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Abstract

This thesis presents an edition, translation and grammatical study of three Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts comprising the story Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma ‘The Story of the Skull’, where typical features of the Jewish variety of Arabic, written and spoken in Egypt during the 19th century, are outlined. Special attention is paid to the dichotomy between the substandard varieties Middle Arabic, Non-Standard Cairene and spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic on one side, and the varieties Standard Arabic and Standard Cairene on the other side. In addition to a number of acknowledged Jewish features attested in the material, new orthographic observations have been made of r as a reflex of emphatic l, e.g. in the spelling of allāh > arrāh ‘God’ and ʿiṭṭallaʿ fi > ʿiṭṭarraʿ fi ‘look closely at’, never before attested in written form.

Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma was originally written in Arabic, only later to be translated to Judaeo-Arabic. The story is reminiscent of the qiṣṣa al-ʿanbiyāʾ genre, which presents the pre-Islamic prophets from a popular, yet Islamic perspective. The Judaeo-Arabic versions, however, are evidently of Jewish influence, both in terms of narrative and linguistic content.

The Judaeo-Arabic language comprises a continuum of Arabic varieties used by Jews living or formerly living in Arabic speaking countries. Their unique sociolinguistic situation makes Judaeo-Arabic relevant to the study of Arabic linguistics, most importantly the history of the Arabic language and its different written and spoken varieties.

Written Judaeo-Arabic is closely connected to the substandard spectrum of written varieties called Middle Arabic, incorporating elements of Classical Arabic, dialect, pseudo-corrected features, and the standardization of such features. Because it is written in Aramaic-Hebrew script, it may reveal substandard phonetic, morphologic, lexical and syntactic features, unlike the conventional and strictly established Arabic orthography. This becomes especially evident in cases of close phonetic spelling, which is also the case for the present material.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Judaeo-Arabic texts: Exhibiting a wide specter of written and spoken varieties

The study of Judaeo-Arabic (henceforth JA) manuscripts provides an opportunity to analyze stages of literary standards on one side and spoken varieties on the other, with reference to the linguistic history of Arabic, dialectology and the case of diglossia. Here, we may speak of Judaeo-Arabic ethnolects or religiolects, varieties used by a distinct religious community, comprising elements of Classical Arabic, dialectal components as well as standard and non-standard pseudo-corrected features.¹ A specter of varieties may be found within both of the categories of written and spoken language.² Naturally, we speak of Arabic dialects, differing from one another based on their geographical location. But we may also say that these dialectal varieties differ within; a wide specter of sociolects may be found within every dialectal variety. Furthermore, these sociolects differ from author to author and speaker to speaker, depending on a number of external factors and individual intentions. These are e.g. the writer’s attitude towards the standard variety’s status and function, i.e. its written norms, puristic grammar and political, religious or ethnic recognition. Another important factor is the domain, pertaining to and determining the use of a particular language in a particular situation. In other words, every single variety is shaped and refined within the social, ethnic or religious groups in which they are spoken.

¹ Hary 1992:xiii. Pseudo-corrected features are discussed in chapter 2.4.1.
² An extensive discussion on the issue of the (connected but also diverging) entities of written and spoken language, is found in Wagner 2010:2ff.
In the study of the Arabic language, especially in sociolinguistics where we are dealing with the two polar varieties ‘High’ and ‘Low’ on the diglossic continuum, we find vast phonological, morphological and syntactic differences between literary Standard Arabic (henceforth StA) and spoken dialects from around the Arabic speaking world. In general, there is a clear dichotomy between the spoken dialect on one side, and StA on the other.

However, not all spoken and written varieties fit into this dichotomy on the diglossic continuum, like those used by Christians and Jews; Non-Muslim communities may have a desire to segregate themselves linguistically from the Muslim population and to create their own sociolects or religiolects. As a result, these communities’ written varieties will not be as closely aligned with Muslim religious literature (which is a cornerstone of the prevalent StA normative). Hence, JA texts may exhibit a register closer to the spoken variety, and features that are neither dialectal nor StA, but rather a variety found somewhere along the Arabic continuum.

JA texts, especially those involving prose, are important tools when studying historical linguistics, various literary standards and dialectology. This is not only because of the ‘special case’ of the Arabic speaking Jews (mentioned above), but also because JA texts are written in the Aramaic-Hebrew script. This potentially reveals numerous deviations from StA on phonetic, morphologic, lexical and syntactic level—deviations that may be more difficult to detect or only hypothetically attested in Arabic script because of its conventional written norms concealing colloquial distinctions. Depending, of course, on the author or scribe’s orthographic style and preferences, JA texts may therefore exhibit elements not usually possible to detect in Arabic script.

---

3 As put forward by Ferguson (1959a). A discussion of the terms ‘High’ and ‘Low’ can be found in chapter 2.2.
4 An explanation of the term Standard Arabic is given in chapter 2.1.
5 Wagner 2010:5
1.2 The thesis

This paper provides philological and sociolinguistic discussions and an overview of relevant scholarly works on the issues presented above (chapter 2). After that, a historical review of the Jews of 19th-century Cairo and their storytelling tradition is given (chapter 3). Next are the two main chapters of the thesis, namely a critical text, apparatus and English translation of three versions of the story Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma (Quṣṣat ilGumguma as it is pronounced in Egyptian Arabic) ‘The Story of the Skull’ (chapter 4), followed by a linguistic analysis providing a relevant grammar of the content found in the three manuscripts (chapter 5). Finally, some concluding remarks on the linguistic analysis are given (chapter 6).

In Blanc’s (1974) study on the register of the spoken variety extant in the Jewish community of Cairo, he made a point out of not labeling the variety ‘Jewish Cairene’, but rather ‘Non-Standard Cairene’ (henceforth NStC). This NStC variety is believed to have fallen into disuse over time, retained only by Jews. However, although holding exclusive Jewish communal features within Cairo, these features may also occur in other spoken varieties outside Cairo, thus it does not represent an exclusive Jewish or communal feature. After Blanc’s pioneering work, Rosenbaum (2002a; 2002b) have been studying the variety he refers to as the spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic dialect (referring to this variety, I will henceforth be using the term coined by Rosenbaum [2002b], i.e. EgJA), aiming to fill in a gap by identifying features exclusively found in the spoken variety of the Jewish community in Cairo and Alexandria. His work is based on data elicited from informants still familiar with their spoken EgJA variety. Today there are almost no Jews remaining in Egypt, and during a recent, personal

---

6 According to Blanc (1974:211), the A-form and the N-form (see chapter 5.2.3.1 for examples from my material and a discussion on the topic) is found in Lower as well as Upper Egypt, in urban as well as rural areas, in sedentary as well as Bedouin varieties, and in qāl-dialects as well as qāl-dialects.

7 As Rosenbaum points out (2002b:35), the vast majority of Egyptian Jews were living in the cities of Cairo and Alexandria in the 20th century.
conversation with him in Jerusalem, he estimated the chances of finding Egyptian Jews today who are still employing this particular variety to be extremely small.

The endeavor of the thesis is to identify and highlight phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical features relevant to the Jewish substandard variety spoken in 19th-century Cairo (and by all accounts, Alexandria)—by means of three 19th-century prosaic JA texts—which might reveal unique Jewish communal variety features, as well as the Jewish community’s contemporary Middle Arabic literary style (henceforth MA). These features will be compared to and studied in the light of the spoken Standard Cairene (which has the function of being the standard Egyptian dialect, henceforth referred to as StC) and the written Standard Arabic variety (StA), as illustrated in the following diagram:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard varieties</th>
<th>Substandard varieties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>StA ← MA → MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>StC ← NStC and the EgJA variety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

With a risk of repeating myself, the aim here is to distinguish non-standard features from standard ones, both written and spoken, which implies that I will identify and single out genuine MA, NStC and EgJA features found in the three manuscripts and examine them in parallel with previous scholarly work on the topic—aiming to document as many features as possible deviating from the spoken StC and written StA normative.

Much has been written on Early and Classical JA, for the most part by means of the pioneering work of Joshua Blau. However, beyond Blanc’s aforementioned article from 1974, little has been written on later and modern Egyptian JA sources in general, and the

---

8 An explanation of the term Middle Arabic is given in chapter 2.4
9 An explanation of the term Standard Cairene is given in chapter 2.3.1.
EgJA variety in particular.\textsuperscript{10} No comprehensive grammar on the topic exists today as far as I know. By means of this thesis, I wish to contribute to the composition of monographic works as such, and contribute to widen the searchable corpora of JA texts, in order for further systematic studies of written and spoken varieties to be carried out in the future. In the following, I will draw general conclusions on the manuscripts' orthographic and linguistic content, and define their language synchronically by their historical period and linguistic level, regarding both the spoken and the written variety.

1.3 The process of collecting and studying the material

Preliminary to the writing I was inspired by an article on a JA text of the \textit{Qiṣṣ\=a\=ṣ al-\={A}nbiyā\={a}}\textsuperscript{2} genre (Edzard 2012) that I read during my courses on medieval JA texts. Because of my knowledge of the Egyptian Arabic dialect, it was natural to look for something related to this variety. Dr. Esther-Miriam Wagner from the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Research Unit at the University of Cambridge made me aware of the vast amount of 18th and 19th-century JA manuscripts from Egypt. Prof. Benjamin Hary, a pioneer scholar in the field of Jewish religiolects, encouraged me to search through the Cairo Collection\textsuperscript{11} for relevant corpora. Here, I found \textit{Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma}, and noticed that it was not included in his work on the \textit{isrā\=al-\=ilyyāt},\textsuperscript{12} and he personally suggested that I take a look at the story, as it could be of great interest. I was lucky to find another two JA versions of the story in the database of Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts at the Israeli National Library in Jerusalem, both belonging to the Karaite community in Israel. In addition, there turned out to be an original, quite similar Muslim-Arabic version of the story, relatively easy to find. The three


\textsuperscript{11} More on the Cairo Collection in chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{12} Hary is currently preparing this for publication, cf. Hary 2009:64
JA manuscripts constitute the primary sources for this thesis, i.e. with the exception of secondary literature, the thesis is solely based on written material.\textsuperscript{13}

When corresponding with Prof. Hary and the Karaite community in Israel, I learned that little or nothing significant had been written on the linguistic character of the manuscripts. In the following period, I interpreted the three manuscripts and transliterated each one separately in Modern Hebrew letters. The three transliterations were aligned in a synopsis, which helped me identify the orthographic and linguistic differences in the material. In turn, these differences were noted in the apparatus along with other visible differences between the manuscripts.\textsuperscript{14} An idiomatic translation of the base text\textsuperscript{15} was made, the theoretical framework laid as a basis for further interpretation, and a linguistic analysis written. The linguistic analysis very much follows the same methodological approach as found in Hary (1992) and Wagner (2010), of whose work I am a great admirer.

\textit{1.4 Technical notes}

When rendering StA, Latin transcription standards according to the system of Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (EALL) are followed.\textsuperscript{16} Case endings are normally applied, albeit not in the end of a sentence: ẓahrun ẓahmaru wa-ẓahrun ẓabyaḍ.\textsuperscript{17} Because the thesis is exclusively based on written sources, the use of phonetic symbols are avoided. When appearing, syllable boundaries are indicated with a dot (/ka.ta.ba.ki.tā.ban/). For

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} See chapter 5.1 for a discussion on the different aspects associated with studying JA written material.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Prof. Ofra Tirosh-Becker at the Hebrew University deserve sincere thanks for helping me with the methodology of this careful process.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Of reasons explained in chapter 4, the GAM manuscript was chosen to represent the base text. In parts of the manuscript were the language is unclear, the two other manuscripts are used to achieve a reasonable understanding and translation.
\item \textsuperscript{16} A detailed description of the transcription of Arabic is found in Reichmuth 2009.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Phonemic representation is according to EALL standards, with the exception of ẓ. Here I have chosen to use ẓ, as it seemed more natural when rendering both the Egyptian pronunciation of StA, and the Egyptian colloquial varieties.
\end{itemize}
transcription of the StC, NStC and the EgJA variety, standards are in accordance with those
given in Fischer and Jastrow (1980:11ff.). The aim is to accurately represent the varieties’
phonetics, but at the same time to reflect their relationship with StA. Therefore I have tried
my best to render pronunciation by means of phonemes found in the StA system of
transcription, with the addition of a few new symbols, e.g. diacritics to represent prosodic
features, and letters and sounds that are not usually found in StA such as ē and ə. According
to the standards of EALL, articles are not hyphenated (iššams, not iš-šams),18 but I cannot
find a good reason not to indicate morpheme boundaries, hence articles are hyphenated iš-
šams. The same are other morpheme boundaries. Latin transcription of Hebrew is done
according to EHLL standards.

I have predominantly used Latin script and EALL phonemes when rendering isolated sounds,
and Arabic script to render examples of StA, but some parts are transliterated in Latin
letters, e.g. when dealing with names of letters19 and grammatical terms, when illustrating
assimilation, ambiguous grammatical affixes and stems, or in other situations where it has
been found it necessary.

It goes without saying that the following is object to editing and translation mistakes,
writing errors and intentional modification. In connection to this, I take full responsibility.

---

18 See Reichmuth 2009.
19 I have predominantly used the names of the Arabic letters, not their Hebrew equivalents, because the
manuscripts are written predominantly in an Arabic variety.
1.5 Abbreviations

In this thesis, the following abbreviations are used:20

CA – Classical Arabic

CAI – Cairo – Jewish Communities 104 (name of manuscript)

GAM – Ramle – Rabbi Yosef Algamil (name of manuscript)

JA – Judaeo-Arabic

EgJA – spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic

KAR – Ramle – The Karaite community in Israel 42 (name of manuscript)

MA – Middle Arabic

MSA – Modern Standard Arabic

StA – Standard Arabic

StC – Standard Cairene

NStC – Non-Standard Cairene

20 For technical symbols found in the critical edition, see 4.2.1.2.
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework

2.1 From Old Arabic to New Arabic

As JA and MA in general represent the different intermediate dimensions of the Arabic language, a natural way to start drawing the theoretical framework for this thesis is to look at the different Arabic varieties (those known to scholars) from a chronological viewpoint. Ancient or Old Arabic refers to the earliest known examples of the Arabic language, presumably dating back to the 4th century. These are so-called ‘epigraphic evidence’, consisting of a number of Arabic documents transcribed in scripts normally used to write in other languages, like Sabaic, Nabataean and Aramaic. Furthermore, there are attestations of a few Arabic words in late Nabataean graffiti, discovered in northwest Arabia. Other examples are the pre-Islamic poetry’s oral traditions preceding the 6th century that were preserved and written down by Arab grammarians during the 8th century. According to Hary (1987:11), Old Arabic was not a standardized language, but was codified and ‘sealed’ by the 8th-century grammarians, into what today is to be referred to as Classical Arabic (CA)—to which the Qur‘ān probably has been the single most influential literary work. Even though there are lexical and stylistic differences, as well as different rules for reading out loud, the strictly codified CA serves as the basis for the conventional (official written) Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) used throughout the Arab world today. The rasm, i.e. the ‘plain outline’ or the ‘skeleton’ of the word in MSA is deliberately written in its CA form; we

---

21 The intermediate varieties of the Arabic language are discussed in general terms in chapter 2.2, and in the framework of the Middle Arabic variety in 2.4. Following Ferguson’s article “Diglossia” (1959a), a number of scholars like Blanc 1960, Kaye 1972 and Badawi 1973 (to mention just a few) have contributed to this discussion.

22 An introduction to the history of the Arabic language is given in Retsö (1990).

23 Macdonald 2008:465

24 The pre-Islamic poetry’s oral traditions, as well as the Qur‘ān and ‘Ayyam al-‘Arab were first preserved orally, only later to be written down, cf. Macdonald 2008:465
may say that MSA is the direct descendant of CA. This implies that when written, orthographic conventions may disguise the writer’s/speaker’s distinguished vernacular characteristics, usually so evident when pronounced. These conventions more or less apply to all written variants of the Arabic Language. The irregularities of written Arabic on the other side, e.g. when compared to written CA, will be discussed in detail later in the present chapter, and in chapter 5. Henceforth, the term Standard Arabic (StA) will predominantly be used when referring to the ‘High’, Classical and Modern Standard Arabic variety, also referred to as al-‘arabiyya al-fushā.

Historically, New Arabic—the Arabic dialects—developed and diverged as partial result of gradual and spontaneous change of lifestyle, and population movement within and outside the Arabic Peninsula in times after the 6th century, to give a terminus post quem. Versteegh (1984:35ff.) suggests three stages in which the Arabic dialects might have emerged: In the first stage, inhabitants of the newly conquered territories at first learned ‘make-shift’ varieties of Arabic (‘pidginization’) that were used in marriages with women whose native language was Berber, Persian, Aramaic etc. The second stage was characterized by a process of nativization of the variety (‘creolization’) by means of these new inhabitants’ children. Later on, in the third stage, this creole language was affected by the standardized form of the native speakers of Arabic (‘decreolization’). Concerning the latter, he suggests that Arabic dialects represent a “[…] radical restructuring of the entire linguistic structure of the Arabic language” (1984:35). His hypothesis has received some criticism (see e.g. Heath 1986; Jastrow 2002). For example, Heath (1986:952f.) points out that the idea of Arabic dialects as general community-wide pidgins that turns into creoles are difficult to accept.

---

and uses the example of Morocco and Iraq (which show few remains of radical\textsuperscript{27} reshaping of stem forms, lexical meaning and the like) to prove his point.\textsuperscript{28} Jastrow calls Versteegh’s model a ‘blatant overstatement’ ‘[…] not applicable to all Arabic islands […] let alone the dialects of Zone II and I’ (2002:349).\textsuperscript{29}

The Arabic dialects, as opposed to the Old Arabic we know today, have almost never been isolated: Religious pilgrimages, trade caravans, markets, alliances and migratory work has brought together people from different tribes and sub-tribes.\textsuperscript{30} Geographically, we are dealing with three ‘zones’, (I) namely parts of the Arabic Peninsula (where Arabic was spoken before Islam), (II) the southern Peninsula, the Levant, Egypt, North Africa, Iraq and parts of Iran (where Arabic language expanded as a result of the Islamic conquest) and (III) the geographical peripheries (Arabic speaking, but somehow isolated societies in present-day Iran, Central-Asian areas like Uzbekistan and Afghanistan, Malta, Cyprus, as well as areas influenced by trade and conquest in Africa).\textsuperscript{31} Dialects from the first and the second zone enjoy strong influence from StA, especially in urban areas, whereas dialects from the third do not. Within Arabic dialectology, one may distinguish between Bedouin on one side and sedentary on the other, and within the sedentary, we separate between urban and rural. According to the old Arab grammarians, the status of the urban vernaculars is somewhat underappreciated when compared to Bedouin dialects and StA. According to Sibawayhi, Bedouin dialects, e.g. the one spoken by ʿahl al-Ḥijāz ‘the people of Ḥijāz’ was considered

\textsuperscript{27} My emphasis.
\textsuperscript{28} See also Versteegh’s counterarguments, in Versteegh 2004.
\textsuperscript{29} The term ‘Arabic islands’ is used by Jastrow to describe Zone III. The terms Zone I, II and III are explained in the following paragraph.
\textsuperscript{30} Watson 2011:852ff.
\textsuperscript{31} Jastrow 2002:348f.
more ‘pure’, and closer to the normative language of the Qur˒ān.32 Likewise, the urban dialects were considered somehow corrupted, by mixed populations and the presence of non-Arabic speakers.33

It is important to note that Old Arabic is not believed to have been a single variety, but to have comprised many distinct dialects.34 The majority of today’s scholars believe that ancient literary (Old) Arabic and colloquial Arabic were two distinct entities.35 Until today the different dialects have been shaped and affected by interaction of different Arabic varieties with adstrate36 and substrate37 languages for almost 15 centuries. Subsequently, as more dialects and varieties are discovered and studied, making comparative reconstructions becomes more challenging—an even more complex picture of the Arabic dialectal patterns and its origin emerges.

### 2.2 The case of diglossia

In his 1959 article “Diglossia”, Ferguson introduced the notion of a ‘High’ and a ‘Low’ variety carefully demonstrating the linguistic distinctions found in a few speech communities—among them Arabic—on the strictly complimentary distribution of formal vs. informal usage, i.e. al-˒arabiyya al-fuʃḥā vs. al-˒āmmiyya. Ferguson’s diglossia is sharply in

---

32 In his famous grammar al-Kitāb, he wrote: “wa-da˒ahum sukūnu l-˒āxiru fi l-mithlayni ˒anna bayyana ˒ahlu l-˒ḥijāz ft l-jazmi fa-qālū ʾurduda wa-l˒ā tardud wa-hiya l-.lu˒gatu l-˒arabiyyatu l-qadimatu l-jayyidatu wa-l˒ākin bani tamim ˒ad˒a˒amū” ‘final sukūn made the people of Hijāz […] pronounce the jussive, saying ʾurduda wa-la tardud, which is the good, old Arabic language, whereas the sons of Tamīm put [the two letters] together’ (Derenbourg 1881-1889:474).

33 See e.g. Corriente 1976:63ff.; Miller 2011:983f.

34 MacDonald 2008:464

35 Versteegh 2001:46f; Watson 2011:858

36 An adstrate refers to one language in contact with another, in a neighbor population, without having identifiably higher or lower prestige.

37 A substrate is a language which has lower power or prestige than another, as opposed to a superstrate, that has higher power or prestige.
contrast to bilingualism, as its ‘High’ and ‘Low’ varieties are used side by side in a speech community, each with a clearly defined role,\textsuperscript{38} not to forget that the ‘High’ variety is superimposed and never exclusively spoken by anyone.\textsuperscript{39} Thus, we may refer to two types of diglossia: One ‘narrow’ (aforementioned as Ferguson’s diglossia)\textsuperscript{40} and one ‘extended’, as put forward by Fishman (1971:73ff.), seeking to relate the research traditions of bilingualism and diglossia. He considers diglossia to cover a broader spectrum of speech communities, “in societies which employ separate dialects, registers, or functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind” (1971:74). Some scholars have also argued for a more nuanced distinction of the term diglossia, like e.g. Mitchell (1986) who discusses the complex stylistic scope of ‘Educated Arabic’, not to forget Badawī (1973). Badawī suggests a continuum of five levels (shading into each other gradually) ranging from the most literal style to the most colloquial (respectively $fusha$ $t$-$tur$āt ‘Classical Arabic’; $fusha$ $l$-$asr$ ‘Modern Standard Arabic’; $\text{\textacutenmiyyat al-mutaqqafin}$ ‘Educated Spoken Arabic’; $\text{\textacutenmiyyat al-mutanawwirin}$ ‘Semi-literate Spoken Arabic’; $\text{\textacutenmiyyat al-ummiyyin}$ ‘Illiterate Spoken Arabic’).\textsuperscript{41} Other scholars, like Hary (1992; 2009) has re-evaluated diglossia through the use of the term ‘multiglossia’, pointing out that it “more accurately reflect[s] the existence of more than two varieties of the language” (1992:3).

We are not only dealing with standard written Arabic on one side and spoken Arabic on the other, but a multitude of distinct registers extant between the two poles. The context of the language greatly depends on the interaction between two interlocutors, or between writer and reader, which leads to a large number of distinct spoken and written varieties,\textsuperscript{42} and however one may consider the diglossic case of Arabic, ‘narrow’ or ‘extended’, the

\textsuperscript{38} Ferguson 1959a:328
\textsuperscript{39} Ferguson 1959a:331
\textsuperscript{40} See also Fergusons own revised thoughts on the topic in Ferguson 1996 (1991).
\textsuperscript{41} Badawi 1973:89ff.
\textsuperscript{42} As described in Wagner 2013:262f.
dichotomy between written and spoken Arabic that diglossia addresses, is one of the Arabic language's most striking features.

2.2.1 Leveling processes in Arabic

2.2.1.1 Code-mixing/switching

Concerning the nature of language leveling in everyday social interactions, scholars prefer to focus on the mixed nature of the varieties between the two poles ‘High’ and ‘Low’, a phenomenon which may be referred to as code-mixing/switching. This is, in brief terms, the use of two or more varieties (codes) in the same conversation. An important focus in studies of code-switching has been to illustrate differences in types of code-switching and explain the choice of codes—i.e. what ‘rights and obligations’ participants in a conversation have and do not have in the process of negotiating and making choices. The markedness (or unmarkedness) of the code choice are naturally associated with, adjusted to and depending on social features which are “salient to the exchange, such as status of the participants, the topic, etc.” (Myers-Scotton 1986:404). However, as Myers-Scotton points out, perceptions of markedness are not categorical but rather gradient; they may differ between speech communities as well as between participants.43

2.2.1.2 Identifying and predicting code choices

Code-mixing is not considered a phenomenon based on grammar, but rather a spontaneously generated construct.44 In e.g. (oral) morphophonology, we find that dialectal grammatical affixes combined with Standard stems are normal (e.g. yitqarrar; ẓiqānit; li-tahqiq-u)45 but

43 Myers-Scotton 1986:404
44 Ryding 2006:669
45 The examples are found in Mejdell 2012:238. Similar examples are found e.g. in Holes 1995:297f., Mejdell 2008:62ff. and Hary 1992:20ff.
combining affixes and stems the other way around, i.e. Standard grammatical affixes applied to dialectal stems (*ultu laha ‘he told her; *mbayinuna ‘they look like…’; *bastannākumā ‘I am waiting for [the two of] you’), as well as the violation ‘normal’ functional constraints (*māḏā āwiz StA ‘what’ + Egyptian Arabic ‘want’), would be perceived as most awkward.

We perceive the code choices generating pure vernacular or conventional written StA as predictable and normative, e.g. Egyptian Arabic āwiz or āyiz ē(h) and StA māḏā turīd.

Nevertheless, when codes are mixed, say, StA rendered orally, (e.g. mā tarīd or māzā turīd) the variation in the code-mixing becomes more difficult, or even impossible to predict.

With regard to this, Kaye (2001:127) distinguishes between straight (unambiguous) basilectic colloquial dialect; (unambiguous) acrolectic StA; and the countless, (ambiguous) mesolectic ‘in between’ variations on the other side. This point may be applied to the standard (StA and StA) vs. the substandard (MA, NStC and EgJA) varieties where we occasionally encounter highly ambiguous mesolectic variations in the substandard varieties—especially evident in pseudo-corrections. It should be borne in mind, however, that pseudo-correct features predominantly occur in written form.

Myers-Scotton’s (1986) model on code-choice primarily concerns speech communities, but may also be relevant to mixed written varieties. Especially (but not exclusively), her thoughts (rule) on ‘switching as an overall unmarked choice’ may prove important: Two or more codes constitute the unmarked choice, when more than one identity is salient for the rights and obligations to participants in a conversation. I will try to verify this point in the following, especially concerning the different scribe’s diverging choice of register for their

---

46 Here, I have used my own examples.
47 See Kaye 2001:120; Mejdell 2012:238
48 Kaye 2001:127
49 See also Hary 1992:12f.
respective manuscripts, where more than one choice seem to constitute the (salient) unmarked choice.

2.3 Dialect contact and ‘koineization’

Dealing with speech communities on a larger scale, and when trying to explain the change from Old Arabic to Modern (especially urban) dialects, some scholars have suggested the idea of an urban koine. The term ‘koine’ refers to a communicative Arabic variety, especially used in interdialectal situations. Ferguson (1959b) suggests that this Arabic variety may not have descended from CA nor from the dialect of a single center, but rather emerged as an interdialectal standard—a sort of lingua franca—during the first centuries of the Islamic conquest. Others, like Corriente (1976:88) suggests an earlier, commercial koine preceding the Islamic era, emerging from Nabaṭī Arabic.

2.3.1 Standard Cairene and the spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic variety

Concerning the JA and MA focus of this paper, Miller (2011:985) notes something very important on koineization: “‘Old’ sedentary urban dialects associated with the initial phase of Arabization/urbanization in the first centuries of the expansion of Islam (7th-10th centuries) are considered to have kept the most ‘innovative’ features. They are still found in a number of Arab cities, often retained by small groups of old-city dwellers and, in most cases, surviving variants/variables rather than fully discrete varieties.” Knowing that old sedentary urban dialects at times have been retained only by Jewish or Christian minorities (see e.g. Blanc 1964), the large amount of available JA and MA sources have been, and may still prove to be invaluably important when searching for and identifying these old sedentary

51 Ferguson 1959b:617
52 My emphasis.
53 My emphasis.
‘innovative’ features. One should keep in mind, however, that in cities like Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo and Mosul, migration during the 14th-20th century did produce a leveling of the urban vernacular, albeit without such radical transformation and subject to a leveling-bedounization process as it did in the old urban dialects in Maghreb, Mesopotamia and Bahrain.\textsuperscript{54}

Woidich (1994:506) describes StC as a ‘Central Delta’ dialect comprising features pertaining to neighboring regions. According to him, modern StC might be the result of a leveling process that occurred in the second part of the 19th century. Massive population migration, renewal of the population due to the agricultural reforms, Muhammad Ali’s urban reforms, and the plagues of the 19th centuries are some of the most important factors (1994:500f.). It is important to note here that StC contain a number of features not present in the rural dialects.\textsuperscript{55} The fact that most of the migrants came from areas in close proximity to Cairo, and spoke a sedentary rural variety close to StC, may explain why the degree of StC leveling was not so radical after all. Blanc (1964; 1974) perceives the urban sedentary variety of religious groups in cities like Cairo, Damascus and Mosul to be more or less the same as the Muslim varieties, as he recorded little variation correlated to religious affiliation here. In his view, the spoken EgJA variety used in Cairo and Alexandria\textsuperscript{56} is merely part of a NStC variety if a distinct variety at all, arguing that “[…] it is quite difficult for anyone to say with certainty that a given utterance will be spoken in a given way by a Jew, in another way by a Muslim, and in a third way by a Christian. A similar situation seems to occur in Aleppo and Cairo, though to an even lesser degree“ (Blanc 1964:14). Although the pre-20th-century

\textsuperscript{54} Miller 2004:182ff.

\textsuperscript{55} Woidich 1994:507

\textsuperscript{56} The vast majority of Egyptian Jews were living in the cities of Cairo and Alexandria in the 20th century, according to Rosenbaum (2002b:35).
Cairo quarters are described as relatively segregated with regard to religion and ethnicity,\(^{57}\) there is no indication that Christian and Jewish Cairene varieties could represent an ‘older urban form’ when compared to the Muslim StC.\(^{58}\)

Dialectal differences among religious groups are often problematic; they may be influenced by the dominant variant spoken in their area, other by the religious community’s sacred or liturgical language. The differences between religious communities seems to be more marginal than those among e.g. social groups. Blanc characterizes the differentiation between Muslim and Jewish Cairene varieties as either *non-existent* or *minor*, pointing out that “[…] (a) differentiation is primarily marginal to the linguistic structure, and (b) there is fluctuation in usage and poor correlation of differences with religious affiliation” (1964:14). However, there are differences reported, which seem to have originated in migration, and later preserved by social distance.\(^{59}\)

The paragraphs above raises important questions, as religious-based varieties in ‘traditional’ Arab cities often have been regarded one of the main factors of sociolinguistic diversity:\(^{60}\) Does Muslim StC in itself represent older urban ‘innovative’ features associated with the first phase of the Arabization, because a radical leveling of StC never took place? Did the Christian and Jewish NStC varieties go through the same leveling process as Muslim StC? Will we be able to prove variation correlated to religious affiliation in the case of Cairo? Usually, the evolution of urban vernaculars as such is reflected (in varying degrees) in a

---

\(^{57}\) Abu Lughod (1971:56) writes: “Born in the nineteenth century, adolescent in the twentieth, modern Cairo had as its birthright […] the basic framework of its regional pattern—three centers which were to coalesce but never quite blend; the basic framework of its social and ecological organization—diverse ethnic, religious, and class divisions which were to subdivide the modern city in much the same way they had fragmented the medieval one”. The Egyptian Jews’ social status will be further discussed in chapter 3.

\(^{58}\) Miller 2004:188

\(^{59}\) Blanc 1964:13

\(^{60}\) Miller 2004:189
number of contemporary linguistic variations, as well as in communal variables (i.e. religious, ethnic or regional affiliation) as well as in social variables (i.e. age, sex, education and social class). As far as we know today, these communal variables does not seem to have affected the EgJA variety, but to quote Hary discussing Jewish and ‘judaicized’ languages in general, “the initial adoption of a local language was an attempt to assimilate into the surrounding environment and to speak like the local inhabitants, but after the language had established itself as Jewish with its Hebrew script and Hebrew and Aramaic linguistic elements, it became a symbol of Jewish identity and an actual obstacle to assimilation” (1992:73). The possibility of a distinct Jewish variety or at least a number of unique Jewish variants diverging from the StC variety, will be carefully studied in the linguistic analysis (chapter 5) of this thesis.

2.4 Middle Arabic

Various scholars have provided definitions of MA. The term was first coined by Fleischer in his *Kleinere Schriften* (1888:155), where, in very general terms, he applied the term (*Mittelarabisch*) to a ‘common language’ that coincided with the overcurrents (Ueberströmen) of Arabic in Persian and Turkish. Fück, mainly adopted the terminology to varieties of Christian and Jewish Arabic (and to some extent Muslim Arabic), reflecting colloquial features, arguing that “the colloquial language, spoken by the lower and middle classes of the urban populations since the days of its origin in the early days of the Islamic conquest, in terms of language history, has been Middle Arabic […]. Jews and Christians of the Orient on the other hand, who were living in entirely different literary traditions than their Muslim environment, had for a long time no part in the Islamic culture, and started using, as soon as they could write Arabic, not the [*]Arabiy[y]a, but the colloquial language

61 I am uncertain about exactly what Fleischer means with this.
of their own time. Therefore the most ancient Christian-Arab memorials from until the 9th century, are also of great interest in Arab language history. In these sources, we have access to the first contiguous texts written in Middle Arabic” (1950:57). To this, he adds that the true nature of Middle Arabic, and the real difference in relation to the classical language can be found in a structural change, which exterior feature is the function of the ʿirāb. Thereby, Middle Arabic “steered into the paths where all other Semitic languages long since had trodden” (1950:59).

Some four decades later, Fischer (1991:432f.) described it as texts written by authors who were not able to reach an educated CA linguistic standard, or who did not intend to adopt such a standard. Blau, who largely shares this particular view, initially regarded MA “the missing link between Classical Arabic and the Modern Arabic dialects” (1988:38), albeit altered his view after some time, eventually considering MA as representing the language of mediaeval texts composed of alternating elements of CA, post-CA, New Arabic and pseudo-corrections in constantly varying degrees.62 T. Nöldeke, albeit without using the term ‘Middle Arabic’ in particular, describes it as “written by the uneducated, merely show[ing] a dialectal coloring, frequently combined with a catachrestic use of the grammatical form of CA, not the genuine aspect of the dialect itself. These features are particularly evident in works by Jews and Christians […]”.63

In later years, scholars like Versteegh have defined Middle Arabic as “the collective name for all texts with deviation from Classical grammar […]” (2001:114). Today, we mainly speak about MA in its written, stylistic sense, viz. a written style of Arabic, regardless of period or area, combining StA and colloquial elements, as well as features which are neither

---

62 See Blau 1999b:225; 2002:14
StA, nor colloquial. Scholars principally agree regarding its connection and mutual relevance to the research on contemporary spoken Mixed Arabic.\textsuperscript{64}

It is legitimate to say that MA is a written variety of Mixed Arabic, in the sense that it is a mixed variety that has existed for centuries, characterized as the product of the interference of the two polar varieties ‘High’ and ‘Low’ on the diglossic continuum.\textsuperscript{65} J. Lentin describes MA as encompassing “[…] all the attested written layers of the language which can be defined as entirely belonging neither to StA nor to colloquial Arabic, and as an intermediate, multiform variety, product of the interference of the two polar varieties on the continuum they bound, a variety that, for this very reason, has its own distinctive characteristics […]”.\textsuperscript{66} He suggests, on a general basis, that MA, historically, had a well-established and standardized register and that the register was a chosen one, viz. it was the authors’ target as a result of carefully considering his audience. This view is supported by the fact that many writers of MA texts also wrote texts in flawless and even sophisticated StA, which in turn rules out the alleged idea of writer’s insufficient command of educated linguistic or epigraphic standards; a ‘hyper-standard’ language may in many occasions have been completely out of place. One in favor of a more radical view could even point to a long lasting tradition of normalizing or standardizing Arabic texts, texts who might as well have been written in MA in the first place.\textsuperscript{67} MA exhibits forms that more or less display a variety

\textsuperscript{64} During the past decade, the typological approach to Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic has gone through a process of enabling the two fields to be studied within a common framework. This was achieved throughout a number of conferences held by The International Association for the Study of Middle and Mixed Arabic—AIMA. See e.g. Den Heijer 2012.

\textsuperscript{65} Lentin 2012:33

\textsuperscript{66} Lentin 2008:216

\textsuperscript{67} Lentin 2012:44
corresponding to its oral Mixed Arabic equivalent, filling a space of the linguistic continuum between both polar varieties.\textsuperscript{68}

Nevertheless, (oral) Mixed Arabic and (written) Middle Arabic are not the same, and one should also be careful of comparing them too categorically to the spoken vernacular. To quote Versteegh (2004:353) on the issue, “Middle Arabic was not a discrete variety with a development and a structure of its own and it can certainly not be equated with the colloquial language of the time”. About its mixed nature, the idea of a mixed style being the target or the norm, drawing on a common, intermediate register is clearly something that the two have in common, however, the specific choices and strategies when applying this register vary to a great extent.\textsuperscript{69} For example, the amount and kind of ‘third type’ (non-StA, non-colloquial) forms\textsuperscript{70} differ considerably. These ‘\textit{usages propres}’ (as coined by Lentin) are one of the most central features when defining MA as a separate variety, and are attested much more often in Lentin’s study on written MA than in spoken mixed style. ‘\textit{Usages propres}’ as such are also found in spoken Mixed Arabic, but mostly on a junctural or suprasegmental level such as in emphasis, or vowel drop and shortening in StA lexical items according to dialectal phonology.\textsuperscript{71} The degree of classicization and colloquialization corresponding to text type also varies considerably. In Mejdell’s comparison of the two varieties (2012:237f.), she also notes that written, graphic representation of data on the one hand, and spoken, phonetic representation on the other hand, provide different kinds of linguistic information; morphophonological variations that are not visible in written texts, or standardized writing conventions, which certainly facilitate good readability, but at the

\textsuperscript{68} Lentin 2008:219
\textsuperscript{69} Mejdell 2012:236
\textsuperscript{70} The term ‘third type’ forms is explained in chapter 2.4.1.2.
\textsuperscript{71} Mejdell 2012:237
same time conceal the underlying dialect form. For example, the combination of dialectal grammatical affixes and StA stems, presented in 2.2.1.2 above (yitqarrar; ḥiqāmit; li-tahqiq-u’u72), are easy to perceive when pronounced, but are usually not visible when written in StA. The dynamic and flexible entity of Middle and Mixed Arabic from earlier, modern and contemporary stages still remains to be carefully and extensively studied from a comparative, diachronic perspective.

2.4.1 Identifying Middle Arabic features

In Hary (1992:59), some of the major characteristics distinguishing MA from StA are presented. These are the disappearance of moods and cases; the change of a synthetic possessive construction ḥidāfa to an analytic construction; the disappearance of the dual in verbs, pronouns and adjectives; the change of word order. However, the most interesting and important feature of MA (distinguishing it from StA) is the occurrence of so-called pseudo-correct features.

2.4.1.1 Blau’s approach: Pseudo-Classical features

In MA texts we find, in varying degrees, an alternation between StA forms and non-StA forms. Local vernaculars constitute a substantial part of the extant non-StA forms, whereas the other forms (which are neither StA forms, nor colloquial) are characterized by J. Blau (1981:27ff.; 1999a:27) as hyper-correct (‘too corrected’) and hypo-correct forms (‘not corrected enough’ or ‘half-corrected’73), often referred to as pseudo-Classical features (or pseudo-corrections). In very general terms, the notion of pseudo-Classical features points to vernacular forms that has been ‘corrected’ because of the author’s desire to write StA.74 In

72 The examples are found in Mejdell 2012:238 (see chapter 2.2.1.2)
73 See also Hary 1992:62ff.; 313f., where this subject is discussed extensively.
74 Blau uses the term Classical Arabic.
turn, a number of new and incorrect StA forms has come into being, which are neither StA, nor living vernacular.

An example of hyper-correction found in the present material (see chapter 4 and 5) is e.g. in the q reflex of StA (‘those things, matters’). The text is: ‘There are those things, matters’, ‘O, (my) Mother’, ‘how did you find, how did you see’, ‘belief in God’ and ‘the Earth’. It is clear that the scribe has corrected ‘too much’ by writing the letter q in the place of ʾ, most probably due to an awareness of the tendency to replace StA q with ʾ in the spoken variety (StC ʾāl ‘he said’ is correctly rendered qāla when classicized with q, whereas StC il-ʾard ‘the Earth’ spelled il-qard, when classicized in the same manner, is hyper-correct).

Hypo-corrections are also attested in the material, where the scribe has only partly corrected his writing according to StA: In the examples (from his statement, remark’ and their eyes’, the genitive state of kalām ( kalāmi-, due to the preceding preposition) is correctly treated according to StA, however not the 3rd person suffix vowel change, thus employing a hypo-corrected form.

Blau states that we must establish the linguistic character of every text or group of text to identify the colloquial features. By merely eliminating the StA features, we would not find exclusively colloquial features, but also the pseudo-corrections, he argues. Only when repeated incidences of the same ambiguous form occur in the corpus, we may seriously eliminate the chance of pseudo-correction (viz. it reflects a genuine MA feature). This leads us to the issue of standardized pseudo-corrections, which are either pseudo-corrections

---

75 Further examples of q for StA ʾ are presented in chapter 5.1.2.18.
76 Further examples of affixed pronouns found in the manuscripts are given in chapter 5.2.1.2.
occurring many times in a given text,\textsuperscript{77} or may even spread and become standardized in a given variety, like we have seen e.g. in the use of \textit{lamm} + verb in the perfect tense in medieval and modern Judaeo-Arabic.\textsuperscript{78}

\textbf{2.4.1.2 Lentin’s approach: \textit{Sui generis} forms and constructions}

On the phenomenon of pseudo-corrections, Lentin writes: “[...] les formes linguistiques employées sont soit dialectales, soit standard, soit, précisément, produits du mélange, c'est-à-dire d'un troisième type, \textit{sui generis}” (1997:11f.), arguing that it may also be characterized as a third, mixed type which are \textit{sui generis} forms and (syntactic) constructions that have been shaped and perfected through centuries when dealing with diglossia, some even preserving old traditions which have been rejected by the usually so strict conventional StA norms.\textsuperscript{79} Lentin describes the register of MA as conforming to a norm, albeit not institutionally conventionalized, nor explicitly recognized. Nevertheless, many of these MA features are consistently repeated; they are undoubtedly present, agreed upon and followed by all. The vast number of common features in MA texts—especially when it comes to the non-StA, non-colloquial ‘third type’—proves the existence of MA conventional norms and well-established usages, and even stylistic hierarchies between them.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{2.4.1.3 Colloquialisms or genuine Middle Arabic features?}

We must always be aware of the possibility that non-StA forms might as well be evidence of the non-StA, non-colloquial features as of local vernacular. The same must be said about

\textsuperscript{77} All three manuscripts presented in this thesis include examples of pseudo-corrections consistently re-occurring in the same text.

\textsuperscript{78} This particular feature is attested in Hary 1992:294; 314; Khan 2006:56f.; Wagner 2010:134; 141, as well as in the material for the present thesis (see chapter 5.3.1).

\textsuperscript{79} Lentin 1997:12

\textsuperscript{80} Lentin 2008:217
distinguishing between what are genuine colloquial forms from an earlier developmental stage rather than the corresponding form in the modern vernaculars, and non-StA, non-colloquial features, a careful investigation of the text or text group’s register is imperative. Lentin’s (1997) study of Ottoman Levantine texts illustrates an important point with regard to this: If a text displays an abundance of colloquialisms, it does not necessarily imply that we will also find genuine MA features, but if genuine MA features are found, there will certainly be colloquialisms among them.

2.5 Judaeo-Arabic

Although some has already been treated with regard to the subject of Judaeo-Arabic, and more will be discussed in the following, the topic deserves a brief introduction from a theoretical viewpoint. The language of Judaeo-Arabic is spoken and written, predominantly by Jews on Jewish topics and for a Jewish audience, and dates back to the 8th century C.E. Judaeo-Arabic is relevant to the study of Arabic linguistics, especially the history of Arabic because of its close connection to MA, which contributes to a better understanding of the development or “missing link” between CA and today’s Arabic dialects. As mentioned above, this particular written variety contains elements of CA, dialect, pseudo-corrected features, and the standardization of such features.

2.5.1 The periods of Judaeo-Arabic as put forward by Benjamin Hary

Hary (1992:75ff.) divides JA into five main periods: Pre-Islamic JA, Early JA (8th to 9th centuries), Classical JA (10th to 15th centuries), Later JA (15th to 19th centuries) and Modern JA (20th century). The two latter are the periods relevant to the present thesis. In

---

81 Khan 2007:530
82 Lentin 1997:898. Lentin uses the term ‘le système C’ (le plus ‘mélangé’).
84 Hary 1992:75
general terms, they exhibit many more dialectal elements than attested in earlier periods. Later JA saw the writing of texts (mostly religious) aimed at the general public and not only the elite. Towards the 19th century and during the period of Modern JA, extensive writing of folk tales and other types of popular literature developed, as well as the tradition of the šarḥ, the translation of Hebrew sacred texts into JA.

2.5.2 Late (19th-century) Egyptian Judaeo-Arabic orthography

The orthography and literary standards naturally vary from period to period. For example, the orthographic tradition of Later Egyptian Arabic (which is relevant to the present thesis) is generally characterized by Hebrew and Aramaic influence, close phonetic representation, and StA orthographic influence, and a strong presence of personal orthographic preferences (Schreierschule), as will be extensively discussed in chapter 5 along with a number of grammatical features characteristic for 19th-century Egypt and its Jewish community.

---

Chapter 3: The Jews of 19th-century Cairo, and their storytelling tradition

The following chapter consists of three parts. First, I will present a short, general introduction to the history, demography and social status of the Jews of Cairo during the 19th century, where the aim is to draw a picture relevant to the Cairene Jews’ sociolinguistic situation. Secondly, I will give an introduction to the storytelling tradition in Islam, and the Jewish reinterpretation of stories as such, with reference to folk tales like qiṣṣa al-ʿanbiyyāʾ and the ʿisraʾīliyyāt. Finally, I will relate this to the material found in the present thesis, introducing the story Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma.

3.1 The Jewish community in Cairo during the 19th century

As we saw in chapter 2, Jewish dialects appear to preserve older urban linguistic traits due to the connectedness within the community and even between Jewish communities from different geographic places. In fact, many Jewish varieties spoken in different geographic places were probably closer to each other than to their respective non-Jewish neighboring dialects. Until recently, scholars have not been completely convinced that the dialect spoken among the Jewish community in Cairo have had distinct features beyond what is described by Blanc (1974:207) as NStC. Admittedly, this particular NStC variety was noted among native Cairene Jews—and thus far among these Jews only—but was not spoken by all Cairene Jews, and he could not find any reason to assume that NStC features did not occur among non-Jewish Cairenes. Therefore, Blanc did not reject the notion of a distinct variety, but refrained from labeling it ‘Jewish Cairene’. To get a better understanding of

86 Wagner 2010:13
their sociolinguistic situation within cities like Cairo and Alexandria, we should review some important historical parts of 19th-century Egypt with regard to the Jewish population.

3.1.1 Background

After Napoleon and the French were expelled from Egypt, power was seized in 1805 by the Ottoman Albanian commander Muhammad Ali, and the country nominally remained an Ottoman province. During his reign of about forty years, Egypt underwent changes of rapid modernization, making Egypt the most powerful player in the region. Muhammad Ali’s successors, continued the modernization of Egypt in many ways, through improvements of the country’s administrative system, the establishment of an Egyptian post office and by providing economical support to the cause of education. Other important means of modernization were the building of railways and telegraphs, not to forget the opening of the Suez Canal in the end of the 1860’s. After 1867, Egypt was granted the status of an autonomous vassal state of the Ottoman Empire. This status remained unchanged de jure for almost 50 more years, despite the British occupation in 1882 (ending the national uprising of Aḥmad ‘Urābī), until it was declared a British protectorate in 1914.

3.1.2 Demography

We know that the Jews of Egypt were not a homogeneous group, but consisting of the Rabbinate Jews (constituting the majority, but composed of many subgroups originating in different geographical and ethnic backgrounds) and the Karaite Jews. In the middle of the 19th century, there were a little less than 4,000 Jews living in Cairo. According to Ashtor

---

87 Egypt was also struck by a series of lethal epidemics of plague and cholera during the century.
88 For a more detailed survey of the century following the French invasion in 1798-1799, see Tignor 2010:196ff.
89 Rosenbaum 2002a:121f.
(2007:344), the Jewish population in 1882 amounted approximately 5,000,\(^90\) and by 1897, 10,000 including 1,000 Karaites residing in the city.

Around the year of 1800, the majority of the Egyptian population did not live in cities, but on the countryside (about 2 million), whereas only about 260,000 lived in Cairo and 150,000 in the remaining cities of Egypt.\(^91\) Other numbers\(^92\) estimate the total population (displaying the population of Cairo between brackets) to around 4.5 million for 1800 (200,000), 5 million for 1830 (about 232,000), 5.4 million for 1848 (about 260,000), 8 million for 1882 (about 360,000), and about 10 million for 1887 (about 900,000),\(^93\) i.e. the Jewish communities of Cairo and Alexandria may have constituted a much more significant demographic entity within the cities than one might assume prima facie, especially since the Jews predominantly dwelt in the cities (unlike the Egyptian majority), and the urbanization did not seriously accelerate before the end of the 19th century.\(^94\) Hence, Jews probably accounted for as much as 1-1.5% of the Cairene population throughout the century, and it is only logical to assume the same for the city of Alexandria.

3.1.3 The social and legal status of the Egyptian Jews

We can assume that, during this period, the general attitude of Islam and the Ottomans towards Jews (who were perceived as ʿahl al-kitāb ‘people of the book’) was tolerant, i.e. they were allowed to maintain their religion, even if they were not first-class citizens in a

\(^{90}\) The numbers corresponds to other sources, to some extent, stating that in 1884, there was an estimated population of 3-4,000 Jews living in the whole of Egypt, i.e. around 0.15 per cent of the population. See El-Badry 1991 apud. Courbage 1997:64

\(^{91}\) El-Badry 1991:1274

\(^{92}\) According to Lincoln Institute’s Atlas of Urban Expansion. See URL: http://www.lincolninst.edu/subcenters/atlas-urban-expansion/images/historical-cairo.zip

\(^{93}\) Panzac 1987:11ff.

\(^{94}\) According to Lincoln Institute’s Atlas of Urban Expansion. See URL: http://www.lincolninst.edu/subcenters/atlas-urban-expansion/images/historical-cairo-map.zip
Muslim state. Apart from a few, generally short periods of prosecution, we do not know of attempts to massacre the Jews or to force them into conversion of religion.\textsuperscript{95} However, Jews residing in the Orient during the 19th century experienced ritual murder accusations (blood libels), charged with killing Christians and Muslims and using their blood for the preparation of \textit{matzah}, in Alexandria (1840), Jerusalem (1870, 1871 and 1896), as well as in Damascus, Beirut, Asia Minor and Turkey. These accusations, although being false, became widely known, and did undoubtedly affect the Egyptian majority’s attitude towards Jews and their religion.\textsuperscript{96} Incitement against the Jews may also have been caused by their pro-French attitude, which became apparent when angry Muslim crowds demonstrated against the French during Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt. French efforts to protect foreign nationals in the Ottoman Empire, as well as Napoleon vaguely promising the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, contributed to encouraging pro-French feelings among Egyptian Jews. According to Jabarti’s (1880) writings, European merchants were imprisoned, and their houses searched, when news came that the French had entered Alexandria. The same were the houses and churches of Syrian Christians, Copts and Greeks, and people “wanted to kill the Christians and Jews, but they were prevented by the authorities”.\textsuperscript{97}

During the next forty-some years, special societies were established to improve the situation of the Jews living in Egypt and elsewhere in the Middle East, predominantly initiated by the Jewish philanthropists in Europe such as the Rothschilds, Sir Moses Montefiore, Baron Maurice de Hirsch and Abraham de Camondo. One of their most important objectives was to oversee that Jews possessed the same advantages and enjoyed the same privileges as were granted to other individuals under the Ottoman rule, as well as raising the general education

\textsuperscript{95} Baer 1966:71f.
\textsuperscript{96} Hirschberg 1969:159f.
\textsuperscript{97} al-Jabarti 1980 apud. el-Messiri 1978:17
standard among Oriental Jews. These measures bore fruits, and became noticeable in the second half of the 19th century; before this, the Jewish communities in the Orient had been isolated, with their society stagnant and unable to exert influence, and had not been involved in the sphere of science and humanities since mediaeval times. Now, Jews in Egypt saw the establishment of schools with instructions in French, English and German, with the addition of many other general subjects, including religious education, inspired by and adopting tendencies prevalent in Western Europe. In 1896, a school for boys (336 pupils) was established in Cairo, followed the next year by the establishment of a girls’ school (145 pupils) in Cairo and one of mixed gender (192 pupils) in Alexandria—all financed by the Alliance Israélite Universelle.

The Jews in Egypt were probably identified as distinct from the ethnic, Muslim Egyptian Cairenes (‘awlād al-balad). According to El-Messiri (1978:14f.), even Arab groups such as North Africans, Syrians, Sudanese and Yemenis, though Arabic speaking Muslims, were not considered ‘awlād al-balad. Their ancestry—and in the situation of the Jews, religion—set them apart, rather than their place of birth. All these groups probably spoke varieties or deployed ethnic variants markedly different from the StC variety. Also, whereas all Muslims were connected with the al-‘Azhar University in one way or another (Moroccans were in the Moroccan class, the Syrians in the Syrian class etc.), the Jews were not. Special clothing within the various groups and classes was virtually obliged. For example, the Mamluks wore yellow shoes, the Copts red shoes, and the Jews blue shoes.

---

98 Hirschberg 1969:212f.  
99 Hirschberg 1969:225  
100 Hirschberg 1969:215f.  
101 According to JewishEncyclopedia.com (article on Alliance Israélite Universelle), see URL: http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/1264-alliance-israelite-universelle  
3.2 Muslim and Jewish storytelling tradition

In 19th-century Judaeo-Arabic, dialectal features as well as pseudo-corrections became more common in the written language, probably due to a greater production of šurūḥ (translations of Hebrew sacred texts into JA) and folk tales like Qīṣṣa al-ʿAnbiyāʾ ‘Stories of the Prophets’ and the ḫisraʿiliyyāt ‘of the Israelites’, which presents the pre-Islamic prophets and stories from the Hebrew Scriptures, respectively, from an Islamic perspective. The term Qīṣṣa is derived from Arabic qaṣṣa ‘to tell a story’, and the term later came to mean ‘tales’ or ‘stories’ of religious nature. The three manuscripts presented in the present thesis, are typical examples of storytelling as such, stories of an oral character which can clearly be associated with the ḥakawātī genre. The particular role of the various prophets are noted in the stories, e.g. Joseph for his beauty, wisdom and love for his father; Jesus for reviving the dead and caring for the poor. To many Muslims, these may be regarded actual historical accounts, relating what may have happened to the prophets. However, few Muslims scholars would ascribe the stories further significance in terms of religious importance. With regard to this, Brinner writes: “From the nature of these tales modern scholars have concluded that they are largely based on oral tradition rather than on written sources” (2002:xx). The stories are written in a style alternating between the folk literature genre and religious commentary; they are filled with religious instructions similar to the scholarly commentaries on the Qurʾān, but are undoubtedly tales for the enjoyment of the reader. The stories’ apparent profane rather than religious role may be illustrated by comparing it to e.g. the Later Egyptian JA writing of the megillah, where the combination ṭū is avoided by scribes because

---

103 Hary 1992:77
104 Brinner 2002:xii
of its sacred significance. In the case of *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma*, although exhibiting religious content, יד is attested several times in all three manuscripts.\(^{106}\)

The tradition of Jewish interpretation of these Muslim tales, re-written in JA script and slightly modified to accommodate its Jewish audience, shows the influence that Islam had on these communities, and the Jews’ natural encounter with Islamic topics, as well as interest and admiration for this part of Islamic literature. It should of course be borne in mind, that the genre, historically speaking, represents the adaptation by Muslim writers of material based on Hebrew and Christian scriptures in the first place, illustrating the strong and long-lasting interaction between the three monotheistic religions.

### 3.3 *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma*

#### 3.3.1 The original, Arabic version

The story found in the present material, *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma* was originally written by ‘Abdullah al-Kafif (died around 1688 C.E.) under the title *qiṣṣatu l-jumjumati ma‘ nabiyyi llāhi ‘īsā ‘alayhi s-salām* ‘The Story of the Skull, with Jesus the Prophet, peace be upon him’. The story is reminiscent of the genre of *qīṣaṣ al-‘anbiyā‘* mentioned above. A printed version can be found in the book *al-munājātu l-kubrā li-sayyidinā mūsā ‘alayhi ṣ-salāt wa-s-salām* ‘Our Master Moses’ Great Intimate Conversation, peace and blessings be upon him’, printed in Cairo in 1956.\(^{107}\)

#### 3.3.2 The Judaeo-Arabic versions: A Jewish narrative

Each one of the three manuscripts are comprised of a Judaeo-Arabic version of *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma* ‘The Story of the Skull’, and they all cover the complete story—a story about life

---

\(^{106}\) Hary 1992:90

\(^{107}\) See al-Kafif 1956.
and death, punishment and submission to God. All three versions have omitted the name of Jesus from the story or any reference to his person; he does not have a name, and is merely referred to as Šaxš or Saxš (חֶטֶן) ‘person’.

It is unquestionably the same story that is presented in al-Kafîf’s original Muslim version and the three Jewish versions, but the former differs a lot from the latter ones—not only because of the vast dialectal traces attested in the Jewish versions, but also in terms of linguistic features, grammatical structure, lexicon and literary style with respect to StA versus MA features. The stories featured in the three Jewish manuscripts are virtually identical; the differences between the three manuscripts are predominantly orthographic, phonological and morphological. These differences are addressed in the apparatus of the critical edition (chapter 4) and in the linguistic analysis (chapter 5).

The story includes a number of names, references and citations from both Christian, Muslim and Jewish tradition (which are also, to some extent, found in the original, Arabic version of the story). For example, the phrase הלנקמה ואגנחה רחמה | הלנקמה | והו | Ideas מליון | דאנו | GAM 6a, 9-11) ‘his body is full of eyes, he has wings for mercy and wings for punishment’ found in the JA version of the story very much resembles the following passage from the Book of Revelation: “And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within” (Rev. 4.8). Other examples are the reference to Munkar and Nakîr ‘the Denied and the Denier’, the two angels who according to Islamic tradition question the newly dead, and numerous Qur’ānic and Biblical references, e.g. the action of

108 The Judaeo-Arabic versions of the story display striking cultural and socio-linguistic similarities to other Judaeo-Arabic stories from the same time and genre. See e.g. Hary 2009 or Edzard 2012.
109 See chapter 4.2 for reading instructions to the critical edition.
110 From the King James Bible.
111 These angels are referred to as Nākir and Nakîr in all three JA versions.
putting sinners in chains, punishing them and throwing them into the blazing fire,\textsuperscript{112} and a reference to a part of the Muslim so-called \textit{kalimat at-tamjid} ‘the word of Majesty’,\textsuperscript{113} compiled from various \textit{hādīṣ}, in \textit{ḥālāha ḥalāha ša'ī'ah aṣhā'īm} (GAM 10b, 10-11) ‘there is no power or strength except with God, the Great’.

\textsuperscript{112} See e.g. Sūrat Ġāfir 71; Sūrat Ḥāqqa 30; Dan. 3.17.

\textsuperscript{113} ‘The word of Majesty’ reads (as recorded \textit{inter alia} by Şāhīh al-Buxārī, Şāhīh Muslim, ŞAbū Dawūd and Tirmīḏī).
Chapter 4: Critical edition and English translation of *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma* ‘The Story of the Skull’

### 4.1 Introduction to the three Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts

On the whole, the manuscripts presented here was copied or translated to JA in 19th-century Egypt, most probably Cairo, and contain the same story, but are written by three different scribes representing three different styles and attitudes towards the linguistic content, thus exhibiting a wide specter of interesting contemporary variety features, both spoken and written. The manuscripts are *Cairo – Jewish Communities 104* (abbreviated CAI), *Ramle – The Karaite community in Israel 42* (KAR) and *Ramle – Rabbi Yosef Algamil* (GAM).

Each of the three manuscripts presented, are indicated by a three letter abbreviation (resembling the name of the manuscript’s custodian library or the person or institution holding its copyrights). Microfilm copies of all three manuscripts can be located in the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in the basement of The Israeli National Library in Jerusalem (their respective Mss. R.R. Film Number at the library’s online catalogue ALEPH500, are displayed in the footnotes).\(^{114}\)

CAI comes from The Cairo Collection,\(^ {115}\) a collection consisting of more than one hundred photocopied manuscripts, mostly from Egypt, dating from the 18th through the 20th century. In the 1980s Benjamin Hary brought this collection from a synagogue in Cairo, to the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts.\(^ {116}\) According to the manuscript’s first folios and colophon, CAI was written or copied between November 13th and 17th, 1887 in

---

\(^{114}\) CAI - F 42863; KAR - F 38842; GAM - F 42596.

\(^{115}\) Permission to copy the manuscript has been given by the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, and from Benjamin Hary himself.

\(^{116}\) For more on The Cairo Collection, see Hary 2009:63ff.
Cairo, Egypt, in *Rue quartier Israëlite*. The scribe’s name is written ذاكي داوود ارجيل in Arabic letters, transliterated with Latin letters, most likely in French, by the scribe himself as *Zooqui D. Argi*. The manuscript is comprised of two separate texts, where ‘The Story of the Skull’ is the first, and a Judaeo-Arabic version of Yehuda Halevi’s *מי כמוך* ‘Who Is Like You?’ is the second. The two stories are written on a total of 30 folios; “The Story of the Skull” is written on 17 folios (400 lines of text, 409 including decoration, each folio containing 15 lines of text, and is written in an Arabic-inspired Aramaic-Hebrew, cursive oriental 16th-century script), including the first folios (the front page and a colophon) of which the whole text has been preserved in readable condition. At the end of the story, there is a reference to another author or scribe, *Nasīm* ‘Anāni wrote it’, but it does not state whether he is the actual author or the scribe of the story.

KAR belongs to and is preserved by the Karaite community in Israel, dating back to the 19th century, found in a storage room in Egypt. It is written on 9 folios (269 lines of text, each folio containing 16-19 lines of text, written in something resembling 15th century Spanish Aramaic-Hebrew rabbinic script [in one instance, the scribe uses Aramaic-Hebrew cursive oriental 16th-century script]) of which the whole text has been preserved in readable condition (with the exception of one word on folio 7b). KAR has no colophon or signature, thus it is unclear who the scribe or possible author is.

---

117 The first folio and the colophon in the beginning of the manuscript is written in Arabic, and the colophon at the end is written in French. The Arabic folios reads هذه الكتاب نزل الخواجه ذاكي داوود ارجيل مصر. هذا الكتاب يوجد في قصة الججمجمة بديعة الجمال وكتبها على يده العبد الفقير ذاكي ارجيل مصر في 13 نوفمبر 1887. whereas the French colophon reads “Cette Livre appartient à M[onsieur] Z. D. Argi. Rue quartier Israëlite. […]ris le 13 Novembre 1887. Caire le 13.11.87”.

118 cf. Table of Early Semitic alphabets by M. Lidzbarski, in Gesenius 1910

119 Permission to copy the manuscript has been granted by Rabbi Yosef Algamil of the Karaite community in Israel.

120 This information is based on personal e-mail correspondence with Rabbi Yosef Algamil.

121 cf. Table of Early Semitic alphabets by M. Lidzbarski, in Gesenius 1910
GAM also belongs to and is preserved by the Karaite community in Israel\textsuperscript{122}, dating back to the 19th century, found in a storage room in Egypt.\textsuperscript{123} It is written on 14 folios (387 lines of text, each folio containing 17-18 lines of text, written in a script close to Aramaic-Hebrew square character Spanish 1470 A.D. script\textsuperscript{124} [the catch words\textsuperscript{125} are written in a script resembling Aramaic-Hebrew cursive 19th century Algerian])\textsuperscript{126}. The text is relatively well preserved, and only some margins and short passages has been damaged.

4.2. Reading instructions to the critical edition

The following paragraphs presents an explanation for the reading of the critical edition to the three manuscripts that have been studied in the preparations for the present thesis.

In the critical edition, GAM is used as the base text,\textsuperscript{127} whereas parts that are omitted, changed, added or written differently in KAR and CAI are pointed out in the variant readings in the apparatus, found below the base text on each page. An idiomatic English translation of the base text is also given, found on the bottom of each page. The reason for this choice is that GAM exhibits much larger number of colloquial, MA and seemingly distinct Jewish features than the other two manuscripts. The base text includes folio numbers and line numbers relative to each folio in the original manuscript. The apparatus does not include folio numbers and line numbers relative to the corresponding story in KAR and CAI, but this can be located in the Critical edition concordance (in the end of this paper).

Both Latin and Hebrew letters are used to denote recto folio and in verso folio (i.e. the front

\textsuperscript{122} Permission to copy the manuscript was granted by Rabbi Yosef Algamil.
\textsuperscript{123} This information is based on personal e-mail correspondence with Rabbi Yosef Algamil.
\textsuperscript{124} cf. Table of Early Semitic alphabets by M. Lidzbarski, in Gesenius 1910
\textsuperscript{125} See the explanation for the term ‘catch word’ below.
\textsuperscript{126} cf. Table of Early Semitic alphabets by M. Lidzbarski, in Gesenius 1910
\textsuperscript{127} Because GAM is used as the base text for the critical edition, a photocopy of the manuscript is also included in the end of this paper, in Photocopy of Ramle – Rabbi Yosef Algamil (GAM).
and back sides of the leaf of paper), and the use varies according to the use of English or Hebrew in writing. In the critical edition, Hebrew folio and line references (ס = recto; ב = verso) are used, whereas Latin references (a = recto; b = verso) are used elsewhere in the present paper. This I have done of esthetic reasons, as well as to ease the reading flow. The numbers beneath the folio reference in the right margin of each page of the critical edition denote the original manuscript’s line number. סְד, which is located at the end of every folio is a šomer daf ‘catch word’, written by the scribe himself or someone else at the end of each folio in the manuscript, representing the first word on the preceding folio—a technique used to keep track of the page order. Similar to GAM, CAI also displays catch words on the end of each folio, but is not included in the variant reading because it is superfluous. In addition, the story’s title קוצת אמגמה is written on the top of each folio in CAI. Therefore, the variant reading of CAI starts from line two on each folio.

The base text presents the story the way it is written in the GAM manuscript, starting at folio 2a, line 1 (2a, 1), ending at folio 14a, line 12 (14a, 12). The corresponding story from the KAR-manuscript starts from 1a, 1, ending at 9b, 13, while CAI starts from 4a, 1, ending at 17b, 8 (I have left the out the colophon and front pages in CAI). Further notes to the critical edition concerning the three versions are included in the footnotes.

4.2.1 Diacritics and other writing conventions: What is included in the critical edition?

The critical edition includes all visible punctuations. However, differences in punctuation between the three manuscripts are included in the variant reading only when indicating a significant phonological meaning. For example, the letter fā' is written with a dot above in CAI (א), and without in KAR and GAM (א). Here, the dot represents nothing more than the scribe’s custom of writing; it does not denote a significant phonological difference, thus it is not included in the variant reading. Likewise, the letter jīm (SC gīm) is written with a dot...
below in KAR (ד), but not in GAM and CAI (ז). In GAM, the letter אā is written with an acute accent (ג), whereas in KAR and CAI, it is written with a dot above (ג). Admittedly, all instances of definite article deviating between the manuscripts (the use of ‘alif-lām ligature ק or comprehensive קק) are included in the variant reading, even when apparently not representing any significant phonological difference, mainly because of its comparative orthographic interest. The place or presence of the punctuation indicating ġayn differs in the three versions. In CAI, it is marked by a dot below the ġim (ג), and in KAR the dot is placed above the letter (ג), whereas in GAM it is not indicated (ג). All instances where ġayn written with a dot in one manuscript and without a dot in another, the difference is included in the variant reading. However—according to the same principle, of indicating only the significant phonological meaning—the difference between the exact places of the dot is not included. There are no distinctions between dāl and dāl, as well as tā and tā in GAM and KAR (the letters are represented by ד and ת, respectively), whereas CAI makes the distinction (by applying diacritics).

In the critical edition, abbreviations (like eulogies and blessings) are transcribed according to Modern Hebrew typography, using the punctuation marks gereš and geršayim (e.g. סב׳ and ס״ו [respectively] = StA 'Glorified and Exalted be He’) although they are not always written that way in the original manuscripts, where the scribes uses different punctuation. Here, abbreviations are usually marked by a stroke or a dot above the letter(s).

4.2.1.2 Technical symbols found in the critical edition

<...> a ripped/torn off or not visible segment that includes at least one whole word.

<..> a ripped/torn off or not visible segment that includes a part of a word.

- combining two words together.

128 Except one occurrence, in GAM 3b, 2.
error in the scribe’s transmission of the text.

doubt about what is written; letter suggested between symbols.

not attested in respective manuscript.

šomer daf ‘catch word’ (first word on preceding folio written at the bottom of each folio).
4.3 Critical edition and English translation of Qīṣṣat al-Jumjuma

| Base text: | GAM | [p. 2a, 1 – p. 14a, 12] |
| Additional manuscripts: | KAR | [p. 1a, 1 – p. 9b, 13] |
| | CAI | [p. 4a, 1 – p. 17b, 8] |

The Story of the Skull. This is the Story of the Skull and what happened to it. The learned, peace be upon them, told that a man was traveling in the land of Greater Syria, walking in an uninhabited meadow, when he encountered a dead skull tossed on the […]

55
[...] road. He took it in his hands, looked at it and examined it, and found it as white as the whitest snow. Thereafter, he implored God, saying: “O my God, my Master, my Belief, my Hope. I implore Thee in Thy grace that Thou grant this skull permission to articulate and express, so that it may speak to me the way man speaks to his companion”. When the man fell silent, [...]

129 The corresponding part is found above (see 3a, 9) in both KAR and CAI, respectively:
 [...] the Creator Almighty in His kingdom commanded it to answer everything that the man might ask and request. So the man said: “O skull, talk to me, from the strength of God, Glorified and Exalted be He”. When the man fell silent, the skull spoke in a fluent and articulate language, and said: “God is indeed the truth, His name is the truth, and so is death. Know this, O man. Utter, speak to me so that I can give you an answer” God, Glorified and Exalted be He, Almighty in His kingdom made me speak, to answer [...]

57
(... whatever you may ask and request from me. So the man asked: “Who are you? Are you a man or a jinn? Are you good or evil? Are you man or woman? Are you tall or short?" When the man fell silent, the skull had listened to his words, and spoke in fluent and articulate language, saying: “Know this, O man, that I was not [...]

130 Sic!

131 The word בלשאן has been split by the scribe in two different lines (4a, 7-8).
and on their foreheads a band embellished with pearls, rubies and [red] coral.

God. I was content thinking of myself as a sultan when I went out riding, going hunting, there were four hundred warrior horsemen traveling with me, wearing armor of velvet and white damask, every one of them holding a falcon bird. And on each one's head was a crown of gold, and on their foreheads a band embellished with pearls, rubies and [red] coral. [...]
Anathmar sat on the throne, and no one could get me off my throne. Moreover, I was of great stature, good looking, and no one could get enough of my boundless beauty. Also, I used to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked and give charity to widows, orphans, beggars and the poor. I gave a thousand dinars worth of alms every day, but later, towards the end Satan coerced me to do evil, and I denied my God and worshipped pagan deities. Then [...]
God stopped providing me grace, Almighty in His kingdom, and converted it to sin and burden, immoral and confinement”. When the skull fell silent, the man said: “O skull, I want you to tell me, how did you see the dead? How did you die? How did you find death with its intensity, confinement and darkness? How did you find the Angel of Death in his greatness?” When the man fell silent, the skull said: “You have inquired about a great matter, so know this, O man, that [today] I have been [...]

132 קָפ is written on the first line of 13b, but written כּ in the catch word of the preceding folio (13a), in CAI.

133 Sic! The nun is incorrectly written as a gimel in CAI.
And I was lying unconscious

Today I have been dead for four hundred and seventy years. That very day, I was going to the bath to clean myself when the intoxication of death struck me and I lost my consciousness. As I was lying unconscious, they came, took me out and put on my clothes. They could not wake me up from my unconsciousness, and carried me to my home and put me to bed in my kingdom’s castle. The concubines and the servants stood around me, serving me. Then, the doctors gathered to give me medication, and examine my limbs, and found that none […]
[...] of the medicines had worked, and the oils did not work adequately. When the fifth day came, everyone was waiting for me to sweat, but instead of sweating, my face became pale, my eyes shrunk, my teeth were stinging, my tongue turned black, and the intoxication of death went away. I heard someone say: “Take him away, there is nothing living left in him”. So my people wept for me. They could not save me from death. Then he came to me, carrying [a raised sword] in his hands [...]
a raised sword [in his hands] and made me drink the horribly bitter glass of death. Then he slit my throat with the sword. When it comes to his appearance, the Angel of Death has his two feet on the ground while his head reaches the sky. His body is full of eyes, he has wings for mercy and wings for punishment. He has a red back and a white back, the color of his hair is all white, and he has six faces. One on his right and one on his left, one on the top of his head and one underneath his chin, one on his back and one in the front. […]

When the skull fell silent, the man said to it: “What is the meaning of these six faces?” So the skull said: “You have inquired about a great matter, so know this, O man. The first face lay hold of the soul of Israel, the face to its left beholds to the people of the High Heaven, and the face underneath his chin watches over the people of the Earth. The face on his back looks to the infidels, and the one on the front sees to the people of Hell, which is Jahannam, the blazing Fire. [The man] said […]

65
[...] The man [said] to the skull: “How did you find the intoxication and conditions of death?” So the skull said: “Know this, O man, in truth I saw the Angel of Death and his eminence, and together with him was the highest of angels. Their eyes were like torches of fire, and in their hands were iron bars. Know this, O man, they did not soothe their anger, these peoples of the High Heaven. Among them were sixty angels. Ten of them came forth, clutched my tongue and pulled out [...]
the words. I screamed out loud, scaring all the people around me. Again, ten of them came forth and clutched my hands. For the third time, ten of them came forth and sat on my stomach, and in their hands were iron hooks of fire. A strong, burning fire came into my body. Then, they took my soul, tortured me and placed me [...]

134 It is plausible that GAM has a type error, as, in the corresponding parts of KAR and CAI, respectively, translates 'they clutched my tongue and pulled the words'.

135 This is probably כאמוני, as it occurs in similar contexts later in the manuscript (8b, 11; 9a, 3).
[...] sitting by myself. I said: My Master, my Desire, I would sacrifice all my wealth to save my soul. One of them came to me and hit me in the face so I fell to the ground. God, may He be Glorified and Exalted in His kingdom, refused to accept the bribe. The time when they took my soul was stronger that one thousand strokes from a sword. Thereafter, the bathers came to wash and shroud me, and they took me to this place. Then, they dug me a grave, lowered me into it and covered with dirt. [...]
My soul returned to me again, as if I was in this world, and angels assigned to this Earth, came to me and they said: Oh and alas, God will judge you from your deeds, in which we took away the Earth’s comfort. They judged me for all the deeds I had conducted in this world, and said: This day you did so-and-so, and that day you did so-and-so. Then they prevented me from talking, and said: Oh and alas, be aware of [...]
They grabbed my chin, forced me up, and [sat me] once again [..]

[...] the day that the miraculous King will be judging! After that, the first angels left and the other angels came, black-bodied and tall as mountains, hair hanging curly on their shoulders and their noses reaching down below their faces. They screamed at me, and I asked: Who are you? With eyes burning with anger and the mercy was drawn out of their hearts, they told me: We are Nākir and Nakī. They grabbed my chin, forced me up, and [sat me] once again [..]
[...] sat me [once again] by myself and hit me with the whip of fire that they were holding. Then, they took me to the lowest of the low. Again they lifted me up and sat me by myself, and said to me: All of this pain is for the load of your sins. I lost my mind and became frightened. My mind confused my soul, and I told them: You are my Lord, my God. Again, they came back and hit my face. Then they took me to the lowest of the low. Once again they lifted me up and sat me […]
[... by myself, and said to me: Oh and alas, be aware of your punishments. I said: O Mother, I wish you had never given birth to me, and that my father had never taken your hand. They said to the Earth: Seize him and take revenge, because he has stolen God's wealth and worshipped others than Him. So the ground opened and swallowed me up so that my bones were crushed together by the strength of the jaw, and my soul and tears exuded down my cheek. It opened and swallowed me up so that I was crushed, then started speaking to me, and said: I swear, by the glory of my Lord, my Creator that I will take revenge [...]

72
on you, because I have been enduring you while walking on my back. And on the day you were inside my womb, I swear, by the glory of my Lord, my Creator, that I will have my vengeance on you. Then, almighty angels tall as mountains came to me, took me out of the grave and carried me to His throne, may He be Glorified and Exalted in His kingdom. And then a herald called, saying: Go forth, seize him and throw him in the blazing Fire. So they threw me into the blazing Fire. I found that the throne has four chairs. The first one belongs to Father Abraham the […]
Friend of God, peace be upon him. The second chair belongs to Master Moses, peace be upon him. The third chair is for those who converted to Judaism out of their own desire. The fourth chair is for those who fear God, peace be upon Him. After that, they brought me to the blazing Fire and started pulling and dragging me around with my (lowered me) face down, called on me saying: This is the one who does not obey his Lord in the life on Earth. They pulled and dragged me, face down, until we reached the Jahannam. At the doors of Hell, I saw an old man with a long and big nose, and in [...]
his hands were the angels assigned for Earth and Hell. They brought me to him, and he said to them: *Seize him and place him in chains sixty cubits long, because he has stolen God's wealth, Glorified and Exalted be He, he has worshipped others than Him and does not believe in God, Glorified and Exalted be He*. Thereafter, they put me in a leather sackcloth, full of snakes and scorpions. How strong and aggressive those snakes and the scorpions were! How strong and aggressive they were! [...]
[...] And if one of them were ever to be allowed out by Him, Glorified and Exalted be He, the Earth would tremble. Then they pulled and dragged me around by my tongue, calling me, saying: *This is the one who does not obey his Lord.* When the man heard what the skull was claiming, he said: "There is no power or strength except with God, the Great," and he wept. Then the man said: "$O* skull, I want you to tell me, how did you see [...]"
[...] Jahannam?” The skull then said to him: “Know this. I have seen Jahannam, and it has seven levels, one above the other.” So the man said: “What is the meaning of these levels?” “You should know this, O man. The first level is for the Christians, the second for those who sacrifice the Day of Resurrection, the third for those who work with stars and black magic, and the forth level is for those who worship any other than God Almighty, Glorified and Exalted be He. The fifth level is for those who worship pagan deities, the sixth [...]

138 Sic!
[...] level for those who do not believe in God Almighty, Glorified and Exalted be He, and the seventh level, which is Jahannam, is for those who do not believe in God Almighty, Glorified and Exalted be He, and do not act according to God's will. O man, if you had seen the torture of Jahannam, you would have cried blood rather than tears. God keeps us and you away from its evil, which is the stain of curse and execration. The end of Hell is of copper, and the middle made of iron. Its voice is the voice of the wrongdoers, its people are the people of the blazing Fire, surrounded by [fire]. [...]

[...] fire. There is fire on their right and fire on their left, fire above them and fire underneath them. They are screaming in thirst, and no one is giving them anything to drink. Their ears have become deaf, their eyes have become blind, their hands and feet are cut off, and they look regretful for their deeds, and the regretfulness does not help them one bit. The angels assigned for Hell are saying: You were safe and then you became misled, you were protected and became disgraced, you were free and became imprisoned. O people, [...]
there is nothing for you but the blazing Fire, there is no food for you but fire, and there is no firewood for Hell but you. After that, they took me to a tree which top was the head of the devils, standing in the lowest of the low with its branches reaching up to the sky. I lost my conscience out of hunger, and they fed me from its horribly bitter fruits, bitter as Socrates' poisonous hemlock and colocynth. I asked them to give me something to drink, but they did not. After that, my skin started falling off, and then melted. [...]

142 The corresponding part is found above (see 11b, 13) in both KAR and CAI.

143 The corresponding part is found above (see 11b, 13) in both KAR and CAI, respectively:
God, Glorified and Exalted be He, repeated this over and over again a thousand times, to hold me, and punish me for my sins, just like that. After this, they said: Step into the flames. But I was not able to enter. So they brought me shoes of iron and told me: Take these shoes on. Now, step into the flames, O you who did not obey your God. You, who witnessed with your own eyes and betray the fervent people, who stole from the people, who annoyed the respectful, who [...]
ate and drank the forbidden, who crushed the hearts of poor, miserable and strangers, of the orphans and the widows. O you, who did not thank God, Glorified and Exalted be He, for what He gave you. Know this, O man, that you can hear the sound of Jahannam from a distance of thousand years. They put me in a mountain that was all fire, in a valley of iron. Underneath was fire and above was fire, and they started punishing me.” When the man heard the […]

147 The corresponding part is found above (see 12a, 13) in both KAR and CAI, respectively:

The corresponding part is found above (see 12a, 13) in both KAR and CAI, respectively:
When the man recovered from his unconsciousness, he wept and cried out loud again. When the man recovered from his unconsciousness, he said: “O skull, I have truly had my soul pulled out, and there is no life for me anymore.” So the skull said: “All this is for the one who disobeys his Lord and does not please Him when he is in this world. Know this, O [...]

[...] things that the skull was telling him about, he lost his conscience.
man, every time when He burns your skin, He repeats this a thousand times,
may He be Glorified and Exalted in His kingdom, to be held and punished for ever.
And know this, O man, in the valley of Jahannam there is a big coffin filled with
snakes and scorpions. And for the amount of my sins, they made me lie in that coffin,
me together with the devils, assigned for me on Earth. They made me go astray and
worse, and I stayed in this punishment for twenty four years. [...]
[...] After that, God, Glorified and Exalted be He, set me free from the torture. By the permission of God, be He Glorified and Exalted, He set me free from punishment so that I may answer what you might ask and request from me. To answer how I have been in the life on Earth, in my reign, in my happiness, about the armies surrounding me, marching in front of me. In the last days of my life I was flung on the face of the ground. Nothing will help Man on the last day except good and loving actions, deeds of giving to [...]

And thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward.\

We ask Him from His goodness that He will help us in our last moments of life, in the resurrection from our bodies’ souls and the grave’s narrowness and darkness. May He have mercy on us, and let us dwell in the Garden of Eden, long live God, together with the righteous forefathers, and reinstate our souls in our bodies again, just like the Text reads: Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned; renew our […]

149 CAI ends here.

150 Isa. 58.8 (from the King James Bible).
[...]*days as of old.* The End. Honesty, mind and spirit, a family member in his eternal home, it is written to you. I am Yeshua ben Yosef Jerusalemite, Elisha Jerusalemite Noah Eden Za’al.
Chapter 5: Linguistic analysis

In this chapter, a selection of the grammar of three (written) Judaeo-Arabic versions of *Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma*, with special attention to the differences between the Jewish written and spoken varieties on one side, and the standard (predominantly Muslim) varieties on the other side, is presented. In particular, the Judaeo-Arabic non-standard varieties Middle Arabic (MA), Non-Standard Cairene (NStC) and spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic (EgJA) are distinguished from the standard varieties Standard Arabic (StA) and Standard Cairene (StC). Special attention is given to the spoken features found in the manuscripts.

I have singled out a number phenomena pertaining to each variety in cases where that has been possible; some are uniquely characteristic of two or more of the varieties, while other possess exclusive and visible affiliation to only one variety. StA is predominantly used as the model to which StC and the non-standard varieties (NStC and MA) are compared, but in some cases StC is also used for this purpose, in order to point out differences between the standard spoken variety StC on one side, and NStC (and its EgJA variety) on the other side.

### 5.1 Orthography and phonology

In this section, the purpose is to identify and address different orthographical and phonological features found in the three manuscripts. The cases where they deviate from each other, as well as in the cases where they deviate from the standard written or spoken normative are outlined.

#### 5.1.1 Judaeo Arabic orthography

Before going into the phonology of the three manuscripts, there are some important preliminary considerations that should be taken into account, regarding JA orthography. Other relevant JA orthographic features are presented in chapter 5.1.4.
5.1.1.1 Judaeo Arabic transliteration: Conventional Arabic vs. phonetic spelling

Many texts written in JA, especially earlier texts, are simply mirroring Arabic orthography, transliterated in its Hebrew equivalent, letter by letter, thus adhering to the rules of StA writing conventions. In cases as such, the JA rasm (the ‘skeleton’ of the word) orthographically resembles its StA equivalent rasm as closely as possible.\footnote{In this connection, see e.g. Saadia Gaon’s (882-942 C.E.) JA translation of the Pentateuch (Gen. 37:1): וסכן יعقوב פי בק סכנא פי בק קナン. Here, the JA version is completely mirroring StA writing conventions.} On the topic, Khan notes that “in the later Judaeo-Arabic Genizah documents, the language has made a break with this [early] orthographic tradition and in general represents directly, with an essentially Rabbinic Hebrew type of orthography, the way the writers were pronouncing the language” (2006:39), adding that if the writer e.g. pronounced the 3rd person masculine singular suffix in the word he was writing with its vernacular form -u, he would represent this by -w in the orthography, e.g. מָוְתָוּ mawtu ‘his death’ instead of the StA conventional -h, מותה. In the following paragraphs, we will see that the three manuscripts apply a written style close to this Rabbinic Hebrew type of orthography, or to what we may refer to as phonetic spelling.\footnote{According to Hary (1992), this is typical of Late Egyptian JA orthography.} In his paper on early phonetic JA spelling, Hopkins (2004:236) uses the lexeme الضارب to illustrate some of the characteristics associated with JA phonetic spelling: The lām of the definite article is not written (as it is not pronounced), and since ḍ does not exist in Hebrew script (at least not in the earlier orthographic tradition),\footnote{In traditional JA (predominantly after Saadia Gaon’s translations), it is marked, like in Arabic, with a Hebrew sade with a dot.} it is occasionally represented by other interdentals e.g. d. The length of vowels are not always marked in Hebrew, i.e. scriptio plena and defectiva (marked long vowels and unmarked short vowels) are not applied. In fact, employment of matres lectionis is somewhat arbitrary throughout,
thus yielding several possibilities of how to spell אדריב ~ אדריב ~ אדריב ~ אדריב when spelled phonetically: 

5.1.1.2 Personal orthographic style (Schreiberschule)

Although being from the same place and period of time, each of the scribes seems to have their own personal, standardized orthographic style (Schreiberschule), which is applied in a very consistent manner. Below, one comparison is made to illustrate the point, in this particular case in the scribes’ different rendering of ‘alif maqṣūra bi-ṣūrati l-yā’.

Determining each individual scribe’s Schreiberschule is important. One of many reasons for this is that it makes decoding of difficult parts of the manuscript easier, allowing us inter alia to determine the pronunciation of certain words according to the way they are written. For example, it is very likely that מוסי (KAR 6b, 3) should be pronounced mūsā (with an ā, not with īmāla, even though the two other manuscripts probably reads mōšē [GAM 9b, 14; CAI 12b, 3]), because the letter yā’ is consistently appearing in the place of ‘alif maqṣūra throughout the KAR manuscript. Another, highly interesting example of personal orthographic style is found in GAM, where the scribe’s individually standardized style has resulted in the use of r in the place of emphatic l, (e.g. אלה > אלה ‘God’) which will be discussed in detail below (in chapter 5.2.2.14).

---

156 Hary’s examples from the Megillah, written in Later Egyptian JA orthography also points to a strong notion of Schreiberschule pertaining to each individual scribe (1992:97).
157 A discussion on this follows in chapter 5.4.5.
158 More on final yā’ denoting StA ‘alif maqṣūra in 5.1.4.3.
5.1.2 Consonants

Phonetic realization of NSIC (or EgJA) sounds are to a large extent identical to that of StC; there are at least no previous studies on the variety indicating a difference as such. The JA phonemes and their Latin equivalents used in this paper, however, needs to be explained. Since we are dealing with three written manuscripts from the same time and place, the inventory of consonant phonemes is very similar in GAM, KAR and CAI. Therefore, I have used a single set of Latin symbols for all three. The Hebrew alphabet consists of only 22 graphemes, whereas Arabic consists of 28. Therefore, JA makes use of a number of slightly modified Hebrew graphemes, usually supplied with signs (usually one, two or three dots, or a stroke) above or beneath the grapheme (as shown in the table below). It is important to note that even though some graphemes are intended to yield a different phonemic representation, they do not always differ in shape (this typically concerns palatalized and non-palatalized נ and ת). In the following analysis, the graphemes have been transcribed into their StA Latin transliteration, according to the standards presented in the following table:

---

159 According to Rosenbaum’s 20th-century findings. See Rosenbaum 2002a:122
5.1.2.1 tafxīm and tarqīq

One of the most striking features found in the three manuscripts, is what may be referred to as tafxīm 'emphasis, pharyngealization', more precisely 'suprasegmental spread of emphasis'. The process of tarqīq stands for the opposite of tafxīm, namely a 'de-emphasis, de-pharyngealization' or a 'diluting' of an already emphatic sound. In the case of tafxīm or

---

160 In the case of tafxīm, we see that one common feature, constricted pharynx, may be used to represent all the different sets of the same phenomenon which are found in each language (notably pharyngealization, velarization, lowering and backing [or absence of fronting], glottalization, absence of aspiration, additional rounding of the labials and trilling of r), as long as the practical effect on the surface form is the same. See Hobermann 1989.
tarqīq, sounds are partly affected by their environment by emphasis, as a result of an additional articulation of the ‘usual’ sounds, by velarization and pharyngealization. Such juxtaposed sounds are homorganic and share manner of articulation, but are co-articulated by a contraction of the upper pharynx.\textsuperscript{161} There are a number of different specifications pertaining to each particular language and dialect when describing the phonologic nature and suprasegmental spread of emphasis; the rules governing one Arabic dialect or variety may differ from the rules governing another Arabic dialect or variety.

As shown in Harrell’s (1957:70ff.) findings on emphasis spread in StC, it may spread from a single syllable to the whole word, in both directions.\textsuperscript{162} In the manuscripts, we find written examples violating this rule, such as \textsuperscript{163}サーティ่าง (GAM 13b, 1) \textsuperscript{163}≈ StA ‘my sultanate’.

Here, the initial syllable (/sal/)\textsuperscript{164} is split between one non-emphatic sound and one emphatic sound. The rules governing this in StC, however, are clear: Emphasis never occur as a single, isolated segment. It has a ‘minimum range’, viz. a feature affecting at least one syllable.\textsuperscript{165} Nevertheless, the scribe does not violate the StC ‘minimum range’ rule with consistency, occasionally writing צרטתי (GAM 4b, 6) and צרטנה (4b, 6), where the emphasis (correctly according to StC phonetic rules) occur throughout the whole syllable.

In the example ofサーティ以上 above, there are clear indications of a somewhat metathetic process involving the place of an emphatic sound metathesizing with the place of a non-emphatic

\textsuperscript{161} Bakalla 2009:421f.
\textsuperscript{162} Whether there is a spread or not, depends on certain factors, like vowel quality and syllable structure, but these factors only govern the progressive kind. Progressive emphasis spreads from an emphatic syllable to the following syllable if the emphatic syllable is closed and the vowel of the following syllable is open. Regressive emphasis spread is not restricted by vowel quality or syllable structure—it simply spreads from an emphatic syllable to the preceding syllable, albeit only in the same word, cf. Broselow 1976:45f.; Hoberman 1989:73
\textsuperscript{163} For a discussion and examples regarding \textit{r} in the place of \textit{l}, see chapter 5.1.2.14.
\textsuperscript{164} Note that a dot beneath the phoneme is used to denote emphasis/pharyngealization.
\textsuperscript{165} Harrell 1957:78
sound, i.e. a changes of the emphasis’ place (at least in written form). Other examples illustrating this process are זהר פ' (GAM 3a, 9) = StC 'ittalla' fi or 'ittalla' fi ‘to look closely at’, אנט סרחא אינומיה (GAM 4a, 3-4) = StA 'are you righteous or wicked?', והם (GAM 11a, 16; 12b, 2) = StA 구וריה, (and) her voice167, 'to become inactive, out of work’ and זלחתא (CAI 17a, 10) = StA מלתני ‘my sultanate’. This process is also attested in other JA sources from the same period,168 but they are admittedly more frequent with one of the scribes than the other two (almost all occurrences are attested in GAM). Whether this reflects actual pronunciation (i.e. a deviation from the principles governing StA distribution of emphasis or StC spread of emphasis), stylistic preferences, pseudo-corrections or merely type errors is hard to say. Yet, it is important to note once again, that the occurrences of emphasis switch in the GAM and CAI manuscripts are rather random; sometimes the original (StA or StC) place of the emphatic sound is retained, sometimes it is not.

The topics discussed here, namely metathesis of the place of the emphasis, and the violation of the StC ‘minimum range’ rule, very much points to an indifferent attitude with the scribe towards whether to use emphasis in plene or not. In Khan’s (2006:54f.) paper on a 19th century JA commercial letter from Egypt, he notes that “in numerous words[,] an original emphatic š is written with ℓ rather than צ […]]. Some words with this type of spelling, however, also exhibit tafxīm in another letter, e.g. הנסלכום ‘it reaches you’ […]], suggesting that the ℓ does not necessarily reflect a loss of emphasis (tarqiq) but is simply an

166 As illustrated in this example (as well as discussed in the preceding paragraph), the place of the emphatic sound may be either maintained or switched; the distribution seems to be arbitrary. Both זהור פ' and זלחתא display emphatic ℓ, but זהור פ' displays t muṣaffa (emphasized), whereas זלחתא displays s muṣaffaq (de-emphasized)
167 We also find 송FLICT spelled correctly according to StA, in GAM 8b, 9 = StA 'with the fire whip'.
orthographic alternant of ⟨צ⟩. This topic in general, and the manuscripts’ different reflexes of the sibilants s and š in particular, is further treated in chapter 5.1.2.9 and 5.1.2.10.

5.1.2.2 tarqīq: t for StA ŏ

The switch from t for ŏ are widely attested throughout the GAM manuscript. For example, we find mantlek (GAM 4a, 8) = StA מתלך ‘free, unrestricted’, (GAM 4b, 11) = StA ‘I/we feed’169, (GAM 3a, 16) = StA ‘you (singular feminine) utter, pronounce’ and הבאה (GAM passim) = StA ‘level’. In line with Wagner’s (2010:35) observations on the same feature, it seems to be limited to particular scribes (the switch is not attested at all in KAR, and only once in CAI, albeit here most probably as a result of metathesis of the emphasis’ place rather than tarqīq).

5.1.2.3 ŏ for StA t

In GAM, ŏ in the place of t occurs in the environment of other emphatic phonemes, albeit not very often. Some examples are מסטורין (GAM 11b, 9) = StA مستוריין ‘hidden, protected (plural)’, (GAM 11a, 16; 12b, 2) = StA ‘(and) her voice’ and יחתרק (GAM 13a, 1) = StA ‘burn up, be burned’, displaying either taťəm or a switch of the emphasis’ place, as discussed above.

5.1.2.4 Reflexes of StA ŏ

The letter ŏ is sometimes replaced by t in the CAI manuscript (which does differentiate between ḥ and ŏ), in line with StC pronunciation. Some examples are התאתי (CAI 13b, 12) = StC wi-tāni ‘(and) second’, התאתי (CAI 13b, 13) = StC wi-tālît ‘(and) third’ and וודאתי (CAI 13b, 8) ‘(and) speak (fem.) to me’, resembling StC haddit. With regard to the latter example,

169 More on the nifli and nifliū denoting the 1st person singular and plural respectively of the imperfect, in chapter 5.2.3.1.
Badawi and Hinds (1986:195) points out that the second, alternative StC form (which is not used in any of the manuscripts), ḥaddīṣ, is restricted to ʿāmmiyat al-muṭaqqafīn ‘Educated Spoken Arabic’. Furthermore, no attestations of this StC voiceless interdental fricative s as a reflex of t are attested in the material.

5.1.2.5 Reflexes of StA ḏ

In GAM and CAI, where the scribes distinguish between d and ḏ, ḏ is mostly used to represent the Arabic equivalent ḏ, like דךּ (CAI 17a, 3) ‘that punishment’; דךּ (GAM 8a, 5) ‘that (demonstrative)’. d is also used in the place of StA ḏ (shift from StA interdental fricatives to stops, like we are familiar with from StC and other Arabic dialects), as in דךּךּ (CAI 5a, 8) = StA נַכְר StC dakar ‘male’ and דךּךּךּ (CAI 13a, 5) = StA נַךְר StC dirā ‘arm cubit’.

Somewhat surprising though, in GAM, in almost every occurrence of the relative pronoun דךּ when spelled with double lām (‘alif-lām ligature + ordinary lām’), ḏ is replaced by d, דךּךּ (GAM passim) (except in GAM 7a, 12), albeit never when written with only one lām (only דךּ), like דךּךּ (GAM passim).

There are a few instances of spelling StA ḏ (StC d) with ḏ as a result of tafrīm, attested in דךּך (GAM 4b, 3) = StA מַךְּ נַךְ (made) of gold’ and דךּךּךּ (GAM 7a, 13) = StA אֵךְ (and) they took’.

z is frequently used to represent ḏ (as in StC) in GAM, albeit never in CAI and KAR.

Examples are דךּךּך (GAM passim) = StAذلك ‘that (dem.)’, דךּךּך (GAM 8b, 10) = StA who

171 More on the issue of the native speaker’s choice of certain phonemes in StC can be found in Hary 1992:8f.; 259f.
172 KAR does not distinguish between the two.
punishment’ and ‘your sins, misdeeds’.

5.1.2.6 tafṣīm: ḍ (or ʂ) for StA d

The letter ḍ (or ʂ) is written in the place of d in one incident: หนาวה ארוץ לך (GAM 3b, 16) ≈ StA حتى أردلك ‘in order to respond to you’. The most plausible explanation for the switch to ʂ is a misspelling of ʂ for ḍ, in turn representing d affected by progressive spread of emphasis from r within the closed syllable /rudd/.

5.1.2.7 d for StA ḍ

There are also attestations of d replacing ḍ. Some examples are ודרבני 드רבה (GAM 7b, 8) ≈ StA וضربני ضربا ‘and he hit me (with a hit)’ and ודרבני (GAM 8b, 9). Note, however, that the GAM scribe (although correctly according to StA conventions,) writes וצרבני (GAM 9a, 1) just a few sentences below, somehow inconsistent with the rest of the manuscript. Although not occurring very frequently, the d-reflex of StA ḍ is found in Egyptian JA orthography from the 16th century (and in copies from later time), the reason being that the letter d phonetically was the closest Hebrew realization of the respective Arabic phoneme. In connection to this Hary (1992:93) questions whether this particular reflex indicates tarqīq, inter alia pointing to the works of Bar-Asher (1988:8; 22) on the d reflex of ḍ in the Maghrebi šaṛḥ. In contrast, Tirosh-Becker (1990:59) argues that there has been a loss of emphasis.

---

173 ḍ is consistently represented by ʂ elsewhere in GAM.
174 Hary 1992:93
5.1.2.8 Reflexes of StA ẓ (ḏ)

Regarding the reflexes of StA ẓ attested in the material, some of the examples reveal whether we are dealing with a stop or fricative, whereas others are more difficult to interpret, as will be demonstrated in the following paragraphs.

The merging in pronunciation of ẓ and d is an old phenomenon, already attested in JA texts from the end of the first millennium. Although not consistent throughout, there are occasional replacement of ẓ for d in all three manuscripts, as illustrated in (GAM 6a, 11-12) ≈ StA ظاهر وأظهر أبيض ‘a red back and a white back’; (KAR (passim) ẓ and d) ‘his back’, (KAR 3a, 6) ≈ StA ظلماته, ظلماهم ‘(and) its darkness’, (KAR 3a, 8) ≈ StA ʿعظم ‘great’ (but in KAR 4b, 7 and in KAR 7b, 2) ≈ StA نظرت ‘you looked, observed’; (CAI 8b, 12) ≈ StA نظر ‘he looks, observes’.

We also find instances of (non-emphatic) d replacing (emphatic) ẓ: (GAM 6b, 11) ≈ StA ظهره ‘his back’ and (GAM 11a, 12) ≈ StA نظرت ‘you saw’. This may either be interpreted as a result of tarqiq, or as Wagner (2010: 31f.) notes: “This may reflect the merging of the dental and alveolar plosives (after ẓ had merged with d into ẓ) or, more likely, the orthographical representation of not only dental plosive d and interdental fricative ẓ, but also of alveolar plosive and fricative ẓ and ẓ by the grapheme ẓ in certain layers of the vernacular”.

ẓ is occasionally used to represent StA ẓ (as widely attested in StC) in GAM, albeit never in CAI and KAR. Examples are (GAM 11a, 16) ≈ StA ظلمون ‘wrongdoers’ and (GAM 13b, 12) ≈ StA ظلمته ‘and his injustice, misdeeds’.

---

175 See e.g. Blau and Hopkins 1987:13
5.1.2.9 tafxiṃ: "ṣ for StA s"

In cases of spelling with "ṣ for s, it is likely to presume that the examples below are results of spread of regressive emphasis (tafxiṃ), e.g. in (GAM 4b, 6) ≈ StA ‘rule, reign’; (CAI 11a, 12) ≈ StA ‘with a whip’; (CAI 14a, 13) ≈ StA ‘(its) middle, center’, and (CAI 14b, 10) ≈ StA ‘hidden, protected (plural)’.

5.1.2.10 s for StA "ṣ"

There are also examples of "ṣ for s in the GAM manuscript. They are (GAM 3b, 9; 4a, 8) ≈ StA ‘fluent, eloquent, articulate’; (GAM 4b, 8) ≈ StA ‘beautiful, good looking’; (GAM 7a, 9) ≈ StA ‘his friends, companions’, (GAM 4a, 3) ≈ StA ‘good’, (GAM 11b, 8; 11b, 9; 11b, 10) ≈ StC ‘you became (plural)’, (GAM 11b, 15) ≈ StA ‘its branches’; (GAM 4b, 15) ≈ StA ‘I refused’ and (CAI passim) ≈ StA ‘chest’. There are no strong indications of reflection of tarqiq in these cases, in fact they all seem to include other emphatic consonant phonemes in neighboring positions like h, r, c, g and t, thus it is likely that the words have not lost their emphatic character. The phenomenon of (non-emphatic) s in the environment of emphatic consonants as such is a puzzling one. Hary (1992:93) does not rule out the possibility of tarqiq, but agrees with Tirosh-Becker (1990:60) that the spelling of s for "ṣ does not necessarily indicate loss of emphatic quality. In support of this view, we see

---

176 However, we find cases of correct spelling of s according to StA, like e.g. (GAM 4a, 11). A discussion on this follows in the next paragraph.

177 This is in line with Khan’s observations, who notes that “the majority of [the cases of suprasegmental spread] are in words containing r” (2006:54).

178 Similar to mine, Hary’s examples also include emphatic consonant phonemes (like h, r, c, g and t) in neighboring positions.
that there is a clear inconsistency regarding ş in the position of s attested in the GAM manuscript, here illustrated by the following variants of the word 'sultanate':

(4b, 6); (4b, 6); (4b, 11) (13b, 1)

5.1.2.11 § for StA s

ş for s is occasionally attested in GAM: بلسان فصيح (GAM 4a, 7-8) = StA السما 'in an eloquent/articulate language' and يفعل celular (GAM 6a, 9) = StA is-sama 'the sky, heaven', which is probably a result of Hebrew and Aramaic orthographic influence. In these particular examples, the switch might also be directly influenced by the Hebrew words לשון 'language' and שמיים 'sky, heaven (written in the plural)'.

5.1.2.12 s for StA ş

In GAM and KAR there is a tendency to replace s with ş, thus אסדemin (GAM 7b, 12) = StA אסד אמין 'stronger, more intense than', (GAM 11b, 14) = StA אסד אנימה 'the devils', (KAR 3a, 6) = StA אסד אמין 'and its intensity' and והו wi-huwwa màsi (GAM 3a, 6) = StC wi-huwwa màsi 'and he walked, as he was walking'. This phenomenon may be attributed either to the influence of the letters' Hebrew epigraphic equivalents sin and shin or to the influence of Judaeo-Spanish orthography (Hary 1992:90). However, the same word is attested, written with a ş, inرش (KAR 6a, 6). In other words, the practice of replacing s with ş is not consistent. Another example, in GAM, illustrating the same inconsistency is והו פייעל כי רצהיו (GAM 11a, 11) vs. והו פייעל כי רצהיו (GAM 12b, 15) 'and does not please Him'. According to Hary (1992:260), the use of şin / sin is often due to influence from Hebrew orthography.

179 Note again that the letter ū here represents an emphatic variant of ū. More on this in chapter 5.1.2.14.
5.1.2.13 Voicing: z for StA š

Probably due to the consonant cluster ġš, the š is voiced in one of the manuscripts, thus (KAR 3a, 12) ≈ StA מַגְשִׁי ‘unconscious’.\textsuperscript{180} When not appearing in a consonant cluster, we find (KAR 8b, 13) ≈ StA מַגְשִׁי or (Old Arabic) מַגְשִׁי or שָׁעֵי StC ġašayānu 'his fainting, unconsciousness', spelled out with the original š.

5.1.2.14 tafsim: r in the place of emphatic l

There is an orthographic similarity between the two graphemes ר and ל in the GAM manuscript, in fact so similar \textit{prima facie} that one might simply overlook the word \textit{allāh} ‘God’ when written אָלָה, or \textit{ṭalab} ‘he requested, required, necessitated’ when written טָרָב, i.e. with r instead of l (thus representing l in an emphatic environment). In this particular manuscript, the only thing separating the two graphemes is a qoṣošel yod (the yod’s ‘cap’ or ‘crown’) above the r, thus r is easily interpreted as l. In 9b, 17 and 12a, 17, however, where the catch word is written in the lower left corner of the folio in a different script, this one resembling Aramaic-Hebrew cursive 19th century Algerian,\textsuperscript{181} it is impossible to misinterpret the grapheme as l (a photocopy of the manuscript can be found at the end of this paper). In contrast to the cursive primarily used in GAM, the font used for the catch word makes a clear distinction between r and l. Consequently, when comparing the catch word with the same word on the following page, the grapheme used in the catch word confirms the notion of an emphatic l written as r in certain environments—a feature that, as far as I am aware, has never been attested before in written form. In Tirosh-Becker’s (1988:86f.) recordings of Constantinian Rabbis, she has encountered some rare and inconsistent examples of r instead

\textsuperscript{180} It is surprising though, that original š here have switched to z, most likely through s. If not, the z must be an equivalent of postalveolar ġ (as in the Levant pronunciation of ġim), but this does not seem like a plausible explanation.

\textsuperscript{181} cf. Table of Early Semitic alphabets by M. Lidzbarski, in Gesenius 1910
of l in the words faďrak for ʼḍărīk,  faďrak for ʼḍărīk,  daemon for ʼĺin in an emphatic environment, however it is not attested in the spelling. The pronunciation with r in the place of l (among other pronunciation variants including emphatic ones) was also attested in darwaqt or darwaq for dolwaq(t) ‘now’ by Marçais (1977:254ff.)\textsuperscript{182} in Algerian Arabic.\textsuperscript{183} Also, referring to StC, and not necessarily its non-Standard varieties, Rosenbaum came over l pronounced as r, especially in words of foreign origin, e.g. borovar ‘pullover’, orredi ‘already’, as well as one Jewish informant telling him that some Jews pronounced the word dolär ‘dollar’ as drär.\textsuperscript{184}

Some examples from GAM of consistent spelling with r for l when in emphatic or pharyngealized environment (mufaxxam) are āverta fi (GAM 3a, 9) \textasciitilde{} StC ʼiṭṭalla` fi or ʼiṭṭalla` fi ‘to look closely at’, ṭawraḥ (GAM 13b, 15) \textasciitilde{} StA ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ (GAM 13b, 15) \textasciitilde{} StC is-sālḥin ‘the worthy, upright (plural)’ and ṭawraḥ (GAM 11b, 4) \textasciitilde{} StA ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ,  ṭawraḥ ‘I became inactive, out of work’. There are dozens of examples throughout the manuscript illustrating this extraordinary feature, occurring in a very consistent manner (listed below), although the occurrence of emphatic l following preposition bi-,  ṭawraḥ (GAM 10a, 13); (11a, 7; 11a, 11) ‘in God’, is puzzling. It should rather have been rendered without emphasis due to the preceding i neutralizing the emphatic l. Such exceptions to the rule leaves us wondering whether they are in fact exceptions, if we are dealing with type errors, pseudo-correct features (or standardizations of these), or if they render the sounds as they were actually pronounced.\textsuperscript{185}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{182} Here, Marçais notes that these pronunciations variants are “prevalent throughout Algeria, [occurring in the] urban, rural [and] Bedouin [variety]” (1977:254).
  \item \textsuperscript{183} Prof. Ofra Tirosh-Becker deserve special thanks for pointing this out for me.
  \item \textsuperscript{184} This information is based on personal e-mail correspondence with Prof. Rosenbaum and other scholars in the field of Egyptian JA.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} In this connection, Blanc have noted that de-emphatization may occur in NS\textsc{c} (and probably also in St\textsc{c}): St\textsc{c} w-mrātu > NS\textsc{c}/St\textsc{c} w-mrātu ‘and his wife’ (1974:218).
\end{itemize}
Regarding my aforementioned thoughts on the scribe’s alleged indifferent attitude towards rendering of tafsim and tarqiq and switch of the place of the emphasis, we should look into one conspicuous inconsistency found in the GAM manuscript, namely מתתלב. Here, the curious morphophonology of this word’s seemingly non-emphatic realization will be discussed, yet by no means solved—but rather than ignoring this strange inconsistency, I wish to shed some more light on the issue cum grano salis. The example of מתתלב (GAM 3b, 15) = StA מתתלב ‘requesting, requiring, necessitating’ is either inconsistently written with t instead of t, or a result a spread of tarqiq (whether it is regressive or progressive is hard to say, as will become clear in the following), possibly due to the lexeme’s pattern. If trying to render the StA VIII. stem active participle mutatallib, the scribe has written the word inconsistently according to his own personal orthographic style. If the scribe were actually rendering the pattern mutatallib according to his own personal orthographic style, he should have written it with the phoneme r (מתתלב) because of the emphatic environment, as discussed above. Interestingly, the verb טראב ([GAM 3a, 12] = StAطلب), consisting of the same original root consonants, is attested in the same manuscript written with the phoneme r. The only reasonable, yet very questionable explanation for the tarqiq in מתתלב is that we are dealing with a pattern resembling a ‘high-vowel-i’ participle pattern like miḥliww (IX. stem) ‘sweetish, sugary’, mistidif (X. stem, mediae infirmae) ‘having received permission’ and/or mistihill (X. stem mediae geminate) ‘found (to be) ḫalāl’\(^\text{186}\), namely mittilib (V. stem mifṭi‘il). In turn, the environment of high vowel i, must have resulted in the spread of tarqiq.

When dealing with tafsim and tarqiq based on written material, it is essential to determine the degree of consistency pertaining to each single scribe (as discussed in 5.1.1.2).

Regarding the spelling of r in the place of emphatic l in the GAM manuscript, we find that the degree of consistency is not 100%, but still high. A complete list of the scribe’s

\(^{186}\) The StC participle patterns presented are found in Woidich 2006:85
consistencies and inconsistencies in connection to this is presented below, with reference to folio and line number together with its respective equivalent StA or StC lexeme between brackets:

\( (i) \) Consistent use of \( r \) for emphatic 1

\( \text{矍ע} \) (3a, 9) = StC \( iťalla \) \( fi \) ‘he looked closely at’

\( \text{דרש} \) (3a, 12) = StC \( ţalab \) ‘he requested, required, necessitated’

\( \text{ארד} \) (3a, 12; 3b, 7; 3b, 10; 9a, 9; 9b, 17 [in the \( šomer \) \( daf \)]; 10a, 1; 10a, 12; 11a, 13; 12a, 17 [in the \( šomer \) \( daf \)]; 12b, 1; 13a, 13) = StA \( \text{لل} \) ‘God’

\( \text{תרוח} \) (3b, 5) = StC \( wi-yaṭlub \) ‘(and) he requests, requires, necessitates’

\( \text{大事} \) (4a, 3); \( \text{סרתא} \) (11a, 14) = StA ‘pious, upright’

\( \text{אנראתינ} \) (13b, 15) = StC \( is-sālḥin \) ‘the worthy, upright (plural)’

\( \text{רראת} \) (4a, 4) = StA ‘wicked, vicious’

\( \text{ר רכש(תנStreamWriter(4a,13) = StC \( wi-niṭla \) ‘I rise, appear’}

\( \text{זתרトイ} \) (4b, 6); \( \text{זתרטנה} \) (4b, 6); \( \text{זתרטנה} \) (13b, 1) = StA ‘سلطنة /سلطنتي (my) reign, sultanate’

\( \text{ורדרוי} \) (5b, 1) = StC \( wi-ṭalūni \) ‘(and) they brought me...’

\( \text{ברטיר} \) (7b, 10) = StA ‘bribe’

\( \text{לאכ} \) (9b, 3) = StC \( ‘axallis \) ‘I finish, bring to an end’

\( \text{רבתרתי} \) (11b, 4) = StA ‘became inactive, out of work’

\( \text{ראנתל} \) (12a, 1) = StA ‘colocynth’

\( \text{סוטה} \) (12a, 13) = StA ‘I slap, strike against’

\( \text{ותרתוור} \) (13a, 15) = StA ‘(and) you ask, request’

\( \text{ותרפאת} \) (13b, 12) = StA ‘(and) its darkness’

\[\text{187 The missing parts of the word are interpreted by means of the critical edition’s apparatus (in chapter 4).}\]
(ii) Possible inconsistencies in the use of l in an emphatic environment

\(\text{jsonp l (3a, 14)} \approx \text{StA 'please'}\)

\(\text{jsonp l (3a, 15)} \approx \text{StA 'requesting, requiring, necessitating'}\)

\(\text{jsonp l (3a, 9); (4a, 8)} \approx \text{StA 'free, un-restricted'}\)

\(\text{jsonp l (4a, 10)} \approx \text{StA الله 'God' or 'a god'}\)

\(\text{jsonp l (6a, 3)} \approx \text{StC يُقَالُโนُن 'they free me (of)'}\)

\(\text{jsonp l (11b, 10)} \approx \text{StA 'free'}\)

(iii) Possible inconsistencies in the use of r in a non-emphatic environment

\(\text{jsonp r (10a, 13); (11a, 7; 11a, 11)}^{189} \approx \text{StA الله 'in/by God'}\)

\(\text{jsonp r (13b, 7)} \approx \text{StA الأرامل 'the widows'}\)

These findings may help us further understand the Later Egyptian JA orthographic traditions for reflecting switch of the emphasis’ place and spread of tafxīm and tarqīq. It is a phenomenon that deserves further investigation in the future.

5.1.2.15 l for r

In addition to the latter case, the GAM manuscript contains another interchange among the liquid consonants, namely l written in the place of r. Examples are

\(\text{jsonp r (GAM 6a, 8)} \approx \text{StC riglēn 'feet, legs'; (GAM 11b, 5)} \approx \text{StC riglēhum 'their feet, legs' as well as one attestation of (GAM 4b, 10)^{190} \approx \text{StA كُثر 'load, abundance'. Also, Rosenbaum have encountered r > l in ladār 'radar', said by a driver speaking StC.}^{191}\)

---

188 Possibly ilāh 'a god', however not in all occurrences.

189 But الله (10b, 11).

190 But حار (passim) elsewhere.

191 This information is based on personal e-mail correspondence with Prof. Rosenbaum and other scholars in the field of Egyptian JA.
5.1.2.16 n for StA l

One example of n replacing l is found in the word סֶלֶשׁ (GAM 10a, 11) \(\approx\) StA סֶלֶשׁ ‘chain’.

It is not impossible that we are dealing with a type error here, as the feature is not attested elsewhere throughout the three manuscripts.\(^{192}\)

5.1.2.17 De-voicing: k for StA j (StC g)

Although StA letter jīm has been pronounced with a velar stop g in Egypt since at least the 17th century,\(^{193}\) it is not always easy to decide whether the scribe is using the one or the other, as the text occasionally exhibits strong StA influence, not to forget the frequent occurrence of pseudo-corrections. However, in GAM, de-voicing k for StC g is attested inlevation (GAM 13b, 12) \(\approx\) StA ה(cal) ‘(to) our bodies’.

5.1.2.18 ˤ for StA q and q for StA ³

Not surprisingly, in a version as ‘colloquial’ as GAM, there are many instances of spelling with ˤ for q, reflecting the switch from q to glottal stop ³ in a number of Arabic dialects, especially the sedentary urban varieties like StC.\(^{194}\) Some of the examples are רֵאָלֶז אֶלֶה (GAM 3a, 12-13) \(\approx\) StA ואֶלֶה יָאֵל ‘and he said O, God’, רֵאָלֶז אֶלֶה (GAM 7b, 4) \(\approx\) StA ואֶלֶה יָאֵל ‘and he said O, God’, רֵאָלֶז אֶלֶה (GAM 4a, 13) \(\approx\) StA וּלְכַנְעָה ‘for hunting and shooting’ and רֵאָלֶז אֶלֶה (GAM 4b, 5) \(\approx\) StA וּלְכַנְעָה ‘for hunting and shooting’ and רֵאָלֶז אֶלֶה (GAM 8b, 8) \(\approx\) StA פְּקָדָנָה ‘they seized me’.

\(^{192}\) In this connection, Prof. Rosenbaum reminded me that l is found pronounced as n in StC, e.g. גַּרְנָא instead of גַּרְנָא ‘newspaper’, אֶסְמָעִין instead of אֶסְמָאאִל ‘Ismael’, נַמְא instead of נַמְא ‘when’.

\(^{193}\) cf. Hary 1996.

\(^{194}\) The ˤ reflex of StA q occur in EgJA even when uttering words of Hebrew origin, as šatta‘be quiet’ derived from the Hebrew root consonants š-t-q, or ‘adidd (the liturgical prayer) Kaddish’ derived from the Hebrew word kaddiš. See Rosenbaum 2002a:123; 2002b:36

\(^{195}\) For a discussion on the verbal stem switch from IV. to I., see chapter 5.2.3.3v.
Somewhat more surprising, the switch also occur the other way around, probably a result of hyper-correction. The most plausible reason for the switch is that the scribes did not always know when a dialectal glottal stop represented the StA q and not an original ʔ. This consistently occurs in the GAM manuscript, as the following examples illustrate:

(GAM 3a, 15) = StA ‘to allow, permit’, (GAM 12b, 6-7) = StA ‘those things, matters’, (GAM 9a, 5) = StA ‘O, (my) Mother’,

(GAM 7a, 12; 7a, 14) ≈ StA ‘medications’, (GAM 10b, 14) ≈ StA ‘how did you find, how did you see’, (GAM 11a, 9; 11a, 11) ≈ StA ‘believe in God’, (GAM 6a, 9) ≈ StA ‘she shakes’.

5.1.2.19 Double spelling of consonants

Double, spelling of the consonants yāʔ and wāw is a frequent feature in all three manuscripts when denoting gemination (šadda) and diphthongs, in other words the marking of w and y as consonants, as well as to distinguish it from a mater lectionis, e.g. (CAI 11a, 3) ‘the first, former (plural)’, (CAI passim) = StA ‘Earth’, (GAM 10b, 1; KAR 7a, 1); (CAI 13a, 9) = StA ‘those snakes’, (GAM 12a, 11; CAI 15b, 5) = StA ‘with betrayal’, (KAR 3a, 13; CAI 7a, 4) = StA ‘revive, wake me up (plural)’ and (GAM 5a, 13) = (hypo-correct) StA + StC meyya ‘four hundred’. This type of double spelling is a typical Egyptian JA orthographic

196 Here, the GAM scribe does not seem to be aware that the first syllable is a part of the verbal pattern.
197 In this last example, I cannot find a good explanation for the final q. Possibly, it is due to the same consonant switch as pointed out above, but initially a result of the following ‘alif wašla in il-’ard ‘the Earth’ pronounced as , which together with the verb, presumably constitutes a fixed expression: (GAM 10b, 4) = StA ‘the Earth would shake’ (the syllables are distributed as follows: /ta.za’/za’. il.’ard/), thus tisa’za’ il-’ard > tisa’za’ il-’ard > tisa’za’ il-’ard.
198 Khan 2006:53
199 See a discussion on the spelling of in chapter 5.3.3.1.
feature, attested in other sources, *inter alia* from the 16th century, and reflects the influence of the Hebrew orthography of the Mishna.

Double spelling of consonants also includes writing the šadda (albeit only in CAI, as in [CAI 12a, 5]) as well as the geminated lām in *allaḏi*, ‘that (relative)’ found in GAM *(passim)*, where lām ʎ comes in addition to the `alif-lām ligature`. It is also attested *inter alia* in the different ways of spelling ‘illā (GAM 10b, 10) ‘except’, `ilayya (GAM *passim*) ‘to me’ and allāh (KAR *passim*; CAI *passim*) ‘God’. The examples exhibiting the `alif-lām ligature` followed by lām ʎ are in line with Wagner’s (2010:38f.) observation on double spelling, which is probably occurring by analogy with the conventional StA spelling of الله.

### 5.1.3 Vowels

Interestingly, the scribes of all three manuscripts presented in this paper write both long and short vowels in plene, as well as vocalizing a few words (in GAM and KAR) with diacritics. These diacritics often reflects the dialectal form of the word, whereas the orthography (the *rasm*) reflects the StA form. For example, [CAI 1b, 6] ≈ StA [CAI 1b, 6] `וַיְמָלֵא` ‘(and) paid close attention’ would have disguised its dialectal (`ימָלֵא`) feature had the diacritics not been applied. One especially common feature found in JA texts, and attested widely throughout all three manuscripts, is short vowel u written in plene. Some examples are [GAM *passim*; KAR 1b, 13] ≈ StA [GAM passim; KAR 1b, 13] `וֶהֶלֶכֶה` ‘His kingdom, kingship’, [GAM *passim*; KAR *passim*; CAI *passim*] ≈ StA [GAM passim; KAR passim; CAI] `וַיְֽלָכֶה` ‘I was’ and [GAM *passim*; KAR *passim*; CAI] `וַיְֽלָכֶה` ‘I was’.

---

200 cf. Hary 1992:91
201 cf. Hary 1992:264
202 This is also pointed out in Khan (2006:39).
203 Occasionally throughout this paper, the JA example is directly followed by a tentative, transcribed reconstruction where I have tried to illustrate the pronunciation according to my own understanding. I take full responsibility for any errors here.
204 The same phenomenon is attested in Hary (1992:248), and is typical of Late Egyptian JA orthography.
passim) = StA قُلتُ ‘I said’, StA كُثر ‘abundance, load’ as well as many others presented below. This is a widely attested feature in the 16th-century Cairene sources (which were copied as late as the 19th century), found in the data of Hary (1992:90). Although not as numerous as the short u in plene, cases of short i and short a in plene are also attested in the three manuscripts.\(^{205}\)

Sometimes, the plene vowels are written not necessary in order to help the reader to avoid misunderstandings, but simply in order to indicate their pronunciation, curiously enough when there is no ambiguity. Likewise, the scribes sometimes leaves out vowels that would have been written in plene according to StA writing conventions.\(^{206}\) An example illustrating this seemingly indifferent attitude towards rules governing the use of matres lectionis, is where the CAI scribe writes ועקבוני ‘they came after me’ in the catch word of folio 9b, but writes ועאקבוני when continuing on 10a, clearly not concerned with whether to use plene or defective a (i.e. marked long a, ‘alif, or unmarked short a, fatha). Other examples illustrating this point are found in CAI (6a, 14; 6b, 2), where the scribe writes מפי in the catch word (the last line) of folio 6a, but מפי when continuing on the next folio, and in GAM, כנת (4b, 13) vs. כונת (GAM passim) = StA كُنت ‘I was’. It is worth mentioning that כנת is written at the very end of the line, probably leading the author to shorten the word. Nevertheless, this again supports the notion of a somewhat indifferent attitude towards StA conventions regarding matres lectionis. As a consequence of studying written material where scriptio plena and defective are not applied correctly according to StA rules, one must naturally undermine the role and importance of vowel quantity (length of articulation). On the contrary, this calls for special attention to the vowel quality, because it may reveal the number of syllables in a

\(^{205}\) This is also a feature occurring in Hary (1992:91; 248f.), but is not as common as the plene short u.

\(^{206}\) This is pointed out in Khan 2006:52
word, as well as occurrences of vowel switch, epenthetic vowels and ūmāla. These topics will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.1.3.1 Reflexes of StA i

(i) Switch from i to u. We find attestations of a switch from StA i to u in all three manuscripts, a feature also attested in Rosenbaum (2002a), illustrating the preference of u over StC i in the EgJA variety. Wagner’s 18th/19th century sources (2010:57f.) verify the findings of Rosenbaum. For example, we have עשרון técnico (KAR 9a, 10) ≈ StA عشرו técnico ‘twenty’, pronounced ‘ušrīn, from the phrase עשרון técnico ‘twenty four’. The switch is either due to the initial w-, assimilating i in the following syllable, or simply an attestation of a permanent switch in the NStC or EgJA variety. Other examples, apparently unique to NStC or even its EgJA variety (as they have no StC equivalent), is דורה técnico (GAM 10a, 11) ≈ StA דורה técnico ‘cubits’ and בגון职业技术 (GAM 11b, 4) ≈ StA בגון职业技术 ‘she/they became inactive, out of work’. The latter is not attested in Badawi and Hinds’ (1986) Egyptian Arabic dictionary, albeit in Spitta (1880:48). The verb pattern fuʿul is also attested in Hary’s (1992:280ff.) 19th-century copies of the Megillah, as well as in Rosenbaum’s (2002a:127ff.) sources from the 20th century, representing a shibboleth of EgJA, due to its gradual replacement elsewhere in Cairo by today’s StC pattern fiʿil.

5.1.3.2 Reflexes of StA a

(i) Switch from a to u. In NStC and its EgJA variety the number 400 is pronounced as ūrbaʿu meyya instead of StC rubʿumeyyā.207 One example of this (at least the initial syllable, which is written in plene) is אורות במאיה אלף ‘ušrīn ‘forty (CAI 5b, 2) ≈ StC rubʿumīt ‘alf ‘four

207 Rosenbaum 2002a:126; 2002b:38
hundred thousand'. Further occurrences of switch from StA a to u are (GAM 11a, 4)≈ StA لنساً (nusrâni or nusrâni208 in the singular) ‘Christian (plural)’, (CAI 12b, 5)≈ StA انفسهم ‘themselves, their souls’ and (CAI 8b, 9)≈ StC الاموم ‘the dead (plural)’. Other attestations of the switch, but most probably due to tafzîm (this is also discussed in 5.1.3.4), are written (CAI passim)≈ StA ثعلیا ‘God, praised and) exalted is He’ and (CAI 14b, 11)≈ StC الثميم ‘food’.209 Also, (KAR 8b, 13); (KAR 8b, 15); (CAI 16a, 11; 16a, 13),≈ StA غضبه ‘first’ and غضبته (Old Arabic غضبه or غضبته) StC الجعان ‘the hungry’. In most cases, the i reflex of a is evidence of 1st and 3rd person epenthetic vowel: In the perfect singular feminine we find attestations of switch from StA a to i, e.g. (GAM 3b, 8; 4a, 7)≈ StA فنتكلت الجمجمة ‘then the skull spoke’, (GAM 4a, 6)≈ (Modern) StC istamaifit ‘she listened’, فرغت من كلامها (GAM 5a, 3; 6b, 1)≈ StA ‘she finished with her words/talking’, as attested in many Arabic dialects, among them StC.210

(ii) Switch from a to i. We find examples of the switch from StA wa to StC wi, in وللنا (GAM 6a, 12)≈ StA ولون شعره ‘(and) the color of his hair’, a feature attested by vocalization, and ولت يش نا (CAI passim) ‘and what’ written with yâ’ plene. Other examples of switch from StA a to i, is واويلي (GAM 9b, 12)≈ StA أول ‘first’ and واويل (GAM 4b, 11; KAR 2b, 11; CAI 6a, 3)≈ StA الجزعان StC ig-gaʿān ‘the hungry’.

In most cases, the i reflex of a is evidence of 1st and 3rd person epenthetic vowel: In the perfect singular feminine we find attestations of switch from StA a to i, e.g. (GAM 3b, 8; 4a, 7)≈ StA فنتكلت الجمجمة ‘then the skull spoke’, (GAM 4a, 6)≈ (Modern) StC istamaifit ‘she listened’, فرغت من كلامها (GAM 5a, 3; 6b, 1)≈ StA ‘she finished with her words/talking’, as attested in many Arabic dialects, among them StC.210

208 nusrâni is restricted to ‘ammîyyat al-mugqaqfîn, cf. Badawî and Hinds 1986:866
209 A number of genuine EgJA examples may be found in Rosenbaum 2002a:128f.
210 See e.g. Woidich 2006a:75
5.1.3.3 ḫimāla: Reflexes of StA ā, ā and ā

Very generally speaking, the term ḫimāla is used to explain the fronting and raising of Old Arabic ā towards i, and a towards i, when occurring in certain conditionings (and combined with the fronting of the point of articulation of the preceding consonant). 211 The phenomenon is widespread throughout the Arabic speaking world, and its earliest historical attestations date back to Old Arabic. 212 In most modern dialects ḫimāla in medial position is represented by the vowel ē, but in some of them i. ḫimāla in final position is predominantly short and unstressed, in some dialects i, and in others e, and in some of them the somewhere between i and e. 213

There are several instances of ḫimāla in the three present manuscripts, revealed both by yāʾ plene and by vocalization. Much of the distribution of ḫimāla is quite similar to that found in other Arabic dialects, i.e. open-mid or open front vowels near front consonants, 214 as illustrated in the examples below.

The ḫimāla reflex of StA ā when followed by i is attested in the examples of עלה חילי (GAM passim; CAI 11a, 12); עלה חילי pronounced כָלָה הַלִּי (KAR 5b, 9) = StA עלי חילי 'by myself', found in all three manuscripts. In other circumstances (i.e. where i does not follow StA ā, but is only in close proximity), the reflex does not occur, 215 thus כָלָה חַלֵּי (GAM 13b, 1); כָלָה חַלֵּי (CAI 17a, 9); כָלָה חַלֵּי (KAR 9a, 14) 'in the situation of…'. This feature is consistent in all three manuscripts. There are different cases of ḫimāla throughout the manuscripts that may be considered separately, as presented below.

211 Levin 2007:311
212 Levin 1971:9ff.
214 See e.g. Blanc 1964:32
215 ḫimāla reflex of ā when preceded by i is attested in e.g. Jewish Baghdadi (StA כָלָה 'dogs' > Jewish Baghdadi klīb), cf. Blanc 1964:42
(i) **StA ā near i.** ĕmāla reflex of ā near i is attested in yôm al-ṳ̄yēma (GAM 11a, 5) \( \approx \) StA ‘on the Day of Resurrection’.

(ii) **Feminine ending.** ĕmāla reflex of feminine ending tā’ marbūta is attested in `uday (KAR 2a, 10) \( \approx \) StA ‘feminine’ and rašwe (KAR 5a, 3) \( \approx \) StA ‘bribe’.

(iii) **Verb-final and word-final a and ā.** As a reflex of final a and ā, ĕmāla is attested as follows: wi-bake buke (KAR 7a, 8) \( \approx \) StA وبكي يبكى StC wi-baka buka; and wi-bake buka (CAI 13b, 6) \( \approx \) StA وبكي يبكى StC wi-baka buka ‘(and) he wept a weep’, wi-tnalle (KAR 1b, 6) \( \approx \) StA ‘(and) paid close attention’, it’adde (KAR 7a, 6) \( \approx \) StA اتتدد and wi-awē (KAR 4b, 11) \( \approx \) StA وأقوى ‘(and) stronger’ and fe- (GAM passim; CAI passim) \( \approx \) StA fa- ‘and, so’.

(iv) **Short e in unstressed closed syllables.** In unstressed closed syllables we find occasional reflection of living Egyptian speech, (marked with short vowel šere) as in in ēmmîn (KAR 7b, 14) \( \approx \) StA أمَينون StC ʔammîn ‘safe (plural)’. Hary (1992:91) also points out this feature.

5.1.3.4 tajxis: ā / ŏ reflexes of StA and StC ā

We find occasional ŏ or ţ reflexes of StA ā in the GAM manuscript: ēmŏn (GAM 4b, 8) \( \approx \) StA āmûn ‘stature, figure’ and rās (KAR 3b, 7 GAM 5b, 15) \( \approx \) StA ‘she penetrated my eyes’. There is also one occurrence of ā or ŏ reflexes of StC ā (historically ʷ [ra’s > rās]) (CAI 15a, 2) \( \approx \) StC râs ‘head, top’, possibly due to adjacent back or

---

216 For a discussion on the verb ḳadda, see chapter 5.2.3.5v.

217 The conjunction particle fa- is almost always spelled as a separate word ʿf, indicating the ĕmāla pronunciation of the word-final a. This is also attested in Egyptian JA 19th-century copies of the Megillah (Hary 1992:269).

218 The conjunction particle fa- is also attested in GAM (5b, 15), without diacritic dot on jīm.
emphatic consonants. There is a possible switch from a to (emphatic) q or o, in (GAM 10b, 11) \( \approx \) StA and StC \textit{wi-baka buka} ‘(and) he wept a weep’.

5.1.3.5 \textit{Epenthetic vowel between StA consonant clusters}

There are a few examples of epenthetic vowel a written in plene between consonant clusters. In the example of \( \text{ופי עקטה} \) (GAM 10b, 7) ‘in the time that, when’, the anaptyxis occurs in a StA final cluster, and is a common feature of many Arabic dialects. The feature seems to resemble epenthetic vowels in a so-called a-coloring environment, i.e. if the vowel preceding the cluster is a and the first of the two final consonants is \( h, g \) or \( h \) the epenthetic vowel is \( a \) \cite{219} (provided that the first of the two final consonants is pronounced with a \( z \)-reflex of q).

Epenthetic vowel i is attested in StA \( \text{בוקיעת} \) ‘stain, spot’, written \( \text{בוקיעת} \) (GAM 11a, 14).

5.1.3.6 Reflexes of StA ay

The i and \( \varepsilon \) reflex (monophthongisation) of the StA diphthong \( ay \) is a type that is familiar from various Arabic dialects due to historical changes. The switch \( ay > \varepsilon \) is attested in the NStC interrogative particle \( \varepsilon \text{יש מה} \) \cite{220} ‘what’ \cite{GAM 6b, 2; KAR 4a, 6} ‘what is the meaning [of]’ and possibly in \( k\varepsilon f \) or \( k\varepsilon f \) ‘how’ \cite{GAM 10b, 14; KAR 4a, 6} ‘how did you find, how did you see’). A somewhat more surprising reflex of StA \( ay \) is the StA word \( \text{שיך} \) ‘elder, venerable gentleman’, spelled \( \text{סאך} \) (GAM 10a, 7); \( \text{swick} \) (GAM 10a, 10), either with a or \( \text{a} \). \cite{221}

---

\cite{219} Similar to the feature attested in e.g. Muslim Baghdadi, cf. Blanc 1964:55
\cite{220} The earlier chronological development of \( \varepsilon \text{יש מה} \), as well as the matter of interrogative particles and a discussion on their role in the NStC (and absence in the StC) variety will re-appear in the part dealing with interrogatives (chapter 5.2.1.5i).
\cite{221} The word is spelled \( \text{swick} \) in the two other manuscripts (KAR 6b, 9; 6b, 12; CAI 12b, 12; 13a, 3).
5.1.3.7 Possible switch from i to e / ə

StA and StC sayyid or StC šid ‘Master’, is written (GAM 9b, 14) ‘belongs to Master Moses, peace be upon him’. The word might also reflect StC šiādit ‘sir, madam’ written without StA tāʾ marbūṭa, but this is highly unlikely. It is more plausible that we are dealing with a switch from i to e or ə (most probably in lack of a better phonemic alternative), thus sayyed / sayyəd. It is possible that we find the same reflex of i in ben yūsuf (GAM 14a, 6-7) ≈ StA ابن يوسف ‘Ben Yosef, son of Yosef’, written with ʼalif.

5.1.4 Other orthographic peculiarities

Because the limited span of this paper, only a selection of orthographical peculiarities appearing in the manuscripts are presented, more precisely, in order to prove a point in cases where the manuscripts’ spelling, pronunciation or semantic meaning needs to be clarified to avoid misunderstandings.

5.1.4.1 ʼalif-lām ligature ʼ for StA lām-ʼalif ligature ʼ

The use of ʼalif-lām ligature ʼ is frequent throughout all three texts, denoting definite article and other instances where lām follows directly after ʼalif or hamza, as in GAM passim; KAR passim; CAI passim) ≈ StA الجمجمة ‘the skull’ and استأعال (GAM 3a, 14; KAR 1b, 8; CAI 4a, 13) ≈ StA استأعال ‘ask (imperative)’. However, there are also some attestations in GAM of the grapheme representing Arabic lām-ʼalif ligature ʼ. Examples are (GAM 5a, 10) ≈ StA الكلاب ‘the hooks’ and possibly מלאכת ʼ (GAM 8a, 4) ≈ StA מלאכת ‘angels’.

222 This is spelled לסיידנא in KAR (6b, 3) and לסיידנא in CAI (12b, 3) ‘belongs to our Master…’
223 Suffice to say that the orthographic features that are not included below follow the lines of Late (19th-century) Egyptian JA orthography grosso modo, as discussed in chapter 2.5.2.
224 The use of the ligature ʼ over ʼ is frequent, albeit not consistent in any of the three texts.
5.1.4.2 Assimilation

The most common feature of assimilation, both in StA and the Arabic dialects, namely assimilation of lām of the definite article and the following so-called sun letters, is hardly attested in the manuscripts. The same orthographic tendency is found in other Late Egyptian JA sources. Only once, in אָרַחְמָה (GAM 8b, 7) = StA ar-raḥma ‘the mercy’ do we find the feature (as opposed to אָרַחַמְתּ [KAR 5b, 8; CAI 11a, 10] where the definite article is written). Wagner, who have noticed the same surprising lack of assimilation in 18th/19th century Egyptian JA letters, writes: “[This] is very surprising considering that utility prose is often regarded as a lower register of substandard writing. A feature that may have contributed to this adherence to [StA] writing standard is the ligature between alif and lām, which made writing a plain alif just as time consuming as the whole ligature, thus keeping the morphophonematic spelling” (2010:64). Based on my own judgment, the three manuscripts at hand may also be regarded as a lower register of (MA) substandard writing, at the very least GAM, where the colloquialisms, pseudo-corrections and the standardization of these are found in abundance. All three manuscripts include several attestations of isolated definite article al- (both א and ﺍ) isolated, e.g. as the last word of a line, or with a space separating the article and the following word (GAM passim; KAR passim; CAI passim), even where there should usually have been assimilation. Examples from the two manuscripts, of unassimilated definite articles as such are רָדָא דֵי-אַלְיָה (GAM 8a, 1) = StA wa-radamū ‘alayya bi-t-turāb ‘they covered me with (the) dirt’ and בֵּי וַ-נַזָּר (CAI 4a, 11) = StA bi-n-naẓar ‘by the look, looking’.

226 This is also in line with the findings in Khan (2006:51; 53f.) and Wagner’s (2010:66) 18th/19th-century material.
5.1.4.3 Final yāʾ for StA ʿalif maqṣūra

In KAR, there is a consistent use of final yāʾ representing StA ʿalif maqṣūra. Examples are (KAR 6b, 8) = StA ‘ḥtî’, (KAR passim) = StA ‘ṭl, towards’, (KAR passim) = StA ‘ṭl, to’, ‘on, above’, (KAR 4a, 6) = StA ‘mnty, meaning, sense’ and (KAR 6b, 3) = StA ‘móṣy, Moses’. According to earlier findings, this feature is typically classical, and rarely found in Late Egyptian JA orthography, where the most frequent way to render the StA ʿalif maqṣūra was rather by means of ḥāʾ (ḥ) or ʿalif (ʾ). Accordingly, the other two scribes (of GAM and CAI) prefer these letters.

5.1.4.4 Final ʿalif for StA tāʿ marbūta

In CAI, final ʿalif for StA tāʿ marbūta is a frequent feature. Some examples are (CAI passim) = StA ʿṭlf, ‘level’ and (CAI 7a, 12) ‘medications’. Hary (1992:89) considers this feature to be a possible reflection of the influence of the Babylonian Talmud which used this kind of spelling both in Hebrew and Aramaic.

5.1.4.5 Hypo-correction: Otiose ʿalif

The CAI scribe writes the 3rd person plural ʿalif zāʾida (otiose ʿalif, ʿā-) according to StA conventions, but uses the NSṭC variant gu for the verb, thus exhibiting hypo-correction: (CAI 7a, 2) = StA ʿfgwr ʿṭl, StC fa-gum ‘then/so they came, arrived’. Based on Hary (1992:91) and Wagner's (2010:51) findings, marking of this particular ʿalif is rare, if not never attested in this period. The fact that the CAI scribe applies the otiose ʿalif supports the notion of this particular scribe’s apparent stronger influence of StA in this manuscript than in those of GAM and KAR. The scribes of the latter two manuscripts use the NSṭC variant gu.

---

227 Hary 1992:91f.
228 More examples and a discussion on this variant can be found in chapter 5.2.3.3ii.
in the corresponding part of the text, conjugated (correctly) according to the spoken variety, in פִּימוֹנָה (GAM 5a, 16) and פֵּאוֹד (KAR 3a, 11).

5.1.4.6 tā’ marbūṭa in the constructive state

The tā’ marbūṭa in the constructive state can be found written as t when in the constructive state (only written as t plene in StA when directly followed by a suffix) in all three manuscripts (which is typical Late Egyptian JA orthographic feature\(^\text{229}\)). Examples are פִּימוֹנָה יִשְׁבַּת (KAR 2b, 8) ‘for a period of twenty years’, אָסַד מָן אָסַד (GAM 7b, 12); אָסַד מָן פַּרְבִּית פָּשִׁיט (KAR 5a, 4; CAI 10a, 8-9) ‘stronger that one thousand strokes from a sword’ and סִכְּרֵית פָּמִית (GAM 5b, 16) ‘the intoxication of death’.

The KAR manuscript displays the following indefinite numeral, סאתה גוג וה (KAR 4a, 3) ‘six faces’ where the genitive construction is indicated by two dots between the final tā’ marbūṭa and the following noun. Here, either Hebrew orthography or early Judaeo-Arabic writing traditions are followed,\(^\text{230}\) which means that the construct state is spelled with t, or the manuscripts are merely exhibiting the spoken variety. The spelling of tā’ marbūṭa with two dots on top of it, even in the case of a genitive construction, has almost completely disappeared from Late Egyptian JA orthography.\(^\text{231}\)

5.2 Morphology

The terms root, root consonant, pattern and stem will be used in the following.\(^\text{232}\) As I have two main purposes for this paper—to identify and describe typical NStC (or EgJA) diverging

---

\(^{229}\) cf. Hary 1992:92

\(^{230}\) See Wagner 2010:39f.

\(^{231}\) Hary 1992:92

\(^{232}\) Arabic words can be reduced to a root (e.g. f-c-l), normally consisting of three root consonants (R\(^1\)=Af, R\(^2\)=B and R\(^3\)=P), which together with the word’s vocalic pattern (f\(\text{a}^\text{c}^\text{i}\text{a}\) vs. f\(\text{a}\)\(\text{i}\) vs. m\(\text{a}\)\(\text{f}\)\(\text{a}\) etc.), fulfill the most important semantic and grammatical functions. The term stem is used when referring to the different classical verbforms I to X (e.g. II. stem, known as fa\(\text{c}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{l}\) and IV. stem, known as ‘af\(\text{a}\)l).
from the StC variety in 19th-century Cairo, and to identify MA literary standards by comparison to literary StA. Features with little or no comparative importance for this purpose will not be taken into consideration. Whether a certain phenomenon represents a pseudo-correction, a written MA standard, a unique NStC or EgJA form, individual written or spoken preferences, or merely a type error, may often be difficult to assert.

5.2.1 Pronouns

5.2.1.1 Personal pronouns

In addition to StA personal pronouns found throughout, typical StC pronouns are also attested in two of the manuscripts: 1st person plural נְחֵנָה (GAM 8b, 5); נחנא (KAR 5b, 7) ≈ StA נحن‘we’ and 2nd person plural אַנְתָו (KAR 5b, 7; 5b, 14) ≈ StA אנח‘you’. In CAI, there is one example of 2nd person singular masculine, written ואנתי מאשי (CAI 12a, 6) ≈ StC wi-இinta māši ‘while you were walking’ (from the part of the story where the Earth has just swallowed the dead sultan). Surprisingly, the pronoun is spelled with final, feminine yā, and followed by a masculine active participle, measi ‘walking’. The corresponding parts of the GAM and KAR manuscript reads ואנתה measi (GAM 9b, 1-2); ואנתא measi (KAR 6a, 9), i.e. they both display gender agreement (masculine pronoun + masculine participle). It is hard to say if we are dealing with a type error, an occurrence of imāla, or due to other dialectal, communal or individual peculiarities here.

5.2.1.2 Affixed pronouns

For the 3rd person masculine affixed pronoun, StC and many other Arabic dialects show h-less alternants of StA -hu. This feature is attested in two of the manuscripts: האטם (CAI 8a, 6)

---

233 These are a typical written 19th century JA features, cf. Wagner 2010:70f.
affixed pronouns have certain rules for their pronunciation and spelling depending on the environment, e.g. if the vowel -i, -ī or -ay (usually found as an ending of the genitive case), precedes the affixed pronoun, then the 3rd person -u changes into -i (hu > hi, hum > him, hunna > hinna). The pronouns are rarely affected this way in dialects like StC, as illustrated in CAI: من كلامه (CAI 4b, 5) \(\approx\) StA من كلامه, but StC min kalāmu ‘from his statement, remark’. Nevertheless, in the corresponding passage of the two other manuscripts, we find من كلامته (GAM 3b, 2); as well as (in all three manuscripts) من كلامته (KAR 1b, 12), as well as (in all three manuscripts) من كلامتهم (KAR 4b, 1; CAI 9a, 10) \(\approx\) StA من كلامتهم, (and) their eyes’ and من كلامتهم (GAM 7a, 3; 7a, 16); من كلامتهم (KAR 4b, 2) \(\approx\) StA من كلامتهم ‘their hands’, exhibiting a degree of regularity, as the feature occur in all three manuscripts. These examples (which are just a few out of dozens of others throughout the manuscripts) presumably display a remarkable hypo-correction, where the genitive state of kalām (> kalāmi-, due to the preceding preposition) is correctly treated according to StA, however not the 3rd person suffix vowel change. A similar feature is discussed e.g. in Khan (2006:55), albeit in the occurrence of -hu after the prepositions li- ‘to, for’, fi ‘in’ and ʿin / ʿan ‘that’, which is not attested in my material.

5.2.1.3 Demonstrative pronouns

In StC and NStC we find the usual demonstratives da, di and dōl. It is possible that dā/dā is a typical MA form, reflecting both the vernacular pronoun but also the StA dā. None of

---

\[234\] I have found only a few attestation of this pronoun written according to the StA rules: من غشته (KAR 8b, 12-13) \(\approx\) StA من غشته ‘from his unconsciousness’ (also written من غشته [KAR 8b, 15] two sentences below) and possibly من رآسي (CAI 9a, 11) \(\approx\) StA من رآسي ‘their hands’. The retention of h in -hā is also attested in the manuscripts, likely resembling StA spelling.

\[235\] cf. Blanc 1974:216. The demonstratives dih and deh are found in Old StC, e.g. in Willmore 1905:108, but not in later grammars of StC like Woidich 2006a:44

\[236\] Wagner 2010:76
these are attested in isolated form in any of the three manuscripts. However, in combination with definite article al-, we find (GAM 10b, 1; 10b, 2; KAR 7a, 1) ‘those snakes’ and (KAR 5b, 11-12) ‘all of this pain is for the load of your sins’. In contrast with StC, where the demonstrative is usually placed after the noun, this (presumably) literary dialectal style of Egyptian Arabic places the demonstrative before the noun. Also, the demonstrative ūdālika di is attested (in GAM), which is neither a StA form nor does it represent dialectal usage. Rather, it is a typical feature of MA. Examples of this feature, found in GAM, are (GAM 10b, 8; 12b 6-7) = StA ‘those things, matters’ and (GAM 4a, 7) = StA ‘that statement, saying’.

Occasionally, demonstratives found in the GAM and KAR manuscripts violate Arabic general rules for agreement in gender and number between subject and predicate (or as part of the subject), probably due to hypo-correction. Examples are (GAM 3a, 1-2); (KAR 1a, 1-2) ‘this is The Story of the Skull’ and (KAR 5a, 9; 5a, 13) ‘this world’.

5.2.1.4 Relative pronouns

StA has six to seven different relative pronouns, and their form all depend on the preceding noun gender, number, whether it is human or non-human, and sometimes case (which inflects the two dual forms, i.e. nominative allaḏānī vs. genitive/accusative allaḏaynī).

Interestingly, the relative pronouns found in three manuscripts are almost exclusively treated as if succeeding a masculine noun in the singular, i.e. allaḏī, even if they do not. In

.readlines
other words they are fossilized and not inflected for gender or number. As far as I can see, different phonological variants of allāḍī are the only forms attested, with only two exceptions: One occurrence of ālī (CAI 17b, 3) = StA التي (following non-human plural ‘his acts, deeds’), and one of alī (GAM 10a, 11) = StC ʿilly, which is known to replace all other relative pronouns irrespective of the preceding noun gender, number, case etc., as it does in in StC and many other Arabic dialects.

Examples of the typical deviations from StA rules are (when succeeding a masculine noun in the plural) ālādīrārī ḍālīrī (GAM 9b, 15) ‘for those who converted to Judaism’, אֲלָאָדָי קָאֶנֶא (KAR 4b, 8-9 ‘the people (who were) around me’, לאָלִי קָפֶּרֶה (CAI 13b, 13-14a, 2) ‘for those who sacrilege …’, (when succeeding a fem. noun in the singular or a non-human plural) וָכָּאָבַהַת אָלִי (GAM 11a, 9-10) ‘and the seventh level, which is Jahannam’, and וָכָּאָבַהוֹת אֲלָאָדָי (KAR 5a, 12) ‘all the deeds (that) I had conducted’ and וָכָּאָבַהוֹת אְמָאָר (CAI 16a, 9) ‘all the things that…’.

5.2.1.5 Interrogative pronouns

(i) The particles ēš ‘what’ and kēf / kīf ‘how’. NStC has retained the interrogative particles ēš ‘what’, kēf or kīf ‘how’ (and lēš ‘why’), which have fallen out of use in StC. We find examples of ēš in two of the manuscripts (GAM and KAR) as in וָאֶשׁ מַעַנָּה (GAM 6b, 2); וָאֶשׁ מַעַנָּה (KAR 4a, 6) ‘what is the meaning (of)’, and kēf or kīf in all three: כָּאָפַת שָׁאוּ (GAM 10b, 14; KAR 7a, 9; CAI 13b, 8) ‘how did you find, how did you see’). Blau (2002:36) suggests that the post-StA/New Arabic feature āyy ʿayy ‘(with time > ēš, as found in many

---

240 cf. Khan 2006:56
241 All the attested forms are alī (in GAM), alī (in KAR), and alī (in CAI).
Arabic dialects today) at one point started superseding StA mā as interrogative pronoun because of the heavy functional load of mā as a negative particle.

It is difficult to know if kēf or kīf is reflecting a NStC (or EgJA) feature or merely StA; most plausibly it reflects the latter. Nevertheless, interrogative ḍēš placed at the beginning of the phrase instead of at the end (as in StC), is in agreement with Rosenbaum’s findings (2002b:38).

(ii) Interrogative particle māḏā + noun. māḏā ‘what’, which is usually found in StA in sentences introducing a verb, is attested once in the CAI manuscript introducing a noun, in מענת ומאד ה (CAI 8b, 2) ≈ StAمعنى وما (‘and) what is the meaning of...’

5.2.2 The noun
5.2.2.1 Number constructions

The StC diphthong ayy / eyy in meyya (≈ StA מן ‘hundred’ is attested in GAM and KAR. When in in a construct state (e.g. before a numbered noun), GAM exhibits the StC alternant מית (GAM 4a, 14) whereas KAR displays мясיא (KAR 2b, 2) which is either influenced by the orthography of the StA rasm מית, or displaying a NStC variant of the lexeme where the diphthong may have been retained also in the construct state. The following examples exhibit the feature (when in isolated form and when in a construct state, respectively):

CAI

וארכתי תמאיה. ארביעהאלף נבארא (GAM 4a, 14-15) ≈ StA‘with me was four hundred thousand strong men’;

KAR

רהב תמאיה א (KAR 2b, 2) ‘four hundred thousand’.

Note also the word מעני ‘meaning’, written hyper-correctly according to words with final tāʾ marbūta and as if in a construct state.
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as opposed to באבuibבונא טים (GAM 5a, 13-14) ≈ StA ‘four hundred and seventy years’;

(KAR 3a, 9) ‘four hundred and seventy’.

5.2.3 The verb

In what follows, relevant StA, StC, and to some extent the substandard stems are retained (see table below). Their designations are as follows (StA and StC equivalents are written in parenthesis in some of the designations): 244

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. stem</th>
<th>II. stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ġasal / yiğsil ‘to wash’</td>
<td>tabbil / yitabbil ‘to season’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>širib / yišrab ‘to drink’</td>
<td>naḍḍaf / yinaḍḍaf ‘to clean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xuluṣ / yixlaṣ ‘to be finished’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-I. stem (≈ StA VIII)</th>
<th>t-II. stem (≈ StA V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ġitgāsal / yitgāsil ‘to be washed’</td>
<td>ġittabbil / yittabbil ‘to be seasoned’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s-I. stem (≈ StC t-I)</th>
<th>II/X. stem (≈ StC t-II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ġṣgama / yīṣgim ‘to gather (intr.)’</td>
<td>ġṣḥaṭṭit / yīṣḥaṭṭit ‘to be lowered’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n-I. stem (≈ StA VII)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ġinbasat / yīnisiṭ ‘to enjoy oneself’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3.1 nf¹ l nfbü

Western Arabic (North Africa, Malta and medieval Spain and Sicily) display 1st person singular nf¹ l and plural nf¹ lü as opposed to the Eastern Arabic, that have the 1st person singular.

---

244 Their designations are very much alike those presented in Woidich’s Das Kairenisch-Arabische (2006a:66ff.). I have slightly modified the names of the stems, tentatively added the NSC or EgJA s-I. and s-II. stem, and included his I. stem xuluṣ / yixlaṣ ‘to be finished’ found in Woidich 2006b.
prefixes \textit{a-} for singular and \textit{n-} for plural. Thus, \textit{nekteb} ‘I (shall) write’ and \textit{nektebū} ‘we (shall) write’ is typical for the Western type paradigm (N-forms), whereas \textit{akteb} and \textit{nekteb} are typically Eastern (A-forms).\footnote{Blanc 1974:206} We find examples of 1st person singular \textit{nfl} (albeit no occurrences of \textit{nflū}) in all three manuscripts: \textit{לאגל מלמד תאני} (GAM 3b, 14); \textit{כון התמה נמי רות לזר} (GAM 4a, 12-13) ‘in order (for me) to answer you’, \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (KAR 2a, 7) ‘(then) when I went out riding, going for a hunt’, \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (CAI 5a, 13-14) ‘(then) when I went out riding, going for a hunt’, \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (KAR 3a, 10) ‘in order (for me) to clean myself’ and \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (GAM 4b, 11-12); \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (KAR 2b, 11-12); \textit{וכונת לפי תרכיב אותו לזר} (CAI 6a, 3-4, exhibiting both the A-form, and the N-form for the singular) ‘I used to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty and clothe the naked’.

Blanc (1974:211) points out a tendency of both \textit{akteb} and \textit{nekteb} for the singular appearing together in the same context. Notwithstanding, one should also consider the fact that although being an exclusive Jewish communal feature within Cairo, the typical A-form and N-form both occur in Lower as well as Upper Egypt, in urban as well as rural areas, in sedentary as well as Bedouin varieties, and in \textit{gāl}-dialects as well as \textit{qāl}-dialects\footnote{According to Blanc (1974:211).}—hence it is not an exclusive Jewish feature.

\textbf{(i) The social status of the N-form.} In his 1974 article, Blanc points to the fact that the servant girl in Muḥammad ‘Uṭmān Jalāl’s adaptation of Molière’s \textit{Les Femmes Savantes} (1889/90) is corrected by her mistress when saying \textit{‘anā mā ni’rafūş ‘I don’t know it’} (1974:214). This is a useful hint as to the social status of such forms, knowing that all three manuscripts presented in this paper display N-form in the singular. In the case of CAI, we know from the manuscript’s colophon that it was of like vintage as \textit{Les Femmes Savantes}:

\footnote{Blanc 1974:206}
Egypt, November 17th 1887 eighty-seven, Gregorian calendar’. W. Max Müller, the first one to notice both the geographical distribution and the social status of the N-forms, (Müller 1903:180 apud. Blanc 1974:214) appointed the N-form in 1st person singular to Gurna in the Qina province, but also to Alexandria and peasant women near Cairo. Of a lady he heard using the N-form, he said that she spoke “consistently in the same odd fashion as the Arab ladies”\(^{247}\) (id.).

5.2.3.2 b/m-imperfect

The b/m-imperfect is not attested at all in StA, but widely in a number of Arabic dialects. It is attested in Judaeo-Arabic sources as early as the 12th century, and in Muslim sources in the 15th century. Nonetheless, according to Davies (1981:235) earlier use of the bi-imperfect here do not resemble its role e.g. in today’s StC, i.e. expression of habit and of present progressive meaning.

This aspectual prefix is attested once in each of the three manuscripts where it is found in the same, corresponding part of the story, in accordance with modern use i.e. expressing habit present progressive meaning. The fact that it is attested in the same place in all three manuscripts, and only once in each one, suggests that the use of the bi-imperfect is not widespread in writing, albeit very consistent (note that the example from CAI displays the m-imperfect, most probably due to assimilation): לאני אנה בנקסי פיך (GAM 9b, 1); לאני אנה בנקסי פיך (KAR 6a, 9);מנקאסי פ יך (CAI 12a, 6) \(\approx\) StA אָכָּס י (because I) am suffering you, enduring you’.

\(^{247}\) Translated from German.
5.2.3.3 I. stem

(i) 1st person fa‘alit. We find some attestations in GAM and KAI of 1st person conjugations in the perfect tense akin to StC fa‘alit\(^{248}\) (i.e. StC epenthetic vowel \(i\), as opposed to StA (GAM 7a, 11) \(\approx\) StC fa‘aat ‘I frightened’, (GAM 7b, 2; 7b, 9; CAI 9b, 12) \(\approx\) StC waqa‘it ‘I fell down’ and (GAM 11b, 4) \(\approx\) StA bi‘it ‘she/they became inactive, out of work’.

(ii) 3rd person. Verbs in the 3rd person feminine sometimes have conjugations akin to StC fa‘alit (StA (GAM 8a, 2) \(\approx\) StC ra‘aat rūḥī ‘ilayya ‘my soul came back to me’, revealing the typical StC epenthetic vowel \(i\) in plene.

3rd person plural agreement in in number is found preceding the subject, a hyper-correction violating the rules governing StA\(^{249}\) as well as StC\(^{250}\). In the GAM and CAI manuscripts, \(\text{כַּף}╮\) replaces StA \(\text{כְּף}╮\) (GAM 3a, 4; CAI 4a, 3) ‘the learned said’. Furthermore, the 3rd person plural is occasionally used to denote StA non-human plural in GAM, e.g. (GAM 5b, 15) \(\approx\) StC wi-snānī tšakkaku, but StA \(\approx\) ‘and my teeth (was) stinged’.

There are some attestations of NStC and EgJA gu or gu’ instead of StC gum, ‘they came’\(^{251}\) as in (GAM 5a, 16; 5b, 3); \(\text{ג}╮\) (GAM 7b, 13); \(\text{ג}gment (KAR 3a, 11; 3a, 13) \(\approx\) StC ya‘it ‘they work’. However, as Blanc (1974:215) and Rosenbaum (2002b:38) notes, this feature is retained also in other NStC varieties. Relevant to this feature, we have a co-

---

\(^{248}\) This is another example of plene written \(\text{anaptyxis}\) between StA consonant clusters, as discussed in chapter 5.1.3.5.

\(^{249}\) If the verb precedes the subject, there is always agreement in gender, but not in number between them, viz. \(\text{גַּאֲחה} r\-riˈjāla ‘lā hunāk ‘the men went there’\), cf. Schulz 2000:58f.

\(^{250}\) As a general rule in StC, the definite subject precedes the verb, and agrees in gender and number, as \(\text{ir}\-\text{riˈjāla} \text{yiʃtāgalu} ‘the men work’\). See e.g. Willmore 1905:275f.

\(^{251}\) According to Rosenbaum (2002a:126; 2002b:38), the Cairene variant gu was retained only by Jews after the beginning of the 20th century within Cairo.
occurrence of StC final -u and -um in the manuscripts, the forms with final -m being the socially lower variants.  One example is גֶּזֶה (KAR 3b, 2) vs. גֶּזְמוֹ (GAM 5b, 8) ≈ StA גֶּזֶה ‘they examined’.

(iii) Glottal stop as a first radical. In StC conjugation of R¹ = اء verbs, the hamza is sometimes omitted in the perfect (e.g. StA أَكَتَ > StC kalt ‘I ate’). I have not found attestations of this in the manuscripts, but rather correct conjugations according to StA rules (e.g. אֵכְדוֹנִי instead of אֵכְדוֹנִי ‘they took’). Nevertheless, a very interesting effect of the omitted hamza is the possible affiliation with some R¹ = ق verbs—due to the pronunciation of qāf as a glottal stop (see chapter 5.1.2.18). In turn, we find one possible attestation of a R¹ = ق verb (where qāf is represented by hamza), conjugated as if they were StC R¹ = اء verbs, i.e. first radical yields phonemic zero initially. The example found is גֶּזֶה (GAM 8b, 12) ≈ StC וַאֲדֻנִי ‘(and) they made me sit down’, but one should not forget the possibility of a type error, especially as the StC verb ‘cause to sit’ is from II. stem qad, a stem in which initial zero never occurs, as far as I am aware.

(iv) Tertiae hamzatae. A common JA feature according to Blau (1999a:74) is the disappearance of hamza when not preceding a vowel, as כָּעָס < כָּעַס ‘cup’, leading to the plural כָּעְס, according to the pattern כָּבֵא ‘door’ כָּבָהוֹ. Consequently, one may find tertiae hamzatae verbs that have passed into tertiae yā (like in לָא אָכָר ‘I did not read’).

---

252 See e.g. Woidich 2006a:82
253 A survey of primae hamzatae verbs from 19th century StC is presented in Spitta 1880:219ff.
254 As opposed to כָּעָס (CAI 11a, 14).
255 The fact that the verb (here conjugated akin to verbs of the I. stem) is used in a causative way can be explained by that the choice of verbal themes, in general, is not always in accordance with StA usage. Sometimes I. stem form is used instead of the IV., cf. Blau (1967:§51.2; 2002:38). More on this below (in chapter 5.2.3.3v).
256 cf. Badawi and Hinds 1986:710
Although being a mere StC feature (and characteristic of MA with regard to syntax), one example of this phenomenon is found in the present material: (GAM 7a, 5) = StA לא הדרו והדהו עליהם ‘they did not calm down’ (as opposed to והדהו [KAR 4b, 3]; והדהו [CAI 9a, 12]). Here, StA negation particle lam is hypo-correctly followed by StC yihdu instead of the conventionally correct StA jussive equivalent.

(v) I. stem ≈ IV stem. One example found in the manuscripts displaying the dichotomy I. stem vs. IV stem is פְּלַמְּא פָּאָק וּמָנָג שָׁוְתוֹ (CAI 16a, 10-11) vs. פְּלַמְּא פָּאָק וּמָנָג שָׁוְתוֹ (KAR 12b, 8-9); פְּלַמְּא פָּאָק וּמָנָג שָׁוְתוֹ (KAR 8b, 12-13) = StA עתָם אָפָךְ מִנְּגָּשָׁי ‘when he recovered from his unconsciousness’. Regarding StC, we know that the IV. stem is rarely or never attested. Conversely, as mentioned in Blau (1967:§51.2; 2002:38), the choice of verbal stem in JA texts is not always in accordance with standard usage. In cases of StA IV. stem, it is sometimes conjugated according to the I. stem. He notes that the feature is especially frequent in $R^2=ו/י$ (which is also the case in the examples above) and $R^2=ו$ verbs. Unfortunately, because StA and StC use two different verbal stems (StA אָפָךְ vs. StC fā) to denote the same semantic meaning ‘to return to one’s normal state of consciousness’, as do the manuscripts (they display both אָפָךְ and פָּאָק), it is not possible to conclude any further regarding whether we are dealing with a typical written or a typical spoken variant.

5.2.3.4 II. stem

(ii) Mediae infirmae. In CAI (7a, 4), the II. stem verb יִפְּלָא קְנֵי ≈ StA יִפְּלָא קְנֵי ‘revive, wake me up (plural)’ has conjugation akin to II. stem $R^2=ו$ verbs found in StA and StC. Nevertheless, in the other two manuscripts, the verb is conjugated as $R^2=ו$ verbs, although

---

257 The negation particle lam is discussed in chapter 5.3.1.
the root is f-w-q: (GAM 5b, 2); יפקוני (KAR 3b, 13). I have yet to find this form attested in the StC variety, however it is not unusual for roots with R² = ח to interchange with R² = י.

5.2.3.5 The passive stems

The fact that there are so few internal passives appearing in the corpus (e.g. along the pattern fuʿila / yufalu), confirms its closeness to the spoken variety. Below, the extant passives are presented:

(ii) t-I. stem (≈ StA VIII). אתנעיל (GAM 12a, 8); אתנעל (CAI 15b, 3), ≈ StC יתניל ‘be shoed, take shoes on (imperative)’ is an example of what may be referred to as the reflexive-passive t-I. stem. Another example of the t-I. stem is אתנגנהו (KAI 3b, 1) ≈ StC יתגנהו ‘they gathered (intransitive)’, a verb also attested in the s-I. and n-I. stem stem (below).

(ii) t-II. stem (≈ StA V). אתינעל (GAM 3a, 9) ≈ StC יתנעל ‘to look closely at’ represents V. stem reflecting initial prosthetic ʿalif or what may be referred to as the transitive t-II. stem or the ifaʿal form. Blau (1999a:70) suggests that the reason for this is the shortening of the a in the first syllable, which in turn leads to prosthetic ʿalif being introduced, as illustrated in אתינעל אותרו אתינעל > אתינעל אותרו אתינעל. Another example from the manuscripts is ואתינעל (CAI 9b, 3) ≈ StA תמסו ‘they came forth’.

(iii) s-I. and II/X. stem (≈ StC t-I. and t-II). The s-I. stem (probably related to the StC reflexive-passive t-I. stem) is attested a once, in אסגרע (GAM 5b, 6) ≈ StC יסגרע ‘they gathered (intr.)’. The II/X. stem (probably related to the StC transitive t-II. stem) is

---

259 See e.g. Blau 1967:§58, 62; Wagner 2010:83
260 cf. Woidich 2006a:67
262 Hary (1992:287) considers this stem—which do not exist in StA, but occurs in StC—to be a ‘mixed’ stem, of II. and X.
attested three times, once in each manuscript: ישתטטיון (GAM 10a, 2; 10a 5) (KAR 6b, 9; CAI 12b, 10); ישתטטיון (KAR 6b, 6; CAI 12b, 7) \(\approx\) StC יתתתת ‘they lowered me’.

(iv) n-I. stem \(\approx\) StA VII. The passive n-I. stem (which is equivalent of the StA VII. stem) is attested once, in אנטונש (CAI 7a, 8) \(\approx\) StC יגמא ‘they gathered (intr.)’, revealing a rather StA influence when compared to the manuscript’s corresponding parts: There, we find StC t-I. stem אנטונש (KAI 3b, 1) and the substandard, possibly EgJA s-I. stem אנטונש (GAM 5b, 6).

(v) The verb ההא: Internal passive or hypo-correct V. stem? A puzzling conjugation to which I cannot find an explanation, appears in CAI, namely התשה. I can only guess here, but we are either dealing with either an internal passive תשמ ‘was promised’ (conjugated incorrectly in the feminine) or a hypo-correct V. stem, in התשה (CAI 13b, 4) ת’אדדה (with emphatic a in first syllable, as attested in התשה [CAI passim] \(\approx\) StA ת”עשת StC ת”עשת [God, praised and] exalted is He’ and התשה [CAI 14b, 11] \(\approx\) StC ת”עשת ‘food’, cf. chapter 5.1.3.) incorrectly interpreted as t-I. stem \(*\text{יתן}‘a > \text{idda}‘a (instead of VIII. stem \(\text{idta}‘a > \text{idda}‘a\)), and consequently imitating StA IV. stem \(*\text{יתן}‘a (in StA, the verb only exists in the VIII. stem, thus StA \(\text{idda}‘a\) ‘he claimed, asserted’. The same verb occurs correctly according to StC rules in \(\text{idda}‘a\) (GAM 10b, 9) ‘she claimed it’, but has seemingly undergone metathesis in \(\text{idda}‘a\) (KAR 7a, 6).

---

263 This is an intransitive verb in StC, but is used transitively in GAM.
5.3 Syntax

5.3.1 Negation

5.3.1.1 Negation of past actions and past perfect

(i) lam + **perfect negating a completed action**. StA lam + jussive / ma + verb in the perfect tense (negating a completed action) is replaced by lam + verb in the perfect tense in all three manuscripts, e.g. (GAM 4a, 9; KAR 2a, 14; CAI 5a, 11) ‘I was not’ and (CAI 15a, 14) ‘I was not able to get in’, probably due to hypo-correction that has undergone standardization. Khan (1991:231f.; 2006:40; 56f.), Hary (1992:294) and Wagner (2010:135) confirms this use of lam, and its frequent occurrence in Later and Modern Egyptian JA sources. Yet, Khan notes that lam as a negating particle is unlikely to correspond to the spoken variety, but that is may have its roots in an earlier period of the development of the variety, possibly an Arabic dialectal literary language that was in general use in Ottoman Egypt.

(ii) lam + **imperfect + šī negating a completed action**. We also find the use of lam + verb in the imperfect tense + šī negating a past action, in (CAI 7a, 11); (KAR 3b, 3); (GAM 5b, 10) ‘it did not work for me’, pointing to some sort of hyper-correction, viz. StA lam + StA jussive tense + hypo-correct šī. It is very surprising to find lam + imperfect + šī negating a completed action, especially because the same is attested in all three manuscripts in the same part of the story. These examples strengthen the notion of standardized forms losing their pseudo-correct status, within small

---

264 They also confirm the frequent use of lam in combination with the imperfect tense, negating present actions (see chapter 5.1.3.2).

265 Khan 2006:40

266 (GAM 5b, 8-9) ‘it (?) didn’t work for me’ (transitive אֲשֶׁר used intransitively, possibly due to hyper-correction) is also attested, corresponding to the same part of the story.
social groups and sometimes significantly larger ones.\(^{267}\) Moreover, Wagner (2010:141) has no attestations of this construction ever used in that way in her study on epistolary writing from the same period.

(iii) _laysa + perfect negating a completed action._ In StA, negated copula _laysa_ ‘not to be’ is regarded as being in the present tense, though it is conjugated analogously to the perfect tense.\(^{268}\) The manuscripts GAM and KAR, however, contain another use of the particle, as in _laysa + verb in the perfect tense_, most probably reflecting StA _lam + jussive / ma + verb in the perfect tense_ for negating a completed action: (GAM 12a, 6); (KAR 8a, 12) \(\approx\) StA ‘so I was not able’. Here, _laysa_ behaves as if grammaticalized in the 3rd person form, functioning merely as a negation particle.

(iv) _lam + kāna (perfect) + perfect negating past perfect._ In StA, negation particle _lam + kāna_ (jussive) + verb in the imperfect tense is used to negate a completed action in the past which took place prior to another action also in the past (past perfect). Yet, in GAM and KAR, _lam + kāna_ (perfect) + verb in the perfect tense is used for this purpose, as attested in the following example: (GAM 9a, 5-7) ‘O Mother, I wish you had never given birth to me, and that my father had never taken your hand’; \(\approx\) (KAR 6a, 2-3) ‘O Mother, I wish you had never given birth to me’. This hypo-correct feature is characterized by the incorrect use of the StA rules governing _kāna_. In CAI, another negation of past perfect is attested: _lā + kāna (perfect) + verb in the imperfect tense_, in (CAI 14a, 10) ‘you would not have cried…’.

---

\(^{267}\) Hary 1992:67

\(^{268}\) Schulz 2000:99
5.3.1.2 Negation of present (and future) actions

(i) (wa-) lam + imperfect (+ šī / bi-šī) negating present and future. It is likely that (wa-) lam + verb in the imperfect tense is used to negate present and future actions (StA lā + imperfect / lan + subjunctive / sawfa + lā + imperfect\(^{269}\)), as attested in חלק נמשך הפרט Antworten של אפרת (GAM 13b, 4-5; KAR 9b, 1) ‘nothing will help Man on the last day’ (as compared to והלו נסף Answers של אפרת to [CAI 17a, 12-13]). We also find (wa-) lam + verb in the imperfect tense + bi-šī, probably used to negate present and future actions as well, like in חלק נמשך הפרט Antworten של אפרת (GAM 11b, 6-7; KAR 7b, 12-13) ‘and the regretfullness does not help them one bit’,れ and (GAM 12b, 15) ‘the one who disobedys his Lord and does not please Him’.

(ii) lā + imperfect + šī negating present and future. lā + verb in the imperfect tense + šī is used for negation of actions taking place in present and future (StC mā + imperfect + š, StA lā + imperfect), attested in חלק נמשך הפרט Antworten של אפרת (GAM 12b, 15). lam + verb in the imperfect tense without š is also used to negate present and future actions: ול hotéis וול condemning lā + imperfect (CAI 10b, 5-6) ‘for the one who disobedys God and does not do…’.

(iii) mā + perfect + š / šī negating a terminated action. A well-known feature of StC is the discontinuous negative construction, composed of the preverbal mā (found in Arabic dialects, as well as StA), and the postverbal particle –š, resembling Old Arabic šay.\(^{271}\) In all three manuscripts, we find examples of mā + šī negating present actions, like המ桥梁 של הוול (KAR 7b, 1-2); המ桥梁 של הוול (GAM 11a, 11) ‘and do not act according to His will’, as well as in the meaning of StA lam ya‘ud ‘to do something no more or no longer’ (i.e. המ桥梁 של הוול (CAI 7b, 6-7); המ桥梁 של הוול (CAI 10b, 5-6) ‘for the one who disobedys God and does not do…’.

---

\(^{269}\) f. Schulz 2000:97

\(^{270}\) Written_morez in KAR.

\(^{271}\) See e.g. Lucas 2010:165
there is nothing alive left (in him)’. The double stroke adjacent to final ‘alif in ‘sha (CAI 7b, 6) probably denotes an expression of accusative tanwin ending -an, representing a StA form of a lexeme not found in StC. Thus, we may say that the three latter examples show, respectively, a development from conventional StA (the example from CAI), a more or less mixed style (the example from KAR), to vernacular (the example from GAM). It is plausible to assume that the examples (here and above), although being from the same period, reflect parts of earlier chronological development of negating present actions, at least in the case of postverbal particle –š, as (CAI) m’ve bq’a fyh sy’an > (KAR) m’ve bq’a fyh sy > (GAM) mh bq’h fy’sy (fyšy).

5.3.1.2 General negation and negated copula

(i) *(wa-)* lam used in general negation. In the manuscripts, the particle *lam* is also used in general negation, *lam* + indefinite noun in the accusative with tanwin (resembling StA lá / StC wa-lá + indefinite noun in the accusative [but without tanwin, akin to StC]):olv[A]ám tás[f]á[f] tás[h]om (GAM 11b, 3); olv ‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and olv ‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and olv ‘‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and olv ‘‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and olv ‘‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and olv ‘‘and no one is giving them anything to drink’ and (GAM 4b, 5); (GAM 11b, 3-4) ‘and no one is throwing (throw) me down’.

(ii) mā + li + noun as negated copula. mā + li + noun is attested as negated copula (StA laysa ‘not to be’) in all three manuscripts. One example is mā + li + noun is attested as negated copula (StA laysa ‘not to be’) in all three manuscripts. One example is mā + li + noun is attested as negated copula (StA laysa ‘not to be’) in all three manuscripts. One example is mā + li + noun is attested as negated copula (StA laysa ‘not to be’) in all three manuscripts. One example is olv ‘there is nothing for you but the blazing Fire, there is no food for you but fire, and there is no firewood for Hell but you’.

5.3.2 Nominal attribution

The term nominal attribution refers to the adding of an independent complement to a noun which then becomes the head of a nominal phrase. Here, the complement functions as a
semantic modifier to the meaning of the head noun.\(^{272}\) Generally speaking, the genitive constructions (\(\text{idāfa}\)) and the noun-adjective phrase are the most common cases where we encounter nominal attribution. Some nominal phrases found in the manuscripts oppose traditional StA conventions (or resemble such constructions hypo-correctly), or exhibit irregular nominal attribution, as discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.3.2.1 Omitted definite article in attributive adjunct in the construct state

The phrase זทันที呵护 (GAM 8b, 14) \(\approx\) StA ذلك الحين ‘that time’ is an example of definite article omitted in an attributive adjunct in the construct state.\(^{273}\) Another construction attested, in another manuscript, is גמגמת ואחד מית (CAI 4a, 7) ‘a dead skull’, where the first term may be regarded as definite (because of the \(tä^2\) marbûṭa written in plene in the constructive state), but the second term does not agree in definiteness.

5.3.2.2 Indefinite noun + definite qualifier

Adjectives or participles functioning as adjectives that agree in determination with the noun to which it qualifies, are found frequently throughout the manuscripts. Nevertheless, we find equivalent constructions, albeit without the article on the governing noun, reminiscent of annexation for category, also referred to as noun-plus-noun annexation (e.g. in \(\text{baytu l-}
\text{muqaddasi} ‘the holy house’ \([=\text{Jerusalem}])\).\(^{274}\) Hary (1992:31f.) considers such a construction as part of a parallel development in later Semitic languages, referring to its existence \textit{inter alia} in Mishnaic Hebrew (‘The Big Assembly’), Classical Arabic (‘جانب الغربي ‘the western side’), Colloquial Palestinian (‘\(\text{en elbēda} ‘the white spring’) and Maltese (\(\text{Ghadira S-}
\text{Safra} ‘the yellow pool’). According to Blanc, \(‘[t]his [construction] has the effect of assimilating the noun-plus-qualifier sequence to a noun-plus-noun annexation or ‘construct


\(^{273}\) i.e. 2nd term of a genitive construction.

\(^{274}\) The example taken from Retsö’s (2009:18).
phrase’ [...]” (1964:126), and applies to fixed phrases, such as place names and expressions of time. Discussing Semitic nominal attribution in detail, Retsö (2009:18) also addresses the chances of the construction being a juxtaposed adjectival complement to a definite head noun which lacks the article (baytu l-muqaddasu), paralleling it to expressions in Biblical Hebrew like ֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֆ

Conversely, he refers to examples attested in Arabic dialects from  inter alia Dër ez-Zőr, Tripoli, Jerusalem, Lebanon together with the Muslim, Christian and Jewish Baghdadi dialects, which do not necessarily apply to fixed phrases. The following examples are all definite adjectives or participles following an indefinite noun, yet whether they are fixed phrases or not is not clear.

In all three manuscripts, פלאני (≈ StC fulāni or filāni, the adjectival equivalent of fulān277) is apparently used in an adjective compound seemingly as attributive adjunct, identified above as a definite qualifier following an indefinite noun: ים א吶 פפלאני פстал חודה ו广大市民 פстал חודה והודה (GAM 8a, 11-12; KAR 5a, 13-14; CAI 10b, 9-10) ‘this (such and such) day you did so-and-so, and that (such and such) day you did so-and-so’. Interestingly, Blanc also notes that it may not be accidental that in the article-less constructions, the qualifiers have that in common that they have contrastive meaning, viz. “the older’ as opposed to the younger and ‘the big’ as opposed to the smaller or lesser, ‘the right’ as opposed to the left, etc.” (1964:127), which may also be found in the example above, viz. ‘this such and such day’ as opposed to any random day. We also find נאר א الجمعة (CAI 9b, 13) ‘the burning fire’, as opposed to (correctly according to StA conventions) באה אל מוהלקה (GAM 7b, 2) and מלאכי אל מלאכי (CAI 10b, 3-4); מלאכי אל מלאכי עלא אודני (KAR 5a, 9-10) ‘angels assigned for the Earth’, as opposed to the corresponding phrase מלאכי אל לומכי עלא אודני (GAM 8a, 4-5).

275 In 1 Kgs 7.8.
276 Retsö 2009:20ff.
277 Hinds 1986:671
In the latter examples (מְלָכִים מְמַחֲלִים עַל לַוָּויִים; מְמַחֲלִים עַל נַעֲרֵי מְלָכִים) there is also a chance of definite article introducing the relative clause. In addition to the variants of StA allāḏī, we might be dealing with attestations of an indefinite noun followed by definite article al- serving as a relative pronoun. Whereas in the GAM manuscript, allāḏī is the preferred relative, the corresponding part of the two other manuscripts both exhibit al- possibly introducing the relative clause. On this topic, Retsö notes that “the article is prefixed directly to the clausal complement without the deictic element […], thus a parallel to [kol ha-ḥiqdiš šmu’el ‘all that Samuel had sanctified’278] in Biblical Hebrew” (2009:18).

5.3.3 Numerals

5.3.3.1 Ordinal numbers

The ordinal numbers found in the three manuscripts are not always in accordance with StA conventions. With regard to syntax, StA ordinal numbers are treated like adjectives, accordingly following the noun, and there is agreement in case, state, gender and number279 (אֵלֶּוהוֹד אַחַד). The ordinals may also precede the noun, as in אֵלֶּוהוֹד אַחַד (GAM 9b, 12) ‘the first chair’, where the ordinal number is connected with the following noun in the form of a genitive construction.280 Conversely, the same passage in CAI reads אֱוָלָן אָאוֹד (CAI 12a, 14), displaying a rather unusual ordinal number ‘first’, and another example of an indefinite noun followed by a definite qualifier, as illustrated above (in chapter 5.3.2.2).

An interesting equivalent to the StA plural אֱוָלָן ‘first (plural)’ is attested in all three manuscripts, as אֱוֶלָן (GAM 8a, 16); אֱוֶלָן (KAR 5b, 3); אֱוֶלָן (CAI 11a, 3), referring

---

278 1 Chron. 26.28. Transcription is written as it appears in Retsö 2009:12
279 Schulz 2000:210
280 The ordinal numbers for 1st (אֵל or אֵלֶּה) are frequently connected with the following noun in the form of a genitive construction. See Schulz 2000:210
to ‘the first (ten) angels’, and found in the following part of the story: גַּם אֶלֶּה תֵּאָרִים אַּלְדוֹת (GAM 8a, 15-8b, 1) ‘and after that, the first angels left and the other angels came’. It is plausible to assume that all three manuscripts render the exact same lexeme. אַלְדוֹת, in CAI (11a, 3) gives the best phonological picture of the plural, as it displays double wāw (probably a diphthong) and double yā (possibly iy + i). I have not succeeded in finding this particular form of the word in connection to the root consonants -w-l, in StA or in StC. Nevertheless, אַלְדוֹת ‘the former’ is attested in Hary’s Late JA sources (1992:319), (a lexeme described as more elevated in its language), thus אַוַּלַֽאַֽנִֽיִּֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽנִֽיִֽn probably represents a sound (external) plural of this pattern.

Another interesting plural pattern is found in the same sentence, namely the StA (elative in form) אֶת-אָֽוֶרֶד (an)other (plural), but written אֶת-אָֽוֶרֶד (in all three manuscripts), possibly pronounced אֶת-אָֽוֶרֶד. Again, the most plausible explanation for the form, is that the scribe have applied a plural suffix, and this time to an already plural form: אֶת-אָֽוֶרֶד (broken plural) + אֶת-אָֽוֶרֶד (sound plural).

5.3.4 Other syntactical features

5.3.4.1 The independent particle -an

In StA, the conjunction -an ‘that’ is employed after modal auxiliary verbs in perfect tense (should’, want’, to be allowed’, to be possible’ etc.). It introduces a verbal clause which fulfills the syntactic function of an object when being subordinate to a transitive verb. According to Blau the emergence of independent particle -an comes from the tanwin accusative ending, and that it was separated from the word, no longer functioning as an indefinite article, but a “morpheme indicating that an indefinite noun is

281 I am not ruling out the possibility that it exist in either the StA or StC variety.
282 Schulz 2000:268
283 Schulz 2000:266
followed by an attribute” (1981:173). Wagner (2010:186) distinguishes between three different categories of the independent particle -an in her material. These are an + attributive adjective, an + attributive noun and an + attributive clause. In the present material, an + attributive adjective is attested, e.g. in [CAI 9b, 5-6] ‘I screamed out a great scream’ and (GAM 10b, 11) 284 ‘and he wept a great weep’. In two of the manuscripts, an + attributive clause is attested: an is employed after interrogative mīn / man ‘who’ (and before, takūni is used hyper-correctly in this context), as in (GAM 4a, 2) = StA ‘who is it that you (feminine) are?’ Here, an (or in as attested in KAR) takes the position as the predicate itself or before the predicate, and may possibly affect the following verb in the subjunctive tense (كوني vs. (كونين), yet this may be difficult to detect in this particular context.

5.3.4.2 -a for StA -an

Accusative -a is found in the place of StA -an, as attested in 286 (GAM passim; CAI passim)
≈ StA ‘also, as well’, i.e. spelled without tanwin in two of the three manuscripts, and possibly pronounced ʿaydā and rather than ʿaydan. This is a feature occasionally found in Egyptian 19th century sources, as pointed out in e.g. Wagner (2010:49) and Hary (1992:89). 287 Totally omitting of the tanwin is attested in (CAI 17a, 9) = StA سابقا ‘earlier’.

---

284 The same feature is also attested in CAI 13b, 6.
285 an followed by an attributive clause is also attested in Khan 2006:51
286 קיינ in KAR (passim).
287 Hary (1992:88f.) considers this feature to be in imitation of standard Hebrew orthography.
5.3.4.3 Reduplications

There are several examples of reduplication of grammatical items, as free relative clauses, conjunctions, prepositions, in coordinating conjunction, combinations etc, possibly as a result of hyper-correction. Below, some of them are presented:

(i) Free Relative Clause. Introducing a nominal relative clause, we find kamā + mā and ka + miš + mā, as in (GAM 8a, 3) (KAR 5a, 8-9) ‘as if I was in this world’, respectively.

(ii) Conjunction. Conjunctions introducing subordinate clauses (e.g. StA likay, kay and li-) are found represented by לאג למא (KAR 3b, 2) ‘in order that’ and reduplicated li + hattā + ʾan / ʾın: (KAR 9a, 12) (CAI 17a, 7) ‘in order (for me) to answer you’.

(iii) Preposition. A combination of the StA prepositions min and ʿalā occurs, in (CAI 15a, 7-8) ‘and my skin was cut from my flesh’.

(iv) Subject. A typical StC feature is attested in גאנה ויהי (GAM 13a, 8) ≈ StC anā wayyāḥ ‘me and him, together with him’. Nevertheless, the feature is followed by ʾאסייסין ‘Satans (plural)’, repeating the subject: גאנה ויהי אסייסין.

(v) Coordinating conjunction fa- + fa-lammā + fa- / fa-lammā + fa-. The conjunction (GAM passim) ‘so when’, functioning as conjunction of time in StA and StC, occurs several times in GAM and occasionally in KAR and CAI, as a conjunction of result or purpose (here, fa-lammā is even preceded by fa-), in (CAI 12b, 6-8)288 ‘when the man heard what the

288 The same function is attested in KAR 8b, 10 and CAI 16a, 8.
skull was telling him, he lost his conscience’. On the topic, somehow in line with the findings in the present three manuscripts, Hary (1992:305) writes: “When a sentence opens with למא in Classical JA, it is not unusual for its apodosis to start with fa-, especially when the למא clause is long. In the Megillah, however, most of the sentences that open with למא have apodosis introduced by fa- only when the verb in the למא clause is a sensory verb (see, watch, hear, etc.)”. This is attested in the 17th, 18th and 19th-century copies of the Megillah.

In the KAR and CAI manuscripts, we also have attestations of fa-lammā + verb in the perfect tense + wa-‘ィדā qad + verb in the perfect tense as a conjunction of result or purpose: פלמה פרג אתין מן דצלים סרהו ויהו דאמרה אפרה קול (KAR 1b, 12-13);加之 שפ חק אנדא שפלנה פריק קול (CAI 4b, 4-6) ‘when the man fell silent, the Creator commanded it…’

Also, we find a consistent use of fa-lammā + verb in the perfect tense + fa- + verb in the perfect tense, when expressing temporal clauses of simultaneousness, as in פלמה פרג אתין מן דצלים סרהו ויהו דאמרה אפרה קול (GAM 5a, 9-10) ‘When the man fell silent, the skull said’. The feature is attested several time throughout GAM.

(vi) Combinations. The combination wa-ba’dā dālīka + tumma (or possibly StC tamm ‘be completed, be accomplished’) is attested in פלמה פרג אתין מן דצלים סרהו ויהו דאמרה אפרה קול (GAM 8a, 5-6) ≈ ‘after that, then they said to me’ and פלמה פרג אתין מן דצלים סרהו ויהו דאמרה אפרה קול (GAM 10a, 1) ‘after that, they brought me…’, probably due to hyper-correction.

5.3.4.4 Prepositions

In addition to frequent occurrence of StC prepositions (e.g. קודאמהו [GAM 6a, 16]; קודאמהו [GAM 4a, 5]; קודאמהו [CAI 8a, 14] = StC quddāmu ‘in front of him’ and קודה אמאו [CAI 6b, 14]...
≈ StC guwwa l-ḥammān ‘inside the bathroom’), there are instances of بين (in) between, among’ with a StA final ġāl marbūṭa, written with a t and used in a construct state: بينهم (GAM 7a, 7; KAR 4b, 4; CAI 9b, 2) ≈ StA بينهم is one example. Also, we find the combination mā + bayn, ما بَین (GAM 8b, 6) ‘among, in’.

5.3.4.5 The particle لاَدر (StA qad / laqad)

qad or laqad is a StA particle that precedes the verb. When preceding the perfect tense (لقد فعل), it shows the definite execution of the action in the past. In GAM, the particle لاَدر (لقد) is written in a consistent manner (three times, in 3b, 13; 5a, 11; 12b, 12), all three instances corresponding to the same particle spelled للد in the other two manuscripts.

5.3.4.6 fa- + mā + imperative

Another puzzling feature is the use of fa- + ma + imperative or fa- + active participle used to denote an imperative, as attested in飲みことができます يا أيها البشر (GAM passim) ‘the skull said: So know this, O man’; I have not yet encountered this combination in StA nor StC.

5.4 Lexical features

The major differentiation between the variants (StA, StC, NStC [and its EgJA variety] and MA) are observed primarily in phonology, morphology and syntax, and only partly in the vocabulary. In the following paragraphs I will nonetheless try to characterize some lexical relationships between the variants, by addressing their differences, discussing terms of historical and comparative interest (some are common to two varieties or more, others are peculiar to only one), as well as examining the Hebrew vocabulary found.

290 Schulz 2000:163
5.4.1 Typical colloquial verbs

It is very clear that the manuscripts are under the influence of the spoken variety. All three manuscripts exhibit dialectal and StC *hatt* ‘to put’. (GAM 7b, 14; KAR 5a, 6; CAI 10a, 11). We also find the dialectal, merged form of *jā’a* + *bi-* (+ *li-* ≈ ‘to bring’ appearing in all of the manuscripts: (GAM 12a, 7); (KAR 8a, 13; CAI 15a, 14-15b, 2) ≈ StA ‘they brought me (something)’. Another merged form is the verb *qāla* and the preposition *li-*: (GAM 3b, 5) ≈ StA ‘so he said to her’. Another typical verb also found in many Arabic dialects, among them StC, is *ya rēt* ‘I wish’ (*ya rēt* + pronoun suffix). This verb is found in all three manuscripts: (GAM 9a, 5); (KAR 6a, 2); (CAI 11b, 11) ‘I wish (that you)’.

5.4.2 Unusual / substandard patterns

Some unusual, possibly substandard plural forms according to StA and StC patterns are attested in the manuscripts, e.g. broken plural (GAM 9b, 2); (CAI 17a, 13) ≈ StA ‘(his) actions, deeds’ and the same plural, albeit both sound and broken at the same time: (GAM 13b, 5). We also find (GAM 7a, 4) ≈ StA ‘rods, sticks, bars’, as well as the puzzling plural form (GAM 5b, 7) ≈ StA ‘doctors’.

In CAI, the adjective (CAI 5a, 8) ≈ StC *nitāya* ‘female’, is written akin to the word’s StC equivalent. In GAM and KAR however, a possible StA hybrid between أَنثَى أَنثاً and أَنثَى أَنثَا may be detected, in (GAM 4a, 4) and (KAR 2a, 10) *wuntāya* or *wuntāye*, a pattern I cannot seem to find attested in StC nor in StA.
5.4.3 The use and reflexes of StA yā and ʿayyuhā

The word yā (AI 16a, 2; 16b, 8) or yāh (GAM passim) ʿayyahu or ʿayyuhu = StA ʿayyuhā, ‘O’ is attested several times. Only in the CAI manuscript it is attested in its conventional StA form: ʿayyahā (CAI passim).

The spelling of ʿayyuhā as ʿayyahu connected to the next word291 is attested few times, most frequent when followed by a word beginning with ʿalif.292 This feature is illustrated in (GAM 3a, 13) ‘And O, my Master (and O,) my Nourisher (and O,) my Hope’ and in the aforementioned (CAI passim) ‘O’.

5.4.4 Abbreviations

The meaning of some of the abbreviations used in the three manuscripts are clear. For example, (GAM passim) from StA ʿalif and ʿesr ʿalif, ‘Almighty and Exalted’ and (KAR 5a, 2); (GAM passim; CAI passim); (CAI passim) from StA ʿesr and ʿalif, ‘Glorified and Exalted be He’.

In the end of the GAM manuscript, we find a number of abbreviations which I can only guess the meaning behind, occurring right after one another, as shown in the following: The phrase in GAM 14a, 4 (containing the following abbreviations) I have interpreted, in respective order, as ʿalif = Hebrew ʿemor, ‘God fearing’; ʿalif = Hebrew ʿemor, ‘family member, relative’; ʿalif = Hebrew ʿemor, ‘honesty’ (possibly in connection with ʿemor, ‘God fearing’); ʿalif = Hebrew ʿemor, ‘soul, spirit’; ʿalif = Hebrew ʿemor, ‘in(to) his grave, eternal home’. The abbreviation ʿalif from the sentence (GAM 14a, 6-10) seems to stand for the name ʿalif, ‘Yerushalmi’ or ‘the Jerusalemite’. Hence, the whole sentence possibly translates ‘Honesty, mind and spirit, a family member, in his eternal home, it is written to

291 As pointed out in Hopkins 1984:§10d.
292 In accordance with Blau 1967:§103; §113; Hopkins 1984:§27d.
you. I am Yeshua ben Yosef Jerusalemite, Elisha Jerusalemite Noah Eden’, yet I am very
uncertain about this interpretation. Below, more Hebrew content from the manuscripts is
discussed.

5.4.5 Hebrew Content

In line with Blanc’s findings (1964:141ff.) on the Jewish Baghdadi variant, we may say that
everyday use of Hebrew terms are not very numerous; usually the Hebrew terms carries a
special stylistic value, and most Hebrew words have Arabic equivalents, at least for the
storytelling genre found in the present material. As the Hebrew words and expressions
occurring in the manuscripts are only rarely vocalized, it is not always possible to know
whether the pronunciation is guided by Masoretic spelling or not. Nonetheless, they are
undoubtedly connected with religious and communal aspects of Jewish life.

5.4.5.1 Biblical names and quotes

The Hebrew name מָשֶה Moses (موسى in Arabic) is probably written according to its traditional
Hebrew pronunciation (mōsē) in two of the three manuscripts. Here, it is written as it is in
Hebrew (משה [GAM 9b, 14; CAI 12b, 3]), whereas KAR reads מוסי (KA
R 6b, 3). As for the
latter, it is very likely that it is spelled according to StA conventions and should be
pronounced mūsā, because the letter yā’ can be found in the place of ‘alif maqūṣūra
throughout the KAR manuscript (see chapter 5.1.4.3). The CAI scribe uses the Hebrew name
The Hebrew phrase יאם פךּ יהוה כבוד צדקך לפניך והלאך (GAM 13b, 8-9) "And thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward" is a quote from the Book of Isaiah. We also find the quote ים פךּ יהוה כבוד צדקך לפניך והלאך (GAM 14a, 1-3) "Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned; renew our days as of old".

5.4.5.2 Nouns

In CAI, the Hebrew word האים 'the dead' is used, in (CAI 13b, 13-14a, 2) 'those who sacrilege in blessing the dead'. The world' is attested once, in CAI 8b, 9, and the term for 'hell', (KAR passim; CAI passim) ≈ Biblical Hebrew כְּקֶדֶם יָמֵינוּ חַדֵשׁ [וְנָשׁוּבָה] וְנשוב אלָךְ יהוה הֲשׁ יבֵנוּ is found throughout KAR and CAI. In GAM, it is written גהנהם (GAM passim), probably resembling Arabic jahannam, albeit spelled consistently with h in penultimate position, which is unusual.

5.4.5.3 Other Hebrew peculiarities

Praise and blessings are occasionally given in Hebrew, as in (GAM 13b, 14) '(long) live God', as well as in mixed (Hebrew-Arabic) components, possibly neologisms created from Hebrew words or roots: The example והתקותי (GAM 3a, 13) ≈ StA wa-yā + Hebrew תָּכֹה '(and) O, my Hope' seems to represent a uniquely Jewish blessing.

The Hebrew construction עֶדֶן + נ which has been merged to one word עֶדֶן (GAM 13b, 14) 'Garden of Eden'.

293 The same phrase is also found in the corresponding parts of CAI and KAR.
294 Isa. 58.8 (from the King James Version).
295 Lam. 5.21 (from the King James Version), resembling the phrase וְנָשׁוּבָה [עֶדֶן] וְנָשׁוּבָה (KAR 1b, 8) in KAR 1b, 8
The Hebrew verb יתניר ‘to convert to Judaism’ is not attested in StA nor StC, but is found in all three manuscripts: יתנירו (GAM 9b, 15); יתנרו (KAR 6b, 4; CAI 12b, 4) ‘they convert to Judaism’.
Chapter 6: Summary and concluding remarks

In the previous two chapters, we have examined and outlined typical features of the written and spoken Judaeo-Arabic in Egypt during the 19th century, based on a grammatical study of three contemporary Judaeo-Arabic versions of Qiṣṣat al-Jumjuma. The aim for the previous chapter has been to focus on the dichotomy between the substandard varieties Middle Arabic, Non-Standard Cairene and spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic on one side, and the standard (predominantly Muslim) varieties Standard Arabic and Standard Cairene on the other side. Below is a summary of the most important and relevant orthographic, phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical features highlighting this dichotomy, and in many ways supporting the notion of a distinct spoken Egyptian Jewish Arabic variety, although much remains to be studied in this regard:

(i) Orthography and phonology. The scribes tend to have their own personal, standardized orthographic style, especially evident in their rendering of StA ʾalīf maqṣūra bī-ṣūra tī yā and other graphemes missing in the Hebrew alphabet. In this connection, it is clear that GAM is the manuscript displaying the most conspicuous personal standardizations, as attested in e.g. the ʾalīf-lām ligature ḳ written in the place of StA lām-ʾalīf ligature ʿ, and plene written anaptyxis between StA consonant clusters.

In addition to this, the manuscripts exhibit obvious traces of Late Egyptian JA orthography, characterized by the frequent occurrence of ʾalīf-lām ligature ḳ, the lack of assimilation of sun-letters, influence of phonetic spelling and very frequent plene spelling of u, which every now and then provides insight to possible EgJA variants. In fact, plene spelling of u and the preference of u over StC i (or a) are shibboleths of EgJA, and a summary of some lexemes possibly unique to EgJA are presented in the paragraph on lexical features (below).
All three texts include several attestations of tafxīm and tarqīq. Nevertheless, these are frequently found adjacent to a switch of the emphasis’ place, and only occasionally in accordance with the phonetic rules governing emphasis spread (the ‘minimum range’ rule) in the StC variety. This is more typical for the GAM manuscript than for KAR and CAI. Rather than actually reflecting a separate set of rules governing the spread of tafxīm and tarqīq unique to NStC or its EgJA variety (i.e. diverging from that of StC), my own and a number of scholars’ findings point to an inconsistency of the scribe towards the representation of emphatic versus non-emphatic phonemes, who might simply reflect orthographic alternants of the original phoneme, and not necessarily tafxīm or tarqīq.

Concluding on this issue for the time being, the apparent spread of tafxīm and tarqīq attested in Later Egyptian JA orthography may be misleading when attempting to reconstruct the phonetic realization of NStC (and its EgJA variety).

This leads us to one of the most interesting features attested in the manuscripts, namely the occurrence of \( r \) in the place of emphatic \( l \). It is difficult to be assertive about the consistency of this kind of spelling, as there are at least ten possible inconsistencies with the use of \( l \) where there should have been \( r \), and a few puzzling spellings of non-emphatic StA لله باšr ‘in/by God’ and الأرامل ‘the widows’ as برا and ﷪קרא旻ี respectively. That said, there are more than 30 unquestionable occurrences of this conspicuous consonant switch throughout the GAM manuscript, which may help us further understand the Later Egyptian JA orthographic traditions for reflecting switch of the emphasis’ place and apparent spread of tafxīm and tarqīq. It is a phenomenon that deserves further investigation and analysis.

The GAM manuscript exhibits an unusual switch of \( q \) written in the place of StA ئ، most probably as a result of hyper-correction. Some examples of this very frequent phenomenon are taqzan ‘to allow, permit’, yā qummi ‘O, (my) mother’, qit’addim ‘came forth, advanced’, yuqmin birrāh ‘believe in God’ il-qard ‘the Earth’, etc.
(ii) Morphology. The morphology of the three manuscripts is very much akin to that of StC. They frequently exhibit ‘Low’ variants (i.e. they show a preference towards choosing an informal register), violation of gender agreement in demonstratives, relatives and even (once) in a personal pronoun, as well as the StC relative pronoun ḥilli in GAM, the b/m-imperfective, the t-I. stem ḫita‘al and the geminated t-II. stem ḫita‘al in both GAM and KAR.

We also find typical MA demonstratives found in GAM and KAR (combined with the following noun, written dil-hayyāt ‘those snakes’ and [hypo-correct] dālika dil-qumūr ‘those things’), and the interrogative particle māḏā (in CAI) used hyper-correctly.

NStC features are found in all three manuscripts, namely the interrogative particles ḫēš ‘what’, wide attestation of the nfN nfNū verb form (N-form), as well as the substandard, possibly EgJA s-I. stem ḫisfa‘al (in GAM).

(iii) Syntax. The StC negation markers mā + š / šī / bi-šī are found in abundance throughout the material. Other negation markers found in the material exhibit strong influence of standardized MA pseudo-corrects, as well as a number of other hypo-corrections. For example, lam + verb in the perfect tense negating a completed action, which is a frequent feature in Later and Modern Egyptian JA sources, is widely attested in all three manuscripts. It is a typical MA feature, which probably originated as a hypo-correction, later to undergo standardization. In GAM and KAR, laysa + perfect is used to negating a completed action, which is probably another hypo-correction, especially because it is not conjugated according to the 1st person singular (lastu), as it should have been in this context, but retained in 3rd person singular laysa. mā + li + noun is attested negating the copula in all three manuscripts.

The cases of nominal attribution attested in the manuscripts occasionally oppose traditional StA conventions for genitive constructions (or they hypo-correctly resemble such
constructions) and noun-adjective phrases. Rules governing definiteness in genitive constructions are violated, e.g. in GAM and CAI by omitting the attributive adjunct definite article in the construct state (ṣālik ḥīn ‘at that time’ and gumgumat wāhid mayyit ‘a dead skull’), and in all three manuscripts we find definite qualifiers following indefinite nouns (e.g. yōm il-fulāni ‘this such and such day’).

The independent article -an, which is attested widely throughout my material (probably a morpheme indicating that an indefinite noun is followed by an attribute), is found e.g. preceding the attributive adjective and the attributive clause.

Another typical Late JA feature is the frequent use and reduplications of the coordinating conjunction fa-. In the manuscripts we find phrases including two, and even as much as three fa-conjunctions in one phrase. Here, fa- + fa-lammā + fa- / fa-lammā + fa- is used as a conjunction of result or purpose. In line with earlier scholarly work on the topic, the apodosis is introduced by fa- only when the verb in the lammā clause is a sensory verb (see, watch, hear, etc.), and is attested in earlier Late and Modern Egyptian JA sources.

There are also some interesting syntactical features found in the GAM manuscript, which I find difficult to explain. These are the particle لاشر (resembling StA لنف) and the use of fa- + ma + imperative or fa- + active participle פימתעלם ‘so know this’, used as an imperative.

(iv) Lexical features. The manuscripts often exhibit a very colloquial content, strongly influenced by the StC variety. It is found occasionally in the partly classicized CAI manuscript, more often in the slightly less classicized KAR manuscript, and in abundance in the more colloquial GAM manuscript. One of many examples is the StC expression ṭišawwaš
xatri ʿala rūḥi ‘my mind confused my soul’ found in both GAM and KAR,\textsuperscript{297} which illustrates
the manuscripts' strong colloquial influence.

There are some NStC lexical variants found in the material, possibly unique to the EgJA
variety. These are found because of the plene spelling of \textit{u} in Late Egyptian JA orthography
and the preference of \textit{u} over StC i (or \textit{a}) in the EgJA variety, e.g. ʿušrīn ‘twenty’, durāʾ
‘cubits’, ʿurbuʾmit ʿalf ‘four hundred thousand’, unfushum ‘their souls’, umwāt ‘the dead
(plural)’, nusāra ‘Christian (plural)’ and the verb pattern \textit{fuʾul}, all attested in the present
material and most probably unique to the NStC or EgJA variant.

Finally, biblical names and quotes are found throughout the manuscripts, albeit not in
abundance. There are also attestations of a few Hebrew nouns, like גהנים ‘the dead’,
‘Hell’ and גן עדן ‘Garden of Eden’, the Hebrew-Arabic combination ויאתקותי ‘(and) O, my Hope’
and the Hebrew verb ה_OTHER ‘to convert to Judaism’.

\textsuperscript{297}CAI 11b, 4-5 = StA: ‘I grieved over my soul’.
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Critical edition concordance

This concordance include folio numbers and line numbers in GAM relative to the corresponding story in KAR end CAI.

GAM 2a = KAR 1a, 1 - 4
GAM 3a = KAR 1b, 1 - 11; CAI 4a, 1 - 4b, 2
GAM 3b = KAR 1b, 11 - 2a, 8; CAI 4b, 2 - 5a, 4
GAM 4a = KAR 2a, 8 - 2b, 3; CAI 5a, 4 - 5b, 4
GAM 4b = KAR 2b, 3 - 3a, 1; CAI 5b, 4 - 6a, 9
GAM 5a = KAR 3a, 1 - 3a, 11; CAI 6a, 9 - 7a, 2
GAM 5b = KAR 3a, 12 - 3b, 8; CAI 7a, 2 - 7b, 4
GAM 6a = KAR 3b, 8 - 4a, 5; CAI 7b, 3 - 8a, 14
GAM 6b = KAR 4a, 5 - 15; CAI 8a, 14 - 9a, 9
GAM 7a = KAR 4a, 16 - 4b, 11; CAI 9a, 9 - 9b, 11
GAM 7b = KAR 4b, 11 - 5a, 7; CAI 9b, 11 - 10a, 12
GAM 8a = KAR 5a, 7 - 5b, 4; CAI 10a, 12 - 11a, 4
GAM 8b = KAR 5b, 4 - 5b, 14; CAI 11a, 4 - 11b, 6
GAM 9a = KAR 5b, 14 - 6a, 8; CAI 11b, 6 - 12a, 5
GAM 9b = KAR 6a, 9 - 6b, 5; CAI 12a, 5 - 12b, 5
GAM 10a = KAR 6b, 5 - 7a, 1; CAI 12b, 6 - 13a, 9
GAM 10b = KAR 7a, 1 - 7a, 11; CAI 13a, 9 - 13b, 10
GAM 11a = KAR 7a, 11 - 7b, 7; CAI 13b, 10 - 14a, 14
GAM 11b = KAR 7b, 7 - 8a, 6; CAI 14a, 14 - 15a, 4
GAM 12a = KAR 8a, 6 - 8b, 6; CAI 15a, 5 - 15b, 12
GAM 12b = KAR 8b, 6 - 9a, 4; CAI 15b, 13 - 16b, 8
GAM 13a = KAR 9a, 4 - 9a, 13; CAI 16b, 8 - 17a, 9
GAM 13b = KAR 9a, 13 - 9b, 11; CAI 17a, 9 - 17b, 7\textsuperscript{298}
GAM 14a = KAR 9b, 12 - 9b, 19\textsuperscript{299}

\textsuperscript{298} CAI ends here.
\textsuperscript{299} KAR ends here.
האם קנה יג
מענהו חזק יז

져 פאלוולמה שלשה יא
שפג בקנו כאפי חותמא
לבך פגום וחי מוסט, לא
 cavalry והמאוהב וכוכב שמח
ננוגנת ניינית למדיה, פי היעל
ספניט וארדא פי כפורを作る
שнская ואורכל אובודה ב ישראל
יא תורה bietet והשכילה לארץ
 зубי פי טראב פי אחר היעל
יא כי变异י ויישו ירחונא יכלה
אסף עם יי הל אומן אסף אחר
תקד מלבט, שפוגנה בברכה
ברך וה฀כלת חודה אכלתותʔ
מִדְנָא שֶלֶם לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְמָל כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וְלַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וַּלָּא לָא לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וַּלָּא לָא לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וַּלָּא לָא לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וַּלָּא לָא לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ וַּלָּא לָא לַגֵלֶל יְמַלְלָה כִּי הָיוּ בְּלִשֵׁנְךָ
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42 (KAR)

Folio 1b-2a