INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL

a. Northern Sinai in history

Throughout history the Sinai desert has served as the natural land bridge between Africa and Asia. Most of the traffic across this land bridge went through its northern part. "Northern Sinai" is understood here to cover the area between the Mediterranean coast in the north, and, more or less, the main road connecting the *Aḥmad Ḥamdi* tunnel a few kilometres north of Suez, the *Mitla* Pass, *Naxl* (*Nixl* in the local dialect), *aṯṮamad* (Thamad) *Nagab* (Naqab) and *Ṭāba* (Taba) on the Gulf of *ʿAgabah* (Aqaba) (which is also, approximately, the old *darb alḥağğ* "the Pilgrimage Route to Mekka"). Today this area covers the Egyptian Governorate of North Sinai and the eastern shore of the Suez Canal, which now administratively falls under the Governorate of *Ismāʿīliyyah* (Ismailia).

Apart from dozens of armies[1], numerous bedouin tribes moved through northern Sinai. Some of these tribes arrived before Islam, other tribes merely passed through on their way to conquer North Africa, and yet other tribes arrived more recently. Some of these moved on and are no longer found in the area[2], while others

---

[1] JARVIS (1931), p. 144, writes that through the ages the area has seen "no less than forty-five invading armies moving either to or from Egypt.". Also, Moses led his people through Sinai to the promised land, and there are theories which locate Moses' crossing of the "Red Sea" in northern Sinai. These theories hold that Moses followed the narrow dune ridge separating the (as it is now called) *Bardawīl* Lagoon from the Mediterranean Sea, after which the Pharao tried to cut them off by crossing the dry bottom of the Lagoon. The Mediterranean waves, swept up by the winds, then broke the dune ridge, filling the Lagoon and drowning the Pharao's army (cf. ibid. chapter IX).

[2] BAILEY (1985), p. 22, mentions, for instance, that during the Crusades the Negev and northern Sinai were inhabited by the major confederations of *Ǧarm* and *Ṯaʿlabah Ṭayy*, who are no longer found in the area. (with the exception of the *Axārsah* and *ʿUgaylī* (i.e. the *ʿAgāylah*) tribes, who were part of the *Ṯaʿlabah Ṭayy*, and are today found in the northwest.

stayed and (eventually) settled[3]. This full settling is for most tribes in Sinai of a relatively recent date[4], and is related (initially) to the completion of the Suez Canal in 1869[5], which made traveling west (with livestock) virtually impossible[6]. Later, in 1946, the area came under Egyptian rule, after which a process of modernization started, and the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 effectively closed the route to Palestine. The Israeli occupation of Sinai from 1967 until 1982 accelerated the process of modernization, and the Egyptian policy to settle the bedouins permanently, after Sinai had been handed back to Egypt in 1982 under the terms of the Camp David Accords of 1979, is still in effect[7].

This process of modernization has led to the bedouins of the area being exposed to education[8] and the mass media and has

---

[3] Some (members) of the tribes may still be semi-nomadic, such as a small part of the *Sawārkah*, whom I saw to have pitched three tents near *Ǧilbānah* in the northwest of Sinai in the spring of 1996, the *ʿAyāydah*, and also *Biliy*, many of whom still live in tents.

[4] BAILEY (1991), introduction, p. 6, writes: "Until the second half of the twentieth century modern civilization made little impact on the 125,000 bedouin of Sinai and the Negev who still resembled their desert ancestors of the biblical period more than they did their non-desert dwelling contemporaries."

Many of the elderly informants interviewed for this study still remembered their seasonal trek to Palestine to find pasture for their small cattle, and also to work as day labourers during harvest time.

[5] There was a conscious policy of bedouin sedentarization in Egypt proper earlier under *Muḥammad ʿAlī* (1804-40), cf. BAILEY/SHMUELI (1977), p. 38. ʿAMMĀR (1944), pp. 38-9, adds that the economic factor contributing to the settling of nomadic tribes in the *Šarqiyyah* should not be overlooked: "[bedouins could maintain their nomadic lifestyle] as long as they could compensate the lack of the pasture by robbing caravans on the one hand and plundering fallaḥeen [i.e. peasants] on the other. When public security was ensured and merchants or pilgrims caravans ceased to cross Sinai, it became inevitable that those nomads should either migrate from the country or change their mode of life. No encouraging region for migration was accessible in the adjoining countries and the latter alternative [i.e. to settle in the *Šarqiyyah*] was the only solution."

[6] BAILEY/SHMUELI (1977), p. 32, fn 27, write: "Barriers arising within the permanent migratory cycle of nomads often afect the traditional pastoral-nomadic system".

[7] Free after BAILEY (1991), pp. 6-7. Bailey also mentions that smuggling activities (as an important source of income for the bedouins) decreased due to the frontline between Israeli and Egyptian forces along the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Suez. This forced bedouin men to seek income from wage-labour jobs in Israel and in Israeli enterprises in Sinai.

[8] I was told that the first (primary) schools outside *alʿArīš* were not established until the early 1960s.

increased their mobility[9]. The effect of this exposure to the developed world, especially among the younger generations, has found an important part of its expression in the speech of these bedouins.

b. Cultural background

In a cultural sense, the Sinai desert, as the natural western extension of Arabia Petraea, is much more part of a larger area covering the northern *Ḥiǧāz* (or Hejaz), southern Transjordania, and the Negev, than it is of Egypt, to which it belongs in a political and administrative sense.

To mention just a few of the many manifestations, this shared cultural background is apparent from customs pertaining to tribal law (cf. STEWART (1987c), p. 480), wedding customs (cf. BAILEY (1974b)), and the tradition of oral poetry (cf. BAILEY (1991)[10]). More visibly in daily life, the traditional dress of the bedouins, their professional activities (rearing small cattle, date palm cultivation), as well as their agricultural tools, such as the plough (referred to as *fard*) with the typical funnel-shaped implement (called a *būg*[11]) mounted on the sole, or the *hōǧal* (or *hawǧal* a "threshing board with sharp stones jammed in its underside"), rather than the *nōrag* (" a threshing sled on iron cutting wheels") one finds in the Egyptian Delta, are all clearly not of the Egyptian type. The opposition is that between a bedouin and (formerly) (semi-) nomadic culture and a rural culture of farmers.

---

[9] It may sound paradoxical: members of bedouin tribes have become more mobile after giving up their (semi-)nomadic lifestyle. The term "mobility" in this context should therefore be understood to refer to individual mobility, which is more on an ad hoc basis than the regular seasonal trek of a nomadic collective. In this sense, men are generally those who have become more mobile, but in Sinai also (usually older) women will visit the different weekly markets (e.g. *sūg ilxamīs* "the Thursday market (in *al'Arīš*)", *sūg ilaṛba'ah* "the Wednesday market (in *Gaṭyah*)", and *sūg ilǧum'ah* "the Friday market near *Rafaḥ*)", where they meet members of other tribes and the populations of towns in the area.

[10] BAILEY (1991) is a masterful collection of poems from Sinai and the Negev, and contains ample information, much of which is in footnotes to the poems, on almost every thinkable aspect of bedouin life.

[11] This *būg* pierces the sole of the plough, and through it the ploughman throws a few seeds at every two steps he takes. This is referred to as *tangīṭ albizr* "(lit.) sprinkling the seed", and the technique is applied to sow watermelon seeds.

Also in a linguistic sense, the influence of a more Syro-Palestinian culture is already apparent in the *Šarqiyyah* Governorate. Together with Fahmi Abul Fadl, Peter Behnstedt and Manfred Woidich state that the dialects of the *Šarqiyyah* are nearer to those of Upper Egypt, and even to those of the Syro-Palestinian area, than the dialects spoken in other parts of the Delta[12]. This influence, as we shall see, is even stronger in Sinai, and indeed, there is a considerable possibility that the tribal communities inhabiting and passing through this area have through the ages actually been the force exerting this linguistic influence on the dialects spoken in the eastern Nile Delta[13].

The dialects spoken by the various tribes in Sinai are an integral part of a shared cultural identity, and the bedouins of northern Sinai are generally very conscious of their common background, but also of the differences that exist between their tribes. Murray's remark[14] on bedouins in southern Sinai that "among themselves, they can distinguish each tribe and subtribe by their looks and dialects [...]" holds for bedouins in northern Sinai as well[15].

c. Surrounding dialects

An important question in a dialect geography is how the dialects of the investigated area link up, or maybe do not link up, to dialects spoken in their immediate vicinity. Our knowledge of dialects to the south of the northern Sinai littoral is limited. One publication partially filling this hiatus is NISHIO (1992), which

[12] ABUL FADL (1961), p. 5. and the remark in BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1988), p. 264: "[...] stehen die Dialekte der Šarqiyya denen Oberägyptens, ja sogar denen des syrisch-palästinensischen Raums, näher als denen des übrigen Deltas".
BEHNSTEDT (1979), p. 63, fn 5, states that (in my translation) "[...] the crux in classifying Egyptian dialects are basically the dialects of the *Šarqiyyah*. Without these one could arrive at a smooth classification in northern, central, and southern dialects, corresponding to the geographical proportions. It is precisely the entire east of the Delta, however, which shows many similarities with Southern Middle Egyptian, and Upper Egyptian, which, in the end, is best explained by the intensive bedouin settlement of these areas."

[13] For the eastern *Šarqiyyah*, map 552 in BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985b) provides a measure as to how great this influence must have been. SCHÖLCH (1976-7), pp. 49-50, writes that in 1882 about 11% of the population of the *Šarqiyyah* were bedouins.

[14] Cf. MURRAY (1935), pp. 256-7.

[15] Comments on the speech of other tribes of informants interviewed for this study, although frequently anecdotic, were often particularly accurate.

gives a basic vocabulary of the dialect of the *Ǧbāliyyah*, a tribe in the mountainous south central part of Sinai (known as *aṭṬūr*) near St. Catherine's Monastery.

Publications on dialects which directly link up to dialects spoken in the northeast of Sinai are: BLANC (1970), the dialect of the *Ḏullām* in the Negev, and STEWART (1987, 1990), the dialect of the *Aḥaywāt* (who are found in the central eastern part of Sinai) and this publication also contains some information on the dialects of other tribes in Sinai, such as the *Taṛābīn* (of the north and of the south), the *Braykāt*, and the *Ṣafāyḥih*[16].

Quite a number of publications shed light on dialects spoken directly to the east of our area. Apart from older publications BERGSTRÄSSER (1915), a dialect atlas of Syria and Palestine, and CANTINEAU (1936, 1937), studies on some dialects of Arab nomads in the Orient, there are the more recent publications: CLEVELAND (1964, 1967), PALVA (1976, 1980, 1984a, 1984-86 1989, 1991), BANI YASIN/OWENS (1984), ROSENHOUSE (1984a, 1984b), SALONEN (1979, 1980), and YRTTIAHO (1988).

On dialects spoken directly to the west of northern Sinai, i.e. in Egypt proper, the publications at our disposal are ABUL FADL (1961), a PhD study on the phonology of the dialects of the *Šarqiyyah*, WOIDICH (1979), an article on the phonology and morphology of *ilʿAwāmṛa*, a village in the eastern *Šarqiyyah*, WOIDICH (1980), texts from the same village, and BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985a, 1985b, 1987 (and 1988)), a dialect atlas of Egypt.

Information from these publications has been incorporated in this study to place the dialects of northern Sinai in a larger geographical perspective.

d. Bedouin tribes found in the northern Sinai littoral today

Apart from the populations of the regional centre of *alʿArīš* and of *Rafaḥ*, and the mostly newly immigrated settlers from the Egyptian mainland, bedouins organized in fourteen or fifteen tribes populate the northern Sinai littoral, either directly on the coast, or just to the south of it. Roughly from east to west the

[16] Cf. STEWART (1990), preface, p. vii.

tribes whose dialects were researched for this study are: *Rmēlāt*, *Sawārkah*, northern *Taṛābīn*, *Biliy*, *Dawāġrah*, *Biyyāḍiyyah*, *Axārsah*, *Samāʿnah*, *ʿAgāylah*, *Masāʿīd*, and *ʿAyāydah*.

Other tribes in the area, the dialects of which would be a topic for future research (preferably soon), are the *Riyāšāt*, who are reported to be living in the area near *ašŠēx Zwayyid*[17], the pariah tribe of *Malālḥah*, who, I was told, today live up in *Wādī alʿArīš*[18], the *ʿAlawiyyah* in *Gaṭyah*, of whom Murray[19] writes that they are a branch of the *Ḥwēṭāt*, whereas aṭṬayyib[20] holds that they are related to the *Awlād ʿAli* living along the Mediterranean coast west of Alexandria, and the *Gaṭāwiyyah*, of whom Šuqayr writes that they originate from the *Ḥiğāz*[21].

e. Present-day distribution and remarks on the history of bedouin tribes in this study

Most of the tribes researched for this study are settled more or less along the main road from the border town of *Rafaḥ* in the east to the ferry at *alGanṭarah* (*Šarg*) on the Suez Canal in the west, which is also roughly the route of the old railroad to Palestine. The third map in the appendix shows the approximate distribution of the tribes, the dialects of which were researched for this study.

---

17 ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 99, mentions them as a branch of the *Sawārkah*. Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 589, however, writes that this is incorrect, and that they are related to *Riyāšāt* found elsewhere in the Arab world (Egypt, Palestine, Jordan, the *Ḥiğāz* and Yemen are mentioned).

18 ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 124, writes that the *Malālḥah* live in an area called *alʿUğrah* together with the *Taṛābīn* and the *Sawārkah*, and that they are the lowest of the *Hutaym* (*Htēm*) tribes. If their social isolation resulting from their lowly status has been as rigorous as in the case of the *Dawāġrah*, their dialect is certainly worth future research. I did not research the dialect of the *Malālḥah* for this study in order not to risk jeopardizing the continuation of my field research, since I was told that one cannot simply go up the *wādī* without official permission from the local authorities.

19 Cf. MURRAY (1935), p. 252 (ᶜAlawin and Haweitat in his transcription).

20 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 613.

21 The number of fourteen or fifteen tribes is uncertain, since AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 614, also mentions the *alGaṭāwiyyah*, who today live in the *Gaṭyah* oasis (hence their name), and in *alGanṭarah Šarg* in northern Sinai, as well as in several locations in *Daqahliyyah*, *Šarqiyyah*, *Ġarbiyyah* and *Qalyūbiyyah* in Egypt proper. I have, however, never heard any of my informants mention this tribe, or met any of its members.

Starting in the northeast: the *Rmēlāt* inhabit a narrow strip of land on the Mediterranean coast between *Rafaḥ* and *aššēx Zwayyid*. In the past the *Rmēlāt* lived in a fertile area named *alGaṛāṛah*, north of *Xān Yūnis* (Khan Yunis), in what is now known as the Gaza Strip. After their wars with the *Taṛābīn*[22], they were pushed south towards the area where they now live. Before they moved to *alGaṛāṛah*, where they initially settled, they are reported to have originated from *alGaṭīf*, in the eastern Arabian Peninsula, after which they moved to *Ḍānā* in northern Jordan[23]. BAILEY (1985) estimates their arrival in Sinai to have been in the eighteenth century at the latest.

The *Sawārkah* live to the south of the *Rmēlāt*, farther west in *Wādī alʿArīš*, and along the Mediterranean coast towards *arRōḍah*. AṬṬayyib writes that the origin of their name is doubtful, but that one theory traces them back to *Wādī Sawālik* in the *Ḥiğāz*, from which they are said to originate, hence they called themselves *Sawālkah*. Later the name changed to *Sawārkah*, although aṭṬayyib is unsure whether this *wādī* still exists under the same name. They are reported to be the largest tribe in Sinai, who during their wars with several other tribes in Sinai (*Taṛābīn*, *Ḥwēṭāt*) were pushed back to the sandy strip of land along the northeastern coast of Sinai, where they live today. In the past, however, they were found as far west as *Bīr alʿAbd*, and as far south as the mountainous region of *aṭṬūr*, both in Sinai[24]. Bailey estimates their arrival in Sinai to have been in the eighteenth century at the latest[25].

The small tribe of *Biliy* (the subsection named *alBarada*) are related to the tribe of the same name (usually transcribed as *Bilī* or *Balī*) of the northern *Ḥiğāz*, and are reported to have arrived in Sinai before Islam[26]. They live to the south of the *Sawārkah*, and

---

22 Cf. BAILEY (1981-2), p. 146, where it is reported that the *Rmēlāt* were pushed out of their *dīrah* (*Garārah*) north of *Xān Yūnis* by the *Taṛābīn Abū Sittah* and emigrated to North Sinai between *Rafaḥ* and *Abū Ṭuwaylah* either during the conquest of the Negev in 1799, or following the war of *Abū Sirḥān* (1813-1816). Cf. also ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 582.

23 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), pp. 581-8, and ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 121.

24 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 572, fn 1.

25 Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 49.

26 Cf. ibid., p. 47. Cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 51 (map 3), for the position of the tribal area of their relatives in the *Ḥiğāz* in the nineteenth century.

are actually not on the Mediterranean coast or the southern shore of the *Bardawīl* Lagoon.

Because of the identified typological similarities of the dialects of these tribes with that of the *Ḏullām* in the Negev described in BLANC (1970), and the dialect of the *Aḥaywāt*[27] (in east central Sinai) as appearing in STEWART (1987a, 1990), the dialects of these tribes have been joined together to form group I, and are described in chapter I (in this study the Roman numbers of the groups to which the tribes have been assigned correspond to the numbering of the descriptive chapters).

In the middle of northern Sinai, on the peninsula of *azZugḇah* and on the southern shore of the *Bardawīl* Lagoon live the *Dawāġrah*, who are a tribe of fishermen. They are considered a pariah tribe, and members of this tribe do not intermarry with members of other tribes[28]. Since the dialect of this tribe shows a great number of typological differences with surrounding dialects,

[27] The *Aḥaywāt* are said (personal communication from several sources in the field) to have originally split off from the *Masāʿīd* as a *ʿēlah* (or *ʿāylah*, "family"). Cf. also MURRAY 1935), p. 248: "the Laheiwat are a section, which has broken away from the Masaʿid division of the Beni ʿAtiya, and now forms a tribe of its own, famous for its enterprise and ferocity". Cf. also ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 122, and AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 151. BAILEY (1985), p. 48, estimates their arrival in central Sinai to have been in the seventeenth century (at the latest). AṬṬAYYIB (1997), Part 1, p. 222, reports that there are still a few families of the *Aḥaywāt* living in "southern Palestine", i.e. the Negev. Cf. ibid. pp. 219-222 for a story on how the *Aḥaywāt* came to be a separate tribe. Their name is there said to be derived from the word حوى , a "spring plant", the leaves and flowers of which were eaten by hungry (now so called) *Aḥaywāt* when they first came to Sinai. The same story is reported in BAILEY/SHMUELI (1977), p. 29, and the plant is identified as "Launaea nudicaulis".

[28] The *Dawāġrah* are said to be *Htēm* (or *Hutaym*, cf. E.I.), who are *Mṭēr* (or *Muṭayr*). Cf. e.g. OPPENHEIM (1943), p. 140. The story told (by members of other tribes) concerning their pariah status is that during the earliest times of Islam, a *Dwēġriy* woman named *Ǧarādah* was caught trying to smuggle a message hidden in her hair to warn the unbelievers among the *Qurayš* against an oncoming raid by the followers of the Prophet. The Prophet, however, was warned by the archangel Gabriel, and *Ǧarādah* was caught in the act. After this act of betrayal the whole tribe was from then on denied any type of equal relationship with the other tribes. The *Qur'ān* verses mentioned with respect to this story are *Sūrah* 60 : 1, 9, 13 (oral information from several independent sources in the field). AṬṬAYYIB (1993), pp. 743-4, gives the same story, and remarks in a footnote that the lady's name was actually *Sārah*.

KENNETT (1925), pp. 23-4 gives another unflattering story concerning their lowly status, which I shall not repeat here. Whatever the truth behind such stories, the social isolation of the *Dawāġrah* has been the result (or perhaps even the other way around; their low social status led to such stories), and we shall see that their dialect must have remained largely unchanged ever since their arrival in Sinai.

clearly setting it apart from these, it is treated separately in chapter IV.

In and near the oasis of *Gaṭyah*[29] in the northwest of Sinai live the *Samāʿnah*[30]. AṭṬayyib paraphrases the late medieval writer Qalqašandī writing that they are a branch of the *Banū Mahdī*, forming a *baṭn*[31] of the *Ǧuḏām*, and that together with the *Saʿadiyyīn* they were among the first tribes to settle in northern Sinai, after which *buṭūn* of the *Ṭayyiʾ* arrived from the *Šām* (an area roughly covering today's Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel), such as the *Biyyāḍiyyah*, *Axārsah* and *ʿAgāylah*.

To the west of the *Samāʿnah* live the *ʿAgāylah*, who are reported to be of *Qaḥṭānī* (also *Ṭayyiʾ*) origin, as a *baṭn* of the *Ṭaʿlabah*. After emigrating from the *Naǧd*, they initially lived in Palestine, after which they emigrated to Sinai and Egypt proper in Ayyubid times (i.e. under Saladin in the twelfth century A.D.)[32]. Bailey estimates their arrival in Sinai to have been between the tenth (perhaps earlier) and thirteenth centuries[33]. Although the dialects of the *Samāʿnah* and *ʿAgāylah* show some notable differences, they do have some peculiarities in common justifying their treatment as one group (group II), which is described in chapter II.

To the west of the *Dawāġrah* and north of *Gaṭyah* live the *Biyyāḍiyyah*. Murray quotes Jarvis, then Governor of Sinai, on the (in Murray's transcription) Bayadiyin: "[...] all lusty specimens of six feet or more, with huge patriarchal beards. Their origin is unknown, but their insistence on their pure Arab blood, and the application of Arab laws and ordinances to the tribe is so marked, that one feels that they protest too much", and Jennings Bramly is

---

29 ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 174, writes that before the opening of the Suez Canal *Gaṭyah* was administratively part of the Province of *Šarqiyyah*.

30 MURRAY (1935), p. 252, reports on the Samᶜana (sic), that "they are said to have come from Syria and to be of Jewish origin", but does not reveal his sources. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 600. BAILEY (1985) does not date their arrival in Sinai.

31 A *baṭn* is a subsection, pl. *buṭūn*. AṬṬAYYIB (1997), p. 26 gives an outline of the "layers of kinship" with the terms used in this respect (starting with the highest layer) *ašša'b* "the people", (each following term is then a subdivision of the preceding:) *qabīlah* (pl. *qabā'il*) "tribe", *ʿimārah* (pl. *ʿamā'ir*) "(lit.) structure", *baṭn* (pl. *buṭūn*) "(lit.) belly / inner portion", *faxḏ* (pl. *fuxūḏ*) "(lit.) thigh", and the lowest subdivision is called a *faṣīlah* (pl. *faṣā'il*) "(lit.) group/family" or *ʿašīrah* (pl. *ʿašā'ir*) "(lit.) clan, kinsfolk" used in the same meaning.

32 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 612.

33 Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 47.

quoted as having said: "They are said to have come from Arabia, but not to be Bedouin."[34] Jarvis offers the sensational suggestion that they are the descendants of a stray colonial Roman legion stranded in Sinai after the Islamic conquests[35]. Initially Bailey agrees with the theory of their non-bedouin background, and suggests that the *Biyyāḍiyyah* were not originally bedouins, but that they came as "[...] small peasant groups who trickled into Sinai from Egypt in order to cultivate some relatively fertile patches along the Mediterranean coast and hence adopted certain bedouin trappings"[36]. In a later article Bailey reconsiders the history of the *Biyyāḍiyyah*, and gives a somewhat more conservative summary of their (Bayyādhīyīn in his transcription) history, basing himself on a mixture of written and oral sources (cf. ibid. for references) (paraphrased): The *Biyyāḍiyyah* were originally part of the larger *Qaḥṭānī* confederation of *Ǧuḍām*, and are reported to have been "the first tribe to join *ʿAmr ibn alʿĀṣ* in the conquest of Egypt[37]". The date of their arrival in Sinai must have been between the seventh and tenth centuries A.D., after which they initially settled more to the east, near *alʿArīš*, but in the thirteenth century their presence in the *Gaṭyah* oasis is attested[38]. This means that the *Biyyāḍiyyah* are the third oldest tribe living in Sinai today, preceded only by *Biliy* in the north, and the *Ǧbāliyyah* in central southern Sinai, the latter of whom are reported to have been sent there from Egypt and the Balkan by the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century A.D. to serve and protect St. Catherine's monastery[39].

To the west of the *Biyyāḍiyyah* live the *Axārsah*. This tribe is estimated to have come to Sinai between the tenth (perhaps earlier) and thirteenth centuries A.D.[40] AṭṬayyib writes that they, like the *ʿAgāylah*, are of *Qaḥṭānī* (*Ṭayyiʾ*, originally from Yemen) origin, and that they are related to the *Biyyāḍiyyah*, with whom they came to Sinai during the times of *Ṣalāḥ adDīn*[41] (or Saladin),

---

34 Cf. MURRAY (1935), p. 252. Jennings Bramly was also a Governor of Sinai.
35 Cf. JARVIS (1931), p. 17.
36 BAILEY (1977), p. 29 (+ fn 4).
37 Cf. ibid. (1985), pp. 1-2.
38 Cf. ibid. pp. 47 and 21.
39 Cf. ŠUQAYR (1916), pp. 114 and 392.
40 Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 47.
41 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 610.

i.e. in the twelfth century. The dialects of the *Biyyāḍiyyah* and *Axārsah* have been joined together in this study to form group III, and are described in chapter III.

Other tribes inhabiting the area are the "northern" *Taṛābīn* (notes on their dialect have been included in chapter I) living to the south of the *Sawārkah*. The *Taṛābīn* are estimated to have come to Sinai in the sixteenth century[42].

To the west of the *Axārsah* we find the *Masāʿīd*[43], who live in and around the village of *Ǧilbānah*. The *Masāʿīd* of northern Sinai are related to the tribe of the same name in the northern *Ḥiǧāz*, east of *ʿAgabah* (Aqaba in southern Jordan), and today sections of this tribe may be found in Jordan, Syria, and Palestine/Israel. The *Aḥaywāt* are reported to have split off as a *ʿēlah* (or *ʿāylah*, lit. "family" or "clan") from the *Masāʿīd*[44]. The *Masāʿīd* are estimated to have arrived in northern Sinai in the eighteenth century (at the latest)[45]. AṭṬayyib writes[46] that they are of *ʿAdnānī* origin, and that they, as a *ʿašīrah* (clan) of *Šaybān* or *Bakr* (who are now part of the *ʿAdnānī* tribe of *ʿAnazah*), were found in the eastern *Naǧd* and the northwest of Iraq until the beginning of the fifth century *Hiǧrah* (appr. the eleventh century A.D.), after which they moved to the northwestern *Ḥiǧāz* with a number of the *Muṭayr*. There they became neighbours of the *Banū ʿUqbah* (of the *Qaḥṭānī Ǧuḍām*) living near *ʿAqabah* with whom they mixed. In the seventh century *Hiǧrah* (appr. the thirteenth century A.D.) the greater part of the *Masāʿīd* and *Banū ʿUqbah* wandered into Palestine, but after the eighth century *Hiǧrah* (appr. the fourteenth century A.D.) many of the *Masāʿīd* moved back (after a battle) to the northern *Ḥiǧāz* (near *ʿAqabah*), to mix again with parts of the *Banū ʿUqbah* who had stayed behind, and with the *Banū ʿAṭīyah* (or *Bani ʿAṭīye*). They closed pacts during the Ottoman era with the *Ḥuwayṭāt* (or *Ḥwēṭāt*) and

---

42 Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 48. The "northern" *Taṛābīn* are related to the "southern" *Taṛābīn* living in *Nwēbiʿ* (i.e. Nuweiba) *atTaṛābīn* and in *Wādī Watīr* in the southeast of Sinai on the Gulf of Aqaba.

43 The *Masāʿīd* (sg. *Masʿūdiy*) are known for their judges (the (sg.) *manšad*) who are specialized in matters of honour in cases of the sexual violation of women, cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 91, and ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 398.

44 Cf. fn 27 in this Introduction.

45 Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 49. Cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 51 (map 3) for the position of the *Masāʿīd* of the northern *Ḥiǧāz* in the nineteenth century.

46 What follows is a paraphrase of AṬṬAYYIB (1997), pp. 137-8.

Taṛābīn in Sinai, Egypt and Palestine, and were paid by the Ottomans to guard the pilgrimage routes to Mecca from Egypt and Syria, as well as trade routes between the *Ḥiğāz* and *ʿAgabah*.

The *ʿAyāydah*[47], who live to the south of the *Masāʿīd* along the eastern bank of the Suez Canal (and also across the canal on its western bank), are estimated to have arrived in Sinai in the seventeenth century (at the latest)[48]. They are reported to be of *Qaḥṭānī* origin[49]. AṬṬayyib also reports that they lived in central southern Sinai (the *Ṭūr* region) before moving to where they are now after a drought struck the south, and that they had palm groves in the south until the beginning of the twentieth century[50]. The dialects of the *Masāʿīd* and *ʿAyāydah* form a southern continuation (inside northern Sinai, that is) of group I towards the west, enveloping groups II, III and IV. Remarks on the dialects of this southern branch are therefore included in chapter I of this study.

As for the settling of bedouin tribes in the *Šarqiyyah*: ʿAMMĀR (1944) mentions the *Qaḥṭānī* (or Southern Arab)[51] *Ṭayyi'* (alternatively transcribed as *Ṭayy*) subdivisions of *Ǧuḏām* and *Laxm*, and to a lesser extent the (also subdivisions of *Ṭayyi'*)

---

47 The tribe is known for their judge (the *mbaššiʿ*) executing the *bišʿah*, i.e. the licking of the red-hot iron to establish the accused's innocence or guilt when no (reliable) witnesses are available, cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 5, STEWART (1988, glossary: *bišʿa*) and (1990, index: Licking the iron), ŠUQAYR (1916), p. 399, MURRAY (1935), p. 232-4, and for less favourable reference to a *mbaššiʿ* JARVIS (1931), pp. 44-5. Cf. also fn 49 to II, 4.4.

48 Cf. BAILEY (1985), pp. 48-9.

49 Cf. BAILEY (1977), p. 29.

50 Cf. AṬṬAYYIB (1993), p. 721-2. Cf. also ŠUQAYR (1916), pp. 109-10, and BAILEY (1977), p. 30.

51 A basic subdivision in the traditional geneology of Arab tribes is that of *alʿArab alʿĀribah* "the true Arabs", who originally lived in Southern Arabia (or Yemen) and are descendants of *Qaḥṭān* (son of *Sām* "Shem, eldest son of Noah") and who are subdivided in *Ḥimyar* and *Kahlān*, and *alʿArab alMustaʿribah* "(lit.) the Arabs who have become Arabs", who originally inhabited the northern regions of the Arabian Peninsula and descend from *ʿAdnān* (also son of *Sām*) and *Ismāʿīl* (Ishmael, son of *Ibrāhīm* "Abraham"), cf. ʿAMMĀR (1944), p. 15, and also AṬṬAYYIB (1997), p. 25.

Sinbis (or *Sunbus*), *Ṯaʿlabah*[52], *Rabīʿah*[53], and *Banū Ṣaxr*[54] as the main tribes to settle in the eastern Nile Delta. These tribes originated from the *Ḥiǧāz* or the southwestern Arabian Peninsula. Some of these initially moved to the Syrian desert or the northern *Nufūd* (in what is now northern Saudi Arabia), but stayed there only temporarily before they came to Egypt[55].

Another tribe to reach the *Šarqiyyah* were *alʿĀyiḍ* (or *alʿĀyid*). ʿAmmār writes that they were a subdivision of the *Ǧuḍām*, but states that their influence on the settled population there was less than that of the other tribes[56]. We see thus that the main Arab element to settle in the province of *Šarqiyyah*, after having arrived there at different times in history, is of the tribal confederation of *Ṭayyiʾ*, who are *Qaḥṭānī* through *Kahlān*. The tribes to have had influence in the *Šarqiyyah* are therefore, far in history, of a relatively homogeneous southwestern/*Ḥiǧāzī* origin. Other Arab elements to have exerted their influence on the *Šarqiyyah* are *Ǧuhaynah* and *Biliy*, both descendents of *Quḍāʿah*, a branch of the (also *Kahlānī*) *Ḥimyar*[57], and these *Ǧuhaynah* and *Biliy* preceded the *Ṭayyiʾ* tribes (in the first *Kahlānī* wave in the second or third century A.D.[58]) to come to these parts of the Nile Delta, but were later pushed out by the conquering Arab tribes who had converted to Islam.

---

52 Cf. Peter Behnstedt, Manfred Woidich, *Die Arabisierung Ägyptens* (to appear), maps 2 and 3 on the movement of bedouin tribes to Egypt in the 12th-15th centuries, and ibid. map 11 for the large number of place names in the eastern Nile Delta that can be traced back to the *Ǧuḍām*. ʿAMMĀR (1944), Vol. II, maps 6-8, illustrates the same.

53 MURRAY (1935), pp. 25 and 33, however, mentions the Rabiʿa (*Rabīʿah*) as an *Ismāʿīlī* (i.e. *ʿAdnānī*) tribal confederation.

54 Cf. ʿAMMĀR (1944), Vol. I, p. 23.

55 Cf. ibid., p. 18.

56 Cf. ibid., pp. 33-4.

57 Cf. ibid., p. 17, fn 1, and p. 24, and also MURRAY (1935), p. 24. Both sources add a footnote however, that the claimed *Qaḥṭānī* origin of the *Quḍāʿah* is not undisputed.

58 Cf. ʿAMMĀR (1944), Vol. II, map 4.

f. Remarks on the estimated dates of arrival of bedouin tribes in northern Sinai

The estimates of the arrival of these bedouin tribes in Sinai in BAILEY (1985) and AṬṬAYYIB (1993) quoted in the preceding paragraphs show a basic chronological dichotomy which has its present-day geographical dimension. (For illustration of the following remarks the reader is referred to the third map in the appendix ("Northern Sinai Littoral: approximate distribution of bedouin tribes") and MAP 74 ("Dialect Groups in Northern Sinai") on the last page of the appendix.

The tribes of groups II (*Samāʿnah* and *ʿAgāylah*) and III (*Biyyāḍiyyah* and *Axārsah*) currently settled in the northwest arrived before the thirteenth century, whereas tribes of group I today found in the northeast (*Rmēlāt*, *Sawārkah*, *Taṛābīn*, except *Biliy*) and central Sinai (*Aḥaywāt*), and to the southwest (*ʿAyāydah*) and west (*Masāʿīd*) of groups II and III arrived in the sixteenth century or later. The treatment of the dialects of these tribes in the proposed different groups thus has a historical, as well as a geographical dimension, although the latter dimension is only limitedly visible; we shall see that the dialects of the tribes who arrived after the sixteenth century and are today found in the northwest (i.e. the *ʿAyāydah*, estimated to have arrived in the seventeenth century at the latest, and the *Masāʿīd*, eighteenth century at the latest[59]) link up typologically to group I, rather than to groups II and III.

The dialect of *Biliy*, who arrived before Islam, although treated in chapter I, occupies a special place within group I. The fact that it is treated in this chapter has more to do with its development towards the dialect type of group I, very likely due to its relative geographical proximity to the tribes of this group[60], than with the assumed original typological features. The presumably older dialect type shows some important typological peculiarities, some of which are reminiscent of features found in group IV.

---

[59] Cf. BAILEY (1985), p. 49.

[60] As TRUDGILL (1986), p. 39, puts it: "The geographical parameter of diffusion models becomes relevant because, other things being equal and transport patterns permitting, people on average come into contact most often with people who live closest to them and least often with people who live furthest away."

The chapters in which the dialects of these tribes are treated are briefly prefaced with remarks on their present-day distribution in Sinai, professional activities, and estimated numbers (if available). Because of the suspected influence of these tribal dialects on the development of the dialect type of the eastern Nile Delta[61], the distribution of the tribes in this area will also be mentioned, although I cannot claim to be exhaustive in this respect.

The dialect of the regional centre of *al'Arīš*, as spoken by its original population the *Fawaxriyyah*, was earlier concluded not to be of a bedouin type[62]. An outline of the dialect of this town is given in the first part of chapter V. The second part of this chapter contains a brief description of the dialect of *Ġazzah* (Gaza) primarily based on SALONEN (1979, 1980), with a few additional remarks based on BERGSTRÄSSER (1915). Since both dialects are spoken in (relatively nearby) towns, and may therefore be expected to be of a sedentary type, and because they are expected to have been exposed to comparable influences from bedouin dialects, they are compared in the Conclusions, I. b.

A typological characterization of these dialects is provided in the Conclusions (II. The dialects of *al'Arīš* and *Ġazzah* compared to dialects of Palestine and Transjordan). The dialect of the town of *Rafaḥ* awaits investigation[63].

g. Research questions and purpose of this study

The primary aim of this study is to give a synchronic description of the phonology and morphology of the dialects under investigation. These descriptions then serve to identify the differences between them, and similarities shared by them, as well as to establish their typological position in a larger geographical area.

The original purpose of this study was twofold: to give a description of the phonology and morphology of dialects spoken in northern Sinai, and to investigate the influences these dialects

61 As described in ABUL FADL (1961), WOIDICH (1979, 1980), and BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985a, 1985b, 1988).

62 Cf. DE JONG (1995), p. 106, and p. 113 (appendix).

63 Due to sensitivities already referred to in the preface of this study, it was deemed wiser not to carry out any field work in this border town.

must have had on the development of the dialect type spoken in the eastern part of the Egyptian province of the *Šarqiyyah* (in the eastern Nile Delta) in terms of "dialect contact", along the lines of reasoning developed in various publications by Trudgill. However, when in the course of the field research the relatively great variety of dialects in northern Sinai was uncovered, it became clear that in order to investigate such influences, one had to know more exactly which tribes had settled where in the *Šarqiyyah*, when, among whom, in what numbers, etc. This would have required much more time for historical research in order to establish stable parameters, than could be afforded. I hope, however, that this study, which is now a dialect geography, may provide a solid basis for an investigation in terms of dialect contact in the future.

The study in hand thus aims to find answers to a number of related questions. The first one of these was posed by Blanc[64]: how far does the Negev dialectal type extend westward into the Sinaitic Peninsula?

Remarks quoted by Murray and Bailey on "Egyptian accents, manners, and dress", and "their way of talking [which] is not that of true Bedouin"[65] concerning the tribes inhabiting northwestern Sinai, prompt a similar question: how far, if at all, does the Egyptian (eastern) Delta dialect type extend eastward into northern Sinai?

Although little was known of the dialects of this area, a certain homogeneity is often suggested when various authors refer to "the Sinai dialects"[66]. The next question is therefore: is such

---

64 Cf. BLANC (1970), p. 2 (113).

65 Cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 5, and MURRAY (1935), p. 251.

66 For instance in PALVA (1984), p. 16, where the author speaks of "the Sinai dialects". On the other hand, PALVA (1991), p.154, offers more nuance when he states that "the most serious gaps in the linguistic material available thus far concern the Ṭuwara in the south of Sinai, the small tribes of the Gaṭya group in the northwestern corner of Sinai, and the Terabīn and Tiyāhā tribes living in northern Sinai and to the south of the Gaza strip."

YRTTIAHO (1988), p. 149 is another example of over-generalization where for Sinai a + is listed for (resyllabication of) syllable structure in nouns *CVCaCV → CCVCV*. In this case it is not only an over-generalization, but also a misrepresentation of the actual situation (cf. remarks below in this Introduction in III. d. *The gahawah-syndrome and resyllabication of CaCaV sequences*); we shall see that the only dialect spoken in Sinai known so far that has such a rule is that of the *Dawāġrah*, and another is that of

homogeneity really to be found in Sinai[67], or is there perhaps a type of patchwork situation, where each patch constitutes a tribal dialect?[68]

If there is such a patchwork situation, does northern Sinai today, with its historical role as a natural land bridge between the eastern and western Arab world, also have the function of a land bridge in a linguistic sense? If we were to study the dialect(s) spoken in the area, can we then perhaps identify this part of the Arab world as an area of transition between the dialect-type spoken in the eastern Nile Delta and that spoken in the Negev and southern Jordan? In other words: if there are "patches", are they then interrelated in such a way that they constitute a continuum? And if so, in how far can these dialects be concluded to form a western branch of the Northwestern group of bedouin dialects (referred to here as *NWA*) proposed in PALVA (1991)? Could we perhaps add to the criteria mentioned there to identify such dialects, or do some of these criteria need to be modified?

---

the *Ḥwēṭāt* (cf. Conclusions, VIII. *Observations on the dialects of the Ḥwēṭāt and Bani ʿAṭīye*).

PROCHAZKA (1988), p. 18, remarks: "tansēn, tansōn instead of more current Sinaitic tansay, tansaw"; the latter two forms may be widespread in Sinai, but we shall see that these are definitely not the only forms heard in Sinai.

PROCHAZKA (1993) (no relation of the afore-mentioned author) on pp. 168, 178-9, 199 and 250 has a number of remarks on "Sinai", basing himself primarily on STEWART (1990), but we shall see that for dialects not appearing in STEWART (1990), the picture may look quite different.

[67] One could imagine several dialect geographical situations. Given the fact that the different tribes living in Sinai today are reported to originate from, or at least have spent numerous generations in, various parts of the Arab world, passing through different areas, and arriving in Sinai at different times in history (cf. BAILEY (1985)), one might have expected a type of patchwork situation in which every tribe speaks its own dialect, and in which the differences between these dialects are unrelated to the geographical spread of the tribes. We shall see that, to a considerable extent, this is the case with the dialect of the *Dawāġrah*, which is quite different from the surrounding dialects, which are tinged more evenly in relation to each other.

[68] The basic assumption is that a given tribal community will speak its own dialect. This should not be understood to mean that other tribal comunities cannot speak the same, or a similar dialect, nor should it mean that differences would not exist within one such tribal community (cf., for instance, the different reflexes *katīr* and *kitīr* for **kaṭīr*, which are reported for different subsections of the *Biyyāḍiyyah* (cf. chapter III, 3.1.1.1.1.).

II. FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY

a. Infrastructural arrangements

Dialect research in Egypt, as in many Arab countries, is often done by non-Arabs and generally not viewed favourably. The main reason appears to be that in most cases the authorities fail to see any direct relevance for such explorations, and will almost automatically assume that to investigate a certain dialect cannot be the "real" reason that a foreigner wishes to visit a given area. Suspicions as to the hidden agenda behind such activities are only amplified when the region happens to be in an area highly sensitive due to its strategic importance, such as Sinai.

The difficulties involved in conducting the necessary field research had therefore kept northern Sinai free from any recent systematic linguistic inquiry, and thus preserved a blind spot between the better researched areas of the Negev and southern Jordan to the east, and the Egyptian Delta dialects to the west.

It was to colour in this blind spot that official permission was requested through highly regarded channels from the relevant authorities in Cairo to conduct linguistic fieldwork in northern Sinai. These official requests were turned down twice. Since I never received a negative reply to the third request, however, I concluded that there were no longer any official objections against my proposed activities, and felt free to continue. Maintaining a low profile, being entirely open about my intentions to the people I dealt with, and restricting actual field visits to an acceptable minimum––while not engaging in any spying––ensured my access to the area.

For the field trips I used to hire a taxi to go from *alʿArīš* to the tribes of my choice. I was usually accompanied by a taxi driver, *Sālim*, who is a member of a respected bedouin family himself, and who is, also as a result of his profession, well-known throughout the area. A distinct advantage of employing his services was that he could introduce me to members of the different tribes. Being accompanied by a bedouin, rather than anybody else, I was also much more easily accepted by

prospective informants than if I had gone without this respected intermediary[69].

Sālim also knew quite precisely where members of the various tribes could be found, and he would take me to several locations not indicated on any of the maps that I had seen of the area. His knowledge of the area and its people proved to be indispensable for the type of research conducted.

Most of the interviews were recorded on (regular size) C-90 compact cassettes, and the recording equipment used was usually a Sony memo-recorder. The principle advantage of these memo-recorders is their limited size, which minimizes any intimidating effect that electronic equipment may have on informants, combined with the quite acceptable quality of (speech) sound[70].

b. Selecting targets for field research

A general assumption in Arabic dialect studies is that the dialect of members of the same tribe will not differ substantially from one location to another within the same tribal area[71]. The result is that if one draws isogloss bundles, these will coincide with the borders of the tribal territories. This basic assumption of uniformity of the dialect within a given social entity of a tribe was adopted as a working hypothesis during the research for this study as well, while at the same time it was put to the test by selecting (different) informants from different locations within one tribal area.

The tribes listed in EUROCONSULT (1992)—the most recent publication with an inventory of the tribes found in northern Sinai

---

[69] One day a session with the *Sawārkah* in *Rōḍah* went wrong after little over an hour of interviewing: the members of the *mag'ad* collectively decided not to answer my questions any longer. It was only later that I realized that part of the reason must have been that I was accompanied by an Egyptian teacher, who had hitched a ride from me from *Balawiy* territory—not a place where you would refuse someone a ride—and who had decided that, since he had nothing else planned, his presence during my visit to this *Swērkiy mag'ad* was an excellent idea. In addition to this, I had hired another taxi driver from *al'Arīš* that day, since the car of my regular taxi driver was in repairs.

[70] A disadvantage is their sensitivity to sand. I therefore always brought two memo-recorders on field trips. Nevertheless, on some occasions I still found myself jotting down notes after both recorders had stopped functioning.

[71] Cf. remarks in INGHAM (1979), p. 25, and remarks on "social dialects" in BLANC (1964), pp. 12-4.

today, and a map illustrating their geographical distribution—were then selected as targets for the field research required for this study.

c. Selecting informants

Most researchers in Arabic dialect studies who have some experience doing fieldwork will agree that selecting informants is done, by necessity, on the basis of very practical considerations. Apart from being proper etiquette, approaching the male elderly members of a tribal community is often the only way to record speech closest to the authentic dialect (on a synchronic level, that is). Interviews are then conducted with those who are willing and able to cooperate[72]. During the research for this study interviews with younger members of such communities were sought as well, although a minimum age of sixteen to eighteen was usually observed to ensure a certain level of coherence in the speech of the interviewees. The result, especially in *Smēʿniy* Arabic of group II, is a rather colourful picture reflecting the dynamics that characterize the development of these dialects towards a more sedentary type.

On some occasions it was possible to interview female informants, or to have such interviews conducted for me, but due to the conservative character of bedouin society, this was not often the case. An exception to this conservatism were the *Dawāġrah*, who let me interview whomever I pleased. In the case of the *Dawāġrah* I did not notice any great differences between the speech of women and that of men. I did notice differences between the speech of those living nearer to the main road (about 50 meters from it, in *Salmānah*), and those living farther (about 7 km, in *Ǧbāṛah* and *atTaʿāwun*) away from it.

When conducting interviews with male members of *Biliy*, I was told that children and women may use certain forms (such as the invariable *-yah* poss. suffix for 1st p. c. sg.), but that such forms

[72] I have often wondered, especially after successful sessions, how a member of a conservative community, say somewhere in the American Midwest, would react if a bedouin in traditional garb would knock on his door unannounced, and ask him if he would cooperate with a dialect research. And would he please answer a list of questions in his own dialect, and in front of a microphone.

were not used by men. The question is whether this is actually the case; I had the feeling that such forms were reserved for the intimacy of the home, and that they were avoided by men in external contacts. I was unable to verify this, however, since I did not have an opportunity to speak to women or children of this tribe. Part of the reason to avoid certain forms appeared to be that they are similar to forms heard in group IV, the dialect of the *Dawāġrah*, who are held in low esteem by other tribes.

The large majority of speakers were interviewed inside their own tribal territories. The speech of those speakers interviewed outside their tribal territory was sometimes noticeably influenced by the dialect spoken in their new surroundings. Extra care was taken to filter out these "foreign" influences. Although the dialect of speakers living outside their territories would show such influences, these were quite easily recognizable if one takes the dialect that is actually spoken in the area where they live into account[73]. In some instances such speakers also provided information no longer traceable, or simply smoothed over in the speech of speakers still living inside the original tribal areas. A good example of this are the interviews I conducted with a speaker of *Balawiy* Arabic in *Gaṭyah*. This speaker, who had been living in *Gaṭyah* for more than twenty-five years, was the first *Balawiy* speaker to use an invariable *-yah* (1st p. c. sg. poss.) suffix in my presence, when he said *ʿyūnyah* for "my eyes" (and other examples), which I had not recorded on a previous visit to *Ġirīf alĠizlān* inside *Balawiy* territory itself. It was only a year later on my next visit to *Ġirīf alĠizlān* that I could verify, although it was initially denied by speakers there, that this form indeed occurs in *BaA*, albeit, as they claimed, only in the speech of women and children.

On average five to six different speakers of one tribe were interviewed, during a minimum of two, and for some dialects up to five or six different sessions varying in length between one and three hours. Of these speakers usually two would be good talkers, from whom I could record spontaneous speech. For reasons outlined above, these interviewees will be referred to by their first names only.

[73] A distinct advantage of conducting dialect research on a broader scale, and covering several dialects at the same time.

In total a number of 77 compact cassette tapes (most of them C-90, which adds up to approximately 100 hours) were recorded. Below informants interviewed for this study are listed. Level of education, if applicable and known, and (estimated) ages follow in brackets. For the locations listed below the reader is referred to the second map ("Northern Sinai Littoral topography") in the appendix:

Rmēlāt: *Ramaḍān* (around 60), *aššēx Zwayyid*; *ʿAliy* (31), *Ḥayy asSalām* west of *Rafaḥ* (primary school); *Mḥammad* (50), *Ḥayy asSalām* west of *Rafaḥ*; *Ḥammād* (82), *Ḥayy asSalām* west of *Rafaḥ*; *Mḥammad* (28), *Ḥayy asSalām* west of *Rafaḥ*.

Sawārkah: *Mḥammad* (25), *Laḥfan* (secondary school); *Ǧimʿih* (early thirties), *alʿArīš*; *Salāmih* (21), *aššēx Zwayyid aḍḌhayr*; *alḤağğ ʿĪd* (76), *aṛṚawḍah*; and 3 more speakers of around 35 years old in *aṛṚawḍah*.

Biliy: *aššēx Ǧimʿih* (55), *Bīr alʿAbd*; *Silīm* (60), *Bīr alʿAbd*; *alḥağğ Sālim* (59), *Gaṭyah alMamlūk*; *ʿĪd* (45), *Ġirīf alĠizlān*; *Silmān* (61), *Ġirīf alĠizlān*; *aššēx Slēm* (66), *Ġirīf alĠizlān*; *ʿAliy* (31), *Ġirīf alĠizlān*.

Taṛābīn: *ʿNēz* (late fifties), Southern *Turḅāniy*, *Wādiy Waṭīr*, near *Nwēbiʿ* (Nuweiba); *Ismāʿīl* (20), Northern *Turḅāniy*, *Barṭ* 21 (primary school); *alḤağğ Slēmān* (60), Northern *Turḅāniy*, *Nagab*.

Dawāġrah: *Mūsa* (29), *Salmānah* (vocational training); *Sālmah* (around 32), *Salmānah*; *Ṣābir* (27), *Ǧbāṛah*; *Xiḍr* (28), *Ǧbāṛah*; *ʿĪd* (52), *Nağāḥ*; *aššēx Silmiy* (65), *atTaʿāwun*; *Ḥāmid* (35), *atTaʿāwun*; *Ḥāmid* (42), *atTaʿāwun*; *Mḥammad* (35), *atTaʿāwun*; *Slēmān* (65), *Ǧbāṛah*; *Salāmih* (50), *Ǧbāṛah*.

Samāʿnah: *ʿIliy* (70), *Gaṭyah alǦanāyin*; *Ḥsēn* (44), *Gaṭyah alǦanāyin*; *aššēx Ṣubbāḥ* (mid sixties), *Gaṭyah alǦanāyin*; *Slēmān* (around 40), *Gaṭyah alǦanāyin*; *ʿIliy* (22), *Gaṭyah alǦanāyin*.

ʿAgāylah: *aššēx Ṣubbāḥ* (70), *aḍḌabʿ*; *Ġānim* (45), between *ašŠōḥaṭ* and *Ṭāsiʿ*; about 8 different male informants varying in age between 20 and 50 in *aḍḌabʿ*.

Biyyāḍiyyah: *iššēx Saʿdi* (62), *Ṛābʿah Mḥammad* (30), *Ṛābʿah* (recorded in *alʿArīš*) (teacher); *Sālim* (40), *Ṛābʿah* (taxi driver); *Samāḥ* (10), *Ṛābʿah* (school drop-out); *Ǧīhān* (16), *Ṛābʿah*; *ʿĪd* (mid thirties), *Bīr ilʿAbd*.

Axārsah: *Sirḥān* (52), *Bālūḍah* (*kuttāb* "Koran school"); *Sayyid* (35), *Bālūḍah*; *Ḥsēn* (45), *Bālūḍah* (*kuttāb*); *ʿAli* (45), *Bālūḍah*; *ilḥağğ Naṣr* (60), from *Ruṃmānah* (recorded in *alʿArīš*).

Masāʿīd: *aššēx ʿImīrih* (48), *Ǧilbānah*; *ʿImīrih* (early thirties), *Ǧilbānah*; *Sālim* (38), *Ǧilbānah*; *ʿĪd* (60), *Xaṛw Xrēw* (appr. 40 km south of *Ǧilbānah*); *Slēmān* (13), *Ǧilbānah* (5 years of primary school); *Aḅuw Slēmān* (early thirties), *Ǧilbānah*.

ʿAyāydah: *Sālim* (mid thirties), *Aḅuw ʿRūg* (interviewed in *Gaṭyah*).

alʿArīš: *Aḥmad* (32, 6 years of primary school); *Amna* (65, 1 year of schooling); *Zēnab* (40, 5 years of primary school); *ʿAbbūd* (43); *ilḤağğa Amīna* (56); *ʿAbdaḷḷah* (38, university training), *Muṭīʿ* (appr. 35); (not *Fawaxriyyah*) *Saʿīd* (45, university training).

d. Gathering linguistic material

To ensure that the speech recorded in the different dialects would be as natural as possible under the given circumstances, I had prepared a list of questions covering everyday activities, and various other topics I expected to be close to a bedouin's experience of his environment. These topics included: agricultural activities (growing watermelons, datepalms, barley), fishing activities (types of fish, nets, fishing techniques, adventures at sea), bread preparation, making coffee or tea, receiving guests, travel through the desert, marriage customs, other festivities,

customary law, camel rearing, water collection, hunting, and stories and fairy tales. In addition I had prepared a questionnaire for systematic direct elicitation[74].

Ideally, on my initial visits I would record as much spontaneous speech as possible to form an idea of what the main characteristics of a particular dialect would be. This worked best when a speaker would start speaking to others present in the *magʿad*[75], rather than to the interviewer. On a following visit I would then go through the questionnaire with other members of the same tribe, and try to form a more complete picture of the dialect in question. Obviously, this approach would not always work; some speakers hardly needed any encouragement to start speaking freely on the topics that I would suggest, while others could not be moved to expand even a little on their answers of one short sentence, or sometimes even on their "yes" or "no" answers. The problem is that the goals of interviewer and interviewee are different; a short answer is often the most economical way to communicate factual information, but the interviewer is simply not as interested in the factual information as he is in the way this answer is worded[76].

When faced with situations where I could not get an interviewee to speak freely or naturally in his own dialect, I would politely try to shift my attention to another potential informant[77]. Usually

[74] Some forms are very difficult to record in spontaneous speech. F. pl. imperatives of verbs, for instance, are seldomly heard being in a typically male environment such as a *magʿad* (cf. following fn).

[75] A *magʿad* (pl. *magāʿid*) is a place where men come together to exchange the latest news, discuss serious or less serious matters, and drink coffee or tea. Members of a *magʿad* will take pride in hospitably receiving any visitor in their midst.

[76] After a few sessions the interviewer will have a fair idea of what the answer to many of his questions will be. This solves the additional problem, at least during the initial stages of field research, that, because the interviewer is still learning the dialect(s) under investigation, sometimes information in the answer is not picked up by him or her. The interviewee notices this, and the role of the interviewer as a serious interlocutor is thereby undermined. In order to communicate factual information, the interviewee may then adapt his speech in order to be understood, with the undesirable side-effect that he no longer speaks his own dialect.

[77] A curious case of inhibitions to speak naturally occurred one day on a visit to the area called *Ġirīf alĠizlān* to interview members of *Biliy*. As it was my third session with speakers of *Balawiy* Arabic, I noticed that the 45-year old man I was interviewing was not speaking proper *Balawiy*, but a type of dialect more resembling that of group III. After interrupting him a number of times to try and persuade him to speak his own dialect, he reached into his oral cavity to remove his dentures. Having removed this obstacle of a rather physical nature, he turned out to be able to speak his original dialect quite acceptably, although his interdentals had suffered, naturally.

more then ten men would be present in a *mag'ad*, and the person with the most to say would often present himself, and, if I was lucky, he would speak the original dialect. On other occasions I could switch to other informants according to changes in the topics of conversation.

If this was not possible, for one reason or another, I would go through the questionnaire in order not to let the visit go to waste. On following visits I would almost always be more successful in eliciting more spontaneous speech.

Sometimes a dialect researcher may have the good fortune of finding an informant who will understand exactly what he is looking for. Personally I had such good fortune with a member of the *Dawāġrah*, a member of the *Biyyāḍiyyah*, and several speakers of *'Arāyšiy*.

On other occasions speakers were successfully recorded in my absence by interviewers whom I had briefed on which topics to discuss.

One particular problem when one sets out to record bedouin speech in Sinai is the tendency among speakers of a dialect type different from the group I (or Negev) -type to accommodate their speech to what they feel to be the "true bedouin" dialect. This is especially the case when speakers are subjected to direct elicitation by going through a questionnaire. Trudgill[78] points out an important aspect of the "observer's paradox": the production of "hyperdialectisms" as an unwanted effect of an informant's predilection towards what he considers to be his original dialect, and his being well-disposed towards the dialect survey itself, especially in unnatural language-situations created by the use of questionnaires. The "ideal" dialect type in these cases was usually that of group I (the type of dialect also spoken in the Negev, described in chapter I). This view differs somewhat from remarks made in STEWART (1990)[79] where it was found that "differences in style between speakers are far more striking than the differences in style between utterances of a single speaker on different occasions". This may be true for the speakers of the tribes appearing in his study, but it holds less so for speakers of tribes who do not speak the "plain colloquial" of this northeastern group

[78] Cf. TRUDGILL (1983), pp. 45-6.
[79] Cf. preface, pp. x-xi..

(our group I, or the Negev-type). Indeed, speakers from the northwest, when they feel that the situation necessitates this, will try to accommodate to this "plain colloquial" of the northeastern group (group I), whereby, in effect, they attempt to incorporate features in their speech of what they consider to be "proper bedouin dialect". Such efforts result in a more elevated style, which is perhaps best described as a "bedouinized colloquial" (characterized by so-called B-forms).

The collection of poems from Sinai and the Negev in BAILEY (1991) is a good example of an apparent homogeneity of dialects in the area; the poems—all appear in transcription—suggest that there is one type of dialect, with a few variations, spoken throughout the area. This relatively uniform dialect-type is largely that described in BLANC (1970), and although this type is spoken as a "plain colloquial" in the Negev and in the northeast of Sinai (apart from certain characteristics of poetic diction), it also serves its role as the "poetic koine" of the area. For this reason a poem recited by a member of the *Biyyāḍiyyah* (in the northwest of Sinai) will sound as if it had been recited by a member of one of the tribes in the northeast of Sinai or the Negev[80]. The fact that such poems are regularly recited in *magāʿid* ("gatherings of men") throughout the area, and that visitors from other tribes are always welcome to exchange the latest news, and to drink coffee or tea in these *magāʿid*, means that most men are exposed to this northeastern dialect type on a fairly regular basis, and will be able to reproduce it quite accurately during direct elicitation[81]. Since

[80] Cf. for instance the poem in BAILEY (1991), p. 140, which the author heard recited, among others, by *Xlēf Mgēbil ilHirš*, a chief of the *Hrūš*-clan of the *Biyyāḍiyyah* in *Ṛābʿah* in the northwest of Sinai. The poem (11 lines) shows quite a few dialect features which are definitely not part of the *Biyyāḍiy* plain colloquial (this dialect is described in chapter III), such as: nunation (10 instances), non-emphatic interdentals (6 instances), the article *al-*, instead of proper *Biyyāḍiy il-* (25 instances), the preposition *b* followed by a suffix has a short base (*bi+* ~ *ib+*), rather than the regular *Biyyāḍiy* long base with *ē* (*bē+*) (2 instances in ll. 1 and 6), and also a 3rd p. m. sg. pron. suffix *-a(h)*, instead of *Biyyāḍiy -u* (1 instance in l. 10). The question remains however, how much of the poem, such as it appears here, was actually recited by *Xlēf* himself.

[81] My best *Biyyāḍiy* informant could even recite entire poems of his favorite poet *ʿNēz Aḅuw Sālim* of the *Taṛābīn Ḥasāblah*. Cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 470 (index of Arabic names and tribal groups), for numerous references to *ʿAnēz Sālim Swēlim l-ʿUṛḍī* (his full name in Bailey's transcription), "the finest living poet in the peninsula" (cf. ibid., p. 9).

such "direct elicitation" tends to focus on single lexemes uttered in isolation, and a speaker is therefore only tested on a small part of his active competence of any particular dialect under investigation, the information gathered by applying this method of linguistic enquiry should be interpreted with the necessary caution.

To filter out such "noise"—no disrespect intended—one has to rely more on the information coming from recordings of spontaneous speech (i.e. uninterrupted descriptions of daily activities, stories, etc.), than on the information gathered through direct elicitation. Ideally, every bit of information derived from direct elicitation should be checked against information emanating from spontaneous speech. If then inconsistencies arise, often apparent because the information gathered for the system to be described is no longer internally coherent, information derived from spontaneous speech should be given preference[82].

If, for instance, a m. pl. verbal ending of the *a*-type imperfect *-uw* is recorded a number of times in spontaneous speech (e.g. *yáftaḥuw* "they (m. p.) open"), and a 2nd f. sg. *a*-type imperfect ending *-iy* is recorded (e.g. *tášṛaḅiy* "you (f. sg.) drink), while direct elicitation yields a 2nd p. m. pl. ending *-aw* of the *a*-type imperfect (e.g. *táftaḥaw* "you (m. pl.) open"), the information gathered on this aspect of verbal morphology is not very likely to be internally coherent, since the vast majority of (and perhaps all) Arabic dialects have identical verbal endings in the 2nd and 3rd persons of the pl. imperfect, and often the absence of vowel harmony in the 2nd p. f. sg. ending will imply absence of vowel harmony in the 2nd and 3rd p. pl. endings as well (although nothing is impossible, of course). If we then give preference to forms recorded in spontaneous speech, we should conclude that the form derived from direct elicitation is inconsistent with the internal coherence of the system we are trying to describe.

This is basically the method followed to create a description which is internally coherent. On the other hand, forms which may be inconsistent with such internal coherence do not appear out of the blue, but are indeed evidence of the dynamics which to a great

---

82 In cases of contradictory information, BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985a), p. 19, also implicitly state that preference should be given to forms recorded in spontaneous speech.

extent characterize the dialects under investigation, especially those spoken in the northwest (groups II and III).

In the case of the dialects of groups II and III these dynamics lie in the development from an older, more "bedouin" type of dialect towards a more "sedentary" type of dialect. Such a development has the occurrence of parallel forms to effect: "foreign" forms may occur parallel with the original forms, and the "foreign" forms may be inconsistent with the internal coherence of the original dialect type, but they will often be heard in the speech of speakers of dialects (where they are not inconsistent with the internal coherence) with whom speakers of the more original dialect have come into contact[83]. Such parallel forms are actually characteristic of the transitional stage in which the dialect finds itself. At a later stage the dialect will often drop one of the parallel forms, often the most marked one. This process is known as "leveling"[84].

Sometimes so-called "interdialect forms" have been created as a result of the dialect contact. These are the result of a compromise between the original dialect and the dialect (type) with which it has come into contact; the "interdialect form" appearing will contain elements of both (or more) dialect(s) (types) involved in the contact, but will not appear in that particular unique form in any of these dialect(s) (types)[85]. To illustrate these dynamics

---

[83] In the initial stages of such dialect contact the contact will be between speakers of different dialects, but at later stage the speaker of the dialect affected by the contact may influence speakers of his own speech community, who may also adopt the new form(s) in their speech.

[84] TRUDGILL (1986), pp. 107-8 (paraphrased): 'Levelling' entails the disappearance of 'minority and otherwise marked speech forms', which is often accompanied by 'simplification', which involves, crucially, a reduction in irregularities. The result of the focussing associated with koineization is a historically mixed but synchronically stable dialect which contains elements from the different dialects that went into the mixture, as well as interdialect forms that were present in none.

[85] Cf. TRUDGILL (1986), p. 62. Such 'interdialect' forms are heard, for instance, in the dialect of *ilFayyūm*, where "telephone" is *talafawn*, "pound" is *ginayh*, and "steering wheel" is *daraksawn*. In these cases the *CaA* monophthongs *ō* and *ē* in the words *tilifōn, ginēh* and *diriksyōn* were phonologically reinterpreted as the *Fayyūmiy* diphthongs *aw* and *ay* (respectively). The fact that these are loanwords (from French "téléphone", English "guinea", and French "direction") shows that we are not dealing with diphthongs from an earlier stage of this Arabic dialect. The short *a*'s in the first two syllables of such forms as *talafawn* and *daraksawn* are to be interpreted in terms of the preferred patterns for loanwords from other languages *a-a-vCC* and *a-a-v̄C*, cf. WOIDICH (1990a), pp.147-8.

parallel forms and interdialect forms have not been ignored in the descriptions of the dialects presented here.

In addition to parallel forms, interdialect forms and "B-forms" (mentioned earlier), "Koine-forms" (K-forms) will often be heard in the speech of the bedouins of northern Sinai. As for the difference between K-forms, B-forms and parallel forms: although it is not always easy to distinguish between these, we should in principle think of K-forms as being supra-regional, i.e. forms of the dialect exerting the influence may also be heard in regions other than, in our case, northern Sinai. For instance, when we hear *hína* for "here" in *Balawiy*, we should consider it to be a K-form (either originating from Cairene Arabic, or possibly from the dialect of *alʿArīš*). When we hear *hniy*, we should consider it to be a B-form (because we can conclude from other forms that extreme raising and diphthongization of final **-ā(')* is not a feature of *Balawiy* Arabic, but rather of neighbouring dialects of groups I and IV). If we hear *íhna*, we should consider it to be a parallel form (presumably as a result of contact with *Biyyāḍiy* Arabic, the neighbouring dialect of group III, and perhaps also the dialects of group II). The form *hní'*, then, should be seen as the original form, which can be concluded from the fact that other forms in *Balawiy* show a similar *-í'* reflex for final **-ā(')*, e.g. *ǧi'* "he came", *ʿamyí'* "blind (f. sg.)".

Things are not always that transparent, however. To give an example: when one hears a speaker from group I say *ṃayyah* or *ṃayyih* instead of the current form *miy* for "water", we may very well be dealing with a K-form (both Cairene and *ʿArāyšiy* Arabic have *ṃayya*), but if the same speaker shows comparable deviations from his original dialect type, which cannot be attributed to a Koine variety, and the form is also heard in neighbouring dialects, the interpretation of a parallel form should be given preference (in this example *ṃayyah* turns out to be current in both groups II and III as well). Another characteristic of K-forms—in my own experience—is that they tend to show up in isolation more so than parallel forms (i.e. the context in which they appear is not of the same Koine variety). Furthermore, K-

---

The Upper Egyptian form *ǧinēh* for "pound" is another example; speakers "knew" that the *CaA* phoneme *g* corresponds to their *ǧ*, and substituted *g* for *ǧ* accordingly.

forms also tend to be certain lexical items, such as *hína* "here", *yiʿmil* (in northern Sinai instead of *ysawwiy*) "he makes/does", *kída* "thus; so", *b(i)tāʿ* "the genitive exponent", *baʾa* (normally adapted to the phoneme system of the dialect as *baga*) instead of *ʿād* in northern Sinai (and similarly in Upper Egyptian dialects, Manfred Woidich, personal communication).[86]

The texts that were recorded were almost all written out, word by word, with the assistence of mainly three people. This was done in *alʿArīš*, where I had rented a *šālēh* ("chalet") on the beach during most of my visits. One of these three people is himself a *Biyyāḍiy* (Muḥammad, mentioned in the preface) with extensive contacts throughout the area. The other two are *ʿArāyšiyyah*[87] (i.e. born and bred sons of *alʿArīš*: Saʿīd and ʿAbdalḷah, also mentioned in the preface), both with a wealth of experience in taking down bedouin oral poetry from Sinai and in interviewing members of the different bedouin tribes in the area. Without these informants much of the material would have been lost to my ears, and through their cooperation they have earned my sincere gratitude.

III. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

a. Selecting criteria for comparison

The publications mentioned above (in the Introduction, I. c. *Surrounding dialects*) also served to set the parameters for comparison; if we assume a certain homogeneity of dialects in the area to be researched, as is suggested when authors speak of "the Sinai dialects", let us then use this as a working hypothesis and put

[86] For remarks on comparable koineizing and bedouinizing tendencies (as well as classicizing tendencies) in the dialect of the *ʿAğārma* tribe in Jordan, cf. PALVA (1976), pp. 7 and 46-9. Notice here that the term "Koine" is used here in a different sense than in the term "poetic koine" used above; the former term refers to the dialect of the centre of linguistic levelling, Cairo, and to some extent also the dialect of the regional centre *alʿArīš*, which looks like a mixture between the rural South Transjordanian type and the urban type (cf.. Conclusions, II). The latter refers to the dialect type viewed as "true bedouin", cf. remarks below in the Introduction, III, b.

[87] The term *ʿArāyšiyyah* (sg. *ʿArāyšiy*) is used here with reference to inhabitants of *alʿArīš*.

it to the test. The criteria for comparison were then selected from these publications, so that we may compare apples with apples.

As in most dialect geographies, the emphasis here tends to be on differences, rather than on shared characteristics[88]. The reason is that one usally looks for differences in a contrastive study, since there is little point in drawing a map on the basis of criteria that yield the same outcome in every location on that map. The fact that a similarity does show up in certain locations on any given dialect map is simply due to the fact that the criterion set yields a difference in other locations on the same map. This makes the selection of similarities biased if we would only take our maps as a starting point. However, the fact that a given similarity shows up in certain locations of an area where applying the same criterion also yields differences in other locations may add relevance to the fact that there is a similarity.

There is, for instance, not much point in drawing a map of our area to show the reflexes of **s*, since the outcome would be the same in all locations checked. From a dialect-geographical point of view, there is just as little point in drawing a map of our area for the reflexes of **q*, since the outcome is the same in all locations. The difference with the preceding example of reflexes of **s*, however, is that a map for the reflexes of **q* will be relevant from a larger geographical, and perhaps also historical perspective, since there are other strong indications that the dialect of the *Dawāġrah* (*DA*, or group IV) is of the *Naǧdiy*-type (cf. remarks in IV, 1.1.3.)[89].

Another point is that the dialect of the regional centre of *al'Arīš* can be classified as a sedentary dialect in many respects, although the reflex for **q* is *g*, which is more typically the case with bedouin dialects. The question is then: why is it that this particular feature is bedouin while so many other features of the dialect are not? In this latter case the influence from surrounding bedouin dialects for this *g* reflex is highly likely, but such particular

[88] The importance of shared innovations should not be underestimated. It is therefore a pity that these tend to remain relatively underexposed in a contrastive study when such innovations are shared by all dialects under discussion.

[89] The conclusion drawn for *DA* in a paper read at the third conference of 'Association Internationale de Dialectologie Arabe' (AIDA) held in Malta in 1998 is that it is originally of the southern *Naǧdiy*-type. The reader is referred here to a summary of this paper, which is to appear in the proceedings of this conference.

questions deserve answers based on more thorough research, which they cannot receive in this study.

An even clearer example of the relevance of similarities is the spread of the *b*-imperfect in the area. Had it not been for *DA*, where this characteristic was concluded to be absent, this feature would not have been represented in a map to show its geographical spread. It is, however, a typologically important characteristic feature shared by all dialects of the area (except *DA*). The typological importance lies in the fact that, although it is found in the bedouin dialects of our area, it is basically a characteristic of sedentary dialects, which should tell us something about the influence sedentary dialects must have exerted on these bedouin dialects[90].

b. True bedouin dialect

As we try to identify an area of transition between the Negev-type of dialect and the dialect type of eastern *Šarqiyyah*, we are in fact looking for a transition from a bedouin type of dialect to a sedentary type of dialect.

An important question is therefore what constitutes a "true bedouin" dialect. Remarks made by Murray and Bailey on "Egyptian accents, manners, and dress", and "their way of talking [which] is not that of true Bedouin"[91] regarding bedouins inhabiting the *Gaṭyah* oasis in the northwest of Sinai presuppose certain criteria, which are, however, not elaborated upon[92].

[90] PALVA (1991), pp. 158-160 and 166.

[91] Cf. BAILEY (1991), p. 5, and MURRAY (1935), p. 251.

[92] The remark quoted by Bailey and Murray was made by an Egyptian officer, and one can only guess as to what his criteria were, but I think it is safe to assume that he was referring to the dialect type spoken in the northeast of Sinai, which also has its southern branch, as the "true bedouin" type. Indeed, a remark recorded from an informant of the *Samāʿnah* (i.e. one of the tribes whose speech the officer referred to as "not that of true Bedouin", cf. description of this dialect type in chapter II) illustrates the same point. I asked an elderly informant why he said *ilmayya* for "water", and not *álmiy*, his answer was: *lamma biǧūna nās... aṣil ibtūʿ aǧǧábal, bigaddru-nniḥna yaʿni ʾēh? ḥaḍar. iw humma lʿarab iṣṣaḥīḥ. fa ʾiḥna binkallimhum bi laġwathum..... mayyih, bingūl lēhum álmiy, ʿašān mā yʿallgūš ʿalēne. innáma-ḥna bingūl ʿinnu mayyih* "When people come to (visit) us, namely (those who are) from the desert, they regard us as what? *ḥaḍar* (i.e. settled population). And they are the true *ʿarab* (i.e. nomads). So then we speak to them in their language. *mayyah* ("water") to them we say *álmiy* ("the water"), so they will not

We therefore have to define first what characterizes a bedouin dialect by formulating criteria enabling us to make more well-founded judgements with respect to the typological classification of the dialects under investigation.

These criteria will be formulated in terms of characteristics generally present in a bedouin dialect[93], which in many cases

---

make (negative) comments about us. But we call it *mayyah...*". For remarks on this northeastern dialect type (as described here in chapter I) as an idealized "bedouin" dialect type, which may serve as a role model for bedouin speakers of other dialect types, cf. DE JONG (1996b).

[93] Here we risk running into the circular nature of the definition "bedouin dialect"; if we select characteristics from bedouin dialects to set as criteria for the classification of other dialects, the question as to how we were able to classify the dialects in which we found these characteristics as "bedouin" in the first place remains open.

The problem of such circularity in definition is perhaps as old as language or dialect research itself: when, for instance, is a certain dialect spoken near the German-Dutch border a dialect of German, and when is it a dialect of Dutch? Is the political border the decisive factor in this case (if it is spoken east of the border, it is a dialect of German, and if it is spoken west of the border, it is a dialect of Dutch), or are there linguistic arguments with which one could *definitively* answer such a question? Here we have chosen to adopt a practical approach to the matter and not to theorize too deeply, however important the issue may be. A few observations may be in order however:

The characteristics that are selected here are apparently generally found in the dialects spoken by those who are labeled by others, and, perhaps more importantly, label themselves as "bedouins". The characteristics of their dialects are not likely to be caused by their nomadic lifestyle *per se* (cf. remarks in fn 97 to this Introduction, III. b.), but it may very well be that certain characteristics stand a better chance to survive in the dialect of a speech community living in the relative isolation of a nomadic collective. Other additional social factors may play an important role here; Trudgill holds that speakers tend to copy speech habits from those who are held in high esteem by them (in our case, for instance, bedouins copying speech habits of other bedouins with whom they wish to associate themselves for whatever reason): "This theory, expounded by Le Page in a number of writings (see Le Page 1968, 1975, 1978; Le Page et al., 1974) seeks to demonstrate a general motive for speakers' linguistic behaviour in terms of attempts to 'resemble as closely as possible those of the group or groups with which from time to time we [speakers] wish to identify", cf. TRUDGILL (1983), p. 144.

Conversely, speech habits may be avoided because the speakers exhibiting them lack prestige (bedouins avoiding speech habits of town dwellers, for instance, or farmers with whom bedouins generally do not wish to be associated). Notice that it may very well be that a particular speech habit may be copied by one speaker, but that the same habit can be avoided by another speaker:; the linguistic nature of the speech habit itself is of no immediate relevance.

The decisive factor here is the personal identity as perceived by the speaker himself/herself (where external factors will play their roles as well), and the linguistic

implies that the absence of such features characterizes a more sedentary type of dialect. A result of this approach is that the sedentary type will be characterized negatively. This does not imply a value judgement on my part; we have to bear in mind that in many cases we could just as well turn things around by rephrasing our criteria in order to positively identify a sedentary dialect, should we wish to do so. For instance, instead of phrasing our criterion 18) as

> Presence of the *gahawah*-syndrome with subsequent morphological restructuring of $*C_1aC_2C_3$ to be $C_1aC_2aC_3$ where $C_2 = X$

we could just as well phrase this criterion as

> Retention of the $*C_1aC_2C_3$ syllable structure where $C_2 = X$

The outcome of applying such a rephrased criterion would be that in most cases a bedouin dialect will be characterized negatively, while most sedentary dialects will be characterized positively.

The rationale behind the choice of the direction bedouin $\Rightarrow$ sedentary in our comparison has a historical justification: sedentary dialects developed out of bedouin dialects, rather than the other way around[94]. We can take this as an axiom, because we know that the language was spread from the Arabian Peninsula by the bedouin tribes that conquered the territory which is now known as "the Arab world".

The direction of change is often illustrated by the loss of more conservative features considered typical of the bedouin type, such as the distinction m./f. in the pl., where in sedentary dialects one would more typically find the original m. pl. in use as a c. pl.[95] Another example is the loss of a (causative) verbal measure 4, the causative function of which has often been assumed by measure 2 or measure 1 in the sedentary type of dialects[96].

On the other hand, bedouin characteristics which are not of a conservative nature, but are better interpreted as bedouin innovations, such as the *gahawah*-syndrome and resyllabication

---

changes/adaptations he/she—not necessarily consciously—wishes to make to bring his/her speech more into conformity with this self-image.

94 ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 3, makes the valuable observation that, historically, all Arabic dialects are bedouin dialects.

95 Cf. FISCHER/JASTROW (1980), p. 61 (5.1.1.).

96 Cf. ibid., p. 46 (3.8.1.).

of sequences *CaCaCV* → *CCvCV*, are more typically absent in a sedentary type of dialect. In such cases the sedentary dialect has the more conservative syllable structure[97].

To distinguish dialects spoken inside our area, an additional selection was made of characteristics of the type of dialect spoken by the Negev bedouins (*ḎA*, spoken by the *Ḏullām*), the dialect described in BLANC (1970).

To be sure, characteristics presented here as typical for the speech of the Negev bedouins, but which are not marked as *general* characteristics, can be typically bedouin as well, but the question is which of these can be said to be generally present in bedouin dialects.

The example of the stressed pron. suffixes *C-ī́* (poss.) and *-nī́* (obj.) of the 1st p. c. sg. (listed below as 38)) may serve to illustrate this. There cannot be much doubt that this is indeed a feature characteristic of bedouin dialects of the area (except of *DA*), which is illustrated by the fact that it is absent in the two clearly sedentary (which can be defined on the basis of other criteria) dialects discussed (those of the eastern *Šarqiyyah* and the town of *alʿArīš*). However, to classify this feature as a *general* characteristic of bedouin dialects is a different matter, since its occurrence is only reported for our area and just a few other places[98]. This feature is therefore not classified as a general bedouin characteristic here.

---

97 This is not to suggest that such bedouin innovations post-date the spread of the language. On the contrary: since the *gahawah*-syndrome is found in many bedouin dialects throughout the Arab world, it is more likely that this innovation ante-dates the spread of the language. After all, inserting *a* in *aXC* sequences is not likely to be caused by a nomadic lifestyle (dry throats?), which is what one would have to assume if one would wish to account for the presence of this innovation in so many bedouin dialects spoken in such a vast area that regular contact between these bedouin dialects is simply not a plausible explanation for the geographical spread of this feature.
We have to assume therefore that in sedentary dialects where such features are not found, they must have been lost. An illustration of this are *Bʿēri* forms *katab* "he wrote", but *kítibat* "she wrote" (cf. WOIDICH (1973-4), p. 359), and also *bagaṛ* "cows (coll.)", but *búguṛa* "cow". These forms *kítibat* and *búguṛa* are presumed to have been reconstructed from (bedouin forms) **bguṛa* and **ktibat* to match the systems of stress and syllabication of the sedentary dialect with which the bedouin dialect(s) that had the forms **bguṛa* and **ktibat* came into contact, cf. WOIDICH (1997).

98 BLANC (1970), p. 20 (131), fn 34, lists the dialect of Omdurman in the Sudan as described in WORSLEY (1925), pp. 8 and 53-4, where higher pitch (and therefore primary stress?) is reported for the 1st p. c. sg. pers. pronominals. REICHMUTH (1983), pp. 13 and 104-5, also lists such stressed 1st p. c. sg. suffixes for the Sudanese central

Another typically Negev bedouin feature is stress in *CaCaC(v)* and *CaCIC* (listed below as 14) and 15)); such sequences will normally be stressed on the second vowel from the left. To classify this stress as a *general* bedouin feature is again a different matter; I am personally not aware that such stress is widespread in bedouin dialects, and have therefore not marked this feature as such (cf., however, Conclusions, IX. Final remarks in conclusion).

Since I have not conducted a general survey of publications on bedouin dialects that have become available to date, I cannot claim to know exactly which features constitute general bedouin characteristics, and which do not. While begging the reader's indulgence, I should like to point out however, that marking those characteristics which have now only been listed as typical for Negev bedouin dialects as general bedouin characteristics, will in most cases not be contradictory with the final conclusions concerning the typological classification of dialects spoken in the northwest of Sinai, and that of the eastern *Šarqiyyah*, but on the contrary add extra evidence to the claim of the presence of a transitional area.

To classify a dialect as bedouin or non-bedouin a number of typological features relevant for the area[99] are used as criteria. The outcome of applying these criteria is represented in maps in the appendix; those criteria that do not yield differences inside our area, and therefore do not draw isoglosses, are not represented in maps. A number of additional criteria that distinguish the different bedouin dialects of our area are also represented in maps.

Nile Valley and the northern region, as well as in the speech of the original inhabitants of the capital. BLANC (1970), ibid. reports similar stress in the dialect of the *Ṭuwara* in southern Sinai, and two bedouin villages in ABUL FADL (1961). Also the *Garāršah* of southern Sinai have such stressed pron. suffixes (Manfred Woidich, personal communication), and NISHIO (1992), p. 178, lists long (stressed) *-nī* and *-ī* as alternatives for *-ni* and *-i* in *Ǧbāliy* Arabic. For more detail, cf. fn 286 to note *4) in I, 3.1.12.2.1.

99 ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 3: "a single feature is not enough to characterize a dialect". Ibid. pp. 8-53 contains a summary, on which this selection of characterizing features is based. For the sake of brevity, I have omitted certain dialectal features not relevant for the classification of dialects within our area.
Bedouin characteristics of Palva's proposed Northwestern Arabian (or *NWA*) group as compared to sedentary dialects mentioned in PALVA (1991) are indicated by the abbreviation *NWA* in brackets.

The criteria that are not reflected in maps follow below. Those criteria generally used for the distinction bedouin-sedentary, forty-one in total, are underlined and marked B-S:

A) (B-S)[100] A voiced affricate reflex *ǧ* (in some dialects ~ fricative *ž*, or ~ affricate *ǵ*) for **ǧ* is found in all dialects under consideration, including sedentary *ʿAA* and *eŠA*[101]. E.g.: *ǧāṛ* "neighbour", *riǧl* "leg" (cf. 1.1.4.).

B) (B-S)[102] A voiced reflex *g* for **q*: found in all dialects under consideration, including sedentary *ʿAA* and *eŠA*[103]. E.g.: *sūg* "market", *gaḷḅ* "heart" (cf. 1.1.3.).

C) (B-S)[104] Affricated variants of */g/* and */k/*: in none of the dialects in the area, including *ʿAA* and *eŠA*[105]. A separate map was not drawn for this criterion, but MAPS 3, 32, and 33 partially cover the absence of this characteristic. E.g. *kalb* "dog", *kull* "every", *kimm* "sleeve" (cf. 1.1.3.).

D) (B-S)[106] A partial lack of phonemic distinction between short high vowels *i* and *u* is found in all dialects under consideration, including sedentary *ʿAA* and *eŠA*, e.g. *šidd* "pull", *ḥuṭṭ* "place" (cf. 1.2.3.2.).

E) (B-S)[107] Reduction of geminated C_2 (C_aC_a) in the imperfect of measure 2 when C_3 (C_b) is followed by *V*, i.e. a cluster $C_aC_aC_bV \rightarrow C_aC_bV$: this occurs in all dialects of the area, including *ʿAA* and *eŠA*. E.g. *yxarrif* + *uw* → *yxarfuw* "they speak" (cf. 2.3.3.3.1.).

F) The 2nd p. m. pl. pron. suffix *-ku(w)*: it occurs in all dialects discussed here (but ~ *-ḳuṃ* in *SaA*), including *ʿAA* and *eŠA*[108]. E.g. *bētkuw* "your (m. pl.) house/tent" (cf. 3.1.12.2.).

---

[100] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 8. The relevance of these criteria A) and B) for Egyptian dialects is stressed in BEHNSTEDT (1979), p. 63, fn 5, and p. 64.

[101] For the sedentary central Delta dialects, where **ǧ* has a *g* reflex, cf. BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985b), maps 10, 11, 12, 15. For *eŠA*, cf. also ABUL FADL (1961), Map 5 (p. 304).

[102] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 3 and p. 9.

[103] For *eŠA*, cf. ABUL FADL (1961), map 3 (p. 302), and cf. BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985b), map 7.

[104] For this criterion, cf. PALVA (1991), p. 155.

[105] For *eŠA*, cf. ABUL FADL (1961), maps 2 and 3 (pp. 301-2). and BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1985b), maps 6-8, and 16-17.

[106] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 11.

[107] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 30. For *eŠA*, cf. WOIDICH (1979), p. 79.

[108] For *eŠA*, cf. ABUL FADL (1961), p. 97, l. 10, l. 13; p. 103, l. 7; p. 141, l. 14, l. 17.

G) (B-S)[109] Preference for construct state instead of indirect annexation (with *šuġl, btāʿ* etc.): such a preference was not apparent in the area. MAP 29 in the appendix was drawn on usage of *šuġl* or *(b)tāʿ* instead. E.g. *ilgahwa btāʿtī* (group III) or *iligháwah šuġḷátyah* "my coffee" (group IV) (cf. 3.1.11.).

H) (B-S)[110] The presence of *tanwīn* (or nunation) as a partial designation for indefiniteness: none of the dialects of our area use *tanwīn* productively; it only occurs in poetic passages and proverbial expressions. Its absence was labeled characteristic of *NWA* dialects, as opposed to its presence in North Arabian dialects (or *Naǧdiy*)[111]. E.g. (nunation underlined) *ṣbayyin* "a little boy" (cf. 4.1.).

I) Use of the locative preposition *fī: fī* for "in" occurs in all dialects under consideration, including *ʿAA* and *eŠA*[112]. E.g. *f-albēt* or *fi lbēt* "in the house/tent" (cf. 3.1.16.).

Other criteria not represented in maps in appendix are:

J) (B-S) Productivity of diminutive patterns[113]. The material is inconclusive for many dialects. The question is often whether diminutives are not just simply lexicalized items (cf. 3.1.6.).

K) (B-S) Use of *ṃāṛ / mēr* for "so then, but"[114]. This conjunction is reported for *ḌA* and *AA*[115], but it was not recorded in any of the other dialects investigated for this study.

L) (B-S) Use of interrogative *ʿalām* + pron. suff. "why, what for?"[116]: this interrogative was recorded in a number of dialects, but for other dialects the material is inconclusive. E.g.: *ʿalāmak?* "what is the matter with you?", and also in the dialect of the *Garāršah* in southern Sinai: *ʿalāmuḳ y-Abu Zēd* "what's the matter with you, *Abu Zayd?*"[117] (cf. 3.1.14.).

---

109 For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), pp. 47, 42.

110 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 48.

111 Cf. PALVA (1991), p. 155.

112 For this criterion, cf. ibid., where it is used to distinguish *NWA* from North Arabian (or northern *Naǧdiy*) dialects. For *eŠA*, cf. ABUL FADL (1961), passim.

113 For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), pp. 23-4.

114 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 45.

115 Cf. BLANC (1970), p. 35 (146), and STEWART (1990), glossary.

116 For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 44.

117 Manfred Woidich, personal communication.

c. Criteria used for maps in the appendix

As was already pointed out, many features that are not considered generally typical of bedouin dialects, or are not specifically marked as such, can of course very well be bedouin characteristics of the bedouin dialects in Negev and Sinai. Here characteristics of Negev bedouin dialect (*ḎA* of group I) are presumed to be typically bedouin for the area, since *ḎA*, only second to *DA*, scores best on those characteristics that have been marked as typically bedouin in a general sense.

Deviations from this Negev-type may be typically bedouin as well (such as the outcome of criterion 1) for *SaA* and *ʿAgA*), but many such deviations are better ascribed to influences from the sedentary type of the central Egyptian Delta dialects (of which *CaA* is the most influential. BEHNSTEDT/WOIDICH (1987), p. 19, refer to central Delta dialects as "dem Kairenischen nahestehend", i.e. near *CaA*). (references "MAP + number" are to the appendix, and numbers following are to the relevant paragraphs in chapters I-V):

1) */k/* and */ḳ/* in the phoneme inventory as separate phonemes: not in the Negev, but in group II *bētḳ* "your (m. sg.) house/tent" and *bētk* "your (f. sg.) house/tent" (MAP 1, cf. 1.1.1. and 3.1.12.2.)
2) (B-S)[118] Interdental reflexes *ṯ*, and *ḏ* for **ṯ* and **ḏ*: also in the Negev. E.g.: *ṯāliṯ* "third", *ḏaháb* "gold" (MAP 2, cf. 1.1.2.)
3) (B-S)[119] Merged interdental reflex *ḍ* for **ḍ* and **ḏ̣*: also in the Negev. E.g. *ḍaṛáḅ* "he hit", *áḍḍaʿan* "the trek (with camels)" (MAP 3, cf. 1.1.2.)
4) (B-S)[120] Secondary velarization, or "emphatization": also in the Negev. E.g. *ġaḷḅ* "heart", *ḳuṃān* "also", *aẋūh* "his brother" (MAP 4, cf. 1.1.7.)
5) Partial monophthongization of the older diphthongs **ay* and **aw*, with phonetic overlapping of monophthongized */ō/* with

[118] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 8. Usually criteria 2) and 3) are taken together as one criterion. For our area we have to make a distinction to cover the situation in *BA*.

[119] For this criterion, ibid.

[120] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 10.

/ū/, and of /ē/ with /ī/: also in the Negev. E.g. *sēf* ~ *sīf* (< **sayf*) "sword", but *ṣayf* (< **ṣayf*) "summer", and *kōm* "pile" (< **kawm*), but *ẋawf* (< **xawf*) "fear", and **ū* almost as low as [o:] in *ẋōẋ* (< **xūx*) "peaches" (MAP 5, cf. 1.2.2.1. and 1.2.4.5.)

6) (B-S)[121] Tendency to retain length of long vowels in unstressed positions: also in the Negev. E.g. *ʿāyzāt* "they (f. pl.) want", *māsūṛah* "pipe line" (MAP 6 , cf. 1.2.2.4.)

7) (B-S)[122] Raising of *a* in open syllable preceding *A* (i.e. stressed *a* or *ā*) in the Negev. E.g. (*katáb* →) *kitáb* "he wrote", (*gaḍāh* →) *guḍāh* "judges" (MAP 7, cf. 1.2.3.4.3.2., 3.1.1.5., 3.1.1.6., and 3.1.1.7.)

8) Raising of the feminine suffix (*T*) (often referred to as *imālah* of **-ah*): *-ih* in neutral environments in the Negev, not conditioned by pausal position. E.g. *ʿāylih* "family" (MAP 8, cf. 1.2.3.4.3.3.)

9) (B-S)[123] Extreme raising of final **-ā(')* in neutral environments in the Negev. E.g. *hniy* "here", *štiy* "winter" (MAP 9, cf. 1.2.4.4.)

10) Absence of raising of final **-ā(')* in non-neutral environments in the Negev. E.g. *xaḍṛá(')* "green (f. sg.)" (MAP 10, cf. 1.2.4.4.)

11) Diphthongal reflexes of **ay* and **aw* when preceded by *X* or *Ṃ* (i.e. phonetically conditioned) in the Negev. E.g. *ḥayṭ* "walls", *ṭayr* "birds", and *xawf* "fear", *ṣawm* "fasting" (also found among *Bdūl* and *Nʿēmāt*, but well established monophthongs */ē/* and */ō/* among *Hwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*). (MAP 11, cf. 1.2.4.1., 1.2.4.6., and 1.2.4.7.)

12) Stress in mediae geminatae where the geminate is word-final. E.g. *yḥúṭṭ* "he puts" and *aššáṭṭ* "the coast" in the Negev (i.e. no reduction of final geminates) (MAP 12, cf. 2.1.1.)

---

[121] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 11, where the tendency, also in bedouin dialects, to shorten unstressed long vowels to half-long or short is mentioned. My own impression was that such shortening was much more regular in the sedentary dialect *ʿAA*, and it is also mentioned as a feature of *eŠA*, cf. WOIDICH (1979), p. 80. This criterion is therefore marked (B-S) here.

[122] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 12-13.

[123] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 12-13. Although this extreme raising is not a general bedouin feature, the degree of raising in bedouin dialects is generally found to be different from that in nearby sedentary dialects. Therefore a (B-S) opposition is concluded here on the basis of applying this criterion.

13) Stress in *maCCaCah* is *máCCaCah* in the Negev. E.g. *mádrasih* "school" (MAP 13, cf. 2.1.1.1.)
14) Stress in **CaCvC* is *CvCáC / CvCíC / CvCúC* in the Negev. E.g. *kataáb ~ kitáb* "he wrote", *širíb* "he drank", *kubúr* "he grew" (MAP 14, cf. 2.1.1.2.)
15) Stress in **CaCaCv*: *CvCáCv* in the Negev. E.g. *šiğárah* "tree", *ğimálah* "his camel", *gaháwah* "coffee" (MAP 15, cf. 2.1.1.2.1.)
16) Stress in **CaCaCaCv* is *CaCáCaCv* in the Negev. E.g. *ṛagábatih* "his neck", *ḍaṛábatih* "she hit him" (MAP 16, cf. 2.1.1.2.1.3.)
17)* (B-S)[124] Resyllabication of *CaCaCV* sequences: not in the Negev. E.g. *waṛágah* "piece of paper", *gaháwah* "coffee" (MAP 17, cf. 2.1.1.2.1.6.)
18) (B-S)[125] The article and measure *n*-1 and 1-*t* preformatives as stressable units: also *NWA*. E.g. *álğimal* "the camels", *ánḍaraḅ* "he was hit", *áttifag* "he agreed" (MAP 18, cf. 2.1.1.2.2.)
19)* (B-S)[126] Presence of the *gahawah*-syndrome, with subsequent morphological restructuring of $*C_1aC_2C_3 > C_1aC_2aC_3$, where $C_2 = X$. Also in the Negev. E.g. *naxáḷ* "palm trees", *naxáḷah* "a palm tree", *álbaḥaṛ* "the sea". (MAP 19, cf. 2.2.1.)
20) (B-S)[127] Presence of initial *CCV* in limited morphological patterns: also in the Negev. E.g. *ʿnab* "grapes" (< **ʿinab*), *ṣgūr* (< **ṣuqūr*) "falcons" (MAP 20, cf. 2.3.5.)
21) Raising of *a* in $C_1aC_2\bar{\imath}C_3(ah)$: morphological restructuring in the Negev ($C_1iC_2\bar{\imath}C_3(ah)$), but still underlying /a/, since it is not $\bullet C_1C_2\bar{\imath}C_3(ah)$. E.g. *kiṭīr* "many" (< **kaṭīr*), *ʿiğīn* (< **ʿağīn*) "dough" (MAP 21, cf. 3.1.1.1.)
22) Raising of *a* in pre-stress closed syllable in $*CaCC\bar{a}C$: no morphological restructuring in the Negev. E.g. *baṛṛād ~ buṛṛād* "tea pot", *waǧʿān ~ wiǧʿān* "in pain" (MAP 22, cf. 3.1.1.4.)

---

[124] For this criterion, cf. ibid., pp. 14-5, but cf. remarks below in this Introduction III. d.
[125] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 16.
[126] For this criterion, cf. ibid., pp. 14-5, but cf. remarks below in this Introduction III. d.
[127] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 13.

23) Raising of *a* in **CaCūC(ah)*: morphological restructuring, but underlying /a/ in the Negev. E.g. *ʿurūs* "bride", *xurūf* "goat" (MAP 23, cf. 3.1.1.8.)
24) The pattern for colours and physical defects: with initial *a-* in the Negev. E.g. *ábyaḍ* "white", *ášdaf* "left-handed" (MAP 24, cf. 3.1.7.)
25) (B-S)[128] Article is *al-*, and relative pronoun *alli(y)* in the Negev. Also in *NWA*. E.g. *álbuṣal* "the onions", *algaháwah* "the coffee" (MAP 25, cf. 3.1.9.1.)
26) Occurrence of */a/* in the initial syllable in a number of irregular nouns (*(ʾ)aṃṃ* "mother", *(ʾ)axt* "sister", *(ʾ)axwān* "brothers", *(ʾ)adēn* "(two) hands", *(ʾ)afám* "mouth") in the Negev. Also in *NWA*. (partially MAP 26, cf. 3.1.9.2.)
27) Treatment of *T* (the feminine suffix) in construction: *T* preceded by historical *aC-*, or in open syllable preceded by *gahawah*-vowel → *-at*, otherwise *-it* in the Negev. E.g. *ṛagábatih* "his neck", *gahawatī́* "my coffee", but (*ṛukbit + ha / hiy* →) *ṛukbitta / ṛukbittiy* "her knee", *naxaḷitna* "our date palm" (MAP 27, cf. 3.1.10.)
28) Elision of the *T*-vowel in construct state: *i* is elided in eligible position in the Negev. E.g. (*ṛukbit + ī́* → **ṛukbitī́* → **ṛukbtī́* →) *ṛukubtī́* "my knee" (MAP 28, cf. 3.1.10.)
29) Annexation with *šuġl* in the Negev (i.e. the genitive exponent)[129]. (cf. criterion G) above). E.g. *albēt šuġḷī́* "my house/tent" (MAP 29, cf. 3.1.11.)
30) (B-S)[130] Gender distinction in 2nd and 3rd p. pl. of pers. pronouns, adjectives and verbs: also *NWA*. E.g. *banāt ḥilwāt* "beautiful girls", *hinna* "they (f. pl.)", *yāklin* "they (f. pl.) eat" (MAP 30, cf. 3.1.12., 3.2.1.1., and 3.2.1.2.)
31) The 3rd p. sg. m. and f. personal pronouns are *hū* and *hī* in the Negev. (MAP 31, cf. 3.1.12.1.)
32) The 1st p. c. sg. personal pronoun: *aná(ʾ #)* in the Negev. (MAP 32, cf. 3.1.12.1.)
33) The 1st. p. c. pl. personal pronoun: *aḥna* in the Negev. (MAP 33, cf. 3.1.12.1.)

---

[128] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 21.

[129] In our dialects there is not so much a preference for the construct state. The distinction here is between the use of *šuġl* and more sedentary *(b)tāʿ*.

[130] For this criterion, cf. ibid., pp. 17, 27.

34) (B-S)[131] Pron. suffix of 3rd p. m. sg.: *-ah* or *-ih*, rather than *-u*: *-ah/-ih* in the Negev. E.g. *bētih* ~ *bītih* "his house/tent", *ġaḷḅah* "his heart" (*-ah / -ih* among the *Bdūl*, *-o* among *Nʿēmāt*, *-ah* among *Ḥwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*). (MAP 34, cf. 3.1.12.2.)

35) Pronominal suffix of 3rd p. f. sg.: *-ha* (*Ḏullām*), *-ha* or *-hiy* (other bedouins) in the Negev. E.g. (poss. suff.) *ṛkaḅha / ṛkaḅhiy* "her knees", *kallamha / kallamhiy* "he spoke to her" (*-ha* among the *Bdūl*, *-ha* among the *Nʿēmāt*, and *-ha* among *Ḥwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*). (MAP 35, cf. 3.1.12.2.)

36) 2nd p. m. sg. pron. suff.: *C-ak* in the Negev. E.g. *bētak* ~ *bītak* "your house/tent" (MAP 36, cf. 3.1.12.2.)

37) 2nd p. f. sg. pron. suff.: invariable *-ki(y)* in the Negev (also *NWA*), E.g. *bētkiy* ~ *bītkiy* "your (f. sg.) house/tent", *ṛuḳbitkiy* "your (f. sg.) knee" (MAP 37, cf. 3.1.12.2.)

38) 1st p. c. sg. pron. suffixes: stressed *-ī́* (poss.) and *-nī́* (obj.) in the Negev (also *NWA*). E.g. *bētī́* ~ *bītī́* "my house/tent", *šāfnī́* "he saw me" (MAP 38, cf. 3.1.12.2.)

39) (B-S)[132] Emphatization of *ḍ* in demonstratives *hāḍ+* if not followed by *-i*: *hāḍa* ~ *hāḍa* in the Negev. (MAP 39, cf. 3.1.13.)

40) The f. sg. demonstrative: *hēḍiy* in the Negev. (MAP 40, cf. 3.1.13.)

41) (B-S)[133] Gender distinction in pl. demonstratives: not in *NWA*. Occurrence of several different pl. forms of the dem. pronoun: *hōḍaḷ(ḷah)* in the Negev (*haḍaḷḷa (haḍōla)* among the *Bdūl*, *haḍōla* among the *Ḥwēṭāt*, and *haḍalla* among the *Bani ʿAṭīye*)[134]. (MAP 41, cf. 3.1.13.)

42) (B-S)[135] Short vowel in *min*? "who?": also in the Negev. (MAP 42, cf. 3.1.14.)

43) (B-S)[136] Interrogative "where?": *wēn?* in the Negev. (MAP 43, cf. 3.1.14)

---

131 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 19.

132 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 20.

133 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 20. This criterion was not combined with criterion 30) because the outcome of applying this criterion for *DA* differs from the outcome for the other dialects in the area.

134 Cf. PALVA (1991), pp. 157-8, for the forms listed.

135 For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 43.

136 For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 44.

44) (B-S)[137] Interrogative "how?": *kēf* ~ *kīf* (~ *kayf*)? in the Negev. (MAP 44, cf. 3.1.14.)

45) (B-S)[138] Adverb "there": *hnuh* / *hnāk* in the Negev. (MAP 45, cf. 3.1.15.1.)

46) (B-S)[139] Adverb "here": *hniy* or *fi hāḍa* ~ *fi hāḍa* in the Negev. (MAP 46, cf. 3.1.15.1.)

47) (B-S)[140] Preposition *l*: usually not *ílu*, *ílha* etc.: *lah* ~ *lih* in the Negev. (MAP 47, cf. 3.1.16.)

48) Preposition "with" suffixed with 3rd. p. m. sg. suff.: *maʿáh* in the Negev. (MAP 48, cf. 3.1.16.)

49) Numeral "one" (f.): ? in the Negev, but *wiḥdih* in other dialects of group I, and in group II (MAP 49, cf. 3.1.17.)

50) Vowel harmony in the 3rd p. m. pl. ending of *a*-type perfects in the Negev. E.g. *kitábaw* "they wrote" (MAP 50, cf. 3.2.1.1.)

51) Vowel harmony in the 3rd p. f. pl. ending of *a*-type perfects in the Negev. E.g. *kitában* "they (f. pl.) wrote" (MAP 51, cf. 3.2.1.1.)

52) The *i*-type perfect: *širíb*, *šarbit*, *širibt* in the Negev: no morphological restructuring. (MAP 52, cf. 2.1.1.2.1.5., and 3.2.1.1.)

53) (B-S)[141] Vowel harmony in the prefix of the imperfect of verbal measure 1, i.e. *yašrab*, *yiktib*, *yugʿud* in the Negev. (also found among the *Bdūl* and *Nʿēmāt*, but not among the *Ḥwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*) (MAP 53, cf. 3.2.1.2.)

54) Vowel harmony in the 3rd p. m. pl. verbal ending of *a*-type imperfects in the Negev: absence of final *-n* in 2nd and 3rd p.

---

[137] PALVA (1991), p. 155, uses this criterion to distinguish North Arabian dialects from *NWA*. In this study *kēf* is contrasted with more sedentary *izzāy*. Therefore it is marked (B-S). Cf. also ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 44, where this interrogative is mentioned as generally characteristic for bedouin dialects.

[138] ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 50, lists quite a few adverbs for "there" typical of bedouin dialects, of which *hnūk* (sic) is given for the Negev. This should read *hnuh*, cf. BLANC (1970), p. 35 (146).

[139] ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 50, also lists quite a few adverbs for "here" typical of bedouin dialects, of which *hniy (yin)* (sic) is given for the Negev. This should read *hniy (yih)*, cf. BLANC (1970), p. 35 (146). Here forms such as *hína*, *íhna* (not listed by Rosenhouse) are considered sedentary, forms listed are considered bedouin.

[140] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 40. Rosenhouse adds that often the first *l* in *gultlu* is dropped in bedouin dialects. I have not used that as a criterion.

[141] For this criterion, cf. ibid., pp. 28-9.

m. pl., and 2nd p. f. sg. endings in the Negev (also *NWA*)[142]. E.g. *yášṛabaw* "they (m. pl.) drink", *tášṛaḅaw* "you drink", *tášṛaḅay* "you (f. sg.) drink" (MAP 54, cf. 3.2.1.2.)

MAP 54 in the appendix only reflects the 3rd p. m. pl. forms, but the 3rd p. m. pl. ending *-aw* for ❒ (i.e. *yášṛaḅaw* "they (m. pl.) drink") is here meant to imply the same ending for the 2nd p. m. pl. (i.e. *tášṛaḅaw* "you (m. pl.) drink"), and also the 2nd p. f. sg. ending *-ay* (i.e. *tášṛaḅay* "you (f. sg.) drink").

The 3rd p. m. pl. ending *-u(w)* (i.e. *yišṛaḅu(w)* "they (m. pl.) drink" for ▼, *yíkitbu(w)* "they (m. pl.) write" for ❒ and ▼) implies the same ending for the 2nd p. m. pl. (i.e. *tišṛaḅu(w)* "you (m. pl.) drink" for ▼, *tíkitbu(w)* "you (m. pl.) write" for ❒ and ▼), and the ending *-i(y)* for the 2nd p. f. sg. (i.e. *tišṛaḅi(y)* "you (f. sg.) drink" for ▼, *tíkitbi(y)* "you (f. sg.) write" for ❒ and ▼).

The 3rd p. m. pl. ending *-um* for ■ (i.e. *yášṛaḅum* "they (m. pl.) drink", *yíkitbum* "they (m. pl.) write") implies the same ending for the 2nd p. m. pl. (i.e. *tášṛaḅum* "you (m. pl.) drink", *tíkitbum* "you (m. pl.) write"), and the ending *-iy* for the 2nd p. f. sg. (i.e. *tášṛaḅiy* "you (f. sg.) drink", *tíkitbiy* "you (f. sg.) write").

The 3rd p. m. pl. ending *-ūn* for ❍ (i.e. *yašṛaḅūn* "they (m. pl.) drink", *yikitbūn* "they (m. pl.) write") implies the same ending for the 2nd p. m. pl. (i.e. *tašṛaḅūn* "you (m. pl.) drink", *tikitbūn* "you (m. pl.) write"), and the ending *-īn* for the 2nd p. f. sg. (i.e. *tašṛaḅīn* "you (f. sg.) drink", *tikitbīn* "they (f. sg.) write").

The endings of the *u*-type imperfect will be the same as those listed here for the *i*-type imperfect: i.e. *yúguʿdu(w)* (for ❒ and ▼) / *yúguʿdum* (for ■) "they (m. pl.) sit", *túguʿdu(w)* (for ❒ and ▼) / *túguʿdum* (for ■) "you (m. pl.) sit", *túguʿdi(y)* (for ❒, ▼, and ■) "you (f. sg.) sit".

For ❍ the forms of the *u*-type imperfect are: *yuguʿdūn* "they (m. pl..) sit", *tuguʿdūn* "you (m. pl.) sit", and *tuguʿdīn* "you (f. sg.) sit".

55) Vowel harmony in the 3rd p. f. pl. ending of *a*-, *i*- and *u*-type imperfects in the Negev. E.g. (*yašṛab* + *an* →) *yašṛaḅan* "they

[142] The absence of final *-n* in these endings is used in PALVA (1991), p. 155, to distinguish *NWA* from North Arabian (or *Nağdiy*) type dialects.

(f. pl.) drink", (*yiktib* + *in* →) *yíkitbin* "they (f. pl.) write", and also (*yugʿud* + *in* →) *yúguʿdin* "they (f. pl.) sit" (in the latter case vowel harmony lies in the fact that both *u* and *i* are high vowels) (MAP 55, cf. 3.2.1.2.)

56) Imperfect primae *wāw* measure 1: *yawṣal* ~ *yōṣal*, *yōzin* in the Negev.

(B-S)[143] Absence of morphologically patterned diphthong *iw*. E.g. not •*yiwzin* in the Negev (MAP 56, cf. 3.2.2.1.)

57) Perfect of primae *hamzah* verbs: with initial *a-* in the Negev (*akal* and *axaḏ*). (MAP 57, cf. 3.2.2.3.)

58) Imperfect vowel in primae *hamzah* verbs: *u* in the Negev (*yākul* and *yāxuḏ*). (MAP 58, cf. 3.2.2.3.)

59) Active part. primae *hamzah* verbs: ? in the Negev, but *mākil* in other dialects of group I, and in groups II and IV (MAP 59, cf. 3.2.2.3.)

60) 3rd. p. m. sg. perfect of the verb "come" without proclitic *(')i-* or *(')ī-* in the Negev: *ǧa(' #)*. (MAP 60, cf. 3.2.2.6.1.)

61) Imperfect of the verb "come" without lengthened prefix vowel: *ī-* in the Negev: *yǧiy*, *aǧíy*, etc. (MAP 61, cf. 3.2.2.6.1.)

62) Occurrence of */a/* in preformative of measures *n*-1, 1-*t*, and *(a)sta*-1 or *(i)sta*-1, stressed when in eligible position in the Negev (also *NWA*). E.g. *ánkital* "he was beaten/killed", *áštara* "he bought", *astafham* "he enquired", rather than *(i)nkátal*, *(i)štára*, *(i)stafham* (MAP 62, cf. 3.2.3.1.1., and 3.2.3.3.1.)

63) Measure *(a)sta*-1 or *(i)sta*-1 perfect and imperfect base vowels analogous to measure 2 in the Negev, i.e. *astafham*, *yistafhim*, rather than in analogy to measure *t*-2 (i.e. *(i)stafham*, *yistafham*). (MAP 63, cf. 3.2.3.4.1.)

64) Measure *ta*-2 or *(i)t*-2: *taCaCCaC* (~ much less *(i)tCaCCaC*), *yitCaCCaC* ~ *ytaCaCCaC* in the Negev. E.g. *takallam* ~ *tikallam* (much less *(i)tkallam*), *yitkallam* ~ *ytakallam* "speak" (MAP 64, cf. 3.2.3.5.4.)

65) (B-S)[144] Relatively frequent use of measure 4 verbs (also *NWA*). E.g. *aʿṭa*, *yiʿṭiy* "give", *aṭnab*, *yiṭnib* "come near" (MAP 65, cf. 3.2.3.7.)

---

[143] For this criterion, cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), pp. 11-2. Here the diphthong occurring in verbs is taken as an example, which links up to preceding criterion 53). Sedentary dialects can also have this diphthong in word-initial position in nouns, e.g. *iwlād* "children".

[144] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 30.

66) (B-S)[145] Typical bedouin verbs of the $C_1\bar{o}C_2aC_3$, $yC_1\bar{o}C_2iC_3$-type: current in the Negev. E.g. *sōlaf, ysōlif* "tell", *gōṭar, ygōṭir* "go" (MAP 66, cf. 3.2.3.9.)

67) (B-S)[146] The f. sg. act. part. + obj. suffix: in construct state in the Negev. E.g. *ʿāyiztah* "she wants him" (MAP 67, cf. remarks in 3.2.1.4.)

68) (B-S)[147] Negation *mā* .. in the Negev instead of compound *mā* . . . *š(i)*. E.g *mā širíb* "he did not drink" (MAP 68, cf. 4.2.)

69) (B-S)[148] The use of the *b*-imperfect: current in the Negev. E.g. *biktib* ~ *byiktib* "he writes" (also found among the *Bdūl* and *Nʿēmāt*, but not among the *Ḥwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*). (MAP 69, cf. 4.3.)

70) Future particle: less current in the Negev. (MAP 70, cf. 4.4.)

71) (B-S)[149] Use of *yōm(-in)* or *lōm(-in)* "when" in the Negev. (MAP 71, cf. 4.6.)

72) Marker of consequent action *gām*: current in the Negev. (MAP 72, cf. 4.7.1.)

73) (B-S)[150] Use of *widd* or *bidd*: *widd* is current in the Negev. (MAP 73, cf. 4.11.)

* Cf. remarks below in the Introduction, III. d.

The 73 criteria listed here enable us to classify the dialects under investigation. The isoglosses resulting from these criteria are represented in maps in the appendix, and are discussed below (cf. Conclusions, V. d.). For ease of reference the numbering of the maps will correspond with the numbering of the criteria listed above.

---

[145] For this criterion, cf. PALVA (1991), p. 155.

[146] This was added as a (B-S) criterion, since bedouin dialects "are considered more conservative than non-Bedouin dialects, in the field of syntax as in other linguistic fields", cf. ROSENHOUSE (1984), p. 46. In this case the construct state is a conservative, and thus a bedouin feature.

[147] For this criterion, cf. ibid., pp. 42-3.

[148] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 37

[149] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 44.

[150] For this criterion, cf. ibid., p. 39.

d. The gahawah-syndrome and resyllabication of CaCaCV sequences

There is a basic misunderstanding on the topics of the *gahawah*-syndrome (listed above as criterion 19)) and resyllabication of *CaCaCV* sequences (listed above as criterion 17)) in some of the literature dealing with Negev Arabic. Rosenhouse suggests that the first *a* in the word *gaháwah* ("coffee") is an anaptyctic[151], inserted to resolve the word-initial consonant cluster *gh* in the form *ghawah*, but fails to explain why the initial cluster is not resolved by an anaptyctic *preceding* the (here) *gh* cluster, which is usually the case in Negev Arabic (or *DA*), e.g. *# iʿnáb* "grapes", *# ihníy* "here", so that one would then expect *•# igháwah*, not *gaháwah*[152].

A distinction is made between the "*gahawa* syndrome" and the "*bṣala/zlima* pattern", but the fact that the former precedes the latter in terms of rule-ordering (i.e. 19) precedes 17)) is not clarified, and the incorrect conclusion is drawn that both *gaháwah* and *•gháwah* would be forms found in the Negev (represented as *g(a)háwa*).

To make the distinction is indeed necessary, but this distinction should focus on whether *CaCaCV* sequences are resyllabified to become *CCiCV* (i.e. *zlima*) or *CCaCV* (i.e. *bṣala*), or not. The fact that Blanc writes the *a* in the first syllable of the form *gahawah* should be interpreted to mean that such resyllabication does *not* take place in Negev Arabic, and nowhere, as far as I am aware, does Blanc suggest that it does. Furthermore, forms without *gahawah*-vowels such as *ṛagábatih*, *zalámatih*, and forms with *gahawah*-vowel insertion such as *saʿádih*, *taḥátih*[153] should be interpreted as evidence that such resyllabication is not a characteristic of the Negev dialect type.

---

[151] Cf. ibid., p. 13: "Bedouin dialects also tend to dissolve this initial cluster by an anaptyctic vowel (e.g. Blanc (1970) uses the term "gaháwa syndrome" not gháwa) [...]".

[152] Cf. BLANC (1970), p. 36 (147), for examples such as (anaptyctic vowels underlined) *widd ịwlādna guwwih* "our children want (need) strength", and *binmūt ịmnaḍḍama* "we'll die of thirst".

[153] Cf. ibid., pp. 21-2 (132-3).

Similarly, Palva[154] erroneously reports a free variation of the two patterns *-XaC-* (i.e. *ghawah*) and *-aXaC-* (i.e. *gahawah*) in the Negev[155]; the first or second *a* in the sequence *CaCaCv* may be stressed or unstressed (one option excluding the other), but neither is ever dropped (i.e. not •*ghawah* or •*gahwah*). The sequence is not resyllabified, and the free variation only lies in the stressing of the sequence: *gáhawah* or *gaháwah*[156], with a preference for the latter option.

The same related error concerning the situation in Negev Arabic which we find in ROSENHOUSE (1984) has slipped into the preceding paragraph[157]: the syllable structure *CICaCV* (e.g. **ʿinab + ih*) is put on a par with *CaCaCV* (e.g. **baṣaḷ + ah*) in that both syllabic patterns are claimed to be reduced to *CCəCV* (so the forms would be •*ʿnəbih* and •*bṣəḷah*). However, the fact that the *V* in *CaCaCV* is an absolute prerequisite for the resyllabication to *CCəCV* to take place (i.e. it is not •*bṣəḷ*, because the last syllable is not followed by *V*), as opposed to *V* in *CICaCV*, where *V* does not play that role, makes these two syllabic patterns incomparable; *CICaC* is resyllabified to become *CCaC*[158] (i.e. *ʿnab*, though not •*CCəC*) as well. Furthermore, in Negev Arabic the *a* in *CICaCV* is neither reduced nor raised; the Negev form is *ʿnábih* "his grapes". Nor is the second *a* reduced or raised in *CaCaCV*; Negev forms are *baṣáḷah* ~ *buṣáḷah* "an onion".

The incomparibility lies in the two different rules that account for the disappearance of the short vowels in these two different patterns. In *CaCaCV* → *CCICV* (e.g. *baṣaḷah* → *bṣálah*, and *zalamah* → *zlímah*) the resyllabication rule applies, but *not* in the Negev; in *CICaC(V)* → *CCaC(V)* (**ʿinab* (+ *ih*) → *ʿnab* (+ *ih*)) the high vowel elision rule applies, as it does in all bedouin dialects of northern Sinai studied so far, and also in the Negev.

---

154 Cf. PALVA (1984), p. 11 (367), fn 25 to criterion (f). PALVA (1991), p. 155, also suggests an automatic resyllabication of "CVCaCV- → CCVCV-" sequences resulting from the *gahawah*-syndrome.

155 Unless Palva's own observations include syllabic patterns of the *ghawah*-type, which I doubt.

156 Cf. BLANC (1970), p. 10 (121), for stress in *CaCaCv*, and pp. 14-6 (125-7), for the *gaháwah* syndrome.

157 Cf. PALVA (1984), pp. 10-11 (366-7), criterion (e).

158 Of course this latter rule, to which I shall refer as "the high vowel elision rule", entails resyllabication as well, as does the *gahawah*-syndrome. For the sake of clarity, however, these separate rules will be referred to in separate terms.

PALVA (1990) seems to be unaware of this criterion on the absence or presence of resyllabication of *CaCaCV* sequences, even though it is also the second of the two main criteria used by Prochazka[159] (his "pattern (b)") to distinguish his group (i) (Southern *Ḥiǧāz* and the *Tihāmah*) from his group (ii) (*Naǧdiy* and eastern Arabian dialects): the reflexes of the *CA* pattern $*C_1aC_2aC_3at/h$ (e.g. *katabat* "she wrote", *baṣalah* "an onion") which yields $C_1aC_2aC_3at/n/h$ (i.e. *katabat*, *baṣalah*) or $C_1aC_2C_3at/n/h$ (i.e. *katbat*, *baṣlah*) in his group (i), and $C_1C_2i/aC_3at/h$ (i.e. *ktibat*, *bṣalah*)) or $C_1iC_2C_3at/h$ (i.e. *kitbat*, *biṣlah* or *buṣlah*) in his group (ii)[160].

Using the added (and typologically very distinctive) criterion of absence or presence of a resyllabication rule for *CaCaCV* sequences to typologically position dialects has the following implication: it has become doubtful whether the dialect of the *Ḥwēṭāt* (and probably also that of the *Bani ʿAṭīye*) should be considered part of the North West Arabian dialect group (where *CaCaCV* is not resyllabified) proposed by Palva[161] (cf. Conclusions, VIII. Observations on the dialects of the *Ḥwēṭāt* and *Bani ʿAṭīye*).

e. Method of description

The methods and terminology used in this study are not uncommon in Arabic dialect studies[162]. The term "root" refers to the (usually) three "radicals" which represent a basic semantic unit,

---

159 Cf. PROCHAZKA (1988), pp. 10-11.

160 Cf. also ibid. p. 22, and INGHAM (1986), p. 276, where the same criterion is applied to identify a *Naǧdiy* dialect. The patterns $C_1C_2i/aC_3at/h$ or $C_1iC_2C_3at/h$ are what ROSENHOUSE (1984) refers to as bṣala/zlima (< **baṣala(h)* "onion" and **zalama(h)* "man").

161 Cf. PALVA (1991). Criteria listed above marked "(also *NWA*)", or with bracketed remarks on the dialects of the *Bdūl*, *Nʿēmāt*, *Ḥwēṭāt* and/or *Bani ʿAṭīye* were taken from this source as well. Since the very purpose of this study is to establish typological similarities of, and differences between bedouin dialects in Sinai, Palva's remarks on "Sinai" were not copied. Notice here that some of these features are actually characteristic of sedentary dialects. The most prominent sedentary characteristic of the Negev (bedouin) dialect is undoubtedly nr 69) (cf. also remarks in PALVA (1991), pp. 158-160 and 166).

162 In principle, the method of notation as outlined in BLANC (1964), pp. 57-9 is followed.

while "pattern" refers to the morphological mould on which these consonantal phonemes (the "radicals") are shaped to create a morphophonemic base or underlying structure. The radicals are then numbered, e.g.: *katab* "he wrote" has the root *k-t-b*, where radicals $k = C_1$, $t = C_2$, and $b = C_3$, coined on the pattern $C_1aC_2aC_3$[163], which is the basic pattern for the *a*-type verbal perfect. The basic pattern for the *i*-type verbal imperfect is $yiC_1C_2iC_3$, which in this case yields *yiktib* "he writes", while a basic pattern $yuC_1C_2uC_3$ for the *u*-type verbal imperfect used for, for example, the root *g-ʿ-d* yields *yugʿud* "he sits (down)". The basic semantic units expressed in the root *k-t-b* is then "write", and in *g-ʿ-d* "sit".

In order to do justice to some phonetic aspects of the dialects, a moderately allophonic transcription in italic script is used. This system of transcription reflects, without going into too much phonetic detail[164], allophones, morphophonemic anaptyctic vowels, sandhi anaptyctics, as well as other phonotactically inserted vowels, such as those produced by the *gahawah*-syndrome and the *bukaṛa*-syndrome. Morphophonemic and sandhi elisions of short vowels are also reflected, as are consonant assimilations. For the purpose of a sound morphological representation the morphophonemic base will serve as a starting point in the description of the dialects.

To avoid "over-phonologizing", I have refrained from standardizing velarized and non-velarized reflexes of **r* as *r*; the fact that in this study *r* and *ṛ* are not isolated in minimal pairs is not to imply that such an opposition is unlikely, or even impossible (cf. remarks in fn 26 to I, 1.1.8.).

The conjunction *w* "and", and all prepositions, including *b* "with" and *l* "to", have been written as separate words. The purpose is to facilitate comparison. For instance, in group III one

[163] Root consonantal phonemes will regularly appear (from left to right) in the patterns in correspondence to their numbering, although in some cases metathesis may have changed a presumed original order, as in (causative measure 4) *aʿṭam, yiʿṭim* "feed (animals)", where the presumably original order *ṭ-ʿ-m* has become *ʿ-ṭ-m*, i.e. C_1 and C_2 have changed places. The metathesis may be the result here of a mix-up with the verb *aʿṭan* "to make (a camel) lie down after having watered it", cf. LANE (1873), p. 2083-4, or *aʿṭa, yiʿṭiy* "give".

[164] The choice of what constitutes too much phonetic detail is an arbitrary one, of course. In terms of methodological principle however, the system of transcription is comparable to systems of transcription generally used in Arabic dialect research.

may hear *la lbint* "to the girl", where in group I this will be represented as *l albint*. The point is that the independent preposition in group III is *la* "to", and the article is *il-* "the" and in group I the preposition is *l* "to", and the article is *al-* "the". The net effect is that "to the girl" will sound exactly the same in both dialect types. The independent forms of this preposition can be deduced from the examples *la bint* "to a girl" in group III, and *il bint* in group I (where the *i* preceding the *l* is an anaptyctic). In the case of the conjunction *w* "and", a preceding anaptyctic (when *w* is followed in sandhi by *C*) will yield *iw*, which will often be shortened to *u*, e.g. *iw ğimál* (*u ğimál*) "and a camel". When *w* is followed by *V* in sandhi, *w* will be syllable-initial in terms of sandhi syllabication, e.g. *w álğimal* (*w ál-ği-mal*) "and the camel". For the sake of transparency, such shortening to *u* when the anaptyctic precedes *w* has not been indicated in the transcription.

Hyphens are used between words where these words form one stress unit, as in *mín-taḥat* "below (lit. from down)", or where a vowel (other than that of the article) from the base form has been dropped. Thus, in group III it will be *l-aḇūy* "to my father", while in group I it will be *l aḇūy*. Similarly, the representation for "in (the) winter" will be *f-áššti y* in group I, but *fi líšta* in group III. Hyphens are also used to link the proclitic *t* (a remnant of the feminine suffix in construct state) to counted nouns, as in *arbaʿ t-ušhur* "four months", but they are not used between the article and the noun.

Phonetic transcriptions are given in I.P.A. script, and appear between brackets [and]. The term "underlying" used in this study with reference to vowels is meant to indicate that such vowels are part of the morphophonemic base, or the underlying structure. Phonemic surface forms are arrived at by applying rules described in the relevant sections; underlying vowels are given between perpendicular slashes (| and |). It should be noted that such underlying vowels need not have an identical phonemic surface allophone. For instance, *i* of the first syllable in the base *širib* "he drank" is concluded to be underlying |a| in group I. In the dialects of the *Aḥaywāt* and that of the *Ḏullām* this *a* indeed "reappears" in closed syllables, and thus has an identical surface allophone: *šarbit* "she drank". In the dialects of the *Rmēlāt* and *Sawārkah* of the same group |a| does not appear as *a* in such positions, for in these

dialects we have *širbit* "she drank". We do have to assume, however, that this vowel is underlying |*a*| in the base form |*šarib*| for "he drank", since it is not dropped in *širíbt* "I drank". If it were an underlying high vowel, it would have to be dropped to conform to another rule which specifies that underlying high vowels are dropped in pre-stress open syllables, e.g. *ʿnab* (< **ʿinab* stressed **ʿináb*) "grapes" in group I, and also *šribt* "I drank" in *BA* of group III (where we would have to conclude an underlying |*širib*| for "he drank"). We shall also see that such underlying vowels reflect historical development.

As is the case with the morphophonemic shapes coined on the base of |*šarib*| for "he drank", conclusions regarding older forms (preceded by an asterix *) are often drawn. Such older forms may be (almost) identical with forms in Classical Arabic (henceforth *CA*). In this case the historical implication is that there is an ancestral base form **šarib* "he drank", based on an earlier conclusion that *RA* and *SA* of the group I dialect type are "différentiels"[165], i.e. short high vowels *i* and *u* are dropped under certain definable conditions, while the low short vowel *a* is not dropped under these same conditions. Since an earlier conclusion for *BA*, based on comparable examples, is that it is "différentiel" in terms of short vowel elision as well, the conclusion of an underlying |*i*| in the first syllable of *širib* "he drank" logically follows: in *BA* the basic pattern for the *i*- type perfect of regular verbs has been morphologically restructured as underlying $|C_1iC_2iC_3|$, whereas in group I the underlying pattern is $|C_1aC_2iC_3|$. In *AA* and *ḌA* of group I the underlying *a* of the first syllable "reappears" in closed syllables (e.g. *šarbit*), but in *RA* and *SA* of this group it does not (e.g. *širbit*). One could therefore conclude that the type of morphological restructuring that we see in *BA* has only been partially executed in *RA* and *SA*: the *a* of the underlying pattern will be *i* in closed and open syllables, but under no circumstances is it dropped.

The conclusion, however, should go no further than this: in the case of group I the underlying form is almost identical with the *CA* form; it should not be interpreted as a development *from CA*. Where *CA* forms are mentioned, this is done in a framework of reference commonly used in Arabic dialect studies.

---

[165] Cf. CANTINEAU (1936), p. 49.

In some cases forms not actually recorded are given for the purpose of illustration. Such forms are preceded by a bold dot •, which signifies that they were not recorded and are deemed unlikely to occur. This will be expounded in the passage the form (marked with •) is meant to illustrate. Forms marked with * were not recorded where in all likelihood they might have occurred; an optional development described in the relevant passage did not take place, but based on comparable examples one may conclude that it could have. Where the form (marked with *) illustrates that an optional rule was not applied, separate mention will be made of this.

Synchronic developments are indicated by an arrow → 'develops into'. Historical developments are indicated by > 'developed into'. Both historical and synchronic developments may be indicated by < 'developed from' or 'develops from'. In representations of rules 'Ø' stands for 'zero', / (forward slash) stands for 'occurring in the sequence', and __ indicates the position in the sequence to which the alteration described preceding the forward slash applies. Three full stops (...) means 'any (combination of) vowel(s) and/or consonant(s)'.

The verbal measures will be referred to in this study as: measure 1 (*CA* I), measure *n*-1 (*CA* VII), measure *t*-1 (no *CA* equivalent), measure 1-*t* (*CA* VIII), measure *asta*-1 or *(i)sta*-1 (*CA* X), measure 2 (*CA* II), measure *t*-2 (*CA* V), measure 3 (*CA* III), measure *t*-3 (*CA* VI) and measure 9 (*CA* IX).

IV. ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

B-form	Bedouinized form
c.	communis
cf.	confer
coll.	collective noun
constr.	construction
dem.	demonstrative
f.	feminine
gen.	genitive
ibid.	ibidem
imper.	imperative

imperf.	imperfect
intrans.	intransitive
I.P.A.	International Phonetic Alphabet
K-form	Koine form
lit.	(translated) literally
m.	masculine
nom.	nominal
n.u.	nomen unitatis
obj.	object
p.	person
perf.	perfect
pl.	plural
poss.	possessive
pron.	pronominal
rel.	relative
sg.	singular
subj.	subject
suff.	suffix
trans.	transitive

A	stressed *a* or *ā*
I	short high vowel *i* or *u*
Ī	long high vowel *ī* or *ū*
ʹI	stressed high long or high short vowel
T	feminine suffix (*tāʾ marbūṭah*)
v	any short vowel
V	any short or long vowel
v̄	any long vowel
C	any consonant
$^{C}/_{V}$	any consonant or vowel except historical *a*
X	any back fricative (*x*, *ġ*, *ḥ*, *ʿ*, *h*)
Ṃ	any velarized consonant (primary or secondary emphatics)
[]	phonetic representation
//	phonemic representation
‖	representation of underlying base form
*	precedes a historical form or phoneme, or follows a form with a remark given below
•	precedes a form not heard in the dialect under discussion and the form is deemed unlikely to occur in that dialect

*	precedes a form not heard in the dialect under discussion, but such a form is deemed likely to occur in that dialect
+	followed by ...
ø	zero
→	develops into (synchronic development)
>	developed into (historical development)
<	developed from (historically), or develops from (synchronically)
≠	does not equal
=	equals
≈	is almost identical with
...	any combination of *V*s and/or *C*s within word boundaries
~	co-occurs with
/	co-occurs not in free variation with
#	speech pause

ʿAA	*ʿAṛāyšiy* Arabic, the dialect of the town of *alʿArīš*
ʿAyA	*ʿAyyādiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *ʿAyāydah*
ʿAgA	*ʿGēliy* Arabic, the dialect of the *ʿAgāylah*
AA	*Aḥaywiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Aḥaywāt*
AxA	*Axrasiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Axārsah*
BA	*Biyyāḍiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Biyyāḍiyyah*
BaA	*Balawiy* Arabic, the dialect of *Biliy*
CA	Classical Arabic
CaA	Cairene Arabic, the dialect of the Egyptian capital Cairo
DA	*Dwēġriy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Dawāġrah*
ḌA	The dialect of the *Ḍullām*, spoken in the Negev
eŠA	Eastern *Šarqāwiy* Arabic, spoken in the eastern *Šarqiyyah*
ǴA	*Ǧbāliy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Ǧbāliyyah*
ĠA	*Ġazzāwiy* Arabic, the dialect of *Ġazzah* (the town Gaza)
MA	*Masʿūdiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Masāʿīd*
MSA	Modern Standard Arabic
NWA	Northwestern Arabian Arabic
RA	*Rmēliy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Rmēlāt*
SA	*Swērkiy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Sawārkah*
SaA	*Smēʿniy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Samāʿnah*
TA	*Tuṛbāniy* Arabic, the dialect of the *Taṛābīn*