[7.3.6] Verbs Whose Second Root Letter is ו or י

I) Verbs whose second root letter is /w/ or /y/ are conjugated in the *kǝttǝb* form like verbs with three whole root letters; the semi-vowel is realized as a consonant.

II) The conjugation models for this verb type are: (A) -CVyyVC-; -CVwwVC-; (B) -CvyyC-; -CVwwC-; the forms feature a diphthong created from the vowel on the first root letter and the first of the double consonants.

III) The vowel on the *first* root letter, /ǝ/, sometimes assimilates to the following double consonant; in this instance, it will be realized as [i] in verbs whose second root letter is י and as [u] when the second root letter is ו. For example: *nkiyys-ǝk* (אַשְׂכִּֽילְךָ֨, Ps 32:8), *tiyyǧu-ni* (כִּתְּרֽוּנִי, Ps 22:13), *ḍiyyaˁti* (אִבַּ֣דְתָּ, Ps 9:6), *nduwwǝb* (אַמְסֶֽה, Ps 6:7), *u-duwwǝbt* (וַתֶּ֣מֶס, Ps 39:12).

When the first root letter is /ˁ ḥ/ or sometimes /ḍ/, the influence of the back consonant outweighs that of the semi-vowel and the vowel on the first root letter is realized as [a]. For example: *ˁayyṭu* (זָֽעֲק֣וּ, Ps 22:6), *u-ḥayyǝr* (וְע֥וּרָה, Ps 7:7), *nˁawwǝm* (אַשְׂחֶ֣ה, Ps 6:7), *tḍayyǝˁ* but also *tḍiyyaˁ* (תְּאַבֵּד֮, Ps 5:7), *tḍawwṛ-ǝk* but also *tḍuwwṛ-ǝk* (תְּסֽוֹבְבֶ֑ךָּ, Ps 7:8).

In most cases, the vowel on the secondroot letter is not influenced by the preceding doubled semi-vowel. However, in verbs the first root letter of which is a back consonant causing the vowel on that letter to be pronounced [a], the influence of the doubling is applied to the following vowel on the second root letter. For example: *ˁayyiš* (חִיָּֽה, Ps 22:30), *ˁayyišti-ni* (חִ֝יִּיתַ֗נִי, Ps 30:4).

In some cases there is a change in the quality of both short vowels in this verb type. It seems likely that the first root letter is first influenced by the doubling that follows, and thereafter the vowel on the second root letter assimilates by way of vowel harmony. For example: *tkiyyis* ((פֶּֽתִי) מַחְכִּ֥ימַת, Ps 19:8), *ibuwwọq* (יָרִ֖יעַ, Ps 41:12).

Although the influence of the doubled /ww/ or /yy/ on the adjacent vowel is prominent and characterizes the conjugation of these verbs, in rare instances the vowel on the first root letter may also be realized as [ǝ], without showing such influence.[[1]](#footnote-1)

This influence of doubling on primarilythe vowel of the first root letter is found in many Maghrebi dialects, including the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[2]](#footnote-2) and Algiers[[3]](#footnote-3) and the dialects of Jijli[[4]](#footnote-4) and Ouled Brahim.[[5]](#footnote-5)

IV) There were a few examples of this verb type founded with not only assimilation of the /ǝ/ to the /yy/, but the pronunciation of the entire chunk /iyy/ as [īy6], for example: *ikīyǝs* (יַֽחֲשָׁ֫ב, Ps 40:18). This was also found in the verb form *tkǝttǝb,* for example: *ǝtkīysu* (הַשְׂכִּ֑ילוּ, Ps 2:10).

V) Examples of the *kǝttǝb* form verb paradigm whose second root letter is ו or י:

Past: First-person singular: *ˁayyaṭt* (שִׁוַּ֥עְתִּי, Ps 30:3), *ˁayyəṭt lɪ̄k* (קְרָאתִ֑יךָ, Ps 31:18).

 Second-person masculine singular: *ḍiyyaˁti* (אִבַּ֣דְתָּ, Ps 9:6), *ˁayyišti-ni* (חִ֝יִּיתַ֗נִי, Ps 30:4), *u-duwwəbt* (וַתֶּ֣מֶס, Ps 39:12).

 Third-person masculine singular: *ˁayyiš* (חִיָּֽה, Ps 22:30).

 Third-person plural: *ˁayyṭu* (זָֽעֲק֣וּ, Ps 22:6), *tayyǧu-ni* / *tiyyǧu-ni* (כִּתְּרֽוּנִי, Ps 22:13),[[6]](#footnote-6) *ḍawwṛu-ni* (סְ֭בָבוּנִי, Ps 22:13, 17).

Future: First-person singular: *nkiyys-ək* (אַשְׂכִּֽילְךָ֨, Ps 32:8), *nˁayyəṭ* (אֲשַׁ֫וֵּ֥עַ, Ps 18:7), *nˁawwum* (אַשְׂחֶ֣ה, Ps 6:7), *nduwwəb* (אַמְסֶֽה, Ps 6:7), *nzuwwəl* (אָסִ֥יר, Ps 18:23).

 Second-person masculine singular: *tḍiyyaˁ* / *tḍayyaˁ* (תְּאַבֵּד֮, Ps 5:7), *tṭiyyəḥ* (תַּשְׁפִּֽיל, Ps 18:28; תַּכְרִ֖יעַ, Ps 18:40), *tmiyyəl* (תַּט, Ps 27:9), *tġayyar* (תְּ֝קַנֵּ֗א, Ps 37:1), *tḍawwṛ-u* (תַּעְטְרֶֽנּוּ, Ps 5:13).

 Third-person masculine singular: *ikīyəs* / i*kiyyəs* (יַֽחֲשָׁ֫ב, Ps 40:18), *u-yˁayyš-u* (וִֽ֭יחַיֵּהוּ, Ps 41:3), *ibuwwọq* (יָרִ֖יעַ, Ps 41:12), *iḍawwṛ-u* (יְסֽוֹבְבֶֽנּוּ, Ps 42:10).

 Third-person feminine singular: *tḍuwwṛ-ək* / *tḍawwṛ-ək* (תְּסֽוֹבְבֶ֑ךָּ, Ps 7:8).

Imperative: Second-person singular: *u-ḥayyər* (וְע֥וּרָה, Ps 7:7), *miyyəl* (הַֽט, Ps 17:6; הַטֵּ֤ה, Ps 31:3), *ṭiyyḥ-u* (הַכְרִיעֵ֑הוּ, Ps 17:13), *ṣuwwọq* (נְחֵ֬נִי, Ps 5:9), *zuwwəl* (הָסֵ֣ר, Ps 39:11).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mˁawwəǧ* (עִ֝קֵּ֗שׁ, Ps 18:27), *mduwwəb* (נָ֝מֵ֗ס, Ps 22:15), *mḍuwwəṛ* (סְ֭חַרְחַר, Ps 38:11).

*Masdar* verbal noun: *fi təmyīl* (בְּמ֥וֹט, Ps 38:17).

Translation of the declined Hebrew infinitive לפעל: u*-li-yˁayyiš-hum* (וּ֝לְחַיּוֹתָ֗ם, Ps 33:19), *li-ykiyyəs* (לְהַשְׂכִּ֣יל, Ps 36:4), *li-ymiyyil* (לִנְט֥וֹת, Ps 17:11), *li-yǧawwəz* (לַֽעֲבֹר֙, Num 24:13).

[7.3.7] Verbs With Third Root Letter י

I) Verbs whose third root letter is /y/ (whether an original /y/ or /\*ˀ/ > /y/) are conjugated in the verb form *kǝttǝb* according to the same rules and suffixes as Form I verbs whose third root letter is י.[[7]](#footnote-7) For example: just as in Form I we find *mšīt* (הָלַ֑כְתִּי, Ps 26:1), so in this verb form we find *ṣaffīt* (זִכִּ֣יתִי, Ps 73:13).

II) Several forms in the corpus reflect the two possible conjugations of the verb form *kǝttǝb*: one maintains the vowel between C1 and C2, and one omits it.[[8]](#footnote-8) Thus we found: *xəbbāw* / *xbbāw* (טָ֝מָ֗נוּ, Ps 9:16), *imašši* / *imšši* (יַדְרֵ֣ךְ, Ps 25:9), *barri-ni* / *brri-ni* (נַקֵּֽנִי, Ps 19;13).

III) Unlike the future conjugation in Form I, where two patterns are found,[[9]](#footnote-9) all the verbs with the third letter as י are conjugated according to a single model with the vowel [i];[[10]](#footnote-10) in this respect, they resemble the conjugation already in CA, for example: *nṣalli* (אֶתְפַּלָּֽל, Ps 5:3).

IV) The suffix –īw, which is characteristic of many persons in the conjugation of Form I verbs with the first root letter י, is also found in the conjugation of the verb form *kǝttǝb*.

V) The vowel on the first root letter is often influenced by its consonantal environment; for example: *mṣọffiy-a* (צְרוּפָ֑ה, Ps 18:31), *xabba* (טָמַ֣ן, Ps 35:8).[[11]](#footnote-11)

VI) Examples of the paradigm for *kǝttǝb* form verbs whose third root letter is י:

Past: First-person singular: *ṣaffīt* (זִכִּ֣יתִי, Ps 73:13).

 Second-person masculine singular: *ṣaffīti-n-* (צְרַפְתַּ֥נִי, Ps 17:3), *xabbīti* (צָפַ֪נְתָּ, Ps 31:20).

 Third-person masculine singular: *ġənna* (שָׁ֥ר, Ps 7:1), *xabba* (טָמַ֣ן, Ps 35:8).

 Third-person plural: *xbbāw* / *xəbbāw* (e.g. טָ֝מָ֗נוּ, Ps 9:16), *məḍḍāw* (פָּ֥תְח֣וּ, Ps 37:14).

Future: First-person singular: *nṣalli* (אֶתְפַּלָּֽל, Ps 5:3), *u-nġənni* (וַֽ֝אֲזַמְּרָ֗ה, Ps 7:18, 9:3).[[12]](#footnote-12)

 Second-person singular: *txəlli-ni* (תִּטְּשֵׁ֥נִי, Ps 27:9), *u-tməšši-ni* (וּֽתְנַהֲלֵֽנִי, Ps 31:4), *txəbbi-hum* (תִּצְפְּנֵ֥ם, Ps 31:21).

 Third-person masculine singular: imaḍḍi (יִלְט֑וֹשׁ, Ps 7:13), *imašši* / *imšši* (יַדְרֵ֣ךְ, Ps 25:9), *iṣalli* (יִתְפַּלֵּ֬ל, Ps 32:6).

 Third-person plural: *iġinnīw* (יְ֭רַנֵּנוּ, Ps 5:12), *w-ixallīw* (וְהִנִּ֥יחוּ, Ps 17:14).

Imperative: Masculine singular: *barri-ni* / *brri-ni* (נַקֵּֽנִי, Ps 19:13), *məšši-ni* (הַדְרִ֘יכֵ֤נִי, Ps 25:5), *ṣaffi* (צָרְפָ֖ה, Ps 26:2).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mġəṭṭi* (כְּס֣וּי, Ps 32:1).

 Feminine singular: *mṣọffiy-a* (צָ֭רוּף, Ps 12:7; צְרוּפָ֑ה, Ps 18:31; מְ֝זֻקָּ֗ק, Ps 12:7).[[13]](#footnote-13)

[7.3.8] First Root Letter ו + Third Root Letter י

The corpus includes three verbs whose first and third root letters are /w/ and /y/, respectively: w.ṣ.y, w.ṛ.y, and w.ḍ.y. Their conjugation models behave like other verbs whose third root letter is י. In these verbs, as in others with a first root letter of ו, the initial /w/ functions as a full-fledged consonant. In many cases this consonant influences the quality of the following vowel, which is realized as [u], although when it appears alongside /ṛ/, it may also be realized as [a].

The word צִוִּֽיתָ (Ps 7:2) is translated in the *šarḥ* by the form *uṣṣēt* / *uṣṣēti*. This form reflects the phenomenon of the omission of the vowel between C1 and C2;[[14]](#footnote-14) i.e., C1C2C2VC3t (in verbs whose third root letter is י: C1C2C2īt). We might have expected the form *wṣṣeti*, but /w/ appearing without an adjacent vowel is realized as [u].[[15]](#footnote-15) Similarly, one of the rabbis pronounced the form *uṣṣa* (צִ֭וָּה, Ps 78:5).

The following conjugation forms of these verbs appeared in the corpus:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *uṣṣēti* / *uṣṣēt* (צִוִּֽיתָ, Ps 7:7).

 Third-person masculine singular: *uṣṣa* / *wuṣṣa* (צִ֝וָּ֗ה, Ps 33:9, 78:5).

Future: First-person singular: *nwǝddi* (אוֹדֶ֤ה, Ps 32:5), *u-nwaṛṛī-k* (וְֽאוֹרְךָ֗, Ps 32:8).

 Second-person masculine singular: *u-twuṣṣi-hum* (וְהִזְהַרְתָּ֣ה אֶתְהֶ֔ם, Ex 18:20).

 Third-person masculine singular: *iwaṛṛi-na* / *iwuṛṛi-na* (יַרְאֵ֪נ֫וּ, Ps 4:7), *iwuṛṛī-h* (י֝וֹרֶ֗נּוּ, Ps 25:21), *iwaṛṛi* / *iwuṛṛi* (יוֹרֶ֖ה, Ps 25:8).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *wuṛṛi-ni* / *waṛṛi-ni* (ה֤וֹרֵ֥נִי, Ps 27:11).

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

Two roots deserve mention under this heading. The first is q.w.y, whose third root letter is an original /y/; the second is ḍ.w.y, where the third root letter /\*ˀ/ has shifted to /y/;[[16]](#footnote-16) the second root letter /w/ functions as a full-fledged consonant in these roots, as it does in roots whose second letter is ו in the *kǝttǝb* verb form. The influence of the doubled /ww/ on the preceding vowel is also apparent, and the latter may be realized as [u]. In the root ḍ.w.y, however, the /ḍ/ sometimes leads to the realization of the vowel as [a].[[17]](#footnote-17)

The form *qwwāw* (עָֽ֝צְמ֗וּ, Ps 40:6) also reflects the omission of the vowels between C1 and C2 , a phenomenon we found various conjugation forms in the verb form *kǝttǝb*.[[18]](#footnote-18)

The corpus includes the following conjugation forms of these verbs:

Past: Third-person plural: *qwwāw* (עָֽ֝צְמ֗וּ, Ps 40:6).

Future: Second-person masculine singular: *tḍawwi*/*tḍuwwi* (תָּאִ֣יר, Ps 18:29).

 Third-person masculine singular: *iqawwī-k* (יְ֝שַׂגֶּבְךָ֗, Ps 20:2).

 Third-person feminine singular: *tḍawwi* / *tḍuwwi* (מְאִירַ֥ת, Ps 19:9), *tquwwa* (תִּכְבַּ֥ד, Ps 32:4).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *ḍawwi* / *ḍuwwi* (הָאִ֥ירָה, Ps 13:4), *ḍawwi* (הָאִ֣ירָה, Ps 31:17).

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

The only root in the corpus that falls into this category is h.y.y, whose third root letter was originally /\*ˀ/. This verb is conjugated like verbs whose third root letter is י, and the vowel on its third root letter is realized as [a] under the influence of the initial /h/, which outweighs the influence of the doubled /yy/.

The corpus includes the following conjugation forms of these verbs:

Past: Third-person masculine singular: *hayya* (הֵכִ֣ין, Ps 7:14).

 Third-person plural: *hayyāw* (טָ֝מָ֗נוּ, Ps 9:16, 31:5).

Future: Second-person masculine singular: *thayyi* (תָּכִ֥ין, Ps 10:17).

Imperative: Second-person plural: *hayyīw* / *hayyāw* (הָב֣וּ, Ps 29:1).

[7.3.9] Secondary Roots

I) The Hebrew root ישר is translated in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms by the root s.g.m. This is a secondary root that originates from Form X of the root q.w.m: استقام.[[19]](#footnote-19) It would seem that, in the first stage, a root s.q.m was created from Form X. In certain dialects, the /q/ is realized as [g]. It is reasonable to assume that the resulting root s.g.m entered CJA as a loan root, since the /q/ is realized as [q] in this dialect itself.[[20]](#footnote-20) Once this root became established in the dialect, however, it began to function as a productive form, appearing both in verbal conjugations and in nouns, for example: *sǝggǝm* (הַיְשַׁ֖ר, Ps 5:9), *b-tǝsgīm* (בְּמֵֽישָׁרִֽים, Ps 9:6), *u-msǝggǝm* (וְיָשָׁ֥ר, Ps 25:8).[[21]](#footnote-21)

The root סגם is also found in other modern dialects, such as the Jewish and Muslim dialects of Algiers,[[22]](#footnote-22) the Muslim dialect of Jijli,[[23]](#footnote-23) and various Moroccan Jewish dialects.[[24]](#footnote-24)

III) The Hebrew root יסד is translated in the *šarḥ* by the root l.s.s, a secondary root whose creation will be clarified below.

In CA, the verb أَسَّسَ is used with the sense “to found.” The noun “foundation” is أَسَاس, which, in CJA, became *sās* due to the omission of the *hamzah* and its vowel.[[25]](#footnote-25) The configuration of the root l.s.s can be explained as a derivative of *l-sās* – the noun with the definite article.[[26]](#footnote-26) This root is productive and conjugated in the *kəttəb* form in the various persons. Thus we find: *lǝssǝst* (יִסַּ֪דְתָּ֫, Ps 8:3), *lǝssǝs-ha* (יְסָדָ֑הּ, Ps 24:2),[[27]](#footnote-27) *ləssəs* (“he founded”).[[28]](#footnote-28)

[7.4] The Verb Form with ā after the First Root Letter

This section will discuss the conjugation of the verbal pattern C1āC2ǝC3, i.e., a form whose chief characteristic is the ā vowel after the first root letter. In CJA, this form represents the CA form فَاعَلَ.

After illustrating this form in verbs with three whole root letters, we will discuss the general characteristics of the different verb types. Lastly, we will present some unique features of the verb types as manifested in the conjugation of this form.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |  |
| Singular |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | [*bārǝkt*] |  | *nbārǝk* |  |
|  | 2: | *bārǝkt* |  | *tbārǝk* |  |
|  | 3M: | *bārǝk* |  | *ibārǝk* |  |
|  | 3F: | [*bārkǝt*] |  | *tbārǝk* |  |
| Plural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | [*bārǝkna*] |  | [*nbārku*] |  |
|  | 2: | [*bārǝktīw*] |  | **[***tbārku*] |  |
|  | 3: | *bārku* |  | *ibārku* |  |
|  | Imperative |  | Part. |  |  |
| 2S: | *bārǝk* | Masculine Singular: | *mbārǝk* |  |  |
| 2P: | *bārku* | Masculine Plural: | *mbārk-īn* |  |  |

I) The conjugation of the *kātəb* form is the same as that of *kəttəb* as described above. The difference between the two is that instead of C2C2- in the *kəttəb* form, we find āC2- in the *kātəb* form.

This form also has two principal models. In the first, the suffix representing the person begins with a consonant (-t, -tīw, -na) or with ø: CāCǝC-; for example: *bārǝk* (בֵּ֝רֵ֗ךְ, Ps 10:3), *sāmaḥt* (נָ֘שָׂ֤אתָ, Ps 32:5). The second model is realized when the suffix representing the person begins with a vowel (-ət, -u, -īn): CāCC-; for example: *xālfu* (מָ֥רוּ, Ps 5:11), *iḥāšfu-ni* (יִ֝שְׂטְנ֗וּנִי, Ps 38:21).

II) The characteristic ā after the first root letter is maintained throughout the conjugation of this form. This form is also found in many other Maghrebi dialects, both sedentary and nomadic, for example the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[29]](#footnote-29) and Algiers,[[30]](#footnote-30) the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen,[[31]](#footnote-31) the dialects of Jijli[[32]](#footnote-32) and Ouled Brahim,[[33]](#footnote-33) the Arba’a dialect,[[34]](#footnote-34) and various Moroccan dialects.[[35]](#footnote-35)

III) The next vowel in the model C1āC2ǝC3, after the second root letter, is /ə/. When the second root letter is one of the consonants /h ḥ ˁ/, the following vowel is usually realized as [a]; for example: *sāmaḥ* (נָשָׂ֥א, Ps 15:3), *nbāyaˁ* (אֶשְׁתַּֽחֲוֶ֥ה, Ps 5:8).[[36]](#footnote-36)

IV) The prefixes of the future tense are not vocalized; for example: *tbārək* (תְּבָרֵ֪ךְ, Ps 5:130. However, a consonantal remnant of the /y/ may accompany the future prefix [i] in the third-person masculine singular and plural.[[37]](#footnote-37)

V) Examples of the paradigm for *kātəb* form verbs with three whole root letters:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *sāmaḥt* (נָ֘שָׂ֤אתָ, Ps 32:5).

 Third-person masculine singular: *sāmaḥ* (נָשָׂ֥א, Ps 15:3), *u-bārk-u* (וַֽיְבָרְכֵ֑הוּ, Gn 27:27), *bārǝk* (בֵּ֝רֵ֗ךְ, Ps 10:3), *u-rāˁǝd* (וַיַּרְעֵ֬ם, Ps 18:14;[[38]](#footnote-38) הִרְעִ֑ים, Ps 29:3), *u-dāhǝš-hum* (וַיְהֻמֵּֽם, Ps 18:15),[[39]](#footnote-39) *sāfǝr* (“he traveled”).

 Third-person plural: *xālfu* (מָ֥רוּ, Ps 5:11).

Future: First-person singular: *nbārək* (אֲבָרֵ֗ךְ, Ps 16:7; אֲבָֽרְכָ֣ה, Ps 34:2).

 Second-person masculine singular: *u-tsāmǝḥ* / *u-tsāmaḥ* (וְֽסָלַחְתָּ֥, Ps 25:11), *tbārək* (תְּבָרֵ֪ךְ, Ps 5:130.

 Third-person masculine singular: *ibārǝk* (יְבָרֵ֖ךְ, Ps 29:11, 115:13), *ixālǝf* (יָמִֽר, Ps 15:4), *idāhǝš-hum* (יְבַֽהֲלֵֽמוֹ, Ps 2:5), *išāṛaˁ* (יָדִ֪ין, Ps 7:9, 9:9).

 Third-person plural: *iḥāšfu-ni* (יִ֝שְׂטְנ֗וּנִי, Ps 38:21).

Imperative: Second-person singular: *u-bārǝk* (וּבָרֵ֥ךְ, Ps 28:9), *xāṣǝm* (רִיבָ֣ה, Ps 35:1), *ṭārǝd* (לְ֝חַ֗ם, Ps 35:1), *šāṛǝˁ-ni* (שָׁפְטֵ֥נִי, Ps 7:9, 26:1), *u-sāmaḥ* (וְ֝שָׂ֗א, Ps 25:18).

Participle: Masculine singular: *msāmaḥ* (נְֽשׂוּי, Ps 32:1).

Masculine plural: *mbārk-īn-u* (מְ֭בֹֽרָכָיו, Ps 37:22), *mxāṣm-īn-i* (יְרִיבַ֑י, Ps 35:1), *mṭārd-īn-i* (לֹֽחֲמָֽי, Ps 35:1).

Translation of the declined Hebrew infinitive לפעל: *li-ybārək* (לברך).

VI) The corpus includes several roots whose second letter is ו in the verb form *kātəb*: ṣ.w.b, ˁ.w.n, ğ.w.b (w.ğ.b), as well as a single root with the second root letter י: b.y.ˁ. These verbs are conjugated like verbs with three whole root letters and the /w/ or /y/ behaves as a fully-fledged consonant. The /ā/ after the first root letter is maintained with its original quality and is not influenced by the second root letter /y/ or /w/. The vowel following the second root letter sometimes assimilates to the /w/ and is realized as [u];[[40]](#footnote-40) for example: *ṣāwub* (כּוֹנֵ֥ן, Ps 40:3), *nˁāwud* (אֲ֝סַפְּרָ֗ה, Ps 9:2).

The Hebrew verb ענה is always translated in the printed *šarḥ* by ואג'ב, with the exception of sole occurrence of ג'אוב. Two of the informants usually used *wāǧəb*, while the third translated *ǧāwəb*.[[41]](#footnote-41) When it appears in the latter form, this verb is conjugated like other verbs whose second root letter is ו; when it appears in the form *wāǧəb*, it is conjugated like verbs whose first root letter is ו.

Examples of the paradigm for *kātəb* form verbs whose second root letter is ו:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *ṣāwəbt* / *ṣāwubti* (כּוֹנָֽנְתָּה, Ps 8:4), *ǧāwubti-ni* (עֲנִיתָֽנִי, Ps 22:22).

 Third-person masculine singular: *u-ṣāwub-ha* (וַֽיְכוֹנְנֶֽהָ, Ps 7:13), *ṣāwəb* / *ṣāwub* (כּוֹנֵ֥ן, Ps 40:3), *u-ˁāwud* (וַיְסַפֵּ֥ר, Gn 37:9), *u-ǧāwub-ni* (וְעָנָ֑נִי, Ps 34:5).

 Third-person plural: *ṣāwbu* (כּֽוֹנְנ֣וּ, Ps 11:2), *u-bāyˁu* (וַיִּֽשְׁתַּחֲו֨וּ, Ps 22:30).

Future: First-person singular: *nˁāwud* / *nˁāwəd* (אֲ֝סַפְּרָ֗ה, e.g. Ps 9:2, 15; 22:23).

 Second-person masculine singular: *tˁāwən* (עוֹזֵֽר, Ps 10:14), *tṣāwəb* / *tṣāwub* (תָּכִ֥ין, Ps 10:17; תְּכוֹנֵ֥ן, Ps 21:13), *tǧāwub-ni* (תַעֲנֵ֣נִי, Ps 17:60.

 Third-person masculine singular: *iṣāwəb* / *iṣāwub* (כּוֹנֵ֖ן, Ps 9:8), *iˁāwən* (עוֹזֵֽר, Ps 22:12), *iṣāwəb-ha* (יְכֽוֹנְנֶֽהָ, Ps 24:2), *iǧāwb-u* (יַֽ֭עֲנֵהוּ, Ps 20:7), *u-yṣāwub-ha* (וַֽיְכוֹנְנֶֽהָ, Ps 7:13).

 Third-person plural: *iˁāwdu* (מְֽסַפְּרִ֥ים, Ps 19:2), *u-ybāyˁu* (וְיִֽשְׁתַּחֲו֥וּ, Ps 22:28).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *ǧāwub-ni* (עֲ֭נֵנִי, Ps 13:4).

 Second-person plural: *bāyˁu* (הִשְׁתַּֽחֲו֥וּ, (Ps 29:2).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mˁāwən* (עֹזֵ֥ר, Ps 30:11).

Translation of the declined Hebrew infinitive לפעל: *u-li-yˁāwəd* (וּ֝לְסַפֵּ֗ר, Ps 26:7).

VII) The following roots with third letter י occurred in the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms: k.f.y, n.d.y, ˁ.f.y. These verbs are conjugated like verbs with third letter י in Form I and in the form *kəttəb*.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Examples of the paradigm for *kātəb* form verbs with third root letter י:

Past: First-person singular: *kāfīt* (גָּ֭מַלְתִּי, Ps 7:5), *nādīt-ək* (קְרָאתִ֣יךָ, Ps 17:6).

 Third-person masculine singular: *kāfa* (גָמַ֣ל, Ps 13:6), *nāda* (קָ֭רָא, Ps 34:7).

 Third-person plural: *nādāw* (קָרָֽאוּ, Ps 14:6).

Future: First-person singular: *nnādi* (אֶקְרָ֑א, e.g. Ps 3:5, 18:4, 7).

 Second-person masculine singular: *tkāfī-h* (תִּתְפַּתָּֽל, Ps 18:27).[[43]](#footnote-43)

 Third-person masculine singular: *ikāfi-ni* (יִגְמְלֵ֣נִי, Ps 28:21).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mˁāfi-ya d-dūni* (שֽׁוֹלְמִ֥י רָ֑ע, Ps 7:5).

*Masdar* verbal noun: fi mnādiyt-i / fi mnādayt-i (בְּקָרְאִ֡י, Ps 4:2), fi mnādiyt-i / *fi munādayt-i* (בְּקָרְאִ֥י, Ps 4:4),[[44]](#footnote-44) *mnādiyt-na* (קָרְאֵֽנוּ, Ps 20:10).

VIII) Two complex roots appeared in the corpus in the *kātəb* form: d.w.y (second root letter ו and third root letter י) and w.t.y (first root letter ו and third root letter י). Both are conjugated like verbs whose third root letter is י.

Examples of the conjugation of these verbs are few:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *u-dāwīti-ni* (וַתִּרְפָּאֵֽנִי, Ps 30:3).

Future: Third-person feminine singular: *twāti* (נָאוָ֥ה, Ps 33:1).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *dāwi-ni* (רְפָאֵ֥נִי, Ps 6:3), *dāwi* (רְפָאָ֥ה, Ps 41:5).

[7.5] The Verb Form with ā after the Second Root Letter (smān)

The wide distribution of the *smān* form in the Maghreb is also reflected in the *šarḥ*, and the form is represented in several roots indicating that this dialectal form also penetrated this linguistic register.

The conjugation model in this verb form is CCāC, i.e. *ā* between the second and third root letters; there is no vowel between the first and second root letters. All the examples found in the corpus are ones with suffixes beginning with a vowel or with ø. Accordingly, we could not compare the behavior of these forms with ones whose suffixes begin with a consonant. Such a comparison could have proved interesting, since the various dialects show divergent forms of behavior when suffixes beginning with a consonant are added. In some dialects, such as the Jewish dialect of Tunis and the dialects of Jijli and Bou Saada, the ā is shortened in such instances (e.g.: *sment*).[[45]](#footnote-45) Conversely, in other dialects, such as the Jewish dialect of Algiers, the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen, and the Fez dialect, the *ā* is not shortened. The difficulty in pronouncing a syllable with a long vowel and a final consonantal cluster **–** CCV̅CC[[46]](#footnote-46) – is resolved through the addition of an *ī* before personal forms beginning with a consonant (e.g.: *smānit*).[[47]](#footnote-47) This form is found in the dialects of Tangiers, Marrakesh, Sale, and elsewhere.[[48]](#footnote-48)

The verb form *smān* probably has its origins in CA Form XI (إِفْعَالَّ), although some scholars believe that it originated in Form IX (إِفْعَلَّ).[[49]](#footnote-49) The characteristic long vowel of the form *smān* is already present in Form XI , while the doubled consonant of the classical form is replaced by a simple consonant in the dialects.[[50]](#footnote-50)

The verb form *smān* is far more prevalent in the Maghrebi dialects than verb forms IX and XI are in CA. While the latter forms serve only to denote the acquisition of colors or physical defects,[[51]](#footnote-51) the semantic scope of *smān* has expanded to inclue the physical properties of various materials as well as human psychological aspects. This form does not denote static states, but rather an emerging quality or process of change. Unsurprisingly, many of the verbs in this form are derived from adjectives.[[52]](#footnote-52)

The examples of this form found in the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms also relate to processes or changes, as follows:

Past: Third-person masculine singular: *ḍyāq* (צַ֫ר, Ps 31:10).

 Third-person feminine singular: *ḍḷāmət* (עָֽשְׁשָׁ֣ה, Ps 6:8, 31:10; עָֽ֝תְקָ֗ה, Ps 6:8).

 Third-person plural: *ktāṛu* (רַבּ֣וּ, Ps 3:2, 4:8, 25:19), *u-ktāṛu* (וְרַבּ֖וּ, Ps 38:20). It is possible that the form *ršāw* (בָּל֣וּ, Ps 32:3) should be regarded as belonging to this form rather than to Form I.

Future: Third-person feminine singular: *tədbāl* (יִבּ֑וֹל, Ps 1;3).

 Third-person plural: *yidbālu* (יִבֹּ֑לוּ, Ps 18:46), (יִכְבְּד֥וּ, Ps 38:5).

Participle: Feminine singular: *u-məryān-a* (רַֽעֲנָֽן, Ps 37:35).

The participle of this verb form is məCCāC; this pattern is in common use in the Maghrebi dialects to denote adjectives.[[53]](#footnote-53)

[7.6] Remnants of the CA Verb Form IV (Causative Form)

The classical Form IV \* أَفْعَلَ has effectively disappeared from the Maghrebi dialects. It was still common in Medieval Judeo-Arabic, where it sometimes replaced Form I.[[54]](#footnote-54) In the modern dialects, the principal causative sense of Form IV was added to the intensive sense of the *kəttəb* form.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Form IV has similarly been displaced from CJA and is no longer in use, with the exception of a handful of participles. The survival of a small number of participles is also documented in the Jewish dialect of Algiers, where they serve as adjectives, nouns, or fossilized words.[[56]](#footnote-56) A few participles from this verb form are also found in the Ouled Brahim[[57]](#footnote-57) and Arba’a[[58]](#footnote-58) dialects. W. Marçais attributes the existence of such forms in the Tlemcen dialect to the influence of the literary language.[[59]](#footnote-59) Participle remnants of Form IV verbs that have disappeared from use may also be found in the Baghdad dialects.[[60]](#footnote-60)

The following participle remnants of Form IV verbs were found in the *šarḥ* to the first 41 Psalms:

Masculine singular: *muġīt* (מ֝וֹשִׁ֗יעַ, Ps 7:11, 17:7, 18:42), *məxfi* / *muxfi* (נִ֝סְתָּ֗ר, Ps 19:7).

Masculine plural: *l-muxfiyy-īn* (נַֽ֝עֲלָמִ֗ים, Ps 26:4), *mūǧˁ-īn* (דַּכְּאֵי, Ps 34:19; נֵ֭כִים, Ps 35:19; רִגְעֵי, Ps 35:20),[[61]](#footnote-61) *u-mənˁal-īn-u* (וּ֝מְקֻלָּלָ֗יו, Ps 37:22).

It is interesting to note that forms of the verb להעלים are translated in the *šarḥ* by Form I conjugations of the root x.f.y. Similarly, the verb הושיע is translated in the *šarḥ* by Form I conjugations of the root ġ.y.t. However, remnants of Form IV survive in participles from these roots.

Several verbs conjugated in Form I can be identified as derivations of Form IV, such as: xfa from أَخْفَى, for example *xfa* (הִסְתִּ֣יר, Ps 22:25), *təxfi* (תַּ֝עְלִ֗ים, Ps 10:1); *fāq* from,أَفَاقَ, for example: *u-fiq* (וְ֭הָקִיצָה, Ps 35:23), *ˁṭa* from أَعْطَى, for example: *ˁṭa* (נָתַ֣ן , Ps 15:5), *yaˁṭi* (יִֽתֶּן, Ps 20:5, 29:11).[[62]](#footnote-62)

[7.7] The Verb Form with Initial *t* and a Doubled Second Root Letter (*tkəttəb*)

In CJA, the verb form with the pattern tC1əC2C2əC3, whose principal characteristics are the initial -t and the doubled second root consonant, represents the CA Form V تَفَعَّلَ.

Just as in CA Form V is used mainly to convey a repetitive or passive meaning of Form II verbs,[[63]](#footnote-63) so the *tkəttəb* form in modern Maghrebi dialects, including CJA, is used primarily to express a repetitive or passive meaning of *kəttəb* verbs.[[64]](#footnote-64)

Since *kəttəb* is a common form in CJA, the *tkəttəb* form is also vibrant and productive.[[65]](#footnote-65) Thus we find, for example: *u-kəṣṣaṛ* (וַיְשַׁבֵּ֥ר, Ps 29:5) and tkəṣṣṛət (נִשְׁבָּֽרָה, Ps 34:21); *u-waqqafti-ni* (וַתַּצִּיבֵ֖נִי, Ps 41:13) and *yitwaqqaf* (יִ֭תְיַצֵּב, Ps 36:5). We also found some instances in which this form relates to Form I, for example: *mšīt* (הָלַ֑כְתִּי, Ps 26:1) and u-*tməššīt* (וְ֝הִתְהַלַּ֗כְתִּי, Ps 26:3).[[66]](#footnote-66) Alongside these meanings, we also found *tkəttəb* form verbs used with other senses,[[67]](#footnote-67) such as: *yitkəllm-u* (יְֽדַבְּרוּ֮, Ps 12:3).

The following is the conjugation of the *tkəttəb* form for verbs with three whole root letters:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Past |  | Future |  |
| Singular |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | [*bārǝkt*] |  | *nətkəlləm* |  |
|  | 2: | *bārǝkt* |  | *tətkəlləm* |  |
|  | 3M: | *bārǝk* |  | *yətkəlləm* |  |
|  | 3F: | [*bārkǝt*] |  | *tətkəlləm* |  |
| Plural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1: | *tkəllmna* |  | *nətkəllmu* |  |
|  | 2: | ]*tkəlləmtīw*] |  | [*tətkəllmu*] |  |
|  | 3: | *tkəllmu* |  | *yətkəllmu* |  |
|  | Imperative |  | Participle |  |  |
| Second-person singular: | *ətkəlləm* | Masculine singular: | *mətkəlləm* |  |  |
| Second-person plural: | *ətkəllmu* | Feminine singular: | *mətkəllm-a* |  |  |
|  |  | Masculine plural: | *mətkəllm-īn* |  |  |
|  |  | Feminine plural: | *mətkəllm-āt* |  |  |

I) The conjugation of the *tkəttəb* form is the same as that of the *kəttəb* form with the addition of the morpheme -t, which imbues this verb form with its reflexive character. This *t* appears throughout the conjugation and is not doubled.[[68]](#footnote-68) The doubling of the second root letter is also maintained throughout the conjugation. As with *kəttəb*, this form also has two conjugation models depending on the person suffix attached to the base form: tCəCCəC- when the suffix begins with a consonant, and tCəCCC- when it begins with a vowel. In this form, too, a vowel may be inserted in order to split the triconsonantal cluster in the second model.[[69]](#footnote-69)

II) The conjugation forms in the past tense open with a consonantal cluster, the first letter of which is the *t* of this verb form. In the future tense, a short vowel separates the future prefix from the *t* of the verb form, thus preventing the creation of a triconsonantal cluster. The short vowel following the future prefix is usually realized as [i] in the third-person masculine singular and in the third-person plural and it often has the same realization in the other persons, where it may reflect vowel dissimilation: *tətkəlləm* > *titkəlləm*. This is uncertain, however, particularly given that the vowel on the future tense prefix is also often realized as [i] in the *tkātəb* form, where there is no cause for dissimilation.

III) The imperative of this verb form maintains an initial /ə/, for example: *ətməqqən* (הַבִּ֣יטָֽה, Ps 13:4). It is not surprising to find such a vowel in the dialectal verb forms that represent the CA verb forms I, VII, VIII, and X, where the imperatives included an initial element before the root (إ at the beginning of a sentence and ٱ in mid-sentence). However, an explanation is called for concerning the presence of this vowel in the imperative of the verb form *tkəttəb*, where the equivalent CA form is تَكَتَّبْ. One might assume that this vowel has been added to the initial cluster in these forms in order to facilitate pronunciation. However, this explanation must be rejected, since no vowel is added in the third-person masculine singular or in the third-person plural in the past tense, forms that are identical to the imperative. In his orthography, too, Rabbi Yosef Renassia records the imperatives of the *tkəttəb* verb form with an initial א. This may reflect his sense that the vowel here forms an integral part of the imperative form. He records the past tense forms as beginning with ת, without the א. In Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts, both the imperative and past conjugations of Form V verbs may feature a prosthetic א.[[70]](#footnote-70)

This initial vowel may be perceived as a morphological sign of the imperative, by way of analogy to Form I and other verb forms that feature this characteristic, leading to its insertion in the *tkəttəb* form. This differentiates between the third-person masculine singular and third-person plural forms of the past tense and the imperative forms (second-person masculine singular and plural), although this differentiation is also reflected in intonation. In any case, this vowel does not serve as a general morpheme for the imperative, since it is not found in the other verb forms (*kəttəb*, *kātəb*), presumably because the phonetic conditions in these forms do not encourage such an addition.

In the translation of the Hebrew imperatives האזינה, הקשיבה, an א was added to mark this vowel in the second-person masculine singular imperative form of the root √ṣnt: אצננת (הַֽאֲזִ֥ינָה, Ps 5:2, 17:1, 39:13; הַקְשִׁ֤יבָה, Ps 5:3, 17:1). The informants sometimes pronounced this form with an *ə*: *əṣənnət*, but in other instances without it. Since this vowel did not appear before other imperatives in the *kəttəb* form and no א was recorded in writing, the form אצננת may be explained as an imperative from the *tkəttəb* form:[[71]](#footnote-71) *əṣṣənnət*, where the assimilation tṣ > ṣṣ has occurred, though the doubling is only rarely audible. However, a conjugation form of this root appeared in the corpus in the future tense of the *kəttəb* form: *tṣannǝt* (תַּקְשִׁ֥יב, Ps 10:17).

When the conjunction ו is added to the imperative in the *tkəttəb* verb form, the *ə* is omitted, as was also seen in Form I. For example: *u-tfǝššǝš* (וְהִתְעַנַּ֥ג, Ps 37:4).

An imperative from the *tkəttəb* form including the initial *ə* is also found in the Jewish dialect of Tunis,[[72]](#footnote-72) though the Muslims of the same city use this form alongside another without this vowel.[[73]](#footnote-73) This vowel is not documented for the dialects of Jijli,[[74]](#footnote-74) Ouled Brahim,[[75]](#footnote-75) or Tlemcen.[[76]](#footnote-76)

IV) As in the other verb forms, the vowel on the first and second root letters may be influenced by their consonantal environment; for example: *tmǝnnaˁ* (חָדַ֖ל, Ps 36:4), *thallku* (נֶֽ֫אֱלָ֥חוּ, Ps 14:3), *tmaqqən* (הִשְׁקִ֪יף, Ps 14:2).

V) Examples of the paradigm for *tkǝttǝb* form verbs with three whole root letters:

Past: First-person singular: *tbǝzzaˁt* (נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי֮, Ps 22:15), *u-thǝrrǝst* (וְנִדְכֵּ֣יתִי, Ps 38:9), *tbǝkkǝšt* (נֶֽאֱלַ֣מְתִּי, Ps 39:3, 10), *tkǝllǝmt* (דִּ֝בַּ֗רְתִּי, Ps 39:4).

 Second-person masculine singular: *tfǝkkaṛti* (פָּ֘קַ֤דְתָּ, Ps 17:3).

 Third-person masculine singular: *tfǝkkaṛ* (זָכָ֑ר, Ps 9:13), *tqǝllǝb* (נֶהְפַּ֥ךְ, Ps 32:4), *tmaqqǝn* (הִשְׁקִ֪יף, Ps 14:2), *tkǝllǝm* (דִּבֶּ֨ר, Ps 18:1), *tmǝnnaˁ* (חָדַ֖ל, Ps 36:4), *tlǝffǝt* (פָנָ֥ה, Ps 40:5), *u-tqǝṛṛǝb* (וַיִּגַּשׁ֙, Gn 27:27).

 Third-person feminine singular: *tmǝllkǝt* (נִלְכְּדָ֥ה, Ps 9:13), *u-traˁˁdǝt* (וַתִּרְעַ֨שׁ, Ps 18:8), *tqǝllbǝt* (נֶהְפַּ֥ךְ, Ps 32:4), *tkǝṣṣṛǝt* (נִשְׁבָּֽרָה, Ps 34:21), *tˁammǝṛǝt* / *tˁammṛǝt* (מָ֣לְאָה, Ps 26:10, 33:5).

 First-person plural: *u-tṛǝffaˁna* (וַנִּתְעוֹדָֽד, Ps 20:9).

 Third-person masculine plural: *thallku* (נֶֽ֫אֱלָ֥חוּ, Ps 14:3), *tkǝllmu* (דִּבְּר֥וּ, Ps 17:10), *tṣǝddqu* (צָֽדְק֥וּ, Ps 19:10), *u-tmǝnnˁu* (וְנִמְלָ֑טוּ, Ps 22:6), *tḥarrku* (נָֽדְד֥וּ, Ps 31:12).

 Third-person feminine plural: *u-tfaṛṛǝqu* / *u-tfaṛṛqu* (וְהִתְפָּֽרְד֗וּ, Ps 22:15).

Future: First-person singular: *u-nitmǝttǝl* (וְ֝נִמְשַׁ֗לְתִּי, Ps 28:1), *nǝtḍaṛṛaˁ* (אֶתְחַנָּֽן, Ps 30:9), *nitkǝllǝm* (אָשִׂ֑יחָה, Ps 77:7), *nitḥǝddǝt* (אָשִׂ֑יחָה, Ps 77:7), *nitfǝkkǝṛ* (אֶ֥זְכְּרָ֥ה, Ps 77:7).

 Second-person masculine singular: *titfǝḍḍal* (תִּתְחַסָּ֑ד, Ps 18:26), *titlǝffǝt* (תִּתְפַּתָּֽל, Ps 18:27), *titfǝkkaṛ* (תִּ֫זְכֹּ֥ר, Ps 25:7).

 Second-person feminine singular: *u-tǝtkǝllǝm* (וְדִבַּ֥רְתְּ, II Sam 14:3), *u-tǝtfǝkkṛi* (וְזָכַ֣רְתְּ, Ez 19:61).

 Third-person masculine singular: *yitkǝllǝm* (יְדַבֵּ֣ר, Ps 2:5, 41:7), *yitṛǝffaˁ* (נִדְגֹּ֑ל,[[77]](#footnote-77) Ps 20:6; יָר֪וּם, Ps 27:6), *yitfǝṛṛǝġ* (יָצ֣וּק, Ps 41:9), *yitfǝkkǝṛ* (“he will remember”).

 Third-person feminine singular: *titkǝllǝm* (תְּדַבֵּ֥ר, Ps 37:30).

 Third-person masculine plural: *yitkǝllmu* (יְֽדַבְּרוּ֮, Ps 12:3), *yitmaqqǝnu* / *yitmaqqnu* (יַ֝בִּ֗יטוּ, Ps 22:18), *yitfǝkkṛu* (יִזְכְּר֤וּ, Ps 22;28), *yitḍaṛṛqu* (יֶֽחֱסָיֽוּן, Ps 36:8), *yitˁallmu* (“they will learn”).

 Third-person feminine plural: *yitbǝkkšu* (תֵּ֥אָלַ֗מְנָה, Ps 31:19), *yitkǝṣṣṛu* (תִּשָּׁבַֽרְנָה, Ps 37:15, 17).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *ǝtfǝxxǝṛ* (הִ֭נָּשֵׂא, Ps 7:7), *ǝtmǝqqan* (הַבִּ֣יטָֽה, Ps 13:4), *ǝtṛǝffaˁ* (ר֣וּמָה, Ps 21;14), *ǝtfǝkkaṛ* (זְכֹר, Ps 25:6, 7), *ǝtlǝffǝt* (פְּנֵֽה, Ps 25:16).

 Second-person plural: *ǝtraˁˁdu* (רִגְז֗וּ, Ps 4:5), *u-tṛǝffˁu* (וְֽ֭הִנָּשְׂאוּ, Ps 24:7).

Participle:

Masculine singular: *u-mǝtkǝllǝm* (וְדֹבֵ֥ר, Ps 15:2).

Feminine singular: *mǝtkǝllm-a* (מְדַבֶּ֥רֶת, Ps 12:4).

Masculine plural: *mǝtkǝllm-īn* (דֹּֽבְרֵ֪י, Ps 5:7, 25:3).

Feminine plural: *l-mǝtkǝllm-āt* (הַדֹּֽבְר֖וֹת, Ps 31:19).

Translation of the declined Hebrew infinitive לפעל: *li-yitfǝkkaṛ* (לזכור), *mǝn li-yitkǝllǝm* (מִדַּבֵּ֥ר, Ps 34:14).

VI) Three roots with double consonants appeared in the corpus in the *tkǝttǝb* form: ġ.š.š, f.š.š and b.n.n. These verbs are conjugated like verbs with three whole root letters.

As in the *kǝttǝb* form, conjugation forms for verbs with double consonants with personal suffixes beginning with a vowel create a model comprising three identical consecutive consonants[[78]](#footnote-78) i.e., -tC1VC2C2C2-. I found only two examples of this category in the corpus. The first was pronounced by our informants with a double cluster rather than a triple one: *ǝtbǝnnu* (טַֽעֲמ֣וּ, Ps 34:9). The second was pronounced sometimes with a double (perhaps even a triple) cluster as *u-yitfǝššu* (וְ֝הִֽתְעַנְּג֗וּ, Ps 37:11) and sometimes with an inserted vowel between the second and third root letters as *yitfǝššǝšu* (וְ֝הִֽתְעַנְּג֗וּ, Ps 37:11 also).

Examples of the paradigm for *tkǝttǝb* form verbs with double root letters:

Past: Second-person masculine singular: *tġǝššǝšti* (גָּעַ֣רְתָּ, Ps 9:6).

 Third-person masculine singular: *tġǝššǝš* (חָ֥רָה, Ps 18:8).

Future: Third-person masculine singular: *yitġǝššǝš* (יֶֽאֱנַ֤ף, Ps 2:12).

 Third-person plural: *u-yitfǝššu* / *u-yitfǝššǝšu* (וְ֝הִֽתְעַנְּג֗וּ, Ps 37:11).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *u-tfǝššǝš* (וְהִתְעַנַּ֥ג, Ps 37:4).

 Second-person plural: *ǝtbǝnnu* (טַֽעֲמ֣וּ, Ps 34:9).

VII) Two verbs with first root letter א appeared in the corpus: ˀ.t.m, ˀ.d.b.. In most cases, the original glottal stop was maintained and followed by the vowel [a]. The conjugation forms of these verbs behave like verbs with three whole root letters.[[79]](#footnote-79)

The conjugation forms of verbs with first root letter א in the corpus are:

Future: Third-person plural: *yitˀattmu* (יֶאְשָֽׁמוּ, Ps 34:22, 23).

Imperative: Second-person plural: *ǝtˀaddǝbu* / *ǝtˀaddbu* (הִ֝וָּֽסְר֗וּ, Ps 2:10).

In one verb a shift occurred: ˀ.x.r > w.x.r; this verb will be discussed in the next section.

VIII) The corpus included three roots with first root letter /w/: w.q.f, w.ğ.ˁ, and w.x.r (> ˀ.x.r). These verbs behave like verbs with three whole root letters. The vowel on their first root letter may be realized as [u] under the influence of the /w/, but this is not a regular feature.

The following conjugation forms of this verb type occurred in the corpus:

Future: Third-person masculine singular: *yitwǝǧǧaˁ* (יִדְכֶּ֥ה, Ps 10:10), *yitwuqqaf* / *yitwaqqaf* (יִ֭תְיַצֵּב, Ps 36:5).

 Third-person plural: *yitwaqqfu* (יִ֥תְיַצְּב֨וּ, Ps 2:2, 5:6), *yitwaxxǝru* (יִסֹּ֣גוּ, Ps 35:4, 40:15).

In the questionnaire, one of the rabbis pronounced a form for a verb with third root letter י: *yityibbǝs* (“will become parched”). This is also conjugated in the same manner as verbs with three whole root letters.

IX) Verbs with second root letter ו or י were represented in the corpus by several roots: ġ.y.y, k.y.s, ḥ.y.r, ˁ.w.n, ˁ.w.ğ, h.w.l. These verbs are conjugated like those with three whole root letters and the second root letter /y/ or /w/ functions as a fully-fledged consonant. The vowels in the conjugated forms may be influenced by the adjacent doubling of the semi-vowel, as with verbs of this type in the *kǝttǝb* form.[[80]](#footnote-80)

The following examples of the conjugation of verbs with second root letter ו or י in the *tkǝttǝb* form appeared in the corpus:

Past: First-person singular: *u-tˁawwǝnt* (וְֽנֶ֫עֱזָ֥רְתִּי, Ps 28:7), *tˁawwǝǧt* (נַֽעֲוֵ֣יתִי, Ps 38:7).

Future: First-person singular: *nǝtġǝyyaṛ* (אֶ֝דְאַ֗ג, Ps 38:19).

 Third-person plural: *yithawwlu* (יֶֽהֱמָי֑וּן, Ps 39:7).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *tḥayyaṛ* (הָעִ֣ירָה, Ps 35:23).

 Second-person plural: *ǝtkīysu* / *ǝtkiyysu* (הַשְׂכִּ֑ילוּ, Ps 2:10).

X) The corpus included several roots with third letter י: m.š.y, ṣ.f.y, ˁ.l.y, b.r.y (> b.r.ˀ). In the *tkǝttǝb* form these roots behave according to the rules described above for verbs of this type in the other verb forms, as illustrated below:

Past: First-person singular: *tmǝššīt* (הִתְהַלָּ֑כְתִּי, Ps 35:14; הִלָּֽכְתִּי, Ps 38:7), *u-tmǝššīt* (וְ֝הִתְהַלַּ֗כְתִּי, Ps 26:3).

 Third-person plural: *tˁaddāw* (חָ֣לְפוּ, Is 24:5).

Future: First-person singular: *nǝtṣǝffa* (אֵיתָ֑ם, Ps 19:14), *u-nǝtbǝṛṛa* (וְ֝נִקֵּ֗יתִי, Ps 19:14).

 Second-person masculine singular: *titṣǝffa* (תִּתַּמָּֽם, Ps 18:26).

 Third-person masculine singular: *yitmǝšša* (יִֽתְהַלֶּךְ, Ps 39:7).

 Third-person plural: *yitmǝššāw* (יִתְהַלָּכ֑וּן, Ps 12:9).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *ǝtˁalla* (הִ֭נָּשֵׂא, Ps 7:7).

 Second-person plural: *ǝtˁallāw* (לְֽכוּ, Ps 34:12).

XI) The only complex root in the *tkǝttǝb* form that occurred in the *šarḥ* to the first 41 Psalms was q.w.y. The conjugation of this verb maintains both the familiar features of verbs with second root letter ו and verbs with third root letter י. Examples:

Past: First-person plural: *u-tquwwēna* (וַנִּתְעוֹדָֽד, Ps 20:9).

 Third-person plural: *tquwwāw* (אָמְצ֥וּ, Ps 18:18; עָצֵ֑מוּ, Ps 38:20, 40:6, 13).

Future: First-person singular: *u-nitquwwa* (וְאַבְלִ֑יגָה, Ps 39:14).

 First-person plural: *nitquwwāw* (נַ֭גְבִּיר, Ps 12:5).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *ǝtquwwa* (חֲ֭זַק, Ps 27:14).

 Second-person plural: *ǝtquwwāw* (חִ֭זְקוּ, Ps 31:25).

[7.8] The Verb Form with Initial *t* and *ā* After the First Root Letter (*tkātǝb*)

I) In CJA, the verb form with the pattern tCāCǝC, the distinctive characteristics of which are the initial -t and the long vowel after the second root consonant, corresponds with the CA Form VI تَفَاعَلَ.

In CA this verb form was created through the addition of an initial morpheme *t* to Form III فَاعَلَ. The principal semantic distinctiveness of the CA Form VI is the denotation of mutual action.[[81]](#footnote-81) This characteristic was inherited by its dialectal successor *tkātǝb* not only in CJA, but also in other Maghrebi dialects.[[82]](#footnote-82) Examples include the Jewish dialects of Algiers[[83]](#footnote-83) and Tunis,[[84]](#footnote-84) the Muslim dialect of Jijli,[[85]](#footnote-85) the Tlemcen[[86]](#footnote-86) and Arba’a[[87]](#footnote-87) dialects, and various Moroccan dialects,[[88]](#footnote-88) including the Jewish dialect of Tafilalat.[[89]](#footnote-89) However, dialectologists also mention additional uses of the *tkātǝb* form, such as a repetitive sense of Form I verbs and a passive sense.[[90]](#footnote-90)

The examples in the corpus also include additional senses beyond the reciprocal. One example we found in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms shows that the *tkātǝb* form may also relate to the *smān* form. Thus, we found *mǝtkāḥǝl* (קֹדֵ֥ר, Ps 35:14), denoting the presence of the relevant quality, while the form *kḥāl* describes its emergence.

II) The conjugation paradigm of the *tkātǝb* form is the same as that of *kātǝb*:[[91]](#footnote-91) the initial *t* is added throughout and the *ā* is also maintained.

III) In the various forms of the future tense (not only the third-person singular and plural), the vowel on the future prefix was realized as [i], as was frequently documented for the *tkǝttǝb* form.[[92]](#footnote-92)

IV) The following examples of the *tkātǝb* form appeared in the corpus:

Past: Third-person plural: *tšārku* (נֽוֹסְדוּ, Ps 2:2).

Future: Second-person masculine singular: *titṭāhaṛ* / *titṭāhǝṛ* (תִּתְבָּרָ֑ר, Ps 18:27), *titxālǝṭ* (תִּתְחַ֥ר, Ps 37:1, 7, 8), *u-titfāhǝm* (וְהִתְבּוֹנַ֖נְתָּ, Ps 37:10), *titbāˁǝd* (תִּרְחַ֥ק, Ps 38:22).

 Third-person masculine singular: *yitˁāwud* (יְסֻפַּ֖ר, Ps 22:31).

 Third-person plural: *yitxālāw* (יִ֭תְלַֽחֲשׁוּ, Ps 41:8).

Participle: Masculine singular: *mǝtkāḥǝl* (קֹדֵ֥ר, Ps 35:14).

The *tkātǝb* form is a documented living form in various dialects.[[93]](#footnote-93) In the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms we found only a handful of examples, but the reason for this may be that the original Hebrew in these verses does not include a large number of Hebrew verbs translated by verbs from this form. Nevertheless, it would seem that the distribution of this form is less than that of the *tkǝttǝb* form described above; this is unsurprising given that the *kātǝb* to which it relates is also less common than *kǝttǝb*.

[7.9] The Repetitive and Passive Verb Forms (n-, t/tt-, -t-)

[7.9.1] General Discussion

In CA, Form VII إِنْفَعَلَ and Form VIII إِفْتَعَلَ serve mainly as the repetitive and passive counterparts of Form I.[[94]](#footnote-94) In the modern dialects, alongside the successors (or remnants) of these forms, a verb form beginning with the prefix t/tt[[95]](#footnote-95) emerged. The various dialects can be classified according to the relations between the –n verb form and the –t verb form, both of which convey a true passive sense. The verb form with an internal *t* (Form VIII in CA), which does not always have a passive sense, plays only a secondary role in this classification.[[96]](#footnote-96)

Classification into the *n* and *t* dialect groups does not imply that an *n* dialect does not include any instances of the *t* verb form, but reflects the preferred and commoner verb form for denoting passive and repetitive senses in the various dialects.[[97]](#footnote-97)

We will distinguish between *n* dialects, which are mainly the successor of the CA Form VII to denote the passive voice, and *t* dialects, where the dialect form beginning with –t/-tt is the main vehicle for this purpose. We will also note the presence of “mixed” dialects that use the *n* and *t* verb forms more or less equally.

*n* dialects

The *n* verb form is common in the Mashriqi dialects; in the Syrian and Palestinian dialects, it serves as the main tool for expressing the passive voice, alongside Form VIII.[[98]](#footnote-98) The *t* form is rare: Cantineau documents it only in two isolated instances in Palmyra.[[99]](#footnote-99) A similar situation is documented in the Mesopotamian *qǝltu* and *gǝlǝt* dialects;[[100]](#footnote-100) the *t* verb form has only a handful of representatives in southern Iraq.[[101]](#footnote-101) The *n* form is also used to denote the passive voice in the northern Arabian dialects.[[102]](#footnote-102) In many western and central dialects, the *n* verb form is common; it is documented, for example, in the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[103]](#footnote-103) in Cherchell[[104]](#footnote-104) and Tlemcen,[[105]](#footnote-105) in Ouled Brahim,[[106]](#footnote-106) and in the Jewish dialects of Fez, Tetouan,[[107]](#footnote-107) Sefrou,[[108]](#footnote-108) and Tafilalat.[[109]](#footnote-109)

*t* dialects

In a significant number of Maghrebi dialects, the use of the *n* form is disappearing and it is function in denoting repetitive and passive meanings is being replaced by the t/tt form. The literary language of the Jews of Tunis, for example, features only remnants of the *n* verb form, while there are no verbs of this form in the Muslim dialect of the city.[[110]](#footnote-110) In general, the t/tt form is the main vehicle for denoting the passive and repetitive counterpart of Form I in the sedentary dialects of Tunisia.[[111]](#footnote-111) This is true, for example, for the dialects of Tunis,[[112]](#footnote-112) Sousse,[[113]](#footnote-113) and Takrouna.[[114]](#footnote-114) The *t* verb form is also prevalent in certain Algerian dialects in the Saharan region, including the Arba’a[[115]](#footnote-115) and Ben Sa’ada[[116]](#footnote-116) dialects.

The dialects of the far west Maghreb may also be classed as *t* dialects, including the Moroccan dialects of Tangier, Casablanca, and Rabat.[[117]](#footnote-117)

The Cairo dialect is an example of a mixed dialect in which the *n* and *t* forms are used more or less equally.[[118]](#footnote-118)

An interesting marking of the passive can be found in the Jijli dialect, where the combined prefixes *nt* or *tn* are used, alongside the *t* form that is also found in the dialect.[[119]](#footnote-119)

To complete the picture, we should delineate the presence of Form VIII, which features a medial *t*, in this system of verb forms:

Verb Form VIII coexists alongside the *n* form in the Syrian and Palestinian dialects and is used both for passive and non-passive functions.[[120]](#footnote-120) In the Mesopotamian *qǝltu* dialects, this verb form is confined to certain lexemes, whereas in the *gǝlǝt* dialects it is widespread, albeit not with a passive connotation.[[121]](#footnote-121)

In most of the Maghrebi dialects (regardless of the above-mentioned distinction between *n* and *t* dialects), Form VIII is disappearing. Only remnants of this form remain in the Jewish dialects of Algiers[[122]](#footnote-122) and Tunis,[[123]](#footnote-123) in the Muslim dialect of Jijli,[[124]](#footnote-124) in Tlemcen,[[125]](#footnote-125) in the Jewish dialect of Tafilalat,[[126]](#footnote-126) and elsewhere.

The displacement of Form VII may have been facilitated by the fact that it is the only form that includes a medial morphemein a system that prefers initial or final morphemes.

Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms includes some 40 instances of the *n* form, over 10 instances of the verb form with medial *t* (Form VIII), and six forms of the t/tt form.[[127]](#footnote-127) Thus the corpus inventory shows that the *n* form is the principal marker of the passive voice in CJA.

It is important to recall that the corpus examined here is of limited scope and so we must be careful not to overclaim. Nevertheless, we will offer a possible explanation for our findings:

In many respects, CJA reflects a more conservative and archaic register than the colloquial language.[[128]](#footnote-128) Accordingly, it may be more prone to preserve the use of the *n* forms, even if in the colloquial speakers primarily (or exclusively) use tt/t forms. Corroboration of this hypothesis may be found in the fact that while the Hebrew יתפשו (יִתָּֽפְשׂ֓וּ, Ps 10:2) is translated in the *šarḥ* as ינחכמו, using an *n* form verb, the rabbi who translated without looking at the printed text translated it as *yitḥakmu*, from a *t* form verb.

Since our study focused on the *šarḥ* and did not examine the passive forms in the colloquial dialect, we can only offer hypotheses regarding the behavior of these forms in this dialect. Thus, it is possible that the dialect:

(A) Uses the *n* and *t* forms interchangeably, though the *t* form is gradually expanding its scope.

(B) Uses *t* forms, while the *n* form is confined to the šarḥ, reflecting an older stratum of the language.

(C) Uses solely *n* forms.

The last of these hypotheses can be rejected out of hand. The use of the *t* form, rather than the *n* form, by the above-mentioned rabbi, as well as the presence of additional *t* forms that have entered the *šarḥ*, show that the dialectal *t* form is recognized. The second hypothesis also seems less plausible than the first, since the rabbis are familiar with the *n* form and use it without any difficulty.[[129]](#footnote-129)

Accordingly, the first hypothesis that the Jews of Constantine use both *t* forms and *n* forms is the most plausible. This hypothesis deserves further scrutiny, but theoretical support for it can be drawn from the geographical location of Constantine. The city is situated between the Tunisian dialect area to the east, whether the t/tt verb form is dominant, and the Algerian dialect areas (such as Algiers, Cherchell, and Tlemcen) to the west, where the *n* form is dominant. This inter-dialectal location may have led to mixing between both forms. We have already noted several linguistic phenomena that reflect Constantine’s geographical location in similar fashion.[[130]](#footnote-130)

Further support for this hypothesis may be found in the forms nt/tn, t/tt encountered in Jijli, which is close to Constantine. These forms may also reflect interdialectal influence such as we have described for CJA.

In conclusion, *n* verb forms are the main tool in CJA to express the passive counterpart of Form I. The small number of instances of *t* form verbs may be explained as the penetration of dialectal forms into the *šarḥ*. It is reasonable to assume that the colloquial language features both *n* and *t* forms, and that the latter are gaining in prominence at the expense of the former.

As noted, Form VIII verbs were also found in the *šarḥ*, albeit relatively rarely. Since this form has been displaced in many Maghrebi dialects, its occasional preservation in the *šarḥ* highlights that this text reflects certain archaisms.[[131]](#footnote-131)

[7.9.2] A Verb Form with Initial *n* (*nǝktǝb*)

I) The verb form with the model nəCCəC has its origins in the CA Form VII إِنْفَعَلَ. As already noted, this form is mainly used in CA as a passive or reflexive counterpart of Form I. This sense is evident in the *nǝktǝb* forms found in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, only two of which have an active meaning.[[132]](#footnote-132)

II) The conjugation of the nəCCəC form is characterized by the additional of an initial *n* to the conjugation model of Form I. When the personal suffix is a consonant or ø, *ə* is added after the *n*. There would seem to be no remnant of the original إ / ٱ in the إِنْفَعَلَ form; an epenthetic vowel may sometimes “reappear” due to synchronic phonetic reasons (the liquid character of the initial *n*).[[133]](#footnote-133)

III) In three instances the /ǝ/ following the *n* was omitted, leaving a cluster in which the liquid *n* facilitated pronunciation: *u-nkšfu* (וַֽיִּגָּלוּ֮, Ps 18:16), *w-inškər* (וְאֻשַּׁ֣ר, Ps 41:3), *nqṭˁat* (נִכְרָֽתָה, Ps 37:38).

IV*)* The corpus did not include any imperative forms, and it is reasonable to assume this is due to its primarily passive sense.

V) The corpus included one instance of the *nǝktǝb* form in which the first root letter is /w/.[[134]](#footnote-134) This word is pronounced in two different ways: nūǧəd / nəwǧəd (נִמְצָֽא, Ps 37:36). The first of these forms can be explained as nǝ + uğǝd, where the /w/ is realized as a consonant since it follow the vowel /ǝ/.[[135]](#footnote-135) The second form may be parsed as the result of the diphthong contraction ǝw > ū,[[136]](#footnote-136) i.e., nəwǧəd > nūǧəd. This contracted form is also documented in the Jewish dialect of Algiers.[[137]](#footnote-137)

VI) The corpus included three instances of verbs wıth the second root letter ו or י in the *nǝktǝb* form: *nṣāb* (נִמְצָֽא, Ps 37:36), *ninġāt* (אִוָּשֵֽׁעַ, Ps 18:4), *yinġāt* (נוֹשָׁ֣ע, Ps 33:16). The typical characteristic of their conjugation is the absence of the vowel /ǝ/ after the initial *n*. Future tense forms from the root ġ.y.t that are conjugated with [ī] in Form I (*yiġīt*) are conjugated with [ā] in the *nǝktǝb* form. Such forms may testify to a phenomenon also found in the Jewish dialect of Algiers whereby the future tense of this form in verbs with second root letter ו or י are always conjugated with *ā*.[[138]](#footnote-138)

VII) The conjugation of other verb types in this verb form do not show any special characteristics, and will be illustrated below along with verbs with three whole root letters.

VIII) Examples of the paradigm for *nǝktǝb* form verbs found in the corpus:

Past: First-person singular: *nuqṭaˁt* (נִגְרַזְתִּי֮, Ps 13:23), *naḥnēt* (שַׁחֽוֹתִי, Ps 35:15, 38:7).

 Third-person masculine singular: *naˁṛəf* / *nˁaṛəf* (נ֤וֹדַ֨ע, Ps 9:17),[[139]](#footnote-139) *nˁatar* (כָּשַׁ֣ל, Ps 31:11; נוֹקֵ֣שׁ, Ps 9:17),[[140]](#footnote-140) *ntəmm* (גָמַ֣ר, Ps 12:2), *nəqṭaˁ* (נִכְרָֽת, Ps 37:28), *nəhlək* (נֶעְכָּֽר, Ps 39:3).

 Third-person feminine singular: *u-nhəzzət* / *u-nhazzət* (וַתִּגְעַ֬שׁ, Psd 18:8), *nqṭˁat* (נִכְרָֽתָה, Ps 37:38), *nəxfāt* (נִסְתָּֽרָה, Ps 38:10).

 Third-person masculine plural: *nǧəmˁu* (רָֽגְשׁ֣וּ, Ps 2:1), *ntəmmu* (תַּ֥מּוּ, Ps 9:7; כָל֪וּ, Ps 31:11), *u-nhəzzu* / *u-nhazzu* (וַ֝יִּתְגָּֽעֲשׁ֗וּ, Ps 18:8), *u-nkšfu* / *u-nkəšfu* (וַֽיִּגָּלוּ֮, Ps 18:16), *nḥərzu* (נִשְׁמָ֑רוּ, Ps 37:28), *u-nǧəmˁu* (וְֽנֶ֫אֱסָ֥פוּ, Ps 35:15), *nəfnāw* (נִשְׁמְד֣וּ, Ps 37:38), *nǧəzzu* (דֹּ֝ח֗וּ, Ps 36:12).

 Third-person feminine plural: *nxəlqu* (נַֽעֲשׂ֑וּ, Ps 33:6).

Future: First-person singular: *ninġāt* (אִוָּשֵֽׁעַ, Ps 18:4).

 Third-person masculine singular: *yinġāt* (נוֹשָׁ֣ע, Ps 33:16).

 Third-person feminine singular: *tinškər* (תִּתְהַלֵּ֣ל, Ps 34:3).

 Third-person masculine plural: *yinˁatru* (יִכָּֽשְׁל֥וּ, Ps 9:4), *yinḥakmu* (יִשָּֽׁפְט֥וּ, Ps 9:20), *yinšəṛˁu* (יִשָּֽׁפְט֥וּ, Ps 9:20), *yinsəmˁu* (יִשָּׁ֣מְעוּ, Ps 18:45), *w-inḥašmu* (וְיִכָּֽלְמ֑וּ, Ps 40:15), *yinfnāw* (יָ֭שֹׁמּוּ, Ps 40:16), *yinhadmu* (יֵהָֽרֵס֑וּן, Ps 11:3).

[7.9.3] A Verb Form with Medial *t* (-t-)

I) The verb form with medial *t* has its origins in the CA Form VIII افْتَعَلَ. In CA, the uses of this form include the passive and repetitive counterpart of Form I.[[141]](#footnote-141) However, the examples of this verb form found in the šarḥ to Psalms 1-41 usually have an active meaning. In the eastern dialects in which this form is found, it is also used in a non-passive sense;[[142]](#footnote-142) we have already described the presence of this verb form in the various dialects.

II) The corpus includes more than 10 different instances of this verb form, none of which are for verbs with three whole root letters.[[143]](#footnote-143) A relatively large number of variations were found in the rabbis’ readings of these forms, and accordingly we cannot ascertain with certainty the conjugation paradigm of this form. However, it is probable that the model is CtəCC. For example, we found the form *štədd* (חָ֥רָה, Ps 18:8), from a root with a double root letter.

III) The corpus included two verbs in this form with the second root letter ו: *xtāṛ* (בָּחַ֖ר, Ps 33:12), *yixtāṛ* (יִבְחָֽר, Ps 28:12), *zdād* (נ֝וֹלָ֗ד, Ps 22:32).

The verb *zdād* has its origins in the root z.w.d; the *t* of this verb form has assimilated to the preceding consonant: \*ztād > zdād. This form is also documented in other Maghrebi dialects, such as the Jewish dialect of Tunis[[144]](#footnote-144) and the Jijli dialect.[[145]](#footnote-145) At my request, one of the rabbis conjugated this verb as follows: *zdədt* (“I was born”), *zdədti* (“you (masc. sing) were born”). He noted that the verb *zdād* (“to be born”) is used by Jews, whereas Muslims use the verb *xlǝq*.[[146]](#footnote-146)

In synchronic terms, some scholars regard the conjugation of this verb form in verbs with the second root letter ו or י a version of the *smān* verb form (CCāC) in which the medial *t* is regarded as one of the root consonants.[[147]](#footnote-147)

IV) The following additional conjugation forms of the medial *t* verb form occurred in the corpus:

Past: First-person singular: *šitwīt* (one informant) / *štwīt* (two informants) (שִׁוִּ֬יתִי, Ps 16:8).

 Third-person masculine singular: *štədd* (חָ֥רָה, Ps 18:8).

Future: Second-person masculine singular: *tšətwi* (תְּשַׁוֶּ֥ה, Ps 21:6)

 Third-person masculine singular: *yišəthi* / *li-yišthi* (יִכְס֣וֹף, Ps 17:12), *layš* *yistwa* (אֵ֤ין ׀ עֲרֹ֬ךְ, Ps 40:6)

 Third-person plural: *yirtaˁdu* (יִרְגָּ֑זוּ, Ps 18:8)

Imperative: Second-person masculine plural: *əšthāw* (one informant) / *əšthīw* (two informants) (נַשְּׁקוּ, Ps 2:12)

Participle: Masculine singular: *əmšətwi* / *məštwi* (מְשַׁוֶּ֣ה, Ps 18:34)

 Masculine plural: *l-məšthiyy-īn* (הַֽנֶּחֱמָדִ֗ים, Ps 19:11)

[7.9.4] Forms with an Initial *t* and without a Doubled Second Root Letter

I) The repetitive verb form with initial *t* or *tt* is a dialectal form that did not exist in CA. Some scholars[[148]](#footnote-148) suggest that it originates from an archaic form \*taCaCaCa that predated the metathetic CA form \*ˀiCtaCaCa. However, rather than regarding the *t* forms as an ancient remnant revived in the modern dialects, we prefer to see the creation of these forms as an extension of the use of the initial *t* to denote reflexivity. Just as the *kǝttǝb* form has its reflexive-passive counterpart *tkǝttǝb*, and the *kātǝb* form has the counterpart *tkātǝb*, so a reflexive-passive form with an initial *t* developed as a counterpart to Form I.[[149]](#footnote-149)

II) Only six instances of forms beginning with t/tt were found in our corpus from the colloquial language.[[150]](#footnote-150) In five of these, the forms do not have a passive meaning. The small number of examples does not allow us to determine when the prefix of this form is *t* and when it is *tt*.[[151]](#footnote-151)

The following examples occurred in the corpus: *ttaṛmīt* (הָשְׁלַ֣כְתִּי, Ps 22:11), *ttənsīt* (נִ֭שְׁכַּחְתִּי, Ps 31:13), *yittəḥna* (יָשֹׁ֑חַ, Ps 10:10), *yittaṛma* (יוּטָ֑ל, Ps 37:24), *yitḥakmu* (יִתָּֽפְשׂ֓וּ, Ps 10:2), *əttərxəf* (הֶ֣רֶף, Ps 37:8).

[7.10] A Verb Form with Initial *st*

I) The verb form with initial *st* has its origins in the CA Form X إِسْتَفْعَلَ, which is created by adding ست to Form I. Since CA does not allow a syllable to begin with a consonant cluster, a prosthetic *alif* was added to the form ستفعل.[[152]](#footnote-152) The modern dialects allow an initial consonant cluster, and accordingly the conjugation model stəCCəC is possible, with no remnant of the CA *alif*.[[153]](#footnote-153)

II) The *šarḥ* to the Psalms of the Jews of Constantine includes a significant number of instances of the *st* verb form; at this point we cannot gauge the extent to which these forms are extant in the colloquial dialect. We should note, however, that this verb form is in retreat in certain dialects, such as that of Jijli,[[154]](#footnote-154) the Jewish dialect of Tafilalat,[[155]](#footnote-155) and the Sousse dialect.[[156]](#footnote-156) In other dialects, however, it remains a living grammatical category; these included the Jewish dialect of Algiers[[157]](#footnote-157) and the Arba’a[[158]](#footnote-158) dialect.

III) Most of the st- verbs that appeared in the corpus convey a sense of desire and anticipation. This meaning is characteristic of the CA Form X.[[159]](#footnote-159)

IV) The imperative of this verb form includes an initial /ǝ/ that is also evident in the orthography: אצתרג'א (קַוֵּ֗ה, Ps 27:14).[[160]](#footnote-160)

V) Verbs of the different types (three whole root letters, third root letter י, second root letter ו, second root letter ו + third root letter י) that appeared in the st- verb form were conjugated according to the rules described above in our discussions of the other verb forms.

VI) In many cases the initial st- becomes emphatic under the influence when one of the original root letters is emphatic. For example: *ṣṭaṛǧīt-ək* (קִוִּיתִֽיךָ, Ps 25:21). This emphasis is also reflected in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s orthography. In most instances the *t* is written as ת, but when the *s* appears in the vicinity of an emphatic consonant and pronounced *ṣ*, it is almost always written as צ.

VII) A shift st > ss or ṣt > ṣṣ sometimes occurs in the prefix of this verb form; for example: *əṣṣəṛǧa* (קַוֵּ֤ה, Ps 37:34; orthography – אצתרג'א). In some instances the ת is also omitted from the orthography, and we can find various alternating spellings, such as: מצג;רץ' (חָפֵ֘ץ, Ps 5:5), אלמצתג;רץ' (הֶֽ֝חָפֵ֗ץ, Ps 35:27), אלמסג;רץ' (הֶֽחָפֵ֣ץ, Ps 34:13). The different spellings suggests that this phenomenon of assimilation is not universal but sporadic. In most instances, the /t/ is realized in these forms and is not assimilated to the /s/. We should add that in some dialects *ss* forms prevail; for example, this is the regular prefix for this verb form in the dialects of Jijli,[[161]](#footnote-161) Tlemcen,[[162]](#footnote-162) and Arba’a.[[163]](#footnote-163)

VIII) The root ḥ.r.z appeared twice in the corpus in this verb form: ושתחרזתי *u-štaḥrəzt* (וָֽ֝אֶשְׁתַּמֵּ֗ר, Ps 18:24);[[164]](#footnote-164) שתחרז *štaḥrəz* (נִזְהָ֣ר, Ps 19:12). Two of the rabbis pronounced this last example as noted, while the third translated *iššaḥrəz*.[[165]](#footnote-165) Since CJA maintains a clear distinction between /s/ and /š/, the exchange here would not appear to be coincidental. However, it is possible that this word was borrowed from another dialect in which these two phonemes merged into a single one perhaps, for example, the Jewish dialect of Tunis, where the suffix for this verb form is *št*.[[166]](#footnote-166)

IX) In various dialects secondary roots are documented derived from the verb form including the initial *st*.[[167]](#footnote-167) We found an example of this in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms: The root סגם appears frequently.[[168]](#footnote-168)

X) The following conjugation forms of the st- verb form appeared in the corpus:

Past: First-person singular: *ṣtaṛǧīt-ək* (קִוִּיתִֽיךָ, Ps 25:21), *ṣtaṛǧīt* (קִּוִּ֣יתִי, Ps 39:8, 40:2; הוֹחָ֑לְתִּי, Ps 38:16), *ṣtaġṛəḍt* (חָפָ֑צְתִּי, Ps 40:9).

 Second-person masculine singular: *ṣtaġṛəḍt* (ṣtaġṛəḍt, Ps 40:7), *ṣtaġṛəḍti* (חָפַ֣צְתָּ, P 41:12).

 Third-person masculine singular: *u-stġfəṛ* (וַיְכַפֵּ֖ר, Num 25:13).

 Third-person feminine singular: *ṣtaṛǧāt* (חִכְּתָ֣ה, Ps 33:20).

 First-person plural: *ṣtaṛǧīna* (יִחַ֥לְנוּ, Ps 33:22).

Future: First-person singular: *u-nəṣtaṛǧa* (וַֽאֲצַפֶּֽה, Ps 5:4).

 Third-person masculine singular: *yistaḥṛəǧ* (יֶֽאֱנַ֤ף, Ps 2:12), *yiṣtaġṛaḍ* (יֶחְפָּֽץ, Ps 37:23), *lli yiṣṣaġṛəḍ* (הֶֽחָפֵ֣ץ, Ps 34:13), *u-lli yistanqəm* (וּמִתְנַקֵּֽם, Ps 8:3).

 Third-person plural: *yisətḥīw* (יֵבֹ֑שׁוּ, Ps 25:3, 31:18, 35:4), *w-istˁāru* (וְיַחְפְּר֑וּ, Ps 35:4, 26), *u-yistˁāru* (וְיַחְפְּר֨וּ, Ps 40:15), *lli yiṣtaṛǧāw* (קֹ֭וֶיךָ, Ps 25:3).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *əṣtaṛǧa* (קַוֵּ֗ה, Ps 27:12), *əṣṣaṛǧa* (קַוֵּ֤ה, Ps 37:34), *u-ṣtaṛǧa* (וְהִתְח֪וֹלֵֽ֫ל, Ps 37:7), *əṣtaṛǧa* (דּ֤וֹם, Ps 37:7), *əstaḥfəḍ* (“beware!”, *Sefer Ha-Azharot*, I, p. 129) [CHECK: גנאסיה, ד. 1987, כרך א', עמ' 129].

Participle: Masculine singular: *məṣtaġṛəḍ* (חָפֵ֘ץ, Ps 5:5, 22:9, 34:13, 35:27), *u-l-məstanqam* (וּמִתְנַקֵּֽם, Ps 8:3).

 Masculine plural: *mən l-məstaˁmd-īn* (מִזֵּדִ֨ים, Ps 19:14), *məṣtaġṛḍ-īn* (חֲפֵצֵ֪י, Ps 35:27, 40:15), *məṣtaṛǧ-īn-ək* (קֹ֭וֶיךָ, Ps 25:3).

[7.11] Quadrilateral Roots

I) Seven quadrilateral roots were found in the *šarḥ* to the first book of Psalms. These roots are conjugated in the *kəttəb* or *tkəttəb* verb forms, whose template provides space for the “extra” consonant. Thus we find C1VC2C3VC4- and tC1VC2C3VC4-. The conjugation of the *kəttəb* and *tkəttəb* verb forms uses two models as described above.[[169]](#footnote-169) These models are also applicable to the quadrilateral roots. Before a personal suffix beginning with a consonant or ø, the model -(t)C1VC2C3VC4- appears. Before a personal suffix beginning with a vowel, the -(t)C1VC2C3C4- model would be expected. Most of the conjugation forms that appeared in the corpus belonged to the former category and followed the appropriate mode. Only two examples of the second category where found and these were conjugated according to the second model, with the insertion of a vowel between C3 and C4: *yitmasxəṛu* (יַלְעִ֣גוּ, Ps 22:8), *tḥawnəfət* (חָֽנְפָ֖ה, Is 24:5). The insertion of this vowel is probably due to the fact that C3 or C4 are liquid consonants.[[170]](#footnote-170) This insertion of a vowel is a characteristic phenomenon of the liquid consonants,[[171]](#footnote-171) and is also found in the conjugation of the *kəttəb* verb form.[[172]](#footnote-172)

II) Three of the seven quadrilateral roots that appeared in the corpus are derived from nouns that contain more than three consonants: ṣ.l.ṭ.n, š.y.t.n, m.s.x.ṛ. One root was created through the doubling of the original biconsonantal root: ḍ.ġ.ḍ.ġ. The root g.r.g.b was probably created through the doubling of the original biconsonantal root k.r, while the second *r* was replaced by *b* by way of dissimilation.[[173]](#footnote-173) The roots ḥ.w.n.f and f.y.s.x were both created through the extension of the triconsonantal root by means of a semi-vowel.[[174]](#footnote-174)

III) As in other verb forms and types, the short vowels in the conjugation forms of these verbs are also influenced by their consonantal environment. For example: *tḍaġḍaġ-hum* (תְּנַפְּצֵֽם, Ps 2:9).

V) The following conjugation forms of quadrilateral roots appeared in the corpus:

*kəttəb* verb form

Past: First-person singular: *ṣalṭant* (נָסַ֣כְתִּי, Ps 2:6).

 Third-person masculine singular: *šayṭan* (רָגַ֨ל, Ps 15:3).

Future: First-person singular: *nḍaġḍaġ-hum* (אֶ֭מְחָצֵם, Ps 18:39).

 Second-person masculine singular: *tḍaġḍaġ-hum* (תְּנַפְּצֵֽם, Ps 2:9).

 Third-person masculine singular: *igargəb* (גֹּ֣ל, Ps 22:9),[[175]](#footnote-175) i*šayṭən* (רָגַ֨ל, Ps 15:3).

Imperative: Second-person masculine singular: *gərgəb* (גֹּ֣ל, Ps 22:9, 37:5).

Participle: Masculine plural: *mfaysx-īn l-quṛṣ-a* (לַֽעֲגֵ֣י מָע֑וֹג, Ps 35:16).

*tkəttəb* verb form

Past: Third-person feminine singular: *tḥawnəfət* (חָֽנְפָ֖ה, Is 24:5).

Future: Third-person masculine singular: *yitməsxaṛ* (יִלְעַג, Ps 2:4).

 Third-person plural: *yitmasxəṛu* (יַלְעִ֣גוּ, Ps 22:8).

[7.12] The Uses of the Tenses

[7.12.1] The Uses of the Tenses in the Spoken Dialect

The question of the use of the tenses in the colloquial Arabic dialect of the Jews of Constantine deserves extensive study. However, since our study focuses on the language of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, as reflected in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s book and in the pronunciation of the Constantine rabbis, we have not examined this subject in depth. The rabbis’ responses to the questions we addressed to them did not yield sufficient data to define with certainty the use of the tenses in their colloquial dialect. However, it would seem possible to delineate some extremely general outlines.

In this dialect, as in other Maghrebi dialects,[[176]](#footnote-176) the indicative tense system is based on a fundamental contrast between two aspects: perfect and imperfect. The perfect aspect denote an action that was completed at some point in time, while the imperfect denotes an action that has not yet been completed. Accordingly, the perfect (“past”) forms generally denote an action in the past, while the imperfect (“future”) forms denote an action in the present or the future, or continuous or repetitive actions that have not yet been completed.

In order to denote an ongoing action in the present, one of the informants used the ancillary form *qāˁəd* (the active participle of the verb *qˁad*) before the imperfect, declining the participle according to the various persons:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| “he is eating” | - | *qāˁəd yākul* |
| “she is eating” | - | *qāˁd-a tākul* |
| “they (masc.) are eating”  | - | *qāˁd-īn yāklu* |
| “they (fem.) are eating” | - | *qāˁd-īn yāklu* |

It is reasonable to assume that participle forms without prefix denote a perfective sense, as in many Maghrebi dialects.[[177]](#footnote-177) The undeclined ancillary form *qāˁəd* and its abridged form *qa* are used regularly in the Jewish dialect of Tunis in order to imbue imperfect forms with durative value.[[178]](#footnote-178) In the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province, Cantineau documents the following durative present prefixes:[[179]](#footnote-179) ka- (ku-), ta- (tu-), a-. In Jijli, *qˁŏ̤d* is often used as one of the particles denoting the commencement of an action.[[180]](#footnote-180)

The Jews of Constantine express the commanding and imperative mode by means of the imperative forms for the second-person singular and plural, as described above.[[181]](#footnote-181) However, it is possible that in the colloquial language the informants also sometimes use future tense forms to express the imperative, as we heard from them a handful of times in the questionnaire.

[7.12.2] The Reflection of the Hebrew Tense Forms in the Arabic Translation

To complete the discussion of verb forms used in CJA, we will examine how and to what extent the tenses of the Hebrew verbs are reflected in the Arabic translation in the *šarḥ*.

This question combines together three layers that emerged at different points in time. We examine here how contemporaryinformants read a translation reflecting a Judeo-Arabic that *predates* their spoken language of an extremely ancientHebrew source. Each of these layers has its own characteristic tense system. It is interesting to examine how the translator expressed the tenses of the biblical forms, and whether the contemporary informants deviated from his translation. This examination will also allow us to gauge the extent to which the Judeo-Arabic translation is shackled in formal terms to the Hebrew source in the field of verbs. This in addition to its shackling in the field of syntax, which is immediately apparent to the reader.

The point of departure for our review is the Hebrew source; we will consider the ways in which this was translated in Judeo-Arabic:

I) Past Tense[[182]](#footnote-182)

\* – the regular biblical past tense forms (קָטַל) are translated in the *šarḥ* by the regular perfect forms (*ktəb*); for example: כ'רג' (יָ֘צָ֤א, Ps 19:5), עג'ג'ב (הִפְלִ֘יא, Ps 31;22), נהלךּ (נֶעְכָּֽר, Ps 39:3), תכלנא (בָטָֽחְנוּ, Ps 33:21), נאדאו (קָרָֽאוּ, Ps 14:4), תעמרו (מָֽלְא֣וּ, Ps 38:8), קולת (אָמַ֣רְתְּ, Ps 16:2), צ'לאמת (עָֽשְׁשָׁ֖ה, Ps 31:10), לססת (יִסַּ֪דְתָּ֫, Ps 8:3), תבזזעת (נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי֮, Ps 22:15).

\* – the biblical form וַיקטל, usually denoting the past tense, is translated by the perfect together with the conjunctive ו; in other words, the translator correctly understood ויקטל as a past tense form,[[183]](#footnote-183) but did not omit the ו, even when it is no longer required in its conjunctive role, for example at the head of a sentence. Thus וַיֹּאמַ֡ר אֶרְחָֽמְךָ֖ יְהוָ֣ה חִזְקִֽי (Ezek 18:2) was translated וקאל אנחבבךּ יא אללאה קוותי. Similarly, in the Aramaic translation: וַאֲמַר אֲחַבְּבִנָךּ ה' תוקפי. Another example is וָֽאֱהִ֗י כְּ֭אִישׁ... (Ps 38:15), translated as וכונת כיף ראג'ל..., and in the Aramaic: וַהֲוֵיתִי כִּגְבַר.... Additional examples: ופ'תשתו (וָֽ֝אֲבַקְשֵׁ֗הוּ, Ps 37:36), ונעסת (וָֽאִ֫ישָׁ֥נָה, Ps 3:6), ומנעתיהום (וַֽתְּפַלְּטֵֽמוֹ, Ps 22:5), ודוובת (וַתֶּ֣מֶס, Ps 39:12), ונהזזו (וַ֝יִּתְגָּֽעֲשׁ֗וּ, Ps 18:8), וחפ'רו (וַֽיַּחְפְּרֵ֑הוּ, Ps 7:16), ותרפ'ענא (וַנִּתְעוֹדָֽד, Ps 20:9), ודאהשהום (וַיְהֻמֵּֽם, Ps 18:15), וזהא (וַיָּ֣גֶל, Ps 16:9).

\* – as expected, when the conjunctive ו appears before the קטל past tense forms, these are translated by the combination of the Arabic conjunctive ו and the Arabic perfect tense; for example: ותעוונת (וְֽנֶ֫עֱזָ֥רְתִּי, Ps 28:7), ותפ'רקו (וְהִתְפָּֽרְד֗וּ, Ps 22:15), ועפ'סו (וְדָֽרְכ֪וּ, Ps 37:14).

II) Future Tense

\* – regular biblical Hebrew future tense forms (יקטֹל) are translated by the regular Judeo-Arabic imperfect forms (yəktəb); for example: תכ'בביהום (תִּצְפְּנֵ֥ם, Ps 31:21), תואג'ב (תַֽ֝עֲנֶ֗ה, Ps 38:16), נמנע (אֶכְלָ֑א, Ps 40:10), אננאדי (אננאדי, Ps 18:7), יג;מזו (יִקְרְצוּ, Ps 35:19), תחב (בו (Ps 4:3), תקתל (תְּמוֹתֵ֣ת, Ps 34:17), יתכצרו (תִּשָּׁבַֽרְנָה, Ps 37:15), נתקוואו (נַ֭גְבִּיר, Ps 12:5), יתמסכ'ר (יִלְעַג, Ps 2:4).

\* – the biblical וְקָטַל is translated in the *šarḥ* by an Arabic imperfect form accompanied by the conjunctive ו, again even when this is not really necessary; for example: וְֽהָיָ֗ה כְּעֵץ֮... (Ps 1:3) – ויכון כיף סג'רא..., and similarly in the Aramaic: וִיהֵי כאילן.... Examples: ויחבל (וְהָרָ֥ה, Ps 7:15), ויכ'ררג' (וְהוֹצִ֣יא, Ps 37:6), ויצ'ואו (וְנָהָ֑רוּ, Ps 34:6), ונתמתל (וְ֝נִמְשַׁ֗לְתִּי, Ps 28:1), ותסאמח (וְֽסָלַחְתָּ֥, Ps 25:11), ותתפ'אהם (וְהִתְבּוֹנַ֖נְתָּ, Ps 37:10), ויטיח (וְנָפַ֥ל, Ps 10:10), ונתברא (וְ֝נִקֵּ֗יתִי, Ps 19:14).

\* – Hebrew future tense forms accompanied by the conjunctive ו are also translated by Judeo-Arabic imperfect forms accompanied by the conjunctive ו. For example: וילחק (וְיַשֵּׂ֗ג, Ps 7:6), ויכון (וִ֘יהִ֤י, Ps 9:10), ונרמיו (וְנַשְׁלִ֖יכָה, Ps 2:3), וירהבו (וְ֝יַחְרְג֗וּ, Ps 18:46).

\* Hebrew extended future tense forms in the first-person (singular and plural) are translated by regular imperfect forms; for example: נמג'ד (אֲזַמֵּֽרָה, Ps 18:50), נעאווד (אֲסַפְּרָ֣ה, Ps 22:23), נקלעו (נְֽ֭נַתְּקָה, Ps 2:3), נשכרו (נְרַנְּנָ֤ה, Ps 20:6). This point provides a clear illustration of the gap between the ancient Hebrew source and the later Judeo-Arabic translation: the latter no longer has any means of expressing the extended future forms, since the three forms of the future tense had already disappeared in Medieval Judeo-Arabic.[[184]](#footnote-184)

III) Imperative

\* – Hebrew imperative forms, whether regular or extended, are translated by the regular Judeo-Arabic imperative (*əktəb*): אפ'תש (בַּקֵּ֖שׁ, Ps 34:15), ואקפ'ל (וּ֭סְגֹר, Ps 35:3), אסמע (שְׁמַע, Ps 30:11), כון (הֱיֵ֤ה, Ps 31:3), כ'אצם (רִיבָ֣ה, Ps 35:1), וקום (וְ֝ק֗וּמָה, Ps 35:2), אצננת (הַֽאֲזִ֥ינָה, Ps 5:2), באייעו (הִשְׁתַּֽחֲו֥וּ, Ps 29:2), ואתכלו (וּ֝בִטְח֗וּ, Ps 4:6), אתחרכי (נ֝֗וּדִי, Ps 11:1).

\* – the Hebrew negative imperative אל + future tense is expressed in the *šarḥ* by ליש + imperfect tense;[[185]](#footnote-185) for example: ליש יקוא (אַל־יָעֹ֣ז, Ps 9:20), ליש יחכמו פ'ייא (אַֽל־יִמְשְׁלוּ־בִ֣י, Ps 19:14), ליש תתכ'אלט (אַל־תִּ֭תְחַר, Ps 37:7), ליש תג'עלני (אַל־תְּשִׂימֵֽנִי, Ps 39:9), ליש תסכת (אַֽל־תֶּחֱרַ֪שׁ, Ps 28:1).

The phrase בל + future is translated similarly: ליש יפ'תש (בַּל־יִדְרֹ֑שׁ, Ps 10:4), ליש יזיד (בַּל־יוֹסִ֥יף, Ps 10:18), ליש נמיל (בַּל־אֶמּ֑וֹט, Ps 10:6).[[186]](#footnote-186)

IV) Participles

Two methods are used to translate the Hebrew participle forms in the first book of Psalms into Judeo-Arabic. The first is by means of the imperfect, which in Judeo-Arabic also denotes an action taking place in the present. The second method – more common in our corpus – is by means of the Judeo-Arabic participle.[[187]](#footnote-187) A differentiation can be identified between the two means of translation into Judeo-Arabic: when the participle form has a nominal sense (whether as a noun or an adjective), it is translated by the Judeo-Arabic participle.[[188]](#footnote-188) However, when the Hebrew participle has a verbal meaning, it is translated by the Arabic imperfect. If “verbal” participle forms had been translated by means of Arabic participles, the action would have been perceived as perfective.

Arab participle forms are very numerous in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, and their number exceeds that of Arabic imperfect forms used to translate Hebrew participles. This is unsurprising: in the biblical language of the Psalms, the participle is not used to denote a verbal tense,[[189]](#footnote-189) and accordingly most of the participles that appear have a nominal sense.

The following examples illustrate our comments above:

\* – Hebrew participles translated by Judeo-Arabic imperfect forms: יקול (אֹמֵ֥ר, Ps 29:6), יכססר (שֹׁבֵ֣ר, Ps 29:5), יפ'רס (טֹרֵ֥ף, Ps 22:14), ויזהר (וְשֹׁאֵֽג, Ps 22:14), יכ'בבר (מַגִּ֥יד, Ps 19:2), ינג'ג'ר (חֹצֵ֗ב, Ps 29:7), יג'ממע (כֹּנֵ֣ס, Ps 33:7), יכ'ממם (זֹמֵ֣ם, Ps 37:12), יקולו (אֹֽמְרִ֪ים, Ps 3:3, 4:7), תצ'ווי לעינין (מְאִירַ֥ת עֵינָֽיִם, Ps 19:9), תרד ארוח (מְשִׁ֣יבַת נָ֑פֶשׁ, Ps 19:8).

\* – Hebrew participles translated by Judeo-Arabic participles: מדהונו (מְשִׁיח֣וֹ, Ps 28:8), כ'אלקי (צוּרִי֮, Ps 28:1), לעאדל (צַדִּ֥יק, Ps 31:19), לעאלי (עֶ֝לְי֗וֹן, Ps 21:8), מקדדש (קָד֑וֹשׁ, Ps 22:4), מדווב (נָ֝מֵ֗ס, Ps 22:15), מלססק (מֻדְבָּ֣ק, Ps 22:16), מעווג' (עִ֝קֵּ֗שׁ, Ps 18:27), פ'אצ'ל (חָסִ֑יד, Ps 12:2), למכרוה (נָבָ֣ל, Ps 14:1), ומסתנקם (וּמִתְנַקֵּֽם, Ps 8:3), מצ'וור (סְ֭חַרְחַר, Ps 38:11), ומג;בון (וְאֶבְי֑וֹן, Ps 37:14), צאפ'ייא (תְּ֭מִימָה, Ps 19:8), מרפ'עאת (רָמ֣וֹת, Ps 18:28), אצ'אלמין (רְשָׁעִים֮, Ps 37:14), פ'אצ'לינו (חֲסִידָ֑יו, Ps 30:5), לכ'אטיין (חַטָּאִ֣ים, Ps 26:9), and others.

\* – however, there are exceptions to this distinction; for example: יכייס (מַשְׂכִּ֣יל, Ps 41:2), תואתי (נָאוָ֥ה, Ps 33:1).

\* – six Hebrew participles that actually serve as relative clauses were translated by Rabbi Yosef Renassia by means of the combination of the relative pronoun[[190]](#footnote-190) in its abridged form (l)li to the imperfect. These instances are: לי יעטי תסנקימאת (הַנּוֹתֵ֣ן נְקָמ֣וֹת, Ps 18:48), לי יאכל (אוֹכֵ֣ל, Ps 41:10), ולי יטמע (וּבֹצֵ֥עַ, Ps 10:3), אלי יקולו (הָאֹֽמְרִ֥ים, Ps 40:16), ואלי יחב אצ'לם (וְאֹהֵ֣ב חָמָ֑ס, Ps 11:5), מן אלי יכ'טפ'ו (מִגֹּֽזְלֽוֹ, Ps 35:10).

As was his practice, Rabbi Sa’adya Gaon translated these phrases with structures broadly reflecting the Hebrew forms, without deviating from the rules of Fusha Arabic: אלמעטיני אלנקם (Ez 48), ואלאכל מן טעאמי (Ps 41:10), ואד' בארך לה ממא טמע בה... (Ps 10:3), אלקאילין (Ps 40:16), ומחב אט'לם (Ps 11:5), מן גאצבה (Ps 35:10).

The use of (l)li + imperfect would seem to have penetrated CJA from the spoken language.[[191]](#footnote-191) A few instances of this form can be found in the *šarḥ*, when it helps to convey the sense of the Hebrew source more precisely. However, this form is probably extremely common in the spoken language. We form this assumption based on the fact that the rabbi who translates the Psalms directly from the Hebrew source used the form (l)li + imperfect to translate participles in dozens of additional instances; another rabbi did so four times (deviating from the written *šarḥ*);[[192]](#footnote-192) for example: *lli yaˁməl* (עֹֽשֵׂה, Ps 14:1, 3), *lli imši* (הוֹלֵ֣ךְ, Ps 15:2), əldi yaxluq (!) (הַיֹּצֵ֣ר, Ps 33:15), *lli titkəlləm* (מְדַבֶּ֥רֶת, Ps 12:4), *lli yinsāw əḷḷah* (שְׁכֵחֵ֥י אֱלֹהִֽים, Ps 9:18), *u-lli yiṛḍˁu* (וְֽיֹנְקִים֮, Ps 8:3).

V) Infinitive Forms

Our review of the translation of Hebrew infinitive forms will distinguish between declined infinitive forms accompanied by ב (or כ) and enclitic pronouns and infinitives of the type לפעל, which also constitute a declined form with the addition of ל. The distinction relates to the different manner in which these two types of infinitives are translated into Arabic.

The declined forms are translatable by *masdar* forms combined with the corresponding Arabic preposition and the appropriate enclitic pronoun, for example: פ'י הרובו (בְּ֝בָרְח֗וֹ, Ps 3:1), פ'י חריזהום (בְּ֝שָׁמְרָ֗ם, Ps 19:12), פ'י תקריב (בִּקְרֹ֤ב, Ps 27:2), פ'י תהדיני (בְשַׁלְוִ֑י, Ps 30:7), פ'י קטיע (בְּהִכָּרֵ֖ת, Ps 37:34), פ'י תמייל רגלי (בְּמ֥וֹט רַ֝גְלִ֗י, Ps 38:17).

Two infinite forms not accompanied by a particle or pronoun were translated by a third-person masculine singular imperfect form: ליש יקררב אילךּ (בַּ֝֗ל קְרֹ֣ב אֵלֶֽיךָ, Ps 32:9), ליש יסתווא (אֵ֤ין ׀ עֲרֹ֬ךְ, Ps 40:6).

The declined forms מִדַּבֵּ֥ר (Ps 34:14), מֵֽחֲט֪וֹא (Ps 39:2), and מִסַּפֵּֽר (Ps 40:6) were translated respectively by: מן ליתכללם, מן אלי יכ'טי, and מן אלי יעווד. The absolute infinitive form that appeared in the corpus – קַוּ֣‍ֹה קִוִּ֣יתִי (Ps 40:2) – was translated in the šarḥ as צתרג'ייא צתרג'ית.

The Hebrew לפעל forms were translated in the *šarḥ* by ל + third-person masculine singular future. This is a fossilized form, i.e., the future tense component is not conjugated according to the person to whom the action relates. Examples: לירמי (לִיר֥וֹת, Ps 11:2), ליקבבח (לְ֝הָרַ֗ע, Ps 15:4), ליאכל (לֶֽאֱכֹ֪ל, Ps 27:2), ליג;יתני (לְהֽוֹשִׁיעֵֽנִי, Ps 31:3), ליחססן (לְהֵיטִֽיב, Ps 36:4), ליורת (לָרֶ֣שֶׁת, Ps 37:34), ליפ'ניהא (לִסְפּ֫וֹתָ֥הּ, Ps 40:15), לימייל (לִנְט֥וֹת, Ps 17:11).

This form is translated regularly in the šarḥ in this manner, and the rabbis read accordingly. Similarly, when they were asked to say “to go” and so forth in their language, they replied using ל + third-person masculine singular future constructions: *li-yimši*, *li-yəḥrəz*, *li-yākul*, etc.

When discussing the translation of לפעל forms by the construction ל + an Arabic future tense form, the following points are worth noting: لِ denoting purpose, followed by a verb in the *mansūb* is a common feature in CA. Even in CA, however, لِ may sometimes open an object sentence in place of אן, after a verb expressing an order or wish: أَرَدْتُ لِأَفْعَلَ instead of أَرَدْتُ أَنْ أَفْعَلَ (“I wished to do”). This use was created by way of analogy to sentences such as جِئْتُ لِأَفْعَلَ, where the لِ has the sense of “in order to.”[[193]](#footnote-193) In Medieval Judeo-Arabic, this ל may serve in place of אן, and even the *nasb* is no longer apparent, due to the disappearance of the cases in the future.[[194]](#footnote-194) At a later stage the use of ל (in place of אן) + a conjugated verb expanded to other verbs, without distinction regarding the nature of the verb.[[195]](#footnote-195)

Accordingly, this use of ל + a conjugated verb is also present on a limited scale in CA, more widely in Medieval Arabic, and extensively in later translations of Hebrew texts.[[196]](#footnote-196) In addition to the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Constantine, this use is also documented in the šarḥ of the Jews of Tafila let.[[197]](#footnote-197) It is also found in a translation of the Haggadah from Algiers (1855; Hatal 1975). In the Maghrebi translation of the Torah *Or Ne’erav*, mentioned above,[[198]](#footnote-198) the Hebrew form לפעל is translated by ל + a conjugated verb in the future tense consistent with the person of the subject, a practice that strengthens the association of this translation tool with the CA structure ל + verb in the future, for example: לָג֣וּר בָּאָרֶץ֮ בָּאנוּ֒ (Gn 47:4) – לנסכון פ'י אל ארץ' ג'ינא.[[199]](#footnote-199) Yissachar Ben-Susan adopts a similar approach in his translation of the Torah.[[200]](#footnote-200) לפעול forms that appear in the Passover Haggadah of Baghdad[[201]](#footnote-201) are also translated according to the person of the subject.

The above review shows that this use of ל + a future form is common in the translations of Hebrew sources into various Judeo-Arabic dialects. I believe that this practice is not coincidental and that several contributory factors combined to encourage its adoption and expansion: the use of ל in place of אן as early as CA (to a limited degree) and Medieval Arabic (to a large extent); the influence of the Hebrew form beginning with ל; and the declining use of infinitive forms in many modern Arabic dialects.[[202]](#footnote-202)

The thrust of my comments is that translators may have used ל as a translation of the ל in the Hebrew source without consciously drawing on the use of ל in place of אן. Given their familiarity with Arabic forms including a prefixed ל, this practice would not have struck them as out of place.[[203]](#footnote-203) They found a conjugated verb form with the prefix ל to be a suitable tool for translating the Hebrew לפעל infinitive.

In conclusion, this method of translating the Hebrew infinitive לפעל is not unique to Rabbi Yosef Renassia and his students: it is an accepted method for rendering this Hebrew form in both Maghrebi and Mashriqi translations.

It is worth noting that the translation of לפעל by means of ל + a third-person masculine singular future tense (or any other person) in the later translations does not reflect the influence of Rabbi Sa’adya Gaon. The reason for this is that Gaon employed various constructions to translate this form, and these are essentially analogous to the forms used in CA. However, the translation of לאמר as קאילא in various traditions[[204]](#footnote-204) probably reflects the influence of Sa’adya Gaon’s translation.

The Constantine rabbi who translates directly from the Hebrew translated the form לפעל several times by use of the particle bāš + a future form, in most instances consistent with the person of the subject. For example: *bāš tiqṭaˁ* (לְהַשְׁבִּ֥ית, Ps 8:3), *bāš yixṭuf* (לַֽחֲט֣וֹף, Ps 10:9), *bāš taḥkəm* (לִשְׁפֹּ֥ט, Ps 10:18), *bāš yinḍaṛ* (לִ֭רְאוֹת, Ps 14:2), *bāš yiqˁud* (לָשֶׁ֥בֶת, Is 47:14).

In all these instances, the לפעל form expresses a purpose. In Ps 10:18, for example, the rabbi translated the first form with *bāš* and the second with *li*, since only the former instance expresses a purpose – לִשְׁפֹּ֥ט יָת֗וֹם וָ֫דָ֥ךְ בַּל־יוֹסִ֥יף ע֑וֹד לַֽעֲרֹ֥ץ אֱ֝נ֗וֹשׁ מִן־הָאָֽרֶץ: לשפט – *bāš taḥkəm*, but לערץ – *li-yqəllaˁ*.

The use of the particle *bāš* to denote purpose is characteristic of the colloquial language,[[205]](#footnote-205) from where it penetrated this rabbi’s translation in several instances.[[206]](#footnote-206) It is important to note, however, that in most of the occurrences of the לפעל form, this rabbi also translated the form with ל. The particle באש did not penetrate the printed šarḥ to the first book of Psalms. Conversely, it is appears frequently in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s commentary on the Psalms;[[207]](#footnote-207) for example: חין ג'אבו באש יווררילו מנין יג'יב אשָמִיר (p. 71, commentary on Psalm 21).

VI) The description thus far of the translation of the various Hebrew forms has been presented from the standpoint of the Hebrew. We will now summarize briefly from the standpoint of the Arabic forms which Hebrew forms they translate:

\* – the perfect form *ktəb* translates קטל and וַיקטל forms denoting the past tense.

\* – the imperfect form *yəktəb* translates יקטל and וְקטל forms denoting the future tense, participles with verbal force, and – when combined with *li* – the לקטל form.

\* – the *masdar* gerund translates Hebrew declined infinitive forms (with the preposition ב).

\* – *ektəb* imperatives translate Hebrew imperative forms.

\* – Arabic participles translate Hebrew participles with nominal force.

In conclusion, the Judeo-Arabic forms used to translate Hebrew verbs seem to reflect faithfully the tense of the latter. Verb forms accompanied by the vav consecutive are translated according to the aspect they denote, rather than by their form (although, as noted, the ו is always retained). The translation also applies a distinction between participles expressing nominal meaning and those with verbal force. Accordingly, the translation is tied to the Hebrew source in terms of the meaning of the verbs, rather than their formal structure (with the exception of לפעל forms).

**Chapter Eight: Pronouns**

[8.1] Independent Personal Pronouns

The following independent personal pronouns appeared in the šarḥ to the first book of Psalms:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  Singular |  |  Plural |
| First-person | *(ˀ)ana* |  |  | *(u-)ḥna* |
| Second-person masculine | *ənta* |  |  | - |
| Second-person feminine | - |  |  | - |
| Third-person masculine |  *huwa (huwwa)* |  |  | *hummān* |
| Third-person feminine | *hiyya* |  |  | - |

The independent personal pronouns used in the spoken language are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Singular |  | Plural |
| 1S | *(ˀ)ana* |  | 1P | *ḥna* |
| 2MS2Fs | *ənti* |  | 2MP2FP | *əntūma(n)* |
|  |
| 3MS | *huwa* *(huwwa)* |  | 3MP3FP | *hummā(n)* |
| 3FS | *hiyya* |  |  |

I) First-Person Singular Pronoun

The independent first-person singular pronoun is *(ˀ)ana* (אנא).[[208]](#footnote-208) The glottal plosive is occasionally realized, but not when the conjunctive ו is added to the pronoun: *w-ana*. The first vowel is often pronounced as long.[[209]](#footnote-209) This form of the independent first-person singular pronoun is found in almost all the Maghrebi dialects.[[210]](#footnote-210)

II) Second-Person Singular Pronouns (Masculine and Feminine)

The *šarḥ* to the first 41 Psalms only incudes the second-person masculine singular pronoun.[[211]](#footnote-211) There is not a single occurrence of the second-person feminine singular pronoun in the entire book of Psalms.

The Hebrew pronoun אתה is invariably translated in the *šarḥ* by אנתא. The rabbis also translate this form as *ənta* when reading from the printed *šarḥ* and when translating freely.[[212]](#footnote-212) The rabbi who reads from the Hebrew source, and whose translation often reflects dialectal influences not documented in the printed *šarḥ*, also translated this pronoun as *ənta*.[[213]](#footnote-213) When the conjunctive ו appears before this form, the initial vowel is omitted and the form is pronounced *u-nta* (e.g.: וְאַתָּ֥ה, Ps 22:4). However, the א is not omitted in the orthography: ואנתא.

Since the second-person feminine singular pronoun did not appear in the šarḥ, we cannot ascertain whether a single form (אנתא) is used for both genders or whether two forms exist.[[214]](#footnote-214) In the spoken language, the masculine and feminine forms merged as *ənti*; in other words, at some stage the feminine form also began to be used for the masculine. We should note in this context that one of the rabbis commented on the form אנתא in the *šarḥ*: “The Ishmaelite in Constantine makes a distinction, adding x̣י for a woman,” thereby reporting a distinction between the masculine and feminine forms of the second-person singular pronoun among the Muslims, in contrast to the unified form used by the Jews (a phenomenon also seen in the conjugation of the verb).[[215]](#footnote-215) A similar situation is described for the city of Bône to the northeast of Constantine, whose Jews use *ənti* for both genders, while the Muslims of the city maintain a distinction between the two genders in the second-person singular pronoun.[[216]](#footnote-216)

The pronoun אנתי is documented in various texts written by Rabbi Yosef Renassia whose language has a more dialectal character than that of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms.[[217]](#footnote-217) We found it, for example, in his translation of the exegeses of the traditional commentators on the Psalms, as well as in his own commentary on the book, Zikhron Yaacov, which accompanies each chapter in the text we examine here. By way of example, Psalm 16:5 – אַ֝תָּ֗ה תּוֹמִ֥יךְ גּֽוֹרָלִֽי – is translated in the *šarḥ* as אנתא מאסךּ קרעתי. Rabbi Yosef Renassia translates Rashi’s commentary on this verb into dialectal Arabic: תומיך גורלי. אנתי יא הקב"ה אלי מסכתילי יד... (p. 53), and in his commentary on this verse he writes: אנתי נסממיךּ ה' עלא כ'אטר אנתי אדון עולם (ibid., p. 55).

Rabbi Yosef Renassia also uses the form אנתי in his commentary on the “Song of Songs,”[[218]](#footnote-218) and this form of the second-person masculine singular pronoun also appears in his Judeo-Arabic translation of the Passover Haggadah, *Zeved Tov*.[[219]](#footnote-219) However, in his translation of Rashi’s commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy, he uses the form אנתא.

The elimination of the distinction between the masculine and feminine in the second-person singular pronoun is also found in various Maghrebi dialects in general, and in the spoken dialects in the surroundings of Constantine, in particular. Cantineau states that a single form is used for both genders in the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Province; this may be the masculine form (*önta*) or the feminine (*önti*).[[220]](#footnote-220) The form *ənti* is used for both genders in all the sedentary dialects and in some of the transitional sedentary dialects in the Philippeville district, to the north of Constantine.[[221]](#footnote-221) Conversely, in the Edough area to the northeast of Constantine, the form *entya* is used for both genders.[[222]](#footnote-222)

The form *ənti* for both genders is also used in the Jewish dialect of Tunis, the Muslim dialect of the same city, and the Jewish dialect of Algiers, although in the latter two cases an additional form is also found.[[223]](#footnote-223) The absence of a distinction between the genders in the second-person singular pronoun is also found in other sedentary dialects in the Algiers area,[[224]](#footnote-224) in the Jewish dialects of Tlemcen and Oron,[[225]](#footnote-225) and in Sousse.[[226]](#footnote-226) By contrast, various Algerian and Tunisian nomadic dialects maintain a distinction between the masculine and feminine second-person singular pronouns. This is the case, for example, in the Es-type nomadic dialects of the Constantine Province,[[227]](#footnote-227) the dialect of Ouled Brahim,[[228]](#footnote-228) and the Arba’a dialect.[[229]](#footnote-229)

III) Third-Person Singular Personal Pronoun (Masculine and Feminine)

The third-person masculine singular pronoun is *huwa* or *huwwa* (הווא).[[230]](#footnote-230) The doubling of the /w/ is sometimes extremely audible and in other instances not realized. The doubling is evident in the third-person feminine singular pronoun *hiyya* (הייא).[[231]](#footnote-231) The initial /h/ is clearly maintained, in some cases even when it is preceded by the conjunctive ו and hence suspended between two vowels: *u-huw(w)a*.

IV) First-Person Plural Pronoun

This pronoun appeared only twice in the corpus, in both instances together with the conjunctive ו: *u-ḥna* (וַֽאֲנַ֓חְנוּ, Ps 20:8, 9).[[232]](#footnote-232) The orthography וחנא reflects the pronunciation of the pronoun without the initial vowel.[[233]](#footnote-233) The questionnaire suggests that the first-person plural pronoun is also *ḥna* in the spoken language. The form *ḥna* is used in other Algerian dialects,[[234]](#footnote-234) including the Jewish dialect of Algiers,[[235]](#footnote-235) the dialects of Jijli,[[236]](#footnote-236) Bou Sa’adeh,[[237]](#footnote-237) and Tlemcen,[[238]](#footnote-238) and the Arba’a[[239]](#footnote-239) dialect.

V) Second-Person Plural Pronouns (Masculine and Feminine)

As in the case of the conjugation of verbs,[[240]](#footnote-240) the distinction between the masculine and feminine has also been lost in the personal pronouns. The first book of Psalms did not include any instances of the second-person plural pronoun, but the form אנתום appeared in Ps 82, 6; 115: 15. Rabbi Yosef Renassia also used this form in the šarḥ on the Passover Hagadah, *Zeved Tov* and in his translation of Rashi’s exegesis on Deuteronomy; it also appears in his trilingual dictionary (anthoume, p. 470). According to the informant who was born in Ein Beida, the forms *əntūma* or *əntūm* are used for the second-person plural pronoun.[[241]](#footnote-241) However, the testimony of the remaining two male informants and the female informant suggests that the forms *əntūman* or *əntūma* are the commonest in the colloquial language.[[242]](#footnote-242)

Once again, it would seem that we must distinguish between the form used in the *šarḥ* (אנתום) and that used in the spoken language – *əntūma(n)* (אנתומאן).[[243]](#footnote-243)

In contrast to the second-person masculine singular pronoun *ənta* (or *ənti* in the colloquial), where the initial vowel is short, the vowel in the plural pronoun is reduced, and in some instances is completely inaudible. The [ū] is long and its syllable is stressed,

A similar form including *n* is also found in the Jewish dialect of Tunis.[[244]](#footnote-244) Forms with and without *n* coexist in the Jewish dialect of Algiers[[245]](#footnote-245) and in Tlemcen.[[246]](#footnote-246) A single form without *n* is found in the dialects of Jijli,[[247]](#footnote-247) Ouled Brahim,[[248]](#footnote-248) and Sousse.[[249]](#footnote-249)

VI) Third-Person Plural Pronouns (Masculine and Feminine)

The corpus includes several occurrences of the independent third-person plural pronoun הומאן,[[250]](#footnote-250) which the rabbis pronounce *hummān*, usually with a doubled *m*, and with a range of variants for the vowel [u].[[251]](#footnote-251) When reading the *šarḥ*, the rabbis always pronounced forms with *n*. In their spoken language they use the form *hummā(n)*, with or without *n*, for both the masculine and feminine third-person plural pronouns.

The feminine third-person plural did not appear in the corpus, and accordingly we cannot determine whether a single form was already in use in the *šarḥ* or whether a distinction still pertained.

A third-person plural pronoun with *n* is found in the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[252]](#footnote-252) and Algiers.[[253]](#footnote-253) In the Tlemcen dialect, as among the Jews of Constantine, forms both with and without *n* are in use.[[254]](#footnote-254) Forms without *n* are used in the Jijli,[[255]](#footnote-255) Ouled Brahim,[[256]](#footnote-256) and Arba’a[[257]](#footnote-257) dialects, among others.

In conclusion, the system of independent personal pronouns reflects the typical forms found in the Constantine area and does not show any unusual features. An interesting difference can be seen between the second-person singular pronoun used in the *šarḥ* and that used in the colloquial language, and the same is probably true of the second-person plural. In the current context we cannot comment on the typical uses of the independent personal pronouns, since in the *šarḥ* these are not used freely but rather according to the Hebrew source.
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2. Cohen, D. 1975, pp. 58-59, 116. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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11. See also the examples below. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. One of the informants translated the Hebrew root זמר by the Arabic verb *ġnna*. In the *šarḥ* the root מג'ד is used in this sense. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
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131. The *šarḥ* of the Jews of Constantine also includes numerous instances of Form VIII verbs, though there are virtually no traces of this verb form in their colloquial language. See: Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
132. *u-nhazzət* (וַתִּגְעַ֬שׁ, Ps 18:8), *nǧəmˁu* (רָֽגְשׁ֣וּ, Ps 2:1). [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
133. See Section [3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
134. In CA, roots that begin with /w/ do not have a Form VII (the same is true of roots that begin with l, r, y, ˀ, n); see: Wright 1981, I, pp. 65-66. [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
135. See Section [2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-135)
136. An alternative explanation for the emergence of this form could be the addition of a prefix *n* (rather than *nǝ*) to *uğǝd*, maintaining the preservation of the vocal realization of the /w/ between two consonants. We find this explanation less plausible since it assumes a distinct prefix (without a vowel) appearing for no identifiable reason. [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
137. Cohen 1912, p. 220. [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
138. Ibid.. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
139. In these examples it would seem that the /ˁ/ may influence the location of the short vowel: naˁṛəf > nˁaṛəf. [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
140. See previous note. [↑](#footnote-ref-140)
141. Wright 1981, I, pp. 41-42. [↑](#footnote-ref-141)
142. See Section [7.9.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-142)
143. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, too, there are no known instances of this verb form for roots with three whole letters: Cohen 1975, p. 126. In Jijli only a single root with three whole root letters is known to appear in this verb form (ž.m.ˁ). See: Marçais, 1956, p. 196. [↑](#footnote-ref-143)
144. Cohen 1975, p. 126. [↑](#footnote-ref-144)
145. Marçais 1956, p. 196 Cf. the form *dzǟd* in Algeria: Cohen, M. 1912, p. 227, and the form *zzä̂d* in Tlemcen: Marçais, W. 1902, p. 82. [↑](#footnote-ref-145)
146. In various Moroccan dialects, too, Jews and Muslims use different words to convey the sense “to be born.” להוסיף הפנייה. [↑](#footnote-ref-146)
147. Cf. Cohen 1975, p. 125 & f.n. 43-44; Marçais 1956, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-147)
148. Cf. Cohen 1975, p. 125 & f.n. 43-44; Marçais 1956, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-148)
149. See previous note. [↑](#footnote-ref-149)
150. See section [7.9.1] for a discussion of the presence of this form by comparison to the *nǝktǝb* form and the form with medial *t*. [↑](#footnote-ref-150)
151. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, for example, *t* and *tt*: Cohen 1975, p. 124. In the Jijli dialect the prefix *tt* is used, while the personal suffix added to the base begins with a consonant or ø; initial *t* appears when the personal suffix added to the base begins with a vowel. See: Marçais 1956, pp. 193-194. In some dialects, only *t* is used as a prefix (e.g. the Arba’a dialect) or only *tt* isi used (e.g. the Jewish dialect of Algiers).  [↑](#footnote-ref-151)
152. Wright 1981, I, p. 26, §26, p. 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-152)
153. The informant who frequently adds epenthetic vowels also pronounces a reduced vowel here before the *st*. However, this has no connection to the CA prosthetic *alif*. [↑](#footnote-ref-153)
154. Marçais 1956, p. 199. [↑](#footnote-ref-154)
155. Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 63. [↑](#footnote-ref-155)
156. In Sousse the *st* form is used by women and elderly men, while young men use other forms of expression. Talmoudi 1980, p. 108. The same is true of the Baghdadi dialects: Blanc 1964a, p. 115. [↑](#footnote-ref-156)
157. Cohen 1912, p. 235. [↑](#footnote-ref-157)
158. Dhina 1938, p. 330. [↑](#footnote-ref-158)
159. Wright 1981, I, pp. 44-45. [↑](#footnote-ref-159)
160. See Sections [7.2.1.3] and [7.7] regarding /ǝ/ as the vowel of the imperative. [↑](#footnote-ref-160)
161. Marçais 1956, p. 197. [↑](#footnote-ref-161)
162. Marçais 1902, p. 83. [↑](#footnote-ref-162)
163. Dhina 1938, p. 330. [↑](#footnote-ref-163)
164. Two of the informants read this pronunciation, while the third translated: *u-naḥrəz ṛūḥi*. [↑](#footnote-ref-164)
165. This form may reflect a shift št > šš, by way of analogy to forms showing the shift st > ss. As we have already noted, however, this shift is not particularly common in our informants’ pronunciation. [↑](#footnote-ref-165)
166. Cohen 1975, p. 130. [↑](#footnote-ref-166)
167. For example, the Jewish dialect of Algiers: Cohen 1912, p. 235, and the Jijli dialect: Marçais 1956, p. 199. [↑](#footnote-ref-167)
168. See Section [7.3.9]. [↑](#footnote-ref-168)
169. See Section [7.3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-169)
170. This phenomenon is also documented in the Jewish dialect of Tunis. See: Cohen, D. 1975, p. 110. Cf. Marçais 1956, p. 202. [↑](#footnote-ref-170)
171. See Section [3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-171)
172. See Section [7.3.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-172)
173. See Section [2.2.8] regarding the [g] realization of /k/ in this root. [↑](#footnote-ref-173)
174. These forms of creation of quadrilateral roots are familiar from CA. See: Wright 1981, I, pp. 47-49. [↑](#footnote-ref-174)
175. One of the rabbis translated these imperative and past tense forms as future forms. [↑](#footnote-ref-175)
176. Cf. Cohen 1975, pp. 132-135; Cohen 1912, pp. 257-259; Marçais 1956, pp. 146-150; Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, pp. 64-65. [↑](#footnote-ref-176)
177. As I was informed by M. Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-177)
178. Cohen 1975, pp. 136-137. [↑](#footnote-ref-178)
179. Cantineau 1938, p. 854. [↑](#footnote-ref-179)
180. The particle *qˁöd* is declined for the different persons according to the subsequent verb form: Marçais 1956, pp. 153-154. Cf. the use of קעד as an ancillary verb in Medieval Arabic: Blau 1961, p. 99, §138. [↑](#footnote-ref-180)
181. See Section [7.2.1.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-181)
182. For convenience’s sake we use here the nomenclature of “past” and “future” tense, despite the well-known reservations concerning the use of such terms in describing the biblical verb system. Conversely, we will use the nomenclature of “perfect” and “imperfect’ for the Judeo-Arabic verbs. [↑](#footnote-ref-182)
183. Naturally, had he translated these forms by *u-yəktəb*, they would have merged with the regular imperfect forms appearing together with the conjunctive ו, thereby obscuring the expression of aspect. [↑](#footnote-ref-183)
184. Blau 1980a, p. 125, §175. [↑](#footnote-ref-184)
185. See section [10.1] regarding the uses of the particle ליש. [↑](#footnote-ref-185)
186. The phrase בל מנעת (בַּל־מָנַ֥עְתָּ, Ps 21:3) is similarly translated ליש מנעת. [↑](#footnote-ref-186)
187. The active or passive participle in Form I. The distinction between the two is no longer maintained in the derived verb forms: see Section [7.3.2.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-187)
188. This differentiation is also apparent in the form of the enclitic pronoun for the first-person singular added to the participle when this expresses a nominal sense or a verbal sense (not translated by a *yəktəb* form): see section [8.2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-188)
189. Blau 1971, p. 112. [↑](#footnote-ref-189)
190. See Section [8.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-190)
191. This usage appears frequently in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s commentary on the Psalms, *Zikhron Yaacov*. See Chapter 12 for a comparison of the language of the commentary to that of the šarḥ. [↑](#footnote-ref-191)
192. The third rabbi followed his usual practice of reading the printed text of the *šarḥ* precisely, and accordingly only used *lli* in those instances when this was the translation chosen by Rabbi Yosef Renassia. [↑](#footnote-ref-192)
193. Brafman 1942, pp. 171-172. Blau 1961, p. 105, §164. [↑](#footnote-ref-193)
194. Blau 1980a, p. 125, §175. [↑](#footnote-ref-194)
195. Blau 1980a, p. 226, §346b; Brafman 1942, pp. 171-172. Despite the differences, it is possible that the development of this use may be compared to the extension of the use of ל with the infinitive in Hebrew and Aramaic. See Blau, ibid., p. 225, fn. 25. See also: Bendavid 1971, Chapter 39, pp. 493-502. [↑](#footnote-ref-195)
196. This use is also found in the Yemenite Habshush dialect; Brafman, ibid., ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-196)
197. I was informed of this by Bar-Asher. See: Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 5. §14. [↑](#footnote-ref-197)
198. See p. 122. [↑](#footnote-ref-198)
199. In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s *Sefer Ha-Azharot*, republished by his son Rabbi Daneil Renassia (Renassia 1987, I:129), we found an example of the adjustment of the future form to conform to the person of the subject: ובעמדך להתפלל – ופ'י וקופ'ך לתצללי. [↑](#footnote-ref-199)
200. Doron 1980, pp. 317-319. [↑](#footnote-ref-200)
201. Baghdad Haggadah 1865. Cf. Blanc 1964b, p. 24, fn. 19. [↑](#footnote-ref-201)
202. Blau 1981, p. 235 (add to p. 105, 12 ff.) [↑](#footnote-ref-202)
203. Bar-Asher notes that translations of לאמר by such forms as קאילן or ליקול appear strange to new student beginning to learn the *šarḥ* (1988a, p. 5). It may be assumed that they will find the latter of these models less alien for the reasons reviewed above. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that the translation were aware of the high register status of the language of the *šarḥ*, and felt that the form ליקול was more appropriate as a representative of the Hebrew form. [↑](#footnote-ref-203)
204. See Section [3.6]. [↑](#footnote-ref-204)
205. In this use and other uses, the particle *bāš* is typical of Magrebi and Spanish-Arabic dialects. See: Cohen 1975, pp. 237, 258; Cohen 1912, p. 347; Marçais and Guîga 1958-61, I, pp. 213-224; Marçais 1902, p. 191; Brunot 1950a, p. 243; Corriente 1977, p. 135 & n. 229. [↑](#footnote-ref-205)
206. The particle באש with the meaning "in order to" is also odcumented in Rabbi Yosef Renassia's dictionary (p. 351): *bache*. [↑](#footnote-ref-206)
207. See Chapter 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-207)
208. This pronoun appears in a various places in the corpus, for example: Ps 2:7, 3:6, 6:3, 16:4, 6, 15; 22:7, and elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-208)
209. According to our orthographic system, we do not add a long vowel marking on vowels that are perceived as long due to the omission of the *hamzah* or the realization of [u] as /w/, even if these have a full-fledged long pronunciation. See section [3.2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-209)
210. Cohen 1975, p. 210. [↑](#footnote-ref-210)
211. This pronoun appeared in various places in the corpus, such as: Ps 2:7, 3:4, 5:5, 16:2, and elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-211)
212. In a few instances, the glottal fricative at the head of this word is realized: *ˀenta*. [↑](#footnote-ref-212)
213. Although in some instances he translated the pronoun as *ənti* (Ps 18:28). [↑](#footnote-ref-213)
214. The *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalet maintains a distinction between the second-person masculine singular pronoun אנתי and its feminine counterpart, ending in -n: אנתין. I learned this from Bar-Asher. Their colloquial dialect uses the form *nti* for both masculine and feminine. Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 58. [↑](#footnote-ref-214)
215. A similar distinction is found between the Jewish and Muslim dialects in the city of Bône; see below. [↑](#footnote-ref-215)
216. Mangion 1937, pp. 374-375. [↑](#footnote-ref-216)
217. See Chapter Eleven. [↑](#footnote-ref-217)
218. For example: צְר֨וֹר הַמֹּ֤ר ׀ דּוֹדִי֙ (Sg 1:13) – אתה אלהי דודי ורעי חסדיך גדלו על מעשי – אנתי הקדוש ברוך הוא חביבי ראהום כ'יראתךּ ג;טטאו אפ'עלי... (*Shir Ben David*, p. 8 [Renassia, Y. 1953, p. 8]). [↑](#footnote-ref-218)
219. In the *piyyut* of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai published by Rabbi Daniel Renassia (Jerba, 1956), the form is pointed אֶנְתִּי and transliterated *enthi* (p. 9) [Renassia, D. 1956, p. 9]. [↑](#footnote-ref-219)
220. Cantineau 1938, pp. 853-854. [↑](#footnote-ref-220)
221. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 74. We should note in this context that the addition of the morpheme -ya to pronouns is a common practice in various Algerian dialects (such as the Arba’a and Ouled Brahim dialects, see note 9-8 below). We did not find any documentation of this practice in the Jewish dialect of Constantine. [↑](#footnote-ref-221)
222. Mangion 1937, pp. 374-375. [↑](#footnote-ref-222)
223. Cohen1975, p. 211. D. Cohen suggests various explanations for the dominance of the present form (1970b, p. 151; see also Cohen 1912, p. 336. [↑](#footnote-ref-223)
224. Millon 1937, p. 347. [↑](#footnote-ref-224)
225. Cantineau 1940, p. 224. [↑](#footnote-ref-225)
226. Talmoudi 1980, p. 143. [↑](#footnote-ref-226)
227. Cantineau 1938, pp. 853-854. [↑](#footnote-ref-227)
228. Marçais 1908, p. 149. [↑](#footnote-ref-228)
229. Dhina 1938, p. 319. [↑](#footnote-ref-229)
230. This pronoun appears in various places in the corpus, such as: Ps9:9, 18:31, 19:6, 25:11, 28:8. [↑](#footnote-ref-230)
231. This pronoun appears twice in the corpus: Ps 39:5, 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-231)
232. When attached to this form, the realization of the conjunctive ו was: *wa-ḥna*. Regarding the [w] realization of the conjunctive ו alongside the consonants ḥ/ˁ, see section [2.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-232)
233. Outside the corpus, in Ps 100:3: חנא, but in Ps 103:14: אחנא. In the Passover Haggadah *Zeved Tov*, the form אחנאן is used. [↑](#footnote-ref-233)
234. In various Tunisian dialects, a form with an initial vowel (*əḥna*) is used; see for example: Talmoudi 1980, p. 143; Cohen, D. 1975, p. 211. [↑](#footnote-ref-234)
235. M. Cohen explains the omission of the initial *n* in the first-person plural pronoun as an instance of dissimilation, and suggests that the final *a* appeared by way of analogy to the enclitic first-person plural pronoun -na and the independent first-person singular pronoun *ana* (1912, p. 336). [↑](#footnote-ref-235)
236. Marçais 1956, p. 435. [↑](#footnote-ref-236)
237. In this dialect, spoken to the southwest of Constantine, *ḥna* serves alongside the principal form *ḥnuma*, which was created by way of analogy to the second and third-person plural pronouns: see Marçais 1947, p. 55. [↑](#footnote-ref-237)
238. Marçais 1902, p. 120. [↑](#footnote-ref-238)
239. Although the form *ḥnaya* is also found. Dhina 1938, p. 319. [↑](#footnote-ref-239)
240. See Section [7.3.2.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-240)
241. These two forms are documented, for example, in the Arba’a dialect. Dhina 1938, p. 319. [↑](#footnote-ref-241)
242. M. Cohen quotes all the above-mentioned forms as second-person plural pronouns use in the Jewish dialect of Algiers, alongside other variants (1912, p. 336). [↑](#footnote-ref-242)
243. One of the rabbis wrote the form down for me using this spelling. [↑](#footnote-ref-243)
244. However, the form used in Tunis differs from that used by the Jews of Constantine in the stress and length of the vowels. See: Cohen, D. 1975, pp. 210, 212. [↑](#footnote-ref-244)
245. The form without *n* is far more common: Cohen, D., ibid., ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-245)
246. W. Marçais provides no fewer than six alternative forms for this pronoun. [↑](#footnote-ref-246)
247. Marçais 1956, p. 435. [↑](#footnote-ref-247)
248. Marçais 1908, p. 149. [↑](#footnote-ref-248)
249. Talmoudi 1980, p. 143. [↑](#footnote-ref-249)
250. This pronoun appeared in various places in the corpus, such as: Ps 9:7, 21; 22:18; 38:11, and elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-250)
251. When this form is pronounced with the stress on the first syllable, the [u] is lengthened. [↑](#footnote-ref-251)
252. Cohen 1975, pp. 210, 211. [↑](#footnote-ref-252)
253. Cohen 1912, p. 336. [↑](#footnote-ref-253)
254. Marçais 1902, p. 120. [↑](#footnote-ref-254)
255. Alongside the form *hum*, see: Marçais 1956, p. 435. [↑](#footnote-ref-255)
256. Marçais 1908, p. 149. [↑](#footnote-ref-256)
257. Dhina 1938, p. 319. [↑](#footnote-ref-257)