SOME OBSERVATIONS ON A MIDDLE ARABIC EGYPTIAN TEXT IN COPTIC CHARACTERS

Joshua Blau

1. In 1901, P. Casanova published the definitive edition of two leaves of a Christian Arabic Egyptian text, presumably from the thirteenth century, in Coptic characters. In 1926, G.P.G. Sobhy edited 35 (!) additional leaves of the same text, and in 1972, H. Satzinger published an important study of this text (as well as of another one), both from Coptic and Arabistic vantage points. At the end of his paper (p. 65, note 40) he invited Arabists to further study this text from the Arabistic point of view and promised that they would be rewarded by a host of interesting observations. I should like to accede in this paper to Satzinger’s invitation, mainly from the standpoint of Middle Arabic, not, however, without first expressing my gratitude to his pioneering article, from which I have learned much and on which I base my observations, even where my results differ from his.

2. Worrel’s (p. 135) general linguistic characterization of our text (also quoted Satzinger, p. 41, note 6) that “it represents a form of Arabic that is neither colloquial... nor classical, but the pedantic compromise now called ‘modern literary’”, cannot be called very fortunate. On the other hand, Satzinger (ibid.), despite some qualification, overemphasized its popular character. As a matter of fact, our text belongs linguistically to the well known type of mediaeval Christian Arabic, which may be termed as Middle Arabic Substandard. Its author(s) intended to write in Classical Arabic, but whether as a result of his (their) ignorance or negligence, elements of Neo-Arabic penetrated into it. Like Middle Arabic texts in general, our text is characterized by freely alternating features of Classical Arabic, Neo-Arabic and pseudo-corrections. Therefore, the linguistic evaluation of its Neo-Arabic layer, i.e., of the Egyptian-Arabic dialect reflected in it, is rather intricate: even in Middle Arabic Substandard the influence of Classical Arabic is quite conspicuous and deviations from Classical Standard need not be genuine Neo-Arabic, but may reflect pseudo-corrections. Moreover, although our text is not written in the ac-

---

1 V. Satzinger, p. 42, where additional references are adduced.
2 For this term v. Blau, Fünkel Festschrift, where, however, I used “Middle Arabic Literary Standard” as a general term, including Middle Arabic Standard (a type called there “Some kind of Classical Arabic with Middle Arabic admixture”) and Middle Arabic Substandard (to which I assigned “Some kind of classicized Middle Arabic” and “Semi-classical Middle Arabic”).
3 V. Blau, Fünkel Festschrift.
4 For which v. Blau, Pseudo-corrections, passim.
5 As the alternation of imperfect forms terminating in written with forms lacking written in accordance with rules of Classical Arabic (v. §41) or the universal concord of ‘alladhi’ with its antecedent (v. §55).
cepted Arabic orthography, but in Coptic characters, nevertheless it does reflect special orthographic habits,⁶ which again may blur the recognition of genuine Neo-Arabic usage. Accordingly, we are somewhat less optimistic than SattINGER (e.g. p. 41; p. 65, note 40) as to the possibility of reconstructing the Mediaeval Egyptian-Arabic dialect reflected in our text, although its importance for the study of Middle Arabic can hardly be exaggerated.

3. The main importance of our text lies in its being written in Coptic characters. It thus discloses facts about consonants and especially about vowels which are concealed in the traditional unvocalized Arabic orthography. The reason for the use of the Coptic script in this instance is similar to that for the use of Karshuni⁷ by Christians or the Hebrew script by Jews.⁸ The Copts, in as far as they were literate, used the Coptic script for writing Coptic and did not switch to Arabic characters when they started to write this language, but rather continued to use their own Coptic script.

4. Certain letters in our text bear superscript Arabic letters. Worrel, p. 135, in fine, regarded them as diacritical marks, to show more precisely the pronunciation of the polyphonic Coptic letters, and so, as an integral part of the system of writing. SattINGER, p. 52, note 20, somewhat inconclusively, argued that

"these interlinear auxiliary signs do not always refer to the really existent form of the word, but rather to its literary form; thus Arabic vowel marks hint at nunation, although it was not pronounced, as proved by the Coptic transcription. Altogether, these auxiliary signs are not used for the sake of pronunciation, but of understanding; therefore, we have disregarded them in this paper".⁹

First, not only the interlinear auxiliary signs, but the text itself often does not mark really existent (i.e., dialectal, Neo-Arabic) forms, but rather literary ones; this because our text, like every Middle Arabic document, is characterized by the free alternation of Classical and Neo-Arabic features (as well as of pseudo-corrections; v. above §2). So this alone would by no means justify the disregard of superscript Arabic letters. Second, one should not confuse the superscript Arabic letters with the use of signs for nunation in the text itself. Although the latter does not evince genuine pronunciation and is only used as some sort of literary embellishment (for details v. §42), it nevertheless forms a part of the text. The Arabic superscript letters, on the other hand, have to be considered later additions to our text (cf. already Violet, p. 40). This is obvious for general considerations and can be buttressed by external signs. Since (v. §3) the use of Coptic characters by the scribe was due to his acquaintance with them, rather than with Arabic letters, one would not, a priori, expect him to use Arabic superscript for the elucidation of Coptic letters.

---

⁶ As the almost general preservation of the vowel of hamza coniunctionis of the definite article (§17.1), the spelling of tā marbūta (§34.1) or the spelling of -iyē (§21). Cf. in general §21.
⁷ V. Blau, Emergence, p. 42, note 1.
⁸ V. Blau, Emergence, pp. 34ff.
Therefore, one will rather regard them as later additions by a scribe for whom Arabic letters, rather than Coptic characters, were the natural means of writing Arabic. He, not the original scribe, found it difficult to interpret correctly the Coptic letters, and, therefore, added the Arabic superscript. The fact that this superscript is written in red ink, whereas the text is generally (with the exception of the first two lines of new sections) written in a thick black uncial (v. H.G.E. White *apud* Sobly, p. 231, beginning), also suggests a different hand for the writing of the superscript. Violet, col. 40, basing himself on C only, was indeed inclined to accept this view (although Casanova, p. 3, was too careful to suggest a different hand; yet even he admitted that the Arabic superscript has been added afterwards). Besides Sobly, plate xxivb = p. 5r, 2 originally t'et'hen has been written, later ann was added over hen, i.e. t'et'ann to be read *tethannen* (not *tethenan*, pace Sobly, ad locum). Above the Coptic h Arabic *ḥ* has been added, yet not exactly above the h, since the place was occupied by the added ann, but rather somewhat to its left, thus proving that the Arabic superscript has only been added after the correction ann had already been carried out. Moreover, the fact that the Arabic superscript sometimes exhibits gross errors hints at a different hand as well. The most conspicuous case I have noticed is 24v/25r t’est’ehel, t’est’e occurring on p. 24v, hēl on p. 25r and h bearing superscript *ḥ*. It was interpreted by Sobly, *ad locum* = *testehel* *eqal* *ḥel* “it may be worthy of . . . condition”, by Satzinger, p. 44, 10f., who thought that he is following Sobly, as *tastalihq. As a matter of fact, it has to be read without any tampering with the text = *testahel* or *testehel*, i.e. *tastalihel* (the whole passage runs as follows: lek’tme: t’est’ehel, ent’exod, elkorben = *lekeymā* testehel *en tēxodh el-qorbēn*, i.e. li-kaymā *tastalihl* ‘an ta’xudh al-qurbān “in order that you may be worthy of partaking of the oblation”).

Accordingly, when dealing with phonetics (and sometimes, as shown above, even in additional cases), one must beware of confusing the information supplied by the text proper with that of the Arabic superscript. The standing of the latter can, *mutatis mutandis*, be compared with vowel signs of the Hebrew Old Testament as against its consonantal text. Although, generally speaking, Biblical vocalization is based on a sound tradition much older than the various vocalization systems, it nevertheless reverts to periods much later than those of the consonantal text. Accordingly, the comparatively late traditions of pronunciation reflected by vocalization must not simply be superimposed on the consonantal text. Similarly, from the methodical point of view, our text proper has to be analysed phonetically apart from the tradition of pronunciation reflected by the Arabic superscript (v. §9, end).

5. As a rule, the stops = , : and . are used to separate words. Very often, however, the stops do not coincide with word ends. Sometimes, words are spelt together, as

---

* Everywhere in plate xxivb *ḥ* has been added exactly above h. In the plates reproducing 1C and 2C, added to Casanova, the only other facsimiles I could peruse, *ḥ*, to be sure, has been added somewhat to the left, but clearly not as much to the left as in our case.
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p. 5r, 9 mehase = финечасї(!) “how much more”; 5r, 16 enet't'aubeh = /en 'et-taw-be/ “behind, repentance”; 6v, 1-2 lemahlem = /lem aclem/ “I did not know”; 8v, 1 [e] mmehou (!) = /emmê hû/ “as to him”; 14v, 2 enk'ont = /en kont/ “if you are”, and similarly 18r, 9 and 18v, 2; 25r, 1 ent'ëxod = /en tëxodâ/ “to partake”; 32r, 14 let'ek'oum = /lë tekîn/ “do not be”; C 1r, 15-16 houiek [el] lemoh = /hû yekelelemwëh/ “he is speaking with him”; C 1v, 11 wênkhou = /we-kën hû/ “and he was”; C 1v, 13 meenkmënî = /më yemkmêmî/ “it is not possible for me”; C 1v, 14 edlem = /'idh lemî(!) “because not”; C 2r, 3 sebahdeho = /sebô'cdeo/ “seven times”; C 2r, 13 icebi = /yë 'ebë/ “O my father”; C 2v, 12 wêfehmëhou = /we-fi'mê hût/ “and while he”.

Very frequently the stops separate syllables of one word. Often these syllables represent separate morphemes, as 24v, 3 men : k'om = /mënkôm/ “of you”; 28v, 13 we : ixxolo = /wa yxxolo/ “and he will be saved”; 29v, 15 fe : eshîf = /fe 'eshîf/ “and heal!”; C 1r, 13 k'el : adëh = /ke-ksâdê/ “according to custom”. In other cases, words are subdivided into syllables without any apparent reason, as 5r, 13 Ax : sel = /aixsel/ “virtues”; 5v, 15 wey't : alakû = /we-yetkaqqûl “and they become connected”; 10v, 4 ien : zôr = /yenzeor/ “he sees”; 14r, 10 quowe : t'i = /qiwi'ti/ “my strength”; 28r, 1 kal : bak = /qalabak/ “your heart”; 28r, 2 feen : nchom = /fe-emmnûmi “for, behold, they”; 31v, 9-10 ek : shéf = /eskëf/ “divulge”; 31b, 12 t'eg : t'i (the superscript written over the stop is presumably not Arabic /b/ but rather a Coptic t', i.e. t'i = t'ëgat'. t'i) = /tëgattìk/ “it will cover you”; C 1v, 8 elef = k'ar = /el-êfâr/ “the thoughts”. Sometimes, the stop divides a syllable: 30v, 1 ieheml : ehe = /ye'hemûl/ “he neglects it (for the third e see §16).

Casanova, p. 9, basing himself mainly on this division of words into syllables, inferred that our text was written at dictation; he was followed in this by Sobhy, p. 231. It is interesting to note that he was also followed by Violet, col. 42, who, however, considered the Psalm fragment in Greek characters which he edited, to have been written without dictation, by a person well versed in Arabic writing, even though it exhibits the same way of subdividing words into syllables (v. also Violet, col. 32). One will rather infer from the similar way of subdivision attested in Violet's Psalm fragment that we too have no reason to assume that our text has been written at dictation. Moreover, for all the erratic use of the tanwîn (cf. §42), it is attested after nouns only, thus demonstrating that our scribe was not such an ignoramus as Casanova and Sobhy would like to make him out. In all likelihood, he copied a manuscript and did not write at dictation.

6. As Satzinger, p. 51, has stated, except in final position, Arabic /t, k, t, q/ are transcribed by Coptic t', k', t, k respectively, presumably because the first two were aspirated, while the last two were unaspirated.10 In final position, however, even /l, q/,11 t, k were aspirated; therefore, final Arabic /t/ is marked not only by

---

10 Cf. Appendix A and §7.

11 Cf. e.g. Bergstrasser, Damaskus, p. 36, 4f., according to whom in the Arabic dialect of

\[ \text{Damascene} \]

Satzinger, p. 51, has stated, except in final position, Arabic /t, k, t, q/ are transcribed by Coptic t', k', t, k respectively, presumably because the first two were aspirated, while the last two were unaspirated. In final position, however, even /l, q/, t, k were aspirated; therefore, final Arabic /t/ is marked not only by
Coptic t’ (as 29r, 10; C 1v, 7 waqt’ = /waqt/ “time”; for other examples v. Satzinger, p. 51), but also by t (as 27r, 10 k’ont = /kont/ “you were”, and similarly 27v, 6; C 1v, 10 ent = /ent/ “you”; 34v, 5 belharek’et = /bi-t-harek’et/ “by the movements”; for other examples v. Satzinger, ibid.), and final Arabic /k/ invariably by Coptic k and never by k’! It is difficult to find a reason for the difference in the spelling of final /t/ and /k/. One could propound that the exclusive use of final k is due to the influence of the pronominal suffix of the second person sing. masc. Aside from the pronominal suffix the occurrence of final k is rather restricted (I have noticed it only in the following cases: 3r, 2; 4r, 2; 7r, 12, 19r, 15; 20r, 14; 21v, 14; 26r, 12; 28r, 11-12; 29v, 7; C 1v, 4; C 2v, 3), whereas the pronominal suffix of the second person sing. masc. occurs frequently. As ill luck would have it, the pronominal suffix of the second person sing. fem. is not attested at all in our text. Yet one could surmise that by orthographic differentiation k became the mark of the masculine pronoun, k’ of the feminine one (perhaps also, because after vowels the k of the feminine pronoun was not in final position, but rather had the form -ki, v. e.g. Willmore, p. 100, Mitchell, p. 53; cf. §24.2, note 41). Then, because of the frequency of the masculine pronoun, final k generally prevailed. No such orthographic pressure existed on final t. On the contrary, one of the most frequent morphemes terminating in -t, viz. the singular feminine morpheme marking the perfect (5r, 6; 27v, 4; C 1, 1 k’enet = /kënet/ “she was”) and construct (v. §34.1), is invariably spelt with t’.12

Satzinger, p. 51, also mentioned that /kk/ may be spelt kk’ or kk. The use of kk is especially interesting, since one would expect the second k, preceding a vowel, to be aspirated. One will regard the spelling with k as an additional sign of the encroachment of k upon the domain of k’. The same applies to the rather marginal use of k marking /k/ preceding a vowel: 7v, 13 ekoun = /ekûn/ “I shall be”; 32r, 9-10 edkorha = /edkorhâ/ “remember them!” (perhaps influenced by the preceding 32r, 8 dekr = /dekr/ “rememberance”, where k forms the first part of a constant cluster, v. infra; similarly one may surmise the influence of spellings like 17v, 16 beferkar = /beferkar/ “in your thought” on 31v, 6, 10 efkarak = /ef-karâk/ “your thoughts” (which, of course, is generally spelt with k’: efkar 10v, 13; 34v, 4; C 1v, 8; C 2r, 1); 23r, 12 wet’erekak = /we-terekak/ “and he left you” (presumably influenced by forms of tarak exhibiting final k and therefore spelt with k, as 28r, 11-12 wet’erekok = /we-térekok/ “and you leave”); 26r, 13 kit’eb: men . k’ot’behom (!) “a book of their books”.

On the other hand, the use of k marking Arabic /k/ in the first part of a consonant cluster is more frequent. Accordingly, one will not attribute this spelling to the spreading of the use of k only, but also to the fact that k (and t) were presumably pronounced unaspirated as the first part of a consonant cluster. We have already

Damascus all the voiceless stops, including f, are almost unaspirated in internal position, yet strongly aspirated in final position.13 Yet the feminine plural morpheme of nouns -āt is spelt both with t (v. supra 34v, 5) and t’ (34r, 8 essaletet = /es-saletet/ “the prayers”).
noticed that /kk/ may be spelt kk'. Other cases: kr = /kːr/; 8v, 5 bokra = /bokra/ “tomorrow”, and so also C 2b, 12; 10r, 13 fekroh = /fekroh/ “his mind”, and similarly 17v, 16; 27r, 11 (with a final cluster fekr); 31r, 9 wekra = /we-akra/ “and force!”, 32r, 8 dekr = /dekr/ “remembrance”, and similarly 32v, 15. ksh = /kʃ/; 31v, 6 t'eskhef = /teskhef/ “you divulge”, and similarly 31v, 9-10. kt' = /kːt/; 29r, 5 et'ar = /et'ar/ “more”. kh = /kʰ/; 2r, 10 fett'rokhome = /fe-etrokhome/ “so leave them!” (yet this spelling may be influenced by forms of tarak exhibiting final k, v. supra). km = /km/; 28r, 5 weyekmenou = /we-yekmenou/ “and they will lie in ambush”.

The spelling of Arabic /t/ is parallel to that of /k/, with one important difference. We have already seen that in final position t' and t marking /t/ alternate, whereas invariably k, rather than k', is used for marking final /k/. In final position I have noticed also t marking /tt/; 18v, 4 weeret = /we-eret/ wa-arad “and you wanted”; 21r, 10 wejet wajad “you found”. In medial position, however, it is not t that is used for marking /t/ (I have noticed only one likely example, 19r, 16, for which v. §9), but rather the opposite tendency obtains to mark /t/ not only by t, which is the general usage (cf. §7), but also (much more often than it would seem from Satzinger's wording, p. 53) by t'. I cannot offer any explanation for this prevalence of t' in spelling. I have noticed t't marking not only /tt/ (3r, 3 bet't'-ezah = /be-etteda/ “with meekness”), but also /tt/ (5v, 3-4 at't'ara = /xat'tara/ “handle [v. Dozy, s.v.]; 2v, 10 hat't'ouhe = /hat'thef/ “put them down!”; 11v, 4 et't'oubi = /et-tubh/ “the blessed one”).13 Easier to interpret is the spelling of /tt/ with t' when occurring at the beginning of a consonant cluster, because in this position, it seems, t' was pronounced without aspiration, so that the opposition between t and t' had become neutralized. I have noticed t't = /tt/ 18r, 14 et'qat'ata = /tetqat'ta/ “you shall be covered”; 18v, 3 et'tarik = /et-tarik/ “the way”. t'l = /t'l/ 24v, 6 et'lobou = /et'lobu/ “seek!”), and similarly 1r, 11; C 1r, 7 weyet'laqoh /we-yetlaqoh/ “and he lets him go away”, and similarly C 1v, 15; C 2r, 14; C 2v, 6-7. t'm = /t'm/ 26v, 15 wetet'mah = /we-tet'ma/ “and you shall desire”, 27v, 16 feyet'meen = /fe-ytet'men/ “and he will trust”. t'h = /t'h/ 25v, 1-2 weyet'hannou = /we-yet'hena/ “and they will advance”.

Yet t' marking /tt/ is not quite exceptional preceding a vowel either, although, it seems, t' was aspirated in this position, while /t/ was unaspirated. I have noticed 1v, 7 kat'tih = /kat'tu/ “flock”; 4v, 9 t'ar = /t'ar/ “he flew”, and similarly 9v, 6 (yet 9r, 13-14 spelt with t'); 10v, 9 wetet'lah = /we-tet'la/ “and he ascended”; 27v, 4 t'alebet'ak = /talebet'ak/ “your prayer”; 33v, 2 elxat'tie = /el-xat'tie/ “the sin”.

7. It stands to reason that emphatic /t/ was unaspirated (just as was /q/), as against aspirated /t/ (and /k/). Satzinger, p. 53, suggesting for /t/ the pronunciation of modern Cairene ݣ mistook tā for dād. On the other hand, d is attested for marking /t/ (2r, 8-9 adrođome = /a-trođ-home/ “I shall expel them”) and t, which generally corresponds to /t/, may designate /d/: 19r, 11 beṭer = /bätēr/(!) “hasten!”. 21v,

2 (v. §5) for the similar d.

8. Satzinger's argument is based on pronunciation, however, and on a transcription even more radical than mine. I have added a few attributes, such as /t/ or /d/ in the interpretation of certain signs. Sobly's name is not mentioned.

9. As for /t'/, this is in agreement with /f/ or /d/ respectively. Satzinger, p. 53, argues that two allels were possible for the final of /t/, /t'/, /d/. Sobly's name is not mentioned.

Cf. also 31v, 12, v. supra §5.
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On contrary

2v, 10 hat't'ouhe = /hat'thef/ “put them down!”; 11v, 4 et't'oubi = /et-tubh/ “the blessed one”).13 Easier to interpret is the spelling of /tt/ with t' when occurring at the beginning of a consonant cluster, because in this position, it seems, t' was pronounced without aspiration, so that the opposition between t and t' had become neutralized. I have noticed t't = /tt/ 18r, 14 et'qat'ata = /tetqat'ta/ “you shall be covered”; 18v, 3 et'tarik = /et-tarik/ “the way”. t'l = /t'l/ 24v, 6 et'lobou = /et'lobu/ “seek!”), and similarly 1r, 11; C 1r, 7 weyet'laqoh /we-yetlaqoh/ “and he lets him go away”, and similarly C 1v, 15; C 2r, 14; C 2v, 6-7. t'm = /t'm/ 26v, 15 wetet'mah = /we-tet'ma/ “and you shall desire”, 27v, 16 feyet'meen = /fe-ytet'men/ “and he will trust”. t'h = /t'h/ 25v, 1-2 weyet'hannou = /we-yet'hena/ “and they will advance”.

Yet t' marking /tt/ is not quite exceptional preceding a vowel either, although, it seems, t' was aspirated in this position, while /t/ was unaspirated. I have noticed 1v, 7 kat'tih = /kat'tu/ “flock”; 4v, 9 t'ar = /t'ar/ “he flew”, and similarly 9v, 6 (yet 9r, 13-14 spelt with t'); 10v, 9 wetet'lah = /we-tet'la/ “and he ascended”; 27v, 4 t'alebet'ak = /talebet'ak/ “your prayer”; 33v, 2 elxat'tie = /el-xat'tie/ “the sin”.

7. It stands to reason that emphatic /t/ was unaspirated (just as was /q/), as against aspirated /t/ (and /k/). Satzinger, p. 53, suggesting for /t/ the pronunciation of modern Cairene ݣ mistook tā for dād. On the other hand, d is attested for marking /t/ (2r, 8-9 adrođome = /a-trođ-home/ “I shall expel them”) and t, which generally corresponds to /t/, may designate /d/: 19r, 11 beṭer = /bätēr/(!) “hasten!”. 21v,
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2 (v. §9); 22r, 9 tauwar = /dawwar/ “wandering”. This spelling is perhaps due to the similarity of unaspirated t (in our case f), d (weak voiceless plosive dental) and d.

8. Satzinger, p. 53, postulated for /q/ the pronunciation g or q, basing himself on *argumentum ex silentio* since /t/ is not unfrequently marked by t, in case of a pronunciation like q, one would certainly expect occasional spelling with k; /q/, however, is invariably spelt with k. This reasoning, however, does not take into account the fact that k in general has encroached upon the domain of k’ (v. §6), even more than t has expanded at the expense of t. Similarly, in medial position I have noticed only one case of /t/ marked by t, v. §§5; 9, yet nobody would attribute a special pronunciation to medial t. Accordingly, one will not attach too much importance to the absence of k’ marking /q/, and, pending further material, interpret /q/ as q, rather than as g/q.

9. As in all modern dialects, /j/ and /z/ have coalesced (historically, /d/ coincided with /j/). Since they are marked by z, it stands to reason that they were pronounced /z/. Satzinger, p. 52, assumes that /th/ and /dh/ have shifted to plosives, viz., t and d respectively. This, however, is quite unlikely. First, he bases his assumption on two alleged cases of t marking /dh/. In both cases, however, Satzinger was misled by Sobhy’s transcription. 21v, 2 belgate, in fact, means “in the morning”, and corresponds to /bi-l-ghadā‘ī/; rather than to /bi-l-ghadāḥē/’. 19r, 16 (en) k‘otēb (= halēk = besēbē = lem tēfhalou) “(if a thing you have not done) is imposed (upon you)” has, it seems to be interpreted as /‘en/ kotēb [i.e., kutiba; for the meaning cf. WB DMG, s.v. kataba, p. 37b, 24ff., where it is explained by “to impose as a duty”, and Ibn Wahb, p. 71, 4, where a sin is imposed; Sobhy and Satzinger interpreted it as kudhiba] /salek be-shay lem tefsalu/]. Moreover, it is rather unlikely, for general reasons, that /z/ (and /d/) should have been preserved as aspirants, whereas the spirants /th/ and /dh/ should have shifted to plosives (/t/ and /d/ respectively). In all the Arabic dialects, at least as far as known to me; either the spirants /t/ , th, dh, have been preserved (the badawī-type) or all the three shifted in a parallel manner, mostly to plosives (d, t, d respectively; the ḥadārī-type), sometimes to sibilants (z, s, z respectively; cf. Jastrow, p. 15). The development, to be sure, need not be parallel. In Uguritic, for instance, Proto-Semitic /t/ and th have been preserved, yet dh, it seems, had shifted to d (cf. JAOS 88, [1968], 523ff.). Nevertheless, the fact that, so far, no Arabic dialect has found displaying asymmetric development of the spirants, imposes the burden of proof on anyone who propounds such a claim. Accordingly, pending further material, I would definitely reconstruct the dialect displayed by our text as preserving the spirants /t/ , th and dh.

On the other hand, it is obvious that in the dialect of the scribe who added the
Arabic superscript, these spirants, had, in fact, shifted to stops. He often writes Arabic /th/ instead of /t/ (as 17v, 8 over the t of dehēbī “you went”, corresponding to /dehēbī/ and not to */dehēbī/; 18v, 13; 18v, 3, 4, 8; 21r, 5; 21v, 2, 6; 23r, 7; 26v, 7; 30r, 10). This has to be interpreted as hyper-correct spelling (inverse spelling): since the scribe knew that in his dialect /th/ had become /t/, in his endeavour to use the more prestigious /th/ he wrote it when even Classical Arabic demanded /t/. And since we interpret this spelling as exhibiting the shift of the spirant /th/ to the stop /t/, we shall similarly postulate the shift of the spirants /z/ and /dz/ to /d/ and /d/ respectively.

10. Final /th/ has been preserved (as 10v, 1 esbēyah “like”; 31r, 9 weakrah /we-ak-rāh/ “and force!”); cf. also for final h marking tā marbūṭa §34.1 and occurring in the pronominal suffix of third pers. sing. masc. §24.3. Yet in /āllah/ it is invariably omitted alla, as 24r, 14; 24v, 16.

11. Our text displays a very pronounced ināla of both short and long a in every position to e (very rarely to e, i, v. infra §11.1). Its main rule has already been laid down by Casonova, pp. 9-10, and more exactly by Satzinger, pp. 43-45. According to it ača shifted to eča, except in the vicinity of the āqāf al-mufaxzama, viz. the emphatic s, t, z, q, further the uvular consonants k, q, in a lesser degree the pharyngeal sounds c, z, and often also r. This statement needs some qualifications, the most important one among them being that only a harf mufaxzam occurring in the same syllable prevents the occurrence of the ināla. Accordingly, the harf mufaxzam has not only to be in direct contact with the a in order that the latter should not shift to e (therefore 33r, 5 lemenh = /le-menc/ “to prevent”, where the sayyn, though occurring in the same syllable, has not prevented the ināla, because it was not in immediate contact with the a), but, besides, it also has to occur in the same syllable. The effects of this rule can be felt everywhere; the following examples of a > e followed by heterosyllabic harf mufaxzam have been chosen at random and others may easily be added: 27v, 8 eshayyatin = /eš-shayetīn/ “the devils” (rather than *eš-shayatīn, since t belongs to a different syllable); 27v, 15-16 ieresada = /yerēsada/ (rather than *yerēsada) “is lying in wait for you”; 28b, 3 wiehōtou = /we-ahētū/ “and they will surround you”; 24v, 14-15 wekefeh = /weqēfe/ “standing”; 15v, 13 seha = /sēca/ “hour”, and similarly 15v, 10; 31r, 7. 24v, 15 bēmexafet = /be-mexāfet/ “with the fear” (rather than *be-mexāfet); 31r, 2 mesadeka = /mesādeqa/ “friendship” (rather than *mesādaqa).

11.1 I have noticed a few cases only in which the ināla is marked by ā15 or i: 28r, 4 elauwēl = /el-āwēl/ “the first”; 28r, 3; 28v, 13-14 kitēl = /kītēl/ “fighting”. So I am inclined to interpret hawwē “these” hawwē 28v, (1-2) (wehadou) hawwē (men koddemak) = /we-hōwē/ (1) hawwē (1) (men qoddēmak)/ “(and) these (turn

15 Cf. Satzinger, p. 44. On the other hand, ā is very frequent as a part of the diphthong āi, v. Satzinger, p. 45.
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aside) in front of you) (34, 10 the interpretation of hawlé depends on the restoration of the text.) On ḍ for ṭā marbuta v. §34.1. The imāla to i is perhaps displayed by 32v, 16 bekī = ḫeqqī bagā "duration", which is the more surprising, since one would have expected the q to prevent the imāla. And even if we derive it from the less frequent infinitive bagī, without assuming imāla to i, the imāla in the first syllable is still surprising; yet one may claim that through the shift baqī > baqī, q has been transferred to the next syllable and, therefore, could not prevent the imāla. Only seemingly is this feature displayed by hekīde "thus" 9v, 9-10; 10v, 11; C 2r, 2; kīdelek in the same sense 16r, 16, which correspond to Classical Arabic hākadhā and kadhālika respectively, so, prima facie, exhibiting the shift ka > ki. Already Fischer, pp. 132-33, had difficulties in explaining this shift in dialectal kīde? Yet J. Greenberg, Hl. 17:64 (1961), in his review of Fischer, with good reason postulated an Old Arabic etymon *ki, different from Classical Arabic ka. And Blanc, p. 199, note 161, in his wake, postulated for Christian Baghdadi hekī the etymon hākīdā, which exactly corresponds to the first of the words occurring in our text; additional proof for this feature was collected by Levin, p. 133. The only certain case of imāla to i I have noticed is 26v, 1 emenītāk = /emēnītak/ "your faith" (though the feminine ending, as a rule, is spelt with et, as 24v, 1; 10).

11.2 The case of ki, treated above (§11.1), reveals an intrinsic difficulty when we come to the historical analysis of the Arabic dialects especially in the field of phonetics and morphology. This becomes even more complicated in Middle Arabic texts, in which Classical and Neo-Arabic elements co-exist. Neo-Arabic must not be considered a direct descendent of Classical Arabic (though, of course, Classical Arabic represents the older layer). Therefore, when reconstructing etymons of Neo-Arabic, one must not simply equate them with Classical forms. This is also the case with the definite article, which, for our dialect at least, has to be derived from *il, rather than from Classical 'al. Therefore, it appears in our text always as el (the l being, as expected, assimilated to "sun" letters) (with the exception of 'allāh, for which v. §10, which also exhibits l mafaxxama, cf. Satzinger, p. 46, note 13; and once illed = 'illedīl/ 16r, 13), even preceding jurīf mafaxxama, like 18v, 3 ettārik = /et-ta'īq/ "the road"; 33v, 6 essora = /'essōral/ "the picture". Were the original form of the article 'al, the a would have been preserved in immediate contact with a harf mafaxxam, occurring in the same syllable.

For other forms which one does not simply derive from etymons identical with Classical forms, v. §§17.1, note 38; 27.2; 27.3; 28.1; 28.2; 28.3; 28.4; 28.6.

11.3 r prevents the shift ā/a to ē/e marginally only; accordingly, in the vicinity of tautosyllabic r both ā/a and ē/e are attested: rā : 10v, 9 jera = /jerāl/ "he ran"; 14v, 11 akra = /'agāl/ (with the shift of verbs III ' to III y, §§18.1, rather than 'agār) "I read"; 13v, 2 ras = /rās/ "head", as also 23, 14-15; 15r, 2 raheb = /'īrāheb/ "monk", and so also 22r, 9; 21r, 12 weiradet = /wē-irādet/ "the will of"; 25r, 4 jerāfat = /jerāfat/ "wounds"; 27v, 12 warahom = /warāhom/ "behind them", and similarly 28r, 6.
Less frequent is re :1v, 5 elxeref = [el-xerēf] “sheep”; 9v, 13 webelhare = [we-bel-hāre]16 “with difficulty, hardly”; 11v, 8-9 enfire = [enfirē] “loneliness”; 24r, 8 eloexre = [el-o'xex] “the other (fem.)”; 27v, 15-16 ieressadak = [ierēśadak] “he is lying in wait for you”.

I have not noticed any cases of ēr, even when the r occurs in the same syllable. In all the occurrences noticed, the r prevents the ināla, thus giving rise to ēr : 3v, 8 belhijar = [be-l-hijar] “with the stones”; 9r, 13 nār = [nār] “fire”; 22r, 9 tawwar = [dawwār] “wandering”. rat > ra (r followed by tā marbātā : 2v, 5 sahra = [saxra] “rock”; 2v, 7-8 hofrah = [hōfra] “hole”; 3v, 11 elhijara = [el-hijāra] (for the ā, v. §11.7.1) “the stones”; 5v, 3-4 xat'tara = [xattāra] “handle”; 10v, 3 shejarah = [shejera] “tree”, and similarly 10v, 10; 17r, 7 t'emonara = [themara] (for the a preceding the r v. §11.7) “fruit”; 24r, 1-2 mejhara = [mejhara] “loud voice”; 34r, 3 wetabarat = [we-taharāt] “and the purity of”.

rat > re (r followed by tā marbātā : 6v, 13-14 megharo = [meghāretho] “his cave”); 11v, 11 kasireh = [qaṣāre] “short (fem. sg.)”; 10v, 5 k'tirēh = [kēthēre] “many (fem. sg.)”; 14v, 4 welextēh = [we-lē-xēre] “and the other world”; 27r, 8 t'amarēt (cf. §11.7) = [thamamet] “the fruit of”; 33r, 6 himere = [îmērē](!) “building”; 33r, 8 zahereh = [izhēre](!) “open (fem. sing.)”.

ra : 3v, 10 wa-rajemonhom = [we-rajemonhom] “and he stoned them”; 6r, 8 radi = [rādi] “bad”; 14r, 4 rab = [rab(b)] “Lord”; 19r, 12 wazarrab = [we-azarrab] “and beat!”; 23r, 3-4 let'ahraf = [le-tahra'af] “to know”; 34v, 7 rajah = [rajā] “he returned”.

re : 7v, 5 wexarej = [we-xarej] “and he went out”, and similarly 20v, 1; 23r, 11 (it is unlikely to interpret it as faris-forms, since one would have expected fisil, v. §27.1; cf. also forms exhibiting xaraq 8r, 3-4; 28r, 14); 7r, 8-9 reźaf = [refadnē] “we have shunned”; 8r, 6 weja[h] = [we-ra] “and he returned”; 8v, 4 t'rekeh = [tērekōh] “he left him”, and similarly 23r, 12; 5v, 10 werresas wa-rāšās “and lead”; 16v, 5-6 arefoh = [karefoh](!) suqafītu “they recognized it”; 34v, 5 belharek'et = [be-l-harekēt] “by movements”; 19r, 15 yet'harrek = [yet'harrek] “it will move”; 5r, 4 sedrehē = [sedrehē] “here bosom”.

ar (with tautosyllabic r) prevails : 6v, 5 arde 'ardā “worse”; 10r, 9-10 weye-t'efarrag = [we-yetefarrag] “and he devotes himself”; ak'har/ek'har “other” 25v, 4; 7r, 3-4 t'arfa[f] = [ta'affle] “you will lift”; 34r, 2 shar sahar “evil”; 34r, 9 weyeslā “and watching”; 25v, 1 el'kabar (v. §11.7).

I have noticed also one certain case of (tautosyllabic) er : 31v, 1 ieressagak = [iyereṣagak] “it makes you free”. 25v, 13 girme “village” may be derived from

16 Satzinger, p. 64, following Sobhy, was wrong in correcting to wa-bi-l-'abāra and translating “more accurately” (Sobhy translated it “furthermore”). For bi-l-'abār in the sense of “with difficulty, hardly” v. Dozy s.v. (where, however, one of the two passages has to be translated, according to Fleischer, II, p. 499, by “at least”), further in Judaeo-Arabic Kuzari, pp. 12, 18 (read sol); 14, 1, in Christian Arabic, Blau, ChA, p. 597, note 33. By the way, even in the sense of “all the more, how much rather” bi-l-'abār should not be derived from bi-l-'abāra, since it occurs in Classical Arabic as well, v. Lane, s.v. harīyy; correct Blau, ChA, p. 597B, end of §491.3, accordingly.
*qirya* (cf. Brockelmann, I, p. 193, §72a), rather than from *qarya*, and the derivation from *ir* may apply also to other cases of *er* as well, v. §§27.2; 27.3; 28.3; 28.4. 19r, 6 leyofer *li-yughf* "that it may be forgiven" is, perhaps, a pseudo-passive form and accordingly *er* may again correspond to *ir* (cf. §29).

11.4 Even more marginal is the use of *h* preventing *imāla*: *hē* is much more frequent than *hā*, as 2r, 5; 2v, 7 *hēhne* = *ḥēhōnē* "here"; 5r, 7; 32v *hēḥdiḥ* "this (fem.)"; 13v, 3 *hēde* = *ḥēḏē* "this (masc.)"; 24r, 1 *bet’ehwen* = *be-tehēwēn* "by negligence"; 24r, 9 *eljohed* = *el-johēd* "the ignorant (men)"; almost always the pronominal suffix of the third pers. sg. fem. has the form *-hē*, as 2v, 10; 23r, 4; 27r, 2; 32r, 10; I have, however, noticed some cases of *ḥā* as well: 4r, 5; 22r, 7-8; 32r, 9-10. Besides, I have noticed one additional case of *ḥā* only: 34r, 3 *wetahara* = *wē-tehārat* "and the purity of".

*he* is also more frequent than *ha*, as 5v, 8 *deheb* = *ḥēheb* "gold"; 12v, 3-4 *et’nehhed* *’atanahhad* "I sigh" (if it exhibits *’atnehhad*; cf. §28.4); 29v, 6 *heweye* = *ḥewēyē* "my inclination"; 35r, 1 *yehem* "he understands"; as against 24r, 1-2 *mehara* "loud voice"; 32r, 11 *iheb* = *ḫēḥeb* "it will go". Similarly, *eh* is more frequent than *ah*, even when the *h* belongs to the same syllable: 12v, 3-4, *et’nehhed*, v. above; 10v, 1 *eshbeh* "very much like"; 14r, 12 *dehr* "time"; 18r, 4 *elhouhi* (v. §24.3) "its people"; 21r, 10 *femmeh* = *fe-mehnē* "whatever". I have noticed only the following cases of *ah*: 14r, 2 *mahrab* "place of refuge"; 33r, 12 *tahar* "you will flee"; 23v, 7-8 *tahar* = *ṭahra* "you pour".

11.5 *w* as a rule, does not belong to the consonants preventing *imāla*. For *wē* cf. e.g. 19v, 14-15 *têtweiwen* = *tetewēnē* "you neglect"; 29v, 6 *heweye* = *ḥewēyē* "my inclination". As to we, *waw copulativum* invariably exhibits the form we, as e.g. 22r, 1; 3; 5. Cf. further 28r, 11 *bekouwet’ak* = *be-qūwetak* "on your power". Yet I have noticed *wē* 2v, 9 *elwadi* = *’el-wēdi* "the valley"; 30v, 4 *mouwaxa* = *muwāxā(t)/ mu’āxā(t) "friendship", and also twice *warā* "behind" 28r, 6; 27v, 12.

11.6 There is a certain marginal tendency to preserve *a* after a glottal stop, when the next syllable opens with one of the *harāf mufaxxama* following the *a* directly. For *aḥad* "one" v. e.g. 7v, 7; 14v, 9; 24r, 5(!); this feature may also be exhibited in the perfect of some *II* w/j verbs, v. §31; 9r, 12 *axadou* = *’axadḥā* "they took"; for *ţaxar* "other" v. 2r, 6; 9r, 8; 18r, 15. Yet this feature is very far from being regular. On the other hand, very rarely to be sure, *’a* may precede a consonant other than *harf mufaxxam*: 25v, 4 *ak’bar* *’akbar* "older", as against 25v, 7 *ek’bar* "with *e*", as is the rule in the elative preceding a consonant other than *harf mufaxxam*, e.g. 6r, 14(!); 9v, 7; 10v, 1; 25v, 16; 28r, 4); amr "thing" 21v, 12; 16; 29r, 8; ajr "reward" 21v, 13. Cf. also §28.3. On the other hand, often *e* may be followed by a heterosyllabic *harf mufaxxam*, as *eḥad* "one", v. 20r, 11; 21r, 15; 34r, 2; further 9v, 2 *exir* = *’exir* "last"; 14v, 4 *welexereh* = *we-l-’exere* "and the other world"; 21v, 1 *exiḥ* = *’exiḥ* "his brother’s", and similarly 22r, 2 *exi* "my brother" (and
even with tautosyllabic ɣ 17r, 15 elex "the brother"; as a rule, however, 'aḫ prevails: 7r, 13; 21r, 5).

11.7 Exceptional cases of the preservation of ā/ā 9r, 5-6 šāṭī šāṭī' "shore", although the t is heterosyllabic. 26v, 5 marī mār(t) used as clerical title is a loan word (from Syriac, where, incidentally, the r is tautosyllabic: mār). Although the perfect suffix first person plur. is almost invariably -nē (v. e.g. 1v, 8), I have noticed 2r, 5 mezaina = (if the reading is correct) [mečaynē] "we went". As a rule, ṣe "he went" is attested, e.g. 7r, 13; yet C 1r, 16, it seems, is attested (since Sobhy’s restoration, following Casanova, ğār does not fit; cf. Violet, p. 40). Yet one has to take into consideration that ja is followed by a lacuna). ḥonak = [ḥōnāk] "there", e.g. 6r, 16, may be due to the influence of the pronominal suffix 2. pers. sing. masc., which, when attached to a word terminating in a consonant, invariably exhibits the form -ak (v. §24.2; this, of course, is itself an exception from imāla; contrast hehene = [ḥēhehēn] "here", e.g. 2r, 2; 5), and, if the preceding word terminates in original -ā, -āk, as 23r, 2 feeiak = [fe-ēyyāk] "beware" (which relates e.g. to 33v, 3 ehem = [eḥēm] ehem, as honak relates to hēhehēn); v. also 23v, 16; 25v, 9; further 25v, 14 hainak = [ḥāyāk] "your eyes"; 30r, 2-3; 31v, 2 xataiak = [xāṭāyāk] "your sins"; 31r, 8; 32v, 5 ahak = [āxādāk] "your enemies". On the other hand, Sattizer, p. 44, is wrong in stating that, besides the regular form ḫalē (e.g. 17r, 5; 24r, 4; 6; 31v, 2), ḫalē "on" also exists. He relied, it seems, on Sobhy’s restoration 25v, 1, which, however, is not accurate (as are also other restorations, such as 8r, 1 read Xēlēmēt, cf. 13r, 1-2; or 35r, 2; 8v, 1 read emmehou, cf. 6v, 11).

There are other cases of a not exhibiting a tautosyllabic ḫarī ṭuṣṣṭīm, often even not a heterosyllabic one: 5v, 7; 8 halaka = [ḥalqāq] "ring"; 17r, 7 t’mēmah = [ṭhemaḥ] "fruit", and 27r, 8 even t’āmarah; 18r, 3 dalālah = [dalāla] "boldness"; 20v, 13-14 erasak "he sent you"; 25v, 1 elk’ābar ‘al-kībar "old age", where the exceptional a corresponds to Classical i, rather than to a; 23v, 6 fechmalou = [fe-émālou] "do it!"; akraḥ "force!" 31r, 9; 31v, 13. Cf. also the pseudo-passive fasbe yUsabī "it will be taken captive" (cf. §29).

11.7.1 As a rule, when the addition of a suffix beginning with a vowel changes the syllable division and transfers a ḫarī ṭuṣṣīm following ā/ā to the following syllable, the ā/ā shifts to e/e, because it occurs now in a different syllable: 9v, 2-3 jenhāin = [jenēḥayn] “two wings”; 20r, 16 niyēhat = [niyēḥay] “his desire”, as against 14v, 3 niḥ; 7v, 5-6 niwedēhoun = [niweddeṣou] “he will part from him”; 23r, 1 audēhak = [awdeṣak] “he confided to you”; 17r, 9-10 t’emehouneh = [tesneṣānēḥ] “you heart it”; 28v, 3 māṭetou (read: māṭet’etou) = [maṭayeh-tētī] “and they will surround”; 25v, 11 imērak = [imēreṣak] “he will bid you”; 31r, 13 ajuēhak = [awdeṣak] “your pains”; C 1v, 16 zaiekat’oh = [dāyeqatōḥ] “and she tormented him”.

There occur, however, cases in which the added suffix, though transferring the ḫarī ṭuṣṣīm to the following syllable, nevertheless does not alter the preceding ā/ā into e/e: 3v, 11 elhijara = [el-lēhijāra] “the stones”, cf. 3v, 8 belhijar; 3v, 4

xalasī = [xalāṣā] "you slept in the 28.3; 2v, 10 qallāyana = [qalāṣānaya] correspond. For verbs, etc.

12. Šātī šāṭī, i/fu is not rendered.

12.1 So the same is with šāṭī šāṭī. It is not rendered, and its distribution is not clear. The name of the Caspian Sea (and the monograph of the same name) corresponds to words in which the men her me or her are rendered. The term, when applied to a place, which means "and they slept", 16v, 4, when applied to a person, means "you slept". 2v, 1. A qalāṣānaya in response to a šāṭī šāṭī (fem. 1st pers. singular) is impossible.
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xalasi = [xalašt] "my salvation", cf. xalas 1r, 5; 11; 5v, 15 weiet’ alak = [weyetca:laqti] “and they will be connected”; 7v, 3-4 asbahou = [asahū] “they were in the morning”; 20v, 12 iemarak ya’humak “he bids you”; 24r, 10 efk’arak, 31v, 6, 10 efkarak = [efkārak] “your thoughts”.

11.8 Exceptional cases of e/e in the vicinity of tautosyllabic ḥarf musfamm: 5r, 13 Ax : cel = [axšēl] “virtues” (as against 32v, 11 xesal); for 32b, 16 beki v. §11.1; 16r, 14-15 se mah et’oh(!) = [semacetoh] “she heard it” (pay attention that in spelling ɛ (‘h’) had been separated from the following e; is this the reason that the ɛ has prevented the imāla of the preceding, but not of the following vowel; cf. also §12.1, note 21); 5r, 4 sedrehē = [sedrehē] “her bosom”; 5r, 14 esl = [ešl] “origin”; 20r, 2 mhrehe macrīfə “knowledge”, and similarly 26r, 2; 34v, 12 mowezebet muwāṣabat “perseverance”; 1r, 15 heb preceded and followed by lacuna, need not correspond to ḥubb “he loved”; it may represent ḥubb (cf. §13.1) “love” as well. For verbal forms, the underlying forms of which are not clear, v. §§27.2; 28.2; 28.3; 28.4. kelleyeh, as 23r, 10; 12-13; 32v, 9, does not, pace Dozy, s.v., represent qallāya with exceptional imāla, but rather qillāya, cf. Fleischer, II, p. 735.\(^\text{17}\)

12. Satzinger’s statement (p. 45) as to the Coptic transcription of short and long i/ju is not quite accurate and needs some qualifications.

12.1 Satzinger, p. 45, claimed that short i, not influenced by ḥarf musfamm, is transcribed by ʾ when stressed, by e when unstressed. I surmise that Satzinger attributes to this dialect mirrored in our text a stress system identical with (or similar to) that of Cairene Arabic. Yet this claim can not be sustained, either according to the Cairene, or according to any other known system of pronunciation. Thus even monosyllabic nouns, which, by necessity, have to be stressed, as a rule display e corresponding to Classical i and, presumably, stemming from it. This is the case not only in words like men “from” (as 1v, 2), which, it seems, were proclitic (loc. cit., men has, in fact, coalesced in spelling with the following word) [and this may even apply to words like metl mithl “like”, e.g. 4r, 9, 10; 4v, 8], but also in words which, in all likelihood, evinced separate stress, as 6v, 15 welebn = [we-lebnu] “and the Son”; 11v, 7 fesebt fasibīt (!) “and I wandered”; 18r, 13 nemt “you slept”. Cf. also a word like menh “from him” 3r, 10 (preceding lacuna); 15v, 5; 16v, 6, 7, which was perhaps pronounced like menno (cf. §24.2), but is spelt as a monosyllabic word, thus demonstrating that the e bore the stress. Additional occurrences of e, representing i in a presumably stressed syllable, (as tseḥebt tasibīt “you were tired” 18v, 3), may be quoted at will. Moreover, i representing i in presumably unstressed syllable is attested as well, though to a more limited extent, as 2r, 11 tseḥēbī = [tse:ebi] “both were tired”; 2v, 3 feberik “and he blessed”, corresponding to Classical ḥa-bēraka (§28.2); 5r, 7; 11v, 9-10 hedhī ḥadhīḥī “this (fem.)” (as against hedēh 16r, 5); for ḥek’ide and ḥekidek, corresponding to Classical hākadhā and kadhālīka, cf. §11.1; rather frequent is the spelling with i in the

\(^{17}\) For the imāla in Violet’s Psalm fragment in Greek characters v. Appendix B.
nominal theme fiṣāl, as 17v, 14 shimele shimmālan “to the left”; 18r, 15 k’iseen (v. §42.1) corresponding to kīṣā’(!) “cover”; 3v, 8 belhijār18 = /be-l-hijār/ “by stones”, and similarly 3v, 11 elhijara18 = /el-hijār/ “the harvest”; C 1r, 11 belhīsae = /be-l-cīshēf “in the evening (meal)”19; 26f, 13 kit’eb “book”; 27v, 8 bek’tel = /be-qitēl “in fighting”, and similarly 28v, 13-14; rather remarkable is 7r, 12 chīlēk “perdition”, which corresponds to Classical al-Hālāk; cf. also other cases of i preceding (original) ā: 33r, 6 hīmere18 = /kīmēre/ “building(?);” 7v, 16 eht’inem “occupation” (alternating with eht’emem 7v, 14; for other cases of e preceding (original) ā cf. 1v, 5 elxeref “the sheep”; 32v, 11 xesal = /xēṣāl/ “virtues”; yet kiem = /qīyēm/ “standing [plur.]” 9r, 5 is ambiguous20, since it may be interpreted as exhibiting /qīyēm/ with elision of the first vowel; 11v, 8-9 enired “loneliness”; 21r, 12 weirdet “and the will of”.

Satzinger’s analysis (p. 44) of the transcription of i in the vicinity of hurāf mutfassama is also not accurate. Such an i is never transcribed by i but, he claims, by e and, in unstresss syllable, sometimes by a. This, however, does not hold water. When dealing above with fiṣāl, we have already quoted cases of i corresponding to i in the vicinity of hurāf mutfassama (v. note 18). Other occurrences of this phenomenon are attested as well, both in stressed and unstressed syllables. I have noticed the following cases: 14v, 13 rikkat = /riqqat/ “the softness of”; 8r, 5-6 [we] hide = /wēhīde/ “one (fem.)” (the restoration is certain), C 2v, 14 wehīd “one (masc.).”

As to the shift of i to a in the vicinity of hurāf mutfassama in unstressed syllables only, one will readily admit that this shift is comparatively frequent in syllables which were presumably unstressed. I have noticed e.g. mawzah mawdīc “place” 2r, 6; 18r, 1-2, 7; 20v, 1-2; 31r, 3; wehad wāhīd “one (masc.)” 4r, 7, wehade wāhīna “one (fem.)” 30v, 7 (as a rule, however, wehed is attested, as 24v, 3; 7v, 6, 9, the last passage exhibiting tashidīd on the d, v. §15, note 32); elmesheyaq ‘al-mashāyix “the elders” 14v, 9-10; 16v, 8-9; essanah as-sānīc “the Maker” 5r, 10, and also sanah 5v, 5 has to be interpreted as sānīc “craftsman”; essalat ‘as-sālīh “the good one”; perhaps also semah samiṣa “he heard” 1r, 9, quoted by Satzinger, ibid., if it does not reflect fasāl, rather than fascal.21

Yet I have also noticed cases in which i has shifted to a in syllables which were certainly or almost certainly stressed: quite frequent is the preposition ẖam, co-

---

18 In order to demonstrate the extent of this feature in fiṣāl, I am quoting cases of i in the vicinity of hurāf mutfassama as well.
19 Yet C 1r, 2 belhashe. In Classical Arabic ẖishā denotes “evening”, ẖasā “supper” (the first phonetically corresponding to C 1r, 11, the second to C 1r, 2). Since both meanings fit in both passages, I am inclined to interpret both words as one lexeme with phonetic alternation.
20 The same applies to 17r, 5-6 liele ẖella “leste”, which might have developed a glide (y) between i and e. Such a glide is perhaps displayed by the spelling lielele 31v, 7-8; yet v. §14 for another possible interpretation.
21 This becomes the more likely, since 16r, 14-15 se mah et’ōlam saniṣat-hu “it heard it” exhibits a preceding a heterosyllabic c and therefore has presumably to be interpreted as fasal (and the same may apply to 34v, 8 wehafaz we-hafiz “and he kept”). For the special problems of inādā in this word v. §11.8. – For other verbal forms which may (but only may) exhibit the shift i > a, v. §§27.3; 28.1; 28.2; 28.3; 28.6.

---
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responding to Classical cinda “at”, as handoh “at him” 1r, 4, and similarly 5r, 6; 9r, 11; 18v, 13. One could, of course, derive cand from an etymon exhibiting a, rather than i; in the light of end 
11r, 15 (which, to be sure, occurs after a lacuna), this is, however, very unlikely, since there is no reason for interpreting end as a Classical loan. fazza fiksa “silver” 5v, 8-9. samaht samichtu “I heard” 11v, 3; 13v, 6; and similarly in the second pers. sg. masc. 26v, 11; yet these forms may reflect fical, rather than facal.21 Frequent is axwe 'inxwatuµ “brethren” (as 6r, 7; 14v, 8). It could be claimed that the shift of i to a is due (also) to morphological attraction to the plural form 'atcsal (cf. in modern Cairene Arabic 'axwatî, v. Spiro s.v.22). Yet, in our text, the word terminates in (the historic descendant of) tá marbiţa, rather than in alif namāda (i.e. not < *'axwā'). This is exhibited not only by the spelling (17v, 3 axwah with final h), but also by forms like axwet'ī “my brethren” 17r, 4. For nānh “we” v. §23. Cf. also §30, note 43. For cases of a > i through assimilation of vowels v. §27.1.

Accordingly, I would propose not to differentiate between stressed and unstressed i on the one hand, and i in the vicinity of haft mufaxxam or remote from it on the other (except for the marginal shift to a through the influence of hurīf mufaxxa-na). As a rule, (short) i is spelt by e, occasionally only by i. Among the instances of spelling with i, two classes stand out. There is a clear tendency to mark i initial i: ide ‘ildhā “when” (e.g. 1r, 8; 5r, 6; 7r, 8; 10r, 7); ide ‘illa “to” (as 8r, 4; 8v, 5; C 2v, 11; similarly ilek “to you”, although the i was presumably unstressed; yet 23v, 13 ilek; further, 17v, 16; 34r, 10 ele); ile ‘illa “except” (as 1r, 6; 17v, 2; spelt with one i ile 6v, 8; yet elle 8r, 1; 1; 14r, 3; 23r, 4).23

As to the second group of i marking, viz. fisal and related themes, I would tentatively suggest that in the dialect reflected in our text, i in this position was elided. The scribe (or the author), who was not able to pronounce short i in this position, lengthened it when reading Classical Arabic (cf., for a similar feature, Brockelmann, 1, p. 93) and, accordingly,25 spelt it with ı. There exist some other indications that, in fact, i in this position has been elided. xisal “virtues” occurs not only in the form of xesal 32v, 11, but also in that of Ax : sel 5r, 13, thus attesting

---

21 For e not being marked in spelling cf. e.g. 11v, 9 wekaad‘ = /we-qasadt/ “and I stayed”; 5v, 15 weiteit. alaka wa-yatacallagū “and they are connected”.

22 Yet Mitchell, p. 41, has 'inxwārt.

23 Whereas in 'ildhā and 'illa the spelling with i prevails, 'illa is frequently spelt with e. In some words I have noticed (almost) only the spelling with e, as in the case of the definite article (v. §11.2, where, however, one case of illedi is quoted) and in that of en 'in “if”, as 25v, 6; 26r, 12; 26v, 7; 27r, 10.

24 According to Satzinger, p. 44 i not exposed to the influence of hurīf mufaxxama, is spelt i, as is also e in the vicinity of hurīf mufaxxama. Yet for the latter he notes two exceptions, exhibiting e. In both cases, however, Satzinger was misled by Sobby’s transcription, since e corresponds to short i, thus standing instead of e (just as, rarely to be sure, e and ı alternate marking a [v. §1.11]. 24v/25r 'estēheh corresponds to Classical tasta'īl, v. §4, and 35v, 3 kāder “able” has to be interpreted as ḥaqādir, rather than as ḥadādir. Accordingly, i is invariably marked by i (30v, 5 hadet “young” corresponds to ḥadath, rather than to ḥadith, as Sobby assumes).
to a transitional form *xšāl, from which by the addition of a prosthetic vowel and adaptation to the 'afšāl plural pattern /uxšāl/ arose. Moreover, I am inclined to interpret 9v, 14 sāgār = /ṣagār/ “small (plur.),” corresponding to Classical ṣihār (Cairene ṣighār, v. Spiro s.v.), as a pseudo-Classical form. The scribe (or the author) wanted to use instead of his dialectal ṣihār a Classical form, yet restored the vowel wrongly. Such a false restoration may also be exhibited by 7r, 12 elhilik ʾal-ḥālāk “perdition”; the scribe (or author) pronounced it ḥālāk (for the elision of a in faṣāl in some dialects cf. e.g. Grotzfeld, p. 31, §36n) and wrongly restored it to ḥulāk.26

12.2 According to Satzinger, p. 44, u is spelt ʿ, ʿʿ ou (to be pronounced ʿāʾ). This is, no doubt, correct. Yet Satzinger again differentiates between cases influenced by hurāf muṣafaxama and those not influenced by them. Influenced u, according to Satzinger, is always spelt ʿ, the uninfluenced one in an unstressed syllable is spelt quite often ou (as is the case, according to Satzinger, with the pronominal suffix third person sing. masc.). This, however, is not quite accurate. Though short ʿ is, as a rule, spelt ʿ, it may marginally (even outside the pronominal suffix third person masc. sing.) also be spelt ou, independent of stress or influence of hurāf muṣafaxam. The following examples will prove this statement: 13v, 3-4 eoum yasādā “he shall consider” (ʿ ; yet 3r, 5; 17r, 14 with ou). kʿoʿoun kal ʿ “all” 14r, 10; 14v, 6 (as against kʿol e.g. 3r, 7, 9, 12; cf. also 3v, 14, where ʿāʾ is added as Arabic superscript over the ʿ of kʿol). 2r, 7, 12 kouf = /qul/ “I said”. 7v, 5-6 iewwdehου ṣawwālī-čuḥā “he will see him off”. 7v, 7 mehoun = /mecu/ “with him”. 30r, 7 taḡfour, as if it exhibited taghfar, rather than the passive form taghfar (v. §2.9). 17r, 15 eiouhve ṣawwghā “O”. 30r, 4 muwawah = /muwaxā[t]/ muwāxāt “friendship”, perhaps exhibiting the “Classical” long pronunciation of a vowel reduced in spoken language (cf. above, §12.1, in fine); and similarly 26r, 7-8 elmouxalefin “the schismatics”. 27v, 11-12 webohoodou wa-baṣiḏu “they went away”.

Similarly, pace Satzinger, ibid., not only in the vicinity of hurāf muṣafaxama may ʿ be spelt occasionally ʿ (cf. also §14), but also outside it: 14r, 8 liehelkʿoḥe = /li-yeh-tekōhē/ “that they destroy it”. 28r, 13-14 ebsarok = /ebsārōk/ “they saw you” (yet r may be a harf muṣafaxam; cf. §11.3; this applies also to the next example). 34v, 3 horob hurāb “fighting”.27

13. As we have seen, both a (§11) and i (§12.1) are very often spelt e, i.e. the opposition between them is very frequently neutralized. On the level of phonemic analysis, one can distinguish between the phonemes a and i only in those comparatively restricted instances in which e alternates either with a (e.g. xarej – xaraj, v. §11.3), thus demonstrating its derivation from the phoneme a, or with i (e.g. elle – ille, v. §12.1), thus proving its belonging to the phoneme i. But even in some of these cases (as ehtemem – ehtimem, §12.1) one of the forms (in our case ehti-

26 As to ʿez, if it really corresponds to Classical ʿezun, cf. §30. Cf. also 24v, 14 havessk §15.
27 Not infrequently ʿ is spelt by o, a Coptic u being added over the o, as 4v, 2; 17r, 13, 13; 33r, 5. Cf. also above kʿol/kʿul.
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mem) may be due to Classical influence. One may, of course, classify the recurrence of e according to its correspondence to Classical Arabic; this, however, does not work in all cases; cf. the pitfalls we have dealt with §11.2. On the morphemic level, the alternation of identical themes exhibiting a in the vicinity of hurif mu-
faxama with e in the case of their absence, as a rule, proves that the e belongs to the phoneme a. Yet in some cases it is very difficult to establish the exact underlying theme. Comparison with Classical Arabic again may prove fallacious and the dialect reflected in our text may use different themes (cf. §§13.1, end; 27.2; 27.3; 28.2; 28.3; 28.4; 28.6). Moreover, there exist cases of i shifting to a in the vicinity of hurif mufaxama, v. §12.1. Accordingly, I forswear the phonemic transcription of the Arabic text. The transliteration of e by /ε/ seems to me the only practical way, whether it belongs to the archiphoneme a or i.

13.1 Similarly, I faithfully transliterated e by /ε/, even when it corresponded to Classical u. As in other dialects, in our text the difference between i and u in many positions has been neutralized. This is mirrored by the alternation of e = /j/ and o = /u/. As a rule e stands for o, sometimes also o for e. I have noticed e for o in stressed closed syllables, v. §§27.2; 27.3; cf., §11.8, as well as in unstressed closed ones: e.g. 24r, 1, 13 t’ehewan tahā’wun “negligence”; 26r, 16 mej’t’emelhi mu-
tamīrān “assembled (plur. masc.)”; 26r, 3 elmez’t’emel al-’nustaqima “straight (fem. sing.).” 30v, 12 ejbort ’uḥbīr (pay attention that o and e have, so to say, changed places; yet this form may also be interpreted as a pseudo-passive feature, cf. §29) “you have been forced.” Rather frequent is e for Classical u in open unstressed syllables; it stands to reason (cf. §12.2) that in this position the vowel has been reduced and e marks the reduced vowel only 29; e.g. 10r, 9 esheyyoux ʾash-shuyūx “the elders”; 19v, 4-5 wuhons wuḥīsh “beasts”; 1r, 12 wyejeselos waw-yawal-
šuhā(l) “and he will save him”; 5v, 11-12 wük’emmellhe wa-yukannmiluhā “and he will make it perfect”; 5v, 10-11 inkim yuqīm “he will complete”, and similarly 26r, 9; 23v, 14 t’esalli ṭuṣallī “you will pray”; 24v, 5 mehallem (§42.1) muqal-
lim(m)an) “teacher”; 27v, 10 mejhež muḥād “exerted”; 27v, 15-16 ieresedak yurūṣidaka(“you are waiting for you”; 29v, 5-6 t’emek’ennī tumakkint “you shall let me”; 29v, 9 jebellet’ak yubullata(k “your creature”; 30r, 4 t’ejarbak τυαρίθμων “they will tempt you”; 30r, 5 denoubak dhunnībaka(“your sins”; 31r, 2 mesedak μυσᾶδ:not “friendship”; 31r, 13 ikek yuqīl “it diminishes”; 31r, 15-16 elemour al-ʾumūr “the things.”

Rather rare are instances in which o corresponds to Classical i, i.e., it presumably stands for e. I have noticed it in an open unstressed syllable, where it presumably represents a reduced vowel: 2v, 15 iok’oun “he will be”, as against ordinary iek’ounn, e.g. 3r, 9; 3-4. In the light of this alternation of e and o in the first syllable, one will regard yakūn as its etymon, rather than yjkūn, as in Classical Arabic. I have noticed

26 Cf. also the alternation of ʾīshā — ʾašhā, v. §12.1, note 19.

29 In all these positions, of course, o may be used as well. Thus o is used in stressed closed syllables 25r, 8; 26v, 7; in unstressed closed ones 24v, 7; 25v, 1, 1, and in unstressed open ones 26r, 5; 26v, 14; 34v, 12.
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this feature in stressed closed syllables as well: 19v, 16 t’ummo “complete” < t’ummo < *t’immnu, v. §§19; 30; 26v, 2 elholm ‘al-ṣilm “knowledge”; 30v, 12 nqib, v. above; 34r, 11 homlo, corresponding to Classical ḥilmali “his burden”; 35r, 10 k’adab kibdū “lie”. For nohn “we” v. §23. Cf. also §27.2.

Just as i in the vicinity of hurūf mufaxrama is apt to shift to a (§12.1), so also is u: 2v, 10 hat’t’ououhe ḥiftūhā “put them down!”. 29r, (2-)3 (fele : t [eğel : han]) et’t’ezarraz (the text has been restored following 30r, 8-9) fa-lā tugfi fil csan’at-tdadarrus “(and do not neglect) to implore”, and similarly 30r, 9 et’t’eḥaffaz at-talaffiuq “to preserve”. Although in these two infinitive forms of the fifth conjugation a influenced by a ḥarīf mufaxrama corresponds to e without tafkaš (cf. 24r, 1, 13 t’ehewen, quoted above, in the parallel sixth conjugation), the a/e must not be morphonemically attributed to the archiphoneme a; the e is due to alternation with u (v. above), whereas the a exhibits the shift u > a (or i > a) when influenced by tafkaš. – For the shift u < a due to assimilation v. §§20, end; 27.1; 28.3.

14. As a rule, diphthongs are spelled as such, not as monophthongs. Nevertheless, as already suggested by Satzinger (though in a somewhat different wording), p. 47, it stands to reason that this spelling is due to the author’s desire to utilize Classical forms. Thus, in the dialect reflected in our text av and ay have shifted to o and e respectively. This is borne out by marginal spellings: 6v, 3 (v. Satzinger, p. 45) welewa wa-laysa “and not” (as against regular leis, e.g. 2r, 7). I am also inclined to interpret 6v, 15; 34v, 9 rauh rūh “spirit”, 31v, 11 errauhnnin ar-raḥūniyyin “the spiritual (ones)”, as pseudo-Classical. The author, it seems, pronounced rūh in his dialect (for u pronounced as o cf. §12.2, end) and wrongly analysed it as representing Classical aw, because of the correspondence dialectal o : Classical aw. Accordingly, he spells it rawh. A similar pseudo-Classical feature may be exhibited by 11v, 6 jēt jēt “I came”; if the dialectal form was jēt/jēt (yet this is by no means certain or even probable, especially since I have not noticed cases of I spell with e), it was, by false regression, spell jēt. In some cases, ou (to be pronounced u) corresponds to Classical aw presumably representing monophongization as well: 22v, 14 houlou (preceded by a lacuna), if it corresponds to hawlaq/(a) “round you” (as against 12r, 3 houlou “round him”). 11r, 8 mousunen (§42, note 55) mowzūmen (cf. Satzinger, p. 45) “weighed”. The same may apply to i representing Classical ay: 32r, 10 haliih caayaran “on them”, and similarly 34v, 9; C 2v, 3 (as against the ordinary spelling with eī e.g. 1r, 10; 1v, 1). On the other hand, the spelling of likay, likaymā with i (lek’ti, leki’m, as 17v, 6, 10; 24r, 13-14; 24v, 16; 28r, 9-10) may stem from a different etymology likīmā, cf. e.g. Hebrew kī (rather than *kē). Some cases of i corresponding to Classical i are attested as well and they may exhibit inverse spelling, viz. the use of a diphthong instead of a genuine monophthong: C 2v, 1-2 eikazak = /tqazak/ “I shall awaken you”, cf. C 2r, 16

Yet 9r, 11 et’nen “two” represents ithnān with imāla, rather than ithnēn < ithnayn, pace Satzinger, p. 45, note 12.
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tikaz “you will awaken”; 31v, 2 eide irdha “when”; 31v, 7-8 leielle lilall “lest” (for another interpretation v. §12.1, note 20); perhaps also 31r, 8 *eideh “the hands of”, 34r, 7 eleideen “both hands”, if they represent *iday(n) (cf. § 33), rather than a blend of the dual and the plural aydt. I have also noticed one case of a instead of aw 3r, 11 iamen yawnan “one day”; this, however, may be due to clerical error.

I have noticed two cases of e for ie, perhaps exhibiting the dissimilation yi > i (cf. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 250, §e): 20v, 5 enfehak yansacak(a) “he is of use to you” (for the prefix ie in the first conjugation even before huruf mufaxama, thus exhibiting the etymon yi, rather than ya, cf. §27.2); 24v, 4 esnah yasnac “he shall make”. Inversely, ie instead of e is attested 17r, 3 iehad *hjad “one”; it may be interpreted as inverse spelling: the scribe knew that he is sometimes spelling ie yet pronouncing e. Accordingly, in his endeavour to use Classical forms, he spelt ie even when Classical spelling demanded e. Yet this instance may also exhibit the shift of initial ‘e > ye (cf. Brockelmann, I, p. 46, §l). This, however, becomes unlikely since this spelling also occurs in the middle of words (albeit at the beginning of a morpheme, and thus it is still possible to interpret it as exhibiting the shift ‘e > ye): 27v, 15; 34v, 10 hinied hina’dh(in) “then”. I prefer to interpret it as reflecting hin-’dhi, rather than hin-edhi; on the other hand, it may be just the result of a clumsy way of spelling (cf., mutatis mutandis, similar ways of spelling in the Qur’an, Noldke, Qorân, III, p. 49).

Final -tw shifts to -t (cf. Brockelmann, I, pp. 189-90): 28v, 14 elhadou alcadu (being the Classical pausal form, cf. e.g. Howell, IV, pp. 813-14) < al-cadtuw “the enemy”; C 2v, 13 sohou suhit(w) “ecstasy”.

15. Final double (or more exactly: lengthened) consonants are sometimes spelt twice (as 5r, 8; 6r, 14; 6v, 15; 9r, 14; 9v, 9; 26v, 4; 28r, 4; 34v, 4; also in verbs, where, however, this spelling is less frequent: 21v, 4), sometimes only once (not only in verbs, as 2v, 12 (?); 19r, 5; 23v, 12, 12; 27v, 1; 27v, 16, 32r, 15, but also outside them; even the same words are sometimes spelt with one, sometimes with two consonants: 4v, 10; 14r, 4; 25r, 2; 25v, 2; 27r, 15, 32v, 2; 34r, 2, 6). Prima facie, the spelling with one consonant represents the dialectal pronunciation, that with two either Classical orthography or influence of forms with suffixes, in which the lengthened consonant had middle position (cf. e.g. 24v, 8-9 t’elejou “you shall urge”). Nevertheless, it can be demonstrated that in external close juncture at least, the consonant was lengthened (doubled) in final position, since an auxiliary vowel may develop under phonetic circumstances which make the double pronunciation of the final consonant necessary (cf. §16): 24v, 2-3 k’olle wehed kull wahid “every one”, the final e of k’olle being due to a cluster of three consonants (llw). On the other hand, the double consonant may become simple even in internal open juncture: 27r, 3-4 tehbabhe = [tehabhe] “you love it”.

Yet the simple spelling of a consonant, which according to Classical grammar at least should have been doubled, occurs also in the middle of words. In some cases it is due to phonetic development: 30r, 4 t’jarbak “she will tempt you” < tujarribak, where, because of the elision of the i following rr, the double r has become simpli-
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... Similarly 22v, 2 t'enêhîhou tunayyênîhu(tû) "you shall comfort him". Perhaps also 24v, 14 hawesak hîwâssak(a) "your senses", which may represent the fiqâl form hîwâs: through the elision of the first vowel (§12.1) and the shortening of the final double consonant, hîwâs has become hîwâs (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 229, §116.1), which was interpreted as hîwâs; for the shift i > a v. §12.1.

In other instances, however, the spelling with simple consonant in the middle of a word, prima facie, exhibits orthographic negligence:31 4r, 8 iet'êjed yatajaddad "it will be renewed", and cf. also 4r, 13. 6v, 3 taieb tayyib "good". 6v, 8 ile i'llâ "except". 5v, 15 weletâ alaço wa-yatacallaqtî "they will be connected". 33v, 1 wet'shêhek wa-turîsfak(a) "and he will inform you(!)". 33v, 1 t'êt'êk'elem takarallim "you speak", and similarly 11r, 3. 35v, 4 weiekouik wa-yuqawwîk(a) "and he will strengthen you".

On the other hand, I have noticed cases of inappropriate doubling of consonants: 6v, 14 mejhed majld "glory". 18r, 8 mehefech ma'ráfa "knowledge" (yet 20r, 2 mehefech).32

16. In the case of the cluster of three consonants (CCC) or two consonants following a long vowel (āCC), an auxiliary vowel is added before the last consonant (CCvC33 and āCCvC34 respectively). The auxiliary vowel is ĕ, yet under the influence of šâk(ť)an a (28v, 4 westahom = jwestatomi) "their middle"; 6r, 13 jemâahom = jjemîkahom) "they all"). I have noticed this phenomenon in external close juncture (v. §15) 24v, 2-3 k'olle wehed kull wâhid "every one"). As a rule, it is frequent preceding pronominal suffixes that open with a consonant; it occurs with great regularity and only under the mentioned phonetic circumstances, the only exception being 30v, 1 iehmâ = jiehmel=ehî "he neglects it". Because of the regularity of this feature one has to take it into consideration when restoring a text, such as 26v, 12-13 wet'âli[me]hom /we-tacîmeho(â) (l) "their teaching". Some examples of āCCvC: 28r, 7 nesebt'ehom = jnësebtehom) "you opposed them"; 15v, 3 nefsene "our soul"; 9v, 4 lek'ênneh "but she"; 2v, 12; 5v, 14-15; 27v, 14-15; C. 1r, 10; 5r, 2, 4, 6; 27r, 5. Some instances of āCCvC: 27r, 15 hinâmi = jîcînenî "help me!"; 29v, 3 ehnêni = j'êcînenî "help me!"; for the long radical vowel (as well as the first conjugation instead of the fourth) v. §31; 20v, 11-12; 25r, 11; 26v, 13; 17r, 6; 24v, 1-2; 27r, 2.

16.1 Bloch, pp. 148ff., has argued that in the dialect of Cairo, in which analytic vowels arise according to the pattern CCvC, an older stage exhibiting āCCvC existed.

---

31 Yet 19r, 11 better "hasten!" corresponds to bâdîr, rather than to baddîr.
32 Also cases of wrong tashâd occur, presumably due to a different hand (cf. §4): 6r, 5; 7r, 9; 31r, 3; 34v, 4. In the last passage ejêsâd, "the body" occurs, which corresponds to 30v, 11 jesadak. In the light of the occurrence of this spelling of jasâd, once in the text, once by superscript, one wonders whether it exhibits genuine pronunciation.
33 For this feature v. recently Bloch.
34 For this feature v. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 213, Jastrow, p. 27, Schreiber, p. 16.
35 The occurrence of this auxiliary vowel after the imperative demonstrates the fallacy of Brockelmann's assumption (I, p. 218) that it continues the ancient case and mood endings.
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He based his argument on the occurrence of numerals like sabac wuzarā < sabc... “seven ministers”, which fits the CvCC, rather than the CCVC, pattern. Since in our text C 2r, 3 sebahdefoh = [sebac defor] “seven times” is attested (cf. also met‘el mitihi “as” 5v, 12-13, as against ordinary (k‘em) met‘l 5v, 2), one is inclined to suggest the same for the dialect reflected in it.

16.2 For the addition of a prosthetic vowel to a word opening with a consonant cluster as /awzēll/ (which also exhibits adaptation to the ‘afkāl plural pattern) — v. §12.1, end.

17. In Classical Arabic, prosthetic alif is only added (in pronunciation) at the beginning of a sentence. In the spelling of our text, however, even in internal open juncture the historical prosthetic alif behaves as a stable glottal stop; I have noticed one exception only: 21r, 1 wesmah wa-smāz “and listen!”. Some random examples:36 3r, 3 beet’et’ezah = /be-ettedfās/ “in meekness”; 2r, 10 feet’rokhome = /fe-etrokhomē/ “so leave them!”; 3v, 6-8 weesht’om..weorjomhom = /we-eshtm..we-orjomhom/ “and revile...and throw stones at them!”; 19r, 12 wezzarab = /we-adrab/ “and perform!”; 19r, 5-6 wees’t’agfer = /we-estagifer/ “and ask forgiveness!”; 21r, 7 feest’edenoh = /fe-este(‘)dhenoh/ “ask him permission!”; 32v, 9 feeh’t’em = /fe-ehtem(m)/ “and give heed!”

17.1 Similar is, prima facie, the behaviour of the definite article (which, in Classical Arabic, exhibits glottal stop in sentence initial as well). Even after proclitic words (i.e., exhibiting internal open juncture) which end in a vowel the definite article invariably preserves its vowel in spelling. Some examples: 2v, 13 fi eljebel fi -libal “in the mountains”; 7r, 12 ileh elhilek ila -halak “to perdition”; 10r, 8-9 hale eshshieoux ‘ala -sh-shuyīx “to the elders”; 11v, 7 hede eljebel hādha -jabal “this mountain”; 17r, 15 eioouhe elex ̀uyuha ̀-rax “O brother”. Yet already Sätzinger, p. 63, note 35, has surmised that, despite the fixed orthographic habit of our text, the vowel of the article is elided when following a vowel. This is corroborated by the fact that the vowel of the article is invariably omitted, when preceded by a word which contains one consonant only.37 Since other words which open with a glottal stop corresponding to alif conjunctions in Classical Arabic preserve the glottal stop following such a word (v. §17, especially note 36) and since it is difficult to find a reason for different orthographical habits preceding alif conjunctions, one will rather explain the different treatment as exhibiting different phonetic behaviour: the alif of the definite article tended to be elided, whereas in other cases the alif was stable. Nevertheless, the vowel of the definite article was not omitted after words that were spelt separately, because (as in Classical Arabic) every word was spelt as if it stood in the absolute beginning of the sentence. Some

36 I have chosen examples in which the word preceding the glottal stop contains one consonant only (and is therefore spelt in Classical Arabic together with the following word), in order to bring out in full relief the different behaviour of the definite article (v. §17.1).

37 The relative pronoun ‘aladhi, etc. behaves so as well: 1r, 1-2 feliedi “and he who”. In ‘allāh “God” the glottal stop is stable: 30r, 1 leaalla “to God”.
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examples: 3v, 8 belhijar = /be-l-hi-jar/ “with stones”; 5v, 3-4 lel. xat’t’am = /le-l-xat-tam/ “to the handle”; 19r, 15 fel = ḡazāb = /fe-l-ḥażāb/ “then anger”; 21v, 7 wessalah wa-s-salāt “and prayer”; 35 C 1r, 13 k’el = adeh ka-l-cada “according to custom”.

18. Although initial glottal stop corresponding to alif conjunctions (except in the definite article) has become stable (§17), I have noticed one case where the original initial glottal stop is omitted: 24v, 12 elmou’r al-umur “things”; it may, however, be the result of a clerical error.

18.1 Even in the middle of words there are some indications for the preservation of the glottal stop: 4r, 6; 4v, 5 seeolah sa’alahū “he asked him”; 12r, 7 jē’ē “they came”; 18r, 7 t’eeddeb ta’addab “be polite!”; 27v, 16 fei’t‘meen fa-yat-ma’in(ū) “and he trusts”. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that these spellings exhibit imitation of Classical Arabic and that in the dialect reflected in our text the glottal stop in the middle and at the end of a word was weakened or even elided. Some spellings, it seems, exhibit the shift of verbs III to II: 11v, 6 wejeit’ wa-jī’ī (cf. §14) “I came”; 21v, 5 fecbdi fa-bda’ “and begin!”; 31r, 4 axta’ī’ axta’t(a) “you sinned”; 27r, 4 jet’a jā’ta “she came to you”. Though short i may sometimes be spelt i (v. §12.1), i as a rule, mirrors i; therefore I am inclined to interpret the following two cases as exhibiting the drop of the initial glottal stop, accompanied by the lengthening of the preceding short i: 24r, 4 tihat’ek’ī tattakī “you shall lean”; 24v, 15 memt’elī muntalī “full”. Cf. also 2v, 8 wejibou (read so for wejinou; for Sobhy’s reading n instead of the very similar b cf. C 2v, 2 et’henak for et’hebak ‘uṭcibak(a) “I shall fatigue you”) wa-jī’ī “and bring!”, being derived from jā’ a b(i) > ā b(i) with the loss of the final glottal stop. The loss of the final glottal stop in alif mamdu’dā is reflected by the spelling 18r, 8 waheieh (with final h, i.e. with tā marbūta, thus exhibiting the identical pronunciation of tā marbūta, i.e. -a>, with alif mamdu’dā, i.e. -a’ > ā > a) wa-hayā’ “and bashfulness”. The omission of the glottal stop (and the case endings) is invariably exhibited by alif mamdu’dā followed by pronominal suffixes, as 27v, 12 warahom wara’ilhum “behind them”; 31r, 8; 32r, 6; 32v, 5 ahdak ‘aṣdā’īka “your enemies”. The shift a’ > ā is mirrored by 27r, 4 jet’a, v. supra, further 30v, 3 enraḥ imra’at “woman”, the shift i’ > ī perhaps by 22v, 14 webidak, if < wa-bi-ti’dak “and in your hand” (for ‘id “hand” v. §33). For the transition of verbs I to Inv cf. 30v, 4 mawwahax mu’āxāt “friendship”.

38 Because the vowel of “and” has remained e, though exposed to ṭafsīm (§11), one will reconstruct its etymon in our dialect as *wet, rather than we as in Classical Arabic (cf., however, Appendix B, note 63). This assumption may perhaps be strengthened by fa being twice spelt fi: 21v, 10; 29v, 2. Yet fa was, presumably, a word taken over from Classical Arabic. Obiter dictu, fi instead of fa is the usual spelling in the rather vulgar Judeo-Arabic manuscript of Egyptian provenance, Ms. Paris Heb. 583, (where fi is usually spelt f preceding ‘al; cf. a similar spelling once attested in our text not preceding ‘al: 17v, 9 f. tarīk fi ṣarīq “in the road”, yet presumably due to clerical error, but cf. also §39).
19. Cases of assimilation: for ts > ss v. §28.5. dt > tt occurs with d as the third radical consonant, r constituting the beginning of the perfect suffix (cf. Brockelmann, I, p. 172): 18v, 4 weerett wa-aradta “and you wanted”; 21r, 10 weyett wajadta “you found”. ghls > xs (Brockelmann, I, p. 162) is reflected by 22r, 7 exselhe ‘ighsilhā “wash them!”, ghlf > xf (v. Willmore, p. 26, line 4) by 32v, 7 exfer ‘ighfir “forgive!” (as against e.g. 35v, 1 iegfer). ḥh > hh is attested only by superscript: 23r, 3 teftahha taftahhā “you will open it”, hh carrying /ḥḥ/ as superscript; for the similar ẓḥ > ḥḥ v. Cantineau, p. 73, Fleisch, p. 81. Since 28v, 3 me warak min warā’ika “from behind you” does not exhibit double w in spelling, it presumably reflects clerical error, rather than assimilation (as it is attested Cantineau, p. 39). Similarly, 19v, 3-4 welek’el “but” wālākin does not exhibit assimilation, but rather mere error.

As to assimilation of vowels to consonants cf. §§13.1; 30 for 19v, 16 t’umnoh “complete it” and §20, end for 22v, 13 bork’e “blessing”. For i/u shifting to a under the influence of tafṣīm v. §§12.1; 13.1, end.

As to assimilation of vowels to vowels, I have noticed 15r, 8 rojol rajul “man”, 17v, 3-4 gorobė ghurabā “strange (plur.)”; 26v, 6 erosoul ar-rasūl “the Apostle”. For this feature in the perfect of the first form v. §27.1, for this feature in the imperfect of the first form v. §27.2. The assimilation of a in closed syllable to a following long vowel, which in Classical Arabic gave rise to forms like qiddīs “holy”, does not exist in our dialect, cf. kAddis e.g. 6r, 6; 15r, 8; 22r, 11; 35v, 7.

20. We have already dealt with the elision of i in ficāl and related themes §12.1, end; with that of u in the prefix mnu §§12.2; 13.1, and in other cases preceding the stress; and with the elision of i (or, more accurately, of the short vowel which corresponds in Classical Arabic to i) in an open unstressed syllable, presumably following the stress, in the imperfect of the second conjugation in §15. Cf. also §28.4, where the rather frequent elision of the short vowel, corresponding in Classical Arabic to a, of the t-prefix of the imperfect of the fifth and sixth conjugations, occurring in an open syllable presumably preceding the stress, is dealt with. For f instead of ft preceding a consonant v. §17.1, note 38, as well as §39, where also b instead of bi is treated. Some of these and the following uses may be due to error. I have noticed 7r, 5 let’emadoh li-alāmiḍhīhi “to his disciples”; 7r, 10 sier[f] oz sa-yarfi’d “he will ignore”, which however may be interpreted not only as /syeer-fod/, exhibiting reduction of the vowel, but also /sti-erfod/ (for yi > i cf. §14), exhibiting (pseudo-Classical) lengthening of sa (for which cf. sā in Ancient South-Palestinian Christian Arabic, Blau, Cha, pp. 68-69); 25v, 15 nezeit’en nāziratayni “looking” (fem. dual, casus obliquis), the elided vowel presumably preceding the stress; 26r, 13, where the text should presumably be restored k’ot’b[ehom] kutub-hum “their books”; the vowel was, it seems, first elided when preceding pronominal suffixes opening with a vowel (like kutubak > kutbak). Cf. also 15r,

---

19 rajul is also frequent in the Egyptian Judaco-Arabic manuscript mentioned in the preceding note.
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11 t'ezhou tada'uhu "you shall put it", which, however, should presumably be interpreted as a clerical error.

In as far as the stress can be elicited from these cases of elision, it fairly corresponds to the general pattern prevailing in Eastern dialects. I could not find any special feature in our text, with the possible exception of 22v, 12 bork'e baraka "blessing", which exhibits a special feature of the omission of a (cf. Landberg, Ha'dramawt, p. 269, line 1 buqrī, Grotfeld, p. 97, line 3) and assimilation of the a to the b (cf. the form quoted from Ha'dramawt). If this interpretation is correct, it would mean, as expected, that faṣāla was stressed on its first syllable.

21. Our text exhibits several special orthographic habits. Cf. §17.1 for the tendency to spell every word as if it stood in absolute sentence initial. For the spelling of tā marbīta v. §34.1, for that of the pronominal suffix third person sing. masc., v. §24.3. We want to mention here only the special habit of marking -iyic by ie(iii), presumably to prevent the accommodation of too many i (iiie): 10r, 14 kazīt'oh qadīyiyyīthī "his matter"; 19v, 12 errobbienna "monastic life", and similarly 27v, 7 errobbienih; 22v, 15 athīc catiyya "gift"; 28v, 12, 16 beli'et'en (§42.1) baliyyatan "misfortune"; 31r, 1 elwesīe 'al-waṣṣīyya "the ordinance" (yet 27v, 3 dīle "reward", presumably exhibiting vernacular diyya, rather than Classical dīya). Cf. also 31v, 11 erruahānim ar-Rūḥāniyyīn "the spiritual one".

The importance of these special orthographical habits (cf. §2, note 6) lies in the fact that they constitute an additional difficulty in properly evaluating our text.

22. In the following I shall quote some cases of errors occurring in our text, in order to bring into full relief the fact that one should not too much rely on the text, if it contravenes what we would have expected: 2v, 10 hat'touh instead of hat't'ouhe; 17v, 5 mahhou instead of mahhom; 19v, 3 wet'ejjah rather than wet'ejzah; 20r, 8 essah rather than esseh. Cf. also passim, e.g. §19.

23. Some personal pronouns: 2 pers. masc. sing. ent., e.g. 14r, 9; 16r, 1. "He" hou (cf. Satzinger, p. 63, note 34; for its distribution cf. S. Morag, Tarbiz 23.237 [1952-53], Eretz-Israel 3.167-68 [1954]), e.g. 6r, 2; C 2v, 12; "she" hi 9v, 12; 10v, 6. "We" nohn = [nohn] (cf. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 199 nahan) 1v, 8; 16r, 16, presumably < nihm (§13.1; for the original vowel i cf. Brockelmann, ibid.); nahan = [nahan] 1v, 5 may exhibit the shift i > a under the influence of tafsīm (§12.1) or continuation of the Classical form, which itself arose in a similar way. "They" (masc.), as a rule hom, e.g. 9v, 3, once, 33v, 4, homme. In modern dialects both short and long forms of "they" are attested. In some of these dialects short and long forms alternate (v. S. Morag, Eretz-Israel 3.168).40 Accordingly, it seems clear that [homme] is a genuine dialectal form, perhaps alongside [hom], which, however, may also exhibit the Classical feature.

40 For the long form in the Middle Arabic cf. Blau, ChA, pp. 134-35, §31.2 (where, however, the possibility of double m should have been stressed in stronger terms).
24. Pronominal suffixes:

24.1 First person singular: as in Classical Arabic, after words terminating in a consonant, -r (e.g. 3v, 4 xalasi = /xalāṣī/ “my salvation”), after long vowels and -a, as 29v, 6 hewyе hawāyiа “my desire”. In accordance with the omissions of short final vowels in our dialect (§§41;42), -y may be used instead of -ya: 29v, 8 bexatai bi-xatāyī⁹⁸ “by my sins”, presumably also 6r, 12-13; 14r, 7 halē “on me”, 6v, 7 rejē “my feet”, if they represent kalayy(a) and nilayy(a) (cf. §15) respectively. In prepositions, I have noticed twice -t instead of expected -y(a): 10v, 15 ēli kalayyā “on me”; 14v, 12 ti fiyya “in me”.

24.2 Second person sing. masc.: after words terminating in a consonant, it has invariably the form -ak (33r, 1 wet’eharefk preceding lacuna is uncertain; for the fixed spelling with k cf. §6), as 24v, 14; 29v, 9, exhibiting a even if not under the influence of tafsīm (§11.7; one may surmise that the ināla was prevented through paradigmatic pressure, in order to prevent the neutralization of the opposition between 2. pers. sing. masc. -ak (> * -ek) and fem. (presumably -ik > -ek).⁴¹ After (long) vowel it has the form -k (invariably spelt k), as 32r, 6, 8, 13; 32v, 8, and so also after the diphthong -ay (which was, perhaps, pronounced e, §14), as 24r, 5-6; 29v, 10, 11; 32v, 12. If the vowel preceding the pronominal suffix is ā, it does not undergo ināla, presumably through the influence of the -ak ending; for particulars v. §11.7. menk minka “from you”, exhibiting after consonant -k, rather than -ak, occurs 25v, 7; 31v, 5; 32r, 11 and seemingly imitates the Classical form with omission of the final short vowel; the genuine dialectal form is, it seems, 25v, 4 memnak, for which cf. Brockelmann, I, p. 498, Willmore, p. 103, Mitchell, p. 54. The same may apply to hank canka “from you” 28v, 16. Quite exceptional is 2r, 9-10 feeshkil’k’e, exhibiting not only the spelling with k’ (because it is not final; v. §6), but also e following k, prima facie corresponding to Classical -ka. Yet according to the context one would have expected a dual form, like fa-yashkiyāka “so that they will complain of you”. Accordingly, one wonders whether one should not interpret this form as a wrongly formed dual (on the background of the supercession of the dual by the plural outside nouns at least, v. §35), the dual ending e-ā being wrongly attached after the pronominal suffix, rather than between the verb and the pronominal suffix.

24.3 Third person sing. masc.: after words terminating in consonants ou (sometimes with, sometimes without Arabic /hl/ as superscript) and oh (sic!, always with h, sometimes with Arabic /hl/, sometimes with Arabic /hu/ as superscript, sometimes without superscript) alternate. In various dialects the pronominal suffix 3. person

⁴¹ In many dialects (v. e.g. Willmore, p. 100, Mitchell, p. 53), the 2. person sing. fem. pronominal suffix has, when postconsonantal, the form -k, which, in our text, v. §12.1, would have the form ek’t; for the assumption of k’⁴¹, rather than k v. §6, where the possibility was mentioned that one of the reasons for the possible spelling of this pronominal suffix with k’ might have been that it had the form -k’i (i.e. did not stand in final position) when postvocalic.
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sing. masc. terminates in -ḥ (v. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 311, where also dialects [Egyptian!] in which -ḥ-forms and -ḥ-less forms alternate are cited), therefore it is well possible that both forms exhibit genuine dialectal forms (though the -ḏḥ forms could also be due to Classical influence). Some examples: – ou 1v, 12; 7v, 6, 7; 19v, 1; 23r, 5; 25v, 12. – ou with /ḥ/ as superscript: 3r, 4, 5, 8; 23v, 6. – oh 1r, 4, 6, 8, 9; 1v, 2; 21r, 14; 25v, 5; 26r, 4. – oh with /ḥ/ as superscript: 15v, 12; 28v, 10. – oh with /w/ as superscript: 3v, 5; 4r, 4; 5, 15; 8v, 4; 34v, 13. Once, in the position of genitive, Classical -ḥḥ was added to the vernacular ou = /ḥ/, giving rise to a pseudo-Classical form: 18r, 4 mah : elouhi maca 'ḥṭḥḥ “with its people”. After long vowels (e.g. 34c, 4-5 ierhabouh = jrṣ허허허/(!) “they frightened him”; 31r, 4) and the diphthongs -av (e.g. 9v, 2; 12r, 4) and -av (e.g. 1r, 10; 1v, 1; 18v, 15) (which were perhaps pronounced as monophthongs, §14), it has the form -ḥ. After some prepositions (cf. §24.2) terminating in consonant, it has unexpectedly the form -ḥ, presumably exhibiting imitation of the Classical form, with omission of the final short vowel, as usual in our text: menh mǐḥḥ “from him” 15v, 4, 5; 16v, 6; hanḥ zaiḥ “from him” 19v, 15; 22v, 4, 34v, 1. Cf. also 28r, 5 beh “in him”, being the imitation of Classical Arabic, biḥḥ as against what seems to be the genuine dialectal form, rīḥ. 7v, 9 mov = /ḥḥ/.

24.4 Other pronominal suffixes: for the 3. person fem. sing. v. §11.4. 3. person plur. masc. has always the form – hon (e.g. 9r, 12), 2. person plur. masc. as a rule – k’om (as 17r, 6; 21r, 4, 15; 24v, 2, 3, 7). I have noticed, however, – k’ohm = – /kum/ 9r, 9.

24.5 It stands to reason that “indirect” pronominal suffixes occur in our text, i.e., ḥ with pronominal suffix so closely attached to the verb that it loses its stress and becomes a veritable suffix (v. for this feature in Middle Arabic and modern dialects Blau, Cha, p. 398, note 32). Yet, since words are sometimes spelt together (§5), it is impossible to prove this phenomenon, since the spelling of ḥ with pronominal suffix together with the preceding verb may be due to spelling habit, rather than to phonetic coalescence. I have noticed 6r, 5 kaloh “he said to him”, and so also 6r, 9; 3v, 2.

25. Interrogative pronouns: as in Middle Arabic and modern dialects, (cf. Blau, Cha, pp. 139-41) “what” may be expressed by ‘ayy shay (14v, 10 ei shei; 16v, 9-10 le ei sheit’ezen il–‘ayyi shay’in tuchtzin/tahtzam “why do you grieve[!], transitive verb”), ‘aysh (6r, 10 eish).

26. The perfect suffixes: both first person singular (2r, 7, 12; 2v, 1-2, 6; 11v, 3) and second person sing. masc. (23r, 8; 23v, 7, 8; 28r, 14) terminate in -t and are not differentiated. This is the case not only at the end of words, but also preceding pronominal suffixes. e before pronominal suffixes beginning with a consonant, synchronically at least, exhibits an auxiliary vowel (CCV, CVČ, §16), rather than the perfect ending: 2v, 4-5 wevedđi’ehom “and I brought them”, 28r, 7 neebt’ehom = /nṣebt’ehom/ “you opposed them”.
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27. The first conjugation:

27.1 The perfect: through the influence of tafṣīm, fāṣil may pass to fāṣal, v. §12.1. Through assimilation fāṣal becomes fīṣal: 27v, 11-12 webohoudou = /we-bo:su:d/ “and they went away”; and fīṣal fīṣal: 34v, 11 helem ḍalīma “he knew”, where the first e has presumably to be interpreted as stemming from i, since if it originated in a, it would not have shifted to e because of the preceding c, one of the hurūf mufaqṣama (§11), though exceptions do occur.

27.2 The imperfect: yfṣil: the prefix has a, recognizable only preceding a harf mufaqṣama: 2r, 8-9 adrodhome = /ạd.ro:dhɔmɛ/ “I shall expel them”; 14r, 7 weīt-ləboun = /we-ya:t:lo: bub/ “they seek”. The prefix has i, again recognizable only before a harf mufaqṣama: 1r, 11 weīt-lo: bu wa-ya:tlu: “he will demand”. Through assimilation this ı may shift to u: 28v, 13 ioxolos = /jo:klo/ “he will be saved”; 31v, 4 iotro: = /jɔtɾo/ “it drives away”. Because of the o in the prefix, I am also inclined to interpret 18v, 9-10 iddehne “he shall anoint them”, e after the second radical standing for u (§13.1). Cf. also 18v, 6 t’edhoun “you shall anoint”.

yfṣil, the i being recognizable again in the vicinity of hurūf mufaqṣama only: the prefix has a, recognizable in the vicinity of hurūf mufaqṣama: 17r, 4 t’ahre: su = /tah.re: su/ “you covet” (although re may represent ra as well, v. §11.3). The prefix vowel i is exhibited, it seems, by 35v, 1 lejger “he forgives”, since gh is mufaqṣam (§11) and ar > er is marginal (§11.3). Cf. also 21r, 15 tert’i = /yɛrtli/ “you shall pity”.

yfṣal, the a being preserved by tafṣim: the prefix has a, also preserved by tafṣim: 23r, 3-4 leṭ’ahra: li-ta:ṣrifa “to know”; 23r, 14; 33r, 11, 12. Cf. also 14v, 11 akra ‘aqrā “I read”. The prefix vowel is i (i.e., e preceding harf mufaqṣam): 14v, 10 esnah = /e:snə/ “I shall do”; 25r, 7 iezhar = /ye:zhar/ “it appears”; 25v, 1-2 weīt-hənou = /we-ye:tsa:nul/ “and they advance”; 26v, 15 wetet’mah = /we-te:maʃ/ “and you desire”; 35r, 8-9 weiehfax = /we-ye:ʃfax/ “and he keeps”. For 20v, 5 cf. §14.

yfṣel, which, for lack of tafṣim, may be interpreted as both yfṣil and yfṣal: the prefix vowel is a, preserved by tafṣim: 19v, 13 t’ahmel taṣmal “you work”, and similarly 20r, 3. The prefix has i, marked by e in the vicinity of hurūf mufaqṣama: 24r, 11 t’eḥme: taṣmal: 3r, 7; 24r, 14 iekb:lay yaqbal “he accepts”; 16v, 10-11 iezlemak yəzli:μək(a) “he harms you”; 22v, 3; 29v, 10-11 t’esref taṣrif “you shall turn”, etc.

In some cases (as 34v, 4-5 ierhabouh “they frighten him”) the verbal form may exhibit both first and fourth (v. §28.3) conjugation.

27.3 The imperative: it always exhibits stable initial glottal stops, v. §17. The glottal stop may be followed by a, preserved by mufaqṣam first radical. This may be the case, when the second radical is followed by a as well, because of the vicinity of hurūf mufaqṣama, as 17v, 14 akra = /a qrə/ “read!”; 19r, 12 weārəb = /we-aqrəb/ “and beat!”; 26r, 5 weah = /we-aʃfax/ “and keep!”; 29v, 8; 31v, 2; 32r, 6. The initial glottal stop may also be followed by a, when the second radical is vocal-
ized by e, which, for lack of tafṣīm, may be analysed as originating in both a and i: 2v, 7 aḥferou = /aḥferū/ “dig!” (plur.); 20r, 4 ahmeloh = /aḥmelō/ “do it!”; 21v, 10; 22v, 13; 27v, 14; 31r, 14; 33r, 8. 'afṣul is attested as well: 2v, 10-11 weakhodou = /we-‘aqṣodū/ “and sit!” (plur.).

If the first radical is a harf muʁaʃxam and is preceded by e, it bears witness to original i. 'efṣol (the a, as a rule, exhibiting tafṣīm) occurs e.g. 19r, 4; 19v, 4; 20r, 15; 20v, 13 esnah = /eṣnah/ “make!”; 23v, 6 Feechmalou = /ffe-‘cmalū/ “do it!” (§11.7) (as against the imperfect form 23v, 4 ahmelou “I shall do it!”). I have also noticed 'efṣul: 21r, 6 etbox = /eṭbox/ “cook!”, where, however, the e may be interpreted as standing for u (§13.1). Similarly 24v, 6 etbou = ‘etbū “ask!” (plur.). ‘etfīl is, it seems, reflected by 8v, 11; 17r, 11; 22r, 1 egfer, spelt 32v, 7 efer “forgive”, since ar > er is quite exceptional (§11.2). 'eṣul (where e may represent both a and i) occurs e.g. 22v, 4-5 ekbelou “receive him!”.

Initial e not followed by harf muʁaʃxam may reflect original a or i. Prima facie, I prefer to analyse it as i and am inclined to interpret initial a before harf muʁaʃxam as exhibiting the shift i > a owing to assimilation to the harf muʁaʃxam (§12.1). 'eṣol occurs e.g. 3r, 13, 14; 29v, 11; 32v, 14; 'eṣel e.g. 26r, 16 (where the second e may be interpreted as representing a or i; this applies to the next examples as well); 31v, 9-10; 32r, 10. 'efṣol e.g. 2v, 10 feet’okhomel = /ffe-‘eṭokhomē/ “so leave both of them”; 3v, 6-7; 18v, 14; 20r, 14; 20v, 2-3; 23v, 11; C 1v, 10-11.

For 'afṣul (both u being marked by o) v. e.g. 3v, 7-8.

28. The derived conjugations:

28.1 The second conjugation: if the third radical is a harf muʁaʃxam,42 in the imperfect and imperative the preceding vowel is a (presumably exhibiting the shift i > a, §12.1; for a similar feature in the modern dialect of Cairo cf. Mitchell, pp. 76-77): 31v, 1 eferrağaḳ = /yeferragaḳ/ “it makes you free” (§11.3); 14r, 3-4 fexallusni fa-xallisi “save me!”; 22r, 7-8 wexallatha wa-xayyithā “and sew them”; 30r, 6 wet’esauvar wa-tugawwir “and she suggests”. Cf. also the quadrilateral 17r, 2-3 iemmar “he shall grieve”.

28.2 The third conjugation: I have noticed three remarkable forms: the perfect C 2v, 3 febērik = /fe-bērik/ “and he blessed”; 28r, 7 neseb’ehom = /nēsəbehom/(!) “you opposed them” (cf. the imperative 24v, 12-13 febēsēb = /fe-nēsēb/(!) “oppose(!)”; and the imperfect 27v, 15-16 ieresadak = /yerēsədak/ “it will lay in wait for you”. The perfect forms clearly exhibit i after the second radical (i, as well as e despite tafṣīm; cf. e.g. Mitchell, p. 77), and the imperative form quoted (exhibiting also e despite tafṣīm) fits it. Yet the imperfect form shows a! It is rather venturesome to infer anything from one example; one could, on the one hand, surmise that besides forms with i after the second radical also forms with a (even in the imperfect and the imperative) existed. On the other hand, the a may be attributed to the shift i > a under the influence of tafṣīm (§12.1).

42. I have not noticed cases of the second radical being a harf muʁaʃxam.
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28.3 The fourth conjugation: The 'prefix in the perfect and the imperative may be vocalized with a (even without the influence of tafṣīm) or with e (even when the first radical is a harf mufaxaxam, thus attesting original i): 7v, 3-4 ashabou 'asbaḥū “they did in the morning”, exhibiting 'a, as against C 2v, 6-7 et'lak = /'etlaq/ “he sent away”, exhibiting /'ifṣal/, as does presumably (cf. §11.3) 20v, 13-14 ersalak “he sent you”; for the prefix of the perfect in verbs ḫw y v. §31. As to the imperative, cf. 31r, 9; 31v, 13 akrah (§11.7) “force!” with a, as against 21r, 11 featslah, reflecting fa-ḵiṣlah “set right!”; pay attention to a following the second radical, for which cf. the imperfect infra. All these forms could be derived from forms opening with 'i, a being due to the shift i > a through the influence of tafṣīm.

In the imperfect, the prefix vowel and the vowel following the second radical may both reflect a and i (the i of the prefix vowel may also be interpreted as standing for u, v. §13.1). I have noticed C 1r, 7 eyet'lakoh wa-yuṣafūh(ti) “and he dismisses him”, and similarly C 1v, 15, exhibiting yifṣal, for which cf. also verbs ḫy /ttaqṣiẓ/ C 2r, 16; C 2v, 1-2, quoted §14; 16v, 9-10 t'ezan tufṣino(“you grieve”, and similarly 16v, 12, exhibiting, it seems, yifṣal or yafṣil. I have noticed certain cases of yifṣal only in verbs ḫy (also original ḫw): 20r, 1 texti tuxiḥi “you sin”; 29v, 4 exți “I sin”; also (cf. §11.3) 24r, 5 t'eri xurti “you shall relax”. Yafṣil or yafṣal is presumably exhibited by 1r, 8 ahfere yurṣir(“I shall inform”); 21r, 2-3 t'ahzenhom tufṣino(“you grieve them”, and similarly 21v, 1. C 2v, 2 et'hebak 'utṣibak(a) “I shall fatigue you” may be derived from yafṣil or yifṣil.

28.4 The fifth and sixth conjugation: in the imperfect, often the prefix t is vowelles, rather than followed by a as in Classical Arabic; presumably due to elision (§20): 1r, 9-10 ib'tehenn Yataḥhanan “he will pity”; 30v, 7 t'et'wene tatawānā “you shall neglect”; 5r, 2 t'et'ħenn(“tataḥhanan “he will pity’’); 12v, 3-4; 25v, 5; 31r, 6; 33v, 1. If the second or third radical is a harf mufaxaxam, the vowel between them is a, as 4v, 10-11 t'et'xalas mataxallas “he will be saved”; 5v, 15; so also in verbs ḫy: 18r, 14 t'et'gat'atataqhatā “you shall be covered”. Yet I have noticed imperative reflecting i after the second radical: 17v, 9 t’ebheb tabḥadd “remove yourself!”; and so does, prima facie, the imperfect form 19r, 9-10 t'et'kekker tatafakkar “you shall think”, since er representing ar is quite rare, v. §11.3.

28.5 I have found one certain case of ‘ifṣal (cf. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 529): 16r, 4 iyesselou = /yesselου/ “they are asked!”), exhibiting the assimilation ts > ss ( <yetselου; cf. e.g. Mitchell, p. 68).

28.6 The eighth conjugation: the following imperfect forms can all be derived from yifṣal: 6r, 3-4 elt'ekk 'aftaqild “I shall visit”; 23r, 15 wet'effekk “you will observe”; 20r, 4-5 t'et'eshem talṭashim “you shall be ashamed”; 22r, 3 eht'emel 'alṭamīl “I shall endure”.

29. Since the internal passive has, it seems, disappeared in the dialect reflected in our text (for the background of this phenomenon cf. Blau, ChA, p. 150, §47), various pseudo-passive forms are attested in our text, due to pseudo-correction; in some cases active forms are used instead of passive ones: 5v, 1 t'eb́la instead of
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tulbāgh “it is reached”; 30r, 7 t'ağfour instead of tugfār “they will be forgiven” (as against 19r, 6 leiofer “that forgiveness be given”, which, prīma facie, reflects Classical li-yugfār(a); yet the very marginal shift ar > er, v. §11.3, makes the possibility of an underlying pseudo-passive form li-yugfār not unlikely); 32r, 7 iṣbā instead of yusbā “it is held captive”. On the contrary, 14r, 5 weiooxzoun “and let them be ashamed” one would expect the active yuxzawn, rather than the passive yuxzwān ( > yuxzūn, §32), which, nevertheless, is possible. 11r, 2 iwejed “there is” yifijad is influenced by active colloquial forms of yewčel (cf. already Satzinger, p. 47, who, however, did not emphasize that the parallel dialect form is active; for the active imperfect of wagad used also in passive sense in the dialect of Cairo cf. Spiro s.v., Willmore, p. 166, §194, rem.). 30v, 12 ejbort 'yibirt “you have been forced” may reflect a pseudo-passive form as well; for another interpretation v. §13.1

30. Verba medial geninatae: after long ā the two identical consonants are not contracted, in order to avoid the occurrence of a long vowel in a closed non-final syllable (for the background of this feature v. Blau, ChA, p. 167, §69, especially note 122): 26v, 3-4 eizaded = [veyeizaded] “it contradicts”.

As in verbs ḫw/j, (§31), the first conjugation is used instead of the fourth in the double verb (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 152, §51.1): 19r, 5 ker 'aqira “confess!” (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 153, note 41); 19v, 16 tommoh 'atinnnahā(!) “perform it!” (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 152A/B); for the o v. §§13.1; 19.

I have the impression that the doubling of final consonants is less frequent in verbs than in other parts of speech, v. §15, where also a case in internal open juncture is discussed.

If 2v, 12 izen really corresponds to 'azun “I think”, it would make the e in the imperfect prefix of the first conjugation (as 22v, 12 t'eeb tahibb “you love” and the similar 27r, 3-4 t'eemah “you love her”;) 43 21v, 4 t'emoss “you touch”) reflect i, rather than a, in accordance with §11.6, though not necessarily.

31. Verbs ḫw/j: marginally, i (and not only 1) may be spelt i (§12.1), u (and not only ū) ou (§12.2). Yet this spelling in verbs ḫw/j is comparatively so frequent, that one is inclined to interpret it as representing long vowels. In other words: after the moods had disappeared (§41), on the analogy of the indicative, the subjunctive and those forms of the jussive and the imperative that contained a long vowel, the other forms of the jussive and the imperative that exhibit a short vowel followed by a vowelless final radical letter, lengthened their vowel (since, contrary to Classical Arabic, Neo-Arabic permits long vowel in final closed syllables; cf. Blau, ChA,

43 In the light of the supersession of the fourth conjugation by the first, one will refrain from analyzing these verbal forms as exhibiting the fourth conjugation. For 1 > a under the influence of tafṣīn cf. §12.1; this feature may also be reflected by 17r, 8 mest’ehaddin mustaṣīd-dīn “ready (plur. masc.)”, if it is not to be derived from an etymon different from the parallel form in Classical Arabic.
p. 185). Some examples: 14r, 7 wele: t’edin wa-lā tadin “do not judge!”; 14r, 16 koul quL “say!”; 18r, 3, 4; 27r, 15; 27v, 9; 29r, 11, 13; 32r, 14; 32v, 6; C 1v, 10. This interpretation is corroborated by the occurrence of auxiliary vowels in positions in which they would have occurred after long vowels only (VCvC, v. §16): 27r, 15 hineni = /eśṭen/ “help me!”, and similarly 29v, 3 ehini = /eśt/.

27r, 15 hineni, rather than ehini, as 29v, 3, quoted above, exhibits the use of the first conjugation instead of the fourth (v. §30). Yet 11v, 7 sebt does not exhibit this phenomenon, since it does not reflect (pace Sobhy) ’asabt, but rather sibt “I roved”.

The participle of the first conjugation is fā’il, rather than fā’il: 9r, 8 kaid qā’il “saying”; 9r, 16; 22v, 9. Cf. also ādeyemī, etc. §40.

It stands to reason that the etymology of the imperfect of the first conjugation is yāfūr/yāft, rather than yāfūr/yāfūr, v. §13.1.

The perfect prefix of the fourth conjugation is a preceding a harf musāxam (cf. §11.6), yet e in other cases: 5v, 6 erad “he wanted”; 8r, 5 akam “he stayed”; 7v, 2 atal “he continued”; 8r, 1; 14v, 1; 16r, 6 ejeb, etc., “he answered”, etc. Yet in the imperative even a harf musāxam is preceded by e: 29v, 3 ehini, v. above.

32. Verbs IIIw/:y: IIIw pass into IIIy (cf. for the background of this phenomenon Blau, Cha, p. 190, note 214): 2r, 9-10 feishek’ik’e (cf. §24.2) “both will complain of you”, exhibiting yashkt, rather than yashkū.

Marginally, i may be spelt i (§12.1). Yet this spelling in verbs IIIy is comparatively so frequent that one is inclined to interpret it as representing long vowels. In other words: after the moods had disappeared (v. §41), on the analogy of the indicative and the subjunctive and those forms of the jussive and the imperative that terminated in suffixes opening with a vowel, the last vowel of the suffixless forms of the jussive and the imperative was lengthened (cf. Blau, Cha, p. 194 §98.1). Some examples: 17v, 15 salli = /sālt/ “pray!”; C 2r, 1-2 lem yemzi = /lɛn yemzɖ/ “he did not go away”; 3v, 5; 18r, 16; 22v, 8, 10; 27r, 13; 28v, 14-15; 29r, 13.

Sometimes, the plural suffix -u(n) is used, where, according to Classical Arabic, one would have expected -aw[nā] (cf. e.g. Brockelmann, I, p. 621, §271De): 2r, 13; 9r, 10 t’elahou tasa’ilaw “come! (plur.)”; for 14r, 5 weinoxoun v. §29. Yet -aw is attested as well, presumably through the influence of Classical Arabic: 9v, 1 ahataw a’tawh(u) “they gave him”; 12r, 4 raaww ra’awh(u) “they saw him” (!). A form like 24v, 1 t’akraw “you read (plur. masc.)” has to be regarded as hypocor.

44 the suffix -aw is Classical, the absence of the -na (taqraw, rather than taqrawna, §41) and the shift of III’ to IIIy (§18.1) vernacular.

33. Exceptionally short words are re-adjusted to the general rhythmic pattern. Thus their short vowel may be lengthened: t’id (corresponding to Classical yad; cf. Blau, Cha, p. 71, note 45) “hand” 32r, 5; for 31r, 8 and 34r, 7 v. §14; for 22v, 14 §18.1, end. Another way of adaptation is the doubling of the final consonant: ’abb “father”
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(cf. Blau, *ChA*, p. 72, note 51) 6v, 15, with the plural *al-labbahāt* "the clerical Fathers" 16r, 4. *āwarā* "he showed", attested 20r, 8-9, also exhibits the adjustment of an exceptionally short form, viz. *āwarā*, to the general rhythmic pattern, this time by an additional wāw (cf. Blau, *ChA*, p. 175, note 163).

34. Gender:

34.1. *Tā marbūṭa* is spelt a or e, influenced by *tāsīm* or without such influence respectively, often followed by h, which presumably exhibits the impact of Classical spelling. Some examples: a e.g. 2v, 5; 3v, 11; 5v, 7, 8; 9r, 9-10, 13; 23r, 2. ah e.g. 1v, 6; 47 2v, 7-8; 23r, 6. e e.g. 2r, 8; 2v, 5-6; 4r, 1; 6r, 4; 9v, 8; 28r, 6. Extremely rare are spellings with ē: 28r, 12, 15; 28v, 6. v. Satzinger, p. 44. eh e.g. 1r, 3; 22v, 15; 26v, 14; 27v, 7. I have noticed two cases of spelling with et in the absolute, once representing *l-ār*, preceding an adjective attributive, 11v, 10-11) elmoddet’. el[ka]-sireh "the short time"; C 1r, 12-(13) essalet eljemela *nasalāt al-fāmilā* "the prayer in common". 48 Non-final *tā marbūṭa*, including *tā marbūṭa* in internal open juncture, i.e. in construct, is spelt (and pronounced) with t-’/ṯ/ as et with *tanwin* marking a following indefinite attribute (§42.1) 1r, 3; 9v, 8. et in construct 1r, 1; 5r, 10; 21v, 6; yet at preceded by a *harf musajlam* 34v, 3. et followed by pronominal suffixes C 1v, 5, yet at preceded by a *harf musajlam* 31r, 7. For it v. §11.1, end.

34.2 I have noticed two cases of words usually terminating in *tā marbūṭa*, which lose this ending, but continue to function as feminines: 4v, 2 haj, behaves as hāja "thing"; 30v, 6 hasir, rather than haštra "mat".

35. The dual: though dual forms of verbs (2r, 11, 12) and pronouns (2r, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14) still occur, they are, presumably, due to Classical influence. In the vernacular

45 For one exceptional case of -ah not preceded by a *harf musajlam* (18r, 3) v. §11.1, end. For one exceptional case of alif *maddāda* (by the way, belonging to the root and not serving as feminine suffix) spelt with eh like *tā marbūṭa* (18r, 8) v. §18.1. Since our text does not mark vowel quantity, *tā marbūṭa* preceded by ā is spelt like *tā marbūṭa*, as ah when influenced by *tāsīm* 30v, 4, eh when not influenced by it 10r, 10; 21v, 7.

46 Cf. the similar spelling in Violet’s Arabic Psalm fragment in Greek characters, Violet, p. 24, who, however wonders whether the consistently used ū for *tā marbūṭa* was not still pronounced ū (yet v. Appendix B, §3, note 65). This is, however, even less likely in our text, where forms with and without ū freely alternate. Cf. also a case like 33r, 8 zāherēh "open (fem. sing.)", where eh is followed by *tanwin*, to be pronounced [zāherēten] i.e. h is pronounced t as in Classical Arabic; yet the *tanwin* may be interpreted as mere external ornament (v. §42). Similarly 29r, 9.

47 = /en-neteqhel/. Translate the passage: "The more so, shall we, the sheep, have the faculty of Christ’s flock..."

48 For the somewhat hazardous assumption that the head and its attribute were pronounced in such a close connection that the t of the *tā marbūṭa* was preserved, cf. Blau, *ChA*, p. 116, note 187.
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(cf. Blau, ChA, p. 209, §106), the dual has, to a great extent, been superseded by the plural. This is the case in the verb (2r, 12-14 fekoult ... lehomu t'ehalou ebroun fa-qiltu lubumā tasalawi -binā “I said to both of them, come, build!”; 2r, 15, 16; 2v, 8, 10, 10-11; 7v, 3-4, 4-5; 9v, 5, 6) and in the pronoun, which, it seems, is somewhat more frequently used in the dual, v. above 2r, 12-14 (some examples for pronouns in the plural, though referring to two: 2r, 3; 2v, 2, 5, 6, 8, 12). Since the dual has been superseded by the plural, a noun in dual not denoting rational beings may be referred to, like the corresponding plural, by the feminine singular (cf. also §42, note 53): 9v, 2-4 jenehain īrīs hom mar lek’ennehe : zahifān = jenēhayn lays hum(l) nār lekennehē dāṣṭēn/ “two wings that were not of fire, but weak”. dāṣṭēn quoted above (which exhibits the nominative with ināla, since the oblique case is invariably marked by a diphthong).49 is remarkable, since in Middle Arabic texts, as a rule, the dual has almost completely disappeared in adjectives (v. Blau, ChA, p. 209, §106); it has, accordingly, to be attributed to the influence of Classical Arabic.

While, as a rule, the dual is superseded by the plural, in Middle Arabic texts (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 216, §108) in nouns denoting the double parts of the body it is the dual that has superseded the plural and is used to mark even more than “two”. As a matter of fact, however, this phenomenon also illustrates the disappearance of the category of the dual: nouns denoting the double parts of the body preserve the form of the dual, which, however, is used as a plural.50 I have noticed 29v, 16 jideū : elledin “the hands of those who...”; 32r, 5-6 idū : ahdak = /‘idey ‘aṣdák/ “the hands of your enemies”, and similarly 31r, 8 (for which v. §14).

Through the influence of Classical Arabic, the cases of the dual are used in accordance with the rules of Classical grammar, the nominative being marked by a or e (when influenced or not influenced by tafṣīm respectively), the oblique case by ay in tafṣīm or ē. I have noticed one exception only 25v, 14-15 fet’ek‘oun . hainak nezert’en “your eyes shall look””, where, according to Classical grammar, nezert’en, exhibiting the nominative ending en, corresponds to Classical nāṣūratayn. Since in Neo-Arabic it was the oblique case which has superseded the nominative (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 218 §110.0), one will regard this feature as hyper-correct (v. ibid., p. 220, §110.3).51

For the possible case of a wrongly formed dual in the verb v. §24.2.

36. I have noticed one case of an ordinary plural form substituted for a plural of paucity marking nouns that do not exceed ten: C 2r, 3 sebahdefoh sabc dušūs (rather than dafaṣāt) “seven times”.

37. sharr “worse” has been transferred to the pattern of ʿafṣal, viz. to ʿasharr (!, pace Sobhy; cf. Blau, ChA, pp. 233-34): 6r, 14; 28r, 4.

49 9r, 11 has to be interpreted in the same way. Correct Satzinger, p. 45) note 12, accordingly!
51 Yet cf. §42, note 53.

39. Prepositions: for ki, rather than ka, "as" v. §11.1 (forms like k'e are ambiguous, e.g. 4r, 10; 4v, 8). One wonders whether 3r, 1 webmeshour[a] wa-bi-mashīra "and by counsel" exhibits phonetic development of bi > b or rather clerical error. If b[wa] is a living feature, f 17v, 9 fi "in" may be due to its analogy; nevertheless, it stands to reason that it reflects error, v. §17.1, note 38. For bū "in him" v. §24.3, end, for calīthā §14, for minnak §24.2.

40. Adverbs: some adverbs are without suffix: 28v, 10; 32v, 11 deiem dā'im(an) "always", in both cases followed by /Create of tanwīn). Others terminate in e (i.e., without tanwīn), as 23r, 7; 25r, 14 jedde jidda(n) "much"; 25r, 16 ebede 'abada(n) "always",' or in a, when following harf mufaxxm: 30r, 9 eiza 'ayda(n) "also"; 30r, 12 hakka (cf. in the modern dialect of Cairo Birkeland, p. 15) ḫaqqa(n) "truly". Sometimes e and a are followed by tanwīn-an (i.e.): 8r, 1; 20r, 6-7 dieemei; "always"; 17v, 13-14 imine: we: shimeel "to the right and to the left"; 32v, 11 ebeed: "always"; 27v, 3 serhi: sarīstan "quickly". The tanwīn is almost never written in full, but marked by i, and since this mark also occurs when it is not pronounced (v. §42), one will not attach too much attention to it, but rather regard it as an external ornament. I have met one case only of adverbial tanwīn written in full, viz. 3r, 11 iaman: beiammi (pay attention to the tanwīn mark added after it had been written in letters!) y̲aw̲n̲a: bi-yawmin "day by day" (this phrase does not occur in Classical Arabic, yet cf. in Biblical Hebrew e.g. yōm bēyōm, e.g. Nehemiah, viii: 18).

From the lexical point of view bukra "tomorrow" is remarkable (cf. Landberg, GD, s.v.) 8v, 5; C 2v, 12.

41. The imperfect: the moods have disappeared; this is exhibited not only by verbs hiw/y (§31) and hiy (§32), but also by the general absence of final short vowels, including those of the imperfect (as 1r, 2, 6-7, etc., etc.), and by the supersession of the imperfect forms terminating in -īna, by -ū (cf. Blau, CHA, pp. 259ff.), as 9v, 6, 11: 24r, 8-9: 24v, 1: 28r, 3, 5: 28v, 3. On the other hand, through the influence of Classical Arabic, forms terminating in -ūn occur; cf. especially 14r, 6-8, where imperfect forms terminating in -īn alternate with an imperfect form exhibiting -ū ending in accordance with the rules of Classical grammar.

The imperfect is frequently used to denote command (for the background of this phenomenon cf. Blau, CHA, pp. 270ff., §172) and thus alternates with the imperative, as 14r, 3-5; 20v, 2-4; 24r, 10-11. Cf. also §51.

42. The case endings have disappeared. This is exhibited by the absence of final short vowels, i.e. the case endings of definite nouns in the singular, the same feminine

---

Yet C 1v, 9 kaiee exhibits feminine ending qā'ilat, rather than qā'ila(n), pace Casanova, Sebbha.
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plural and the broken plural, as well as by 'abī used also outside the nominative 11r, 15 (alongside with Classical forms like leexih 7v, 12 "to his brother"), and similarly 8r, 6-7. Besides, tanwīn is almost never written in full, but, if marked at all, it is indicated by //. This mark is, to be sure, only added to nouns; I have, however, noticed two cases in which it was added in positions in which nouns do not receive tanwīn in Classical Arabic: 25v, 15 nezert'en// nāziratān(i) "looking (fem. dual)", where it is added to a noun in the dual!⁵³ 18v, 5 bekālīl // zēit "with a little oil", literally "with a small (amount) of oil", corresponding to bi-qalīl zayūn.⁵⁴ Moreover (with one exception, viz. 29r, 8 men ejj èmar fī "on account of something"!), where tanwīn -in is used in accordance with the rules of Classical Arabic), invariably (always in a facultative manner) tanwīn -an is utilized, not only where it corresponds to an accusative in Classical Arabic (as in adverbs, e.g. 9r, 8, 16; 17v, 10, direct objects, e.g. 15r, 9, 11 [the last instance exhibiting internal object]; 18v, 7, 9, predicates of kān, e.g. 18r, 9; 20r, 10; 20v, 7; 21r, 5; 21v, 16, 16; 22r, 9), but also instead of Classical nominative (e.g. 9r, 7; 12v, 5; 21v, 9, 13, 13) and genitive (as 14v, 6; 15v, 5; 18r, 5, 7, 11, 12, 16). Accordingly, one has to regard the use of tanwīn as a mere external ornament, not belonging to the dialect reflected in our text. This is also reflected by the fact that in the comparatively few cases in which the tanwīn is spelt in letters,⁵⁵ it may be followed by the mark of tanwīn, v. §40 and especially §42.1, thus exhibiting its redundant character,⁵⁶ especially since it may be added after a stop sign (as 19r, 7-8 ensen =// "man").

42.1 Yet there exists a clearly defined syntactic position in which (facultatively, to be sure) tanwīn is regularly spelt in letters (en). This tanwīn serves as a morpheme indicating that the indefinite noun, to which it is affixed regardless of case, is followed by an attribute, either in the form of an adjective or an attribute clause. An indefinite noun terminating in en followed by an adjectival attribute: 1r, 2-3 bemesk'enent'en házimeh = [be-meskeneten cāzime] "in great poverty"; 18r, 15-16 fi k'iseen wēhed = // kīse'en wēhed(t) "under one cover"; 18r-18v salii salet'en k'tirēh = // salīt (§32) saleten kethire] "pray much prayer!"; 24v, 5-6 k'en : mellemelēn ġarib = // kēn melcallemēn gharib] "there was a strange teacher".

⁵³ nezert'en, however, may be interpreted as feminine singular, either because the preceding hainak may be interpreted as singular saynak or because the dual saynak may be referred to by a feminine singular (v. §35, beginning). In this case, nezert'en would exhibit an additional case of the tanwīn written in full; since it is in addition followed by the tanwīn mark, it would even in this case attest to the tanwīn mark being a mere external ornament; v. infra.


⁵⁵ Except once in an adverb (v. §40) and several times under the special circumstances enumerated §42.1, I have noticed it spelt in letters only once: 11r, 8 (as the predicate of kān) mounounen "weighed" (cf. Satzinger, p. 45, and §14). Cf. also note 53.

⁵⁶ I have not noticed cases of the preservation of case endings outside adverbs (§40). 33v, 13 webelhāk "in truth" read: webelhakk = /we-be-l-haqql.
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followed by an attribute clause: 28v, 11-12 men beli\textquoteleft en = t'et\textquoteleft i "from any misfortune that comes", and similarly 28v, 15-16 iedfah hank : beli\textquoteleft en t'et\textquoteleft i = \[yedfas can\textquoteleft k beliy\textacute{y}yen t\textacute{e}til\] "he shall drive away from you any misfortune that comes". en followed by // preceding an adjectival attribute: 9v, 7-8 febe sohoubet\textquoteleft en// : hazime = \[\text{f}e\text{-be-\textquoteright}soc\textquoteright ibeten ca\textacute{z}ime\] "and with great difficulty(!)"; 19r, 7-9 ween kallak . ensen =\[h\textquoteright \ k\textacute{e}met\textquoteleft en// shedide\]h "and if anyone speaks to you a hard word", en followed by // preceding an attribute clause: 12r, 5-7 mede t'en\textacute{z}or... kawmen// jeou = \[m\textacute{\'}edh\textacute{\'}e \ t\textacute{e}nzor... kawmen j\textacute{e}\textacute{\'}\u00e6\] "what do you see?... Some people who came". en spelt as a separate word(!) preceding an adjectival attribute: 6r, 7-8 k'e\textquoteright f : hal : el : axwe = kali = hal : en = radi = \[k\textacute{e}yf\ h\textacute{\'}al\ e\textacute{\'}l-\textacute{\'}axwe \ k\textacute{\'}al\ h\textacute{\'}al\ en\ radi\] "how is the condition of the brethren? He said: Bad condition(!)", en spelt as a separate word, preceded by // and followed by an adjectival attribute: 15r, 8 rojal// en kaddis : ebsar = \[\text{rujul\ en\ qadd\textacute{\'}is\ ebsar}\] "a holy man saw"; 15r, 10 febek\textacute{e} . bok\textacute{e} // en eedd (sic, instead of the expected shedid; pay attention to // directly preceding en and not directly following the indefinite noun, contrary to the preceding example!\) "he wept a great deal".

Tan\textacute{\'}vin as an optional morpheme indicating that the noun to which it is affixed is followed by an attribute is marginally attested in mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic (v. Blau, \textit{Emergence}, pp. 173ff.) and occurs often in various Bedouin dialects (v. \textit{ibid.}, pp. 193ff.). In Judaeo-Arabic, as has been shown by D.H. Baneth in his important Hebrew paper in the \textit{Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society} 12.141ff. (1945-46), the \textit{tan\textacute{\'}vin} in this function has become transformed into a separate word, spelt \text{\textacute{\'}en}. So far, this usage as a separate word outside Judaeo-Arabic was known mainly from vulgar Spanish Arabic only (v. Blau, \textit{Emergence}, pp. 193-94, note 1), where it is quite frequent. Accordingly, till now it stood to reason that this feature arose in the writings of Jews first in Spanish Judaeo-Arabic, to spread afterwards to Judaeo-Arabic literature in general. In the light of the occurrence of \text{\textacute{\'}en} as a separate word in our and other texts from outside Spain,\textsuperscript{57} however, the exclusive derivation of this feature in Judaeo-Arabic from Spain becomes much more dubious. One has to take into consideration the possibility of this feature aris-

\textsuperscript{57} I. Friedländer, \textit{JQR} 19 (1906-07), p. 89, states that he distinctly remembers having met \textit{\textacute{\'}en} preceding an indefinite attribute in a Muslim lot book; for particulars cf. Blau, \textit{Emergence}, p. 208, note 2. Moreover S. Hopkins was kind enough to draw my attention to some Arabic documents of Egyptian provenance, one of which bears the date 27 Dhu \textit{-}l-Q\textacuter{a}da 532 = November 11,1129 (D.S. Margoliouth \textendash{} E.J. Holmyard, "Arabic Documents from the Monneret Collection", \textit{Islamica} 4 (1929-31), p. 249-271). In these documents \textit{\textacute{\'}en} preceding an indefinite attribute occurs p. 250, line 12, and p. 253, line 15. \textit{\textacute{\'}al} in the same function (yet spelt together with the following word, as usual with \textit{\textacute{\'}al}; v. Blau, \textit{Emergence}, pp. 276-77) occurs p. 249, lines 3 and S. [By the way, in document A, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 249-50, from which three of the four occurrences are cited, the word \textit{\textacute{\'}al} (p. 249, line 3) occurs, explained by the editors as \textit{\textacute{\'}eg\textacute{\'}al} "should be washed", i.e., as exhibiting \textit{f} for \textit{gh}. Since in Judaeo-Arabic both \textit{\textacute{\'}al} and \textit{\textacute{\'}al} are marked by \textit{gin\textacute{\'}el}, one could surmise that this document was copied from a Judaeo-Arabic Vorlage and, accordingly, \textit{\textacute{\'}en}/\textit{\textacute{\'}al} preceding indefinite attributes in this document, is due to Judaeo-Arabic, usage. Yet, admittedly, this supposition is founded on a rather narrow basis.] Besides, S. Hopkins called my attention to a text from the 11th-12th century (text no. 160, p. 441, lines 1-2
ing, by parallel development, in various dialects, thus facilitating the spread of this phenomenon over the whole Judaeo-Arabic literature. Moreover, our text is, so far, the only text in which en affixed to the preceding noun and as a separate word alternates. Baneth, ibid., has adduced convincing proofs for the derivation of 'n in Judaeo-Arabic, indicating that the preceding noun is followed by an attribute, from the tarwīn. In light of our text his thesis is finally proved right.

43. 20v, 15; 23r, 8 ile gorbe(h) 'īlā ghurba “out of doors” one would have rather expected the use of the generic article. The same applies to 17v, 9 f. tarīk fī tarīq “in the road”.

44. As in all stages of Arabic (v. e.g. Brockelmann, II, p. 213f.), there occur appositions like 9r, 9-10, 13 ejneha = nar 'ajnāqatun nārum “wings of fire”; 5v, 7-9 halaka dehev . wehalaka . fazza halaqatun dhahabun wa-halaqatun fājdun “gold and silver rings”.

45. The construct relation may be expressed by 'alladhi li- or matās (cf. for their background e.g. Blau, Emergence, p. 82): 5v, 2-4 kemetl . elkhasebe . ellet‘i . lel. xat‘ara . metah. elme = [kemetl el-xashebe 'ellet‘i le-xat‘ara metās 'el-mē] “like the wood of the handle of water” (i.e. the handle of the water pump).

Two nouns in construct that express one notion, need not be separated, as in Classical Arabic, but the nomen rectum may be placed after the last (cf. for the background of this feature Blau, ChA, p. 345, note 2): 21r, 11-12 bexauf weiradet‘ : alla “in the fear and favour of God”. Cf. also §42, note 54.

46. As in many layers of Arabic (v. Blau, ChA, p. 305, note 19), the negation layṣ(a) has become invariable, not only when preceding a finite verb (in the imperfect, as 5r, 5v lēis t’elōg “it is not reached”; 19v, 9; 22r, 3; 27v, 1; v. ibid., p. 305, §204.1.1) or when preceding a personal pronoun (in a nominal sentence: 9v, 3 lēis hom nar “they are not (of) fire”; v. ibid., p. 307, §204.1.3), in which cases person, number and gender are sufficiently indicated by the verb/personal pronoun, but also in ordinary nominal sentences (32r, 2 xat‘ah : lēis : lelmuat‘ “a sin which is not mortal”; v. ibid., p. 306, §204.1.2).

Like many verbs having positive form, but negative content (v. Blau, ChA, p. 313, §208), verbs designating “to guard oneself against” may be followed by a negative (asynthetic or synthetic) clause denoting the thing against which one is guarding oneself: 31r, 14 ahres . lē . t’chod 'aḥnus lā taṣudd “guard yourself against esteeming”; 32r, 6-7 ahfas : nefsak : en le : iasbe . haklak 'ilfas nafsak 'an lā yusbā ṣaqlak “guard your self from letting your mind be held captive”. Yet positive clauses governed by such verbs are attested as well (cf. 26r, 5-6).

in: F. Bilabel-A. Grohman, Koptische und arabischs Texte zur Religion und religiösen Literatur in Ägyptens Spätzeit, Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen, Heft 5, Heidelberg 1934) fī ’ayy mawḍī an shif “wherever you want” (Grohman’s translation ibid. is erroneous).
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47. 11r, 6-7 weheodemba Jejoi. k'en "and behold/this Abba Jijjoi was" ḥāḏḥā may be interpreted either as presentative or as a demonstrative pronoun preceding a noun not determined by the definite article (cf. Blau, CHA, p. 400, n.38).

ḥāḏḥā... 'al-wāḥid "the same" occurs 4r, 6-7 seeloh. hede... elax elwehad "this same brother asked him".

Anticipatory ḥāḏḥā referring to a following clause (cf. Blau, CHA, pp. 405-06, §294): 13, 2-5 ras = k'ol: shei hou: hede... en le: iedou = elensen nefsoh shei elbet'te "the main thing is that one shall not consider (l, ya'add) himself to be anything at all".

48. I have noticed two cases of numerals 3-10 terminating in -a(t) referring to feminine nouns: 24v, 10 dhefat'ain. aw telet' ete ḏaṣṣatayni 'aw thulūtha "twice or thrice"; 32v, 10-11 behedih: etetele'et sāsūl = [be-hē-ḥādīh 'eth-thelāthēth xezāl] "to these three habits" (for the general background of this phenomenon v. Blau, CHA, p. 366, §247). The second of these examples exhibits also the phenomenon of the definite article attached to a numeral in construct; for this feature cf. ibid., pp. 379ff., especially §264.2.

Invariable aḥad irrespective of gender (cf. ibid., p. 373, §251.1) occurs 24r, 5-6 aḥad = rażeli "one of your legs".

49. For the use of bi in the paronomastic adverbial expression denoting time yawman bi-yawmih 3r, 11 v. §40. As already in Classical Arabic and very often in Middle Arabic (v. Blau, CHA, p. 248, §154.1) kamātht "as" is used, rather than simple ka, e.g. 4r, 10; 5v, 2. In Middle-Arabic, li with its dependent phrase supplants direct objects (especially determine ones, v. ibid., pp. 413ff., especially §305.1.1.1, where this use of li preceding pronominals is dealt with). I have noticed this feature only in the phrase cadd nafṣahū li-shayy "he accounted himself something" 17r, 14-15; 31r, 14-15, alternating with cadd nafṣahū shayy' 13v, 3-5 (read sol).

50. Concord: as very often in Middle Arabic (v. Blau, CHA, pp. 275ff.), the verb preceding a subject denoting several persons may stand in the plural: 17v, 3 iet'ouk: axwēh "brethren come"; 28v, 1-2 wehadow hawlē = [weḥāṣā ḥawle-i] "and those turned aside"(!); 24r, 8-9. Rarer is the plural concord of a verb referring to a verb designating several non-persons: C 1v, 8-9 zaikouk = elef = k'ar = el = ax ġāyaqū 'al-aṣfār 'al-ax "thoughts disturbed the brother". The last example also exhibits the phenomenon of plurals not denoting persons being referred to as plurals (cf. Blau, CHA, pp. 285ff., §184). Other examples: 34v, 4-5 efk'ar... eljesad... ierhabouh 'aṣfār 'al-jasad yarcahib(i) "the thoughts of the body frighten him"; 5v, 14-15.

ḥā'ula'i) is used as "neuter" in the sense of "this" (cf. ibid., p. 291-92, §187.3.4) 6v, 9-10 kal = hawle-i "he said this".

51. For the expression of command yakūn with the imperfect may be used (cf. Blau, CHA, p. 437, §322): 14v, 4-5 tek'oun... tekouli takūn taqūl "say!" (cf. §41, end).
52. Verbs expressing motion may be followed asymmetrically by verbs that denote an action performed by the same subject, which occurs simultaneously or immediately thereafter (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 488, §383): C 2v, 4-5 welemme = kamou = hamelou wa-lammâ qânimû samîla “and when they arose and made” (!; the main clause opens with 'atlaq). Frequent are asymmetric object clauses (ibid., pp. 492ff.): 18v, 4 weerett = t’endenhe wa-arada tandahin “and you wanted to be anointed”, and similarly after arîd 21v, 12; further 22r, 3-4 welîs : ehtemel : esmah wa-laysa ’alhtamîl ‘asmaç “I cannot endure to hear”; 29v, 5-6 wele : t’emekk’enni . et’bah . heweie wa-lâ tumakkinni ‘atbas hâwâya “and do not enable me to follow my desire”; C 2v, 1-2 mejesart = elza’ak mâ jasartu ’aqlizak “I did not venture to awaken you”; for 31r, 14 v. §46. An asymmetric subject clause (v. Blau, ChA, pp. 499ff.) occurs mejemk’enni = em[zi] = /mē yemkenntû/l ‘emyâl/ “it is not possible for me to go”. Similarly 15v, 6-8 iejeb . ierreheb . en . Je . jâhkad yajib li-râhîb ‘in . . lâ yaâqad “the monk must not harbour ill feelings, if . . ”.

53. As in other Middle Arabic texts (v. Blau, ChA, pp. 510 ff., §402), the boundaries between ‘an, ‘anna and ‘inna have become blurred. Accordingly, en occurs in syntactical positions in which, in classical Arabic, one would have expected either ‘anna or ‘inna. en for ‘anna: 23r, 5-6 len : hormet elwediah : sheref li-‘anna lurnmat al-wadîsâ shariqa “because the respect due to a trust is sacred”; 23v, 11-13 edk’or : en alla : haz : wejel ienhorz : elizik ‘udhkur ‘anna ‘allâh çażza wa-jalla yanzur ilayka “remember that God, praise and majesty to Him, observes you!”. en instead of ‘inna: 5r, 15-16 kalloh . . enet’t’aubeh . . lâis . . “he said . . . behold, repentance is rot . . .”; 16v, 3 feen(!) . eshsheitan . . “behold, Satan . . .”; and similarly 31r, 16; 32r, 12; 27v, 1 feen : lâis : akwe fa-‘in(nant) laysa aqwâ “for I am not able”; perhaps also 35v, 2, where, however, the text is unclear.

en may introduce an independent desire (for this function of ‘an in Middle Arabic v. Blau, ChA, p. 516, §403): 24v, 12-15 feneseb : ekt’arak : ween t’ek’oun : hawesak = wekefeh fa-nâsib(!) ‘aflkârak wa-‘an takûn hâwassak wogifâ “oppose(!) your thoughts and let your feelings stand . . .!”.

For mâ çasâ ‘an 1v, 3-4 (cf. §34.1, note 47, further Satzinger, p. 50, note 17); 5r, 9 denoting conclusion a minori ad matus cf. Dozy, s.v. çasâ (cf. also in Judaeo-Arabic Ms. Bodl. Heb. Neubauer 1274, p. 92, -5ff.).

54. As in many Christian Arabic texts (v. Blau, ChA, pp. 536ff., especially §420.2), li-kay-mâ “in order that” is frequent, as 24r, 13-14; 24v, 16; 28r, 9-10; 31v, 12 lek’ime (cf. §14).

55. Contrary to many Middle Arabic texts (v. Blau, ChA, pp. 549ff., §431), the inflected forms of alladhi is always used in accordance with Classical usage, no doubt, through its influence (cf. ibid., p. 551, §432), as 1v, 6 ellet‘i; 14r, 6 ellowin.

For en introducing a relative clause after an indefinite antecedent v. §42.1, for alladhi li expressing the construct relation §45.
56. Conditional clauses: the pronominal subject may separate ‘idhā’in from its verb (for this phenomenon cf. Blau, ChA, p. 577, note 2; p. 589, note 1): 1v, 7-8 ide nolm. twekkelke ‘idhā na‘nu ta-wakkalnā “if we rely” 28r, 6-7 ween ent : neebtehom wa-‘in anta nāsabthom(l) “and if you oppose them”; 23r, 7; 29r, 7.

‘in is followed by a perfect preceding a parallel imperfect (v. Blau, ChA, p. 592. §480.1): 23r, 7-14 ween ent dehbet : ile : gørbe fet’enzel : hand : enes... wexarej . hou . ..wet‘erekak . ..feeliak en . .. “if you go abroad and live with (cheid) someone... and he goes out... and leaves you... , beware” ; this example is the more interesting, because the imperfect preceded by a perfect form is followed by two parallel perfect verbs.

‘in kān is rather frequent (cf. ibid., pp. 593-94, §482); yet I have not noticed invariable ‘in kān. The coalescense of ‘in kān into one word is hinted at by being spelt as one word (§5), yet the habits of our text as to spelling words together and separating them are somewhat erratic (§5), and one must not rely on them too much. On the other hand, the use of redundant kān in cases like 14v, 2 erk‘ont t‘erid “if you want” , rather than ‘in aradta, also suggests that ‘in kān, etc., has become a veritable conditional conjunction.

fa is often wanting at the beginning of the apodosis of ‘in/’idhā contrary to strict Classical usage, both when preceding the imperfect and in other cases (cf. Blau, ChA, pp. 447fr., §§341; 342): 7r, 8-11 weide : refazne : elwehded. , . . .sier[f] ozne el = k‘ol wa-‘idhā ra‘a‘idna ‘al-wāhid. . . .sa-yafqī‘inā ‘al-kull “if we deny the One... , everyone will deny us”; 10r, 7-8 ide : feraq : men : elhisad : jetouf ‘idhā fara‘g mīn ‘al-hiṣād yatīf (pay attention to the imperfect denoting a repeated action in the past; for this feature in the modern dialect of Cairo v. Spitta, p. 341, §162b) “when he had finished the harvest, he went around”; 1r, 8-10 feide semah : saheboh iet‘hannen halēh fa-‘idhā samīc sabibuhī yatāhānn canalayhi “when his master hears, he will have pity on him”; 15v, 7-8 en . axta . halēh axouh le . iakhad ‘in ‘axta‘ canalayhi ‘axtūhu tā yahgad “if his brother sins against him, he must not harbour ill feelings”; 17v, 8-10 en . dehbet : mah : axwe f. tairk. t‘ebhed hanhom ‘in dhababta ma‘a ‘ixwad(f) ft‘ tamāq tabāzd canthum “if you walk with brethren in the road, separate yourself from them!” ; 30v, 12-14. Yet fa introducing the protasis in accordance with the rules of Classical grammar is not rare either, especially preceding an order or a prohibition, as 18r, 9; 19v, 2, 14; 20v, 2, 16; 21r, 7; 23r, 13-14. On the other hand, I have also noticed one case of wa introducing the apodosis (cf. for its background Blau, ChA, p. 450 §346, especially note 16): 20v, 10-13 en . eden lak . en . t‘ejles . t‘esmah . k‘elehām . wek‘eme . iemarak feesanah ‘in ‘adhīna lakā ‘an ta‘līs tasnīc kalāmah qamā na‘mūnka fa‘isnaq “if he permits you to sit and listen to their conversation, do as he orders you!” .

I have noticed one case of asyndetic conditional clause (cf. Blau, ChA, p. 594, §484), alternating with an ‘idhā-clause: 7r, 6-11 nemejied . el = wehehd , . . . wek‘ol . ahad = iemajedne : weide : refazne : elwehded . . . sier[f]. ozne el = k‘ol “if we praise the One, everyone will praise us, and if we deny (rafa‘dnā) the One... , everyone will deny us”. Pay attention that what may be called protasis and apodosis of the asyndetic conditional clause, are connected by wa “and”, rather than asyndetically.
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In Middle Arabic in general as well as in modern dialects (v. Blau, ChA, pp. 601ff., §501) indirect questions may be introduced by historical conditional particles. I have noticed one case exhibiting this phenomenon: 20r, 9-10 weesbor en k'en hede. jëiied\(\) em le = \(\text{we-'ebsor 'en kën hëdëf jëyyed 'em lëf}\) “and see(1) whether this is good or not!”.

APPENDIX A

Parallels to the transliteration of \(\text{t}, \text{k}\) by \(\text{t}^\text{\prime}, \text{k}^\text{\prime}\) respectively.

As stated (§§§6; 7), \(\text{t}, \text{k}\) are, as a rule, transliterated by \(\text{t}^\text{\prime}, \text{k}^\text{\prime}\) respectively, because \(\text{t}\) and \(\text{k}\) were aspirated, whereas unaspirated \(\text{t}, \text{q}\) are, as a rule, transliterated by \(\text{t}, \text{k}\) respectively. Similarly, ancient Greek transcriptions of Biblical Hebrew transcribe Hebrew \(\text{t}, \text{k}, \text{p}\) by Greek \(\text{t}', \text{k}', \text{f} (= \text{p'})\) respectively, \(\text{t}, \text{q}\) by \(\text{t}, \text{k}\) respectively, presumably because Hebrew \(\text{t}, \text{k}, \text{p}\) were aspirated, \(\text{t}, \text{q}\) unaspirated, and Latin transcriptions reflect a similar situation. Cf. recently e.g. Rodinson, pp. 318-19, J. Barr, JSS 12, 9-11 (1967), E. Kutscher, Leshonenu 29.49ff. (1964-65). Accordingly, one will not accept Kahle’s solution (Kahle, pp. 179ff.), who assumes that this transcription of Hebrew \(\text{t}, \text{k}, \text{p}\) reflects the general spirantized pronunciation of these sounds (\(\text{th}, \text{x}, \text{f}\)). If one accepted Kahle’s interpretation, one would be obligated to assume spirantized pronunciation of Aramaic \(\text{t}, \text{k}, \text{p}\) as well, at least till the end of the fifth Christian century, because they are transcribed in a similar manner. And in fact, this consistent inference from Kahle’s wrong premises was deduced by Altheim-Stiehl, pp. 39ff. Quite recently, B. S. J. Isserlin (pp. 19ff.) inferred from the transcription of Arabic \(\text{t}, \text{k}\) by Greek \(\text{t}', \text{k}'\) in the Nessana papyri that, through Aramaic influence, these Arabic sounds have become spirantized (\(\text{th}, \text{x}\)). This is the more surprising, since he relies on Cantineau, who, in the passage quoted by Isserlin, quite correctly concluded that Greek \(\text{t}', \text{k}', \text{f}\) in the transcription of Nabatean Aramaic reflect the well-known double pronunciation of these sounds in Aramaic, viz. as aspirated stops (\(\text{t}^\text{\prime}, \text{k}^\text{\prime}, \text{p}^\text{\prime}\)) and spirantized sounds (\(\text{th}, \text{x}, \text{f}\)). Nor can one rely on Levin’s statement, quoted from Blau, ChA, p. 108, since Blau, ibid., note 140, proved Levin’s statement to be erroneous. Moreover, if Arabic \(\text{k}\) were in fact pronounced \(\text{x}\), one would expect to find the same Greek transcription of both Arabic \(\text{k}\) and Arabic \(\text{x}\) (\(\xi\)). The latter, however, is transcribed differently, v. Isserlin p. 23. Accordingly, one will not accept the various theories of Kahle, Altheim-Stiehl and Isserlin, as if Greek \(\text{t}', \text{k}'\) and \(\text{f}\) could only represent Semitic spirants, rather than aspirated stops; and indeed the transcription of aspirated \(\text{t}\) and \(\text{k}\) by \(\text{t}^\text{\prime}\) and \(\text{k}^\text{\prime}\) respectively is further corroborated by our text.
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APPENDIX B

The imāla in Violet’s Psalm fragment.

In the following I shall endeavour to state the conditions of imāla in the small Arabic Psalm fragment (parts of Psalm Lxxviii) written in Greek majuscules and published by Violet. It dates, presumably, from the eighth century. Yet, because of the small size of this text and the rather intricate character of imāla, one has to consider the results arrived at as quite tentative.

If my conclusions are correct the conditions of imāla are as follows: 1. ā shifts to ē when the preceding or following syllable contains i. 2. In the perfect of the first conjugation of verbs ḥywā ā is preserved when preceded or followed by a harf mufaxxam; otherwise it shifts to ē. 3. a is preserved when preceded or followed by a harf mufaxxam occurring in the same syllable; otherwise it shifts to ē. 4. By some sort of vowel assimilation, a preceding aḍ tends not to shift to ē, even if not adjacent to a harf mufaxxam.58

1. ā > ē in the vicinity of i: 21 lideliq “therefore”; 23 sixeb, exhibiting i in the first syllable, as against Classical saḥāb “clouds”; 25 elmelikeū = [el-mltkeśu] “the angels”; 28 kē. em. īm = [lxvēΊmum] “their tents”; 25 el. insē “the man”; 51; 55 mese [kin] “dwellings”; 54 īl “ilā “to” (in final position): 55 mir [t] mītāth “inheritance”; 56 el.īlē “al-ilāh “God”.59 i = [r] does not induce imāla: 20 malāh = [māyēh] (sic!, not miyāh, as expected, as against slībāb quoted above) “water”; maideh = [mīyēh] < māydē < mā’ida “table”. One will not regard 21 israēl as a veritable exception, since it may be influenced by Greek orthography (despite Violet’s doubts, p. 26). On the other hand, 26 el. gasif al-cāṣif “the wind”, exhibits a veritable exception (which one will not attempt to explain away by tafṣim, since above in slībāb it did not prevent imāla). Contrariwise, imāla did occur in 58 be. men. koutē. tē. īm = [bi-myn̄hatetiminn] “with their graven (images)” through the influence of i of the case ending, no doubt an artificial feature, exhibiting the dialectal pronunciation of a Classical form, whereas 57 mitlā. abā. i. īm = [mīthl ‘abā]. jīlūm] “like their fathers” exhibits a less vulgar pronunciation.60

Some examples for the preservation of ā when not influenced by i, in both word middle and word final: 21, 22 gala cašā “on”; 23 aboab abwāb “doors”;

58 In the following, the numbers refer to the verses of Psalm Lxxviii. Whenever doubt could arise which vowel of a given word an example refers to, the vowel referred to is printed in capital letters.

59 If Kahle, Bibel, p. xiv, is correct in stating that i is never marked by ē, one will have (also apud Kahle) to read i for ē. The same may apply to ē above, which, however, is not adduced by Kahle.

60 For ē marking i v. the preceding note. Violet, p. 32, generally states that the diacritical marks are, as a rule, rather blurred and one has to rely on shadows only. Nevertheless, in our case it could also be interpreted as exhibiting veritable y, i.e. abāyhum, a hyper-correct form, for which cf. Blau, Chist., p. 90, note. 30.

61 Nevertheless, even abā[thim] is a hypo-correct form, as against Classical abā[thim] and vulgar abāθum? 58 haw. t. an. lūm b’awthānīm “with their idols” may exhibit a similar Classical pronunciation; yet the ē is not certain, v. Violet, p. 33, Kahle, Bibel, p. 34, note 6.
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22 k'alasū = [xalāṣhi]⁶² “his salvation”; 26 el.sema “heaven”, and similarly 23; 27 elturab “dust”; 30 ma “that”; fa.u.īm “their mouth”, presumably = [sāhum], v. Nöldeke, NBSS, p. 173 (where the quotation is not accurate), Kahle, Bibel, p. 34, note 4, Blau, ChA, p. 322B; 24 lab[.] in li-yaḵulū (〈li-ya’kulū) “that they eat”; 56 k’e.ā.d[.] tu = [shehAdfā] tol “his testimonies”. The only clear exception I have noticed is 26 aṭA (sic!, fourth conjugation, pace Kahle’s Arabic transcription [Kahle, Bibel, p. 33]) “he brought”.

2. The perfect of the first conjugation of verbs ḫw/y exhibits ʾ when not influenced by taḵām: 20 faseet fašalat “and she flowed”; 29 geb “he brought”; 30 ken “was”; yet it exhibits ā when influenced by taḵām: 20 fa.dat fādat “she overflowed”; 52 sak sāq “he guided”.

I have noticed two cases of the perfect of the fourth conjugation: 26 a.nag ʾalāj “he caused to blow”; 58 a.gr.rou.ī tāgārītu “they moved him to jealousy”. These cases may be interpreted according to §1 (ā, because the adjacent syllables do not contain ʾ). Yet they may also be analysed according to our paragraph, since not only gh, but also h (cf. §11.4) may be analyzed as hūrif mufaxxama. Yet since this usage of h is very marginal (v. §11.4), the first interpretation is much more likely.

3. a influenced by (tautosyllabic) harf mufaxxam: 20 sakʾr.ū sāxra “rock”; legal lasʿAll “perhaps”; 21 elrab “the Lord”; faamtenag fa-ntenAṣ “and he abstained”; ek(teg).alet ishtacAlat “it was kindled (fem. sing.)”; nag.kōu bāsṭāb “Jacob”; sāg... sās[t] “he came up”; 22 bīlīāb bīllāb “in God”; k’alasū xAlāṣ(i)lī “his salvation”; 24 am.tar ʿanṯAr “he rained”; 25 bagat bāṣAṯī “he sent”; 27 galei ʾum ʿAlayhīm “on them”; 27 raml “sand”, etc. etc.

Although the harf mufaxxam has to be tautosyllabic (cf. 20 legal ʿAṣall), there occur cases in which an added suffix, though transferring the harf mufaxxam to the following syllable, nevertheless does not alter the preceding a to e (cf. §11.7.1, second paragraph): 56 mar.marou māmArū “they grieved”; iek’.fa.dou yafṣAẓū “they will keep”; 57 ga.ḍa.rou ghadArū “they left”.

Exceptionally, a shifts to e despite taḵām: 28 ga.s.ker.ūm = [caskErhum] “their camp”; 60 bak’er = [bashEr] “men”, as against e.g. maArmiArū above. 20 k’ecig.bū[i] shāb[i] “his people”, as against e.g. yaqūb avobe. 23 fatek ʿatAl “he opened”, as against e.g. 53 bakʾr bahr “sea”. The prefix vowel e of the imperfect of the first conjugation preceding a harf mufaxxam (20 iek’.dir yaqdir “he can”; 56 iek’.fa.dou yafṣAẓū “they keep”) does perhaps not reflect exception, since its etymology is, it seems, i (cf. §27.2).⁶³

⁶²Again a hypo-correct form, as against Classical xalāṣhi and vulgar kalaṣṣi? In this case, in contradistinction to /abāʾīhum/, dealt with in the preceding note, it is the vowel of the pronominal suffix, rather than the case ending, that reflects Classical influence.

⁶³In this Psalm fragment, to be sure, i is, as a rule, transcribed by Greek i, in some exceptional cases by ē (v. Violet, p. 26), marginally only by e (ibid., p. 35). Violet (ibid.) adduces one certain case only, the double occurrence of gedda jīddan “much” 29; 59. He is somewhat un-
Without the influence of tafšīm, a shifts to e; some examples: 20 faselet fašāsat “and she flowed”; 21 semig samik “he heard”; 22 lien “because”; 51, 55 mesekin mAsēkin “dwellings”; 52 genam ghanam “sheep”; 54 iem... yanf iim-hū “his right hand”; 55 oume[m] umaf[m] “nations”; 29 akelou akAlū “they ate”, etc. etc. a not exposed to the influence of tafšīm occurs always in wa “and” (cf. above, note 63), fa “and”, further 56 lam “not”. Expected leum lahīm “to them” 24 interchanges with la.hīm 25, 29. Initial glottal stop prevents māla, not only in cases like 24, 27 am.tar Amtar “he rained”; 23 amar “he ordered”, etc., which may be attributed to §4, infra, but also 29 akelou Akalū “they ate”; 59 af.sel “he abhorred”; 56 ab.te.leu Abtalaw (for the A v. note 63, second half) “they tempted”; 21 faamtenag fa-Amtana “and he refrained”. I have noticed exceptions only preceding sibilants (for their influence cf. Brockelmann, I, pp. 201-2, §76): 21 ek’teg allel Ashtasalat “it (fem. sing.) was kindled” (for Ashtasalat corresponding to Classical ishtasalat cf. note 63, second half); 60 es.ken “he placed” (as against 55 ask[en]; 61 as[l]e[m] “he delivered”).

Tā nmarbaṭa behaves as expected: it shifts to e, except when exposed to tafšīm; accordingly it is marked by aū 27 mug.nek’aū mujnāḥa “winged”, as against ēu... certain as to 53 (=Violet, p. 12 [not 16!], 11) berri[ge] bif-raj “in hope” (pay attention to the theme fašāl being used as against Classical fašāl, as is also above §1 shāb, where also mAyāb, exhibiting fašāl as against Classical fašāl, is cited). In the light of 22 billā “in God”; 55 bill[...]; and e.g. 61 lil.se[b] “to captivity”, however, this interpretation is quite likely. It is much less likely to interpret berri... as exhibiting the e of the definite article (which is invariably, even preceding sun letters, transcribed by el; only in our case does it exhibit assimilation of the l; Violet, p. 24). Yet I have also noted two cases in which we “and”, invariably transcribed ǣa, preceding the article is spelt ǣ (these two cases being the only occurrence of wa preceding ǣl: 20 oeludiel “and the river-beds”; 21 oelmar “and fire”, §17.1, note 38, I have attempted to reconstruct an etymon *w. This, however, is impossible in our case because of the fixed spelling ǣa (and accordingly makes also our reconstruction above somewhat dubious). Therefore, one will interpret ǣ as exhibiting the e of the definite article, and this may also apply to berri... (which, at any rate, exhibits an exceptional spelling of the definite article). Nevertheless, the interpretation ǣ/ber containing e = /l/ is note unlikely, since it stands to reason that the etymon of the definite article itself is l, rather than ǣ (cf. also §11.2); 30 el.tag.am aṯ-fa sani “food” hints in this direction, since ǣ should have been spelt al preceding a harf mufaxsam. Accordingly, el would also exhibit the spelling of i by e. Since, however, the spelling of the definite article is conventional, rather than phonetic (as stated, it exhibits I even preceding sun letters), the spelling with e even preceding a harf mufaxsam to which the l is assimilated, may be due to spelling convention only. At any rate, 21 ek’teg allel “it (fem. sing.) was kindled” has to be derived from Ashtasalat, rather than from Ashtasalat (pace Violet, p. 35), so that the first e corresponds to a: this is demonstrated by 21 faamtenag fa-Amtana “and he refrained”. To sum up, since the spelling of i with e does occur in Violet, though admittedly quite marginally, one may interpret the prefix vowel e of the imperfect of the first conjugation as representing i (as may also 30 lough, demou “they will finish”, which corresponds to Classical yuedAmū, but may represent yuedAmū [cf. also §28.3]). In this case, of course, we have to analyse also ye not exposed to the influence of tafšīm: 53 leza... yelze[s] “they fear”. 24 m... a manna may exhibit long ā; in this case, because of the lack of adjacent i, the absence of imāla is expected. But even if the a should be short, its absence is not surprising, since it is a Greek loan word. At any rate, Kahle, p. 33, was wrong in interpreting the a as tanwin-āt.
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20 oeleudieh...maideh wa-l'awdīya...mā'īda “and the river beds...table”; 25 elmeleikeh 'al-malā'ika “the angels”. I am inclined to interpret 57 gauge sawjāh(‘) “deceitful, curved (fem. sing.)”, although it is not spelt with final ī (as tā marbuṭa invariably occurs in Violet), as exhibiting the passage of final alif madda into tā marbuṭa (cf. §18.1).65

4. a directly preceding a/ā tends to be preserved; e.g. 20 malāw = mAyāh “water”; 25 bagat hĀcath “he sent”; 28 fāna.kāg.at fāw.Aqaṣat “and she fell”; osat wAsat “middle”; 53 īhā[ā] hadā “he led”; 58 aw.t'an.i īm Awthānīhim “their idols”.66

Yet e preceding a/ā occurs as well: 20 legal lāṣal(l) “perhaps”; 27 mug.nek'āwā muṣnAha “winged”; 56 k'c.ūa.ī.[ā] ītī shAḥādī'ī ītāl “his testimonies”; 59 tegāfēl tAghāfāl “he neglected”; 26 sema samā heaven (yet 23 sesama exhibiting some sort of diptography, hinting to both ɪsamā and ḫsamā).67

APPENDIX C

S. Hopkins has kindly called my attention to the bilingual charm in the Cambridge University Library, Taylor-Schechter Collection 12, 207, published by W.E. Crum, Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology 24.329-31 (1902), with notes by B. Moritz, ibid., 25.89 (1903), and translated into German by A.M. Kropp, Ausgewählte koptische Zauber texte, II, Bruxelles 1931, pp. 242-43. I am very much obliged to Mr. Hopkins for providing me with a xerox copy, and to the Library for their permission to print it. The main part of the charm is in Coptic, its first six lines, however, preceding two or three irregular lines of ill-written signs, is in Arabic, in Coptic characters. The Arabic text runs as follows:

(1) besmelle elrahmen elrahim haka (2) lisēnnak ī xarib ben sit (3) elk'oule ī īēstatī īētiēk'ēl (4) lem elk'elem hakaī lisennou (5) han t'ījar bent cete behak (5) īē tilesēm ī hauelī ēmin.

I interpret haka (1, 4) as 'aqadt > 'aqatt, i.e. “I tied”. lisēnnak “your tong"e", as I am inclined to divide the letters, exhibits an erroneous doubling of the

65 According to §1 above, ī should be always preserved (for the lack of ū in the adjacent syllable). Yet no device can explain 29 gedda jiddān “much”, since both an etymon jiddā (because of the preceding ī) and jiddā (because of the absence of tabīm) should have resulted in *gedde. – If in fact alif manfa'da shifted to tā marbuṭa, this would prove that the spelling of the latter with ū = /ḥ/ is mere convention, rather than exhibiting final h; cf. §34.1, note 46.

66 Violet, p. 34, is at a loss to explain the alternation of āu and eu marking aw; yet all the cases are in accordance with §3 and §4.

67 Remarkable are 23 fātek'fatah “he opened” and 60 bak'ar hashar “man”. One would expect (v. above §3) a in both words in the final syllable. Yet the first syllable in both words is spelt with ā, as if it preceded a!
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n; another error is, as already recognized, the second i in iētēk'ellem (4-5) and, in my opinion tilesmē for tītilesmē, v. infra. Pay also attention that /lisān/ is once spelt with ē (2) and once with e (4), a further indication of the careless spelling. For iē (2) cf. already Crum, p. 330, note 6, who admitted that the final letter could be ē. tilesmē (5), as I am inclined to divide the letters, is perhaps a special plural form /talāsim/ “talismans” pronounced tōfēsm, the i marking the shwa between the ζ and the l. In my opinion, it is preceded by the demonstrative hā and followed by the presumably Classical demonstrative hā'ulā‘i. For nouns preceded and followed by demonstratives e.g. Fischer, p. 46; since nouns in this position are determinate, I am inclined to consider tilesmē as determinate, i.e. tītilesmē. The Arabic text, accordingly, runs as follows (in a somewhat classicalized form):

(1) bism ‘allāh ‘ar-ralāmān ‘ar-ralāmīn. aqadt (2) lisānak yā Gharib bin Sitt (3) al-kul, la yastattīs yatakal- (4) lam ‘al-kalām. aqadt lisānī (5) ‘an Tījār bint Sitte (?) bi-haqq (5) hā-ttalāsimā hā’ulā‘i. amīn.

I would translate it as follows:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. I have tied your tongue, O Gharib, son of Sitt el-Kull. He will not be able to speak anything (literally: the speech). I have tied his tongue against Tījār (i.e., so that he will not be able to speak against T.), the daughter of Sitti (?), by these talismans.

Amen.

The text is too short and careless for further phonetic analysis.

ABBREVIATIONS

Numbers refer to the pages and lines of Ms. Cairo no. 45, as quoted Sobhy, pp. 234-267, the number of the page being followed by r(ecto) and v(erso) respectively. C preceding the number of the page refers to Ms. Cambridge University Library Add. 1886, 17, containing Casanova’s text, as quoted Sobhy, pp. 268-269. An exclamation mark calls attention to deviation from Sobhy’s reading, transcription or translation. The Coptic letters are transliterated in bold face, the exact Arabic transcription in italics between / /, as a rule following =, whereas the corresponding Classical form or the (reconstructed) underlying form are adduced in italics. ‘ indicates average forms (in dialects). Most transcriptions are self evident; I only make the following remarks: as to Coptic letters, I transliterate beta by w(!), gamma by g, eta by η, theta by θ, pi by b(!), khi by k, shāi by sh, chai by x, janna by j, ypsilon by u and omikron plus ypsilon (pronounced u) by ou. In the Arabic transcription hamza is transcribed by · ’ayn by ẓ, ḥa by ḥḏ add by ḷ (the two last transcriptions were only used for the sake of greater simplicity and clearness, although both were pronounced ḷ [v. §9]). In Appendix B numbers refer to the respective verses of Psalm 1xxviii in Violet’s text, the Greek is transliterated in bold face letters (as to some extent also in Appendix A). Most transliterations are again self evident; I men-
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tion only: Eta (pronounced ë), theta by t', epsilon by α, (sometimes, just as iota, with spiritus asper on it, i being, as a rule, pronounced as y, u as h), phi by f and khi by k'. For the sake of simplicity, I have not indicated the accents occurring in Violet; cf. for them *SOAS* 35 (1972), 480-81. In Appendix B, in cases of doubts, the vowel referred to was printed in capital letters.
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Nöldeke, NBSS – Th. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Strassburg, 1910.
Violet – E. Violet, Ein zweisprachiges Psalmsfragment aus Damaskus, berichtiger Sonderabzug aus der Orientalistischen Litteratur-Zeitung 1901 (4.384-403, 425-441, 475-488), Berlin 1902. [I have taken into account Kahle’s edition of the greater part of this text (Kahle, Bibel, pp. XLVf.; 32-35), without always stating it expressly. Numbers in Appendix B refer to the verses of Psalm xxviii according to the Arabic text in Greek majuscules; Violet, p. followed by a number refers to columns in Violet’s paper.]
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