

## **Evidentiality in Traditional Negev Arabic Narrative: Morphological, Lexical, and Discourse-Syntactic Strategies**

### **Abstract**

Evidentiality as a linguistic category marks the source of information transmitted, from the speaker's point of view, as non-witnessed or surprising. It may be encoded in grammatical, lexical, syntactic and discourse means. Grammatical evidentiality has been recognized as a highly diffusible Balkan Sprachbund feature (**Joseph 2003 §3; Aikhenvald 2006 9.2.1**).

Surprisingly, a morphological evidential strategy was also established over 24 years ago in the Bedouin dialects spoken in the Negev, where the perfective-resultative active participle is often clearly evidential (**Henkin 1992**). Since the area has never been in substantial contact with the evidential Sprachbund (notwithstanding Ottoman rule) a contact origin is hard to surmise unless intermediate areas can be shown to have it too. The only other Arabic dialects where it has since been documented (Procházka 2002; **2006; Procházka & Batan 2016**) are clearly within the Turkish influence zone.

A resultative participle is indeed a natural candidate for morphological evidentiality (**Aikhenvald 2006 4.2**), but the close connection between resultativity and evidentiality makes it difficult to distinguish between the two categories. This closeness is a potential motivation for additional marking in Traditional Negev Arabic of evidentiality with other lexical and discourse-syntactic means in the context. I will show interrelations between these alternative means in traditional oral narrative. It is characterized by the lexical evidential particles *itrā(t)*, *itrīt*, *tarīt*, *atāriy* 'apparently'; discourse-syntactic markers of evidentiality in this genre include presentative structures of both conversational and narrative discourse types, combining the visual evidential (seeing the evidence in front of one's eyes and deducing the events that led to it) with the mirative element of surprise.

As multiple elements of evidentiality cluster together to mark evidential environments, the result is saturated environments (**Weizman 1997**) which may differ in their specific components across genres, text types and dialects, but share the principle of marking evidentiality through saturation of lexical, morphological and syntactic discourses strategies. Finally, I show similar clustering patterns of evidential strategies in other Bedouin and sedentary dialects of the area, with or without potential contact with the Balkan Sprachbund.

### **1. Evidentiality: Lexical, Grammatical, Functional**

The cross-linguistic category *evidentiality* is generally defined as marking the information transmitted as secondhand knowledge, accessed by various means, such as seeing results and inferring causes or hearing about events. The various terms for the category and its subcategories across languages reflect these different sources and their relative salience: visual, inferential, quotative, reportative, hearsay, assumed, presumptive, among others. A less studied but major factor of mirativity, surprise, may override the source of information and cause use of the evidential category for events that are personally witnessed, but by an 'unprepared mind' (**Slobin & Aksu 1982; Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986; Peterson 2015**).

Some scholars reserve the term for a grammatical category, excluding languages that have only lexical means, such as English 'reportedly', 'evidently', 'it is said that', 'apparently',

‘allegedly’, ‘it seems that’, ‘they say that’ (**Aikhenvald 2006**). Others view the category as a functional conceptual substance domain (**Boye and Harder 2009**) with both lexical and grammatical means of expression. One advantage of this wider view is that it obviates the need to differentiate lexical from grammatical in border cases such as particle vs. adverb. Another is that when grammar and lexicon fulfill the same function their interaction may be very interesting and fruitful to study. I find this to be the case in Negev Arabic, but on the other hand I appreciate the importance of distinguishing between grammatical and lexical categories, so I take a middle path:

- (i) The term ‘evidentiality’ designates the wide functional category;
- (ii) ‘evidentials’ are strictly grammatical categories, though not necessarily compulsory, and organized in evidential systems, e.g. Turkish *-miş* [§2 below];
- (iii) ‘evidential strategies’ may be lexical or grammatical. They share primary non-evidential and secondary evidential functions (**Aikhenvald 2006 Ch 4**), e.g. the French *conditionnel de l’information incertaine*.<sup>1</sup>

Evidentials characterize about 500 languages, many of which are in South America and North America (Indian varieties), Caucasus and Tibeto-Burman family area (**Aikhenvald 2006: 17**). Evidentiality seems to be a highly diffusible category – once a group is exposed to it in a contact situation, it may well develop the need. It spreads geographically as an areal or Sprachbund feature, sometimes even from less influential languages to more dominant ones.<sup>2</sup> In the Balkans it has been studied in Turkic, Uralic, Slavic and Romance languages of the area, including the contact languages Vlach Romani (**Matras 1995**) and Judezmo (**Friedman and Joseph 2014**).

Evidentiality systems have been classified according to the number of members or oppositions in the category: from 1 to 6 or more. In many languages marking information as non-witnessed is compulsory, so a sentence like ‘Columbus discovered America’ would be considered a lie if not encoded with the proper non-witnessed morpheme (**Aikhenvald 2006 9.2.3**). Most relevant to my study of evidentiality in Negev Arabic, however, is the Turkish system with just two members and optional usage.

## 2. The Turkish Evidential

Turkish evidentiality is a two member category: the evidential suffix */-miş/* opposes the unmarked member of the category – primarily the verbal past tense */-di/* suffix<sup>3</sup> – for marking inference, hearsay, surprise, or pragmatic extensions such as irony, scorn or compliments (**Slobin & Aksu 1982; Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986**). As a very salient category of Turkish grammar evidentiality has been studied (under various terminological systems) in terms of semantic, pragmatic,

---

<sup>1</sup> An example of this secondary usage of the French conditional: *La flotte britannique aurait quitté... le port...* ‘The British Navy would have left the port’ (we are told) (**Aikhenvald 2006:106**).

<sup>2</sup> Although there are also cases of loss due to contact with a non-evidential language (**Joseph 2003 §3; Aikhenvald 2006 §9.2.2**).

<sup>3</sup> The morphemes */miş/* and */di/* represent all respective allomorphs such as *miş~muş~müş* and *di~du~ti*.

psychological and developmental aspects.

As a marked form *-miş* is optional: a speaker can choose to formulate non-witnessed events in the unmarked *-di* form if he has assimilated them enough to posit them as neutral or unmarked with regard to source of information, which has faded away (**Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986:163**). This is normally the case for non-witnessed but well established past events such as ‘Columbus discovered America’; the evidential *-miş* thus marks the event as non-witnessed or otherwise distanced and unexpected, i.e. it represents ‘the unprepared mind’ or **mirativity** – findings contrary to expectations may be formulated in evidential forms even if witnessed personally (**Slobin & Aksu 1982:187; Aikhenvald 2006 Ch 6:195–215**).<sup>4</sup> The lexical equivalents in English would be ‘to my surprise’, ‘turns out that’.

The evidential form also serves generally for inherently non-witnessed narrative genres of fantasy, as in myths, folk tales, dreams, jokes in Turkish (**Slobin & Aksu 1982:187; Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986:160; 164**), the Balkan (**Aikhenvald 2006 10.2.2:317**) and also Šāwi Arabic dialects in contact with Turkish (**Procházka & Batan 2016 fn. 16**) as we shall see below [§7.2]; but not in narrating established historical facts. This genre division correlates with gender and cultural stereotypes: men’s stories are considered credible, factual and are therefore narrated with the unmarked preterite tense; women’s folktales, in contrast, are typically tales of fantasy, so they use the evidential (**Aikhenvald 2006:315**). This sociolinguistic contrast between men’s and women’s genres in oral narrative styles has been noted, among others, in Negev Arabic (**Henkin 2010**) but whether this distinction is reflected in the use of evidential strategies remains to be seen.

In Turkish and other languages where marking non-witnessed events as such is optional, the marked category can serve stylistic, discourse and rhetorical functions. It serves locally for stylistic highlighting, foregrounding and backgrounding – as a focusing device (**Aikhenvald 2006:317**) and this will be very important for our study of evidentiality in the Arabic dialects of the Negev.

### **3. Evidentiality in Arabic: State of Research**

Insofar as evidentiality is mentioned at all in the grammatical literature on Arabic, both Standard and dialectal, it is predominantly restricted to lexical devices (**Alhaisoni et al 2012; Labaniyeh 2013; Grigore 2016**) or to the explicit assertion that it does not exist as a grammatical category:

Only due to external linguistic influence in locations at the periphery of a language region, is an Arabic dialect likely to develop grammaticalized evidential categories (**Isaksson 2000:397**).

In the generally acknowledged state of art summary of Arabic linguistics, *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, the lemmas on Mood (**El-Hassan 2008**), Participle (**Owens 2008**), and Tense (**Horesh 2009**) make no reference to the concept of evidentiality, which, needless to say, does not appear as a lemma.

---

<sup>4</sup> Obviously, terms like ‘non-witnessed’ for defining evidentials fail to accommodate for the use of evidentials for events relating to 1st person, thus experienced personally. Evidentiality in such contexts is associated with events the speaker may have witnessed physically but was mentally unaware of or does not remember, e.g. childhood events or those that occurred while he was drunk or unconscious.

This absence of the concept of grammatical evidentiality in the dominant research literature on dialectal Arabic to this day is somewhat surprising, as morphological evidentiality was established in some dialects some 24 years ago. In my 1992 article “The Three Faces of the Participle in Negev Bedouin Dialects: Continuous, Resultative, and Evidential” I argued for evidentiality as one of the functions of the participle, besides its more conventional roles in the temporal system, as a resultative and as a progressive form. The claim was based on the corpus and findings of my 1985 dissertation, showing this hitherto almost unrecognized phenomenon to be well rooted. There, however, the concept of evidentiality was not yet introduced. I talked in terms of modality, following **Mitchell (1978: 241 ff.)** who compared temporality and modality in the participle of Educated Spoken Arabic in Jordan as against Egypt. He showed the Jordanian participle, in contrast with its Egyptian cognate, to be modal in the sense that we would now call evidential. As far as I know, Mitchell was the first to recognize modality of non-commitment in the discussion on the participle in any variety of Arabic.<sup>5</sup>

Subsequent recognition of the modality of the participle in some dialects, again with no mention of evidentiality, we find in **Holes 2004: 221 ff.6.2.1** on Aspect and Factuality.<sup>6</sup> Evidentiality as such has been recognized only for Cilician Arabic (Procházka 2002; **2006 2.3.5.3**); and for Šawi Bedouin dialects of Syrian Jazeera area and Harran Urfa region in Turkey (**Procházka & Batan 2016**). All these locations are within the area of Turkish influence. For our dialect I still have no answer as to its origin.

My 2010 book on Negev Arabic focuses on the traditional narrative styles typical of elderly men and women, in the variety which I have lately chosen to label Traditional Negev Arabic (TNA).<sup>7</sup> There I very briefly mention evidentiality of the different types under the major oral narrative category of presentatives (**Henkin 2010 7.4**; here §6 below]. Now I wish to reverse the analytic focus and examine presentatives, along with other means of evidentiality, under the category of evidential strategies. Moreover, I wish to show the interaction of lexical, morpho-syntactic, and discourse evidential strategies in TNA narrative.

I will present the three evidential strategies, starting with the most grammatical morphological category [§4], then the lexical [§5], then the discourse-syntactic [§6]; then I will show their interaction in oral narrative texts [§7]. In each case I differentiate between their use in the two basic layers of narrative (**Fleischman 1990 3.2**):

- a) mimetic – dialogue or direct speech
- b) diegetic – narrative proper

---

<sup>5</sup> Similarity of the Jordanian participle to that of Negev Arabic is not surprising in view of their dialectal affinity. Mitchell also claimed, however, that the Jordanian participle, unlike the Egyptian, is non-resultative and primarily modal. In my Negev Arabic data the participle is primarily resultative and only secondarily modal. We must remember, of course, that Mitchell treats an elevated formal or koineized variety of Jordanian and Egyptian dialects, so that differences in our findings may be due to differences in register.

<sup>6</sup> Based mainly on **Mitchell & al-Hassan 1994:18** and referring also to **Henkin 1992**.

<sup>7</sup> The term Traditional Negev Arabic (TNA) was first used by Cerqueglini in her 2015 study of the spatial language of the elderly in the Negev, as distinct from the more leveled and koineized speech of the young.

## 4. Morphological Evidentiality in TNA

### 4.1 The Multifunctional Participle

In TNA, as in many other dialects of the area, the active participle (P) is primarily resultative. So, in conversational discourse, including that embedded in narrative as dialogue, *ana mākil* ‘I have eaten’; with certain verbs, most prominently motion verbs, it may be progressive: *ana māši* ‘I am walking’ or denote proximate future: *ana ṭāli* ‘bukrah’ ‘I am going out tomorrow’. In narrative proper, resultativity will primarily be pluperfect: *ja lig̃thum mākl̃n* ‘he came and found they had eaten’

What has so far been almost totally unrecognized, however, is that in some dialects it may be evidential, marking events as either non-witnessed or mirative, i.e. unexpected, or in a pragmatic extension of these concepts, such as scorn or admiration. In such cases, evidentials may alternate with the unmarked finite verbal forms that encode events not marked as evidential. I will show this interaction in dialogue (a) and narrative diegetic layers of oral narrative (b).

#### a) In dialogue

In a traditional story about two friends who test their respective wives’ efficiency as hostesses by hosting each other, one asks his wife if she has any watermelon to serve. The alternation here is pragmatically significant – the host hedges his question politely as non-witnessed and distanced, thus lowering expectations; her assertive answer in F-form shows her commitment to her evidence as first hand, enhancing her competence as ‘mistress of the home’:<sup>8</sup>

- (1) ba<sup>c</sup>d iṣwayyih gāl: "ya wiliyyih, mā fih baṭṭīxah ‘ind’kiy **ḍallah**<sub>evd,P</sub>?"  
gālat: "dallat<sub>F</sub>".

After a short while he said: “Woman, isn’t there [by any chance] a watermelon **left**<sub>evd,P</sub> over?”

She said: “There is (one) left<sub>F</sub>”. [M.ŞH53]

In many cases analysis may seem problematic, as evidentiality is virtually inseparable from resultativity. In (2), for instance, the second verb, in preterite form, signals firsthand evidence, the speaker having seen the policeman coming. The evidential participle preceding it, however, seems ambiguous, interpretable as inference, resultativity, mirativity or all of these:

---

<sup>8</sup> Abbreviations: bY=byaf<sup>c</sup>al (imperfective tense form); evd=evidential; M=male narrator; F=fa<sup>c</sup>al (perfective tense form) or female narrator (when in square brackets supplying source of examples): [F.NA45] designates a 45 year old female narrator named NA; P=active participle; pl=plural; res=resultative; sg.=singular. Curly brackets denote intervention by a speaker from the audience. In the examples, evidential forms are bolded and additionally marked in subscript as participial (P), lexical (lex) or presentative (prs); the default narrative tense F is underlined when contrasted with P (only in the original, not the translation).

- (2) gāl: "bnāxak **kātil**<sub>evd.P.res.</sub> wāḥid f-al-Lidd. wja<sub>F</sub> al-buliṣ biydawwir ʿilīh. walliy min al-Lidd f-al-ḥikmih".

He said: "Your relative has [apparently] **injured**<sub>evd.P.res.</sub> someone in Lydda. And the police have come<sub>F</sub> looking for him. And the guy from Lydda is in hospital [M.IH54]

Now, this apparent ambiguity is not surprising – evidentiality is indeed widely recognized as a potential outgrowth of resultative perfectivity (**Comrie 1976 §5.2.2.1** on the inferential; **Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986:164; Aikhenvald 2006 4.2; 4.4**). These related categories are not exclusive and often overlap or combine, which is probably why the distinct evidential use of the Arabic dialectal participle has not been recognized as such. In any particular case, the correct interpretation of P may be context bound.

I wish to argue, however, that a distinction or choice between competing options is simply unnecessary, as all these concepts are intertwined in one complex category. In such cases, then, I will not try to determine one interpretation. Rather, I will consider the participle as denoting evidential resultativity, and will mark all such cases as simply evidential, ignoring the often inseparable aspect of resultativity, which is marginal to this paper.

#### b) In narrative

The narrator describes a childhood memory of her father one day as she was sitting with him after he had shaved his head:

- (3) **umzayyin**<sub>evd.P</sub> rāsih, **msawwīh**<sub>evd.P</sub> aṣla<sup>ʿ</sup> z-al-baṭṭīxah

And he had [just] **had his hair cut**<sub>evd.P</sub>, **had made it**<sub>evd.P</sub> bald like a watermelon [F.DN63]

#### 4.2 The Participle as a Narrative Plotline Tense

In addition to the resultative and evidential functions attributable to the participle in short sequences of two or three consecutive forms at the most, the TNA participle may stretch over fairly long narrative sequences, thus serving as a pure narrative tense. This, however, is very different from evidential narrating in languages where the coding of evidentiality is compulsory, so that inherently fictional narrative genres must utilize it throughout [Aikhenvald]. In TNA this is by no means the case – it is used sparingly as a useful, highly marked, salient stylistic highlighter. With 110 tokens in a 240 thousand word corpus, it is much less frequent than the Narrative Present, the Narrative Imperative (250 tokens), motion verb compounds, and other marked narrative tenses typical of lively, dramatic oral narrative (**Henkin 2010 7.5 -7.7**). (4) shows an alternation between F and P over a narrative segment:

- (4) awwal jiddhum ismih Salāmih,  
uSalāmih ʿaggab<sub>F</sub> Ibrāhīm wIbrāhīm ʿaggab<sub>F</sub> Salāmih...  
**māxid**<sub>evd.P</sub> lih ḥurmah Turbāniyyih, ʾmn-at-Tarābīn,  
mā walladat<sub>F</sub> ʿindh.

alḥīn **ḥmgōṭrīn**<sub>evd.P</sub>,... widdhum ḥyḥārbuw,  
 at-Taṛābīn nuṣṣhum mū **ṭālī**<sub>evd.P</sub> ḥmn-al-blād.  
**gāyil**<sub>evd.P</sub> ḥlha: sawwiy ḥlhum ḡada'.  
**gāymih**<sub>evd.P</sub> **ḥājnih**<sub>evd.P</sub> ... **ḥājnih**<sub>evd.P</sub> ḥlhum xub<sup>u</sup>z šīṭr b-ḥnxāṭih  
**uḥāṭṭah**<sub>evd.P</sub> nuṣṣah milḥ, ḥāṣān yaḥāṣaw, yuktulhum āḡ-ḡama.  
 ḥzlāmha ḥumūlitta tistagwiy ḥalīhum  
 {I: ḥāḡiy at-Tuṛbāniyyih?}  
 ā<sup>h</sup> Tuṛbāniyyih ḥī, alḥīn ḥū<sup>h</sup> **māxidha**<sub>evd.P</sub> ḥa-zīnha, ḥa-zīnha...  
**wimḡārid**<sub>evd.P</sub> maḥum aš-šāyib, ... **ḥmsawwiy**<sub>evd.P</sub> bēnhum ubēn baḥāḡhum ḥšrūt....  
 alḥīn walādah ismih Ibrāḥīm, ḥū Salāmih ismih...  
 walādah **migbil**<sub>evd.P</sub>, **ḥmgallt**<sub>evd.P</sub>-az-zād,  
**ḡāyḡīn**<sub>evd.P</sub> az-zād, **gāyīn**<sub>evd.P</sub>: gill gill y-Abu ḥRgayyig, gill ...!  
 int ḥāṣān at-Tuṛbāniyyih widdak ḥtkattinna!

Their first ancestor was called Salāmih,  
 and Salāmih **begot<sub>F</sub>** Ibrāḥīm and Ibrāḥīm **begot<sub>F</sub>** Salāmih...  
 He had **married**<sub>evd.P</sub> a Tuṛbāniy woman from the Taṛābīn,  
 she **had<sub>F</sub>** no children from him.  
 Now they **went off**<sub>evd.P</sub>... they wanted to fight,  
 half of the Taṛābīn had not **left**<sub>evd.P</sub> the area.”  
**He said**<sub>evd.P</sub> to her: “Make them lunch”  
 She **got up**<sub>evd.P</sub> and **kneaded** bread<sub>evd.P</sub>, **kneaded**<sub>evd.P</sub>, for them oat bread in its bran  
 and **put**<sub>evd.P</sub> half of it salt so that they would become thirsty,  
 so the thirst would kill them,  
 So that her men, of her family, would get the better of them  
 {I: That was the Tuṛbāniy woman?}<sup>9</sup>  
 Yes, she was Tuṛbāniy. Now he had **married her**<sub>evd.P</sub> for her beauty, for her beauty.  
 his old man had agreed with them, established conditions among them  
 Now his son was called Ibrāḥīm; he [himself] was called Salāmih.  
 His son **came up**<sub>evd.P</sub>, **served**<sub>evd.P</sub> the food,  
 they tasted<sub>evd.P</sub> the food and **said**<sub>evd.P</sub> Take it away! Take it away, Abu ḥRgayyig, take it  
 away!  
 Because of the Tuṛbāniy woman you want to kill us! [FJAK]

Clearly, the alternation is not due to differences in the source of information for the consecutive plotline events. Rather, it serves stylistic narrative needs to highlight or background segments and create a varied texture.

Women’s narratives seem to be richer in evidential forms on the plotline than men’s texts. This gender distinction is to a certain extent parallel to a genre distinction: women tend to narrate fictional, fantastic folktales, while men prefer to be seen as narrating

<sup>9</sup> This is the narrator’s son intervening with a cooperative question, possibly for the benefit of his son, the graduate student who was recording the interview.

credible recounts of tribal history and family descent, though they too, indulge in folktales and mixed genres. The sociolinguistic status of men’s and women’s texts is more clear cut than the actual genre division: men’s stories are considered to be true (even when full of impossible hyperboles); women’s stories will be considered as fantasy. even when constituting non-fictional personal stories or tribal history, as in (4) above.

### 5. Lexical Evidential Strategies

Explicit lexical coding of evidentiality and mirativity is achieved with evidential particles. Typical of TNA oral narrative and oral poetry are: *aṭāriy*, *itrā(t)*, *itrīt*, *tarīt* ‘apparently; turns out that’. Most of these can inflect: *itrā-hin* (ex. 13; also exs 6, 8, 11, 14), *itrīt-ha*, *tarīt-hum*. Etymologically, these seem to be of a common origin, possibly *aṭar* ‘footsteps’ (as evidence), perhaps hybridized with *r.’y* ‘to see’, maybe through *tara* ‘you reckon? I wonder’ (**Henkin 2010 7.4.3**). Only *itrā(t)* and *itrīt* are listed in Shawarbah’s glossary of the Tiyāha variety of Negev dialect under the root *’tr* (**Shawarbah 2007**); and in his glossary of the ‘Azāzmih variety we find *trā(t)* and *trīt* under the root *try* (**Shawarbah 2012**).

#### (a) In dialogue

A short folkstory ‘The wolf’ tells of a young man trying to communicate at night with a girl he had befriended while shepherding, so he howls like a wolf outside her camp. This short narrative is the background to the poem, where an old woman, the orphaned girl’s only companion in the camp, warns her of the wolf’s teeth:

- (5) ḥurşik mn-aḍ-ḍīb la-yduggik ’b-nābih  
**witrī**<sub>evd.lex</sub> nāb aḍ-ḍīb, ya bint, mā bih taṭābīb  
 Beware of the wolf lest he bite you with his teeth  
**witrī**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [=you’ll find that] a wolf’s teeth, my girl, have no healing  
 medicine [for their bite]. [M.MAS75]

Again the motivation for the evidential lexeme is pragmatic, meant to posit the old woman as knowledgeable and experienced, thus able to pass on surprising but important information about men and adult life to the innocent girl. The girl, by the way, is not convinced, and curses the old woman for interfering and trying to part good friends.

In the story ‘Aliy bin Min’im [Henkin 2010 Story 4/14], the heroine is disappointed with her very manly looking suitor, who turns out to be a coward. She addresses him directly with this verse of poetic criticism, where an explicit former expectation is directly contradicted in a mirative opposition: ‘I considered...’/‘it turned out that...’

- (6) gālāt-lu: “xṣ, ya šēn”  
 anā baḥsābak min ’wlād aṣ-ṣugūrah ṭṣīdniyX2  
**tarīt-ak**<sub>evd.lex</sub> mn-’wlād ár-ṛaxam wal-būm  
 She said to him: “Pooh, you good for nothing!”  
 I considered you a young falcon hunting meX2.  
**tarīt-you**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [=turns out you are] son of vultures and owls. [M.IAS90?]



## (b) In narrative

All six components of the narrative structure model – Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Action, Evaluation, Resolution, Coda (**Labov 1972:363**) – are potential sites for lexical evidential strategies.

### (i) Orientation

A short narrative, actually the background to a dialogue-poem between a lamenting father and his dead son, begins with the inferential particle. It is then corroborated by the evidential phrase ‘according to what I heard’:

- (7) **atāriy**<sub>evd.lex</sub> fih šāyib ʾxtiyār. wal-xtiyār lih walád wāhid.  
gaddar al-mgaddar ál-walad māt [...] ‘**á-ma basma**’<sub>evd.lex</sub>  
**atāriy**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [=Apparently] there was an old man. And the old man had one son.  
As fate would have it, the son died [...] **according to what I heard** [M.SK60]

### Complicating Action

In a folktale about a ‘hidden daughter’,<sup>10</sup> who had been kept secluded in her parents’ home till her wedding, we hear that in the bridal litter (*hawdaj*) she was offered new strange food she had never encountered before. Apparently she ate it – this was inferred, as we are then told that the new food upset her stomach:

- (8) whuṭṭuw<sup>11</sup> ʿindʿhiy fa-hal-hawdaj wʾ**itrāt-hiy**<sub>evd.lex</sub> btākil.  
And they put [some food] for her in the bridal litter and **itrāt**<sub>evd.lex</sub>-**she** ate [some]  
[F.NA45]

### Evaluation

The narrator reminisces on how, as a child, he had been caught up in an alarming attack on his family camp when the men were out herding. The attackers, having waited in ambush for this opportunity [**cp. ex. (14) below**], were expecting easy loot, but it turned out that one man had been left to guard. Suddenly, unexpectedly, the child inside the tent heard them shouting outside at this man to put down his gun. At this point the listener Y (having heard this story before) makes a cooperative move by formulating his guess as to who this defender may have been; and the narrator confirms, using a lexical evidential as an evaluative means to mark both non-witnessed information and mirativity, and also to dramatize and add narrative tension at this narrative climax:

- (9) halḥīn basma<sup>c</sup> wəḥid minhum uhū biygūl: "irʾmha wint taslam! irʾmha wint taslam!"

<sup>10</sup> See **Henkin (2010:28)** on the socio-cultural concept *bint mxabḥāh* ‘hidden daughter’, whose value derives from her being kept in seclusion so that no man has set his eyes on her until the right bridegroom comes along.

<sup>11</sup> This verb is set in the Narrative Imperative form, typical of Bedouin oral narrative style, as a means of concretizing and dramatizing the narrative sequence (**Henkin 2010 7.7.2**).

{Y: [...] Aḅū Warrād}

**itrāt**<sub>evd.lex</sub> Aḅū Warrād. halḥīn axād al-bārūdih uṭilī<sup>c</sup> min dīl ar-ṛwāg.

Now I heard one of them saying: “Put it down and you’ll be safe! Put it down and you’ll be safe!”

{Y: [...] Aḅū Warrād}

**itrāt**<sub>evd.lex</sub> Aḅū Warrād. Now he took the gun and went out from the back flap of the tent. [M.IH54]

## 6. Discourse-Syntactic Evidential strategies: Presentatives

The crosslinguistic category known as ‘presentatives’ comprises of diverse linguistic elements that present an object, action or scene as appearing before the eyes of the beholder, e.g. archaic English ‘lo (and behold)’, French *voilà*, Hebrew *hinneh*.

Classical Arabic uses demonstratives as well as the particle *ida* (*bi-*) (Khan 2008).

TNA has several presentative particles, which I wish to divide to two distinct categories:

	discourse type	presentative particles	approximate gloss	narrative layer
(i)	conversational	proximate: <i>ar<sup>c</sup>, hay</i> distant: <i>hawēn</i> <sup>12</sup>	look; here you have way over there	mimetic
(ii)	narrative	<i>win, wlin, willa, illa w</i>	and there was...	diegetic

Like the lexical evidentials, most of the presentative particles inflect: *ar<sup>c</sup>u* ‘look you guys’ (ex.10 below); *hay-hum* ‘here they are’; *hawēn-hum* ‘there they are, way over there’; *w(l)in-hum* ‘there they were’ (ex. 10 below).

Type (i) presentatives of the *mimetic* conversational or direct speech layer typically be associated with mirativity, rather than non-witnessed information, as the scene is presented before our eyes; whereas the *diegetic* layer of the narrative proper, both plotline and background, will characterize type (ii) presentatives and enables both mirativity and non-witnessed information.

Interestingly, I have not found the distinction between types (i) and (ii) in dialectal and oral narrative studies — some describe just one type and ignore the other, others mix the two. But I find the distinction crucial, especially within oral narrative, where the two co-occur, but in distinct layers.

We can see this interaction of morphological evidential strategies and the two presentative type (marked as subscript *pres(i)* and *pres(ii)*) in the story of the attack on the unmanned camp (cf. ex. 9). The following day the family men set out to track down the attackers:

- (10) wallāhi umār aṣ-ṣubḥ **win-hum**<sub>pres(ii)</sub> ygūluw: "**ar<sup>c</sup>uw**<sub>pres(i)</sub>".  
wallāhi xābir **winhum**<sub>pres(ii)</sub> iygūluw: "**ar<sup>c</sup>uw**<sub>pres(i)</sub> **ar<sup>c</sup>uw**<sub>pres(i)</sub> **ar<sup>c</sup>uw**<sub>pres(i)</sub> migē'idhum! **ar<sup>c</sup>uw**<sub>pres(i)</sub>!"  
**win**<sub>pres(ii)</sub> kull wēhid minhum **gē'id**<sub>evd.P</sub> fī janb mitnānih  
*wallāhi umār* in the morning **win-they**<sub>pres(ii)</sub> [there they were] saying: “**Look**<sub>pres(i).pl!</sub>”

<sup>12</sup> (*h*)*ar<sup>c</sup>(iy)*, *hay*, and *hawēn* are presented as ‘presentative particles with a demonstrative aspect’ (Shawarbah 2012:116). *ar<sup>c</sup>* is assumed to be an apocopated imperative of the root *r.<sup>2</sup>.y* ‘see’, with the characteristically Bedouin sound shift of the weak medial glottal stop to ‘ (Shawarbah 2012:39).

*waḷḷāhi* I remember **win-they**<sub>prs(ii)</sub> [there they were] saying: “**Look**<sub>prs(i)•pl!</sub>! **Look**<sub>prs(i)•pl</sub>  
**Look**<sub>prs(i)•pl!</sub> [=There are] their standpoints (lit. sitting posts)! **Look**<sub>prs(i)•pl!</sub>”  
**win**<sub>prs(ii)</sub> [=there was] each one of them had **sat**<sub>evd.P</sub> next to a *mitnān* bush [M.IH54]

This narrative segment, showing incorporation of the morphological evidential **gē'id** in a series of syntactic presentatives of both types (i) and (ii), leads us to the main section of this study: the interaction and combinations of the three evidential strategies.

## 7. Combined Strategies: Morphological, Lexical, and Discourse-Syntactic

In TNA oral narrative, in both the diegetic and mimetic layers, all three evidential strategies, lexical, grammatical and discourse-syntactic, combine in interesting ways to serve stylistic and rhetorical needs. I wish to show that the basic, better recognized function of cross-linguistic evidentiality as conveying non-witnessed information is secondary – their primary function in narrative is marking mirativity and as means of evaluation (in the Labovian sense): for dramatizing, highlighting, foregrounding and backgrounding. I will show this in various combinations: morphological and syntactic (7.1); morphological and lexical (7.2); morphological, lexical, and syntactic (7.3).

### 7.1 Morphological and Syntactic

See (10) above.

### 7.2 Morphological and Lexical

#### (a) In dialogue

In the story Jallāl<sup>13</sup> the hero, of a noble Bedouin family, hid in an alien camp, disguised as a simple dung collector, waiting to avenge his father. After succeeding and revealing his true identity, the host acknowledged his skill in keeping his secret so long and now surprising them all. The passage is a prototypical case of mirativity in the mimetic layer of dialog within narrative:

- (11) *gāl*: "waḷḷah brāwah ʿalēk yā-n-nišmiy. **itrā-k**<sub>evd.lex</sub> **mgabbīy**<sub>evd.P</sub> ḥālak, *tgūl*: 'aná jallāl, aná jallāl' winti<sup>(h)</sup> flān".

He said: “By God, bravo, you champion. **itrā-you**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [There you are] **pretending to be stupid**<sub>evd.P</sub> saying : ‘I am a dung collector, I am a dung collector’ while you were actually so-and-so” [M.MAS75]

In her childhood memoirs dating back to the pre-state era a narrator recalls an event she had witnessed with her father: an old woman from another family got all agitated over a British soldier patrolling on his motorcycle on a hill. She thought he was out to get her or her sheep:

- (12) *tanna-būy gāl*: "al-ḥurmah hēdiy muxxhiy **mxallis**<sub>evd.P</sub> min řashiy. māhum **hærjīn**<sub>evd.P</sub> ʿalēhiy. **itrīt**<sub>evd.lex</sub> az-zalamah, yā ḥarām, kull yōm biymurr min hniyyāntiy, uhēdiy bitgūl mīhī **šæyftih**<sub>evd.P</sub>, *tgūl* awwal mařrah bimurr.

My father came back saying: “This woman, her brain has **strayed**<sub>evd.P</sub> from her head.

They did not **talk**<sub>evd.P</sub> to her. **itrīt**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [=Apparently] the man, poor chap, every day he

<sup>13</sup> Henkin 2010 Story 1 is another version of this well known men’s story.

passes from here, and she says she has not **seen him**<sub>evd.P</sub> [before], she says it's the first time he has passed by [F.DN63]

### b) In narrative

A man condemning the custom of women going to mourn their deceased relatives at night<sup>14</sup> tells a scary tale of how such a group were met one night by a ghost. He starts by criticizing their illogical choice of a time, past midnight:

- (13) fī<sup>h</sup> ḥṛayyim mašān<sub>F...</sub> yan'an wāḥad 'ind al-gbūr. iwhin im'aggdāt<sub>P</sub><sup>15</sup> f-aṭ-ṭirīg, 'a-ma **biyxarrfuw**<sub>evd.lex</sub> kān nās gaḷāyil, f-al-lēl. **gāymāt**<sub>evd.P</sub> ṭal'<sup>t</sup> an-najmih, lā fī<sup>h</sup> sā'ah wālā šiy, **witrā-hin**<sub>evd.lex</sub> **gāymāt**<sub>evd.P</sub> nuṣṣ al-lēl...

Some women went<sub>F...</sub> to mourn a man, at the graveyard. As they were walking<sub>P</sub> along the way, **according to what they say**<sub>evd</sub>, there were few people around, at night. They **got up**<sub>evd.P</sub> with the rise of a star, there were no clocks, nothing, and **itrā-they**<sub>evd.lex</sub> [=apparently] they **got up**<sub>evd.P</sub> at midnight... [M.SAG69]

The conventional plotline actions are formulated in the unmarked F-form. The more surprising fact, that it was past midnight, is in the marked mirative form, evidential P; these events are also marked lexically by the evidential particle **witrā-hin**.

In the childhood memoirs of the raiding attack which we saw above [ex. 9, 10], the narrator infers how the enemy had come to know that the camp was supposed to be empty of men:

- (14) alḥīn al-gōm **itrāt-ha**<sub>evd.lex</sub> **jāyyih**<sub>evd.P</sub> **ulābdīn**<sub>evd.P</sub> min šarg al-ḥarāb fī Rās Fā'iy. Now the enemy **apparently-they**<sub>16evd.lex</sub> **had come**<sub>evd.P</sub> and **had hidden**<sub>evd.P</sub> east of the Rās Fā'iy waterholes. [M.IH54]

### 7.3 Morphological, Lexical, and Discourse-Syntactic

The above segments were short, with just two or three morphological evidentials. Longer segments, whole chunks of narrative, characterized a Gdīriy woman who narrates at length about the recurring wars between her tribe and the 'Azāzmih. Her text of about 11,3900 words contained 60 morphological evidentials. In addition to ex. (4) above, the following example will show the place of evidentials in her style.

A man comes home and finds his tribe's herds had just been robbed. As the alarm is raised and the loss is announced, the chief's sister volunteers to get them back. This is an utter surprise to all, therefore all the verbs of this segment are in the mirative evidential forms. It turns out afterwards that, unknown to her family, she had at some point in the past helped the chief of the rival tribe and he owed her a favor.

<sup>14</sup> As they are forbidden from attending funerals or visiting during the day.

<sup>15</sup> The participle here is not evidential, but rather progressive, within the syntagm of the circumstantial *ḥāl*-clause.

<sup>16</sup> The collective noun *gōm* 'enemy' is feminine in the dialect, as reflected in the inflection of the evidential particle and the first evidential participle; but then the second participle agrees with the semantic plurality of the group.

(15) halhīn rawwaḥ **win aṣ-ṣāyih jāy**<sub>prs</sub>,  
 gālaw: waḷḷah Abu Ġinīmih axād aṭ-ṭruš.

hī ʷwawḥdih maʿha bint ʿamm ʾlhaʿ,

**mlawwdih**<sub>evd.P</sub> ʿalīhum f-aš-šigg

**gæylih**<sub>evd.P</sub>: hay<sup>h</sup> ya flān

**gāl**<sub>evd.lex</sub> **tgūl**<sub>evd.lex</sub> axūha ʿigīd gōm [...].

**gæylih**<sub>evd</sub>: iʿṭunī<sup>h</sup> ʾflānih ʷwaṣṣlūna al-ḥadd,

Now he went home and **found the ‘alarm raiser’<sup>17</sup> had come**<sub>prs</sub><sup>18</sup>

They said: “By God, Abu Ġinīmih has taken the herds”.

She and a cousin of hers who was with her

**slipped**<sub>evd.P</sub> in to them in the hosting tent

and **said**<sub>evd.P</sub>: “Hey, you so-and-so”

**He said**<sub>evd.lex</sub>, **you could say**<sub>evd.lex</sub>, her brother was the leader of the tribe [...]

**She said**<sub>evd.P</sub>: “Give me this woman companion, and take us to the border”

Besides the presentative syntagm dramatizing the discovery of the robbery and the mirative series of evidentials describing the girl’s surprising statements, we also see two saying verbs, that function just as evidentials, there is no actual speaker. This combination of lexical, morphological and discourse-syntactic evidential strategies constitute what has been called ‘saturated environments’, which characterize narrative peaks.

## 8. Evidentials in Arabic-Hebrew Contact

Hebrew is a non-evidential language. Native speakers of Negev Arabic, when speaking Hebrew, sometimes show L1 interference in the form of evidential strategies translated word for word. For example, a Negev Bedouin student, complaining in Hebrew about a bad grade he had just received, produced this evidential use of the Hebrew participle:

(16) ma ani ʿose ʿasu l-i kaxa?  
 What I **do**<sub>evd.P</sub> they did to-me so  
 What have I (allegedly) done for them to do this to me?

<sup>17</sup> *aṣ-ṣāyih* lit. ‘the shouter’ is a shepherd who sets off the alarm when he spots an enemy raiding party approaching or, as in this case, the herds have already been carried off from their grazing ground without the owning tribe noticing.

<sup>18</sup> Or ‘was coming’. In the case of motion verbs, both perfective and progressive interpretations are possible.

This interference is extremely salient, as in Modern Hebrew the active participle is basically a present tense, used also for proximate planned future, much as in English ‘we’re flying tomorrow’. So native Hebrew speakers would probably interpret this as ‘What am I supposed to do now they’ve done this to me?’

### 9. Is Negev Arabic the Only Evidential Dialect Around?

Since finding the morphological evidential in the Negev I have become more aware of it in other dialects. Although not mentioned in the dialectal literature (except for the Turkish influence area), it seems to crop up in many places. Three examples follow of dialect areas where it seems to be thriving.

#### 9.1 Palestinian Arabic

Palestinian Arabic folk story collections published by Meron et al (Galilean), Seeger (Ramallah) and Schmidt & Kahle (Bir Zet) show both the morphological and the presentative evidentials in all the uses attested in the Negev. Typical of these sedentary dialects seems to be the participle *bāki* (from the root *b.k.y* ‘remain’) as a formulaic folktale opener and, in fact, typical of the orientation or background:

- (17) **bāki**<sub>evd.P</sub> haz-zalama [...] **muxallif**<sub>evd.P</sub> talt<sup>i</sup> wlād  
**msammihim**<sub>evd.P</sub> <sup>i</sup>Mḥammad <sup>i</sup>Mḥammad <sup>i</sup>Mḥammad [...]  
**bāki**<sub>evd.P</sub> iz-zgīr minhim mušāgīb  
 Es **war**<sub>evd.P</sub> einmal ein Mann [...], der **hatte**<sub>evd.P</sub> drei Söhne  
 die er Mḥammad Mḥammad und Mḥammad **nannte**<sub>evd.P</sub>. [...]  
 Der Jüngste unter ihnen **war**<sub>evd.P</sub> aufsässig. (Seeger 1997:282)<sup>19</sup>

In first person, it will be replaced by the preterite:

- (18) ḳāl-ilha: wēn **bākye**<sub>evd.P</sub>?  
 ḳālat-lu: ba<sup>20</sup>ēt<sub>F</sub> <sup>ʿ</sup>ind xālti  
 He asked her: Where **have you been**<sub>evd.P</sub>?  
 She said to him: I was<sub>F</sub> at my aunt's. (Meron et al 1997:186)<sup>21</sup>

Like its TNA counterpart, the Palestinian participle can stretch over plotline narrative sequences:

- (19) ya flāne, **bākye**<sub>evd.P</sub> bint ḥamātik ma<sup>ʿ</sup> wāḥad ḳēsi fi-l-matmūra  
**unāfid**<sub>evd.P</sub> <sup>ʿ</sup>alēhim jōzi **ufāyilhim**<sub>evd.P</sub>  
 Du, NN, die Schwester dienes Mannes **war**<sub>evd.P</sub> mit einem Keissiten in der Korngrube,  
 Mein Mann **hat sie überrascht**<sub>evd.P</sub> und reinen Mund über sie **gehalten**<sub>evd.P</sub> [Text

<sup>19</sup> The well known story has at least one more version in this book (**Text 105:406**), beginning with participles like here.

<sup>20</sup> **Blau (1970:112)** notes this alternation in 1st person.

<sup>21</sup> There is at least one more evidential in this story, narrated by a fallahi woman.

## 9.2 Syrian Desert Bedouin Arabic

The oral narratives of women in the Jezeera, as published by Bettini 2006, contain a lot of morphological evidentials. In fact, there is a whole story, by an elderly woman, with almost all the narrative plotline in this participial form (Text 27:269ff).<sup>22</sup>

The evidential lexical<sup>23</sup> and syntactic strategies are also very similar to those of TNA:

(20) hāda *atāriy*<sub>evd.lex</sub> *mḥāči*<sub>evd.P</sub> l-bint wgāyil<sub>evd.P</sub>-lhe  
 mais il **se trouve que**<sub>evd.lex</sub> le jeune homme avait **parlé**<sub>evd.P</sub> à la fille et lui **avait dit**<sub>evd.P</sub>. . . . (Text --:---)

(21) xašš 'al-binit. yōm xašš 'al-binit **winn-ha**<sub>prs</sub> ṭla'at wmnāwšitt<sub>evd.P</sub> xātam  
 Il entra chez la fille, quand il fut entré chez la fille,<sup>24</sup> **voilà qu'elle**<sub>prs</sub> sortit et lui **donna**<sub>evd.P</sub> une bague. (Text --:---)

In the case of this area, which is clearly in the range of Turkish influence, the prevalence of evidential strategies is not surprising.

## 8. Summary

Traditional Negev Arabic displays a wide range of evidential strategies — morphological, lexical, and discourse-syntactic. Only the lexical items are unambiguously evidential. Morphological evidentiality is secondary to resultativity, and the discourse-syntactic structures are primarily presentatives. However, when these means cluster together in saturated environments, their evidential effect is very strong.

In addition to prototypical evidentiality for marking nonwitnessed information and mirativity, we find pragmatic extensions to convey scorn or admiration. And the morphological participial form is found in narrative sequences alternating with the other narrative tenses for foregrounding, backgrounding and other techniques for texturizing the narrative. I still have no definitive answer to the question I posed 24 years ago — where does this category come from to the Negev, if it is unknown in other Arabic varieties and cannot be traced to contact with Turkish. But now I see that it is not at all isolated, as I thought. Evidential strategies of all three types are, *itrā-hin*, all around.

<sup>22</sup> Although Procházka & Batan 2016:465 say these texts seem not to have any. Additional cases of the narrative evidential in this collection include Text 3:85/2; Text 3:91/20; Text 8:120; Text 15:191/16; Text 24:; 253ff/1; 2; 4; 21; Text 41:318/1; 2.

<sup>23</sup> Cp Alshamari 2015 §3.11 for North Hail Arabic *atāri*. Similar mirative functions seem to be fulfilled by Baghdadi Arabic *ašū~ašu* ‘it looks’, ‘it seems’ speculatively originating from *ašūf* ‘I see’ (Blanc 1964:146; Grigore 2016). I thank Letizia Cerqueglini for bringing this Baghdadi item to my attention.

<sup>24</sup> This repetition of a clause as a temporal when-clause is also very common in TNA narrative style. I call it ‘backstitching’ (Henkin 2010 §7.3).

## References

- Aikhenvald**, Alexandra Y. 2006 *Evidentiality*. Oxford.
- Aksu-Koç**, Ayhan & Dan I. **Slobin** 1986 A Psychological Account of the Development and Use of Evidentials in Turkish. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ADP 20. eds. Chafe and Nichols: 159-167.
- Alhaisoni**, Eid, Marwan A. **Jarrah** & Muhammad S. **Shehadeh** 2012 An Investigation of Evidentiality in the Arabic Language. *International Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 2: 260-273.
- Alshamari**, Murdhy Radad 2015 Documentation of Discourse-related Particles in North Hail Arabic. *English Linguistics Research* Vol. 4, No. 4: 44 -57.
- Bettini**, Lidia 2006 Contes féminins de la haute jézireh syrienne. *Quaderni di Semitistica* 26.
- Blanc**, Haim 1964 Communal Dialects in Baghdad. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Blau**, Joshua 1960 Syntax des palästinensischen Bauerndialektes von Bīr-Zēt. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte des Orients 13. Walldorf-Hessen: Verlag für Orientkunde Dr. H. Vorndran.
- Boye**, Kasper & Peter **Harder** 2009 Evidentiality – Linguistic Categories and Grammaticalization. *Functions of Language* 16/1: 9–43.
- Caubet**, Dominique 1991. The Active Participle as a Means to Renew the Aspectual System: A Comparative Study in Several Dialects of Arabic. *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau* (85): 209–224.
- Cerqueglini**, Letizia 2015 Object-Based Selection of Spatial Frames of Reference in aš-Šāni<sup>f</sup> Arabic. Pisa University Press.
- Chafe**, Wallace & Johanna **Nichols** (eds.) (1986) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. ADP 20.
- Comrie**, Bernard 1976 *Aspect: An introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- El-Hassan**, Shahir 2007 Mood (Arabic Dialects). In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* Vol. 3. Leiden: E. J. Brill:262–269.
- Fleischman**, Suzanne 1990 *Tense and Narrativity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Friedman**, Victor A. & Brian D. **Joseph** 2014 Lessons from Judezmo about the Balkan Sprachbund and Contact Linguistics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 226:3–23.
- Grigore**, George 2016 Expressing Certainty and Uncertainty in Baghdadi Arabic. *Arabic Varieties: Far and Wide. Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of AIDA*, Bucharest, 2015:259-267.
- Henkin**, Roni 1992 The Three Faces of the Participle in Negev Bedouin Dialects: Continuous, Resultative, and Evidential. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LV/ 3:433–444.
- Henkin**, Roni 2007 Negev Arabic. In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* Vol. 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, pp. 360–369.
- Henkin**, Roni 2010 *Negev Arabic: Dialectal, Sociolinguistic, and Stylistic Variation*. Semitica Viva Series. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.



- Holes**, Clive 2004 *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties*. Rev. Version.
- Horesh**, Uri 2009 Tense. In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 4:44-458.
- Isakkson**, Bo 2000 Expressions of evidentiality in two Semitic languages—Hebrew and Arabic. In Lars Johanson & Bo Utas (eds.) *Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 383–399.
- Joseph**, Brian D. 2003 Evidentials: Summation, Questions, Prospects. *Studies in Evidentiality*. In: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Typological Studies in Language* 54. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 307-327.
- Khan**, Geoffrey 2008 Presentatives. In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 3:703–705.
- Labaniyeh**, Reema Taher 2013 A Study of Evidentiality in Arabic and English. *Alandalus for Social and Applied Sciences* Vol.(5). Issue (9):55-72.
- Labov**, William 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Matras**, Yaron 1995 Verb Evidentials and Their Discourse Function in Vlach Romani Narratives. In Matras, Yaron *Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language*: 95 -124.
- Meron**, J, C. **Shehadi** & N. **Masarwi** 1997. *Seed of Pomegranate: The Woman in Arab Folktales*. Givat Haviva [in Hebrew].
- Mitchell**, T.F. 1978 Educated Spoken Arabic in Egypt and the Levant, with Special Reference to Participle and Tense. *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 227-258.
- Mitchell**, T.F., & S.A. **Al-Hassan** 1994 *Modality, Mood and Aspect in Spoken Arabic*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Owens**, Jonathan 2008 Participle. In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 3:541–546.
- Peterson**, Tyler 2015 Grammatical Evidentiality and the Unprepared Mind. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 13/2: 314–352.
- Piamenta**, Moshe 1996 “More on the Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins”. *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 14, pp. 123–136. [3.8.4]
- Procházka** 2002 *Die arabischen Dialekte der Çukurova (Südtürkei)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Procházka**, Stephan 2006 Cilician Arabic: In: Kees Versteegh et al. (eds.): *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 1:388-397.
- Procházka**, Stephan & Ismail **Batan** 2016 The Functions of Active Participles in Šāwi Bedouin Dialects. *Arabic Varieties: Far and Wide. Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of AIDA*, Bucharest, 2015:457–466.
- Schmidt**, Hans & Paul **Kahle** 1918 *Volkserzählungen aus Palästina 1. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 17. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Seeger**, Ulrich 2009 *Der arabische Dialekt der Dörfer um Ramallah. Teil I. Texte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Shawarbah**, Musa 2007 *Ha-dialekt ha-bedui šel ha-Tiyāha ba-Negev (The Bedouin Dialect of the Tiyāha in the Negev: Phonology, Morphology and Some Selected Syntactic Issues)*. Ph.D. dissertation. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University (in Hebrew).

- Shawarbah**, Musa 2012 *A Grammar of Negev Arabic: Comparative Studies, Texts and Glossary in the Bedouin Dialect of the 'Azāzmih Tribe*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Slobin**, D.I. & **Aksu**, A.A. 1982 Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the use of the Turkish Evidential. *Tense-aspect: Between Semantics & Pragmatics*. Ed. P.J.Hopper: Benjamins, Amsterdam: 185-200.
- Weizman**, Elda 1997 Journalistic Discourse in Modern Hebrew: Saturated Environments. In: Bentolila, Y. (ed.), *Shay la'Hadassa: Research in the Hebrew Language and in Judaic Languages*. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University:211-227 (in Hebrew).