The verbs לשיר and לשבח are translated ın the *šarḥ* to the Psalms by the verb סבח, whose various conjugations are usually written with ס, for example: נסבבח (אָשִׁ֥ירָה, Ps 27:6), סבח (שָׁ֥ר, Ps 7:1). However, we found two instances of words with this root spelled with ש – נשבבח (אָשִׁ֥ירָה, Ps 13:6), ישבחוךּ (יְשַׁבְּחֽוּנְךָ, Ps 63:4) – where all informants were careful to read the text as written, reading [s] when ס was used but reading the form with ש as [š]. As already shown, the alternative with ש may reflect the influence on the *šarḥ* of the form *šǝbbaḥ*, which is current in the colloquial and has its origins in the influence of Hebrew.

In conclusion, the presence of /s/ and /š/ as distinct phonemes in CJA, as reflected in the *šarḥ* as read by the Jews of Constantine, is also evident in the orthography. With a few words, however, a difference in pronunciation was observed that reflected the orthography of Rabbi Yosef Renassia between it and the rabbis’ natural pronunciation of them.

e) Orthographic Representation of /q/

The Jews of Constantine realize the uvular consonant /q/ as a voiceless uvular plosive in their speech. Accordingly, it is represented in the transliteration by the letter ק, for example: קום (קוּמָ֣ה, Ps 9:20), קריבו (קְרֹבֽוֹ, Ps 15:3), חמקךּ (פָּ֫נֶ֥יךָ, Ps 21:10), צ'ייאק (צַ֫ר, Ps 31:10), וקת (עֵ֑ת, Ps 34:2), קפ'לו (סָּֽגְר֑וּ, Ps 37:10).

However, with a few words, the Jews of Constantine realize /q/ as a voiced velar plosive [g], probably due to dialect mixture.[[1]](#footnote-1) For those words in which this voiced realization is regular, it is also consistently represented in writing as ג (without a diacritic), for example: מסגגם (יָ֝שָׁ֗ר, Ps 11:7), בתסגים (בְּמֵֽישָׁרִֽים, Ps 9:6), בלגדים (בְּנֶשֶׁךְ֮, Ps 15:5), גרג'ומתהום (גְּרֹנָ֑ם, Ps 5:10), ונגגזהום (וַיַּרְקִידֵ֥ם, Ps 29:6). In translating the word קרנים (וּמִקַּרְנֵ֖י רֵמִ֣ים, Ps 22:22), a discrepancy was apparent between the rabbis’ pronunciation of the word as *gṛūn* and the orthography of the *šarḥ*, which is קרון.[[2]](#footnote-2)

f) The Orthography of the Other Consonants

The representation of the remaining consonants is unremarkable. All realizations of a given consonantal phoneme are represented by a single Hebrew grapheme. Thus, for example ג' represents both the [ğ] realization and the [ž] realization of the phoneme /ğ/ without any distinction. This provides further support for the view already put forward that the orthography of Rabbi Yosef Renassia reflects only regular shifts in his language, and effectively only its foundations. Allophonic or sporadic realizations are not marked and are represented by the grapheme used for the entire phoneme. Thus, the consonantal orthography may be largely regarded as phonemic transcription in Hebrew letters.

[6.1.4] Orthographic Reflection of Metathesis

Any metathesis in verbs is reflected in the orthography. Thus, the Hebrew verb ענה is almost always translated in the *šarḥ* in its metathetic form ואג'ב.[[3]](#footnote-3) Similarly, the Hebrew verbs האזין and הקשיב are translated by צננת, reflecting the metathesis nṣt > ṣnt in the various conjugation forms. For example: תצננת (תַּקְשִׁ֥יב, Ps 10:17), אצננת (הַֽאֲזִ֥ינָה, Ps 5:2). The metathesis in the root lˁn > nˁl is also documented in the orthography: ומנעלינו (וּ֝מְקֻלָּלָ֗יו, Ps 37:22). Another instance of metathesis reflected in the orthography is the word העד (“covenant”), although in this instance the marking of the vowel on the /h/ is inconsistent: העדו (בְ֝רִית֗וֹ, Ps 25:10) / והאעדו (וּ֝בְרִית֗וֹ, Ps 25:14). We should add that exchanges between the liquid consonants are not reflected in the orthography.[[4]](#footnote-4)

[6.1.5] Double Consonants

The marking of consonant doubling by means of a double letter can be found in numerous Maghrebi texts.[[5]](#footnote-5) Rabbi Yosef Renassia also did so occasionally. A double consonant due to a verbal conjugation or nominal pattern is quite often represented in the *šarḥ* by a double letter,[[6]](#footnote-7) though not always. In most cases, the second root consonant in the verb form *kǝttǝb* is represented by a double letter, for example: ומרפ'פ'ע (וּמֵרִ֥ים, Ps 3:4), סגגם (הַיְשַׁ֖ר, Ps 5:9), רטטב (הֶחֱלִ֣יק, Ps 36:3), ליעטטל (לְהַשְׁבִּ֥ית, Ps 8:3), תללפ'הום (הַדִּיחֵ֑מוֹ, Ps 5:11), בטטל (הֵפִ֥יר, Ps 33:10), עדדבת (עִנֵּ֣יתִי, Ps 35:13). However, *kǝttǝb* forms also appear with orthographic doubling, particularly in verbs with two identical root letters, where the writer is reluctant to write three identical consonants in a row, for example: כ'ממת (זַ֝מֹּתִ֗י, Ps 17:3), פ'ששת (דִּשַּׁ֥נְתָּ, Ps 23:5), נצפ'ף (אֶֽעֱרָךְ, Ps 5:4), וחזמתיני (וַתְּאַזְּרֵ֣נִי, Ps 18:40, 30:12). Nevertheless, a third-person masculine singular future form is written as יכ'ממם (יַחְשֹׁ֗ב, Ps 36:5; זֹמֵ֣ם, Ps 37:12), presumably because of the distinctive grapheme used for the third instance of the letter (a final *mem*).

In the verb form *tkǝttǝb*, some forms with a double consonant are written with a double letter, although the exceptions to this practice are more numerous than the instances in which it is observed, and not only in roots with two identical root consonants. Thus, we find, for example: תבזזעת (נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי֮, Ps 22:15), ותהררסת (וְנִדְכֵּ֣יתִי, Ps 38:9), אתפ'כ'כ'ר (הִ֭נָּשֵׂא, Ps 7:7), יתכללם (יְדַבֵּ֣ר, Ps 2:5), אתכייסו (הַשְׂכִּ֑ילוּ, Ps 2:10), אנתבבע (אֶרְדּ֣וֹף, Ps 18:38), תבככשת (נֶֽאֱלַ֣מְתִּי, Ps 39:3, 10), נתצפ'פ'א (אֵיתָ֑ם, Ps 19:14). However, we also find, among many examples: ונתברא (וְ֝נִקֵּ֗יתִי, Ps 19:14),[[7]](#footnote-8) אתחרכי (נ֝֗וּדִי, Ps 11:1), יתבכשו (תֵּ֥אָלַ֗מְנָה, Ps 31:19), ותרפ'ענא (וַנִּתְעוֹדָֽד, Ps 20:9), תמקן (הִשְׁקִ֪יף, Ps 14:2), תכצרת (נִשְׁבָּֽרָה, Ps 34:21).

Double consonants in Form I verbs whose roots include two identical consonants are reflected in the orthography, for example: חבבית (אָ֭הַבְתִּי, Ps 26:8), תחבבו (תֶּֽאֱהָב֣וּן, Ps 4:3), חאבבין (אֹֽהֲבֵ֥י, Ps 5:12). This practice is not consistent, however, for example: תפ'כני (תַּצִּילֵֽנִי, Ps 18:49). The double consonant is not marked in final position, for example: יחב / חאב (אָהֵ֑ב, Ps 11:7), וסל (וְהָ֘רֵ֤ק, Ps 35:3), רד (הָשִׁ֣יבָה, Ps 35:17).

Rabbi Renassia did not adopt a strict rule of representing double consonants in nominal patterns. Thus, we find ללמדדאח (לַמְנַצֵּ֥חַ, Ps 5:1), חקקךּ (אֲמִתֶּֽךָ, Ps 30:10), נששאבהום (חִצָּ֣ם, Ps 11:2), בלדדאת (בַּנְּעִמִ֑ים, Ps 16:6), ברראני (נֵכָ֥ר, Ps 18:46), אללאה (אלהים, in may places), but also חוכאם (שֹׁ֣פְטֵי, Ps 2:10), ללמדאח (לַמְנַצֵּ֗חַ, Ps 20:1). The particle לסבבת (for example: לְמַ֥עַן, Ps 5:9) is always written with a double letter, whereas מן קודאם (for example: מִפְּנֵ֤י, Ps 3:1) is always written without one.

In verbal forms where the third root letter is /t/ and the person morpheme begins with *t*, we found בחתתי (בָּ֘חַ֤נְתָּ, Ps 17:3), but also סכת (הֶֽחֱשֵׁ֣יתִי, Ps 39:3).[[8]](#footnote-9) As in the case of the verbs with two identical root letters, it is possible that Rabbi Renassia refrained from marking doubling in final positions.

The first consonant of a noun that begins with a “sun letter” and is accompanied by the definite article is not doubled.[[9]](#footnote-10)

In conclusion, doubled consonants are often denoted orthographically by a double letter, particularly in the verb form *kǝttǝb*. Like muchy North African orthography, however, Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s does not observe this rule strictly.[[10]](#footnote-11)

[6.2] Representation of the Semi-Vowels and Diphthongs

This section will discuss both the orthography of the semi-vowels, with their consonantal and vocal realizations, and that of the diphthongs, all of which are represented alternatively by one of the signs ו, י, וו, and יי. We have separated this discussion from the examination of ו and י as *matres lectionis*.[[11]](#footnote-12)

In their vocal realizations – i.e., as [u] and [i], /w/ and /y/ – they are represented in the orthography by a single ו or י, respectively. Examples:

ו: וקף' (עָמָ֑ד, Ps 1:1), וקארי (כְּ֝בוֹדִ֗י, Ps 3:4), וסעת (הִרְחַ֣בְתָּ, Ps 4:2), ללוראתא (לְנַֽחֲלָ֣ה, Ps 33:12), פ'לוסאע (בַמֶּרְחָ֣ב, Ps 31:9), וג'יעאת למות (חֶבְלֵי־מָ֑וֶת, Ps 18:5).

י: ימין (אָלָ֤ה, Ps 10:7), יתים (יָ֝ת֗וֹם, Ps 10:14), יבס (יָ֘בֵ֤שׁ, Ps 22:16), מן ימיני (מִֽ֝ימִינִ֗י, Ps 16:8).

In their consonantal realizations – i.e., as [w] and [y], /w/ and /y/ – they are represented in the orthography respectively by a single ו or י, or by double וו or יי.[[12]](#footnote-13) No conditioning was observed for either form, though there appears to be a tendency to represent the second root letter [w] with וו in the conjugations of the verb form *kātǝb*. Examples:

ו: נודדי (אוֹדֶ֤ה, Ps 32:5), ודלוקת (וְ֭עַתָּה, Ps 2:10), לכ'ואני (לְאֶחָ֑י, Ps 22:23), שוארב (שִׂפְתֵ֥י, Ps 17:1), וידאן (נְ֝הָר֗וֹת, Ps 24:2).

וו: נווכל (אַפְקִ֪יד, Ps 31:6), ונוורריךּ (וְֽאוֹרְךָ֗, Ps 32:8), דעווא (אָלָ֤ה, Ps 10:7), בטג;ווא (בְגֵאֽוּת, Ps 17:10), צאוובו (כּֽוֹנְנ֣וּ, Ps 11:2),[[13]](#footnote-14) נעאווד (אֲ֝סַפְּרָ֗ה, Ps 9:2, 15), תעאוון (עוֹזֵֽר, Ps 10:14), לסמאוואת (שְׁחָקִֽים, Ps 36:6).

י: וצאיאת (פִּקּ֘וּדֵ֤י, Ps 19:9), יתבבע (יִ֥רַדֹּֽף, Ps 7:6), ידךּ (יָֽדְךָ֨, Ps 17:14), לג'יוס (צְבָא֑וֹת, Ps 24:10).

יי: תייאבי (בְגָדַ֣י, Ps 22:19), זייאדא (ע֑וֹד, Ps 10:18), ביידךּ (בְּיָ֫דֶ֥ךָ, Ps 10:14), צ'ייאר (חֲצֵרִ֗ים, Ps 10:8), ובאייעו (וַיִּֽשְׁתַּחֲו֨וּ, Ps 22:30), אבייץ' (אַ֝שְׁרֵ֗י, Ps 2:12).[[14]](#footnote-15)

Doubled /w/ and /y/ are represented by double וו and יי.[[15]](#footnote-16) Most are found in the verb forms *kǝttǝb* and *tkǝttǝb* in verbs whose second root letter is ו or י. For example:

וו: תצ'וורו (תַּעְטְרֶֽנּוּ, Ps 5:13), ותעוונת (וְֽנֶ֫עֱזָ֥רְתִּי, Ps 28:7), נזוול (אָסִ֥יר, Ps 18:23), קווא (עֹ֥ז, Ps 30:8), קוותהום (מָֽ֝עוּזָּ֗ם, Ps 37:39).

יי: מכ'אצרייה (לֵ֝צִ֗ים, Ps 1:1), יעייטו (יְשַׁוְּע֥וּ, Ps 18:42), תייג'וני (כִּתְּרֽוּנִי, Ps 22:13), מייל (הַטֵּ֤ה, Ps 31:3), האייא (הֵכִ֣ין, Ps 7:14).

When writing medial diphthongs, Rabbi Yosef Renassia tended to distinguish between a potential diphthong found in the governed word of a construct chain and a potential diphthong found in a word outside such a chain. The former is represented by a single ו or י and the latter by a double וו or יי. Thus, we find:

י: וליל (וָלָֽיְלָה, Ps 1:2), ליש (לא, in many places), כ'יר (טֽוֹב, Ps 34:11), לעין (עָֽיִן, Ps 35:19), סיף (חֶ֤רֶב, Ps 37:14), ג'יס (חָ֑יִל, Ps 33:16), אלכ'יל (הַ֭סּוּס, Ps 33:17).

ו: בלכ'וף (בְּיִרְאָ֑ה, Ps 2:11), קום (ק֘וּמָ֤ה, Ps 3:8), זור (אָֽוֶן, Ps 5:6), צות (ק֭וֹל, Ps 77:18), קוץ (קֶ֗שֶׁת, Ps 11:2).

יי: לבייתךּ (בֵיתֶ֑ךָ, Ps 5:8), עייניךּ (עֵינֶ֑יךָ, Ps 5:6), ג'ייסו (חֵ֝יל֗וֹ, Ps 33:17), ליישו (אֵינֶ֑נּוּ, Ps 37:36), כ'יירךּ (טֽוּבְךָ֣, Ps 25:7), עיינייא (עֵינַ֣י, Ps 25:15), סייפ'הום (חַ֭רְבָּם, Ps 37:15), and in several verbs: שייטן (רָגַ֨ל, Ps 15:3), מפ'ייסכ'ין (לַֽעֲגֵ֣י, Ps 35:16).

וו: וחווזתךּ (וַ֝אֲחֻזָּֽתְךָ֗, Ps 2:8), קוומו (עַמּ֣וֹ, Ps 29:11), צוותי (ק֭וֹלִי, Ps 3:5), צוות אללאה (ק֥וֹל יְהוָ֗ה, Ps 29:3, 4, 5).

Once again, we found exceptions such as: קומךּ (עַמְּךָ֖, Ps 3:9), קוצהום (קַ֫שְׁתָּ֥ם, Ps 37:14), ג'ייס (חָ֑יִל, Ps 18:33).

These orthographic forms suggest that where a diphthong appears in a word in a construct chain, or accompanied by a pronoun, it will be maintained, while where the word appears in the separate state, the diphthong will be contracted. The first part of this orthographic tendency is consistent with our findings concerning the realization of the diphthongs.[[16]](#footnote-17) The rabbis maintained the diphthongs when they appeared in a governed word in a construct chain or were accompanied by a pronoun. The second part, however, is only partially consistent with our findings. In words that are not part of a construct chain and in which the diphthong is preceded by one of the consonants /ǧ ˁ ḥ ġ q ṭ ḍ ṣ/, the diphthong is maintained in the pronunciation, while alongside other consonants it normally, though not always, contracts. Rabbi Yosef Renassia did not apply this distinction between different consonantal environments in which the diphthong appears to his orthography. Accordingly, it seems that any diphthong not in a word-forming part of a construct chain will be contracted. Additional evidence of diphthong contraction in several such words, as realized by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, can be found in his trilingual dictionary, for example: פחד *khofe* (p. 336), קול *tsouth[[17]](#footnote-18)* (p. 468), סוס *khile* (p. 78), and חיל *djich* (p. 24). However, we also find, for example עין *aine* (p. 314) and חרב *saife* (p. 183).

The orthography of the final diphthongs reflects their precise pronunciation as closely as possible: *āw* is represented by או[[18]](#footnote-19), *īw* is represented by יו, and *āy* by אי. For example:

*āw*: ואזהאו (וְ֝גִ֗ילוּ, Ps 2:11), יתמשאו (יִתְהַלָּכ֑וּן, Ps 12:9), יעייאו (יִבֹּ֑לוּ, Ps 18:46), יכ'לאו (יָ֭שֹׁמּוּ, Ps 40:16), כ'בבאו[[19]](#footnote-20) (טָ֝מָ֗נוּ, Ps 9:16).

*īw*: ירמיו (יַפִּ֥ילוּ, Ps 22:19), יסתחיו (יֵבֹ֣שׁוּ, Ps 35:4), ויכ'לליו (וְהִנִּ֥יחוּ, Ps 17:14), אשתהיו (נַשְּׁקוּ, Ps 2:12), יכ'פ'יו (יִצְפֹּֽנוּ, Ps 10:8).

*āy*: כיף שואי (כִּמְעַ֣ט, Ps 2:12)

[6.3] Orthography of the Vowels

[6.3.1] Short Vowels

Short vowels are not usually written, for example: יבעת (יִשְׁלַֽח, Ps 20:3), וקלב (וָלֵ֣ב, Ps 12:3), ערפ'ת (יָדַ֗עְתִּי, Ps 20:7), ומנטק (וִיפֵ֥חַ, Ps 27:12), בכתרת ג'הד (בְּרָב־כֹּֽחַ, Ps 33:16).

However, *matres lectionis* are used relatively frequently to represent the quality of the short vowel.[[20]](#footnote-21) For example:

א represents the [a] quality of the short vowel, and appears very frequently before or after /h/, /ḥ/, /ˁ/, particularly in verbal forms: כראה (שִׁקַּ֡ץ, Ps 22:25), אפ'האם (בִּ֣ינָה, Ps 5:2), סאמאח (נָשָׂ֥א, Ps 15:3), ונדבאח (וְאֶזְבְּחָ֣ה, Ps 27:6), לאחמי (בְּ֝שָׂרִ֗י, Ps 16:9), וליצבבאח (וּלְבַקֵּ֥ר, Ps 27:4), פ'ראח (שָׂמַ֣ח, Ps 16:9), סמאע (שָׁמַ֥ע, Ps 6:9), וג'עאל (וַיִּתֵּ֖ן, Ps 18:33), צ'אייאע (אֹבֵֽד, Ps 31:13), בליש יטלאע (בְלִיַּ֣עַל, Ps 18:5), נקטעאת (נִכְרָֽתָה, Ps 37:38), תמנאע (חָדַ֖ל, Ps 36:4), and many others.[[21]](#footnote-22)

However, this is also not consistently observed and the same words may also be found without א, for example: יפ'הם (יָבִ֑ין, Ps 19:13), ג'על (שָֽׂם, Ps 19:5), נשבע (אֶשְׂבְּעָ֥ה, Ps 17:15), סמע (שָׁמֵֽעַ, Ps 22:25), קעד (יָשָֽׁב, Ps 1:1), ונפ'רח (וְאֶשְׂמְחָ֗ה, Ps 31:8).

The use of א to denote vowel quality before ה, ח, and ע is also found among the Jews of Algiers.[[22]](#footnote-23)

א was also used to denote vowel quality after ר (ṛ): נועראף (נ֤וֹדַ֨ע, Ps 9:17). It may also be found before a doubled consonant (at least in CA):[[23]](#footnote-24) חאק (אֱ֝מֶ֗ת, Ps 15:2), טאייק אלחאק (אֵ֣ל אֱמֶֽת, Ps 31:6).

The use of ו to denote [u] vowel quality is also common:[[24]](#footnote-25) אשוכראן (תְהִלָּֽה, Ps 33:1), פ'ום (פִּֽי, Ps 37:30), קודשךּ (קָ֝דְשְׁךָ֗, Ps 5:8), חופ'רא (בֽוֹר, Ps 28:1), קורעא (גוֹרָֽל, Ps 22:19), חושמו[[25]](#footnote-26) (בֽוֹשׁוּ, Ps 22:6), מוג;ית (מוֹשִׁ֣יעַ, Ps 17:7), אומום (גוֹיִ֑ם, Ps 2:1), עודייאני (אֹֽיְבַ֣י, Ps 3:8), צולטאנו (מַ֫לְכּ֥וֹ, Ps 18:51), etc.

The vowel of the second root letter in the future tense of complete Form I verbs is not marked with a *mater lectiones*. The same is true in verbs with two identical root letters, except in a few future tense and imperative forms of the root √fkk: יפ'וכני (יַצִּילֵ֗נִי, Ps 18:18), פ'וכני (הַצִּ֫ילֵ֥נִי, Ps 31:3) – but יפ'ךּ (מַצִּֽיל, Ps 7:3).

ו is often used to denote the short vowel in the past tense of Form I verbs whose second root letter is ו, for example: פ'וקת (הֱקִיצ֑וֹתִי, Ps 3:6), כונת (הָיִ֑יתָ, Ps 27:9), קולת (אָמַ֣רְתְּ, Ps 16:2), שובת (זָ֫קַ֥נְתִּי, Ps 37:25), קומנא (קַּ֝֗מְנו, Ps 20:9). In the imperative forms of verbs whose second root letter is ו or י, these letters are used to denote a long vowel,[[26]](#footnote-27) for example: כון (הֱיֵה, Ps 31:3), ג;ית (הוֹשִׁ֤יעָה, Ps 28:9), זול (ס֣וּר, Ps 37:27). Our impression is that verbs whose second root letter is ו or י are always written as such, whether it is pronounced as a long or short vowel, thereby representating all three root consonants.

ו is also found in the second- and third-person plural enclitic pronouns,[[27]](#footnote-28) for example: תצ'ג;צ'ג;הום: (תְּנַפְּצֵֽם, Ps 2:9), וימינהום (וִֽ֝ימִינָ֗ם, Ps 26:10), קוצהום (קַ֫שְׁתָּ֥ם, Ps 17:14), ילמהום (אֹסְפָֽם, Ps 39:7), ג'בלכום (הַרְכֶ֥ם, Ps 11:1), פ'י קלבכום (בִ֭לְבַבְכֶם, Ps 4:5). The third-person plural enclitic pronoun is written in rare instances without a ו, usually due to lack of space at the end of a line, for example: עליהם (עָלֵ֑ימוֹ, Ps 5:12), פ'כהם (הִצִּילָֽם, Ps 34:18), ג;ייארהם (עַצְּבוֹתָם֮, Ps 16:4), תמזיזהם (נִסְכֵּיהֶ֣ם, Ps 16:4).

In several words, ו denotes the quality of a short vowel before a consonant and, in at least one instance, this consonant was doubled:[[28]](#footnote-29) חוכאם (שֹׁ֣פְטֵי, Ps 2:10), קודאמי (לְפָנַ֣י, Ps 5:9), כולו (כֻּ֝לּ֗וֹ, Ps 29:9), אומי (אִמִּֽי, Ps 22:10).

Of the three *matres lectionis*, י is used least often to denote the quality of a short vowel.[[29]](#footnote-30) It mainly appears in this capacity after א in order to mark the vowel on the *hamzah,* which has often been omitted, for example: אילא (אֶת, e.g.: Ps 2:3), איסם (שֵׁ֤ם, Ps 20:2), אינסאן (אֱ֝נ֗וֹשׁ, Ps 10:18), אילאה (אֱלֹהֵ֬י, Ps 20:2), אילאהי (אֱלֹהָ֑י, Ps 30:3), ליהום (לָֽמוֹ, Ps 2:4).

The initial vowel of imperatives of Form I and from the form *tkǝttǝb* is usually a short /ǝ/ represented in the orthography as א.[[30]](#footnote-31)

[6.3.2] Long Vowels

The long vowels are marked with the *matres lectionis* both in nominal patterns and in the conjugation of relevant verb types,[[31]](#footnote-32) for example:

א – /ā/: נהאר (יוֹמָ֥ם, Ps 1:2), תמארו (פִּרְי֨וֹ, Ps 1:3), פ'י צ'לאלו (בְסֻכֹּ֗ה, Ps 10:9), זייאדא (ע֑וֹד, Ps 10:18), תעאוון (עוֹזֵֽר, Ps 10:14), עארף (יוֹדֵ֣עַ, Ps 1:6), עאדלין (צַדִּיקִֽים, Ps 1:5), כאן (הָיָ֣ה, Ps 22:15), נכ'אף (אִ֘ירָ֤א, Ps 23:4), נאדא (קָ֭רָא, Ps 34:7), נבארךּ (אֲבָרֵ֗ךְ, Ps 16:7).

ו – /ū/: בלכ'יול (בַסּוּסִ֑ים, Ps 20:8), דנובי (עֲו‍ֹנִ֥י, Ps 38:19), יקולו (יֹֽאמְר֣וּ, Ps 40:17), נקום (אָ֭קוּם, Ps 12:6), רוחי (נַפְשִׁ֣י, Ps 16:10), ומברוךּ (וּבָר֣וּךְ, Ps 18:47), פ'לאומום (בַגּוֹיִ֥ם, Ps 18:50), עדוייא (אֹֽיְבִ֣י, Ps 13:5), יורת (יִ֣ירַשׁ, Ps 25:13).[[32]](#footnote-33)

י – /ī/: בעיד (רָח֥וֹק, Ps 22:2), ג'מיע (כָּֽל, Ps 22:15), מן תפ'שיש (מִדֶּ֣שֶׁן, Ps 36:9), ויצ'יעו (וְ֝יֹֽאבְד֗וּ, Ps 9:4), סידי (אֲדֹנָ֣י, Ps 16:2), נג'רי (אָרֻ֣ץ, Ps 18:30), נמיל (אֶמּֽוֹט, Ps 16:8), סריר (עֶ֣רֶשׂ, Ps 41:4), חבבית (אָ֭הַבְתִּי, Ps 26:8).[[33]](#footnote-34)

*Alif maqsurah* is almost always represented as א as, for example, in verbs whose third root letter is י or an א that becomes י, for example: נסא (שָׁ֣כַֽח, Ps 10:11), כ'פ'א (הִסְתִּ֥יר, Ps 10:11), ורעאהום (וּֽרְעֵ֥ם, Ps 28:9),[[34]](#footnote-35) כ'בבא (טָמַ֣ן, Ps 35:8), נאדא (קָ֭רָא, Ps 34:7), ונזהא (וְאֶֽעֶלְצָ֣ה, Ps 9:3), and many others. However, we also found a few words in which ה was used:[[35]](#footnote-36) טובה (אַ֥שְֽׁרֵי, Ps 1:1), ונצרג'ה (וַֽאֲצַפֶּֽה, Ps 5:4).

A short vowel that is lengthened,[[36]](#footnote-37) such as in the word *ṛ-ṛāğǝl*, *hāˁǝd*, is also denoted in the orthography, for example: אלראג'ל (הָ֭אִישׁ, Ps 25:12), והאעדו (וּ֝בְרִית֗וֹ, Ps 25:14), but also העדו (בְ֝רִית֗וֹ, Ps 25:10).[[37]](#footnote-38)

[6.3.3] Epenthetic Vowel

The epenthetic vowel does not have phonemic value in CJA.[[38]](#footnote-39) However, instances in which it is reflected in writing at the head of a word show that speakers are aware of its presence.

Documentation of this vowel can be found, for example, in first-person singular future forms (in 17 out of the 122 such forms found in the corpus), for example: אנשכרו (אֲהוֹדֶֽנּוּ, Ps 28:7), אנכ'אף (אִירָ֑א, Ps 27:1), אנעללמכום (אֲלַמֶּדְכֶֽם, Ps 34:12), אנדווב (אַמְסֶֽה, Ps 6:7). It is also documented in other verbal forms, for example: אצ'רבת (הִכִּ֣יתָ, Ps 3:8), אפ'דית (פָּדִ֖יתָ, Ps 31:6).

We found a similar phenomenon to the marking of an epenthetic א in the Algiers Passover *Haggadah* (1855),[[39]](#footnote-40) where the written form אננאדי appears several times (e.g., Ps 116:2, 13, 17).[[40]](#footnote-41)

Naturally, a medial ancillary vowel is never documented in the orthography.

The residual *tanwin* is not documented in the orthography and only thanks to the reading by the rabbis were we able to gauge its presence in the word דאיים *dāymǝn* (e.g., סֶֽלָה, Ps 4:3, 5; תָמִ֑יד, Ps 16:8).

[6.4] Joining of Words in the Orthography

\* – the particle פ'י is written separately and not joined to any following word that is the governed constituent of a construct chain or includes an enclitic pronoun. In other words, the affinity of this word to the following element prevents the attachment of פי before it, for example: פ'י צ'בארת (בַּֽעֲצַ֪ת, Ps 1:1), פ'י רוחו (בְּרוּח֣וֹ, Ps 32:2), פ'י פ'ומי (בְּפִֽי, Ps 34:2), פ'י ג'מיע אלארץ' (בְּכָל־הָאָ֨רֶץ, Ps 19:5), פ'י צ'ייקאת רוחי (בְּצָר֥וֹת נַפְשִֽׁי, Ps 31:8), פ'י ג'בל קודשךּ (בְּהַ֣ר קָדְשֶֽׁךָ, Ps 15:1).

When פ'י precedes a word in the absolute state it is connected and the י omitted, for example:[[41]](#footnote-42) פ'למכ'פ'י (בַּמִּסְתָּ֨ר, Ps 10:9), פ'צ'אייקא (בַּצָּרָֽה, Ps 10:1), פ'סמא (בַּשָּׁמַ֣יִם, Ps 2:4, 11:4), פ'לג'וע (בָּֽרָעָֽב, Ps 33:19), פ'לחכם (בַּמִּשְׁפָּ֑ט, Ps 1:5), פ'צ'למא (בְּ֝שׁוֹאָ֗ה, Ps 35:8). There are extremely rare exceptions to this orthographic practice, such as פ'למכ'אזן אתהום (בְּאֽוֹצָר֣וֹת תְּהוֹמֽוֹת, Ps 33:7), פ'י ג'מאעא כבירא (בְּקָהָ֣ל רָ֑ב, Ps 35:18).[[42]](#footnote-43)

\* – in one instance the preposition ל together with its enclitic pronoun was suffixed to the verb form: קדרתלו (יְכָלְתִּ֑יו, Ps 13:5), reflecting the penetration of a dialectal form into the *šarḥ*.[[43]](#footnote-44)

\* – the orthographic practice of attaching the definite article to the noun is discussed in Section [9.2].

[6.5] Conclusion

Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts do not extensively reflect dialectal differences, mostly due to the unpointed orthography and the scribes’ conservative orthographic approach to ensuring that their texts could be read by speakers of differing dialects.[[44]](#footnote-45)

The influence of dialectal characteristics became more evident in later Judeo-Arabic texts when writers clearly tried to adjust their orthography to the local language. This is particularly true in the morphology and vocabulary, as reflected in the orthography, but it would also seem to apply to orthographic technique. This tendency developed both consciously and subconsciously. The writer would have been aware of the audience’s linguistic level and that it could not understand text according with CA orthography such as that used in Sa’adia Gaon’s translation. The writer also subconsciously reinforced this trend, being also ineluctably influenced by the local language.[[45]](#footnote-46)

Renassia’s orthography shows clear signs of the dialectical features of his own language, though he does not overdo their integration. He reflects regular consonant shifts in his orthography, such as the merging of the interdental consonants with their plosive counterparts, in his writing as in pronunciation. Words in which “new” emphasis spread occurred regularly are written with the appropriate emphatic consonants; regular dissimilation between sibilants (such as in the word ג'יס) is a common feature; words in which /q/ is always pronounced [g] are written with ג rather than ק;[[46]](#footnote-47) root metathesis that has become established in the dialect is reflected in writing, and so forth.

However, sporadic and circumstantial shifts that occur in some instances but not in others or free alternates are not represented in his orthography. Accordingly, we cannot describe Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s orthography as fully phonetic. In essence, his writing reflects only the consonantal phonemes of his dialect and, as such, we regard it as largely phonemic orthography in Hebrew graphemes.

Vowels are treated differently in that the quality of a relatively large number of short vowels is marked through the use of the *matres lectionis*, thereby blurring the distinction between short and long vowels. However, this orthographic practice tallies with our conclusion that the qualitative distinction between the vowels is the more important dimension in CJA. The occasional orthographic representation of the epenthetic vowel, despite it lacking phonemic or allophonic status, also confirms that vocal orthography does not solely mark units of distinguishing value.

When discussing the orthography of this text, we must not forget that Renassia was a scholar, intellectual, and polymath who produced an enormous volume of Judeo-Arabic writing. This was not the first book in which he employed Judeo-Arabic orthography. His extensive experience would surely have helped him settle on certain orthographic practices, even if he did not observe them always consistently. Occasionally he wrote the same word in different ways, for example: האודא (הִנֵּ֥ה, Ps 7:15) / הודא (הִנֵּ֣ה, Ps 40:10), קוי (צ֝֗וּר, Ps 18:32) / קווי (עָ֑ז, Ps 18:18). It is quite understandable that his writing is influenced of the more ancient Judeo-Arabic orthographic tradition he encountered in the texts he studied and hHe was certainly familiar with important Judeo-Arabic works that provided him with the foundation for his own.

Renassia could read and write Arabic fluently. In his dictionary and in his book on root analogies between Hebrew and Arabic, he shows a clear awareness of the affinity between the two and identifies the etymological origins of the words. It is reasonable to assume that this knowledge influenced his orthography, preventing him from drawing too far away from “classical” writing style. Since the Constantine dialect is relatively conservative in its pronunciation of many consonants, there is a high level of correlation between “phonemic dialectal” and etymological orthography. The grapheme ק, for example, documents the pronunciation in the living dialect and is not merely an etymological witness to its CA consonantal origin.

Any review of the various factors that may have influenced Renassia’s orthography should include the possible influence of Tunisian orthography, due both to the geographical proximity of Constantine to Tunisia and Djerba – the latter a center for the printing and distribution of books, including his own – and due to his audience including Tunisian as well as Constantine Jews.

The diverse influences on Rabbi Renassia’s orthography are apparent in the two forms דלוקת (נָ֬א, Ps 7:10) and דלווק (עַתָּ֣ה, Ps 17:11). Aware of the etymology of this word, the rabbi usually wrote דלוקת, itself a dialectal form derived from הדא אל וקת. However, in a likely moment of distraction, he also produced a fully dialectal form of the same word: דלווק.[[47]](#footnote-48)

We found a large degree of correlation between the rabbis’ pronunciation and that reflected in the orthography of the *šarḥ*. Divergences occurred in the pronunciation of some diphthongs and certain words such as סמש, סג'רא, and קרון. This correlation cannot be attributed solely to the influence of the written text. As mentioned, one of the informants was indeed particularly careful not to deviate from the text, but the pronunciation of the other two was also otherwise mainly very consistent with the pronunciation reflected in the orthography. Moreover, the same pronunciation traits were also reflected in the questionnaire and in the rabbis’ self-translations.

This highlights the advantage of combined research using a written text and a recording of informants reading. The recordings allow the text to spring to life and can corroborate or refute a researcher’s hypotheses regarding the language reflected in the orthography. Moreover, the recordings provide an additional linguistic layer: various phenomena that are not documented in the orthography, which is inherently more conservative than pronunciation, can only be discerned from the informers’ reading of the text. Examples of this include the spread of emphasis to the secondary emphatic consonants, the influence of emphatic and back consonants on vowels, circumstantial shifts, and the pronunciation of the residual *tanwin*.

Few Hebrew words in the corpus were written precisely in Hebrew orthography; where a definite article was required, the Arabic article was used,[[48]](#footnote-49) for example: אילת השחר (Ps 22:1), אלגתית (Ps 8:1), טפש (Ps 14:1), אנחילות (Ps 5:1).[[49]](#footnote-50)

In conclusion, Renassia’s orthography in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms reflects the system of consonants of distinguishing value as perceived by the speaker. He was influenced by several practices in his writing, although he deviates from these to varying degrees. A combination of factors is reflected in his orthography: phonological changes in his local spoken language; his repository of knowledge of Arabic in general, and Judeo-Arabic in particular, which influences him, including the traditional Judeo-Arabic orthography, with which he was familiar; the affinity between various Arabic words and their Hebrew equivalents; and, in all probability, the influence of the neighboring Tunisian orthography.[[50]](#footnote-51) Numerous characteristics that were imminent or fully extant in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts are also evident in his orthography and form a foundation to which the local dialectal features are added.

**Part Two: Morphology**

**Chapter Seven: The Verb**

[7.1] General Observations

This chapter describes the verb system reflected in the rabbis’ reading of the Zichron Ya’acov *šarḥ* to the Psalms. To this end we examined all of the some 2,000 verbal forms that appear in the first book of Psalms as read by each rabbi.

The discussion is based on the Form I (*ktǝb*)verb form[[51]](#footnote-52) and the derived forms *kǝttǝb*, *kātǝb*, *smān*, as well as the remnants of the causative form *\*ˀaktaba*, *tkǝttǝb*, *tkātǝb*, the group of forms with passive and repetitive meaning: *nǝktǝb*, the form beginning with *t*/*tt* and the form including a medial *t*, and the form beginning with *st-*.[[52]](#footnote-53)

The discussion of each verb form begins with a presentation of a paradigm for the conjugation of verbs whose roots have three full consonants, a description of this paradigm, and examples from the *šarḥ* to the Psalms.[[53]](#footnote-54) Since the corpus does not include examples of every conjugation of each verb form, in some cases we had no choice but to complete the paradigm on the basis of forms taken from the questionnaire;[[54]](#footnote-55) these were presented between curly brackets { }.[[55]](#footnote-56) The forms in the paradigm are written phonemically. However, when presenting the various examples, we used a slightly higher resolution transcription reflecting the qualities of the short vowel. For each verb type, the conjugation is presented in the following order: past, future,[[56]](#footnote-57) imperative, and participle.

We will first present here remarks on a number of general morphological tendencies regarding the verb system; the detailed discussion of these aspects will be presented as they first occur.[[57]](#footnote-58) The distinction between the masculine and feminine in the second-person singular of the past tense has been lost and the forms *ktǝbti* and *ktǝbt* are used for both sexes. The first-person singular of the past tense has merged with one of these second-person morphological forms (*ktǝbt*). The second-person masculine and feminine persons of the future tense have also merged as *tǝktǝb*. These changes in the past and future tenses were caused mainly by the omission of the short final vowels, something already attested in Medieval Arabic dialects, Jewish and non-Jewish.[[58]](#footnote-59) In the plural, the distinction between masculine and feminine has been lost: the second person plural form in the past ends in –tīw, by way of analogy to the second person singular form *ktǝbti*, while in the future it ends in –u. The third-person plural form in both the past and future tense ends in –u. Dual conjugational forms no longer exist.

[7.2] Verb Form I (*ktǝb*)

[7.2.1] Verbs with Three Whole Root Consonants

This verb form includes verbs with three stable consonants. These are conjugated as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |  |
| Singular |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | ktǝbt |  | nǝktǝb |  |
|  | 2: | ktǝbt/ ktǝbti |  | tǝktǝb |  |
|  | 3M: | ktǝb |  | yǝktǝb |  |
|  | 3F: | kǝtbǝt |  | tǝktǝb |  |
| Plural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | ktǝbna |  | nkǝtbu |  |
|  | 2: | { ktǝbtīw} |  | tkǝtbu |  |
|  | 3: | kǝtbu |  | yikǝtbu |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Imperative |  | Act.Part. |  | Pass.Part. |
| 2S: | ǝktǝb | MS: | kātǝb |  | mǝktūb |
| 2P: | ǝktbu | FS: | kātb-a |  | mǝktūb-a |
|  |  | MP: | kātb-īn |  | mǝktūb-īn |
|  |  | FP: | kātb-āt |  |  |

*Maṣdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

ǧbūd zrīb qˁād fhām-a

[7.2.1.1] Past Tense

Several person conjugations have unified in the past tense in all the verb forms and types. We will discuss these instances in turn:

a) Unification of the masculine and feminine second-person singular: The Constantine dialect has lost the distinction between the masculine and feminine in the second-person singular of the past tense; either may be realized as *ktǝbt* or *ktǝbti*. This unification of the masculine and feminine second-person singular of the past tense is found in many sedentary Maghrebi dialects, including those in the Constantine Province,[[59]](#footnote-60) Jijli,[[60]](#footnote-61) the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[61]](#footnote-62) and Algiers,[[62]](#footnote-63) the Muslim dialects of Tlemcen[[63]](#footnote-64) and Sousse,[[64]](#footnote-65) the Jewish dialects of Tafilalt[[65]](#footnote-66) and Sefrou,[[66]](#footnote-67) and others.

By contrast with these dialects, a distinction between the masculine and feminine is maintained in the second-person singular forms of the past tense in the Muslim dialect of Algiers,[[67]](#footnote-68) the dialect of Ben Saada,[[68]](#footnote-69) the nomadic dialects of Arba’a[[69]](#footnote-70) and Ouled Brahim, and all the rural dialects in the Oran area.[[70]](#footnote-71) This distinction is also maintained in Tetouan and in inherently conservative Algerian urban dialects, such as those of Cherchell, Miliana, Mada Blida, and Dalis.[[71]](#footnote-72) It can also be found in dialects of Syria, Egypt, Tripolitania, Oman,[[72]](#footnote-73) Baghdad,[[73]](#footnote-74) and elsewhere.

Thus, the lack of distinction between the masculine and feminine forms in the second-person singular is not a unique feature of CJA. The forms themselves, however, are certainly distinctive in certain respects, as described below.

The forms *ktǝbt* and *ktǝbti* are used interchangeably, with one restriction: before an enclitic pronoun[[74]](#footnote-75) only the form *ktǝbti* is used. Thus: *ṭlǝbt* / *ṭlǝbti* (שָׁאָֽלְתָּ, Ps 40:7) versus u-naqaṣtī-h (וַתְּחַסְּרֵ֣הוּ, Ps 8:6), *trǝktī-ni* (עֲזַבְתָּ֑נִי, Ps 22:2). The corpus includes only one feminine second-person singular form: *qult* (אָמַ֣רְתְּ, Ps 16:2), but additional forms were included in the questionnaire.

According to Cantineau’s[[75]](#footnote-76) isogloss map for the dialects of Constantine Province, Constantine is located on the “border” between the area where *ktǝbt* is used for the masculine and second-person singular (as in Jijli,[[76]](#footnote-77) for example) and the area where *ktǝbti* is used for both persons (in the Philippeville district[[77]](#footnote-78) and around Adough, to the northwest of Bône,[[78]](#footnote-79) for example); this division relates to the sedentary dialects. This would seem to explain why these two forms are interchangeable among the Jews of Constantine, situated as they are at a dialectal junction.

Renassia usually wrote the second-person singular form without י, for example: תרכת (עָזַ֖בְתָּ, Ps 9:11), נצ'רת (רָאִ֡תָה, Ps 10:14). He used a י in these forms only three times in the corpus: בחתתי (בָּ֘חַ֤נְתָּ, Ps 17:3), ג'עלתי (שַׁ֣תָּה, Ps 8:7), תפ'כרתי (פָּ֘קַ֤דְתָּ, Ps 17:3). The י was also maintained in second-person singular forms with an enclitic pronoun: חבסתיני, מכנתיני (הִ֭סְגַּרְתַּנִי, Ps 31:9), וחזמתיני (וַתְּאַזְּרֵ֣נִי, Ps 18:40), ומנעתיהום (וַֽתְּפַלְּטֵֽמוֹ, Ps 22:5). A single feminine second-person singular form appeared in the corpus and was written without a י: קולת (אָמַ֣רְתְּ, Ps 16:2).[[79]](#footnote-80)

A comparison of the rabbis’ pronunciations of the masculine second-person singular forms clearly reflects this admixture of forms. One rabbi pronounced –ti forms in 60 percent of instances, and –t in 40 percent. The second rabbi always pronounced –t forms, pronouncing –ti only when a י appeared in the text. This rabbi was born in Ein Beida, to the southwest of Constantine, in the *ktǝbt* area of Cantineau’s map. The third rabbi usually pronounced –ti forms, but sometimes –t. The female informant used both forms: *raḥti* (“you went”), *kǝṣṣǝṛti* (“you broke”), *skǝnti* (“you resided”), *nsīt* (“you forgot”), *ˁmǝlt* (“you did”).

Thus, both *ktǝbt* and *ktǝbti* are used for the masculine and feminine second-person singular in the *šarḥ* and the spoken language. This differs from the dialects of Sefrou, for example, where the Jews exclusively use *kţǝbţ* [CHECK sign] for both genders, while the Muslims use *kţǝbţi* for both.[[80]](#footnote-81)

b) Unification of the first-person plural form with the second person singular form *ktǝbt*: The first-person form is always *ktǝbt*, showing unification with the shorter of the two second-person singular forms, *ktǝbt*; for example: *ˁmǝlt* (עָשִׂ֣יתִי, Ps 7:4), identical to ˁmǝlt (עָשִׂ֨יתָ, Ps 40:6). Thus, three singular forms were sometimes unified in the conjugation of the past tense.

In some dialects, there is no longer a distinction between the conjugation of these forms and that of the feminine third-person singular. This is true of the Jews of Tafilalt[[81]](#footnote-82) and Fes,[[82]](#footnote-83) for example. In general, the feminine third-person singular form has not merged with the second-person singular masculine and feminine in CJA. However, the informant who was born in Ein Beida refelected this merger in some instances, pronouncing a handful of first- and second-person singular forms (for which he usually used the *ktǝbt* pattern) according to the feminine third-person singular form *kǝtbǝt*, for example: ˁaṛfǝt (יָדַ֣עְתִּי, Ps 18:440, tǝklǝt (בָטַחְתִּי֮, Ps 13:6), ḍaṛbǝt (הִכִּ֣יתָ, Ps 3:8). With these exceptions, this informant always used *ktǝbt* for the first- and second-person singular forms.

c) Unification of the second-person plural form *ktǝbtīw*: The CA suffix for the masculine second-person plural of the past tense is تُمْ and for the feminine تُنَّ. These have merged into the form *ktǝbtīw* in all CJA verb types. This form was created by way of analogy to the second-person singular form *ktǝbti*, to which the plural morpheme –u was added, realized as [w].[[83]](#footnote-84) The second-person plural form in *–tīw* can be found in some of the dialects of Philippeville, to the northeast of Constantine;[[84]](#footnote-85) among members of one of the tribes in the Edough area (northeast of Bône),[[85]](#footnote-86) and in certain Moroccan dialects.[[86]](#footnote-87)

The second-person plural form of the past with the suffix *–tu* is common in a wider range of dialects.[[87]](#footnote-88) It is found, for example, in the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[88]](#footnote-89) the Muslim dialect of Sousse,[[89]](#footnote-90) the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[90]](#footnote-91) the Muslim dialects of Jijli,[[91]](#footnote-92) Tlemcen,[[92]](#footnote-93) and Ouled Brahim,[[93]](#footnote-94) as well as in various Moroccan dialects, such as the Jewish dialects of Sefrou[[94]](#footnote-95) and Tafilalt.[[95]](#footnote-96)

Since no first-person plural forms occurred in the corpus and since we drew these forms from our conversations with the rabbis, we could not examine their orthographic representation in the *šarḥ*. We found evidence of this form in *Nishmat Kol Chai*, Renassia’s translation of the Mishnah: קולתיו (אמרתם, Betzah 1:1), בחאל מא זווג'תיו (כדרך שנשאתם: B. Bat. 8:8).

d) Unification of the masculine and feminine third-person plural form *kǝtbu*: In Classical Arabic, the masculine third-person plural ending was ُوا and the feminine ending ْنَ. In CJA, as in many other dialects, the distinction between the masculine and feminine has been lost in the third-person plural. Thus, for example, we find: *tǝklu* (בָּֽטְח֣וּ (אֲבֹתֵ֑ינוּ), Ps 22:5), *ǧāžu* (עֲ֭וֽ‍ֹנֹתַי)) עָֽבְר֣וּ, Ps 38:5).

The three patterns of Form I in CA have been unified in CJA:[[96]](#footnote-97)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| خَرَجَ | xaraǧa | > | xrǝǧ | (יָ֘צָ֤א, Ps 19:5) |
| بَسُطَ | basuṭa | > | bsǝṭ | (u-bsǝṭ, וַיֵּ֣ט, Ps 18:10) |
| رَكِبَ | rakiba | > | rkǝb | (u-rkǝb, וַיִּרְכַּ֣ב, Ps 18:11) |

The process of formation of the monosyllabic masculine third-person form CCV̆C can be described as omission of the final short vowel; omission of the short vowel in an open syllable; neutralization of the quality of the short vowel:[[97]](#footnote-98)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| xrǝǧ |  | 3< |  | xraǧ |  | 2< |  | xaraǧ |  | 1< |  | xaraǧa |

The forms of the other two patterns were neutralized in the same manner and the remaining conjugation forms in the past tense shortened likewise. Thus, for example, the singular first- and second-person form *ktǝbt* is also monosyllabic, in contrast to the trisyllabic form of CA.

The conjugations of the past tense forms can be divided into two models: Forms with a suffix beginning with a consonant (or ø) follow the pattern CCVC-: ktǝb, ktǝbt, ktǝbti, ktǝbtīw, ktǝbna; and forms with a suffix beginning with a vowel follow the pattern CVCC-: kǝtbǝt, kǝtbu. These rules shape the syllable structure in the morphology of CSA[[98]](#footnote-99) and are common to many Maghrebi dialects.[[99]](#footnote-100)

The same outline can be used to describe the behavior of verb forms when enclitic pronouns are added. An enclitic pronoun beginning with a consonant does not alter the verb form in either of the two models. However, an enclitic pronoun beginning with a vowel[[100]](#footnote-101) will alter a third-person past tense form conjugated according to the first model to the second: ktǝb + u > kǝtbu. The pronoun does not influence the other forms. For example: *ḍaṛb-u* (“he hit him”) versus: *trǝkti-ni* (עֲזַבְתָּ֑נִי, Ps 22:2), *trǝk-ni* (עֲזָבָֽנִי, Ps 40:13), *hlǝknā-h* (בִּֽלַּעֲנֽוּהוּ, Ps 35:25).

The /ǝ/ vowel that is inserted between the root consonants in the past tense is realized as [ǝ] when it appears between “regular” consonants, for example: *u-qtǝl* (וַיַּדְבֵּ֖ר, Ps 18:48), *sǝktu* (דָֽמּוּ, Ps 35:15). However, it is often influenced by the surrounding consonants.[[101]](#footnote-102) When one of the root letters is a pharyngeal consonant /ḥ ˁ/ or the glottal plosive /h/, the /ǝ/ is almost always realized as [a], whether it comes before or after this consonant. Examples where the first root letter is /ḥ ˁ h/: *ḥasnǝt* (שָֽׁפְרָ֥ה, Ps 16:6), *ˁamlu* (עָשׂ֑וּ, Ps 9:16), *halku* (הִֽשְׁחִ֗יתוּ, Ps 14:1). Examples where the second root letter is /ḥ ˁ h/, include: *qˁadt* (יָ֭שַׁבְתִּי, Ps 26:4), *u-nˁast* (וָֽאִ֫ישָׁ֥נָה, Ps 3:6), *ǧˁalti* (שַׁ֣תָּה, Ps 8:7), *bḥatti* (בָּ֘חַ֤נְתָּ, Ps 17:3), *u-bˁat* (וַיִּשְׁלַ֣ח, Ps 18:15), *dahšǝt* (נִבְהֲלָ֣ה, Ps 6:4), *laḥqu-ni* (הִשִּׂיג֣וּנִי, Ps 40:13). Examples where the root letter is /ḥ ˁ h/ include: *ṣnaˁt* (עָשִׂ֣יתִי, Ps 7:4), *kṛaht* (שָׂנֵ֗אתִי, Ps 31:7), *mnaˁti* (מָנַ֥עְתָּ, Ps 21:3), *fṛaḥ* (שָׂמַ֣ח, Ps 16:9), *kaṛhat* (שָֽׂנְאָ֥ה, Ps 11:5), *šbaˁtīw* (“you swore”).

Similarly, when one of the root consonants is the voiceless uvular plosive /q/ or one of the emphatic consonants /ṣ ṛ ṭ ḍ [ẓ]/, /ǝ/ may be realized as [a], although not regularly so, for example: *ḍṛabti* (הִכִּ֣יתָ, Ps 3:8), *qadru* (יָ֥כְלוּ, Ps 36:13), *nḍaṛt* (רָאִ֡תָה, Ps 10:14), *nḍaṛ* (רָ֝אָ֗ה, Ps 33:13), *ẓalṭu* (רָשׁ֣וּ, Ps 34:11), *ḥmaqt* (גָּעַ֣רְתָּ, Ps 9:6), *xaṭfu-ni* (שַׁדּ֑וּנִי, Ps 17:9).

When one of the root letters is a velar consonant /ġ x/, /ǝ/ may again be realized as [a]. However, this is not regular and was not attested equally among all the informants. Thus, for example, we find *xalṣu* (פַ֥סּוּ, Ps 12:2) but also *ġǝršǝt* (עָֽשְׁשָׁ֣ה, Ps 6:8), *ġǝršu* (עָשֵֽׁשׁוּ, Ps 31:11).

The /k/ may influence /ǝ/, causing it to be realized as [a], [u] or event [i]. For example: *škur* (הִלֵּ֣ל, Ps 10:3), *trakti-ni* (עֲזַבְתָּ֑נִי, Ps 22:2), *tkǝlt* / *tkilt* (בָּ֝טַ֗חְתִּי, Ps 26:1; חָסִ֑יתִי, Ps 7:2), *trikt* (עָזַ֖בְתָּ, Ps 9:11), *tkalna* (בָטָֽחְנוּ, Ps 33:21).

C) When one of the root consonants is a labial /b w m f/, the /ǝ/ may be realized as [u]; for example: *ṭlub* (שָׁאַ֣ל, Ps 21:5), *ṭlubt* (שָׁאַ֣לְתִּי, Ps 27:4).

Examples of the past tense paradigm of Form I verbs with three whole consonants:

First-person singular: *qdǝrt* (יָכֹ֣לְתִּי, Ps 40:13), *ṛqǝdt* (שָׁכַ֗בְתִּי, Ps 3:6), *ǧḥǝdt* (כִחַ֥דְתִּי, Ps 40:11), *ḥrǝzt* (שָׁ֝מַ֗רְתִּי, Ps 17:4), *smaˁt* (שָׁמַ֨עְתִּי, Ps 31:14).

Second-person singular: *msǝkt* (תָּמַ֣כְתָּ, Ps 41:13), *ḍṛabti* (הִכִּ֣יתָ, Ps 3:8), *nḍaṛti* (רָ֭אִיתָ, Ps 31:8), *nḍaṛti* (רָאִ֑ית, I Sam 28:15), *ḥfǝṛt* (כָּרִ֣יתָ, Ps 40:7), *ˁmǝlt* (עָ֭שִׂיתָ, Ps 9:5), *qˁadt* (יָשַׁ֥בְתָּ, Ps 9:5), *bḥatti* (בָּ֘חַ֤נְתָּ, Ps 17:3), *xsǝlti* (“you bathed”).

Third-person masculine singular: *rfǝd* (נָשָׂ֥א, Ps 15:3), *u-qtǝl* (וַיַּדְבֵּ֖ר, Ps 18:48), *tkǝl* (בָטַ֥ח, Ps 28:7), *ṛqǝd* (שָׁ֝כַ֗ב, Ps 41:9), *ḥfǝṛ* (שָׁ֝כַ֗ב, Ps 7:16), *u-hbǝṭ* (וַיֵּרַ֑ד, Ps 18:10), *fˁǝl* (פָּעָֽל, Ps 11:3), *ṭlaˁ* (עָ֘לָ֤ה, Ps 18:9), *kṛah* (שִׁקַּ֡ץ, Ps 22:25).

Third-person feminine singular: *ġǝršǝt* (עָֽשְׁשָׁ֣ה, Ps 6:8), *u-zǝrbǝt* (וַתְּמַהֵ֗ר, Ps 24:46), *u-naḍṛǝt* (וַתֵּ֖רֶא, Ps 24:64), *dahšǝt* (נִבְהֲלָ֣ה, Ps 6:4), *kaṛhat* (שָֽׂנְאָ֥ה, Ps 11:5), *ḥasnǝt* (שָֽׁפְרָ֥ה, Ps 16:6), *qaˁdǝt* (“she sat”), *xǝslǝt* (“she bathed”).

First-person plural: *tkalna* (בָטָֽחְנוּ בָטָֽחְנוּ, Ps 33:21), *hlǝknā-h* (בִּֽלַּעֲנֽוּהוּ, Ps 35:25).

Second-person plural: there are no examples in the corpus. From the questionnaire: *šrǝbtīw* (“you (m. pl.) drank”), *šbaˁtīw* (“you (f. pl.) were sated”), *skǝntīw* (“you (pl.) lived”), *ḍṛǝbtīw* (“you (m. pl.) beat”).

Third-person plural: *zǝrbu* (מָ֫הָ֥רוּ, Ps 16:40), *qǝflu* (סָּֽגְר֑וּ, Ps 17:10), *zalqu* (מָֽ֝עֲד֗וּ, Ps 18:37), *tǝklu* (בָּֽטְח֣וּ, Ps 22:5), *u-ḍahṛu* (וַיֵּ֤רָא֨וּ, Ps 18:16), *rǝkˁu* (כָּֽרְע֣וּ, Ps 20:9), *ˁatru* (כָֽשְׁל֣וּ, Ps 27:2).

[7.2.1.2] Conjugation of the Future Tense

Several persons have unified in the future tense conjugations of all verb forms and types.

a) Unification of the masculine and feminine second person singular: Even in CA, the masculine second-person and feminine third-person forms of the future tense are identical (as in Hebrew): تَكْتُبُ – “you/she will write.” In many sedentary dialects, the feminine second-person also merged with these forms. Since the corpus did not include any instances of this person, we were forced to clarify this question through the questionnaire and the results were somewhat inconsistent.

The three informants tended to use the masculine singular form to refer to the feminine when translating biblical verses, for example: u-tǝdxul (וּבָאת֙, II Sam 14:3), *u-tǝtkǝllǝm* (וְדִבַּ֥רְתְּ, II Sam 14:3), *u-titfǝkkǝṛ* (וְזָכַ֣רְתְּ, Exek 16:61), *u-taḥšum* (וְנִכְלַמְתְּ֒, Ezek 16:61).[[102]](#footnote-103) The informants stated that the masculine form is also used for the feminine. However, in conversations with them they sometimes used a second-person feminine singular form ending in –I, for example: *tzurği* (“you (f. sing.) will go out”), *txāfi* (“you (f. sing.) will be afraid”). The female informant used the masculine form (e.g., *tfīq*) for both masculine and feminine and stated that the two forms are identical.

One rabbi stated that Jews do not customarily distinguish between the masculine and feminine forms, whereas Muslims did. Accordingly, I believe, we may speak of the merging of the masculine and feminine forms in the second-person singular of the future tense in CJA. However, the Muslim dialect of Constantine has had a clear influence on their language. It is also possible that my questions themselves may have influenced the forms they realized.[[103]](#footnote-104)

A similar distinction between the Muslim and Jewish dialects regarding the masculine and feminine singular forms of the future tense can be found in Bône. The Jews of the city use the form *tekteb* for both genders, while the Muslims distinguish between the masculine and feminine.[[104]](#footnote-105) A similar picture can be seen in Sefrou, where Muslims distinguish between the masculine and feminine in this context while the Jews of the city use a merged form.[[105]](#footnote-106) Cantineau documents the loss of distinction between the two forms for the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province.[[106]](#footnote-108) The same is true of most of the dialects in the Philippeville district and only a small number of nomadic dialects in this district maintain the distinction between *tekteb* for the masculine and *tektĕbi* for the feminine.[[107]](#footnote-109)

In broad terms, the distinction between these two forms is characteristic of the nomadic dialects, such as those of the Arba’a nomadic tribes of the Sahara,[[108]](#footnote-110) the dialect of Ouled Brahim,[[109]](#footnote-111) and Libyan and Tunisian Bedouin dialects.[[110]](#footnote-112) By contrast, many sedentary dialects have a merged form for the masculine and feminine, including the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[111]](#footnote-113) the Jewish dialect of Algiers[[112]](#footnote-114) and other dialects in and around the city,[[113]](#footnote-115) the Muslim dialects of Jijli,[[114]](#footnote-116) Tlemcen,[[115]](#footnote-117) and Sousse,[[116]](#footnote-118) and the Jewish dialect of Sefrou.[[117]](#footnote-119) By way of comparison, the Jewish dialect of Baghdad, for example, not only maintains the distinction between the masculine (*teftaḥ*) and feminine (*tefetḥēn*) second-person singular forms of the future tense but, as can be seen, the feminine form maintains the final –n.[[118]](#footnote-120)

b) Unification of the masculine and feminine second person plural: The CA future tense suffix for the masculine second-person plural is ـُونَ while the feminine form is ـْنَ. In CJA, as in many other dialects, the distinction between these two forms has been lost. The ن has been omitted and a form with the suffix –u – *tkǝtbu-u* – is used for both genders.[[119]](#footnote-121)

c) Unification of the masculine and feminine third-person plural: In CA, the forms ـُونَ and ـْنَ are used for the masculine and feminine respectively. These forms have unified in the dialectal form *yikǝtbu*, and no distinction survives.

The first-person singular and plural: In CJA, *nǝktǝb* serves as the future for the first person singular, while *nkǝtbu* is used for the plural. For example: *nǝmǧǝd* (אֲזַמְּרָ֖ה, Ps 9:3), *nǝġsǝl* (אֶרְחַ֣ץ, Ps 26:6), *nqalˁu* (נְֽ֭נַתְּקָה, Ps 2:3), *ndakṛu* (נַזְכִּֽיר, Ps 20:8).

The form נכתב for the first-person singular and נכתבו for the first-person plural of the imperfect are the commonest forms in North African dialects. Indeed, this feature is one of the criteria used to distinguish between Maghrebi and Mashriqi dialects.[[120]](#footnote-122) Such forms already appear in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts. They are one of the few dialectal features that can be discerned in these texts and, accordingly, are particularly significant. In the Medieval texts, the form נכתב is much more common than נכתבו,[[121]](#footnote-124) it seems because the authors tried to avoid colloquial language and overtly dialectal forms. נכתב was already present in CA and other dialects, albeit in a different function, as the imperfect of the first-person plural. Accordingly, it was perceived as less unusual. By contrast, נכתבו neither exists in CA nor outside the Maghrebi dialects, and accordingly it was regarded as “incorrect” and alien and was used sparingly.[[122]](#footnote-125) In modern Maghrebi dialects, נכתב/נכתבו[[123]](#footnote-126) are dominant: for example, in , for the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[124]](#footnote-127) and Algiers,[[125]](#footnote-128) the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen,[[126]](#footnote-129) the Jewish dialects of Sefrou[[127]](#footnote-130) and Tafilalt,[[128]](#footnote-131) among many others.

The form נכתבו is not attested in any other Semitic language or dialect apart from the dialects of the Maghreb (including Egyptian dialects, for this purpose).[[129]](#footnote-132) By contrast, the form נכתב for the first-person singular appears in other languages and dialects.[[130]](#footnote-133)

Two theories seek to explain the creation of the נכתב/נכתבו forms. The first, proposed by Fischer, explains their creation as the product of double analogy. He suggests that the first-person plural form *nktbu* was created first, by analogy to *yktbu* / *tktbu*, and thereafter *nktb* was created by analogy to *yktb* / *tktb*. This theory was adopted by Brockelmann, Bergsträsser, and others.[[131]](#footnote-134)

Blau contests this explanation[[132]](#footnote-135) since, in some dialects, only the form נכתב exists for the first-person singular without the plural form נכתבו. Accordingly, he finds it illogical to suggest that the more widespread term נכתב was created after the rarer נכתבו. His own theory is that the form נכתב emerged first through the merger of the early pronoun אנא + אכתב,[[133]](#footnote-136) thus producing: ˀana + ˀaktb > nktb. He proves the existence, at least in the Middle Ages, of such prefixed pronouns in Jewish texts of Maghrebi origin, thereby addressing Naldeke’s reservations about the presence of such forms. Once the form נכתב was in common use for both the singular and plural of the first-person, a plural form נכתבו emerged for the purpose of differentiation, by analogy to יכתבו / תכתבו.[[134]](#footnote-137)

Future prefixes: The future tense prefixes are nǝ-, tǝ-, and yǝ- for the first-person singular, second-person singular (masculine and feminine) and for the third-person feminine singular, and the third-person masculine, respectively. The vowel that follows the *y* in the third-person masculine singular is usually realized as [i] due to assimilation to the adjacent semi-vowel.[[135]](#footnote-138) When the first root letter is /h ḥ ˁ/, the vowel of the prefix is realized as [a],[[136]](#footnote-139) for example: *nǝrfǝd* (אֶשָּׂא, Ps 16:4), *tǝtruk-ni* (תַּעַזְבֵנִי, Ps 27:9), *yimṭǝṛ* (יַמְטֵר, Ps 11:6), *naḥšǝm* (אֵבוֹשׁ, Ps 25:20), *taḥrǝz-hum* (תִּשְׁמְרֵם, Ps 12:8), *yahbəṭ* (יֵרֵד, Ps 7:12), *yaˁməl* (יַעֲשֶׂה, Ps 1:3).

The plural forms in the future begin with the prefixes n-, t-, yi- for the first, second, and third persons respectively.

The third-person plural of the future tense is somewhat unusual. Just as the future forms of the first- and second-person plurals begin with a consonant alone, so we might have expected that the future forms of the third-person plural would begin with the consonant *y*. However, since /y/, which is a semi-vowel, has the realization [i] when it does not appear alongside a vowel,[[137]](#footnote-140) it would have been reasonable to predict a third-person plural form *ikǝtbu*. However, since when pronouncing the third-person forms the rabbis did not realize a pure initial vowel, and in most cases a remnant of the consonantal aspect of the /y/ may be discerned, we preferred to mark this form as *yikətbu*. A similar situation can be found in one of the future patterns in the Jewish dialect of Algiers, which is marked in a similar manner by M. Cohen: *i̯išǫ̆ṛbu*, *tšǫ̆ṛbu*, etc. Here, too, we would expect an initial *i* in accordance with the behavioral rules of the semi-vowels, but Cohen reports that a remnant of the *y* is always maintained in the pronunciation.[[138]](#footnote-141) The realization of the future prefix in the third person plural ranges from [i] to [yǝ],[[139]](#footnote-142) testifying to the instability of this prefix. This instability may be related to the fact that in the speakers’ consciousness, *y* is regarded as a consonantal prefix, like the *n* and *t*, rather than as a vowel.

Cantineau provides support for our position. He argues that, even in instances in which the semi-vowel is realized in its vocal dimension [u], [i] (*imūt*, *dalu*, and so forth), this should be transcribed phonologically as *y* or *w* since, in the speaker’s consciousness, these realizations have consonantal value.[[140]](#footnote-143) Further corroboration that the future prefix of the third-person plural is regarded by the speaker as having consonantal value can be found in the fact that this phenomenon is not confined to verbs with three whole root letters, but can also be found in similar circumstances in other verb forms and types. However, forms beginning with a true [i] prefix are numerous in the verb forms *kǝttǝb* and *kātǝb*,.

Future plural forms: These forms are created by a process of *ressaut*, as discussed at length in Section [5.4.3]. Future forms in the pattern *nkǝtbu* are characteristic of the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province[[141]](#footnote-144) and are also documented for the sedentary dialects in Philippeville district to the northeast of Constantine[[142]](#footnote-145) and in Jijli.[[143]](#footnote-146)

The addition of pronouns beginning with a vowel (-ǝk; -u) to the singular future forms (i.e., forms ending in a consonant) alters the syllabic structure of the word in accordance with the *ressaut* mechanism.[[144]](#footnote-147)

The vowel on the second root letter: In the future tense of Form I verbs with three complete root letters, the vowel on the second root letter is usually [u] or [ǝ]; forms where the vowel on this letter was [a] or [i] occurr less frequently.

We sought to examine what factors, if any, influence the vowel in the second root letter, focusing on two questions: Is there any affinity between the vowel on the second root letter in the dialectal future tense and the vowel on this letter in CA (i.e., an examination of the diachronic aspect)?; Is the vowel on the second root letter influenced by its consonantal environment (as we found in the past tense, for example) and what is the scope of this influence? (i.e., an examination of the synchronic aspect). We also considered that both factors might be involved.

With regard to affinity with the CA second root letter, a significant level of correlation was found between a [u] vowel on the second root letter in future singular forms in the corpus and the vowel ُ on the second root letter of their equivalents in CA. Indeed, 60 percent of roots with three complete letters that occurred in the corpus and whose classical equivalents are conjugated in the future with ـُ on the second root letter appeared in the future singular with [u] on this letter,[[145]](#footnote-148) for example: *nǝṛqud* (אֶשְׁכְּבָ֪ה, Ps 4:9) [أَرْقُدُ], *nǝdxul* (אָב֣וֹא, Ps 5:8) [أَدْخُلُ], *yiškur* (יֽוֹדֶה, Ps 6:6) [يَشْكُرُ], *tǝskut* (תֶּ֫חֱרַ֥שׁ, Ps 39:13), [تَسْكُتُ]. However, in some instances a future form from the same root a verb conjugated with ـُ on the second root letter has a vowel realized as [ǝ] rather than [u], for example: *yiskǝt* (יִדֹּ֑ם, Ps 30:13) [يَسْكُتُ].

Moreover, except for the root √xṭf, we did not find any dialectal forms in which the vowel on the second root letter is consistently [u] while the analogous vowel in CA is ـَ or ـِ: *yixṭuf* (וּבֹצֵ֥עַ, Ps 10:3, יַחְטֹ֥ף, Ps 10:9) [يَخْطَفُ]. The pronunciation here as [u] would seem to reflect the influence of the adjacent labial consonant /f/. In two other verbs where the vowel on the second root letter is not ـُ, the second root letter is realized alternately as [ǝ] or [u], again under the influence of the adjacent labial: (אֵ֝ב֗וֹשׁ, Ps 25:20) *naḥšǝm* / *naḥšum* (אֵב֑וֹשָׁה, Ps 25:2), (יָבִ֑ין, Ps 19:13) *yifhum* / *yifhǝm* (הָ֫בִ֥ין, Ps 32:9). Nevertheless, in 40 percent of the roots in the corpus whose CAequivalents have the vowel ـُ , the rabbis realized the vowel as [ǝ] (i.e., the neutralizing central vowel) or as [a] under the influence of an adjacent pharyngeal consonant, for example: *nǝmǧǝd* (אֲזַמְּרָ֖ה, Ps 9:3) [أَمْجُدُ], *yikbǝr* (יִגְדַּ֣ל, Ps 40:17) [يَكْبُرُ], *yinfǝx* (יָפִ֥יחַ, Ps 10:5) [يَنْفُخُ], *yahbǝṭ* (יֵרֵֽד, Ps 7:17) [يَهْبُطُ].

We did not find a similar pattern of preservation in the future tense regarding the CA vowels ـَ or ـِ on the second root letter as pronounced by the rabbis. In dialectal verbs whose CA equivalents had ـَ or ـِ on the second root letter, the vowel was pronounced [ǝ], or as [a] before a pharyngeal or back consonant, for example: *nǝrfǝd* (אֶשָּׂ֥א, Ps 16:4, 25:1) [أَرْفِدُ], *nǝġsǝl* (אֶרְחַ֣ץ, Ps 26:6) [أَغْسِلُ], *naˁṛǝf* (אֵֽ֝דְעָ֗ה, Ps 39:5) [أَعْرِفُ], *yinṭaq* (יָפִ֥יחַ, Ps 10:5; יֹאמַ֣ר, Ps 12:6) [يَنْطِقُ]. Only in a few instances do we find what seems to be a chance correlation between the “modern” vowel on the second root letter and the CA vowel, probably attributable to the consonantal environment, for example: *nǝzḷaq* (אֶמְעָֽד, Ps 26:1) [أَزْلَقُ].

Those verbs with three whole root letters in which the second or third root letter is one of the consonants /h ḥ ˁ/ and the dialectal vowel [a] on the second root letter mirrors the classical ـَ. It is very reasonable to assume that it is the pharyngeal root letter that preservedthe vowel; indeed, it is possible that even in CA the vowel ـَ was prone to appear in roots with one of these consonants.

With regard to the influence of the consonantal environment on the quality of the vowel on the second root letter, we examined the quality of the vowel on the second root letter with reference to the surrounding consonants, regardless of the vowel on this root letter in the same root in CA. It emerged that many roots in which the vowel on the second root letter is [u] include a back consonant /q k x/ or the emphatic /ḍ/, which may attract the vowel [u].[[146]](#footnote-149)

Almost all the verbs in which the vowel on the second root letter in the future tense is [a] include one of the consonants /q h ḥ ˁ/, which tend to attract the vowel [a], for example: *nǝfṛaḥ* (אֶשְׂמְחָ֣ה, Ps 9:3), *nišbaˁ* (אֶשְׂבְּעָ֥ה, Ps 17:15), *tiǧˁal* (תִתֵּ֥ן, Ps 16:10), *yiḍḥak* (יִשְׂחָ֑ק, Ps 2:4), *yirǧaˁ* (יָ֭שׁוּב, Ps 7:13), *u-yizhaṛ* (וְשֹׁאֵֽג, Ps 22:14), *tizlaq* (תִמְעַ֣ד, Ps 37:31).

Very few instances were found in the corpus of future forms with the vowel [i] on the second root letter. Examples include *tǝtrik* (תַעֲזֹ֣ב, Ps 16:10) [تَتْرُكُ] and *yinzil* (יִ֝שְׁכֹּ֗ן, Ps 15:1, 16:9) [يَنْزِلُ].

The quality of the vowel on the second root letter cannot always be explained by the consonantal environment. For example, why in the root √qˁd do we find the future form yiqˁud (יֵשֵׁ֑ב, Ps 9:8) rather than *yiqˁad*, as we would expect of the vowel [ǝ] alongside /ˁ/? This instance probably reflects the preservation of the ـُ vowel on the second root letter in CA: يَقْعُدُ. If we assume that the influence of the consonantal environment is decisive in determining the quality of the vowel on the second root letter, we can, in turn, wonder why in the form *nǝrfǝd* (אֶשָּׂ֥א, Ps 16:4) the vowel on this letter is not [u], reflecting the labial influence (and cf. *yixṭuf* above)? In this case, the neutralization of the [i] (نَرْفِدُ) to [ǝ] appears to have outweighed the influence of the labial.

To summarize our findings, it would seem that the phenomenon we have examined here has a morphophonemic character, reflecting the preservation in CJA of the ـُ on the second root letter in CA in the conjugation of the future tense in many verbs. This phenomenon is not consistently attested, however, both because of the non-preservation of the CA vowels ـَ and ـِ and because of the deviations from this tendency with ـُ. The consonantal environment also has a significant influence in determining the quality of the vowel on the second root letter, particularly when this vowel appears alongside the consonants /h ḥ ˁ/, though it should be recalled that this vowel was already ـَ in most cases in CA.

We prefer to regard verbs in which the vowel on the second root letter is [u] as reflecting the preservation of the CA ـُ rather than solely the influence of the consonantal environment for two reasons. The first is the virtual absence of exceptions to this tendency: in fact, we found only one true example. The second is that the influence of the consonants /ḍ q k x/ on changing the quality of /ǝ/ to [u] is very much less than that of /h ḥ ˁ/ in the realization of /e/ as [a]. Moreover, the consonants /ḍ q k x/ may also cause the [a] realization of the /ǝ/ vowel.[[147]](#footnote-150)

The preservation of the CA short ـُ is documented in the Tlemcen dialect in the conjugation of the past and future tenses, as well as in several nouns.[[148]](#footnote-151) However, in the Jijli dialect there is no preservation of the original CA vowels, it differing in this respect from many Maghreb dialects, in which, according to Marçais, the process of neutralization of these vowels has not been completed and remnants may still be found.[[149]](#footnote-152) In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, D. Cohen found a correlation between the vowel on the second root letter in the past tense and the future tense, under the influence of the consonantal environment, for example: *fṛăḥ* - *yǝ́fṛăḥ*.[[150]](#footnote-153)

Examples of the future tense paradigm of Form I verbs with three whole consonants:

First-person singular: *nǝtkǝl* (אֶֽחֱסֶה, Ps 18:3), *nǝšku*r (אוֹדֶ֣ה, Ps 7:18), *nǝnqǝṣ* (אֶחְסָֽר, Ps 23:1), *nǝnḍuṛ* (אֶרְאֶ֣ה, Ps 8:4), *nǝḥšǝm* (אֵב֑וֹשָׁה, Ps 25:2), *nǝḥrǝz* (אֶ֥שְׁמְרָ֣ה, Ps 39:2), *u-nǝrǧaˁ* (וְשַׁבְתִּ֥י, Ps 23:6), *naˁṛǝf* (אֵֽ֝דְעָ֗ה, Ps 39:5).

Second-person singular (masculine and feminine): *tdakṛ-u* (תִזְכְּרֶ֑נּוּ, Ps 8”5), *tfaqd-u* (תִפְקְדֶֽנּוּ, Ps 8:5), *tǝtruk-ni* (תַּֽ֝עַזְבֵ֗נִי, Ps 27:9, 38:22), *tiskut* (תֶּ֫חֱרַ֥שׁ, Ps 39:13), *tiǧˁal* (תִתֵּ֥ן, Ps 16:10), *u-tǝdxul* (וּבָאת֙, II Sam 14:3), *tuxruǧ* (“you (sing.) will depart”), *u-taḥšum* / *u-tḥǝšmi* (וְנִכְלַמְתְּ֒, Ezek 16:61).

Third-person masculine singular: yirfǝd (יִשָּׂ֣א, Ps 24:5), yitkǝl (יֶֽחֱסֶה, Ps 34:9), yižbǝd-ni (יַֽ֝מְשֵׁ֗נִי, Ps 18:17), *yikbǝr* (יִגְדַּ֣ל, Ps 40:17), *yinṭaq* (יַבִּ֣יעַֽ, Ps 19:3), *yidkuṛ* (יִזְכֹּ֥ר, Ps 20:4), *u-yaˁfǝs* (וְיִרְמֹ֣ס, Ps 7:6), *u-yilḥaq* (וְיַשֵּׂ֗ג, Ps 7:6), *yifṛaḥ* (יִשְׂמַ֥ח, Ps 14:7).

Third-person feminine singular: *taḥrǝq* (תֹּאכֵ֑ל, Ps 18:9), *u-taḥrǝq-hum* (וְֽתֹאכְלֵ֥ם, Ps 21:10), *tišˁal* (תִבְעַר, Ps 39:4), *tǝrǧaˁ* (תָשֽׁוּב, Ps 35:13), *titqal* (תִּכְבַּ֥ד, Ps 32:4), *tizlaq* (תִמְעַ֣ד, Ps 37:31), *tǝnṭaq* (תֶּהְגֶּ֣ה, Ps 35:28), *tuqˁud* (“she will sit”).

First-person plural: *ndakṛu* (נַזְכִּֽיר, Ps 20:8), *nqalˁu* (נְֽ֭נַתְּקָה, Ps 2:3), *nqaṭˁu* (נְֽ֭נַתְּקָה, Ps 2:3), *nḍaḥku* (we will laugh), *nxǝdmu* (we will serve).

Second-person plural (masculine and feminine): *tfǝtšu* (תְּבַקְשׁ֖וּ, Ps 4:3), *tḥǝšmu* (תָבִ֑ישׁוּ, Ps 14:6), *tqaˁdu* (you will sit).

Third-person plural (masculine and feminine): *yinǝṭqu* / *yinṭqu* (יֶהְגּוּ, Ps 2:1), *yinǝḍṛu* (יֶֽחֱז֥וּ, Ps 11:7), *yiṛǝṭbu* (יַֽחֲלִיקֽוּן, Ps 5:10), *yikǝtru* (יִרְבּ֥וּ, Ps 16:4), *yiġǝmzu* (יִקְרְצוּ, Ps 35:19), *yinaḍṛu* (תֶּֽחֱזֶ֥ינָה, Ps 17:2), *yisǝmˁu* (יִשְׁמְע֖וּ, Ps 34:2).

[7.2.1.3] Imperative Forms

In the first book of Psalms, numerous imperative forms appeared for the masculine singular and the plural, but only one feminine singular imperative occurred in the verb form *tkǝttǝb*: *ǝtḥarrki* (נ֝֗וּדִי, Ps 11:1). This would appear to be an archaic form preserved in the language of the *šarḥ* but, since it was a unique instance in our corpus, we could not make a definitive conclusion.[[151]](#footnote-154) As in the future tense, no distinct form is used in the spoken language for a feminine singular imperative and a single form serves for both genders. The unification of these forms is found in other Maghrebi dialects, such as the Jewish dialects of Algiers[[152]](#footnote-155) and Tunis,[[153]](#footnote-156) the Muslim dialects of Sousse,[[154]](#footnote-157) Jijli,[[155]](#footnote-158) and Tlemcen,[[156]](#footnote-159) and the Jewish dialect of Sefrou,[[157]](#footnote-160) i.e., in those dialects that also feature a single form for the masculine and feminine of the second-person singular.

In dialects that distinguish between the masculine and feminine in the second-person singular, we also find distinct imperative forms for these persons. Examples include the nomadic dialects of Algeria, such as that of Ouled Brahim,[[158]](#footnote-161) the Arba’a dialect,[[159]](#footnote-162) and various Moroccan dialects,[[160]](#footnote-163) such as the Muslim dialect of Sefrou.[[161]](#footnote-164) In the Mashriq, this distinction is found in the Baghdadi dialects, among others.[[162]](#footnote-165)

Unlike the Jews of Constantine, the Muslims of the city distinguished between the masculine and feminine in the singular imperative forms, just as they did in the future tense. Accordingly, an occasional use of a female imperative ending in –i by our informants may be explained by the influence of the surrounding Muslim dialect.

There is no separate imperative form for the feminine plural, and the masculine form is also used when addressing women.

The second person masculine singular imperative is derived from the future form *tǝktǝb* through the omission of the initial –t. Both this form and the plural of the imperative begin with an initial *ǝ*. This vowel has the length of a short vowel,[[163]](#footnote-166) although it has an extremely short realization sometimes.[[164]](#footnote-167) Although its principal realization is the central vowel [ǝ], it may sometimes be realized as [a] when the first root letter is /ḥ/,[[165]](#footnote-168) for example: *aḥfuḍ* (נְצֹ֣ר, Ps 34:14), *aḥrǝz-ni* (שָׁ֭מְרֵנִי, Ps 17:8), *aḥkǝm-ni* (שָׁפְטֵ֤נִי, Ps 26:1), alongside: *ǝḥrǝz-ni* (שָֽׁמְרֵ֥נִי, Ps 16:1). It may also be realized as [u] through vocal harmony with a [u] vowel on the second root letter,[[166]](#footnote-169) for example: *unḍuṛ* (רְאֵ֣ה, Ps 9:14), *uṭlub* (שְׁאַ֤ל, Ps 2:8).

The /e/ vowel of the imperative is sometimes realized together with a glottal stop, for example: *ˀǝkdǝb* (“lie!”), *ˀǝdǝbḥu* (זִבְח֥וּ, Ps 4:6), *ˀuṭlub* (שְׁאַ֤ל, Ps 2:8, as pronounced by one informant).

The vowel on the second root letter in the singular imperative is the same as the vowel in the future form from which it is derived.[[167]](#footnote-170) Accordingly, it is realized in many cases as [e], for example: *ǝrfǝd* (נְשָׂ֣א, Ps 10:12), *ǝmsǝk* (תָּמֹ֣ךְ, Ps 17:5). However, this vowel may be realized as [u], for example: *unḍuṛ* (רְאֵ֣ה, Ps 25:18), *ǝṭlub* (שְׁאַ֤ל, Ps 2:8), *aḥfuḍ* (נְצֹ֣ר, Ps 34:14). When the second or third root letter is /h h ˁ/, the vowel on the second root letter in the imperative is realized as [a], for example: *ǝbḥat-ni* (בְּחָנֵ֣נִי, Ps 26:2), *ǝǧˁal* (תְּנָ֥ה, Ps 8:2), *ǝfham* (בִּ֣ינָה, Ps 5:2).

The plural imperative form is *ǝktbu*; an epenthetic vowel is sometimes inserted between C1 and C2 in order to facilitate the pronunciation of the triconsonantal cluster. Thus, we find, for example: *ǝškru* (הוֹד֣וּ, Ps 33:2) versus *ǝdǝbḥu* (זִבְח֥וּ, Ps 4:6).

When the conjunctive particle /w/ is added to the imperative, the initial vowel of the form is usually omitted, for example: *u-škru* (וְ֝הוֹד֗וּ, Ps 30:5) versus *ǝškru* (הוֹד֣וּ, Ps 33:2), *u-tklu* (וּ֝בִטְח֗וּ, Ps 4:6),[[168]](#footnote-171) *u-sktu* (וְדֹ֣מּוּ, Ps 4:5),[[169]](#footnote-172) *u-nḍṛu* (וּ֭רְאוּ, Ps 34:9). The form *ḥkǝm-ni* (שָׁפְטֵ֥נִי, Ps 7:9, 26:1), with omission of the initial vowel probably due to the addition of the pronoun and the consequent lengthening of the word, was used by the rabbis alongside the form *ǝḥkǝm-ni*.

This initial vowel was recorded in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s orthography as א and is regarded as an integral part of the imperative of Form I verbs.[[170]](#footnote-173) Moreover, even when the conjunctive ו is added to the imperative, Renassia is careful to include the initial א, for example: ואתכלו (וּ֝בִטְח֗וּ, Ps 4:6).

Examples of the imperative paradigm of Form I verbs with three whole consonants:

Second-person singular: *ǝzrǝb* (חֽוּשָׁה, Ps 22:20, 38:23), *unḍuṛ* (רְאֵ֣ה, Ps 9:14), *ǝmsǝk* (תָּמֹ֣ךְ, Ps 17:5), *ǝrfǝd* (נְשָׂ֣א, Ps 10:12), *ǝḥrǝz* (שָׁמְרָ֣ה, Ps 25:20), *ǝǧˁal* (תְּנָ֥ה, Ps 8:2), *ǝsmaˁ* (שְׁמַ֣ע, Ps 17:6).

Second-person plural: *ǝfṛḥu* (שִׂמְח֬וּ, Ps 32:11), *ǝsmˁu* (שִׁמְעוּ, Ps 34:12), *ǝrfdu* (שְׂא֤וּ, Ps 24:9), *u-nḍṛu* (וּ֭רְאוּ, Ps 34:9), *ǝškrū-h* (הַֽלְל֗וּהוּ, Ps 22:24), *ǝdǝbḥu* (זִבְח֥וּ, Ps 4:6).

[7.2.1.4] Participle Forms

With regard to the active participle, the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms provides us with numerous examples in the masculine, both singular and plural, but only a few feminine forms, reflecting the paucity of these forms in the Hebrew original.[[171]](#footnote-174) It would seem that feminine plural forms are not used in colloquial speech and are preserved in the *šarḥ* as a formal and literal translation of their Hebrew counterparts. The rabbis were certainly familiar with the productive suffix –āt for forming the feminine plural of nouns, but translated the Hebrew participles in the questionnaire by means of the masculine plural: שומעים, שומעות were translated *sāmˁ-īn*,[[172]](#footnote-175) מפחדים, מפחדות by *xāyf-īn*. Additional evidence of the disappearance of the feminine plural form of the participle was provided by the rabbi who translated without looking at the printed *šarḥ*. When required to translate אֲמָר֪וֹת טְהֹ֫ר֥וֹת (Ps 12:7), he gave *qwāl-āt ṣāfy-īn*. In the *šarḥ* itself, we found the masculine plural used instead of the feminine in the translation of the verse פִּקּ֘וּדֵ֤י יְהוָ֣ה יְ֭שָׁרִים מְשַׂמְּחֵי־לֵ֑ב (Ps 19:9) – וצאיאת אללאה מסגמין מפ'רחין לקלב. In this instance, however, the masculine plural form reflects the influence of the following masculine form in the Hebrew, rather than that of dialectal usage. In the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalt, the feminine plural form of the participle is also used solely to represent analogous Hebrew forms, while in the spoken language the masculine plural is used for both genders.[[173]](#footnote-176)

The singular participle *kātǝb* is always stressed on the first syllable. The masculine plural form usually has the same stress,[[174]](#footnote-177) and the vowel in the first syllable is longer than that in the suffix –īn; however, this is not completely regular.

When the second or third root letters are one of the consonants /h ḥ ˁ/, the /ǝ/ in the singular may be realized as [a], for example: *qāˁad* (י֝וֹשֵׁ֗ב, Ps 22:4), *ṭāhaṛ* (נָבָ֥ר, Ps 18:27), *sāmaˁ* (שָׁמֵ֑עַ, Ps 34:18).[[175]](#footnote-178) However, the influence of the pharyngeal consonant on the /ǝ/ is not regular and we also find *u-fāˁǝl* (וּפֹעֵ֥ל, Ps 15:2) and *qāˁǝd* (יוֹשֵׁ֣ב, Ps 2:4), for example. In a few instances, the /ǝ/ in this form is realized as [i]: *nāzil* (חֹנֶ֤ה, Ps 34:8), *ḥākim* (שׁוֹפֵ֥ט, Ps 9:5), *sākin* (יֹשֵׁ֣ב, Ps 9:12).

The plural suffix –īn of both the active and passive participles is not omitted in construct chains or when enclitic pronouns are added.[[176]](#footnote-179) Thus we find, for example: *fāˁl-īn z-zawṛ* (פֹּ֥עֲלֵי אָֽוֶן, Ps 5:6), *kāṛh-īn-ǝk* (שֹֽׂנְאֶֽיךָ, Ps 21:9).

The feminine singular, masculine plural, and feminine plural forms of the participle are created by adding the appropriate suffix (beginning with a vowel) to the singular form *kātǝb*. This opens the second syllable and accordingly the *ǝ* is omitted: *kātb-a*, *kātb-īn*, *kātb-āt*.

Similarly, when an enclitic pronoun beginning with a vowel is added to the masculine singular active participle, its syllabic structure changes, for example: *xālq-i* (צוּרִ֥י, Ps 19:15), *u-šāfˁ-i* (וְגֹֽאֲלִֽי, Ps 19:15), *u-mānˁ-i* (וּמְפַ֫לְטִ֥י, Ps 18:3; מְפַלְּטִ֗י: Ps 18:49). The enclitic first-person singular pronoun added to the participle is –i (like the suffix on nouns) and not –ni (like the suffix added to verbal conjugations). When such a pronoun is added to the plural forms it does not, of course, alter the structure of the word, for example: *nāḍṛ-īn-i* (שֽׁוֹרְרָ֑י, Ps 5:9).

Examples of the paradigm of the active participle for Form I verbs:

Masculine singular: *fāḍǝl* (חָסִ֣יד, Ps 4:4), *ḍ-ḍālǝm* (רָשָׁ֑ע, Ps 9:6, 39:2), *māsǝk* (תּוֹמִ֥יךְ, Ps

16:5), *l-kāfǝṛ* (בְלִיַּ֣עַל, Ps 18:5), *l-ġāfǝl* (פֶּֽתִי, Ps 19:8), *tākǝl* (בֹּטֵ֣חַ, Ps 21:8), *nāqǝṣ* (חָדֵ֥ל, Ps 39:8), *ˁāṛǝf* (יוֹדֵ֣עַ, Ps 1:6), *ḥāfǝḍ* (נֹצֵ֣ר, Ps 31:24), *u-bāḥǝt* (וּבֹחֵ֣ן, Ps 7:10), *šāṛǝˁ* (שׁוֹפֵ֣ט, Ps 7:12).

Feminine singular: *ṭāhṛ-a* (טְהוֹרָה֮, Ps 19:10), *sāmˁ-a* (“she is hearing”).

Masculine plural: *tākl-īn* (חוֹסִ֑ים, Ps 17:7), *ḍ-ḍālm-īn* (רְשָׁעִים֮, Ps 7:10), *u-sākn-īn* (וְיֹ֣שְׁבֵי,

Ps 24:1), *fāḍl-īn-u* (חֲסִידָ֑יו, Ps 30:5), *nāḍṛ-īn-i* (רֹ֭אַי, Ps 22:8), *ˁāṛf-īn* (יֽוֹדְעֵ֣י, Ps 9:11), *l-ˁādl-īn* (צַדִּיקִ֑ים, Ps 32:11), *u-ṛāḍˁ-īn* (וְֽיֹנְקִים֮, Ps 8:3).

Feminine plural: *ṭāhṛ-āt* (טְהֹ֫ר֥וֹת, Ps 12:7).

The corpus also includes instances of the masculine singular, feminine singular, and masculine plural passive participles. As with the active participle, the feminine plural form is no longer used in the spoken dialect. Since this form did not appear in the corpus, we were unable to ascertain whether it is documented in the language of the *šarḥ*.

The vowel on the first syllable of the passive participle form *mǝktūb* is realized as [ǝ] or [a], not always with any influence from the C1 consonant.[[177]](#footnote-180)

Examples of the paradigm of the passive participle for Form I verbs:

Masculine singular: *mabxūṣ* (נִבְזֶ֤ה, Ps 15:4), *mǝškūr* (מְ֭הֻלָּל, Ps 18:4), *u-mǝbrūk* (וּבָר֣וּךְ,

Ps 18:47), *u-maġbūn* (וְאֶבְיוֹן֮, Ps 40:18), *mǝktūb* (כָּת֥וּב, Ps 40:8), *b-ǝl-mǝkšūf* (בַּֽעֲלִ֣יל, Ps 12:7), *mahlūk* (אֻמְלַ֫ל, Ps 6:3), *l-mahdūm* (פָּרִֽיץ, Ps 17:4), *mǝdhūn-u* (מְשִׁ֫יח֥וֹ, Ps 20:7), *maqṭūˁ* (אֻמְלַ֫ל, Ps 6:3), *makṛūh* (נִמְאָ֗ס, Ps 15:4).

Feminine singular: *mǝfṛūǧ-a* (מְ֝זֻקָּ֗ק, Ps 12:7), *maḥṣūṛ-a* ((בְּעִ֣יר) מָצֽוֹר, Ps 31:22),

*mamḥūṣ-a* (מְ֝זֻקָּ֗ק, Ps 12:7).

Masculine plural: *mǝkṣūṛ-īn ǝṛ-ṛūḥ* (דַּכְּאֵי־ר֥וּחַ, Ps 34:19), maḍṛūb-īn (נֵ֭כִים, Ps 35:15), *l-l-*

*mǝkṣūṛ-īn l-qǝlb* (לְנִשְׁבְּרֵי־לֵ֑ב, Ps 34:19).

[7.2.1.5] *Masdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

The main patterns found in the corpus for verbal nouns in Form I are: CCūC, CCīC,[[178]](#footnote-181) for example: *fi rǧūˁ* (בְּשׁ֣וּב, Ps 14:7), *fi zrīb-i* (בְחָפְזִ֗י, Ps 31:23). The pattern CCāC is also found, for example: *qˁād-i* (שִׁבְתִּ֣י, Ps 27:4), and a pattern CCĀC-a is also documented, for example: *fhām-a* (הָ֫בִ֥ין, Ps 32:9).

Since these forms translate Hebrew declined forms, most of the *masdar* verbal forms in the corpus are accompanied by prepositions and/or enclitic pronouns. The enclitic pronoun for the first person is –i, as is typical in nouns.[[179]](#footnote-182)

Additional examples:

*fi hbūṭ-i* (בְּרִדְתִּ֪י, Ps 30:10), *fi rfūd-i* (בְּנָשְׂאִ֥י, Ps 28:2), *fi hṛūb-u* (בְּ֝בָרְח֗ו, Ps 3:1), *fi nṭīq-i* (בַּֽהֲגִיגִ֥י, Ps 39:4), *mǝn qtīl* (מִתִּגְרַ֥ת, Ps 39:11), *fi hdīn* (בְּשׁ֣וּב, Ps 14:7), *fi ḥrīz-hum* (בְּ֝שָׁמְרָ֗ם, Ps 19:12), *u-fi qˁād* (וּבְמוֹשַׁ֥ב, Ps 1:1), *ṛqād* (“lying”), *zyād-a* (ע֑וֹד, Ps 10:18).[[180]](#footnote-183)

The declined Hebrew infinitive form לפעל is translated in the *šarḥ* by a combination of ל and the third-person masculine singular of the future.[[181]](#footnote-184) Examples of this usage:

*li-yiqfǝl* (לִבְל֑וֹם, Ps 32:9), *li-yixṭuf* (לַֽחֲט֣וֹף, Ps 10:9), *li-yinḍaṛ* (לִרְא֥וֹת, Ps 34:13), *li-yifrǝs* (לִטְרֹ֑ף, Ps 17:12), *li-yiqṭaˁ* (לְהַכְרִ֖ית, Ps 34:17), *li-yikṛah* (לִשְׂנֹֽא, Ps 36:3), *li-yaˁmǝl* (לַ֥עֲשׂוֹת, Ps 40:9), *li-yaḥkǝm* (לִשְׁפֹּ֥ט, Ps 10:18), *li-yigdǝm* (“to bite”).

[7.2.1.6] Secondary Root

The root of the verb *tkǝl*, which is conjugated in Form I as a stable verb in the various forms, is secondary. It was created from the CA Form VIII verb إِتَّكَلَ, from the root وكل. The root √tkl exists in CA تَكَلَ and is common in many of the Maghrebi dialects.[[182]](#footnote-185) This verb is also documented in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s dictionary (p. 92): בטח – تكل – *thkèle*.

In the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Constantine, this verb is used to translate the Hebrew verbs בטח, חסה,[[183]](#footnote-186) for example: *tkǝlt* (בָּטָֽחְתִּי, Ps 31:7), *tkǝl* (בָטַ֥ח, Ps 28:7), *tkǝlna* (בָטָֽחְנוּ, Ps 33:21), *nǝtkǝl* (אֶֽחֱסֶה, Ps 18:3), *u-yitkǝlu* (וְ֝יִבְטְח֗וּ, Ps 40:4), *u-tklu* (וּ֝בִטְח֗וּ, Ps 4:6), *tākǝl* (בוֹטֵֽחַ, Ps 27:3), *tākl-īn* (חוֹסִ֑ים, Ps 17:7).

[7.2.2] Verbs with Identical Second and Third Root Consonants

These verbs are conjugated as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |  |
| Singular |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | fǝkkīt |  | nfǝkk |  |
|  | 2: | fǝkkīt / fǝkkīti |  | tfǝkk |  |
|  | 3M: | fǝkk |  | yifǝkk |  |
|  | 3F: | {fǝkkǝt} |  | tfǝkk |  |
| Plural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | {fǝkkīna} |  | {nfǝkku} |  |
|  | 2: | {fǝkkītīw} |  | tfǝkku |  |
|  | 3: | fǝkku |  | yifǝkku |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Imperative |  | Act.Part. |  | Pass.Part. |
| 2S: | fǝkk | MS: | - |  | mǝktūb |
| 2P: | fǝkku | MP: | fākk- īn |  | mǝktūb-a |
|  |  | MP: | kātb-īn |  | mǝktūb-īn |

*Masdar* verbal noun – *ḍlāl*.

[7.2.2.1] Past Tense

In the past tense of the first and second singular and plural persons, an /ī/ vowel is found between the third root letter and the pronominal morpheme.[[184]](#footnote-187) Thus, these forms are effectively identical to conjugations of the *kǝttǝb* verb form whose third root letter is /y/ or /w/.[[185]](#footnote-188) This vowel is often realiazed as [ī], or even as a lower [ē] under the influence of the consonantal environment,[[186]](#footnote-189) for example: *rǝddīt* (גָּ֭מַלְתִּי, Ps 7:5), *xaṭṭēt* (שִׁוִּ֬יתִי, Ps 16:8).

The realization of the /ǝ/ on the third root letter is also influenced by the surrounding consonantal environment, for example: *ḥabbɪ̄t* (אָ֭הַבְתִּי, Ps 26:8), *fɪkk* (הִֽצִּיל, Ps 18:1), *fǝkkīti* (“you (masc. sing.) saved”).

Examples of the past tense paradigm of Form I verbs with identical second and third consonants:

First-person singular: *ḥabbɪ̄t* (אָ֭הַבְתִּי, Ps 26:8), *xaṭṭēt* (שִׁוִּ֬יתִי, Ps 16:8), *rǝddīt* (גָּ֭מַלְתִּי, Ps 7:5), *fǝkkīt* (I saved), *ḥannīt* (I pardoned), *ḥallīt* (I solved), *mǝddīt* (I reached out).

Second-person singular (masculine and feminine): *ḥallīt* (פִּתַּ֥חְתָּ, Ps 30:12), *fǝkkīti* (“you (sing. masc. or fem.) saved”), *ḥannīt* (“you pardoned”).

Third-person masculine singular: *fɪkk* (הִֽצִּיל, Ps 18:1), *fǝkk-ni* (הִצִּילָֽנִי, Ps 34:5), *u-rǝdd* (וַיָּֽשֶׁב, Ps 18:25), *fǝkk-hum* (הִצִּילָֽם, Ps 34:18), *u-šǝmm* (וַיָּ֣רַח, Gen 8:21), *ḥann* (“he pardoned”), *mǝdd* (“he reached out”).

Third-person feminine singular: *fǝkkǝt* (“she saved”), *ḥannǝt* (“she pardoned”).

First person plural: *fǝkkīna* (“we saved”).

Second person plural (masculine and feminine): *fǝkkītīw* (“you (pl.) saved”).

Third person plural (masculine and feminine): *ḥallu* (פָּצ֣וּ, Ps 22:14; פָּ֥תְח֣וּ, Ps 37:14), *fǝkku* (“they saved”).

[7.2.2.2] Past Tense

In this verb type there is no vowel after the future prefix: *nfǝkk*, *tfǝkk*, *tfǝkku*, etc. The future prefix of the third-person singular and plural is realized as [yi]. Since there is no vowel after the prefix, its expected realization would be [i], but a remnant of the [y] can be heard, although forms realized with a true [i] are also encountered.[[187]](#footnote-190)

The vowel on the third root letter is /ǝ/, whose realization is often influenced by its surroundings. In the singular persons it is usually realized as [ǝ] or [u]; these realizations may even be used interchangeably by the same informant for the same form. Forms also occurred in which this vowel is realized as [a] or [i], for example: *yiḥǝbb* / *yiḥubb* (וְאֹהֵ֣ב, Ps 11:5), *yifǝkk-ni* / *yifukk-ni* (יַצִּילֵ֗נִי, Ps 18:18),[[188]](#footnote-191) *yitimm* (יִגְמָר, Ps 7:10), *yihadd-hum* (יֶֽ֝הֶרְסֵ֗ם, Ps 28:5). In several verbs in which the vowel [u] is realized, the vowel in the future tense in CA was also ـُ (فَكَّ, رَدَّ, قَصَّ).[[189]](#footnote-192)

In the plural persons, the vowel on the first root letter is usually realized as [ǝ], even in verbs in which the singular is realized with [u], for example: *yifǝkku* (יַצִּ֖ילוּ, I Sam 12:21), *tḥǝbbu* (תֶּֽאֱהָב֣וּן, Ps 4:3). The exception to this is the form *yiḥallu* (יַפְטִ֥ירוּ, Ps 22:8), where the /ḥ/ has clearly influenced the vowel.

Examples of the future tense paradigm of Form I verbs with identical second and third consonants:

First-person singular: *nbǝll* (אַמְסֶֽה, Ps 6:7), *nḥǝbb-ǝk* (אֶרְחָֽמְךָ֖, Ps 18:2), *nḥǝll* (אֶפְתַּח, Ps 39:10), *nfukk* (“noble”).

Second-person singular (masculine and feminine): *tfǝkk-ni* (תַּצִּילֵֽנִי, Ps 19:49), *tǧǝrr-ni* (תִּמְשְׁכֵ֣נִי, Ps 28:3), *tḥunn* (“you will pardon”), *tfukk* (“you will save”).

Third-person masculine singular: yifǝkk (מַצִּֽיל, Ps 7:3), yifǝkk-u (יַ֝צִּילֵ֗הוּ, Ps 22:9), *u-lli yiḥubb* (וְאֹהֵ֣ב, Ps 11:5), *yirudd* (יָשִׁ֥יב, Ps 18:21), *yiquṣṣ* (חֹצֵ֗ב, Ps 29:7), *yiǧǝzz* (דּוֹחֶֽה, Ps 35:5), *yitǝmm* (יִגְמָר, Ps 7:10), *yilǝmm-hum* (אֹסְפָֽם, Ps 39:7), *yiḥunn* (חוֹנֵ֥ן, Ps 37:21).

Third-person feminine singular: *trudd* (מְשִׁ֣יבַת, Ps 19:8), *tǧǝzz-u* (תִּדְּפֶ֥נּוּ, Ps 1:4), *tfukk* (“she will save”), *tḥunn* (“she will pardon”).

First-person plural: nfǝkku (“we will save”).

Second-person plural (masculine and feminine): *tḥǝbbu* (תֶּֽאֱהָב֣וּן, Ps 4:3), *tfǝkku* (“you will save”).

Third-person plural (masculine and feminine): *yiḥallu* (יַפְטִ֥ירוּ, Ps 22:8), *yifǝkku* (יַצִּ֖ילוּ, I Sam 12:21).

[7.2.2.3] The Imperative

In the verb f where the second and third root consonants are identical, the imperative forms do not include an initial /ǝ/. The masculine singular and masculine plural imperative forms are identical to the third person singular and plural forms of the past tense, respectively.

The vowel on the first root letter in the imperative forms – /ǝ/ – is often influenced by its consonantal surroundings and may be realized as [a o u ǝ].

Examples of the imperative paradigm of Form I verbs where the second and third root consonants are identical:

Second person singular: *ḥọnn ˁli-ya* (חָנֵּ֥נִי, Ps 6:3), *u-fukk-ni* (וְהַצִּילֵֽנִי, Ps 7:2), *fǝkk*

(הַצִּ֣ילָה, Ps 22:21),[[190]](#footnote-193) *rudd* (הָשֵׁ֖ב, Ps 28:4; הָשִׁ֣יבָה, Ps 35:17), *u-sǝll* (וְהָ֘רֵ֤ק, Ps 35:3), *ǧǝrr* (מְשֹׁ֣ךְ, Ps 36:11).

Second person plural: *ḥabbu* (אֶ֥הֱב֥וּ, Ps 31:24), *fǝkku* (“save!”).

[7.2.2.4] Participle Forms

Only one plural participle form for this verb type appeared in the corpus (twice): *ḥābb-īn* (אֹֽהֲבֵ֥י (שְׁמֶֽךָ), Ps 5:12; אֹֽ֝הֲבֵ֗י (תְּשֽׁוּעָתֶֽךָ), Ps 40:17). The informant, who tends to add numerous epenthetic vowels, did so here between the two identical consonants: *ḥābǝb-īn*.

Rabbi Yosef Renassia suggested two ways to translate the word אָהֵ֑ב (Ps 11:7), the second of which was the masculine singular active participle יחב (חאב). Based on this orthography, we may reconstruct the active participle form as \*ḥāb(b).[[191]](#footnote-194) The informants read here the future form *iḥubb* solely.

No passive participles for this verb type appeared in the corpus.

[7.2.2.5] *Masdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

The corpus included one verbal noun for this verb type, with the pattern CCāC: *fi ḍlāl-u* (בְּסֻכֹּה֮, Ps 27:5).

Examples of the declined Hebrew infinitive form לפעל in verbs where the second and third root letters are identical: *li-yfǝkk* (לְהַצִּ֣יל, Ps 33:19), *li-yfukk-ni* (לְהַצִּילֵ֑נִי, Ps 40:14), *li-yḥǝnn* (“to pardon”).

[7.2.3] Verbs with the First Root Letter ו or י

This verb type includes verbs whose first root letter is /w/ or /y/. These verbs are conjugated as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |  |
| Singular |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | uqǝft |  |  |  |
|  | 2: | uqǝft/uqǝfti |  | tuwqǝf/tūqǝf |  |
|  | 3M: | uqǝf |  | yuwqǝf/yūqǝf |  |
|  | 3F: | wǝqfǝt |  | tuwqǝf/[tūqǝf] |  |
| Plural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | {uqǝfna} |  | {nwǝqfu} |  |
|  | 2: | {uqǝftīw} |  | {twǝqfu} |  |
|  | 3: | wǝqfu |  | iwǝqfu |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Imperative |  | Act.Part. |  | Pass.Part. |
| 2S: | {uqǝf} | MS: | wāqǝf |  | mowǧūd |
| 2P: | {uqfu} | FS: | wāqf-a |  |  |
|  |  | P: |  |  |  |

*Masdar* verbal noun --- .

In the entire corpus, only a single form appeared for this verb type in Form I: *ibǝs* / *yibis* (יָ֘בֵ֤שׁ, Ps 22:16). Verbs with the first root letter י are uncommon in modern Maghrebi dialects. The root √ybs is the only one of its type in the Jewish dialects of Tunis and Algiers, and the Muslim dialect of Sousse.[[192]](#footnote-195) As noted above,[[193]](#footnote-196) the /y/ here was also realized with a consonantal remnant from the semi-vowel, through one informant pronounced it as a true [i].

Accordingly, our discussion is largely confined to verbs whose first root letter is /w/.

Verbs with a first root letter ו found in the corpus in Form I are: w.q.f., w.l.d., w.ṣ.l., w.ğ.d., w.r.t.

[7.2.3.1] Past Tense

According to the rules of behavior of the semi-vowels,[[194]](#footnote-197) the /w/ in the first-person singular and plural, second-person singular and plural, and third-person masculine singular will be realized as [u], since it appears without an adjacent vowel in these forms, for example: *uqǝf* (עָמָ֑ד, Ps 1:1). In the feminine singular and in the third person plural forms, it is realized as [w] due to the adjacent vowel, for example: *waqfu* (עָמָֽדוּ, Ps 38:12). According to the same rules, we find: *layš uqǝf*, where the /w/ is adjacent to a consonant, versus *ma-wqǝf-š*, where it is adjacent to a vowel.[[195]](#footnote-198), However, a remnant of the consonantal realization of the /w/ may sometimes be heard even in forms where [u] would be expected, for example: *wulidt-ǝk* (יְלִדְתִּֽיךָ, Ps 2:7), *wuqǝf* (עָמָ֑ד, Ps 1:1).[[196]](#footnote-199)

In past forms in which [w] is realized and followed by a vowel, this vowel may assimilate to the adjacent [w],[[197]](#footnote-200) for example: *wuqfu* (“they stood”). The realization of [w] may also change under the influence of the following consonant C2, for example: *waqfət* ( עָֽמְדָ֣ה, Ps 26:12).

Examples of the past tense paradigm of Form I verbs whose first root letter is ו:

First-person singular: *ulidt-ǝk* (יְלִדְתִּֽיךָ, Ps 2:7), *urətt* (“I inherited”), *uğədt* (“I found”), *ulədt* (“I gave birth”), *uqəft* (“I rose, stood”).

Second-person masculine singular: *uqəfti* (“you rose, stood”)

Third-person masculine singular: *uqəf* (עָמָ֑ד, Ps 1:1; וַיָּ֨קָם֙, I Sam 2:25), *uqaf* (וַֽיַּעֲמֹֽד, Ps 33:9).

Third-person feminine singular: *waqfət* (עָֽמְדָ֣ה, Ps 26:12), *wuldət* (“she gave birth”).

First-person plural: *wuqəfna* (“we rose, stood”).

Second-person plural masculine and feminine: *uqəftīw* (“you rose, stood”).

Third-person plural masculine and feminine: *waqfu* (עָמָֽדוּ, Ps 38:12), *wuqfu* (“they rose, stood”)

[7.2.3.2] Conjugation of the Future Tense

In CA, the و is not reflected in the future tense of verbs whose first root letter is ו – أَصِفُ, تَصِفُ, etc. In CJA, by contrast, C1=w is manifested in the future form.[[198]](#footnote-201)

The conjugation of the future tense in the singular is in two forms. One maintains the diphthong, for example: *tuwğəd* (תִּמְצָ֑א, Ps 17:3), while the other contracts it to a long vowel, for example: *tūğəd* (תִּמְצָֽא, Ps 10:15). The latter form is also found in the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[199]](#footnote-202) in Sousse,[[200]](#footnote-203) in the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[201]](#footnote-204) in Ouled Brahim,[[202]](#footnote-205) and among speakers of the Arba’a dialect.[[203]](#footnote-206) A form maintaining the diphthong (albeit a different one) is found in Tlemcen – *yé͜uṣöl*. The CJA form *tuwqəf*, which maintains the diphthong *uw*, reflects the conjugation of the root √wqf according to that of verbs with three whole root letters – for example, *təktəb* – though the /ə/ assimilates to the following /w/ and is realized as /u/. The form *tūqəf* also has its origin in the pattern *tuwqəf*, but the diphthong has contracted.[[204]](#footnote-207)

A third form for the conjugation of the future tense in the singular with a long ā was documented in the speech of one of the informants: *nāquf* (“I will stand”), *tāquf* (“you masc. or fem. will stand”), *yāquf* (“he will stand”). This is also documented in several dialects in the Edough region (*yāgöf*) and among some of the Jews of Bône.[[205]](#footnote-208)

The plural is conjugated in the future according to a single model: *nwəqfu*. This is documented as characteristic of the sedentary dialects in the Philippeville district.[[206]](#footnote-209) Forms on the model of *iwəqfu* are sometimes found in Jijli[[207]](#footnote-210) and in the sedentary dialects in the Algiers area.[[208]](#footnote-211) In the Jewish dialect of Algiers itself this model is attested alongside that of *yūṣlu*.[[209]](#footnote-212) The model *yūṣlu* is characteristic of the nomadic dialects[[210]](#footnote-213) and may be found, for example, in the dialect of Ouled Brahim[[211]](#footnote-214) and among speakers of the Arba’a dialect.[[212]](#footnote-215) However, it is also documented in the sedentary dialects, such as those of the Jews of Tunis[[213]](#footnote-216) and Sefrou.[[214]](#footnote-217)

Examples of the future tense paradigm of Form I verbs whose first root letter is ו:

Second-person singular masculine and feminine: *tūqǝf* / *tuwqǝf* (תַּֽעֲמֹ֣ד, Ps 10:1), *tūǧǝd* / *tuwǧǝd* (תִּמְצָֽא, Ps 10:15), *tuwğəd* (תִּמְצָ֑א, Ps 17:3).

Third-person masculine singular: *u-yūlǝd* / *u-yuwlǝd* (וְיָ֣לַד, Ps 7:15), *yūrǝt* (יִ֣ירַשׁ, Ps 25:13).

Third-person feminine singular: *tuwǧǝd* (תִּמְצָ֣א, Ps 21:9), *tuwqəf* (תַּֽעֲמֹ֑ד, Ps 33:11).

First-person plural: *nwuqfu* (“we will stand”).

Second-person plural masculine and feminine: *twuqfu* (“you will stand”).

Third-person plural masculine and feminine: *iwaṣlu* (יַגִּֽיעוּ, Ps 32:6), *iwərtu* (יִֽירְשׁוּ־, Ps 37:9, 11), *iwuqfu* (יַֽעֲמֹ֑דוּ, Ps 38:12). These forms are also used in the Jewish dialect of Algiers.[[215]](#footnote-218)

[7.2.3.3] Imperative Forms

No imperative forms from verbs whose third root letter is ו appeared in the corpus. According to the pronunciation of one of the informants, the imperative forms are in the form *uqəf, uqfu*.[[216]](#footnote-219)

[7.2.3.4] Participle Forms

The active participle forms of verbs whose third root letter is ו are declined in the same manner as verbs with three whole root letters. Masculine singular: *wāqəf* (נִצָּ֥ב, Ps 39:6), feminine singular: *wāqf-a* (עוֹמֶ֪דֶת, Ps 19:10). No plural active participle forms appeared in the corpus.

The only passive participle form that appeared in the corpus is *mowǧūd* (מְאֹד֮, Ps 31:12). This form is used as an adverb in CJA. The diphthong is also maintained in the passive participle in the dialect of Tlemcen,[[217]](#footnote-220) but is contracted in the Jewish dialects of Algiers[[218]](#footnote-221) and Tangiers.[[219]](#footnote-222)

[7.2.3.5] *Masdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

No examples were found in the corpus of a verbal noun formed from a verb whose third root letter is ו.

The combination used to translate the declined Hebrew infinitive לפעל appeared twice: *li-yūqəf* (ק֑וּם, Ps 18:39), *li- yuwǧǝd* (לִמְצֹ֖א, Ps 36:3).

[7.2.4] Verbs with the Second Root Letter ו or י

This verb type includes verbs whose second root letter is /w/ or /y/. Their conjugation is illustrated below for three patterns distinguished by the vowel on their second root letter in the future tense:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past | | |
| Sing. |  | xāf | kān | māl |
|  | 1: | xuft | kunt |  |
|  | 2: | {xuft/xufti} | kunt/kunti |  |
|  | 3M: | xāf | kān | māl |
|  | 3F: | {xāfǝt} | {kānǝt} | {mālǝt} |
| Plural: |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | {xufna} | kunna |  |
|  | 2: | {xuftīw} | {kuntīw} |  |
|  | 3: | xāfu | kānu | mālu |
|  |  | Future | | |
| Sing. |  | ixāf | ikūn | imīl |
|  | 1: | nxāf | nkūn | nmīl |
|  | 2: | txāf | {tkūn} | tmīl |
|  | 3M: | yixāf | yikūn | yimīl |
|  | 3F: | {txāf} | tkūn | tmīl |
| Plural: |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | {nxāfu} | {nkūnu} | {nmīlu} |
|  | 2: | {txāfu} | tkūnu | {tmīlu} |
|  | 3: | yixāfu | yikūnu | yimīlu |
| Imperative: |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2S | {xāf} | kūn | mīl |
|  | 2P | xāfu | kūnu | [mīlu] |
| Act. Part. |  |  |  |  |
|  | MS: | xāyǝf | kāyǝn | māyǝl |
|  | FS: | {xāyf-a} | [kāyn-a] | [māyl-a] |
|  | MP: | xāyf-īn | kāyn-īn | māyl-īn |
| *Masdar* (verbal noun) | | | ˁyāṭ |  |

7.2.4.1 Past Tense

In the first and second person forms (singular and plural) of the past tense of verbs whose second root letter is ו, a short and sometimes even reduced [u] is realized in most cases, reflecting the origin of this root letter in the semi-vowel /w/.[[220]](#footnote-223) Sometimes this vowel is neutralized to [ə], as common with the short vowels. Thus, we find, for example: *qult* (אָ֝מַ֗רְתִּי, Ps 31:15), *šəft* (“I saw”), *xuft* (“I feared”).[[221]](#footnote-224) Since the corpus did not include any forms of this verb type in these persons, we cannot determine at this stage whether a form such as that translating the Hebrew נטיתי would be pronounced \*məlt or \*milt.[[222]](#footnote-225)

Examples of the past tense paradigm of Form I verbs whose second root letter is ו or י:

First-person singular: *u-kunt* (וָֽאֱהִ֣י, e.g., Ps 18:24, 38:15), *qult* (אָמַ֣רְתִּי, e.g. Ps 30:7, 31:15, 23), *šubt* (זָ֫קַ֥נְתִּי, Ps 37:25), *nəmt* (חָלַ֤מְתִּֽי, Gen 37:90, *fuqt* (הֱקִיצ֑וֹתִי, Ps 3:6), *xuft* (I feared), *qumt* (I arose), *šəft* (I saw).

Second-person masculine singular: *kunt*/*kunti* (הָיִ֑יתָ, Ps 27:9, 10:14), *šəfti* (רָאִ֡תָה, Ps 10:14),[[223]](#footnote-226) *xuft*/*xufti* (“you feared”), *qulti* (“you said”).

Second-person feminine singular (second root letter ו): *qult* (אָמַ֣רְתְּ, Ps 16:2), *qulti* (“you said”), *šuft* (רָאִ֑ית, II Sam 28:13),[[224]](#footnote-227) *raḥti* (“you went”), *xuft* (“you feared”).

Third-person masculine singular (second root letter ו): *qāl* (אָמַ֘ר, e.g. Ps 2:7, 33:9), *zāl* (סָר֮, Ps 14:3), *u-kān* (וַֽיְהִי, e.g. Ps 18:19, 33:9), *u-sāq* (וַיַּדְבֵּ֖ר, Ps 18:48), *u-nām* (וַיַּֽחֲלֹ֥ם, Gen 37:9), *u-bās-hum* (וַיִּשַּׁק־ל֔וֹ,[[225]](#footnote-228) Gen 27:27), *u-qām* (וַיָּ֨קָם֙, I Sam 20:250, *xāf* (“he feared”), *zāṛ* (“he visited”).

(2nd root letter י): *u-ṭāḥ* (וַ֝יִּפֹּ֗ל, Ps 7:16), *ḍāˁ* (אָבַ֖ד, Ps 9:7), *u-ṭāṛ* (וַיָּעֹ֑ף, Ps 18:11), *ġāt* (הוֹשִׁ֥יעַ, Ps 20:7), *ġāt-u* (הֽוֹשִׁיעֽוֹ, Ps 34:7), *māl* (פָנָ֥ה, Ps 40:5), *ġāṛ* (קִנֵּא֙, Num 25:13), *ǧāb* (“he brought”), *fāq* (“he awoke”).

Third-person feminine singular (second root letter ו): u-šāfǝt (וַתֵּ֖רֶא, Gen 24:64), *u-qālǝt* (וַתֹּ֣אמֶר, Gen 24:46, I Sam 28:13), *xāfǝt* (“she feared”).

(2nd root letter י): *u-ṭāḥǝt* (וַתִּפֹּ֖ל, Gen 24:64).

First-person plural (second root letter ו): *qumna* (קַּ֝֗מְנוּ, Ps 20:9), *qulna* (“we said”), *xufna* (“we feared”).

(second root letter י): *ḍaˁna* (“we lost”).

Second-person plural (masculine and feminine) (2nd root letter ו): *qālu* (אָֽמְר֨וּ, Ps 12:5), *xāfu* (פָּ֣חֲדוּ, Ps 14:5), *qāmu* (קָֽמוּ, Ps 27:12), *ǧāzu* (עָֽבְר֑וּ, Ps 18:13, 38:5), *u-ǧāˁu* (וְרָעֵ֑בוּ, Ps 34:11), *ḍāṛu* (אָפְפֽוּ, Ps 40:13), *kānu* (הָי֤וּ, Josh 47:14).

(second root letter ו): *qultīw* (you said), *xuftīw* (you feared).

Third-person plural (masculine and feminine) (second root letter ו): *qālu* (אָֽמְר֨וּ, Ps 12:5), *xāfu* (פָּ֣חֲדוּ, Ps 14:5), *qāmu* (קָֽמוּ, Ps 27:12), *ǧāzu* (עָֽבְר֑וּ, Ps 18:13, 38:5), *u-ǧāˁu* (וְרָעֵ֑בוּ, Ps 34:11), *ḍāṛu* (אָפְפֽוּ, Ps 40:130), *kānu* (הָי֤וּ, Is 47:14).

(second root letter י): *mālu* (נָמ֥וֹטּוּ, Ps 17:5; נָט֣וּ, Ps 21:12), *ḍāˁu* (אָֽבְד֥וּ, Ps 10:16), *ṭāḥu* (נָֽפְלוּ, Ps 16:6, 36:13), *u-ṭāḥu* (וְנָפָ֑לוּ, Ps 20:9, 27:2).

[7.2.4.2] Future Tense

CJA has maintained the vowels on the three patterns of the future tense as these exist in CA. Thus, we find: *nxāf* (אִ֭ירָא, Ps 3:7), *nqūm* (אָ֭קוּם, Ps 12:60, *nmīl* (אֶמּ֑וֹט, Ps 10:6). In the future tense of the verb *bāt* (“to sleep overnight”) alone, the vowel has changed in the conjugation: CA has تَبِيتُ while in CJA the quality of the vowel is *a*:[[226]](#footnote-229) *tbat* (תָּלִ֑ין, Ps 25:13), *ibāt* (יָלִ֥ין, Ps 30:6).

The realization of the vowel on the first root letter may be influenced by its consonantal surroundings. Back and emphatic consonants often lead to a lowered pronunciation, for example: *nṭēḥ* (אֶמּֽוֹט, Ps 13:5), *yiġēṛ* (“he will be jealous”), *yiṣọ̄q-ni* (יְנַֽהֲלֵֽנִי, Ps 23:2), *tṣōq-ni* (תַּֽנְחֵ֥נִי, Ps 31:4), *yiṭēḥu* (יִ֝פְּל֗וּ, Ps 18:39).

The prefix of the future tense is not followed by a vowel: *nxāf*, *txāf*, *txāfu*, etc. According to the rules of behavior of the semi-vowels, we would have expected the [i] realization of the future prefix in the third-person masculine singular and plural forms with /y/. We often find this realization in the single persons, but in many cases a residual consonantal /y/ can be heard, particularly in the plural. Thus, the realizations of the future prefix in this verb type range from [i] to [yǝ],[[227]](#footnote-230) for example: *yǝqūmu* (יָקֻ֣מוּ, Ps 1:5), *ikūnu* (יִֽהְי֗וּ, Ps 35:5), *yifǝṛḥu* (יִשְׂמְחוּ, Ps 35:19).

Examples of the future tense paradigm of Form I verbs whose second root letter is ו or י:

First-person singular (second root letter ו): *nxāf* (אִ֘ירָ֤א, Ps 23:4, 27:1),[[228]](#footnote-231) *u-nḍūṛ* (וַאֲסֹֽבְבָ֖ה, Ps 26:6), *nšūf* (אֶֽחֱזֶ֣ה, Ps 16:15),[[229]](#footnote-232) *nqūm* (אָ֭קוּם, Ps 12:6).

(second root letter י): *nmīl* (אֶמּֽוֹט , Ps 16:8), *nṭīḥ* (אֶמּֽוֹט, Ps 13:5).

Second-person singular (masculine and feminine) (second root letter ו): *tṣūq-ni* (תַּֽנְחֵ֥נִי, Ps 31:4), *txāf* (“you will fear”).

(second root letter י): *tġīt* (תוֹשִׁ֑יעַ, Ps 18:28, 36:7), *tfīq* (“you will awake”), *tḍīˁ* (“you will lose”).

Third-person masculine singular (second root letter ו): *w-ikūn* (וְֽהָיָ֗ה, Ps 1:3; וִ֘יהִ֤י, Ps 9:10), *yiqūl* (יֹאמַ֣ר, Ps 13:5, אֹמֵ֥ר, Ps 29:9), *yiǧūz* (יַֽעֲבָר, Ps 16:3), *yimūt* (יָ֝מ֗וּת, Ps 41:6), *yisūq-ni* (יַֽנְחֵ֥נִי, Ps 23:3), *yiqūm* (יָ֝ק֗וּם, Ps 24:3), *yixāf* (יִירָ֪א, Ps 26:3), *yibāt* (יָלִ֥ין, Ps 30:6).

(second root letter י): *yiṭīḥ* (יֵרֵֽד, Ps 7:17), *yimīl* (יִמּֽוֹט, Ps 21:8), *yiˁīš* (יְחִ֖י, Ps 22:27), *yizīd* (יוֹסִ֥יף, Ps 41:9), *yiġīt* (יוֹשִֽׁיעַ, Ps 34:19), *w-iḍīˁ* (וְאָבַ֥ד, Ps 41:6).

Third-person feminine singular (second root letter ו): *tqūm* (תָּק֣וּם, Ps 27:3), *tkūn* (תִּֽהְיֶֽה, Ps 36:18), *u-tkūn* (וְהָ֤יְתָה, Num 25:13), *tbāt* (תָּלִ֑ין, Ps 25:130), *txāf* (she will fear).

(second root letter י): *tḍīˁ* (תֹּאבֵֽד, Psd 1:6, 9:19), *tṭīḥ* (יִבּ֑וֹל, Ps 1:3).

First-person plural (second root letter ו): *nšūfu* (“we will see”), *nxāfu* (“we will fear”).

(second root letter י): *nḍīˁu* (“we will lose”).

Second-person plural (second root letter ו): *tqūlu* (תֹּֽאמְר֣וּ, Ps 11:1), *tkūnu* (תִּֽהְי֤וּ, Ps 32:9), *tzūlu* (תָּס֑וּרוּ, I Sam 12:21), *txāfu* (“you will fear”).

(second root letter י): u-tḍīˁu (וְתֹ֬אבְדוּ, Ps 2:12).

Third-person masculine plural (second root letter ו): *yixāfu* (יָ֝ג֗וּרוּ, Ps 33:8), *w-ixāfu* (וְיִירָ֑אוּ, Ps 40:4), *yiqūlu* (אֹֽמְרִ֪ים: PS 3:3, 3:4, 4:7; יֹֽאמְר֣וּ, Ps 40:17), *yišūfu* (יֶֽחֱז֑וּ, Ps 11:4),[[230]](#footnote-233) *yiḍūṛu* (יַקִּ֥יפוּ, Ps 17:9), *yikūnu* (יִ֥הְיֽוּ, Ps 19:15), *yiqūmu* (יְ֭קוּמוּן, Ps 35:11).

(second root letter י): *yiṭīḥu* (יִפְּלוּ֮, Ps 5:11), *u-yḍīˁu* (וְ֝יֹֽאבְד֗וּ, Ps 9:4).

Third-person feminine plural (second root letter ו): *yišūfu* (תֶּֽחֱזֶ֥ינָה, Ps 17:2), *yiqūlu* (תֹּאמַרְנָה֮, Ps 35:10).

[7.2.4.3] Imperative Forms

As in the conjugation of the future, the imperative forms also maintain the three patterns found in CA.

The vowel in the second-person masculine singular imperative is long, unlike its CA counterpart in CA, whose rules dictate that only a short vowel may appear in a closed syllable.[[231]](#footnote-234) The lengthening of this vowel in CJA may be due to analogy with the future form or with the plural form of the imperative.[[232]](#footnote-235) Thus we find: *xāf* (\*خَفْ!)) (fear!), *mīl* (\*مِلْ!) (lean!), *qūm* (\*!قُمْ) (arise! stand up!). This phenomenon of the lengthening of the vowel in the second-person masculine singular imperative is found in numerous Maghrebi dialects and elsewhere, for example the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[233]](#footnote-236) the dialect of Sousse,[[234]](#footnote-237) the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[235]](#footnote-238) and the Muslim dialects of Jijli[[236]](#footnote-239) and Tlemcen.[[237]](#footnote-240)

The realizations of the vowel in the imperative may be influenced by its consonantal surroundings, for example: *ṣọ̄q-ni* (נְחֵ֬נִי, Pd 5:9), *ġēṛ* (“be jealous!”).

Examples of the imperative paradigm of Form I verbs whose second root letter is ו or י:

Second-person masculine singular (secondroot letter ו): *qūm* (ק֘וּמָ֤ה, e.g., Ps 3:8., 9:20), *u-ṣūq-ni* (וּ֭נְחֵנִי, Ps 27:11), *kūn* (הֱֽיֵה, Ps 30:11, 31:3), *zūl* (ס֣וּר, Ps 34:15), *qūl* (אֱמֹ֥ר, Ps 35:3), *šūf* (רְאֵה֙, Gen 27:27), *zūṛ* (“visit!”).

(second root letter י): *ġīt* (הוֹשִׁ֣יעָה, e.g., Ps 12:2, 28:9), *ġīt-ni* (הֽוֹשִׁ֘יעֵ֤נִי, e.g., Ps 3:8, 6:5, 7:2), *u-fīq* (וְ֭הָקִיצָה, Ps 35:23), *ġēṛ* (“be jealous!”), *ǧīb* (“bring!”).

Second-person plural (2nd root letter ו): *qūlu* (אִמְר֣וּ, Ps 4:5), *zūlu* (ס֣וּרוּ, Ps 6:9), *xāfu* (יְר֣אוּ, Ps 34:10), *u-xāfu* (וְג֥וּרוּ, Ps 22:24), *būsu* (נַשְּׁקוּ, Ps 2:12).

[7.2.4.4] Participle Forms

The corpus includes solely active singular and plural participle forms for this verb type. It does not include any instances of the passive participle.

For all the three patterns of verbs whose second root letter is ו or י, the participle is declined in the same manner as that of verbs with three whole root letters. This form features the [y] that originates from the CA \*ˀ[[238]](#footnote-241) and, under its influence, the following /ǝ/ is often realized as [ɪ]; for example: *ṭ-ṭāyɪq* (הָאֵ֗ל, Ps 18:48).

This vowel is omitted in the feminine singular and the masculine plural of the active participle due to the addition to the masculine singular form of a suffix beginning with a vowel, for example: *xāyf-a* (“afraid” fem. sing.), *xāyf-īn* (“afraid” masc. pl.).

Similarly, when an enclitic pronoun beginning with a vowel is added to the masculine singular form of the participle, the vowel following the [y] is omitted, for example: *ṭāyq-i* (אֵ֣לִי, Pa 22:11), *ḍāyq-i* (צֽוֹרְרִ֣י, Ps 7:5).

Examples of participle forms of Form I verbs whose second root letter is ו or י:

Masculine singular: *u-ṭāyɪq* (וְ֝אֵ֗ל, e.g., Ps 7:12), *ǧāyɪz* (עֹ֝בֵ֗ר, Ps 8:9), *dāyɪm* (חַי, Ps 18:470, *xāyɪf* (יְרֵ֣א, Ps 25:12), *ḍāyǝˁ* (אֹבֵֽד, Ps 31:13), *mǝn ḍ-ḍāyǝq* (מִצַּ֪ר, Ps 32:7).

Feminine singular: *xāyf-a*

Masculine plural: *qāym-īn* (קָמִ֥ים, Ps 3:2), *qāym-īn-i* (קָ֭מַי, Ps 18:49), *ḍāyq-īn-i* (צָרָ֑י, Ps 3:2; צֽוֹרְרָֽי, Ps 6:8), *ḍāyq-īn-ǝk* (צֽוֹרְרֶ֑יךָ, Ps 8:3), *xāyf-īn ǝḷ-ḷah* (יִרְאֵ֣י יְהוָ֣ה, Ps 15:4), *xāyf-īn-u* (יְרֵאָ֑יו, Ps 33:18), *u-māyl-īn l-kdǝb* (וְשָׂטֵ֥י כָזָֽב, Ps 40:5).

Feminine plural: *xāyf-īn* (“they are fearing”).

[7.2.4.5] *Masdar* (verbal noun) forms

The corpus includes only one verbal noun for this verb type, which occurs three times: *u-fi ˁyāṭ-u* (וּֽבְשַׁוְּע֖וֹ, Ps 22:25), *fi ˁyāṭ-i* (בְּשַׁוְּעִ֣י, Ps 28:2, 31:23).

Examples of the structure translating the Hebrew declined infinitive in Form I of verbs whose second root letter is ו or י:

(secondroot letter ו): *u-li-yzūṛ* (וּלְבַקֵּ֥ר, Ps 27:4), *li-yqūm* (קֽוּם, Ps 36:13; לָקֽוּם, Ps 41:9), *li-yqūl* (II Kgs 8:7), *li-yšūf* (to see).

(secondroot letter י): *li-ymīl* (לִנְט֥וֹת, Ps 17:11), *li-yġīt-ni* (לְהֽוֹשִׁיעֵֽנִי, Ps 31:3).

[7.2.5] Verbs Whose Third Root Letter is ו or י

This verb type includes verbs with an original third root letter is /w/ or /y/, verbs whose original third letter was /ˀ/ and which behave as if this letter were י, and two verbs whose third root letter is א – א.כ.ל. and א.כ'.ד. – which are conjugated in the past like verbs whose third root letter is י.

The following paradigm illustrates the conjugation of this verb type:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | zha | Past | mša |  |
| Sing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: |  | zhīt |  | mšīt |  |
|  | 2: |  | zhīt/ zhīti |  | mšīt/ mšīti |  |
|  | 3M: |  | zha |  | mša |  |
|  | 3F: |  |  |  | {mšāt} |  |
| Plural: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2: |  |  |  | {mšītīw} |  |
|  | 3: |  | zhāw |  | {mšāw} |  |
|  |  |  |  | Future |  |  |
| Sing.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: |  | nəzha |  | nəmši |  |
|  | 2: |  | [təzha] |  | təmši |  |
|  | 3M: |  | yəzha |  | yəmši |  |
|  | 3F: |  | təzha |  |  |  |
| Plural: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: |  | nəzhāw |  | nəmšīw |  |
|  | 2: |  | [təzhāw] |  | təmšīw |  |
|  | 3: |  | yəzhāw |  | yəmšīw |  |
|  | Imperative | |  | Act. Part. | | |
| 2S | əzha | əmši |  | MS: | ṣāfi | māši |
| 2P | əzhāw | əmšīw |  | FS: | ṣāfy-a | [māšy-a] |
|  |  |  |  | MP: | ṣāfy-īn | māšy-īn |

7.2.5.1 Past Tense

The three models for the conjugation of this verb type in the past have unified in CJA, as in many other dialects,[[239]](#footnote-242) into a single conjugation pattern. Thus CaCiya (e.g., نَسِيَ), CaCā (e.g., رَمَى) and CaCuwa (e.g., سَرُوَ) have merged into CCa.

In CA, the third-person feminine singular form in the past is مَشَتْ \*mašat. In CJA, as in many other dialects, this form is *mšāt*, featuring a long vowel in a closed syllable. This form should probably be explained as a new one based on the masculine:[[240]](#footnote-243) *mšā* + t > *mšāt*.

The long /ī/ found in the first and second persons singular and plural of the past tense may have a lower realized [ē] under the influence of a back or emphatic consonant, for example: *šqēt* (יָגַ֤עְתִּי, Ps 6:7), *xṭēt* (חָטָ֥אתִי, Ps 41:5).

The first vowel in the diphthong *āw*, found in the third-person plural forms, has a truly long realization sometimes, but in other instances is short. Its creation should probably be regarded as a new diphthong produced due to the addition of the plural morpheme *u* to the singular form ending in a vowel. When this morpheme appears alongside a vowel, it is realized as [w]: mšā + u > mšāw.[[241]](#footnote-244) Plural forms in the pattern *mšāw* are documented in the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province, as well as in Algerian-type nomadic dialects (referred to by Cantineau as A and B dialects) found on the western margins of this province. Conversely, in the Tunisian-type dialects, which exert a considerable influence on the eastern part of this province, the plural form *mšû* is found, with omission of the final long vowel before the plural suffix.[[242]](#footnote-245)

Examples of the past paradigm of Form I verbs whose third root letter is ו or י:

First person singular (third root letter י): *šqēt* (יָגַ֤עְתִּי, Ps 6:7), *mšīt* (הָלַ֑כְתִּי, Ps 26:1), *fnīt* (כָלִֽיתִי, Ps 39:11), *nsīt* (“I forgot”), *ˁṭīt* (“I gave”).[[243]](#footnote-246) Third root letter א > third root letter י: *xṭēt* (חָטָ֥אתִי, Ps 41:5), *bdīt* (“I began”).

Second person singular (masculine and feminine) (third root letter ו): *mḥīt* / *mḥēti* (מָ֝חִ֗יתָ, Ps 9:6). Third root letter י: *ˁṭīti* (נָתַ֣תָּה, Ps 4:8), *ˁṭēt* (נָתַ֣תָּה, Ps 18:41, 21:3, 5), *mšīt* (“you went”), *xfīt* / *xfīti* (הִסְתַּ֥רְתָּ, Ps 30:8), *nsīt* / *nsīti* (“you forgot”).

Third person masculine singular (third root letter ו): *u-zha* (וַיָּ֣גֶל, Ps 16:9; וַיַּֽעֲלֹ֥ז, Ps 28:7). third root letter י: *mša* (הָלַךְ֮, Ps 1:1), *nsa* (שָׁ֝כַ֗ח, Ps 9:13, 10:11), *xfa* (הִסְתִּ֥יר, Ps 10:11; 22:25), *ˁṭa* (נָתַ֣ן, Ps 15:5). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *bda* (“he began”).

Third person feminine singular (third root letter י): sqāt (הִשְׁקָֽתָה, Gen 24:46).

Second-person plural masculine and feminine (third root letter י): *šrītīw* (“you purchased”), *mšītīw* (“you walked”), *bnītīw* (“you built”).

Third-person plural masculine and feminine (third root letter ו): *u-zhāw* (וְ֝גִ֗ילוּ, Ps 2:11) [לבדוק אם לא צורת ציווי נוכחים], *ršāw* (בָּל֣וּ, Ps 32:3). Third root letter י: *ˁṭāw* (מָ֫הָ֥רוּ, Ps 16:4), *mšāw* (“they walked”), *bnāw* (“they built”), *šrāw* (“they purchased”).

[7.2.5.2] Future Tense

In contrast to the three patterns for the future tense forms of this verb type found in CA,[[244]](#footnote-247) the reading of the *šarḥ* by the Jews of Constantine presents just two: in the first, the singular forms end in –I, for example: *nəmši* and, in the second, in –a, for example: *nǝzha*. The corpus did not include any instances of a future conjugation form ending in *u*. This pattern is also rare in other dialects.[[245]](#footnote-248) Verbs whose future tense in CA was formed with ـُ divided in various Maghrebi dialects[[246]](#footnote-249) into those conjugated with *a* and those conjugated with *i*. Our corpus included only verbs conjugated with *a*, for example: أَزْهُو *nǝzha* (אָ֝גִ֗ילָה, Ps 9:15), نَعْلُو *nˁalāw* (נִדְגֹּ֑ל, Ps 20:6).[[247]](#footnote-250)

The plural forms in the future end in the diphthong –īw in the conjugation pattern with *i* and in *–*āw in the pattern with *a*. Thus, we find *u-yizhāw* (וְֽיַעְלְצ֥וּ, Ps 5:12), *yixfīw* (יִצְפֹּֽנוּ, Ps 10:8). The explanation of the creation of these diphthongs is similar to that for the diphthong –āw in the plural of the past tense. The presence of final diphthongs in the plural forms of the future tense in verbs whose third root letter is ו or י is a characteristic feature of the sedentary dialects. Such diphthongs can be found in the Edough and Bône areas,[[248]](#footnote-251) in the Muslim and Jewish dialects of Algiers,[[249]](#footnote-252) in Tlemcen[[250]](#footnote-253) and Jijli,[[251]](#footnote-254) in various Moroccan dialects,[[252]](#footnote-255) including the Jewish dialect of Sefrou,[[253]](#footnote-256) and elsewhere.[[254]](#footnote-257)

Forms without a diphthong, such as *yǝmšu*, are characteristic of the nomadic dialects, such as that of Ouled Brahim,[[255]](#footnote-258) the Arba’a dialects,[[256]](#footnote-259) Tunisian nomadic dialects,[[257]](#footnote-260) and others.

The future tense prefixes are accompanied by the vowel /ǝ/, realized as [i] when it follows the third-person masculine and feminine singular prefix /y/, for example: *nǝmši* (אֵלֵ֣ךְ, Ps 39:14), but *yifdi* (פֹּדֶ֣ה, Ps 34:23). The realization [i] of the vowel on the prefix also occurs commonly in the future conjugation of other persons as, for example, in many forms from the root √zhw, in all of which this vowel is realized as [i], for example: *yizha* (יָ֤גֵ֥ל, Ps 13:6), *nizha* (אָ֝גִ֗ילָה, Ps 9:15), *timši* (“you fem. sing. will go”).

When the first root letter is /x ˁ/,[[258]](#footnote-261) the vowel on the prefix may be [a], for example: *yaˁṭi* (יִתֵּ֬ן, Ps 1:3), *taxfi-hum* (תַּסְתִּירֵ֤ם, Ps 31:21).

Examples of the future paradigm of Form I verbs whose third root letter is ו or י:

First-person singular (third root letter ו): *u-nizha* (וְאֶֽעֶלְצָ֣ה, Ps 9:3), *nizha* (אָ֝גִ֗ילָה, Ps 9:15, 31:8). Third root letter י: *u-naˁṭi* (וְאֶתְּנָ֣ה, Ps 2:8), *nǝžri* (אָרֻ֣ץ, Ps 18:30), *nǝmši* (אֵלֵ֨ךְ, Ps 23:4, 39:14).

Second-person masculine singular (third root letter י): *tǝxfi* (תַּ֝עְלִ֗ים, Ps 10:1; תַּסְתִּ֖יר, Ps 13:2), *tǝxfi-ni* (תַּסְתִּירֵֽנִי, Ps 17:8), *tǝnsa-ni* / *tinsa-ni* (תִּשְׁכָּחֵ֣נִי, Ps 13:2), *taxfi-hum* (תַּסְתִּירֵ֤ם, Ps 31:21), *tǝmši* (תֵלֵ֑ךְ, Ps 32:8), *tǝsqi-hum* (תַשְׁקֵֽם, Ps 36:9), *taˁṭi* (you will give), *tišri* (“you will purchase”).

Second-person feminine singular (third root letter י): *taˁṭi* (“you will give”), *timši* (“you will walk”), *tišri* (“you will purchase”), *tinsi* (“you will forget”).

Third-person masculine singular (third root letter ו): *yizha* (e.g., יָגֵ֥ל, Ps 14:7). Third root letter י: *yaˁṭi* (יִֽתֶּן, e.g., Ps 20:5, 29:11), *yixfi-ni* (יַ֭סְתִּרֵנִי, Ps 27:5), *yibni-hum* (יִבְנֵֽם, Ps 28:5), *yifdi* (פֹּדֶ֣ה, Ps 34:23), *yinsa* (“he will forget”). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *yibda* (“he will begin”).

Third-person feminine singular (third root letter ו): *tizha* (תָּגִ֣יל, תָּ֝שִׂ֗ישׂ, Ps 35:9).

First-person plural (third root letter ו): *nˁalāw* (נִדְגֹּ֑ל, Ps 20:6). Third root letter י: u-*nǝṛmīw* (וְנַשְׁלִ֖יכָה, Ps 2:3), *nǝmšīw* (“we will walk”), *nǝnsāw* (“we will forget”).

Second-person plural (masculine and feminine) (third root letter י): *tǝmšīw* (“you will walk”), *tǝšrīw* (“you will purchase”), *tinsāw* (“you will forget”). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *tǝxṭāw* (תֶּ֫חֱטָ֥אוּ, Ps 4:5).

Third-person plural (third root letter ו): *u-yizhāw* (וְֽיַעְלְצ֥וּ, Ps 5:12), *yizhāw* (יָ֝גִ֗ילוּ, Ps 13:5; יַֽעַלְצ֖וּ, Ps 25:2), *yixlāw* (יָ֭שֹׁמּוּ, Ps 40:16). Third root letter י: *yixfīw* (יִצְפֹּֽנוּ, Ps 10:8), *yiṛmīw* (יַפִּ֥ילוּ, Ps 22:19), *yimšīw* (יֵ֣לְכוּ, Ex 18:20), *yibkīw* (“they will cry”), *yinsāw* (“they will forget”).

[7.2.5.3] Imperative Forms

The imperatives of Form I verbs whose third root letter is ו or י are conjugated in two patterns, like the future tense of this type. The first pattern features a short /ǝ/ as in the imperative forms of verbs with three whole root letters. Thus, in the pattern with *i* we find *ǝmši* and in the pattern with *a* – *ǝzha*.

The examples of the second-person singular imperative found in the corpus are: *ǝfdi* (פְּדֵ֣ה, Ps 25:22), *ǝfdi-ni* (פְּדֵ֣נִי, Ps 26:11), *aˁṭi* (תֵּ֣ן, Ps 28:4), *aṛḍa* (רְצֵ֣ה, Ps 40:14). The initial vowel is omitted when the conjunctive ו precedes the imperative: *u-ṛˁa-hum* (וּֽרְעֵ֥ם, Ps 28:9).

The second-person plural imperative forms found in the corpus are: *aˁṭīw* (הָב֣וּ, Ps 29:1, 2), *u-zhāw* (וְ֝גִ֗ילוּ, Ps 2:11; 32:11).

[7.2.5.4] Participle Forms

The corpus included only active participle forms for this verb type. The pattern for the masculine singular active participle is CāCi, for example: *ṣāfi* (תָּ֭מִים, Ps 15:2). The feminine singular and plural forms follow the pattern for verbs with three whole root letters in the forms CāCy-a, for example: *ṣāfy-a* (צְרוּפָ֑ה, Ps 18:31) and CāCy-īn,[[259]](#footnote-262) for example: *l-xāṭy-īn* (חַטָּאִ֣ים, Ps 25:8). The plural form is often pronounced *xāṭiyy-īn* (חַטָּאִ֣ים, Ps 26:9), with the insertion of a short [i] before the third root letter[[260]](#footnote-263) and secondary doubling of the third root letter /y/. This form also sometimes appears in a further variant: *l-xāṭyy-īn* (חַ֭טָּאִים, Ps 1:1).

Examples of the active participle forms of Form I verbs whose third root letter is ו or י:

Masculine singular (third root letter ו): *u-l-ˁāli* (וְ֭עֶלְיוֹן, Ps 18:14), *ǝl-ˁāli* (עֶ֝לְי֗וֹן, Ps 21:8), *ṣāfi* (תָּ֝מִ֗ים, Ps 18:26, 31), *u-ṣāfi- l-qǝlb* (וּֽבַר־לֵ֫בָ֥ב, Ps 24:4). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *bāri l-kfūf* (נְקִ֥י כַפַּ֗יִם, Ps 24:4), *ǝl-bāri* (נָקִ֑י, Ps 10:8, 15:5). Third root letter י: *māši* (הוֹלֵ֣ךְ, Ps 15:2), *ṛāˁy-ya dyāl-i* (רֹ֝עִ֗י, Ps 23:1).

Feminine singular (third root letter ו): *ṣāfy-a* (e.g., צְרוּפָ֑ה, Ps 18:31; בָּ֝רָ֗ה, Ps 19:9).

Masculine plural (third root letter ו): *ṣāfy-īn* (יִשְׁרֵי, Ps 7:11). Third root letter י: *nāsy-īn* *ǝḷ-ḷah* (שְׁכֵחֵ֥י אֱלֹהִֽים, Ps 9:18), *fāny-īn* (אֹֽכְלֵ֣י, Ps 14:4). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *l-xāṭy-īn* (חַטָּאִ֣ים, Ps 25:8).

[7.2.5.5] *Masdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

Only a single infinitive for Form I of this verb type appeared in the corpus: *l-fnī-hum* / *ḥtta fnī-hum* (עַד־כַּלּוֹתָֽם, Ps 18:38).

Examples of the phrase used to translate the Hebrew form לפעל in this verb type: (third root letter י) *li-yaˁṭi* (לָתֵ֪ת, Ps 10:14), *li-yiǧri* (לָר֥וּץ, Ps 19:6), *li-yaṛmi* / *li-yiṛmi* (לִיר֥וֹת, Ps 11:2), *li-yɪfne-ha* (לִסְפּ֫וֹתָ֥הּ, Ps 40:15), *li-yimši* (“to walk”). Third root letter א > third root letter י: *mǝn li-yixṭi* (מֵֽחֲט֪וֹא, Ps 39:2: מן אלי יכ'טי).

[7.2.5.6] Verbs with the Third Root Letter א Conjugated as Verbs with the Third Root Letter י

Verbs with an original third root letter is /\*ˀ/ are conjugated exactly as if the third root letter were י.[[261]](#footnote-264) The corpus included five roots in this category, as follows:[[262]](#footnote-265)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| xṭy | < | \*xṭˀ |  |  |  | bry | < | \*brˀ |
| ḍwy | < | \*ḍwˀ |  |  |  | wṭy | < | \*wṭˀ |
|  |  |  | bdy | < | \*bdˀ |  |  |  |

[7.2.5.7] The Verbs א.כ.ל. and א.כ.ד.

In many Arab dialects, the behavior of these two verbs with an original third root letter of /\*ˀ/ is interesting.

The *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms included only a handful of forms for these verbs.[[263]](#footnote-266) However, they can help us understand the conjugation of these roots in CJA. The forms that appeared in the corpus are: *xda* (לָ֫קָ֥ח, Ps 15:5),[[264]](#footnote-267) *klāw* (אָ֣כְלוּ, Ps 14:4, 22:30). Thus, CJA belongs to the group of dialects in which these verbs are conjugated in the past like verbs whose third root letter is ו or י.[[265]](#footnote-268)

Based on the questionnaire, the past tense of the verb *kla* can be determined as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1PS: | klīt |  | 1PP: | klīna |
| 2PS: | klīt / klīti |  | 2PP: | klītīw [[266]](#footnote-269) |
| 3PMS: | kla |  | 3PP: | klāw |
| 3PFS: | klāt |  |  |  |

This pattern of conjugation of *qla* in the past tense is found both in sedentary and nomadic dialects, for example in the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[267]](#footnote-270) in Sousse,[[268]](#footnote-271) in the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[269]](#footnote-272) in Jijli[[270]](#footnote-273) and Tlemcen,[[271]](#footnote-274) in Ouled Brahim,[[272]](#footnote-275) in the Arba’a dialects,[[273]](#footnote-276) in various Moroccan dialects,[[274]](#footnote-277) and elsewhere.

Another pattern of conjugation of these two verbs, following the conjugation of verbs whose second root letter is ו – *kal* – is also common in various Maghrebi dialects, such as the Jewish dialects of Sefrou[[275]](#footnote-278) and Tafilalat.[[276]](#footnote-279) In Egyptian Arabic, too, the forms *kal* and *xad* serve for the conjugation of these verbs in the past tense.[[277]](#footnote-280)

The corpus included a third-person masculine singular form of the future tense from the root √ˀxd: *yāxud* (יִקָּֽח, Ps 6:10), *yāxud-ni* (יִקָּחֵ֑נִי, Ps 18:17); and a third-person plural future form from the root √ˀkl: *yāklu* (יֹֽאכְל֬וּ, Ps 22:27).[[278]](#footnote-281) The conjugation of these verbs in the future tense essentially reflects their conjugation in CA. However, the vowelless *hamzah* is omitted and the preceding vowel lengthened: \*yaˀkul > yăkul.

Thus, we can present the following paradigm for the future tense:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1PS: | nākul |  | 1PP: | nāklu |
| 2PS: | tākul |  | 2PP: | tāklu |
| 3PMS: | yākul |  | 3PP: | yāklu |
| 3PFS: | tākul |  |  |  |

This conjugation of the root √ˀkl in the future tense, preserving the vowel on the second root letter in CA, is documented in additional Algerian dialects, such as the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[279]](#footnote-282) the dialects of Bône[[280]](#footnote-283) and Tlemcen,[[281]](#footnote-284) the transitional nomadic dialects (Cs) in the Philippeville district,[[282]](#footnote-285) and the Ouled Brahim[[283]](#footnote-286) and Arba’a dialects.[[284]](#footnote-287) This conjugation is also documented outside Algeria, in the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[285]](#footnote-288) in Sefrou,[[286]](#footnote-289) and in Egyptian Arabic,[[287]](#footnote-290) among other dialects.

In many dialects the same model is used for the conjugation of the future tense, but the vowel on the second root letter is realized as [e].[[288]](#footnote-291) Examples include the Jijli dialect[[289]](#footnote-292) and certain sedentary dialects in the Philippeville district.[[290]](#footnote-293)

The imperative forms of these verbs already were distinctive in CA from the other imperatives for verbs whose first root is א. In CJA, as in many Maghrebi dialects, they are conjugated according to the pattern for verbs whose second root letter is ו: *kūl* (“eat!”), kūlu (“eat!” pl.).

The infinitive form לפעל is translated as follows by the rabbis for these verbs: *li-yāxud* (לָקַ֖חַת, Ps 31:14), *li-yākul* (לֶֽאֱכֹ֪ל, Ps 27:2).

[7.2.6] Complex Roots

The various verbs that appeared in the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms include several that have “complex” roots, that is, roots that contain more than one special consonant. The occurrences of these verbs are few and will be reviewed briefly here.[[291]](#footnote-294)

[7.2.6.1] Second Root י + Third Root א

The Hebrew verb בא is translated in the *šarḥ* by its Arabic equivalent *ğa*, which has its origins in the CA جَاءَ, i.e., a root whose second and third letters are /y/ and /ˀ/, respectively. In CA, it is conjugated like verbs whose second and third roots are י and א, respectively. In CJA, as in many other dialects,[[292]](#footnote-295) there is no remnant of the final *Hamzah* in these verbs, which are conjugated like verbs whose third root letter is י (such as *mša*).

The forms of this verb that were found (in the corpus and elsewhere)[[293]](#footnote-296) are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Past: | 1PS | - | ğīt (בָ֑אתִי, Ps 40:8) |
|  | 2PMS | - | ǧīt / ǧīti (“you came”) |
|  | 2PFS | - | ğīt (“you came”) |
|  | 3PMS | - | ğa (בָּ֤א, Ps 41:7), u-ğa (וַיָּבֹ֤א, II Kgs 8:7) |
|  | 3PFS | - | ğāt (“she came”) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Future: | 2PFS | - | u-tǧi (וּבָאת֙, II Sam 14:3) |
|  | 3PMS | - | iǧi (יָבֹ֥א, Ps 37:13) |
|  | 3PFS | - | tǧi (תָּב֬וֹא, Ps 18:7), tǧī-h (תְּבוֹאֵ֣הוּ, Ps 35:8), tǧī-ni (תְּ֭בוֹאֵנִי, Ps 36:12) |
|  | 3PP | - | yiǧīw (יָ֭בֹאוּ, Ps 22:32; יָ֘חִ֤ילוּ, Ps 10:5)[[294]](#footnote-297) |

[7.2.6.2] Second Root Letter י + Third Root Letter י

The Hebrew verb יגע is translated in the *šarḥ* by the Arabic verb originating in the CA عيي, that is, a root whose second and third letters are the semi-vowel /y/. In this instance the second root letter is realized as a consonantal [y] and the verb is conjugated like verbs whose third root letter (only) is י.[[295]](#footnote-298)

The forms from this root that appear in the corpus are first-person singular in the past *ˁyīt* (יָגַ֤עְתִּי, Ps 6:7)[[296]](#footnote-299) and third-person plural in the future *yǝˁyāw* (יִבֹּ֑לוּ, Ps 18:46).

[7.2.6.3] Second Root Letter ו + Third Root Letter י

The corpus includes two roots in which the second root letter is /w/ and the third /y/: √qwy and √rwy. These verbs were conjugated according to the model for verbs whose third root letter is י; the [w] functions as a full-fledged consonant.

Third-person plural in the past: *qwāw* (עָֽצְמ֥וּ, Ps 40:13); third person masculine singular in the future: *yiqwa* (יָעֹ֣ז, Ps 9:20); third person plural in the future: *yirwāw* (יִ֭רְוְיֻן, Ps 36:9); feminine singular active participle: *rāwiy-a* (רְוָיָֽה, Ps 23:5).[[297]](#footnote-300)

[7.2.6.4] Second Root Letter ו + Third Root Letter א

The corpus includes a single form from a root with the second root letter /w/ and the third root letter /\*ˀ/: \*√ḍwˀ – *u-yiḍwāw* (וְנָהָ֑רוּ, Ps 34:6). Like all verbs whose third root letter is א,[[298]](#footnote-301) this verb is also conjugated as if its third root letter were י; the second root letter [w] functions as full-fledged consonant.

[7.2.6.5] First Root Letter ו + Third Root Letter א

The word ענוים is translated in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms by an active participle form from the root \*√wṭˀ: *l-wāṭy-īn* (עֲנָוִֽים, Ps 9:13; עֲנָוִ֣ים, Ps 10:17).

This form combines the characteristics of each of the relevant verb types. Like other verbs whose first root letter is ו, the first root letter follows the pattern for verbs with three whole root letters.[[299]](#footnote-302) Like other verbs whose third root letter is א, it is conjugated according to the participle form of verbs whose third root letter is י.[[300]](#footnote-303)

[7.3] Verb Form with a Doubled Second Root Letter (*kǝttǝb*)

[7.3.1] General Observations

This section discusses the verbal structure of a model C1VC2C2VC3, i.e., one where the second root letter is doubled. Most of the representatives of this form have their origins in Form II of the CA verb (فَعَّلَ). This form is used frequently in the *šarḥ* with a causative force, translating the Hebrew forms פִּעֵّל and הפעיל.[[301]](#footnote-304)

Our presentation of this issue adopts an approach of regarding the triconsonantal root as the foundation of the Arabic verbal system, as in other Semitic languages. We should, however, note the emergence of a new approach in linguistics that analyzes the verbal system on the basis of templates in which consonants and vowels are inserted. One of the advocates of this approach is Heath, whose discussion of verb morphology examines various roots with three and four consonants and considers their possible arrangement according to different templates. Thus Heath analyzes *kǝttǝb*-type verbal forms as verbs with quadrilateral roots where two root letters are identical, rather than a triconsonantal root with a doubled middle consonant. From his perspective, for example, there is no difference between the conjugation of *kǝttǝb* and that of *gǝrgǝb*.[[302]](#footnote-305)

We will discuss below the conjugation of the verb form *kǝttǝb* according to the various verb types.

[7.3.2] Verbs with Three Whole Root Letters

This form includes verbs with three stable consonants. They are conjugated as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |
| Singular: | 1: | sǝllǝkt |  | nsǝllǝk |
|  | 2: | sǝllǝkt / sǝllǝkti |  | tsǝllǝk |
|  | 3M: | sǝllǝk |  | isǝllǝk |
|  | 3F: | {sǝllkǝt} |  | [tsǝllǝk] |
| Plural: |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | [sǝllǝkna] |  | nsǝllku |
|  | 2: | sǝllǝktīw |  | tsǝllku |
|  | 3: | sǝllku |  | isǝllku |
|  |  |  |  | |
|  | Imperative |  | Participle | |
| 2S: | sǝllǝk |  | MS: | msǝllǝk |
| 2P: | sǝllku |  | FS: | msǝllk-a |
|  |  |  | MP: | msǝllk-īn |
|  |  |  | FP: | msǝllk-āt |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Masdar* (verbal noun) forms: tǝslīk, tǝslīk-a. | | | | |

The conjugation of the verb form *kǝttǝb* in the various tenses and persons follows two basic models: When the suffix indicating person begins with a consonant (-t, -tīw, -na) or with ø, the conjugation model is: -C1VC2C2VC3-, for example: *sǝllǝkt*, *sǝllǝktīw*, *tsǝllǝk*. When the suffix indicating person begins with a vowel (-ǝt, -u- -īn), the conjugation model is: -C1VC2C2C3-, for example: *sǝllku*, *nsǝllku*, *msǝllk-īn*, *tsellk-u*. In some cases, a vowel splits the triconsonantal cluster created in the latter model, particularly when C2 or C3 are a liquid consonant:[[303]](#footnote-306) -C1VC2C2ǝC3-. For example, in the second-person plural imperative, we find *xabbǝṛu* alongside *xabbṛu* (הַגִּ֥ידוּ, Ps 9:12); in the third-person feminine singular of the past tense *maqqǝnu* (הִבִּ֣יטוּ, Ps 34:6); and in the plural of the participle: l-mkabbaṛ-īn (הַֽמַּגְדִּילִ֥ים, Ps 35:26). This phenomenon was particularly evident in the pronunciation of one of the informants, and it is possible that it should be regarded primarily as an idiolectical feature.[[304]](#footnote-307) However, the documentation of this phenomenon in additional Algerian dialects, such as the Jijli dialect,[[305]](#footnote-308) the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[306]](#footnote-309) and the Tlemcen dialect,[[307]](#footnote-310) strengthens the case for its possible appearance in CJA.[[308]](#footnote-311)

[7.3.2.1] Past Tense

The conjugation of the past tense in the verb form C1ǝC2C2ǝC3 broadly follows the models described above. In some instances, the vowel between C1 and C2 is omitted in forms conjugated according to the first model, thereby creating a triconsonantal cluster: C1C2C2ǝC3-,[[309]](#footnote-312) for example: *kṣṣǝṛt* (שִׁבַּֽרְתָּ, Ps 3:8), *sbbaḥ* (שָׁ֥ר, Ps 7:1), *kṣṣǝṛ* (וַיְשַׁבֵּ֥ר, Ps 29:5). This phenomenon is also documented in the Jewish dialect of Algiers.[[310]](#footnote-313)

The two short /ǝ/ vowels found in the conjugation forms according to the first model and the sole short vowel of the second model are often influenced by their consonantal environment.[[311]](#footnote-314)

The influence of the consonants /h ḥ ˁ/ is particularly noticeable. When the first root letter is one of these consonants, the following vowel is realized as [a], for example: *u-ḥazzǝmti-ni* (וַתְּאַזְּרֵ֣נִי, Ps 18:40), *ˁaǧǧǝb* (הִפְלִ֘יא, Ps 31:22). When the third root letter is one of these consonants, the preceding vowel is realized as [a], for example: *qǝllaˁt* (נָתַ֑שְׁתָּ, Ps 9:7), *ṭǝllaˁt* (הֶֽעֱלִ֣יתָ, Ps 30:4). The corpus does not include any instances of verbs whose second root letter is one of these consonants.

The change in the quality of the short vowel to [a] may also occur alongside the back consonants /x q/ or the emphatics /ṭ ḍ ṣ ṛ/, for example: *ḍabbaṛ ˁliya* (יְעָצָ֑נִי, Ps 16:7), *baṭṭal* (הֵפִ֥יר, Ps 33:10), *qallǝbt* (הָפַ֣כְתָּ, Ps 30:12). The labial consonants may also influence the realization of /ǝ/ as [u], for example: *buṭṭlu* (הֵפֵ֖רוּ, Is 24:5).[[312]](#footnote-315)

Examples of the past tense paradigm of *kǝttǝb* form verbs with three whole consonants:[[313]](#footnote-316)

First person singular: *u-sǝllǝkt* (וָֽאֲחַלְּצָ֖ה, Ps 7:5), *fǝttǝšt* (דָּרַ֣שְׁתִּי, Ps 34:5),[[314]](#footnote-317) *bǝššart* (בִּשַּׂ֤רְתִּי, Ps 40:10), *ˁaddǝbt* (עִנֵּ֣יתִי, Ps 35:13), *nǝggǝzt* (“I made dance”).

Second person masculine singular: *qallǝbti* / *qallǝbt* (הָפַ֣כְתָּ, Ps 30:12, 41:4), *qǝllaˁti* / *qǝllaˁt* (נָתַ֑שְׁתָּ, Ps 9:7), *fǝṛṛaḥti* / *fǝṛṛaḥt* (שִׂמַּ֖חְתָּ, Ps 30:2), *ṭallaˁti / ṭəllaˁt* (הֶֽעֱלִ֣יתָ, Ps 30:4), *ṛǝffaˁti-ni* (דִלִּיתָ֑נִי, Ps 30:2), *u-mnnaˁti-hum* (וַֽתְּפַלְּטֵֽמוֹ, Ps 22:5), *kṣṣaṛt* / *kṣṣaṛti* (שִׁבַּֽרְתָּ, Ps 3:8), *ǧarrǝbti-ni* (צְרַפְתַּ֥נִי, Ps 17:3).

Third person masculine singular: *u-sǝllǝk-hum* (וַֽיְחַלְּצֵֽם, Ps 34:8), *ṛǝṭṭǝb* (הֶחֱלִ֣יק, Ps 36:3), *kabbaṛ* (הִגְדִּ֖יל, Ps 41:10), *u-xarrǝǧ-ni* (וַיּֽוֹצִיאֵ֥נִי, Ps 18:20), *u-nǝggǝz-hum* (וַיַּרְקִידֵ֥ם, Ps 29:6), *u-kǝššǝf* (וַֽיֶּחֱשֹׂ֪ף, Ps 29:9), *maqqan* (הִבִּ֣יט, Ps 33:13), *u-ṭallaˁ-ni* (וַיַּֽעֲלֵ֤נִי, Ps 40:3).

Third person feminine singular: *u-habbṭǝt* (וַתּ֤וֹרֶד, Gn 24:46).

Second person plural masculine and feminine: *kaṣṣaṛtīw* (“you broke”).

Third person plural: *maqqǝnu* (הִבִּ֣יטוּ, Ps 34:6), *kabbǝṛu* (הִגְדִּֽילוּ, Ps 38:17), *u-xabbṛu* (וַיֻּגַּד, II Kgs 8:7), *kǝṣṣṛu* (they broke), *buṭṭlu* (הֵפֵ֖רוּ, Is 24:5), *bǝddǝlu* (חָ֣לְפוּ, Is 24:5).

[7.3.2.2] Past Tense

The future prefixes in the verb form *kǝttǝb* do not have a following vowel. Thus, the prefix for the third-person masculine singular and the third-person plural /y/ is usually realized as [i], in keeping with the behavior of the semi-vowels in CJA. Once again, however, this [i] is sometimes pronounced with a consonantal remnant of the /y/,[[315]](#footnote-318) though this occurs less frequently than in Form I.[[316]](#footnote-319)

The conjugation of the future in the form C1ǝC2C2ǝC3 usually follows the two models described above. As occasionally in the past tense, the vowel between C1 and C2 may be omitted in the future tense too,[[317]](#footnote-320) for example: *ikṣṣǝṛ* (פֹּ֝רֵ֗ק, Ps 7:3; שֹׁבֵ֣ר, Ps 29:5), *tkṣṣǝṛ-hum* (תְּ֭רֹעֵם, Ps 2:9), *inzzǝl* (יַשְׁכֵּ֣ן, Ps 7:6), *tfrrǝt-hum* (תְּנַפְּצֵֽם, Ps 2:9).

The short vowels /ǝ/ in the future forms may be influenced by their consonantal environment as we described with the past tense, for example: *nsǝbbaḥ* (אָשִׁ֥ירָה, Ps 13:6), *tˁammaṛ* (תְּמַלֵּ֪א, Ps 17:14), *nxabbaṛ* (אַגִּ֥ידָה, Ps 40:6), *nxǝllaṣ* (אֲ֝שַׁלֵּ֗ם, Ps 22:26).

Examples of the future tense paradigm of *kǝttǝb* form verbs with three whole consonants:

First-person singular: *nṛaṭṭab* (אַמְסֶֽה, Ps 6:7), *u-nmǝǧǧǝd* (וַֽ֝אֲזַמְּרָ֗ה, Ps 7:18), *nfǝṛṛǝġ-hum* (אֲרִיקֵֽם, Ps 18:43), *nfǝttǝš* (אֲבַ֫קֵּ֥שׁ, Ps 27:4), *nġǝmmǝz* (אִֽיעֲצָ֖ה, Ps 32:8), *u-nxallǝṣ* (וַֽאֲשַׁלְּמָ֥ה, Ps 41:11), *nˁaṛṛf-ǝk* (אוֹדִ֪יעֲךָ֡, Ps 32:5), *ntǝbbaˁ* (אֶרְדּ֣וֹף, Ps 18:38).

Second-person masculine singular: *u-tḍǝṛṛǝq* (וְתָסֵ֣ךְ, Ps 5:12), *tmǝqqan* (תַּבִּיט֮, Ps 10:14), *tfǝttǝš* (תִּֽדְרוֹשׁ, Ps 10:15), *tṣannǝt* (תַּקְשִׁ֥יב, Ps 10:17), *tsabbq-u* (תְ֭קַדְּמֶנּוּ, Ps 21:4), *txarrǝǧ-ni* (תּֽוֹצִיאֵ֗נִי, Ps 31:5), *tmǝnnaˁ-ni* (תְּפַלְּטֵנִי֮, Ps 18:44), *tˁaṛṛǝf-ni* (תּֽוֹדִיעֵנִי֮, Ps 16:11).

Third-person masculine singular: *isǝllǝk-ni* (יְ֝חַלְּצֵ֗נִי, Ps 18:20), *ikǝmmǝl* (יִגְמָר, Ps 7:10), *ifǝttǝš* (יִדְרֹ֑שׁ, Ps 10:4), *ikǝmmǝn* (יֶֽאֱרֹ֬ב, Ps 10:9), *imǝṭṭaṛ* (יַמְטֵ֥ר, Ps 11:6), *išaṛṛǝq* (יַגִּ֥יהַּ, Ps 18:29), *iṛammǝḍ* (יְדַשְּׁנֶ֣ה, Ps 20:4), *ihaddǝn* (יְשׁוֹבֵ֑ב, Ps 23:3), *imǝnnaˁ* (יְמַלֵּֽט, Ps 33:17).

Third-person feminine singular: *tsǝnnǝd-ni* (תִסְעָדֵ֑נִי, Ps 18:36), *tkǝttǝr-ni* (תַרְבֵּֽנִי, 18:36), *u-tkǝṣṣaṛ* (וְֽנִחֲתָ֥ה, Ps 18:35), *tnǝggǝz* (“she jumps”), *tḥarrǝk-ni* (תְּנִדֵֽנִי, Ps 36:12).

First-person singular: *u-nmǝǧǧdu* (וּֽ֝נְזַמְּרָ֗ה, Ps 21:14), *nsǝbbḥu* (נָשִׁ֥ירָה, Ps 21:14), *u-nṛǝffˁu* (וּנְרֽוֹמְמָ֖ה, Ps 34:4)

Second-person plural: *tfǝttšu* (תְּבַקְשׁ֖וּ, Ps 4:3).

Third-person plural: *ifǝǧǧˁu-ni* (יְבַֽעֲתֽוּנִי, Ps 18:5), *u-yṛaffˁū-h* (וִֽ֭ירוֹמְמוּהוּ, Ps 107:32), *iṛaṭṭbu* (יַֽחֲלִיקֽוּן, Ps 5:10), *išǝkkru* (יְ֭רַנֵּנוּ, Ps 5:12), *u-yxabbṛu* (וְיַגִּ֣ידוּ, Ps 22:32), *iṣabbṛu-ni* (יְנַֽחֲמֻֽנִי, Ps 23:4).

[7.3.2.3] Imperative Forms

The second-person singular and plural imperatives are identical to the third-person singular and plural forms of the past tense, for example: *sǝllǝk*, *sǝllku*. Thus, the singular imperative is formed according to first and the plural according to the second model.

As noted, with the past and future tenses, the quality of the short vowels may change or diversify under the influence of surrounding consonants, for example: *mǝnnaˁ* (פַּלְּטָ֥ה, Ps 17:13), *ḥassnu* (הֵיטִ֥יבוּ, Ps 33:3).

Examples of the imperative forms of *kǝttǝb* form verbs with three whole consonants:

Second-person singular: *sǝggǝm* (הַיְשַׁ֖ר, Ps 5:9), *tǝllǝf-hum* (הַדִּיחֵ֑מוֹ, Ps 5:11), *sǝllǝk* (חַלְּצָ֣ה, Ps 6:5), *kǝṣṣǝṛ* (שְׁ֭בֹר, Ps 10:15), *ˁaṛṛǝf-ni* (הֽוֹדִיעֵ֑נִי, Ps 25:4), *ˁallǝm-ni* (לַמְּדֵֽנִי, Ps 25:4), *ṛǝffaˁ* (נְֽסָה, Ps 4:7), *xǝrrǝǧ-ni* (הֽוֹצִיאֵֽנִי, Ps 25:17), *fǝttǝš* (בַּקֵּ֖שׁ, Ps 34:15).

Second-person plural: *mǝǧǧdu* (זַמְּרוּ, Ps 33:2), *xabbǝṛu* / *xabbṛu* (הַגִּ֥ידוּ, Ps 9:12), *fǝttšu* (בַּקְּשׁ֣וּ, Ps 27:8), *kabbǝṛu* (גַּדְּל֣וּ, Ps 34:4), *ḥassnu* (הֵיטִ֥יבוּ, Ps 33:3), *sǝbbḥu* (שִֽׁירוּ, Ps 33:3).

[7.3.2.4] Participle Forms

The participle form mCǝCCǝC- is used for both the active and the passive participle,[[318]](#footnote-321) for example:

Active Participle: *u-mṛǝffaˁ* (וּמֵרִ֥ים, Ps 3:4), *mxarrǝǧ-ni* (גֹחִ֣י, Ps 22:10), *mfǝttš-īn* *(ṛūḥ-i)* (מְבַקְשֵׁ֥י נַפְשִׁ֗י, Ps 40:15).

Passive Participle: *mlǝṣṣaq* (מֻדְבָּ֣ק, Ps 22:16), *mbaxxǝṣ* (נִבְזֶ֤ה, Ps 15:4), *mkaṣṣǝṛ* (“broken”).

The word קדושים was translated by two of the informants by means of a participle including a *u* vowel after the /m/: *l-muqaddš-īn* (לִ֭קְדוֹשִׁים, Ps 16:3), *muqaddš-īn-u* (קְדֹשָׁ֑יו, Ps 34:10).[[319]](#footnote-322) This would seem to constitute an ancillary vowel inserted between the prefix *m* and the first consonant, pronounced [u] under the influence of the labial.[[320]](#footnote-323)

Additional examples:

Masculine singular: *msǝggǝm* (יָ֝שָׁ֗ר, Ps 11:7, 33:4), *mkabbaṛ* (מַגְדִּל֮, Ps 18:51), *mqaddǝš* (קָד֑וֹשׁ, Ps 22:4), *l-mḥazzǝm-ni* (הַמְאַזְּרֵ֣נִי, Ps 18:33), *mṛǝffaˁ-ni* (מְ֝רֽוֹמְמִ֗י, Ps 9:14).

Feminine singular: *msǝggm-a* (“honest”).

Masculine plural: *msǝggm-īn* (יְ֭שָׁרִים, Ps 19:9), *l-ǝl-mqaddš-īn* (לִ֭קְדוֹשִׁים, Ps 16:3), *l-mkabbaṛ-īn* (הַֽמַּגְדִּילִ֥ים, Ps 35:26), *u-mxallǝṣ-īn* (וּמְשַׁלְּמֵ֣י, Ps 38:21), *mfǝttš-īn-ǝk* (מְבַ֫קְשֶׁ֥יךָ, Ps 40:17), *l-mtǝbbˁ-īn* (לְֽדֹלְקִ֥ים, Ps 7:14).

Feminine plural: *mṛaffˁ-āt* (רָמ֣וֹת, Ps 18:28).

[7.3.2.5] *Masdar* (Verbal Noun) Forms

The pattern for the *masdar* in the verb form *kǝttǝb* for verbs with three whole root letters is tǝCCīC. This pattern is common in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms and occurrs frequently with a feminine suffix: tǝCCīC-a.[[321]](#footnote-324) The vowel in the first syllable is often realized as [ǝ], but it may be realized as [a] under the influence of the first root letter.

Examples: *fi tahdīn-i* (בְשַׁלְוִ֑י , Ps 30:7), *fi taqrīb* (בִּקְרֹ֤ב, Ps 27:2), *mǝn tǝfšīš* (מִדֶּ֣שֶׁן, Ps 36:9), *u-tǝsgīm* (יֹ֥שֶׁר, Ps 25:21), *u-tǝnhīd-t-i* (וְ֝אַנְחָתִ֗י, Ps 38:10), *fi taḍbīṛ-hum* (בְּהִוָּֽסְדָ֣ם, Ps 31:14).

Examples of the structure used to translate the Hebrew form לפעל (ל + third person masculine singular of the future tense) with the future conjugated in the *kǝttǝb* form: *li-ykṣṣaṛ* / *li-ykǝṣṣaṛ* (לַֽעֲרֹ֥ץ, Ps 10:18), *li-yḥassǝn* (לְהֵיטִֽיב, Ps 36:4), *li-yˁaṭṭal* (לְהַשְׁבִּ֥ית, Ps 8:3), *li-yˁaṛṛǝf-hum* (לְהֽוֹדִיעָֽם, Ps 25:14), *li-yqabbaḥ* (לְ֝הָרַ֗ע, Ps 15:4).

[7.3.3] Verbs with a Double Root Letter

Three identical consonants are found in the *kǝttǝb* form conjugation of verbs with identical second and third root letters. Thus, the basic conjugation model for this type is C1VC2C2VC2. When a suffix ending in a consonant or ø is added to this model, it remains unchanged and the verbal forms for verbs with a double root letter behave like verbs with three whole root letters, for example: *lǝssǝst* (יִסַּ֪דְתָּ֫, Ps 8:3),[[322]](#footnote-325) *nmǝzzǝz* (אַסִּ֣יךְ, Ps 16:4).

In cases when the model -C1VC2C2C2- would be expected – i.e., when the conjugation morpheme begins with a vowel – a cluster of three identical consonants is created. The difficulty in pronouncing such a cluster is resolved in CJA in most cases by the insertion of a splitting vowel between the second and third consonants in the cluster:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| -C1VC2C2ǝC2- | < | C1VC2C2C2- |
| fǝššǝšu | < | \*fǝšššu |

Examples: *xammǝmu* (חָשָֽׁבוּ, Ps 10:2, 21:12), *lǝssǝsu* (נֽוֹסְדוּ, Ps 2:2), *iḥallǝlu* (יַפְטִ֥ירוּ, Ps 22:8), *rannǝnu* (רַנְּנ֣וּ, Ps 33:1).

Another solution to this problem of clusters of three identical letter sexists in other Maghrebi dialects, entailing the contraction of the triple cluster to a double one:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| -C1VC2C2- | < | C1VC2C2C2- |
| fǝššu | < | \*fǝšššu |

These two solutions are found in the Jewish dialects of Algiers[[323]](#footnote-326) and Tunis[[324]](#footnote-327) and in Jijli.[[325]](#footnote-328) In Tlemcen, the second method – contraction of the cluster – is prevalent.[[326]](#footnote-329)

Two irregularities were found in the conjugation of the *kǝttǝb* form in verbs with two identical root letters. In the first-person singular past form, we found *xammǝt* alongside *xammǝmt* (זַ֝מֹּתִ֗י, Ps 17:3), the latter being the regular form. In the second-person masculine singular past, we found *fǝššǝt* alongside f*ǝššǝšt* (דִּשַּׁ֥נְתָּ, Ps 23:5). These forms ostensibly illustrate the phenomenon of the contraction of the triple cluster to a double, as we described for other dialects. However, it should be recalled that the past tense forms for the first- and second-person singular are usually conjugated according to the first model, since the suffix indicating person begins with a consonant. Accordingly, we would not expect to find the creation of a cluster of three identical consonants in these forms, so no need would arise for the omission of one of the components of such a cluster. One may explain the presence of these forms by way of analogy to forms beginning with a vowel, conjugated with a double cluster rather than a triple one, i.e., forms such as *xammu*, if we assume that such forms are likely to be present in CJA despite not finding any instances.[[327]](#footnote-330) This would mean that, as in other dialects, CJA also maintains two realizations of the forms in this verb type.

Examples of the conjugation of *kǝttǝb* form verbs with two identical root letters:

Past: First-person singular: *xammǝmt* / *xammǝt* (זַ֝מֹּתִ֗י, Ps 17:3), *mǝzzǝzt* (נָסַ֣כְתִּי, Ps 2:6).

Second-person masculine singular: *lǝssǝst* / *lǝssǝsti* (יִסַּ֪דְתָּ֫, Ps 8:3), *fǝššǝt* / *fǝššǝšti* (דִּשַּׁ֥נְתָּ, Ps 23:5).

Third-person masculine singular: *lǝssǝs-ha* / *ˀǝssǝs-ha* (יְסָדָ֑הּ, Ps 24:2), *u-bǝddǝd-hum* (וַיְפִיצֵ֑ם, Ps 18:15).

Third person plural: *xammǝmu* (זָמָֽמוּ, Ps 31:14).

Future: First-person singular: *nṣǝffǝf* (אֶֽעֱרָךְ, Ps 5:4), *nmǝzzǝz* (אַסִּ֣יךְ, Ps 16:4).

Second-person masculine singular: *tṣǝffǝf-ni* (תִּשְׁפְּתֵֽנִי, Ps 22:16), *tṣǝffǝf* (תַּֽעֲרֹ֬ךְ, Ps 23:5).

Third-person masculine singular: *ifǝššǝš* (יְדַשְּׁנֶ֣ה, Ps 20:4), *w-iṣaḥḥaḥ* (וְיַֽאֲמֵ֣ץ, Ps 27:14), *ixammǝm* (יַחְשֹׁ֗ב, Ps 36:5).

Third person plural: iḥallǝlu (יַפְטִ֥ירוּ, Ps 22:8), ixammǝmu (יַחְשְׁב֖וּ, Ps 41:8).

Imperative: Second-person plural: *rannǝnu* (רַנְּנ֣וּ, Ps 33:1), *u-rannǝnu* (וְ֝הַרְנִ֗ינוּ, Ps 32:11).

Participle: Plural: *mxammǝm-īn* (חֹֽ֝שְׁבֵ֗י, Ps 35:4).

Translation of the infinitive form לפעל: *li-yxammǝm* (“to think”).

[7.3.4] Verbs Whose First Root Letter is א

The first book of Psalms included conjugated forms of *kǝttǝb* form verbs whose first root letter is /ˀ/[[328]](#footnote-331) The three verbs of which instances occurred are: ˀ.d.b, ˀ.m.n, ˀ.t.m.

In CJA, these verbs are conjugated in the same manner as verbs with three whole letters. The glottal stop is usually maintained,[[329]](#footnote-332) for example: *ˀammǝnt* (הֶֽ֭אֱמַנְתִּי, Ps 27:13), *ˀaddbu-ni* (יִסְּר֥וּנִי, Ps 16:7). At the head of a word, the vowel [a] is sometimes pronounced on its own and the glottal stop is not realized, but in medial position it is always realized, for example: *tˀaddǝb-ni* (תְיַסְּרֵֽנִי, Ps 6:2).

The vowel on the first root letter is always realized as [a].

In some of the participle forms from this verb type, a short [u] is realized between the initial /m/ and the first root letter /ˀ/. This would appear to be an ancillary vowel whose realization is influenced by the preceding labial consonant,[[330]](#footnote-333) for example: *muˀammn-a* (נֶֽ֝אֱמָנָ֗ה, Ps 19:8).

As noted, verbs of this type in CJA are a distinct category and are not transformed into verbs whose first root letter is ו. This is interesting given that many dialects show the shift from א to ו in the first root letter, such as the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[331]](#footnote-334) the dialect of Sousse,[[332]](#footnote-335) the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[333]](#footnote-336) the dialects of Jijli[[334]](#footnote-337) and Ouled Brahim,[[335]](#footnote-338) and others.

In the Tlemcen dialect *kǝttǝb* verb forms realized with /ˀ/ are found alongside forms showing the shift \*ˀ > w; differentiation has occurred in the meanings of these verb pairs.[[336]](#footnote-339)

In our material, a shift \*ˀ > w was only found for one root: \*ˀ.x.r > w.x.r.[[337]](#footnote-340) From a synchronic perspective, this verb should be regarded as belonging to the category of verbs whose first root letter is ו.

Examples of the conjugation of form *kǝttǝb* verbs whose first root letter is א:

Past: First-person singular: *(ˀ)ammǝnt* (הֶֽ֭אֱמַנְתִּי, Ps 27:13).

Second-person masculine singular: *ˀaddǝbti* (יִסַּ֬רְתָּ, Ps 39:12)

Third-person plural: *ˀaddbu-ni* / *ˀaddǝbu-ni* (יִסְּר֥וּנִי, Ps 16:7).

Future: Second-person masculine singular: *tˀaddǝb-ni* (תְיַסְּרֵֽנִי, Ps 6:2).

Third-person masculine singular: *iˀattǝm* (“he will blame”), *iˀattm-u* (“he blames him”).

Imperative: Second-person singular: *(ˀ)ǝttǝm-hum* (הַ֥אֲשִׁימֵ֨ם, Ps 5:11).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mˀammǝn* (faithful), feminine singular: *muˀammn-a* (נֶֽ֝אֱמָנָ֗ה, Ps 19:8), masculine plural: *mˀammn-īn* (אֱ֭מוּנִים, Ps 31:24), *mˀammn-īn* / *l-muˀammn-īn* (אֱ֝מוּנִ֗ים, Ps 12:2), feminine plural: *mˀammn-āt* (faithful).

[7.3.5] Verbs Whose First Root Letter is ו

Verbs whose first root letter is /w/ are conjugated in the *kǝttǝb* form according to the pattern for verbs with three whole root letters; the semi-vowel is realized as a consonant.[[338]](#footnote-341)

The vowel on the first root letter often assimilates to the first root letter /w/ and is pronounced [u], for example: *wuqqǝfti* (הֶֽעֱמַ֖דְתָּ, Ps 31:9), *iwuǧǧaˁ* (יְחַבֶּל, Ps 7:15). However, when the second root letter is a back consonant, such as /ˁ x q/, a “struggle” ensues between the influence of the back consonant, encouraging the realization of the /ǝ/ as [a], and that of the /w/, favoring its realization as [u]. This “struggle” is reflected in the existence of two parallel forms,[[339]](#footnote-342) for example: *iwaqqaṛ* alongside *iwuqqaṛ* (יְכַבֵּ֑ד, Ps 15:4), *waqqǝft* alongside *wuqqǝft* (הֶֽעֱמַ֪דְתָּה, Ps 30:8).

Sometimes the /ǝ/ has a centralized realization as [ǝ] even if verbs of this type, for example: *wǝssˁu* (הִרְחִ֑יבוּ, Psd 25:17), *nwǝkkǝl* (אַפְקִ֪יד, Ps 31:6).

The vowel on the secondroot letter may be influenced by its consonantal environment as we described above for the verb type with three full root letters.

The verb *waxxar* (“to be late”) has its origins in \* أَخَّرَ, which underwent a shift \*ˀ > w.[[340]](#footnote-343) In synchronic terms, this verb behaves in all respects like verbs whose first root letter is ו and we have accordingly included it here.

Examples of the conjugation of *kǝttǝb* form verbs whose first root letter is ו:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *wuqqǝft* / *waqqǝft* (הֶֽעֱמַ֪דְתָּה, Ps 30:8), *wuqqǝfti* (הֶֽעֱמַ֖דְתָּ, Ps 31:9), *u-waqqafti-ni* (וַתַּצִּיבֵ֖נִי, Ps 41:13), *wussaˁti* (הִרְחַ֣בְתָּ, Ps 4:2).

Third-person masculine singular: *u-waqqaf* (וַיָּ֖קֶם, Ps 40:3).

Third-person feminine plural: *wǝssˁu* (הִרְחִ֑יבוּ, Ps 25:17).

Future: First-person singular: *nwǝkkǝl* (אַפְקִ֪יד, Ps 31:6).

Second-person masculine singular: *u-twussaˁ* / *u-twǝssaˁ* (תַּרְחִ֣יב, Ps 18:37), *twuxxǝr* / *twaxxar* (תְּאַחַֽר, Ps 40:18), *twubbax-ni* (תֽוֹכִיחֵ֑נִי, Ps 6:2).

Third-person masculine singular: *iwaqqǝf-ni* / *iwuqqǝf-ni* (יַֽעֲמִידֵֽנִי, Ps 18:34), *iwaqqaṛ* / *iwuqqaṛ* (יְכַבֵּ֑ד, Ps 15:4), *iwuǧǧaˁ* (יָחִ֣יל, Ps 29:8; יְחַבֶּל, Ps 7:15).

Imperative: Second person singular: *u-waqqǝf-ni* (וַֽהֲקִימֵ֑נִי, Ps 41:11).

Second person plural: *waqqǝṛū-h* (כַּבְּד֑וּהוּ, Ps 22:24).

Participle: Masculine plural: *mwǝǧǧˁ-īn* (חֵ֣ל כָּאִֽים: ג'יס מוג'עין: Ps 10:10).

1. See Section [2.2.9] [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For further details concerning this word, see p. 53. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See Section [2.7] for discussion of the forms ג'אוב / ואג'ב. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Section [2.6]. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Yahuda notes this phenomenon in his introduction to *Chovot Ha-Lvavot* (1904, pp. 24-25, fn. 2). Several examples of the representation of doubling by a double letter can be found in the rabbinical literature and also in Palestinian Syrian dialect. See: Bar-Asher 1981, pp. 88-90. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See Section [6.2] on the writing of double יי and וו. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The forms נתצפ'פ'א and נתברא are even found adjacent to each other in the same verse. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Cf. Doron 1980, p. 77; Blau 1980a, pp. 50-51, §32. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See Section [9.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. In particular, he is not inclined to mark a doubling that is not original, such as the *d* in *fi yidd-ǝk* (e.g., בידך – בְּיָֽדְךָ֮, Ps 31:6). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. See Section [6.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. In common texts written in Medieval Judeo-Arabic, non-doubled consonantal ו or י were, in rare instances, represented by וו or יי (Blau 1980a, p. 49, §31). In the orthography of the Jews of Algeria, a distinction is made between the representation of semi-vowels realized as a vowel (ו or י) and the use of וו or יי when the semi-vowels are realized as consonants (Cohen 1912, p. 106). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. However, a form with a single ו also exists: וצאובהא (וַֽיְכוֹנְנֶֽהָ, Ps 7:13). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Cf. Fleischer 1888, p. 435. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. This orthographic form can already be found in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts. See: Blau 1980a, p. 48, §30 and fn. 26 there; Blau attributes this phenomenon to the influence of the Hebrew orthography of the Mishnah. Similar forms can be found in the šarḥ of Issachar ben Mordecai ibn Susan; see Doron 1980, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. See Chapter Four: Diphthongs. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. The *ou* in the Latin transliteration represents the – וּ vowel, while Renassia represents the diphthong [aw] as *aou*. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Renassia’s orthographical representation for the final diphthong *aw* is consistent, unlike that in the *šarḥ* of Issachar ben Mordecai ibn Susan (Doron 1980, p. 47). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Blau mentions the suffix אוas a morpheme for third-person past tense and second- and third-person masculine plural past/present? tense forms of verbs whose third root letter is ל or י as being a saliently Maghrebi feature (1958, p. 88). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. The recordings confirm that these instances do not involve vowel lengthening, but solely the denotation of vowel quality. Cf.: Doron 1980, p. 41 (naturally Doron can only present his conclusion by way of a hypothesis). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Rabbi Daniel Renassia also wrote יפ'ראח, יאעמל, נעאייט when I asked him to write various words. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Here, too, there are many exceptions (Cohen 1912, p. 132). We also found this orthography in the Algiers *Haggadah* (1855): נקטאעהום (אֲמִילַֽם, Ps 118:10-12). For the realization of /ǝ/ alongside back and emphatic consonants, see Section [3.3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. See: Blau 1980a, p. 21, §8c. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Blau 1980a, p. 23, §8k. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. This orthography documents the phenomenon of vocal harmony in this word. See Section [3.5.1.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. On the lengthening of the vowel in the single imperative in verbs whose second root letter is ו or י, see Section [3.2.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Cf.: Blau 1980a, pp. 60-61, §50h. See also: Fleischer 1888, p. 433. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Cf.: Doron 1980, p. 45, and see above regarding א. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. It is also rare in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts. Blau 1980a, p. 23, §8J. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. See Dection [6.1.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Regarding the phonemic status, realizations, and qualities of the long vowels, see Section [3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. This use of ו is consistent with both the pronunciations of such forms (yuwrǝt / yūrǝt). [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Regarding the vowels obtained following diphthong contraction, see section above on Orthography of Semi-Vowels and Diphthongs and also Section [7.2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. This is the only example in this group in which the *alif maqsurah* appears in the middle of the word rather than at the end. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. Regarding Medieval Judeo-Arabic, see: Blau 1980a, pp. 289-290, addendum to p. 43, §27Ca. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. See above regarding the lengthening of the vowel in the singular imperative form of verbs whose second root letter is ו or י, marked as ו/י, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. See Section [3.2.2] regarding the lengthening of the vowel in these words. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. See Section [3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. Hatal 1975. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. However, the same writer later uses the spelling ננאדי. An initial א of this type appears only in this verb in the Algiers *Haggadah*. The first-person singular forms of other verbs begun with נ, for example: נתמשא, נכ'אף. The reason for this may be the double initial נ in *nnādi*. Cf. the spelling אנג'ליתי מן לבנון (“I was exiled from Lebanon”) (Commentary on the Song of Songs, 4:8, Renassia, Y. 1953, p. 20). [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. The form פ'י attached to the following noun is also found in other Maghrebi texts. See: Fleischer 1888, p. 436. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. This instance may be influenced by the attachment of the adjective to the noun. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. See Section [8.2.2] and Blau 1980a, p. 171, §253; Brockelmann 1961, II, p. 320. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. Blau 1958, p. 83. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. When I asked Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s son, Rabbi Daniel Renassia, whether they used to write in accordance with fixed orthographic rules, he replied: “Everyone wrote according to how they spoke.” This was clearly one of the factors that influenced the orthography of writers and copiers. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. Thus, the sporadic pronunciation of the word כדב with [g] is not documented in his orthography. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. The female informant offered a further dialectal form, pronouncing this word *dǝr-waq*, a form the rabbis also use in their spoken language. See also Section [10.10]. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. This is the usual practice in Maghrebi Judeo-Arabic texts. See: Bar-Asher 1978, p. 172; Shetrit 1989, p. 38. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. Regarding the paucity of Hebrew words in the šarḥ to the Psalms, compared to the large number in Nishmat Kol Chai, the translation and commentary of the Mishnah by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, see Chapter 11 in this book. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. On the main features of the orthography of *šarḥ* authors in Morocco, see: Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. We refer to the basic verb forms of roots with three whole consonants by means of the reference √ktb (with the exception of Section [7.5] *smān*), since the constituent consonants of this root do not influence the conjugation or vowels of the respective verb forms. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. We preferred to examine these verb forms separately, while noting the mutual affinities between certain forms, rather than clustering them in groups such as *kǝttǝb – tkǝttǝb*, *ktǝb – nǝktǝb*, although such an analytical approach is also possible. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. Most of the examples will be presented jointly at the end of each section. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. Forms from the questionnaire were included only when they were clearly consistent with the parts of the paradigm found in the corpus. Moreover, many of the forms in the questionnaire are taken from the rabbis’ translations of biblical verses outside the corpus. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. More rarely, we added conjugation forms based on the obvious template; these were marked with square brackets [ ]. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. The terms “past, future” we used instead of “perfect, imperfect” to enhance the clarity of the discussion. See section [7.12]: Uses of the Tenses. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. In most cases, this will come during the presentation of Form I of verbs with three complete root letters. As necessary, several examples from other verb forms and types will already be included in the discussion of Form I in order to ensure a complete overview. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. Blau 1980a, p. 67, §; p. 69, §60. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. Cantineau 1938, pp. 853-854. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
60. Marçais 1956, p. 155. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
61. Cohen 1975, pp. 94-95. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
62. Cohen 1912, pp. 181-182. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
63. Marçais 1902, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
64. Talmoudi 1980, p. 78. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
65. Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
66. Stillman 1981, p. 239. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
67. This is one of the features that distinguishes the Jewish dialect of Algiers from the Muslim dialect of the city (Cohen 1912, p. 182). [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
68. Marçais 1947, p. 41. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
69. Dhina 1938, p. 320. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
70. Marçais 1908, p. 424. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
71. Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 261. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
72. Marçais 1908, p. 424. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
73. Blanc 1964a, p. 98. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
74. And also, when the *ma… š* of the negative is added – *ma-ˁmǝltī-š*; however, this form of negation is not used in the šarḥ; see Ssection [10.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
75. See Appendix II. Cantineau 1938, p. 854. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
76. Marçais 1956, p. 155. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
77. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 74. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
78. Mangion 1937, p. 374. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
79. In the *šarḥ* of Issachar ben Mordecai ibn Susan, the forms with ת and תי are used interchangeably for the feminine second-person singular: Doron 1980, p. 161. Doron notes in his introduction that this *šarḥ* reflects neither a pure Maghrebi dialect nor a pure איל"י one, but rather an artificial mix (p. ii). [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
80. Stillman 1981, p. 239. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
81. However, this unification does not occur in verbs whose second or third root letter is ו or י. See: Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
82. Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 261. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
83. See Section [2.3]. A similar phenomenon occurred in the dialects of northern Palestine, where the plural form *katabaw* was created through analogy to the singular form *kataba*. Bar-Asher informed me that he heard this observation from Sharon. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
84. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, pp. 64, 74. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
85. Mangion 1937, p. 374. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
86. Brunot 1950a, p. 63; Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 63. I heard from Bar-Asher that the Muslims of Tafilalt used the form *–msitiw* [לא ברור לי מה המשמעות של לאר כאן]; it remains to be clarified whether this form is unique to verbs whose third letter is ו or י by way of analogy to the future form *tǝmsiw*. Heath also informed me that he is familiar with this suffix from Moroccan dialects. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
87. According to the testimony of one of the rabbis, *-tu* (*ktǝbtu*) is used as a suffix for the second person plural among the Muslims of Constantine. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
88. Cohen 1975, p. 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
89. Talmoudi 1980, p. 78. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
90. Cohen 1912, p. 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
91. Marçais 1956, p. 155. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
92. Marçais 1902, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
93. Marçais 1908, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
94. Stillman 1980, p. 240. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
95. Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
96. The same is true of the Jewish dialect of Tunis (Cohen 1975, p. 95). [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
97. For details, see Sections [5.3.1] and [5.3.3]. Note that unlike nouns, where the presence of a consonant חסר המשך המשפט [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
98. See Sections [5.3.1] and [5.3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
99. Cohen1975, p. 96. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
100. On the behavior of enclitic pronouns added to a word ending in a vowel or a consonant, see Section [8.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
101. For a detailed discussion of this, see Section [3.3.2]. The influence of the root consonants on a vowel inserted between them is also documented in other dialects. For example, in the Jewish dialect of Tunis (Cohen 1975, p. 95) and the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen (Marçais 1902, p. 62). See also the realization of /ǝ/ in the forms presented by Marçais for the dialect of Jijli (1956, pp. 156-157). [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
102. However, one informant read that form וְנִכְלַמְתְּ֒ (Ezek 16:61) as *u-tḥǝšmi*. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
103. Asking “how do you say ‘you will sit’” in Hebrew inevitably invites attention to gender distinctions. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
104. Mangion 1937, p. 374. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
105. According to Stillman, the standard Moroccan Muslim dialect applies a distinction between the masculine and feminine forms of the second-person singular in the future tense ( 1981, pp. 239-240, fn. 23). [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
106. Cantineau 1938, pp. 853-85. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
107. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, pp. 74-75. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
108. Dhina 1938, p. 320. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
109. Marçais 1908, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
110. Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 261. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
111. Cohen 1975, p. 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
112. Cohen 1912, p. 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
113. Millon 1937, p. 34. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
114. Marçais 1956, p. 15. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
115. Marçais 1902, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
116. Talmoudi 1980, p. 78. [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
117. Stillman 1981, p. 240. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
118. Blanc 1964a, p. 100. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
119. The unification of the masculine and feminine plurals in a form that maintains the suffix – ونcan be found in the Baghdadi dialects (Blanc 1964a, p. 100). Distinct forms for the masculine and feminine second-person plurals are found, for example, in Maragez: *tikitbu* for the masculine and *tikitbin* for the feminine. A similar gender distinction is also maintained in the third-person plural (Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 261). [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
120. Blanc 1974, p. 206. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
121. Blau 1980a, p. 70, §§63, 64, 70; Blau 1981, pp. 53, 59. [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
122. Blau 1958, p. 83, fn. 5; 1961, p. 71, §23. On the appearance of a handful of Hebrew נפעלו forms in the Talmudic literature, see: Mishor 1980, pp. 296-297. [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
123. The eastern border of these Maghrebi forms lies in Egypt. Although נכתב/נכתבו forms are receding in Egypt, with a growing preference for the classical אכתב/נכתב forms, the former can still be encountered, particularly among Jews. See: Blanc 1974, pp. 206-207, 210. [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
124. Cohen, D. 1975, p. 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
125. Cohen, M. 1912, p. 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
126. Marçais, W. 1902, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
127. Stillman 1981, p. 240. [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
128. Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 65. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
129. Blau 1958, p. 83, fn. 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
130. For example: Future tense forms with the prefix נ appear in the Palestinian Targum; see: Ginsburg 1934, p. 382. This form is also found in Neo-Aramaic in Maaloula, as well as in several Modern Arabic dialects in Najd, Hadhramaut, and Yemen: Blau 1981, pp. 119-120. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
131. According to Blau, 1981, p. 216. See: Fischer, MSOS I (1898) [ADD to bibliography], p. 216. Cohen agrees that the form נכתבו was created first, by analogy to the second- and third-person plural forms, thereby leaving נכתב free for the first person singular (1912, p. 181). [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
132. However, after additional findings came to light, he accepted it as one possibility, hypothesizing that in some dialects the form נכתב emerged first, and in others נכתבו. See: Blau 1981, p. 238, add. to. pp. 119-120. [↑](#footnote-ref-135)
133. Cohen notes that the weakening of the *hamzah* in אכתב contributed to the spread of the form נכתב (1912, p. 181). [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
134. Blau, 1981, pp. 119-120. [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
135. In the paradigm, this vowel is marked as /ǝ/ as for the other persons; in the examples, the vowel is transcribed in a slightly narrower manner according to its realization in each form. We should note that, in a handful of instances, the vowel following the prefixes *n* and *t* was also realized as [i]. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
136. See Section [3.5.1.1], and cf.: Marçais 1902, p. 63. [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
137. See Section [2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-140)
138. Cohen 1912, pp. 181-182, 186-187. In Fez and Meknes, too, a /y/ that undergoes syllablization does not become a pure /i/ (Heath 1987, p. 287). [↑](#footnote-ref-141)
139. For the sake of consistency, we have marked the prefix as yi. [↑](#footnote-ref-142)
140. Cantineau 1960, p. 88. [↑](#footnote-ref-143)
141. Cantineau 1938, p. 854. [↑](#footnote-ref-144)
142. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 76. For a comparison of these forms with the future plural forms in other dialects, see section [5.3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-145)
143. Marçais 1956, p. 155. [↑](#footnote-ref-146)
144. See Section [5.3.4] for a discussion of this phenomenon. [↑](#footnote-ref-147)
145. In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s orthography the quality of the vowel on the second root letter is not marked with a *mater lectionis* (see Section [6.3.1]). The orthography could not, therefore, have influenced the informants’ pronunciation in this case. [↑](#footnote-ref-148)
146. See Sections [3.3.2]and [7.2.1.1]. Regarding the influence of post-palatal consonants on the realization of the short vowel as [e] in the Muslim dialect of Algiers, see Cohen 1912, p. 117. [↑](#footnote-ref-149)
147. See Section [3.3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-150)
148. For example: *ḫúbz*, *yẹ́dḫul*, *yẹ́skun* (Marçais 1902, pp. 39-40). [↑](#footnote-ref-151)
149. Marçais 1956, p. 158. [↑](#footnote-ref-152)
150. Cohen 1975, p. 97. [↑](#footnote-ref-153)
151. We find it unlikely that this form reflects the penetration of the characteristic conjugation among the Muslims of the city – see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-154)
152. Cohen 1912, p. 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-155)
153. Cohen 1975, p. 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-156)
154. Talmoudi 1980, p. 78. [↑](#footnote-ref-157)
155. Marçais 1956, pp. 155, 158. [↑](#footnote-ref-158)
156. Marçais 1902, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-159)
157. Stillman 1981, p. 240. [↑](#footnote-ref-160)
158. Marçais 1908, p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-161)
159. Dhina 1938, p. 320. [↑](#footnote-ref-162)
160. Brunot 1950a, p. 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-163)
161. Stillman 1981, fn. 24 [↑](#footnote-ref-164)
162. Blanc 1964a, pp.100-101. [↑](#footnote-ref-165)
163. See Section [3.3.1] regarding the phonemic contrast *ǝrfǝd* : *rfǝd*. [↑](#footnote-ref-166)
164. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, for example, this vowel is realized as a short [ǝ]: (Cohen 1975, p. 9). In the Jijli dialect and the Jewish dialect of Algiers, the vowel appears only for certain phonetic reasons. Regarding instances when the vowel has an extremely short realization and is influenced by its consonantal and vocal environment( Cohen 1912, p. 247; Marçais 1956, p. 158). In the Tlemcen dialect the initial vowel may appear (*édḫul*) but is often omitted (*dḫul*) (Marçais 1902, p. 63). [↑](#footnote-ref-167)
165. It is reasonable to assume that the same realization will appear alongside /h ˁ/, but no examples of this were found in the corpus. [↑](#footnote-ref-168)
166. Cf. the realizations of the initial vowel in the imperative under the influence of the consonantal environment in the Jewish dialect of Tunis (Cohen 1975, p. 98). Regarding the correlation between the initial vowel and the vowel on the second root letter in the imperative in Sousse, see: Talmoudi 1980, pp. 79-80. [↑](#footnote-ref-169)
167. Regarding the affinity to the vowel on this root letter in CA and the influence of the consonantal environment, see our discussion on the vowel on the second root letter in the future in Section [7.2.1.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-170)
168. Though in the same place another informant pronounced it *u-ˀǝtǝklu*. [↑](#footnote-ref-171)
169. The same informant mentioned in the previous note pronounced it *u-ǝsǝktu*. [↑](#footnote-ref-172)
170. Regarding the imperative of the verb form *tkǝttǝb*, see Section [7.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-173)
171. The uses of the participles follow the Hebrew original and is discussed in Section [7.12]. [↑](#footnote-ref-174)
172. This phenomenon is documented in other dialects: for example Cohen 1975, p. 94 and Marçais 1908, p. 76 present a single plural form for the participle. [↑](#footnote-ref-175)
173. I heard of this practice from Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-176)
174. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the stress in this form is on the final syllable (*kätbī́n*) (Cohen 1975, p. 94); the same is true in Ouled Brahim (*gǟsmîn*) (Marçais 1908, p. 76). [↑](#footnote-ref-177)
175. In this instance, the form in the *šarḥ* is written סאמאע. Usually, the participle is written סאמע. [↑](#footnote-ref-178)
176. Written evidence of the presence of the נ in masculine plural forms, even in a construct chain, can already be found in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts. See: Blau 1980a, p. 107, §128. [↑](#footnote-ref-179)
177. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the realizations of the /ǝ/ vowel in the pattern *mǝktūb* are influenced by their consonantal environment. See: Cohen 1975, p. 98. [↑](#footnote-ref-180)
178. As I learned from Bar-Asher, these are also the commonest patterns in the *šarḥ* and in the spoken language of the Jews of Tafilalt. [↑](#footnote-ref-181)
179. On the translation of the Hebrew verbs and verbal nouns, see Section [7.12]. [↑](#footnote-ref-182)
180. This form is used as an adverb in the *šarḥ*. [↑](#footnote-ref-183)
181. See note 901 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-184)
182. Hava 1970, pp. 61, 891; Cohen 1975, p. 126 & fn. 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-185)
183. See p. 304, fn. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-186)
184. A similar form with the same vowel is found in many Maghrebi dialects, such as: the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis and the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen (Cohen, 1912, pp. 185-186; Cohen 1975, pp. 98-99; Marçais 1902, p. 64). In the dialect of Ouled Brahim the diphthong *ê̖ĭ* is found in these forms (*messe͜ĭt*): Marçais 1908, p. 80. The Jewish dialect of Sefrou has *ḥǝbbt* (for all three persons), contrasting with /ḥǝbbit/ in standard Muslim Moroccan. Stillman 1981, p. 241, fn. 27. [↑](#footnote-ref-187)
185. See Section [7.3.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-188)
186. Cf. Cohen 1912, pp. 185-186. [↑](#footnote-ref-189)
187. For the sake of consistency, we always record this vowel as yi; see Section [7.2.1.2]. M. Cohen documents a similar situation in the Jewish dialect of Algiers (*imǝdd* / *i̯imǝdd*) (1912, pp. 185-186). In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the prefix for the third person singular and plural of this verb type is realized as [i] (Cohen 1975, pp. 98-100). [↑](#footnote-ref-190)
188. In this instance, Rabbi Yosef Renassia wrote the *mater lectiones* to mark the vowel of the future tense יפ'וכני, although not his usual practice for the future forms. Examples of the pronunciation [u] in this verb can be found in other occurrences in which the vowel is not marked in writing. However, in the masculine singular imperative from the root פ'.כ.כ. (and from this root alone), he often writes פ'וךּ with a *mater lectiones*; for example: הַצִּ֣ילָה (Ps 22:21), וְהַצִּילֵֽנִי (Ps 7:2). [↑](#footnote-ref-191)
189. Regarding the realization of this vowel under the influence of its environment, see: Cohen 1975, p. 99. [↑](#footnote-ref-192)
190. When asked to translate the feminine singular imperative form הצילי (in the questionnaire), one of the rabbis first said *fǝkk*, and then added “or *fǝkki*.” The form with –i would seem to reflect the influence of the Muslim dialect of Constantine, with which he was familiar. See also Section [7.2.1.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-193)
191. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the participle form is identical to that of verbs with three whole root letters: *šǟ́dǝd*, *mǟ́dǝd* (Cohen 1975, pp. 99-100). [↑](#footnote-ref-194)
192. Cohen 1975, p. 101; Cohen 1912, p. 188; Talmoudi 1980, p. 83. [↑](#footnote-ref-195)
193. See Section [7.2.1.2] regarding the prefixes of the third-person masculine singular and plural in the future tense. [↑](#footnote-ref-196)
194. See Section [2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-197)
195. Psalm 1:1; the negation with *layš* is found in the *šarḥ*; the rabbi who translates orally used the negation form *ma…š*. [↑](#footnote-ref-198)
196. For the sake of consistency, we mark the realizations of [w] and [u] here according to the rules of behavior of the semi-vowels; readers should bear in mind that these rules are not always scrupulously observed in the past tense conjugation of verbs whose first root letter is ו. [↑](#footnote-ref-199)
197. See Section [3.5.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-200)
198. The /w/ is similarly manifested (albeit with a different realization) in the future tense in other dialects, for example in the Jewish dialect of Algiers (in some instances, in the plural persons) and in the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen: Cohen 1912, p. 188; Marçais 1902, pp. 66-67. [↑](#footnote-ref-201)
199. Talmoudi 1980, pp. 83-84. [↑](#footnote-ref-202)
200. Cohen 1912, ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-203)
201. Marçais 1908, p. 82. [↑](#footnote-ref-204)
202. Dhina 1938, pp. 321-322. [↑](#footnote-ref-205)
203. Marçais 1902, p. 66. [↑](#footnote-ref-206)
204. Cf. Cohen 1912, p. 188; Cohen 1975, p. 101; Cantineau 1960, p. 86. [↑](#footnote-ref-207)
205. This form is rare among the Muslims of Bône, who pronounce it *yûgöf*. See: Mangion 1937, p. 378. Regarding the conjugation model *yāgöf*, Mangion notes that it is difficult to determine whether this is typical of sedentary or nomadic dialects. [↑](#footnote-ref-208)
206. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-209)
207. Marçais 1956, p. 162. [↑](#footnote-ref-210)
208. Millon 1937, p. 347. [↑](#footnote-ref-211)
209. Cohen notes that the model *iu̯ǝṣlu* is used only in slowed speech (1912, pp. 188-189). [↑](#footnote-ref-212)
210. Millon 1937, p. 347; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-213)
211. Marçais, W. 1908, p. 82. [↑](#footnote-ref-214)
212. Dhina 1938, p. 322. [↑](#footnote-ref-215)
213. Cohen 1975, p. 101; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-216)
214. Stillman 1981, p. 241. [↑](#footnote-ref-217)
215. The informant pronounced these forms with an accompanying glottal plosive, resulting from the realization of these forms with the emphatic tone of the imperative: *ˀuqef!* *ˀuqfu!* [↑](#footnote-ref-218)
216. Cohen 1912, p. 188. [↑](#footnote-ref-219)
217. Marçais 1902, pp. 66-67. [↑](#footnote-ref-220)
218. Cohen 1912, pp. 188-189. [↑](#footnote-ref-221)
219. Cohen 1975, p. 101. [↑](#footnote-ref-222)
220. The [u] also appears as a remnant of the ـُ of CA in verbs of this type in Tlemcen (Marçais 1902, p. 39). [↑](#footnote-ref-223)
221. In the dialect, this verb is conjugated in the first- and in the second-person singular and plural with the vowel [u]. In CA, it is conjugated with an *i* vowel, for example: خِفْتُ. [↑](#footnote-ref-224)
222. Various Maghrebi dialects conjugate verbs whose second root letter is י with an *i* or *ə* vowel. For example, in the Tlemcen dialect the vowel on the second root letter in the past tense is usually [e] and never *i* (Marçais 1902, p. 68). However, in Sousse a conjugation pattern is found with *i*: *milt*, *milna*, etc.; see: Talmoudi 1980, p. 85. [↑](#footnote-ref-225)
223. This form is taken from the translation of one of the rabbis. The verb שאף is not used in the *šarḥ*, where נצ'ר is used in the sense of “see.” [↑](#footnote-ref-226)
224. See previous comment. [↑](#footnote-ref-227)
225. The informant translated this form with the plural enclitic pronoun. [↑](#footnote-ref-228)
226. This change in the vowel on the second root letter is also found in other dialects; for example, see: Talmoudi 1980, p. 85; Cohen 1975, p. 103. In the spoken language of the Jews of Tafilalt, the two forms *ibat/ibit* coexist. The form with *i* is preferred in the šarḥ, but that with *a* also appears. I learned these details from Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-229)
227. For the sake of consistency, we have marked this as yi. [↑](#footnote-ref-230)
228. See Section [6.3.3] regarding the spelling of this form with an initial א. [↑](#footnote-ref-231)
229. See p. 194, fn. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-232)
230. See p. 194, fn. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-233)
231. In CJA, a long vowel is also found in a closed syllable in the future forms *tqūl*, in forms with contracted diphthongs – *zōṛ* and elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-234)
232. See Section [3.2.2.]. [↑](#footnote-ref-235)
233. Cohen 1975, pp. 102-103. [↑](#footnote-ref-236)
234. Talmoudi 1980, pp. 85-86. [↑](#footnote-ref-237)
235. Cohen 1912, pp. 189-190. [↑](#footnote-ref-238)
236. Marçais 1956, pp. 162, 164. [↑](#footnote-ref-239)
237. Marçais 1902, p. 68. [↑](#footnote-ref-240)
238. See Section [2.2.1.1] regarding the realization of the *hamzah*. [↑](#footnote-ref-241)
239. The Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis, the Jijli dialect, and others: Cohen 1912, p. 192; Cohen 1975, p. 104; Marçais 1956, pp. 168-169. [↑](#footnote-ref-242)
240. Nöldeke (W.Z.K.M. 1894, pp. 260-261) [ADD to bibliography] offered this explanation for the form, but later suggested that the feminine form CCāt should be regarded as an archaic one preceding the form of Classical Arabic. Marçais, followed by M. Cohen and D. Cohen, prefer the early explanation to the later one: Marçais 1908, p. 86 & fn. 3; Cohen 1912, p. 194; Cohen 1975, p. 104. [↑](#footnote-ref-243)
241. M. Cohen offers an alternative explanation, while noting that it is less plausible, namely that this diphthong could be regarded as the preservation of the classical diphthong due to its morphological value, with lengthening of the vowel by analogy to the forms in other persons including a long vowel (1912, p. 194). [↑](#footnote-ref-244)
242. Cantineau 1938, p. 85. See Appendix II in this book. Forms in the pattern *mšāw* are used in the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis: Cohen 1912, p. 194; Cohen 1975, p. 104. [↑](#footnote-ref-245)
243. The verb *ˁṭa*, which has its origins in the Form IV verb \*ˀaˁṭa, is conjugated according to the Form I pattern. [↑](#footnote-ref-246)
244. Wright 1981, I, pp. 88-89, 313-31. [↑](#footnote-ref-247)
245. We have found documentation for such a form in Jijli and Sousse: Marçais, Ph. 1956, pp. 168, 171; Talmoudi 1980, p. 86. In the Jewish dialects of Tunis and Algiers, this pattern is found in a single word. Some Jews in both these cities use the future form *yä̐ḥbu* (from the verb *ḥba* – to walk on all fours. See: Cohen 1912, p. 193; Cohen 1975, p. 104. [↑](#footnote-ref-248)
246. For example, in the Jewish dialect of Tunis: Cohen 1975, p. 105, and the Jewish dialect of Algiers: Cohen 1912, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-249)
247. In this form the short vowel appears after the first root letter, rather than before it (nǝCCāw), since the first root letter is /ˁ/. [↑](#footnote-ref-250)
248. Mangion 1937, p. 375. [↑](#footnote-ref-251)
249. Cohen 1912, p. 192. [↑](#footnote-ref-252)
250. Marçais 1902, p. 69. [↑](#footnote-ref-253)
251. Marçais 1956, p. 168. [↑](#footnote-ref-254)
252. Brunot 1950a, p. 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-255)
253. Stillman 1981, p. 244. [↑](#footnote-ref-256)
254. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the suffix \*īu bedcame *yu* rather than \*īw: *yəmšyu*. In that dialect, however, the second pattern of the future tense is *nəbdǟ́w*: Cohen, 1975, P. 104. [↑](#footnote-ref-257)
255. Marçais 1908, p. 85. [↑](#footnote-ref-258)
256. This dialect also maintains forms with a diphthong: Dhina 1938, pp. 323-324. [↑](#footnote-ref-259)
257. Cantineau 1938, p. 858; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-260)
258. It is possible that the initial vowel will also be realized as [a] alongside other back consonants, according to the usual behavior of /ǝ/ in such surroundings. However, no examples of this occurred in the corpus. [↑](#footnote-ref-261)
259. Regarding the presence of this form in Moroccan dialects, see: Brunot 1950a, p. 77; Stillman 1981, p. 244. [↑](#footnote-ref-262)
260. The same phenomenon is also found in the feminine participle forms: *rāwiy-a* (רְוָיָֽה, Ps 23:5), *mṣọffiy-a* ((כֶּ֣סֶף) צָ֭רוּף, Ps 12:7) [לבדוק האם ה-i צריכה להיות תלויה כאן כמו בדוגמה הקודמת]. See sections [7.2.6.3], [7.3.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-263)
261. The shift from third root letter א to י is already reflected in Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts. See: Blau 1980a, p. 84, §98. This change is also found in other modern Judeo-Arabic texts; see: Habshush 1894, p. 77, §20. [↑](#footnote-ref-264)
262. The examples of the conjugation of the roots √bdy, √xṭy, and √bry appeared in previous sections. The verb √ḍwy is complex and will be illustrated in Section [7.2.6.4]. Regarding another complex root, √wṭy, see Section [7.2.6.5]. [↑](#footnote-ref-265)
263. These are the only two verbs whose third root letter is א that appeared in the corpus in Form I. See Ssection [7.3.4] regarding verbs of this type in the verb form *kǝttǝb*. [↑](#footnote-ref-266)
264. Similarly, in reading the form וַיִּקַּ֞ח (Gen 41:1) – *u-xda*. [↑](#footnote-ref-267)
265. In his trilingual dictionary (p. 291), Rabbi Renassia uses the etymological form akêle – اكل. [↑](#footnote-ref-268)
266. The informant noted that the form among the Muslims is *klītu*. [↑](#footnote-ref-269)
267. Cohen 1975, pp. 108-110. [↑](#footnote-ref-270)
268. Talmoudi 1980, pp. 92-93. [↑](#footnote-ref-271)
269. Cohen 1912, pp. 198-199. [↑](#footnote-ref-272)
270. Marçais 1956, p. 173. [↑](#footnote-ref-273)
271. Marçais 1902, p. 71. [↑](#footnote-ref-274)
272. Marçais 1908, p. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-275)
273. Dhina 1938, p. 324. [↑](#footnote-ref-276)
274. Brunot 1950a, p. 119. [↑](#footnote-ref-277)
275. In this dialect the third person masculine singular of the past tense is realized as *kel*, versus the form *xda* for “he took.” Stillman mentions in note 32 that in standard Moroccan the root \*ˀkl is also conjugated according to the pattern *kla* ( 1981, p. 242). [↑](#footnote-ref-278)
276. In this dialect, the third-person masculine singular of the past tense is realized as *tal* (due to the shift \*k > t): Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-279)
277. Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 226, §11.2.5.9. [↑](#footnote-ref-280)
278. The informant who was born in Ein Beida realized the vowel on the second root letter as [ǝ] in both these instances: *yāxǝd*, *li-yākǝl*. See below regarding this conjugation model. [↑](#footnote-ref-281)
279. The future form of א.כ.ל. in this dialect is *i̯ǟkul*, but that of א.כ'.ד. is *i̯ǟḫǝd*: Cohen 1912, pp. 196, 198. [↑](#footnote-ref-282)
280. Mangion 1937, p. 378. [↑](#footnote-ref-283)
281. Marçais 1902, p. 71. [↑](#footnote-ref-284)
282. According to Ostoya-Delmas, the typical form in the sedentary dialects of this province is actually *têkel* with *Amalah* (1938, p. 77). [↑](#footnote-ref-285)
283. Marçais 1908, p. 87 (*i̯ä̂kul*, *i̯ä̂xọδ̣*). [↑](#footnote-ref-286)
284. Dhina 1938, p. 324. [↑](#footnote-ref-287)
285. Cohen 1975, pp. 109-110. [↑](#footnote-ref-288)
286. Stillman 1981, p. 242, & fn. 32. [↑](#footnote-ref-289)
287. Fischer and Jastrow 1980, p. 226. [↑](#footnote-ref-290)
288. Cf. the Muslim dialect of Baghdad: *yākul*, *tākul*; however, the Jewish and Christian dialects of that city have *yākǝl*, *tākǝl*. Blanc 1964a, p. 105. [↑](#footnote-ref-291)
289. Marçais 1956, p. 173 (*yâ̤kӗl* but *yâ̤ḫŏ̤d*). [↑](#footnote-ref-292)
290. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 77. Cantineau documents the conjugation of the verb ˀ.k.l. in the future tense in the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province according to the pattern for verbs whose second root letter is ו: *nčul*, *nčulu*. This model is unique against the background of the picture I have outlined here. See: Cantineau 1938, p. 854. [↑](#footnote-ref-293)
291. The headings of the sub-sections here relate to the etymological root of the relevant verb. [↑](#footnote-ref-294)
292. For example: Marçais 1956, p. 174; Cohen 1975, p. 106; Cohen 1912, pp. 195-196. [↑](#footnote-ref-295)
293. The written translation of Ecclesiastes provided by Rabbi Yosef Renassia included one participle form from this root: מאג'י (בָּ֔א, Ecc 1:4). This is probably by way of analogy to the preceding form מאשי: ג'יל מאשי וג'יל מאג'י. [↑](#footnote-ref-296)
294. In the description of the dialects of Philippeville district prepared by Ostoya-Delmas, the model *nžî* is documented as typical of the nomadic dialects, while the form *nežžī* is documented for the sedentary dialects in the district (1938, p. 77). [↑](#footnote-ref-297)
295. Cf. the conjugation of these forms in the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis: Cohen 1912, pp. 191-192; Cohen 1975, p. 106. [↑](#footnote-ref-298)
296. The informant who translated orally used this pronunciation. The *šarḥ* has the written form שקית, pronounced šqēt. [↑](#footnote-ref-299)
297. Cf. Section [7.2.5.4] regarding the reduced vowel [i] pronounced in this form. [↑](#footnote-ref-300)
298. See the discussion above in Section [7.2.5.6]. [↑](#footnote-ref-301)
299. See Section [7.2.3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-302)
300. See section [7.2.5.4]. This form was also sometimes realized with a secondary doubling of the /y/, and in some instances a short [i] was inserted before the third root letter. Thus, we find: l*-waṭyy-īn* (עֲנָוִ֣ים, Ps 34:3), *l-waṭiyy-īn* (עֲנָוִֽים, Ps 10:12) [האם שני התעתיקים פה צריכים להיות עם תנועת ā ארוכה? השווי לראש סעיף 7.2.5.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-303)
301. Cf. Section [7.6] regarding the disappearance of the CA causative form أَفْعَلَ. [↑](#footnote-ref-304)
302. Heath 1987, pp. 11-12, 61 ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-305)
303. See Section [3.4]A. [↑](#footnote-ref-306)
304. This informant showed a general tendency to add epenthetic vowels. [↑](#footnote-ref-307)
305. Ph. Marçais states that the model combined with suffixes beginning with a vowel is CVCCC- or CVCC◦C- [CHECK symbol], with a vocal element between C2 and C3, when this is encouraged by the phonetic characteristics of the final consonant. Marçais 1956, p. 176. [↑](#footnote-ref-308)
306. Cohen 1912, pp. 67, 200. [↑](#footnote-ref-309)
307. Marçais 1902, p. 73. [↑](#footnote-ref-310)
308. This phenomenon is also found in other verb types in this verb form, such as *ˀaddǝbu-ni* (יִסְּר֥וּנִי, Ps 16:7); we will not discuss this for each different verb form. [↑](#footnote-ref-311)
309. See Section [5.2.]. [↑](#footnote-ref-312)
310. Cohen 1912, p. 200. [↑](#footnote-ref-313)
311. The phenomenon of the influence of the consonantal environment on the realization of the vowels is examined in the description of verbs with three whole root letters, but it also occurs in the other verb types. We will not discuss it separately for each type, unless some unique feature deserves mention. [↑](#footnote-ref-314)
312. This example may reflect the phenomenon of vowel harmony. See Section [3.5.1.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-315)
313. For this form and all the verb forms, we do not mention persons for which no examples were found. [↑](#footnote-ref-316)
314. In CJA, the root √ftṣ is used both in Form I and in this form with the same meaning. This root shows the same behavior in the Jewish dialect of Algiers. See: Cohen 1912, p. 204. [↑](#footnote-ref-317)
315. Cf. the forms *i̯ikǝddǝb*, i̯*ikǝddbu* documented by M. Cohen for the Jewish dialect of Algiers (1912, p. 200). [↑](#footnote-ref-318)
316. Accordingly, we mark the future prefix for these persons in the verb form *kǝttǝb* as *i*. [↑](#footnote-ref-319)
317. Cf. Cohen 1912, (*i̯nǧǧǝm* / *i̯nǝǧǧǝm*). [↑](#footnote-ref-320)
318. Regarding this phenomenon, cf. the Jewish dialects of Tunis and Algiers, see: Cohen 1975, p. 115; Cohen 1912, p. 201. [↑](#footnote-ref-321)
319. See also the forms *muˀammn-a* (נֶֽ֝אֱמָנָ֗ה, Ps 19:8), *l-muˀammǝn-īn* (אֱ֝מוּנִ֗ים, Ps 12:2) in Section [7.3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-322)
320. M. Cohen mentions that one of his informants claimed that this prefix mu- is used to distinguish between the active and passive participles. M. Cohen did not accept this claim and suggests that the informant was remembering this form from ancient Arabic he may have encountered in old religious texts (1912, p. 201). I find the phonetic explanation I presented above more convincing. [↑](#footnote-ref-323)
321. A characteristic that is also common in other Maghrebi dialects. [↑](#footnote-ref-324)
322. See Section [7.3.9] regarding the emergence of this root. [↑](#footnote-ref-325)
323. Here a third solution is also mentioned – *ḫămǝmu*. See: Cohen 1912, p. 201. [↑](#footnote-ref-326)
324. Cohen 1975, pp. 115-116. [↑](#footnote-ref-327)
325. Marçais 1956, p. 177. [↑](#footnote-ref-328)
326. Marçais 1902, p. 73. [↑](#footnote-ref-329)
327. Support for this hypothesis can be found in the fact that in both the examples found in the *tkǝttǝb* verb form for roots with two identical letters, where the suffixes begin with a vowel, the solution of a double cluster occurred alongside that of a splitting vowel. In other words, these forms also behaved in the manner we are assuming here could potential occur in the *kǝttǝb* form. See Section [7.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-330)
328. Cf. Section [7.2.5.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-331)
329. Regarding the realizations of the glottal stop in CJA, see Section [2.2.11]. [↑](#footnote-ref-332)
330. See Section [7.3.2.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-333)
331. With the exception of the verb ä̐mmǝn [CHECK symbol], which is also pronounced without a glottal stop. See: Cohen, D. 1975, p. 117. [↑](#footnote-ref-334)
332. Talmoudi 1980, p. 98. [↑](#footnote-ref-335)
333. M. Cohen also documents a verb in which the *Hamzah* and its vowel have been omitted without compensation: *ddä* (1912, pp. 40, 202, 203; cf. Dhina 1938, p. 327). [↑](#footnote-ref-336)
334. Marçais 1956, p. 30. [↑](#footnote-ref-337)
335. Marçais 1908, p. 90. [↑](#footnote-ref-338)
336. See Section [2.2.11] and Marçais 1902, pp. 74-75. [↑](#footnote-ref-339)
337. See also Section [7.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-340)
338. The same is true of many dialects, such as that of Jijli: Marçais 1956, p. 177. [↑](#footnote-ref-341)
339. See Sections [3.3.2] and [3.5.1.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-342)
340. See Section [7.3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-343)