *yēktēb* “he writes”: *yēkkeṭbu* “they write”)] (Tlemcen).
- (5) $\check{v}CCC + -v > CvCCv$ [insertion of a stressed short vowel between the first and the second consonants and elimination of the short vowel preceding the first consonant (Tripoli-Jewish *yākcāb* “he writes”: *yācū* “they write”)] (Tripoli-Jewish, Djidjelli, Constantine-Jewish, Fez-Jewish, UH., Skūra).

On the comparative table (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) are indicated as 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

3.1.3.2. Suffixed conjugation 3.f.sg. + suffix pronoun beginning with a vowel -ū (3.m.sg.), -ək (2.sg.) [PH12]

In the whole Maghrib, the suffixed conjugation of 3.f.sg. is formed by adding a conjugational suffix -*ṣt* (*ṣ* may be *a*, *ə* or *i* according to dialects) to the verb stem. When a pronoun suffix beginning with a vowel, i.e. -ū, -a or -ah (3.m.sg.), -ək (2.m.sg.), is added to it, the short vowel of the conjugational suffix stands in an open syllable; Tunis-Muslim *kitbit* “she wrote” + -ū “it (m.)” > **kitbitū*. As stated above (see 3.1.1.2.), in most cases such a short vowel cannot exist. To resolve this problem, the following measures take place.

In the following the short vowel of the suffix for 3.f.sg. is represented as *ṣ*, and the pronoun suffix beginning with a vowel is represented as *v̄*.

- (1) $CvCC\check{v}t + -\check{v} > CvCC\check{v}t\check{v}$ [gemination of the ending *t* (Tunis-Muslim *kitbit* “she wrote”: *kitbū* “she wrote it (m.)”)] (Tunis-Muslim, Djidjelli).
- (2) $CvCCit + -\check{v} > CvCC\check{v}t\check{v}$ [lengthening of the short vowel (UH. *ḍarbat* “she hit”: *ḍarbātu* “she hit him”)] (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, Saida, Cherchell, Tlemcen, UH.).
- (3) $CvCCit + -\check{v} > CCvCtu$ [alteration of the syllabic structure (Tripoli-Jewish *kācāb* “she wrote”: *kācū* “she wrote it (m.)”)] (Tripoli-Jewish, Fez-Jewish).

On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

3.2. Morphology

3.2.1. Pronouns

3.2.1.1. Personal pronoun

(1) 1.sg. [MP1]

(Benghazi) *aná, na*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *ǎné*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *aná, ána*, (Malta) *jien, jiena*, (Tunis-Muslim) *āna*, (Tunis-Jewish) *ānā*, (Sūsa) *āni*, (el-Ĥamma) *āni^a*, (Marāzīg) *anē*, (Tozeur) *ānā, nā, nāyā*, (Constantine-Jewish) *ana*, (Djidjelli) *āna*, (Algiers-Jewish) *ānā*, (Mzāb) *āna, anāya*, (Cherchell) *āna, ānāya*, (Saida) *āna, ānāya*, (Tlemcen) *āna, ána, aná, anā*, (Fez-Jewish) *yāna*, (UH.) *āna, ānāya*, (Sefrou-Jewish) *yana, ana*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *ina*, (Skūra) *āna*, (Ĥassāniya) *āna*.

For some other dialects a suffix element *-ya* is added. In Malta and Fez-Jewish the first vowel takes an additional *y-*. There are two formal variations:

- (a) Forms originating from *ána* with stressed penultimate syllable (Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Mzāb, Cherchell, Saida, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, UH. Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ĥassāniya).
- (b) Forms originating from *aná* with stressed ultimate syllable (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(2) 2.sg. [MP2]

(Benghazi) m. *inta*, f. *inti*, (Tripoli-Muslim) m. *ántā*; f. *éti*, (Tripoli-Jewish) m. *nča*, f. *nči*, (Malta) c. *int*, (Tunis-Muslim) c. *inti*, (Tunis-Jewish) c. *anti*, (Sūsa) c. *inti*, (el-Ĥamma) m. *entā*, f. *enti*, (Marāzīg) m. *entā*, f. *enti*, (Tozeur) m. *ančā*, f. *anči*, (Constantine-Jewish) c. *anta*, (Djidjelli) c. *éntā, éntina*, (Algiers-Jewish) c. *enti*, (*anti*, *’nti*) *entīnā*, (Mzāb) m. *’nta, ’ntāya*, f. *’nti, ’ntiya*, (Cherchell) m. *ənča, ənčāya*, f. *ənči, ənčiya*, (Saida) m. *entā, entāya*, f. *enti, entiya*, (Tlemcen) c. *nīn, enīn, nīna, enīna*, (Fez-Jewish) c. *nīn*, (UH.) m. *anta, antāya, antina*, f. *anti, antiya, antina*, (Sefrou-Jewish) c. *nīn*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) c. *nti*, (Skūra) m. *nta*, f. *nti*, (Ĥassāniya) m. *antā*, f. *anti, antiyyā*

In many dialects there is no gender distinction for the second-person pronoun. Even in dialects where the gender is distinguished, the verb conjugation does not necessarily follow it, for example in UH the gender is distinct for the verb conjugation only in the prefixed conjugation (cf. 3.2.2.1. below). In some dialects without gender distinction, a form originated from CA feminine (CA *’anti*) is adopted. In dialects of west Algeria and Morocco forms with *-n(a)* are generally found.

There are two formal variations according to the stress position (here we do not take account of the gender distinction).

- (a) Forms originating from **inta* with stressed penultimate syllable (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur,

Constantine-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Ḥassānīya).

- (b) Forms originating from **intá* with stressed ultimate syllable (Tripoli-Jewish, Djidjelli, Mzāb, Tlemcen, Saida, Fez-Jewish, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(3) 3.sg.

(Benghazi) m. *hu*, f. *hi*, (Tripoli-Muslim) m. *hūwā*, f. *hījā*, (Tripoli-Jewish) m. *uwa*, f. *iya*, (Malta) m. *huwa*, f. *hija*, (Tunis-Muslim) m. *hūwa*, f. *hīya*, (Tunis-Jewish) m. *ūwā*, f. *īyā*, (Sūsa) m. *hūwā*, f. *hīyā*, (el-Ḥamma) m. *hūwā*, f. *hīya*, (Marāzīg) m. *hu*, f. *hi*, (Tozeur) m. *hūwa*, f. *hīya*, (Constantine-Jewish) m. *huwa*, *huwwa*, f. *hiyya*, (Djidjelli) m. *houwa*, f. *heiya*, (Algiers-Jewish) m. *uwwā*, f. *īyyā*, (Mzāb) m. *hu*, *hūwa*, f. *hi*, *hīya*, (Cherchell) m. *hūwa*, f. *hīya*, (Saida) m. *howwa*, f. *hēya*, (Tlemcen) m. *heuwa*, *hūwa*, f. *hīya*, (Fez-Jewish) m. *nōwa*, f. *nīya*, (UH.) m. *hūwa*, f. *hīya*, (Sefrou-Jewish) m. *huwa*, f. *hiya*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) m. *huwa*, f. *hiya*, (Skūra) m. *huwwa*, f. *hiyya*, (Ḥassānīya) m. *huwwā*, *hūwā*, f. *hiyyā*, *hīyā*

For this item no great formal differences are found in the whole Maghrib, so this is not used as a criterion for classification. The origin of the initial *n-* of *nōwa*, f. *nīya* of Fez-Jewish is unknown; but cf. Stillman (1988) p. 38.

(4) 1.pl. [MP3]

(Benghazi) *nīhna*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *hné*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *hnan*, (Malta) *āhna*, (Tunis-Muslim) *āhna*, (Tunis-Jewish) *āhnā*, (Sūsa) *āhnā*, (el-Ḥamma) *hni^a*, (Marāzīg) *hnē*, (Tozeur) *āhnā*, *nāhnā*, (Constantine-Jewish) *hna*, (Djidjelli) *hna*, (Algiers-Jewish) *hnā*, (Mzāb) *^ahna*, *^ahnāya*, (Cherchell) *hna*, *hnāya*, (Saida) *hōnā*, *hōnāya*, (Tlemcen) *hnā*, (UH.) *hna*, *hnāya*, (Sefrou-Jewish) *aḥna*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *hna*, (Skūra) *hna*, (Ḥassānīya) *āhnā*, *nāhnā*

Two formal variations are attested according to the stress position:

- (a) Forms originating from *(*n*)*āhna* with stressed penultimate syllable (Benghazi, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Tozeur, Ḥassānīya).
 (b) Forms originating from *(*n*)*aḥnā* with stressed ultimate syllable (dialects other than those belonging to (a)).

Forms such as *hna*, *hnāya* of (b) result from the elimination of the unstressed penultimate vowel. On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(5) 2.pl. [MP4]

(Benghazi) m. *intu*, f. *intan*, (Tripoli-Muslim) c. *āntum*, (Tripoli-Jewish) c. *nčam*, (Tunis-Muslim) c. *ntūma*, (Malta) c. *intom*, (Tunis-Jewish) c. (*ə*)*ntumān*, (Sūsa) c. *ntūmā*, (el-Ḥamma) c. *əntum*, (Marāzīg) m. *əntum*, f. *ənten*, (Tozeur) c. *ančom*, *anču*, (Constantine-Jewish) -, (Djidjelli) c. *^entum*, *^entūma*, (Algiers-Jewish) *əntum* (*əntum*, *^antum*), *əntūmā*, *əntūmāⁿ*, (Mzāb) c. *^antum*, *^antūma*, (Cherchell) c. *ənčūmān*, (Saida) c.

entûm, entûma, (Tlemcen) c. *n̄ûm, en̄ûma, n̄ûma, en̄ûmân, n̄ûmân*, (Fez-Jewish) c. [ntûma], (UH.) c. *əntûma*, (Sefrou-Jewish) [əntûma], (Tafilalt-Jewish) c. *ntuma*, (Skūra) c. *ntûma*, (Ḥassānīya) m. *əntūmä, f. əntūmāti*

Only in Benghazi and Ḥassānīya is the gender distinct; in Benghazi both pronouns correspond to CA forms *intu* < CA *ʾantum*, *intan* < CA *ʾantunna*, and in Ḥassānīya the pronoun for the feminine takes an ending *-āti* which is not connected etymologically with CA, but is an innovation of this dialect [cf. Cohen 1963 pp. 147-148]. In Benghazi this distinction conforms to the verb conjugation which also distinguishes 3.m.pl. from 3.f.pl. In Ḥassānīya, however, verbs do not distinguish them. In some dialects the pronoun has an ending *-n*.

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) With a short stem vowel *u* or *o* (Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Algiers-Jewish, Djidjelli, Mzāb).
- (b) With a long stem vowel *ū* (dialects other than those belonging to (a), but also in Djidjelli and Mzāb (a) is attested).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(6) 3.pl. [MP5]

(Benghazi) m. *hum*, f. *hin*, (Tripoli-Muslim) c. *hūmmā*, (Tripoli-Jewish) c. *əṃṃa*, (Malta) c. *huma*, (Tunis-Muslim) c. *hūma*, (Tunis-Jewish) c. *umān*, (Sūsa) *hūmä*, (el-Ḥamma) c. *hum*, (Marāzīg) m. *hum*, f. *hin*, (Tozeur) m. *homma*, f. *honnā*, (Constantine-Jewish) c. *humman*, (Djidjelli) c. *hum*, *hūma*, (Algiers-Jewish) c. *umān*, (Mzāb) c. *hum*, *hūma*, (Cherchell) c. *hūmān*, (Saida) c. *hūm*, *hūma*, (Tlemcen) c. *hūma*, *hūmān*, (Fez-Jewish) c. *nōma*, (UH.) c. *hūma*, ((Sefrou-Jewish) c. [hūma], (Tafilalt-Jewish) c. *huma*, Skūra) c. *hūma*, (Ḥassānīya) m. *hūmä*, f. *hūmāti*

In some dialects the pronoun has an ending *-n*. Ḥassānīya has two pronouns for the masculine and the feminine, but the verb conjugation does not distinguish the gender in the 3.pl., and *hūmāti* of 3.f.pl. is, as seen in the case of *əntūmāti* of 2.f.pl. (above (5)), not etymologically connected with CA but an innovation of this dialect.²⁶⁾

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) With a geminated *m* (Tripoli-Jewish, Tripoli-Muslim, Constantine-Jewish).
- (b) With a long vowel (dialects other than those belonging to (a)).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.1.2. Demonstratives

3.2.1.2.1. Pronouns

(1) Near reference [MD1]

(Benghazi) m. *haḍa*, f. *haḍi*, m.pl. *haḍōl*, f.pl. *haḍēn*, (Tripoli-Muslim) m. *hāḍa*,

26) Cohen (1963) pp. 147-148.

hādājā, f. *hādi*, *hādijā*, pl. *hādu* etc., (Tripoli-Jewish) m. *ada*, f. *adi*, pl. *aḍun*, (Malta) m. *dan(a)*, f. *din(a)*, pl. *dawn(a)*, (Tunis-Muslim) m. *hāda*, *hādāya*, f. *hādi*, *hādīya*, pl. *hādūma*, *hādūm*, (Tunis-Jewish) m. *ādā*, f. *ādi*, pl. *ādu*, (Sūsa) m. *hādā*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādūmā*, (el-Hamma) m. *hādā*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādū*, *hādū^am*, *hādūm* etc., (Marāzīg) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, m.pl. *hādōm(a)*, f.pl. *hādōn(a)*, (Tozeur) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. -, (Constantine-Jewish) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Djidjelli) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Algiers-Jewish) m. *hādā*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Mzāb) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Cherchell) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Saida) m. *hādā*, *hādi*, *hādu*, (Tlemcen) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Fes-Jewish) f. *hādi*, (UH.) m. *hāda*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Sefrou-Jewish) *had*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) m. *hada*, f. *hadi*, pl. *hadu*, (Skūra) m. *hāda* f. *hādi*, pl. *hādu*, (Ḥassāniya) m. *hādā*, f. *hādi*, pl. *hādū*

Except for Malta, a form like *hāda* stands for the masculine, *hādi* for the feminine and *hādu* for the plural. In some dialects of the Eastern Maghrib an additional ending *-ya* is attached. Malta has forms different from other dialects; i.e., *dan*, *din*, *dawn* ending with *-n(a)* and without a preformative *hā-*. Such forms ending with *-n(a)* are never attested in modern dialects²⁷⁾.

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) With the preformative *hā-* (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Hamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Mzāb, Saida, Tlemcen, Fes-Jewish, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ḥassāniya).
- (b) Without the preformative *hā-* (Malta).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(2) Far reference [MD2]

(Benghazi) m. *haḍak*, f. *haḍik*; pl. -, (Tripoli-Muslim) m. *hādāk*, *hādāka* etc., f. *hādik* (*hādik*), *hādikā* (*hādikā*) etc., pl. *hādūk*, *hādūka* etc., (Tripoli-Jewish) m. *adak*, f. *adik*, pl. *aḍuk*, (Malta) m. *dak*, f. *dik*, pl. *dawk*, (Tunis-Muslim) m. *hādāka*, f. *hādīka*, pl. *hādūkum*, *hādūmka*, (Tunis-Jewish) m. *ādāk*, f. *ādīk*, pl. *ādūk*, (Sūsa) m. *hādākā*, f. *hādīkā*, pl. *hādūkum*, (el-Hamma) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Marāzīg) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, m.pl. *hādōkum*, f.pl. *hādīken*, (Tozeur) m. -, f. *dikā*, pl. *hādōnā*, (Djidjelli) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Algiers-Jewish) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Mzāb) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Cherchell) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Saida) m. *dāk*, f. *dīk*, pl. *dūk*, (Tlemcen) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Fes-Jewish) *dak*, (UH.) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) m. *hadat*, f. *hadit*, pl. *hadut*, (Skūra) m. *hādāk*, f. *hādīk*, pl. *hādūk*, (Ḥassāniya) m. *dāk*, f. *dīk*, pl. *dūk*

The demonstrative pronoun for far reference is usually made by suffixing *-k* to the here reference stem. The ending *-t* in *hadat*, *hadit*, *hadut* of Tafilalt-Jewish is a

27) Fischer (1959) p. 59, states that these forms ending with *-na* are a secondary development proper to Malta; the earlier forms were *dā*, *dī*.

result of the regular phonological change CA $k > t$ proper to this dialect; see Heath & Bar-Asher (1982) p. 34-36.

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) With the preformative *hā* (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Mzāb, Cherchell, Tlemcen, UH., Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra).
- (b) Without the preformative *hā* (Malta, Saïda, Ḥassāniya).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.1.2.2. Adverbs

(1) Here [MA1]

(Benghazi) *haná*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *hēnā*, *hēnē*, *hēnājā*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *anaya*, (Malta) *hawn*, (Tunis-Muslim) *hūni*, (Tunis-Jewish) *awni*, (Sūsa) *hnā*, (el-Ḥamma) *h^ani^a*, (Marāzīg) *ehnē*, (Tozeur) *hnā*, *āhnī*, *ahnā*, (Djidjelli) *hna*, (Algiers-Jewish) *innā*²⁸⁾, (Mzāb) *hōn*, (Cherchell) *hna*, *hnāya*, (Saïda) *hānā*, *hānāya*, (Tlemcen) *hānā*, (UH.) *hnā*, *hnāya*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *hni*, *hniya*, (Skūra) *hna*, *hnākīna*, (Ḥassāniya) *hūni*

In the Maghrib the adverb for “here” splits into two groups according to its original form: forms containing a consonant cluster *hn* which corresponds to CA *hunā*²⁹⁾ and forms with *hūn* or *hawn* which correspond to CA *hāhunā*³⁰⁾. Forms ending with *i* or *e*, as in Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, are brought about by the *imāla*.³¹⁾ For some dialects endings *-ya*, *-kīna* are suffixed.

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) *hūn*, *hawn* (< CA *hāhunā*) group (Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Mzāb, Ḥas- sāniya).
- (b) *hna* (< CA *hunā*) group (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Saïda, Tlemcen, UH., Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(2) There [AD2]

(Benghazi) *gādi*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *tāmmā*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *gadi*, (Malta) *hemm*, (Tunis-Muslim) *tamma*, *famma*, *tammīka*, *fammīka*, *gādi*, (Sūsa) *gādi*, (el-Ḥamma) *tamm*, *tamma*, (Marāzīg) *hnāk*, *tamm*, *tammīk(a)*, (Tozeur) *temm*, (Constantine-Jewish) *tamm*, (Djidjelli) *l-tamm*, *l-hēh*, (Algiers-Jewish) *innāk*, *hinnāk*, *hnāk*,

28) As for the formation of this form corresponding to CA *hunā*, see Fischer (1959) p. 116.

29) Ibid. pp. 114-118.

30) Ibid. pp. 118-123.

31) Cohen (1975) p. 242.

təm(m), *təmmā*, (Mzāb) *tamma*, (Cherchell) *famma*, *ġādi*, (Saida) *temm*, *temma*, *tēmmāti*, *tēmmātīn*, (Tlemcen) *ṭemma*, *ṭémm*, *ṭemmāk*, (UH.) *tamma*, *təmmāya*, *təmmāk*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *hnit*, *hniyat*, (Skūra) *tamma*, *təmmāk*, *təmmākīna*, (Ḥassānīya) *hōk*

Four formal variations are attested:

- (a) *ġādī* (< CA *ġādī* ³²⁾) (Benghazi, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Sūsa, Cherchell).
- (b) *tamma* (< CA *tamma*) (Tripoli-Muslim, Malta ³³⁾, Tunis-Muslim, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Mzāb, Saida, Bou-Saāda, Tlemcen, Fes-Jewish, UH., Skūra).
- (c) *hnāk* (< CA *hunāka*), *hōk* (< CA *hāhunāka*) (Marāzīg, Algiers-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Ḥassānīya).
- (d) *lhēh* (< CA *li-hunā*) ³⁴⁾ (Djidjelli).

On the comparative table (a), (b), (c) and (b) are indicated as 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

3.2.1.3. Interrogative

3.2.1.3.1. Pronouns

(1) What? [MI1]

(Benghazi) *šinu*, *ēš*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *āš*, *āš*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *ša*, (Malta) *xi*, (Tunis-Muslim) *āš*, (Tunis-Jewish) *āš*, (Sūsa) *šnuwwā*, (el-Ḥamma) *āš*, (Marāzīg) *āš*, (Tozeur) *āš*, *šnūwa*, (Djidjelli) *ma*, *āš* (with prepositions), (Algiers-Jewish) *aš* (Mzāb) *š*, (Cherchell) *wāš*, (Saida) *wāš*, (Tlemcen) *wāš*, *wāšta*, *āšta*, *āšenhūwa*, *āšénhu*, *āšnu*, *āšenhīya*, *āšénhi*, *āšni*, (Fes-Jewish) *s*, (UH.) *āš*, *šnu*, (Sefrou-Jewish) *as*, *snu*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *as*, *asnu*, (Skūra) *āš*, *əš*, *šnu*, (Ḥassānīya) *āš*, *əš*

š (< CA *ʔayy šayʔ*) as basic element for “what” is broadly attested. *šnūwa* (< CA *ʔayy šayʔin hūwa*) is used, usually with the same meaning as *š*. Two variations may be attested when the interrogative is used independently, i.e., without suffix element *-nūwa*, *-nu*.

- (a) *ša*, *ši* [with a long vowel after *š*-element] (Tripoli-Jewish, Malta).
- (b) (*w*)*āš*, *əš* [with a vowel before *š*-element] (dialects other than Tripoli-Jewish and Malta).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

(2) Who? [MI2]

(Benghazi) *man*, *manu*, *min*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *āškūn*, *āškūn*, *aškūn*, *āškūn*; *min*, *myn*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *škun*, (Malta) *min*, (Tunis-Muslim) *aškūn*, (Tunis-Jewish) *āškūn*,

32) Passive participle of the verb *ġadā* “to go in the morning”; see Fischer (1959) p. 30-131.

33) As for the development of CA *tamma* to Malta *hemm*, see Fischer (1959) p. 127.

34) Fischer (1959) p. 123.

(ə)š_{kūn}, (Sūsa) š_{kūn}, (el-Ḥamma) mən, (Marāzīg) men, (Tozeur) š_{kūn}, men, (Djidjelli) mən, (Algiers-Jewish) aš_{kūn}, mən (with prepositions), (Mzāb) mən (Cherchell) š_{kūn}, mən (with prepositions), (Saida) āš_{kūn} (eš_{kūn}, š_{kūn}), (Tlemcen) āš_{kūn} (aš_{kūn}), men (with prepositions), (Fez-Jewish) skōn, (UH.) š_{kūn}, mən (with prepositions), (Sefrou-Jewish) skūn, men, (Tafilalt-Jewish) stun, astun, mn, (Skūra) š_{kūn}, mən (with prepositions), (Ḥassānīya) mən

Two formal variations are attested:

- (a) š_{kūn} (Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Tozeur, Constantine-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Bou-Saāda, Cherchell, Saida, Tlemcen, Fes-Jewish, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra).
- (b) mən (Benghazi, (Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Mzāb, Tlemcen, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ḥassānīya).

On the comparative table (a) and (b) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.1.4.2. Adverbs

(1) When? [MI3]

(Benghazi) amta, (Tripoli-Muslim) āmtā, āmtā, (Tripoli-Jewish) amča, (Malta) meta, (Tunis-Muslim) waqtāš, (Tunis-Jewish) wāqtāš, (Sūsa) waqtāš, (el-Ḥamma) wagtāš, (Marāzīg) yēmat, (Djidjelli) fāywoq, (Algiers-Jewish) aywoq, faywoq, alwoq, adwoq, (Mzāb) weinta, weiqta, (Cherchell) dīwqāš, waqtāš, (Saida) wēynta, (Bou-Saāda) wēyket, wēikta, waqtāš, (Tlemcen) fāyfoq, woqtāš, (UH.) fūqāš, waqtāš, (Sefrou-Jewish) fawʾ, (Tafilalt-Jewish) fawk, (Skūra) īnta, (Ḥassānīya) āyntā

There are, broadly speaking, three formal variations:

- (a) amta-series (<matā) (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Marāzīg, Mzāb, Saida, Skūra, Ḥassānīya)
- (b) waqtāš-series (<waqt ʾayy šayʾ) (Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Cherchell, Bou-Saāda, Tlemcen, UH.).
- (c) faywuq-series (<fī ʾayy waqt) (Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Mzāb, Bou-Saāda, Tlemcen, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish).

On the comparative table (a), (b) and (c) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

(2) Where? [MI4]

(Benghazi) wēn, (Tripoli-Muslim) wēn, wēn, wēn, (Tripoli-Jewish) win, (Malta) fejn, (Tunis-Muslim) wīn, fīn, (Tunis-Jewish) wāyən, (Sūsa) wīn, fīn, (Tozeur) wīan, (el-Ḥamma) wī^an, (Marāzīg) wēn, (Djidjelli) fāyen, (Algiers-Jewish) fāyn, (Mzāb) wein, (Cherchell) fāyən, wāyən, (Saida) wēn (wēyn, wīn), (Bou-Saāda) wēyn, (Tlemcen) fāyn, (UH.) fāyn, fīn, (Tafilalt-Jewish) fayn, (Skūra) fīn, (Ḥassānīya) āyn

For this item no great difference in form is observed.

3.2.2. Verb

3.2.2.1. Distinction of the gender in the 2nd person [MV1]

Among the Maghribi dialects the gender of the 2nd person is distinct for some dialects and not for others (cf. 3.2.1.1.(2)).

- (1) Dialects with gender distinction (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tozeur, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Bou-Saāda, Mzāb, Cherchell, Saida, UH., Skūra, Ḥassāniya).
- (2) Dialects without gender distinction (Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Tlemcen, Fes-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalet-Jewish)

On the comparative table (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.2.2. Preformative vowel of the prefixed conjugation of the 1st radical *w* verbs [MV2]

The prefixed conjugation of the first radical *w/y* verbs is in the Maghrib distinguished in three ways as to the treatment of the radical *w/y*.

- (1) The first radical is merged with the conjugation prefix and appears as a long vowel; *yūCvC* [Tunis-Muslim *yūṣu!* “he arrives”] (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Tozeur, el-Ĥamma, Marāzīg, Constantine-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Bou-Saāda, Mzāb, Saida, Sefrou-Jewish, Ḥassāniya).
- (2) The first radical *w/y* is connected with the conjugation prefix and these two elements form a diphthong *yəwCvC* [Djidjelli *yəuṣāl* “he arrives”] (Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tlemcen, UH., Skūra).
- (3) The first radical is eliminated as in CA *yaCvC* [Malta *yasal* “he arrives”] (Malta).

On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

3.2.2.3. Formation of conjugation in the plural of 3rd radical weak verbs [MV3]

There are two forms for the 3rd radical weak verbs on the 1st form. All verbs of this kind end with *ā* in the 3.sg.m. in the suffixed conjugation and *-ā* or *-ī* in the prefixed conjugation (Tunis-Muslim *lqā-yilqā* “to meet”, *mšā-yimši* “to go”). When they are in the 3.pl., the ending varies according to dialect.

There are four formal variations:

- (1) *CCāw-yvCCāw*, *CCāw-yvCCīw* [Tunis-Muslim *lqāw-yilqāw*, *mšāw-yimšīw*] (Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Tlemcen, UH., Sefrou-Jewish, Skūra).
- (2) *CCāw-yvCCāw*, *CCāw-yvCCu* [Ḥassāniya *lgāw-yālgāw*, *šrāw-yəšru*] (Malta, Bou-Saāda, Ḥassāniya).
- (3) *CCāw-yvCCū*, *CCāw-yvCCū* [Saida *glōw-yēglu*, *ensōw-yēnsu*] (Saida).

- (4) *CCū-yvCCū, CCū-yvCCū* [Tripoli-Muslim *šrū-jéšru, lgū-jélgu*] (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, el-Hamma, Marāzīg).

On the comparative table (1), (2), (3) and (4) are indicated as 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

3.2.2.4. Reflection of CA أخذ and أكل [MV4]

CA أخذ and أكل are realized in the Maghribi dialects as:

- (1) 2nd *radical weak* verb: *xād, kāl* (or *xad, kal*) (Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Fez-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ḥassānīya).
- (2) 3rd *radical weak* verb: *xdā, klā* (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Hamma, Marāzīg, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Bou-Saāda, Cherchell, Saida, Tlemcen, UH.).³⁵⁾

On the comparative table (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.2.5. Formation of the imperative form of the verb “to come” [MV5]

(Benghazi) *ta^cāl*, (Tripoli-Muslim) *tā^cāla*, (Tripoli-Jewish) *čā^cla*, (Malta) *ejja*, (Tunis-Muslim) *īza*, (Tunis-Jewish) *īzā*, (Sūsa) *īza*, (el-Hamma) *ɪ^cāla*, (Marāzīg) *ɪ^aāla*, (Djidjelli) *īzi*, (Algiers-Jewish) *aḡi*, (Cherchell) *āḡi*, (Saida) *arwāḥ*, *ɪ^cāla*, (Bou-Saāda) *īzī*, (Tlemcen) *āji* (*āji*), (Fes-Jewish) *āzi*, (Tafilalt-Jewish) *azi*, (Skūra) *āzi*, (Ḥassānīya) *ži*

There are four formal variations:

- (1) *īza, āzi* (Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Bou-Saāda, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ḥassānīya).
- (2) *arwāḥ* (Saida).
- (3) *ɪ^cālā* (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, el-Hamma, Marāzīg, Saida).
- (4) *hayyā* (Malta).

On the comparative table (1), (2), (3) and (4) are indicated as 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

3.2.2.6. Formation of derived verbs for passive or reflective meaning [MV6]

In CA a reflexive or middle signification is expressed by the VIIth form with a prefix *n-*. In the Maghribi dialects the same signification may be expressed by, here also, the VIIth form or a derived form with a prefix *t-* (henceforth T-form) according to dialect. For most dialects these two forms do not coexist.

- (1) Dialects *with* the T-form (Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Tozeur, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Bou-Saāda, Mzāb, UH., Skūra).
- (2) Dialects *with* the VIIth form (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta,

35) Sefrou-Jewish has *xda* (3rd radical weak) for أخذ and *kel* (2nd radical weak) for أكل.

el-Ĥamma, Marāzîg, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell, Saida, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, Sefrou-Jewish, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra, Ḥassāniya).

On the comparative table (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.2.7. The stem of the suffixed conjugation of the VIIth and VIIIth forms of 2nd radical weak verbs and of the XIth form of strong verbs [MV7]

When the VIIth and VIIIth forms of the 2nd radical weak verb, for example Tunis-Muslim *nzād* “to increase”, *xtār* “to choose” respectively, or the XIth form, for example Tunis-Muslim *ḥmār* “to become red”, is in the 1st and 2nd persons of the suffixed conjugation, there are two ways of formation of the verb stem.

- (1) With a short vowel CCVC- [Tunis-Muslim *xtart* “I chose”] (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Sūsa, el-Ĥamma, Marāzîg, Constantine-Jewish, Djidjelli, Bou-Saāda, Cherchell, Ḥassāniya).
- (2) With a long vowel with connective *ī* between the stem and the conjugational suffix [Tripoli-Jewish *xtārīč* “I chose”] (Tripoli-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish, Saida, Tlemcen).
- (3) With a long vowel [Tunis-Jewish / *ṣḏāḏt* “I chase”] (Tunis-Jewish, UH., Skūra).

On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

3.2.3. Nouns

3.2.3.1. Plural form of adjectives on the pattern *ʾafʿal* for colour and physical defect [MN1]

In CA the plural of adjectives on the pattern *ʾafʿal* which denotes colours or physical defects is *fuʿl*. In the Maghribi dialects there are three formal variations:

- (1) CCVC [Tunis-Muslim *xḏur* “green (pl.)”] (Tunis-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Algiers-Jewish(also CvCCīn), Ḥassāniya).
- (2) CVC(ṽ)C [Tripoli-Muslim *ṭórš* (*ṭórōš*) “dump”] (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Malta, el-Ĥamma, Marāzîg, Tozeur, Mzāb, Saida, Bou-Saāda, Tafilalt-Jewish).
- (3) CVCVC [Djidjelli *kūḥel* (also *kūḥlīn*) “black”] (Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tlemcen, UH.).
- (4) CVCīC [Skūra *ḥamīn* “red”] (Algiers-Jewish, Skūra).

We can assert that the CvCC, CvCvC and CCvC are historically related: When the CA CuCC- had lost its case ending, a consonant cluster arose CVC, then a helping vowel was inserted CVCVC (segolization). In this stage the short vowel of the first syllable stood in an open syllable. As seen in 3.1.1.1.2. above, in many Maghribi dialects such a short vowel is not allowed. Then this problem has been solved in two different ways; (a) the short vowel is lengthened as in (3), (b) the short vowel is eliminated as in (1).

On the comparative table (1), (2), (3) and (4) are indicated as 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

3.2.3.2. Formation of dual and pseudo-dual [MN2]

In modern Arabic dialects the function of the dual is restricted. When nouns denoting paired parts of the body take *-īn*, *-ēn*, they never indicate duality but mere plurality, i.e., Tripoli-Muslim *wadhīn* (< CA **uḏnayn*) “ears”. Therefore to express “two ears”, we must say *zūz wadhīn*. On the other hand, the real dual is used for nouns indicating measures, time and the numerals 200 and 2000; i.e., Tunis-Muslim *maṛṛtīn* (< CA *marratayn*) “two times”. We can safely say that *maṛṛtīn* is a dual form, since *maṛra* has its plural form *maṛrāt*.³⁶⁾

In the Maghrib there are two ways of forming the dual and the pseudo-dual. For some dialects the dual and the pseudo-dual are formed by the same ending *-īn* or *-ēn*, while for other dialects the dual and the pseudo-dual are formed differently; the real dual takes *-āyn* and the pseudo-dual *īn*.

- (1) Both dual and pseudo-dual are formed with the same ending (Benghazi, Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, Algiers-Jewish, Mzāb, Saida, Skūra³⁷⁾, Ḥassānīya).
- (2) Dual and pseudo-dual are formed with different endings (Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tlemcen, Fez-Jewish, UH.).

On the comparative table (1) and (2) are indicated as 1 and 2 respectively.

3.2.4. Numerals

3.2.4.1. Ending consonant of the construct state form of 11~19 [MN3]

In CA numerals 11~19 are formed by two elements, *xamsata* ‘*ašar*- “fifteen (m.)”. In modern Arabic dialects these two elements are compound and considered as one word; Tunis-Muslim *xamṣtāš*. In the Maghribi dialects, as seen in the example of Tunis-Muslim, *r* of the etymological ‘*ašar*- is eliminated.³⁸⁾ However, when the numerals 11~19 stands in the construct state, i.e., followed by a counted noun, a consonant, *l*, *n* or *r* appears according to dialects.

- (1) *l* (Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Saida, Tlemcen, UH.).
- (2) *n* (Tunis-Muslim, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Djidjelli, Algiers-Jewish, Cherchell).
- (3) *r* (Benghazi, Skūra, Ḥassānīya).

For UH. and Skūra the construct state is not used but the numeral and the counted noun are connected with a preposition (*d*, *dyāl*, *ntā*‘); UH. *ḥdāš d-əl-ktūb* “eleven books”, Skūra *ṣaṭṭāš ntāw’ aḍ-dyūr* “sixteen houses”, *ṭnāš dyāl əl-kīsān* “twelve chairs”.

On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

36) On this subject, see Blanc (1970).

37) Skūra has two endings *-āyn* and *-īn*, but they are free variants; i.e. both are used for the dual and the pseudo-dual, for example *maṛṛtāyn~maṛṛtīn* “two times”; see Aguadé & Elyacoubi (1995) p. 100.

38) In the eastern dialects this *-r* is usually retained.

3.2.4.2. Formation of the ordinal number on the pattern of *CāCiC* [MN4]

The ordinal numeral pattern *CāCiC* is applied

- (1) to 10 (Malta, Tunis-Muslim, Djidjelli, Cherchell, Tafilalt-Jewish, Skūra)
- (2) to 11 (Algiers-Jewish, Saida, Tlemcen UH.)
- (3) to 12 (Tripoli-Muslim, Tripoli-Jewish, Tunis-Jewish, Sūsa, Ḥassāniya)

On the comparative table (1), (2) and (3) are indicated as 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

4. Conclusion

From the data collected so far, we will now try to sub-classify the Maghribi dialects. The data have been put in the comparative table appended to the present work. The table consists of two parts; the upper part for sedentary dialects and the lower part for bedouin dialects. The dialects are ordered according to their location, i.e. from the east to the west.

4.1. Difference between bedouin dialects and sedentary dialects

Besides the reflection of the CA ق, there is no decisive marker to distinguish sedentary dialects from bedouin dialects. However bedouin dialects show the following tendencies.

- (1) No bedouin dialect has a one-short-vowel system or a four-short-vowels system.
- (2) All bedouin dialects have a short vowel system in which *a* is opposed by another vowel, *i* and *u* in the three-short-vowels system, or *ə* in the two-short-vowels system.

4.2. Difference within bedouin dialects

Cantineau and Marcçais have distinguished at least three bedouin dialect groups of Algeria and Tunisia; Sulaym dialect, Hilāl dialect, which they further distinguished into three sub-groups, and Maʿqil dialect. In the present study such a detailed classification is impossible because of a lack of data. Nevertheless, from the data available to us, we may divide the Maghribi bedouin dialects into two main groups, i.e., Eastern and Western, according to the following differences.

	Eastern bedouin	Western bedouin
(1) Short vowel system [MP1]	3	2
(2) Long vowel system [MP3]	5	3
(3) The stress position of personal pronoun (1.sg. [MP1]), (2.sg. [MP2])	<i>aná, ínta</i>	<i>ána, intá</i>
(4) Conjugational suffix for <i>IIIy</i> verb [MV3]	<i>lqū-yəlqū</i>	<i>lqāw-yəlqū</i>
(5) Stem type of the imperative of “to come” [MV5]	<i>ʿāla</i>	<i>īzā, āzī</i>
(6) Umlaut [PH4]	○	×

Western bedouin dialects are Benghazi, Tripoli-M., el-Ḥamma, Marāzīg, Tozeur, all

of which are Sulaym dialects.

Eastern bedouin dialects are Mzāb, Saida, Bou-Saāda and Ḥassānīya, among which Mzāb and Bou-Saāda belong to Hilāl dialect and Saida and Ḥassānīya to Maʿqil dialect. The boundary between the eastern and the western bedouin dialect groups lies in eastern Algeria.

4.3. Difference within the sedentary dialects

Just as with the case of the bedouin dialects, no clear-cut classification within the sedentary dialects is possible, though the following tendencies are noted.

- (1) One-short-vowel system is particular to Judaeo-Arabic dialects (except for Tunis-Jewish) [PH1].
- (2) The absence of *h* is particular to non-Muslim dialects (Tripoli-Jewish, Malta, Tunis-Jewish) [PH10].
- (3) The reflection of the 1st radical *hamza* verbs (< CA ʾakala, ʾaxaḍa) as 2nd radical weak verbs *kāl*, *xād* are mostly found in Jewish dialects (except for Skūra and Ḥassānīya) [MV4].

As with the case of the bedouin dialects, sedentary dialects of the Maghrib are broadly divided into a Western group, and an Eastern group. We have to emphasize the fact that the following division is not absolute but merely shows tendencies, therefore exceptional cases are common.

	Eastern bedouin	Western bedouin
(1) Short vowel system [PH2]	3	2
(2) The reflection of CA ʿ [PH6]	non-affricate	affricate
(3) Aufsprengen pattern [PH11]	$ʔvCCCv̄$	$ʔCvCCv̄, ʔvCCv̄CCv̄$
(4) The stress position of personal pronoun of 2.sg. [MP2]	<i>intá</i>	<i>inta</i>
(5) The stress position of personal pronoun of 1.pl. [MP3]	<i>áhna</i>	<i>aḥná</i>
(6) The interrogative pronoun for "who?" [MI2]	<i>škūn</i>	<i>škūn</i> and <i>mən</i>
(7) The preformative vowel of the pre-fixed conjugation of the 1st radical <i>w/y</i> verbs	$ʔv̄CvC$	$ʔəwCvC, ʔəyCvC$
(8) The adverb for "when?"	<i>amta, waqtāš</i>	<i>faywoq, fūqāš</i>
(9) Plural form of adjectives on the pattern ʾafʿal [MN1]	$CCvC$	$Cv̄CvC$
(10) The formal distinction of dual and pseudo-dual [MN2]	no distinction	different forms

The boundary between the Western and the Eastern sedentary dialects is not stable. Generally speaking the boundary is situated in eastern Algeria, but for [PH2], [PH11]

and [MP3] the boundary lies between Sūsa and Constantine, for [PH6], [MP2], [MV2], [MN1] and [MN2] the boundary lies between Constantine and Djidjelli, and for [MI2] between Djidjelli and Algiers³⁹⁾. A special situation of Algiers-J. and Tripoli-J. should be mentioned; though Algiers-J. is situated in the west of Djidjelli, it has some common points ([PH2], [MP2], [MN1] and [MN2]) with eastern sedentary dialects, and Tripoli-J., though it is the most eastern sedentary dialect of the Maghrib, shows common points ([PH6], [PH11], [MP2] and [MP3]) with Western sedentary dialects.

We can conclude from the above analysis that the Maghribi dialects, both sedentary and bedouin can be sub-classified into two groups: eastern dialects and western dialects. The boundary between the eastern and the western dialects is found in the east Algeria. There is a decisive criterion to distinguish the east and the west: the stress position of the personal pronoun for the 1.pl.. In the eastern dialects the pronoun bears the stress on the penultimate syllable as *áhna*, while in the western dialects it is on the ultimate syllable as *aḥná*. Some other features may be criteria for the division, though not decisive.

39) The expression “boundary” does not necessarily mean that the two dialects in question are adjacent to each other. For example the distance between Sūsa and Constantine is more than 400 km. and there are a number of cities where sedentary dialects are spoken. Therefore the term “boundary” implies less a concrete line dividing the two dialect groups than a hypothetical one.

ANNEX: The comparative table of the Maghribi dialects

	PH1	PH2	PH3	PH4	PH5	PH6	PH7	PH8	PH9	PH10	PH11	PH12
Tripoli-J.	1	3	3b	2	2	1	ž	ğ	3	∅	5	3
Malta	4	1	3a	2	2	2	ğ	ğ	3	∅	1	2
Tunis-M	3b	3	3b	2	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	1
Tunis-J.	2b	3	3a	2	2	2	ž	ğ	2	∅	1	?
Sūsa	3b	3	3b	2	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	?
Constantine-J.	1	3	3b	2	2	2	ğ	ğ	3	h	5	?
Djидjelli	2b	3	3b	2	2	1	ž	ğ	3	h	5	1
Algiers-J.	1	3	3b	2	2	2	ğ	ğ	3	h	1	?
Cherchell	2b	3	3b	2	1	1	ğ	ğ	3	h	3	2
Tlemcen	2b	3	3b	2	2	1	ğ	ğ	3	h	4	2
Fes-J.	2b	3	3b	2	2	1	z	ğ	1	h	5	3
UH	2b	3	3b	2	2	2	ž	ğ	3	h	5	2
Sefrou-J.	1	3	3b	2	2	1	z	ğ	1	h	?	?
Tafilalt-J.	1	3	3b	2	2	1	z	ğ	1	h	?	?
Skūra	2b	3	3b	2	2	1	ž	ğ	3	h	5	?
Benghazi	2a	3	5	1	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	2	2
Tripoli-M.	3a	3	5	1	2	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	2
el-Hamma	3a	3	5	1	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	?
Marāzīg	3a	2	5	1	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	?
Tozeur	3a	3	5	2	1	1	ž	ğ	3	h	1	?
Bou-Saāda	3a	2	3a	2	1	2	ğ	q	3	h	?	?
Mzāb	2a	3	3a	2	1	2	ž	q	3	h	2	?
Saida	2a	3	3a	2	1	2	ğ	ğ	3	h	3	2
Hassāniya	2a	3	3a	2	1	2	ž	ğ	3	h	1	?

	MP1	MP2	MP3	MP4	MP5	MD1	MD2	MA1	MA2	MI1	MI2	MI3
Tripoli-J.	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Malta	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1
Tunis-M	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1/2	2	1	2
Tunis-J.	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	?	2	1	2
Sūsa	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
Constantine-J.	1	1	2	?	1	1	?	?	2	2	1	?
Djидjelli	1	2	2	1/2	2	1	1	2	2/4	2	2	3
Algiers-J.	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2/3	2	1/2	3
Cherchell	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2
Tlemcen	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1/2	2/3
Fes-J.	1	2	?	2	2	1	?	?	2	2	1	?
UH	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1/2	2/3
Sefrou-J.	1	2	2	2	2	1	?	?	?	2	1/2	3
Tafilalt-J.	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	1/2	3
Skūra	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1/2	1
Benghazi	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1
Tripoli-M.	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1/2	1
el-Hamma	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Marāzīg	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2/3	2	2	1
Tozeur	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1/2	?
Bou-Saāda	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	2	2	1	2/3
Mzāb	1	2	2	1/2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1/3
Saida	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Hassāniya	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	2	2	1

	MV1	MV2	MV3	MV4	MV5	MV6	MV7	MN1	MN2	MN3	MN4
Tripoli-J.	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	3
Malta	2	3	2	1	4	2	1	2	1	1	1
Tunis-M	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Tunis-J.	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	?	1	2	3
Sūsa	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	?	1	2	3
Constantine-J.	2	1	1	1	?	1/2	1	?	?	?	?
Djидjelli	2	2	1	2	1	1/2	1	3	2	2	1
Algiers-J.	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1/4	1	2	2
Cherchell	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	2	1
Tlemcen	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2
Fes-J.	2	?	?	1	1	2	?	?	2	?	?
UH	1	2	1	2	?	1	3	3	2	3	2
Sefrou-J.	2	1	1	1/2	?	2	?	?	?	?	?
Tafilalt-J.	2	?	?	1	1	2	?	2	?	?	1
Skūra	1	2	1	1	1	1/2	3	4	1	1	1
Benghazi	1	1	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	3	?
Tripoli-M.	1	1	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	3
el-Hāmma	1	1	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	?	?
Marāzig	1	1	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	?	?
Tozeur	1	1	?	?	?	1	?	2	1	?	?
Bou-Saāda	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	?	?	?
Mzāb	1	1	?	?	?	1	?	2	1	?	?
Saida	1	1	3	2	2/3	2	2	2	1	1	2
Ḥassāniya	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3

References

- J. Aguadé & M.Elyaacoubi, *El dialecto arabe de Skūra (Marruecos)* (Madrid 1995).
 J. Aquilina, *Maltese* (Teach Yourself Books) (London 1965).
 A. Attia, *Description phonologique du parler arabe de Mahdia, Travaux de phonologie* (Tunis 1969) 115-138.
 H. Blanc, *Communal dialects in Baghdad* (Cambridge 1964).
 ——— “Dual and Pseudo-Dual in the Arabic Dialects” *Language* 46 (1970) 42-57.
 L. Brunot, “Notes sur le parler arabe des juifs de Fès”, *Hespéris* 22 (1936) 1-32.
 L. Brunot & E.Malka, *Textes judéo-arabes de Fès. Textes, transcription, traduction annotées* (Rabat 1939).
 J. Cantineau, “Géographie linguistique des parlers arabes algériens”, *RA* 79 (1936) 91-93.
 ——— “Les parlers arabes du département d’Alger”, *RA* 81 (1937) 703-711.
 ——— “Les parlers arabes du département de Constantine”, *Actes du I^{er} Congrès de la fédération des sociétés savantes de l’Afrique du Nord* 2 (1938) 849-863.
 ——— “Les parlers arabes du département d’Oran”, *RA* 84 (1940) 220-231.
 ——— “Les parlers arabes des Territoires du Sud”, *RA* 85 (1941) 72-77.
 ——— “La dialectologie arabe” *Orbis* 4 (1955) 149-169.
 D. Caubet, *L’arabe marocain. Tome I Phonologie et Morphosyntaxe, Tome II Syntaxe et Catégories Grammaticales, Textes* (Paris-Louvain 1993).
 A. Cesàro, *L’arabo parlato a Tripoli* (Roma 1939).
 D. Cohen, *Le dialecte arabe Ḥassāniya de Mauritanie (parler de la Gābla)* (Paris 1963).
 ——— *Le parler arabe des Juifs de Tunis. I Textes et documents linguistiques et ethnographiques* (Paris 1964), *II Étude linguistique* (Paris-La Haye 1975).

- M. Cohen, *Le parler arabe des juifs d'Alger* (Paris 1912).
- R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* I/II New edition (Leiden 1881).
- W. Fischer, *Die demonstrativen Bildungen der neuarabischen Dialekte. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Arabischen* ('s-Gravenhage 1959).
- W. Fischer, & O. Jastrow, *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte* (Wiesbaden 1980).
- H. Grand'hénry, *Le parler arabe de Cherchell* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1972).
- *Les parlers arabes de la région du Mzâb (Sahara algérien)* (Leiden 1976).
- J. Heath & M. Bar-Asher, "A Judeo-Arabic dialect of Tafilalt (Southeastern Morocco)", *ZAL* 9 (1982) 32-79.
- Ph. Marçais, *Le parler arabe de Djidjelli (Nord constantinois, Algérie)* (Paris 1956).
- "Les parlers arabes" in *Initiation à l'Algérie* (Paris 1957) 215-237.
- *Esquisse grammaticale de l'arabe maghrébin* (Paris 1977).
- W. Marçais, *Le dialecte arabe parlé à Tlemcen. Grammaire, textes et glossaire* (Paris 1902).
- *Le dialecte arabe des Ūlâd Brâhîm de Saïda* (Paris 1908).
- S. Ostoya-Delmas, "Notes préliminaires à l'étude des parlers de l'arrondissement de Philippeville", *Revue africaine* 82 (1938) 60-83.
- J. Owens, *A short reference grammar of eastern Libyan Arabic* (Wiesbaden 1984).
- E. Panetta, *L'Arabo parlato a Bengasi*. Vol. 1: *Testi con traduzione e note*. Vol. 2: *Grammatiche e lessici delle lingue dell'Africa italiana* (Roma 1943).
- L. Saada, *Éléments de description du parler arabe de Tozeur (Tunisie)* (Paris 1984).
- H. R. Singer, "Das Westarabische oder Maghribinische" in *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte*, ed. by Fischer & Jastrow (Wiesbaden 1980) 249-291.
- *Grammatik der arabischen Mundart der Medina von Tunis* (Berlin-New York 1984).
- N. A. Stillman, *The Language and Culture of the Jews of Sefrou, Morocco: an Ethnolinguistic Study* (University of Manchester 1988).
- H. Stumme, *Grammatik des tunisischen Arabisch* (Leipzig 1896).
- *Märchen und Gedichte aus der Stadt Tripolis in Nordafrika* (Leipzig 1898).
- C. Taine-Cheikh, "Les alterations conditionnées des chuintantes et des sifflantes dans les dialectes arabes", *Compte rendus du GLECS* 24-28 (1979-84) 413-435.
- F. Talmoudi, *The Arabic Dialect of Sūsa (Tunisia): Transcription, Translation, Notes and Glossary* (Göteborg 1981).
- K. Versteegh, *The Arabic Language* (Edinburgh) 1997.
- A. Willms, *Einführung in das vulgärarabische von Nordwestafrika* (Leiden 1972).
- S. Yoda, "The Correlation between Short Vowel Subsystem and Long Vowel System in the Modern Maghribi Dialects", *AJAMES* 15 (2000) 91-125.
- *A Description of the Arabic Dialect of the Jews of Tripoli (Libya) Grammar, Texts and Glossary*, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, the Hebrew University (Jerusalem 2000).
- "Sifflant" and "chuintant" in the Arabic dialect of the Jews of Gabes (south Tunisia) (forthcoming).