ON PARTICIPLE CONSTRUCTIONS

WITH AN *n*-ELEMENT

IN SOME ARABIC DIALECTS

BY
KERSTIN EKSELL

KERSTIN EKSELL (Göteborg and Copenhagen)

ON PARTICIPLE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN *n*-ELEMENT IN SOME ARABIC DIALECTS

In certain dialects of the Arabian Peninsula and in Uzbekistan, there exists a particular type of participle construction: the participle is connected with a pronominal suffix with the help of an *n*-element, for example *kātbinno*, instead of the ordinary way of connecting either directly or with the help of a preposition.

This phenomenon has proved difficult to explain. First, it is difficult to derive the function of the *n*-element from the material, since the *n*-participles often seem to be in free variation with the ordinary participles. Secondly, the etymological background is complicated because Arabic — as well as other Semitic languages — contains different *n*-elements, the function and etymology of which are often obscure. Thirdly, there is no automatic close link between those dialects using the participles, nor is there any apparent reason why they should occur precisely in those dialects to the exclusion of others.

In the beginning of this century, the *n*-participles received some attention, and several theories were put forward concerning the etymology of the *n*-element. No solution, however, was generally accepted. It is the aim of this paper to discuss different approaches to the problem and to suggest a plausible solution (partly in the light of more recent material).

L i t e r a t u r e [1]

The *n*-participles have so far been attested for Oman, Datīna, Ḥaḍramawt, Yemen, the Syrian desert, the Gulf, and Uzbekistan.

In Oman, the participles are realized in the following way[2]:

MSg	*ḍārbínno*	FSg	*ḍārbít-no*
	ḍārbinnhé		*ḍārbit-nhé*
	ḍārbínnek, -iš		*ḍārbit-nek, -niš*
	ḍārbínní		*ḍārbit-ni*

	ḍā̆rbínnhum, -hin		*ḍā̆rbít-nhum, -nhin*
	ḍā̆rbínnkum, -ken		*ḍā̆rbít-nkum, -nken*
	ḍā̆rbínne		*ḍā̆rbít-ne*
MP1	*ḍā̆rbīn-n-o, (nhé)*	FP1	*ḍā̆rbāt-ínno*
	ḍā̆rbīn-nek, -niš		*ḍā̆rbātínnek, -inniš*
	ḍā̆rbīn-ni		*ḍā̆rbātínni*
	ḍā̆rbīn-nhum, -nhin[3]		
	ḍā̆rbīn-kum, -ken		
	ḍā̆rbīn-ne		

This is the ordinary way of annexing a suffix to a participle in Oman. On the function of the participle — without suffixes — and the *n*-participle, Reinhardt says[4]: "Perfectivische Bedeutung hat das Particip Praes. meist in Verbindung mit den sich anschliessenden Suffixen. Für das zwar richtige aber weniger gebrauchte *min kétbo* (wer hat es geschrieben?) sagt der ᶜOmān-Araber, namentlich da, wo es sich um eine nicht soeben geschehene Tatsache handelt, meistens *min kātbínno*".

Verbal adjectives of the type faᶜlān + obj.suff. are constructed in the same way, e.g. *rohbān-innek* (⟨he⟩ has feared/is fearing you)[5].

There are also forms like *kātbúbbo* and *kātbíllo*, in which the prepositions /b/ and /l/ have been doubled, and which may be compared with the *n*-participles. Examples: MSg *kātbúbbo, kātbúbbhe,* ᶜ*ölmānibbo*; MP1 *ḍā̆rbíbbo*; FP1 *ḍā̆rbātübbo*[6]. B u t : FSg ᶜ*ölmānít-bo, sādqít-li*[7].

It is possible that this type of construction contains an *n*-element where the /n/ has been assimilated to the following /b/ or /l/.

For Datī̆na, Landberg gives the following scheme of realization[8]:

MSg	*kā̆tibínneh*	FSg	*kā̆tibetínneh* (rare; the MSg is preferred)
	musāḥibínneha, rāḥimínnha		
	meḥālifínnak		
	lābiǧínni		
	rābiṭ ínnehom		
	meḥarriǧínnehin		
MP1	*qābilī̆nínnah*	FP1	*sā̆riqāt ínnak*
	ᶜ*ā̆wizī̆nínneš*		
	meqādi(y)ī̆nínni		
	ḥāmilī̆nínnehom		
	meḥālifī̆nínna		

The n-participles are used together with forms without an n-element. According to Landberg[9], the n-participle may acquire a past, present or future sense like the ordinary participle but seems to occur most frequently with a f u t u r e sense. To express the past, the perfect is preferred to the n-participle.

For other parts of South Arabia, Landberg says[10] that the n-participles occur generally in Western Ḥaḍramawt and in the Yemen but very sporadically among the bedouins of Ḥaḍramawt. Diem gives one example of the n-participle in a text from Yarīm in the south of Yemen:

> *kāfiyinnuk* (ich gab dir reichlich)[11]

For the Syrian desert, Wetzstein has found n-participles with the Weld ^{C}Alī bedouins (belonging to the ^{C}Anaza group)[12]:

MSg فَاعِلتُّه   FSg فَاعِلتَّه

The following two text examples are given[13]:

هُوَ بْوَارْدِي وُثُرَات الْبوَارْدى شَايَفَنَّه مِن   (Es war ein Schütze; derselbe hatte
بَعيد وُداغْلَتَّه يُريد يْقَوِّسُه   ihn nämlich von Weitem gesehen und
                                                sich herangeschluchen in der Absicht
                                                ihn zu schiessen.)

وشرات البنت شربتَّه   (und es fand sich, dass ihn das Mäd-
                                                chen getrunken hatte.)

Wetzstein gives no information on the spread and frequency of these forms. As to their function, he explains[14] that *māčilītuh* means "sie isst es s o e b e n" while *māčiltennuh* means "sie hatte es gegessen". Thus, there would be a clear semantic opposition between n-participle, which is translated with a German pluperfect and the ordinary participle, which is translated with a progressive present.

For the n-participle in the Gulf dialects, Qafisheh[15] gives the following forms (of "having known"):

MSg		FSg	
^{C}*ārfínna*		^{C}*āriftínna*	
^{C}*ārfínha*		^{C}*āriftínha*	
^{C}*ārfínnak, -ič*		^{C}*āriftínnak, -ič*	
^{C}*ārfínni*		^{C}*āriftínni*	
^{C}*ārfínhum, -hin*		^{C}*āriftínhum, -hin*	
^{C}*ārfínku(m), -kin*		^{C}*āriftínku(m), -kin*	
^{C}*ārfínna*		^{C}*āriftínna*	

There is no information on plural forms.

Prochazka[16] gives further examples from the Shī‘ī dialect of Bahrain, e.g.:
MSg *ḥāfḍinnih* (having kept it); *kātbinhe* (having written it); FSg *kātbitinhe*
(having written it); *yāyitinniš* (coming to you), together with the interesting
information that in this dialect, the *n*-participles occur only in the singular
and are found "unacceptable" in the dialect of Muharraq town.

For Uzbekistan, there is a corresponding paradigm for the participle in the
singular (the verb = CA *ḍaraba*)[17]:

MSg	*zorbinnu*		FSg	*zorbitinnu*
	zorbinnā, (zorbā)			
	(zorbak)			*(zorbitak)*
	(zōribkī)			*(zorbitkī)*
	zorbinnī			*zorbitinnī*
	(zōrib⟨h⟩um), zorbinnum			
	zorbinnin, zorbinin			
	(zōribkum)			
	(zōribkin)			
	(zōribnā)			

Apparently, there is an *n*-element only together with suffixes in the 1st and
3rd persons singular.

This is the ordinary way of connecting the participle with an object suffix.[18]
The participle is usually perfective.[19]

T h e o r i e s

Landberg[20] relates the *n*-element back to a basic *n*-element occurring in the
Semitic languages and represented for example in Hebrew *hinnē* and Classical
Arabic *'in(na)*. According to Landberg, such a "phonème demonstratif" /na/,
/an/ → /inn/ has been productive before suffixes in several types of word
constructions in modern Arabic dialects. Even if this /inn/ does not exist in
Classical Arabic, it may well have been preserved in the dialects. Landberg
has found it used with suffixes in two types of words: a number of interrog-
ative pronouns, most of them with a first component /š/ (corresponding to
Classical Arabic *'ayyu šay'in*), and a type of adverbs ending in *-in* which
produce new adverbial forms with the help of suffixes. Examples of interrog-
ative pronouns with š: Iraq *šinhu, šinhi*, Tanger *šinnu*, Beirut *āšinhūa*, Mosul
āšnak (for further examples, see Singer[21]); without š: Damascus *'anu, 'ani*[22],
Egypt *āna, ānahu*, Tunisia *kīfen-hūa* or *kīfénnhu*. Examples of adverbs with suf-
fixes: *ḥīn inni, yōm inna, waqt innu*. (The adverbs should be compared with ex-
pressions such as *in(n) kān, kēf in(n) kān, ēš in(n) kān* etc.)

Exactly which function this n-element should have — or have had — is un-
clear, as well as which principles the preservation and development of the
n-element should have followed. Landberg himself admits that it is difficult
to explain why it should have been preserved in those particular participle
constructions occurring in single dialects. It should be added that Landberg
does not rule out a certain contamination between the original *inn* and the
tanwīn, since the function of the *tanwīn* may sometimes appear obscure.

Landberg's theory is thus rather vague. The specific examples mentioned, how-
ever, have received other explanations. The interrogative *š*-pronouns are eas-
ier understood as developments from Old Arabic *'ayyu šayyin* + pronominal suf-
fix (cf., e.g. *šinhi*, *āšinhūa*, while *āšnak* may be a secondary development).[23]
The forms without *š* (interrogative pronouns and adverbs) are usually consider-
ed either as derived from Old Arabic *'an* or as a contamination between *'an* and
tanwīn.[24] According to Nöldeke[25], the n-element in these adverbs may be a der-
ivation of a demonstrative suffix common to several Semitic languages but ab-
sent in Classical Arabic. It is obvious from the context that Nöldeke's view
is a tentative suggestion rather than a developed theory.

Barth — writing before the discovery of Ugaritic — suggests a theory some-
what similar to Landberg's but more concrete. According to Barth[26], there ex-
ists in Northwest Semitic an n-element *-en*, *-in* between a verbal form and its
pronominal suffix, the function of which is to give the suffix verbal rection.
His starting points are those Hebrew suffix forms which have been considered
an archaic energicus, *-ænnī*, *-ækkā* etc. In Hebrew, there are also single
examples of such n-forms in other verbal forms than the imperfect, and often
-n + suffix after certain particles with verbal force. A corresponding n-ele-
ment occurs furthermore in both Western and Eastern Aramaic, usually with
plural suffixes and after the imperfect, perfect, infinitive, and, rarely,
after the imperative and the participle.

Since a true energicus exists in Ugaritic, Barth's theory can no longer be
applied without modification. Still, even if this n-element came to function
only secondarily as a *nota accusativi*, as such it would have filled a gap in
a Semitic suffix system which otherwise lacks particular object suffixes (ex-
cept for the 1st person singular *-ni*).

The participle constructions in the Arabic dialects should then be explained
in the same way. However, it is still difficult to understand how this n-ele-
ment has found its way precisely into these dialects and only with partici-
ples.

Both Barth and Landberg refer the n-element to the suffix. More commonly, it is related to the participle, in which case it is considered as a residue of *tanwīn*. Such is the view of Wetzstein, Socin, Brockelmann and, more recently, of Fischer and Blau.[27] It is well known that residues of *tanwīn* do exist in modern Arabic dialects, generally in lexicalized adverbs, but in North Arabia, in the Gulf and in Uzbekistan (but not in Oman and South Arabia), a *tanwīn* ending *-in* occurs as a productive though optional morpheme with indefinite nouns, including participles, in certain syntactic positions.

That the n-element in the participle construction should be a residue of *tanwīn* is in a way a very natural supposition, since *tanwīn* is the only n-element of relevance that is known to exist within such close range, viz. within several of the actual dialects, and thus easier to accept than any ancient Semitic element, the link of which with modern dialects is obscure. Even so, it remains to be explained how the *tanwīn* has come to be used in this particular way. Brockelmann among others[28] suggests that the n-participles may be an analogy construction after forms such as the Omani *kātbúbbo*, *kātbíllo* etc. Against this, it may be argued that those forms do not necessarily contain any assimilated *-n*, compare forms like *qultullo*, *tekkeltnebbo*.[29] On the other hand, assimilated forms (participle + *tanwīn* + preposition + suffix) do occur, e.g., in North Arabia: *meḥārbello*, *ṣadīǧilluh*.[30] Fischer proposes[31] *ḏārbinno* < *ḏārib-ən-lu*, but this would mean progressive assimilation, which is rare, and, furthermore, *kātbíllo* etc. would then be incomprehensible.

It should be noted that those who advocate the *tanwīn* theory do so on grounds of formal etymology; there is no opinion as to the function of the n-element in the modern constructions.

Landberg, who is a strong adversary of the *tanwīn* theory, argues that the Arabs would never destruct their own linguistic system to the extent of preserving *tanwīn* directly before a suffix.[32]

Finally, there is the solution proposed by Nöldeke[33], according to which the *kātbinno* forms have developed in analogy with the participle + suffix in the 1st person singular.

The analogy theory is made more plausible by the existence of a suffix *-nu* in the 3rd person singular. Among Jews and Christians of Baghdad and in Mosul, *-nu* is used as a combinatory allomorph of the object suffix /u/ after a vowel, e.g.: *'abūnu*, *bīnu*, *qatalūnu*.[34] In Uzbekistan, the use of *-nu* is more restricted: the ordinary form of the object suffix after a vowel is *-h*, and *-nu*

is used only after the plural ending $-\bar{u}$ and the feminine ending $-\bar{\imath}$, e.g. *ḥa-farūnu*, *ṭul'īnu*. Furthermore, in the same way, the feminine plural suffix is *-nin* (*ḥafarūnin*), instead of the ordinary *-hin*.[35] For Oman, Nöldeke has found the example *ilāno* from Reinhardt's texts.[36]

Whatever the origin of *-nu* — which has been explained in several ways[37] —, it is a fact that it does occur both in Uzbekistan and Oman and may have facilitated analogy formations.

There is a certain attractive simplicity about the theory of analogy, and it should not be totally disregarded. It may have been particularly important for Uzbekistan, since the *n*-element there occurs only with suffixes in the 1st and 3rd person singular. For the *n*-participles in general, however, it remains to be explained why the force of analogy has been at work precisely here and not in other verbal forms.

D i s c u s s i o n

It seems that the problem has so far been approached from two opposite angles. Barth and Landberg are mainly concerned with the f u n c t i o n of the *n*-element. The strength of Barth's theory is that he provides a functional explanation of the *n*-element, that of giving the participle verbal rection, but neither Barth nor Landberg can explain why the *n*-element should have developed in these particular dialects and with participles only. The *tanwīn* and analogy theories, on the other hand, disregard the question of function and concentrate on explaining the formal etymology of the *n*-element. There is something basically sound both in Barth's theory and in the *tanwīn* theory. Any explanation, however, should take into account both the formal and the functional etymology.

According to Landberg, the *n*-participles could not contain *tanwīn*, because the use of *tanwīn* in this way would be incompatible with the *tanwīn* system. However, since Landberg's time it has become apparent that the use of *tanwīn* in the dialects has undergone deepgoing changes and can no longer be judged by the rules of Classical Arabic. Landberg's argument was a formal one: the *tanwīn* would not be preserved before a suffix. But in modern dialects, the use of *tanwīn* has become generalized to include also dual and plural masculine forms. Examples:

gā̱dbīnin	(holding)[38]
mimriḥīnin 'arḏ̱	(dwelling in the land of)[39]

Consequently, the morphological structure of the *tanwīn* such as it appeared

in Classical Arabic does not exist in the modern dialects. It cannot — with any degree of certainty — be used as an argument against the appearance of *tanwīn* before suffixes.

Implied in Landberg's discussion is another argument, which to me seems to touch the very kernel of the problem: the *tanwīn* would not have been preserved precisely with a participle in possession of a strong verbal force.

It is a basic characteristic of the participle that it belongs both to the nominal and the verbal system, as reflected by its being nominally inflected and at the same time able to take a direct object like any verbal form. Now, as Landberg points out, the *n*-participles are clearly verbal. Why, then, should the indetermination morpheme indicating the nominal character of the participle have been preserved before a pronominal suffix when, in addition, the verbal force of the participle is ordinarily sufficient to annex a suffix directly?

To understand this, it is necessary to survey the role of *tanwīn* in the modern dialects. The point of departure may have been the preservation of the *tanwīn* in the middle of a breath-group[40], but its use can now be analyzed according to the syntactic position of the nunated noun. Briefly, it appears with a noun or a nominal predicate followed by a prepositional phrase or a clause, with a noun followed by an attribute and with a participle followed by an object.[41] The status of the *tanwīn* as an indetermination morpheme is considerably weakened. Instead, it has acquired a new function: it serves as a means of defining a syntactic position.

In the particular case of a participle governing an object, there are a few points to be made. First, the participle often occupies the position of a nominal predicate in a clause. Already in Classical Arabic, *tanwīn* with a nominal predicate serves to indicate the predicative position. After the breaking down of the *tanwīn* as an indetermination system, the *tanwīn* ending will still have been preserved with a predicate, consolidating this secondary syntactic function. As a predicate, the participle occupies a semi-verbal position. Paradoxically, the *tanwīn* ending has thus come to accentuate the verbal (and not the nominal) force of the participle. Secondly, the mere fact that the participle is governing an object does of course strengthen its verbal force. It is also safe to say that the *tanwīn* ending in this case — whether the participle is a predicate or not — marks the relation between the participle and its object, and from there it is only one step to assume

that it has come to be regarded as a mark of the verbal force of the participle.

The diachronic process may be described as follows: At some stage after the Old Arabic linguistic system as represented by Classical Arabic, the *tanwīn* as a system for indetermination breaks down. The *tanwīn* ending becomes optional and acquires new functions according to the syntactic environment. With a participle governing an object, it tends to serve as a mark of the verbal force already inherent in the participle and strengthened by its being in a predicative position and/or governing an object. Since the formal system of the *tanwīn* has broken down as well, there is no evidence of any objection to a pronoun suffix being added directly to the nunated participle. Thus, no formal obstacle can be found against regarding the n-element as a generalized residue of *tanwīn*; on the contrary, there is a strong logical assumption that it is precisely that.

According to the definition above, that the *tanwīn* ending marks the relation between the participle and its object, the n-element may also be described as a means of defining the term following the participle as an object. There is an obvious connection here with Barth's theory, since the n-element no doubt comes close to being a *nota accusativi*. An urge to compensate for the lack of object suffixes in Arabic may well have been a promoting factor in the development of the n-participles, at some time after the emergence of the post-classical *tanwīn* functions. The need for a *nota accusativi* may have been more strongly felt after participles than after other verbal forms, since the ordinary suffix pronoun after a (nominal) participle may also, at least theoretically, be interpreted as a possessive suffix. That the development of the n-element in the Arabic participles is partially parallel to that of other Semitic languages is a vague confirmation of the present theory; still, the resemblance is purely functional, while the etymological backgrounds are different.

It should be emphasized that only if the n-element is formally a residue of *tanwīn* is it possible to understand why it occurs with participles (and verbal adjectives) to the exclusion of other verbal forms, and also the geographical distribution of the n-participles seems logical. A prerequisite for the *tanwīn* theory is of course that the *tanwīn* has been productive at a stage after that reflected by Classical Arabic, which is the case in North Arabia, the Gulf and Uzbekistan but not in Arabic dialects in general. It is true that such a stage is not known to have existed in South Arabia and Oman, although

it may well have, but even with this reservation, the *tanwīn* theory is to be
preferred to the other theories which would imply a random development.

A few more words may be added with regard to the present function of the *n*-
participles and their position in the verbal system. It seems clear that they
have a perfective/resultative function. Reinhardt calls them "perfektivisch"
and Wetzstein demonstrates the completedness of the resultative function by
translating his example *māćiltennuh* with a German pluperfect and contrasting
it with a progressive present. Diem's example *kāfiyinnuk* is better translated
as "ich habe dir reichlich gegeben". Landberg says that the *n*-participle in
the southwestern Peninsular Arabic usually has a futural sense, but this is
no contradiction since the completed action of the participle may take place
in any time. Furthermore, most of his own examples are translated with a
French perfect, e.g.: *maᶜallaqínneha* (je l'ai suspendu), *rābit ínnehom* (il
leur a defendu). Several examples are translated with a French present; this
is unfortunate, since the resultative function excludes any notion of a du-
rative action. Some of them, however, may still be interpreted as resultatives,
e.g.: *hū' meḥālifínnak* (il est ton allié) = he has become your ally and still
is; *laḥna qābilíninnah* (nous l'acceptons) = we have accepted it and still do.[42]

According to my parallel investigation of the function of the participle in
Peninsular dialects[43], participles of verbs of action have a perfective/re-
sultative function. According to Fischer, the participle in Uzbekistan is usu-
ally perfective. Neither Qafisheh nor Prochazka note any difference of func-
tion between *n*- and Ø-participles. Thus, it seems that the *n*-participles are
really in free distribution with the Ø-participles with regard to function.
Since the Ø-participle already has a potential verbal force and may annex a
suffix directly, the need for a *nota accusativi* can never have been absolute.
This explains the lack of opposition between *n*- and Ø-participles, as well as
the limited spread and frequency of the former.

Still to be evaluated is the single statement of Wetzstein that there is an
opposition between the *n*-participle (*māćiltennuh*) and the Ø-participle (*mā-
ćilītu*), probably perfective *versus* durative. At the present stage of research,
the statement cannot be accepted at its face value, since there are many ex-
amples from North Arabian dialects in which the Ø-participle + object suffix
pronoun is clearly perfective, e.g.: *ḏarab əs-səddāna – wənno māzə́ᶜha mazəᶜtēn*
(He struck the anvil...The sword cut it in two pieces)[44]; *wi-ḥaṭṭat iṭ-ṭayyāra
wlē-ḏa B. mitlāgí-hu N.* (The plane landed and there was P. and N. who had met

⟨P. earlier⟩).[45] And, in Wetzstein's own text: لِأَنَّهُ صَايْبُهُ مَا صَاب الخَالدى (denn was dem Chalidi widerfahren war, war auch ihm widerfahren); لَبِس لِبْس البَنَات آلَى كَان أَبُوهْ شَارِيهِنْ لُه (⟨Er⟩ zog die von seinem Vater gekauften Mädchenkleider an).[46] Similarly, nunated participles directing an object noun seem to follow the same pattern of verbal functions as participles without *tanwīn* and be mainly perfective or mainly durative present depending on the type of action, e.g.: *'uḍrubo b-ha-s-sēf - winno gāṭəᶜen rāso* (He hit him with the sword and cut off his head) (perfective)[47]; *ya nāsdin alᶜassīs* (Oh he who enquires of the scout) (durative).[48]

A lack of opposition between the *n*-participles and the Ø-participles is not very surprising, since the present theory suggests that the *n*-element has come into existence to mark the verbal function as such *versus* the nominal one. It would then have nothing to do with a later — or parallel — development of the participle w i t h i n the verbal system. Still, something might be said in support of Wetzstein's statement, because if there really is — or has been — a semantic opposition between the verbal *n*-participle and the nominal/verbal Ø-participle, it may well have come to be perceived as an opposition between the *n*-participle as perfective, — stressing the (completed) action, — and the Ø-participle as imperfective, — stressing the (incompleted) state. With Wetzstein's example: *māčiltennuh*, she has (already, certainly) performed the act of eating *versus* *māčilītuh*, she is in the state of eating it (she has begun to eat and is still eating). When also Ø-participles denoting action tend to be perfective, the *n*-element would serve rather as a means of achieving a stylistic emphasis on the completedness of the action. Such an interpretation is easily applicable to Wetzstein's examples in context (see p. 5 above) and also to Diem's example in context: *gal: "laiš 'aḥnabt nafsuk yā waladi w-'ana kāfiyinnuk fī l-kiswān w-fī l-'akl w-fī š-šarāb w-fī t-tuffāḥ w-fī l-laimūn w-fī kullə ma ṭalabat an-nafs."* (Da sagte der Vater: "Warum hast du dich denn abgequält, Junge, wo ich dir doch reichlich Kleidung, Essen, Trinken, Äpfel, Zitronen und alles was das Herz begehrte, gab?").

The use of the *n*-element in those dialects where both *n*- and Ø-participles are productive would thus be something equivalent to the use of *qad* in Classical Arabic, where the simple perfect means that the action has taken place while *qad* + perfect means that it has already and certainly taken place and which may therefore also acquire a pluperfect sense in the same way as Wetzstein's text examples.

However, it should be repeated that the evidence of any opposition at all be-
tween *n*- and ∅-participles rests with Wetzstein's informant only, and no con-
clusions on this subject can be made before further material is obtained. It
is also possible that, for example, some dialects of the Gulf have borrowed
the *n*-participles from North Arabian or Omani dialects and for that reason
are able to use them as perfectly free variants together with the ∅-partici-
ples.

Summary

The origin and development of the *n*-participle may be outlined in the fol-
lowing scheme:

S t a g e 1 = the stage represented by Classical Arabic + an early stage af-
ter this. The *tanwīn* ending defines the syntactic position of the participle
as verbal. The participle itself is potentially nominal/verbal.

S t a g e 2. The old *tanwīn* system has broken down. The *tanwīn* ending marks
the verbal position of the participle. A suffix pronoun may be added directly
after. The *n*-participle comes into existence. The *n*-element becomes an option-
al object marker: it may be described as a means of denoting the suffix as an
object and as a means of strengthening the verbal force of the participle.
The exact verbal function of the participle itself is unknown.

S t a g e 3 = the present situation, but may well have existed over a long
period of time. The *n*-participle now tends to occupy a fixed position within
the verbal system, viz. a perfective one. So, however, does the ordinary par-
ticiple for dynamic transitive verbs. Since already the ∅-participle has ver-
bal force and may annex a suffix directly, the spread of the *n*-participles is
limited. It is also difficult to find any semantic opposition between the *n*-
and the ∅-participles. There is a vague indication from one North Arabian di-
alect that the use of the *n*-element marks an emphasis on the action of the
participle as completed; however, it is impossible to determine whether this
is an established use in this or other dialects, perhaps reflecting an ear-
lier verbal *vs.* nominal opposition, or whether it is simply a subjective ap-
preciation of the particular informant.

The *n*-participle is an interesting example of the innovativeness of the syn-
tax in bedawi or bedawi-influenced dialects. The present discussion has also
underlined the need for a proper investigation into two other and more cen-
tral syntactic problems in Peninsular dialects: the function of the *tanwīn*
and the function of the participle.

NOTES

1 The transcription has been slightly adjusted in order to facilitate comparison, e.g.: Reinhardt $y \rightarrow \bar{\imath}$; Landberg $\acute{g} \rightarrow \breve{g}$, $\acute{s} \rightarrow \check{s}$; Socin $\acute{c} \rightarrow \acute{g}$; Wetzstein $\acute{g} \rightarrow \acute{c}$; vowel length consequently $\bar{v}$.

2 Reinhardt, Ein arabischer Dialekt..., pp. 139f.

3 Or rather through haplology: *ḏārbīnhum*, *ḏārbīnhum*, cf. *id.*, p. 381 *lāḥqīnhum*.

4 Reinhardt, Ein arabischer Dialekt..., p. 139.

5 *ibid.*, p. 154, note 1: *nītek rohbān-innek-i* (glaubst du, dass ich dich fürchte).

6 *ibid.*, pp. 140, 158, and 12.

7 *ibid.*, p. 141.

8 The scheme is a systematization of examples given by Landberg, Daṯînah..., pp. 720-724.

9 Landberg, Daṯînah..., p. 724ff.

10 *ibid.*, pp. 720ff.

11 Diem, Skizzen..., p. 132, with a note referring to Landberg, Daṯînah..., pp. 720-739.

12 Wetzstein, Sprachliches..., p. 192, note.

13 *ibid.*, p. 75:9 (translation, p. 92) and p. 192, note.

14 *ibid.*, p. 192, note.

15 Qafisheh, Gulf Arabic..., pp. 243f.

16 Prochazka, The Shī^{c}ī dialects..., p. 46f.

17 Fischer, Die Sprache..., p. 255.

18 *ibid.*, p. 255.

19 *ibid.*, p. 253.

20 Landberg, Daṯînah...: the following discussion including examples if not otherwise specified pp. 727-739.

21 Singer, Neuarabische Fragewörter..., p. 239.

22 Grotzfeld, Syrisch-Arabische Grammatik..., pp. 23f.

23 Singer, Neuarabische Fragewörter..., pp. 238ff.

24 See Blau, The emergence..., pp. 174f. (*-an/'an*); p. 193, note 1, and p. 196, note 1 (the *tanwīn* as a separate word in modern dialects).

25 Nöldeke, Beiträge..., p. 14.

26 Barth, Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen..., pp. 1-12.

27 Wetzstein, Sprachliches..., p. 192, note; Socin, Diwan III, p. 187; Brockelmann, Grundriss I, p. 473 and p. 639; Fischer, Die Sprache..., p. 255; Blau, The emergence..., p. 197, note 1.

28 Brockelmann, Grundriss I, pp. 472f. and p. 639.

29 Landberg, Daṯînah..., pp. 738f.

30 Blau, The emergence..., p. 197: *meḥārbello* after R. Montagne, Le Ghazou de

Šâyè^c Alemsâḥ, Mélanges Maspéro III. Le Caire 1935-40, pp. 411-416, and *ṣadīǧilluh* after Socin, Diwan III, p. 187.

31 Fischer, Die Sprache..., p. 255.

32 Landberg, Datînah..., pp. 728f.

33 Nöldeke, Ueber einen arabischen Dialekt..., pp. 12f.

34 Blanc, Communal dialects..., pp. 64 and 66.

35 Fischer, Die Sprache..., p. 240.

36 Nöldeke, Ueber einen arabischen Dialekt..., p. 13.

37 *ibid.*, pp. 12f.: analogy after *-ni*; Brockelmann, Grundriss I, pp. 52 and 477: *-n-* to avoid hiatus; Barth, Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen..., pp. 10ff.: *-nu* = particular suffix pronoun for the 3rd person masculine singular.

38 Abboud, The syntax..., p. 13.

39 Blau, The emergence..., p. 197: after H.H. Spoer and E.N. Haddad, Poems by Nimr ibn ^cAdwan. Zeitschrift für Semitistik 7 (1929), p. 275:9.

40 Blau, The emergence..., p. 188.

41 Palva, Characteristics..., pp. 130f.

42 Landberg, Datînah..., pp. 721f.

43 Preliminary title: On the function of the verbal active participle in Northern Arabian narrative texts.

44 Palva, Studies..., p. 80:67.

45 Johnstone, Eastern Arabian..., p. 222.

46 Wetzstein, Sprachliches..., p. 75:14-15, and p. 76:18 (translation, p. 93 and p. 95).

47 From a tape-recording made by Prof. Heikki Palva in November 1981: the Bani Ṣaxar tribe.

48 Ingham, Notes..., p. 33:-4-3.

REFERENCES

Abboud, P. F. (1964), *The syntax of Najdi Arabic*. Diss. Austin, Texas.

Barth, J. (1907), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.

Blanc, H. (1964), *Communal dialects in Baghdad. (Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs* 10.) Cambridge, Mass.

Blau, J. (1965), *The emergence and linguistic background of Judaeo-Arabic. A study of the origins of Middle Arabic. (Scripta Judaica* 5.) Oxford.

Brockelmann, C. (1908, 1913), *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I-II. Berlin.

Diem, W. (1973), *Skizzen jemenitischer Dialekte. (Beiruter Texte und Studien* 13.) Beirut.

Fischer, W. (1961), Die Sprache der arabischen Sprachinsel in Uzbekistan. *Der Islam* 36, pp. 232-263.

Grotzfeld, H. (1965), *Syrisch-Arabische Grammatik. Dialekt von Damaskus. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, N.S.* 8.) Wiesbaden.

Ingham, B. (1979), Notes on the dialect of the Muṭair of Eastern Arabic. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 2, pp. 23-35.

Johnstone, T. M. (1967), *Eastern Arabian dialect studies.* (*London Oriental Series* 17.) London.

Landberg, C. de (1905-1913), *Études sur les dialects de l'Arabie méridionale* II. *Daṯînah.* Leiden.

Nöldeke, T. (1904), *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Strassburg.

Nöldeke, T. (1895), Ueber einen arabischen Dialekt. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 9, pp. 1-25.

Palva, H. (1980), Characteristics of the Arabic dialect of the Bani Ṣaxar tribe. *Orientalia Suecana* XXIX, pp. 112-139.

Palva, H. (1976), *Studies in the Arabic dialect of the semi-nomadic əl-ᶜAǧārma tribe (al-Balqāʾ District, Jordan).* (*Orientalia Gothoburgensia* 2.) Göteborg.

Prochazka, T. (1981), The Shīᶜī dialects of Baḥrain and their relationship to the Eastern Arabian dialect of Muḥarraq and the Omani dialect of al-Ristāq. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 6, pp. 16-55.

Qafisheh, H. A. (1979), *Gulf Arabic. Intermediate level.* Tucson, Arizona.

Reinhardt, C. (1894), *Ein arabischer Dialekt gesprochen in ᶜOmān und Zanzibar. Nach praktischen Gesichtspunkten für das Seminar für orientalische Sprachen in Berlin.* Stuttgart/Berlin.

Singer, H.-R. (1958), *Neuarabische Fragewörter.* München.

Socin, A. (1900-1901), *Diwan aus Centralarabien* I-III. Hrsg. von H. Stumme. (*Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 19.) Leipzig.

Wetzstein, J. G. (1868), Sprachliches aus den Zeltlagern der syrischen Wüste. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 22, pp. 69-194.