Phillip W. Stokes
*University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

# Orthography and Phonology in Vocalized Medieval Christian Arabic Gospel Manuscripts

*Introduction*

Pre-modern vocalized Arabic manuscripts can reveal a great deal about a variety of linguistic features represented in each text. Recent work has demonstrated the potential that vocalized manuscripts have, specifically for revealing aspects of the phonology of the corpora including the Quran,[1] Judaeo-Arabic,[2] and later 'Middle Arabic' texts.[3] Christian Arabic texts, however, have been less frequently studied in this manner. Blau's grammar of the Christian Arabic of south Palestine in the 9th/10th centuries CE[4] draws primarily on unvocalized manuscripts, and therefore the phonological details he provides are inferred primarily from consonantal orthographic patterns.[5] While a few others have focused on

---

[1]  Marijn van Putten, "Inferring the Phonetics of Quranic Arabic from the Quranic Consonantal Text", *The International Journal of Arabic Linguistics* 5(1) (2019), pp. 1-19; Marijn van Putten, *Quranic Arabic: From its Hijazi origins to its Classical Reading Traditions*. (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

[2]  Esther-Miriam Wagner, *Linguistic Variety of Judaeo-Arabic in letters from the Cairo Genizah*. (Leiden: Brill, 2010). Geoffrey Khan, "Vocalised Judaeo-Arabic Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah", in Ben Outhwaite and Siam Bhayro (eds), *"From a Sacred Source": Genizah Studies in Honour of Professor Stefan C. Reif*. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 201-218; Geoffrey Khan, "Orthography and Reading in Medieval Judaeo-Arabic", in Ahmad Al-Jallad (ed.), *Arabic in Context: Celebrating 400 Years of Arabic at Leiden University*. (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 395-404; Benjamin Hary, "Spoken Late Egyptian Judaeo-Arabic as Reflected in Written Forms", in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 44 (2017), pp. 11-36.

[3]  Jérôme Lentin, "Normes orthographiques en moyen arabe: Sur la notation du vocalisme bref", in Liesbeth Zack and Arie Schippers (eds.), *Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: Diachrony and Synchrony*. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 209-234.

[4]  Joshua Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic based mainly on south Palestinian texts from the first millennium*. 3 Vols, col. «Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium» 267, 276, 279; «Subsidia» 27-29 (Louvain: Peeters, 1966-1967).

[5]  See especially Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, §§2-29, pp. 50-130.

Christian Arabic manuscripts from the medieval period,[6] there has been little work that undertakes a phonological description of vocalized Christian manuscripts in a thorough and systematic way.[7] Most existing studies approach the description of the language of these manuscripts through the assumption that the scribes are attempting to write Classical Arabic (henceforth ClAr).[8] For that reason, features are typically noted only when deviating from ClAr. Further, due to the focus on the supposedly non-ClAr nature of the manuscripts, the features analyzed cluster in the domains of morphology and syntax, where the differences between the language of the text and ClAr are thought to be most significant. There is still a significant gap in our understanding of the phonologies of vocalized Christian texts. This paper is a first step toward filling this lacuna by examining six vocalized Christian manuscripts with an eye toward discovering what evidence can inform our understanding of the phonologies of the texts. Reference is made to other phonological phenomena drawn from any Arabic variety, ancient or modern. I will attempt to show not only that much can be said about the phonologies of the varieties and registers represented in the vocalizations, but also that scholars can also gain significant insights into the nature of register mixing that, I suggest, becomes evident from a close analysis of the texts.

---

[6] Bengt Knutsson, *Studies in the Text and Language of Three Syriac-Arabic Versions of the Book of Judicum with Special Reference to the Middle Arabic Elements* (Leiden: Brill, 1974); Per Bengtsson, *Two Arabic Versions of the Book of Ruth*, col. «Studia Orientalia Lundensia» 6 (Lund: Lund University Press, 1995).

[7] A recent overview of shared orthographic practices by Jewish and Christian scribes is Esther-Miriam Wagner, "Birds of a Feather? Arabic Scribal Conventions in Christian and Jewish Arabic", in Nadi Vidro, Ronny Vollandt, Esther-Miriam Wagner, and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger (eds.), *Studies in Semitic Linguistics and Manuscripts: A Liber Discipulorum in Honour of Professor Geoffrey Khan.* (Uppsala: Upsalla University Press, 2018), pp. 376-391. The features relevant to phonology focus mostly on Judaeo-Arabic, and are fairly limited in scope; see Wagner, "Birds of a Feather?", pp. 381-384.

[8] This is the case in, e.g., Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*. Recent research has rightly problematized this; see, e.g., Johannes Den Heijer, "Introduction: Middle and Mixed Arabic, A New Trend in Arabic Studies," in Liesbeth Zack and Arie Schippers (eds.), *Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: Diachrony and Synchrony.* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 1-26. Nevertheless, the framework is still often assumed in the approach to linguistic descriptions of these texts. An example of this is Wagner's note that, in terms of comparison of Judaeo-Arabic and Christian features, "The point of reference will be an artificial, presumed Standard Arabic of the Ottoman period, which is close to Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic"; Wagner, "Birds of a Feather?", p. 381. Tellingly, Wagner admits that this is problematic, acknowledging "This approach is admittedly flawed…as the time period of the materials precedes the *nahḍa*, during which ideas of normative grammar informed by Classical Arabic were again superimposed on Arabic." Nevertheless, she concludes "there is no real alternative, as for now Classical Arabic or Modern Standard Arabic are the only varieties with a prescriptive, fixed set of rules, described in grammar books, against which any other variety can be measured and compared." It is axiomatically easier to compare a text to a standard, prescribed norm; however, this is not a principle upon which historical linguistic study should be based. These assumptions continue to dominate, both for reasons of convention and, as Wagner's quote demonstrates, convenience, but they ultimately hamper efforts at understanding the linguistic varieties of non-ClAr texts.

The manuscripts selected for this study were composed between the 13th and 15th centuries CE and are currently housed at St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai. The manuscripts were chosen for two main reasons. First, they are accessible online. Second, they exhibit numerous non-Classical orthographic patterns, which are as yet unexplained. The features attested here are not unique to these manuscripts, but for reasons of space, I have chosen to examine their distribution in just these six manuscripts. Four of the six manuscripts (Sinai Arabic 82 & 89, and Sinai Arabic 90 & 91) should be considered two pairs, rather than independent, since they were copied by the same scribe. Nevertheless, as we will see, this does not always entail that the usage of the various orthographic signs are identical. Importantly, according to Kashouh, all six of the manuscripts belong to the same family (Family J), the so-called 'Melkite Vulgate', with five of the six belonging to the same sub-group within the family (Sinai Arabic 76 being the exception).[9] I have included his family designations in the table of manuscripts below.

Table 1

| Siglum | Date | Family (Kashouh 2012) |
|---|---|---|
| Sinai Arabic 76 | 13th CE | Family J$^c$ |
| Sinai Arabic 80 | 1469 CE | Family J$^b$ |
| Sinai Arabic 82 | 1287 CE | Family J$^b$ |
| Sinai Arabic 89 | 1285 CE | Family J$^b$ |
| Sinai Arabic 90 | 1281 CE | Family J$^b$ |
| Sinai Arabic 91 | 1288 CE | Family J$^b$ |

In some ways, then, this study might be considered a first study of the scribal practices involved in the production of manuscripts from Family J, and particularly J$^b$. And as we will see, there are some differences between the distribution of certain signs in the five manuscripts from Family J$^b$ on the one hand, and SAr. 76 from Family J$^c$ on the other. However, there are differences between the manuscripts from Family J$^b$, too, and indeed text type is no guarantor of like orthography (or phonology). For example, according to Kashouh, SAr. 112 and SAr. 146 are both members of Family Ja;[10] however, the orthographic practices attested differ drastically between the two. In SAr. 112, most words are vocalized, and a number of non-Classical orthographic features occur, whereas in SAr.

---

9    Hikmat Kashouh, *The Arabic Versions of the Gospels: The Manuscripts and their Families*. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012).

10   Kashouh, *Arabic Versions*, pp. 173-184.

146, vocalizations are much less common, and those few that occur are almost always classical. Finally, a limitation of this study is that, due to the lack of any manuscript family stemmata, we cannot yet determine how faithfully any particular scribe copied the orthographic practices of the exemplar from which he copied. However, as we will see, the inclusion of two pairs of manuscripts – two manuscripts each copied by the same scribe – can provide some insight into scribal behavior.

Each manuscript was accessed digitally via the Sinai Manuscripts Digital Library, hosted online in partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles' library.[11] For each manuscript, I documented the diacritics and vocalizations for the entirety of the Gospel of Matthew found in each manuscript, or approximately 20% of each manuscript. The discussion of each manuscript focuses on two aspects of the text: orthography and phonology. Since any proposed phonological analysis of a manuscript must take into account the orthographic practices of the scribe(s) that produced it, the discussions below will be devoted also to the patterns attested, in order to offer sound phonological interpretation.

In each section below, I reproduce examples in Arabic font, mirroring the spelling as best as possible with modern type font, followed by a literal transliteration, as well as a reconstructed phonetic transliteration. It should be noted that, unless specified otherwise, each of the patterns identified occurs in a greater number of examples than those listed here. Indeed in many cases the feature under discussion is present on every folio. The reconstructed transliterations are by definition speculative to one degree or another, and I have indicated particularly difficult readings with a question mark. The purpose of these reconstructions is illustrative; I do not pretend that precise determinations of, e.g., vowel qualities can be known. Finally, the following transliteration conventions should be noted:

i. I indicate the presence of *shaddah* by writing the marked consonants twice (e.g., كلّ = <kull>).

ii. I indicate explicit *sukūn*s with the numeral 0 (e.g., يؤم = <yw0m>). This is primarily significant for SAr. 76

iii. I transliterate the *maddah* with two long *ā* vowels (e.g., سمآء = <samāāʾi>).

iv. I transliterate each word exactly as it appears in the Arabic. Since this results in vowels being written on consonants with which they were presumably not pronounced, I have also included a proposed vocalization, when relevant, in order to make my interpretation of the word explicit.

In the following sections, most Arabic examples from the texts are presented in tables. When examples are referenced in the text, I place transliterations of the Arabic text within brackets < > and phonetic reconstructions between forward slashes / /, for example: كلّ <kull> /kull/ and يؤم <yw0m> /yūm/ (see below on vowel quality). Arabic words whose vocalizations are known (as in ClAr or dialectal words) are written italicized, and reconstructions of proto-forms are likewise written italicized accompanied by the * sign to indicate a proto-form reconstruction.

---

[11]  Accessed on the website: https://sinaimanuscripts.library.ucla.edu/; last accessed April 25, 2022.

## *SAr. 76*

SAr. 76 was written by a scribe whose name is unknown and, due to the lack of a colophon, can only be relatively dated. Atiya[12] dates it to the 13th century CE, which is accepted by most scholars who have subsequently studied the manuscripts.[13] It consists of 315 folia of paper, which contain complete copies of the synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) and up to 20:1 of the Gospel of John. The script used is *naskh*, and is ornamentally executed, with numerous diacritics and vocalizations. As mentioned above, this manuscript belongs to Kashouh's family J^c.[14]

*Diacritics and Vocalization Marks*

The *ḍammah* is used frequently throughout and is regularly written as a miniature *wāw*. The *kasrah* is written both from top left to bottom right, as well as top right to bottom left, with no discernible difference in implication. The *fatḥah* is used, though less frequently than *ḍammah* and *kasrah*, and is a diagonal line from top right to bottom left, written above the letter. The *maddah* is used (on its distribution, see below, section 2.5.3) and is written as a tilde above the letter (usually a glide). Finally, *sukūn* is attested throughout the manuscript, written as a small circle, typically closed, atop the consonant.

In addition to these vocalization marks, other diacritics are employed frequently in the manuscript. These diacritics, which distinguish letters that are undotted from their dotted relatives, are referred to as ʿ*alāmāt al-ihmāl*, lit. "signs of neglect".[15] While this group of signs was quite diverse across time and geography, the ones utilized in SAr. 76 are widespread outside of Christian Arabic manuscripts. The most common *ʾihmāl* diacritic in SAr. 76 is the v-shaped sign, which was used to mark several consonants, including: *rāʾ*, *sīn*, and *ṭāʾ*. In addition to the v-shaped sign, a miniature *kāf* is often written atop the *kāf*, especially when non-word final; a miniature *ṣād* is written below the *ṣād*; and a miniature *ḥāʾ* is written below the *ḥāʾ*. None of the vocalization diacritics is used ubiquitously, though each is used

---

[12] Aziz S. Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné of the Mount Sinai Arabic Manuscripts: Complete Analytic Listing of the Arabic Collection Preserved in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai*. Volume 1. (Alexandria: Galal Hazzi & Co [Arabic], 1970), p. 150.

[13] J. Valentin, "Les évangéliaires arabes de la bibliothèque du Monastère Ste-Catherine (Mont Sinai): Essai de classification d'après l'étude d'un chapitre (Matth. 28): Traducteurs, réviseurs, types textuels", in *Le Museon* 116 (2003), pp. 415-477, espec. 459.

[14] On Family J^c, and SAr. 76 in particular, see Kashouh, *Arabic Gospels*, pp. 195-200.

[15] Adam Gacek, *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers*, col. «Handbook of Oriental Studies» 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 286; Jan Just Witkam, "The Neglect Neglected. To Point or Not to Point, That is the Question", in *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 6 (2015), pp. 376-408.

regularly throughout the text. This lack of complete consistency in fully vocalizing each word is common in many of the Christian manuscripts produced and/or housed at St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai.

*Ḍammah*

*Ḍammah* is, as expected, primarily used to write etymological *u*:

Table 2

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| كُلّ | kull | /kull/ | "each, every; all" | 35r; 83r |
| سَتُقَام | sa-tuqām | /sa-tuqɑ:m/ | "she will be raised up" | 44r |
| سُقم | suqm | /suqm/ | "illness" | 35r |
| حُكمآءٍ | ḥukmāāʾ-in | /ḥukamɑ:ʾ-in/ or /ḥukamɑ::ʾ-in/ | "wise men" | 40r |
| هُم | hum | /hum/ | "they (mpl)" | 41r |
| مُنْد | mun0d | /mund/ or /munḏ/ | "since" | 47v |

Elsewhere, unetymological *ḍammah* is written in the proximity of bilabials:

Table 3

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الربُّ | ʾl-rbbu | /ar-rubb/ | "the lord" | 18v; 67v; 94v |
| نعُمُ | nʿumu | /nɑʿɑm/ | "yes" | 24v |
| الفُمّ | ʾl-fumm | /al-fumm/ | "the mouth" | 43r |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| التُّيمن | ʾl-tuymmn | /at-taymun/ or /at-ty:mun?/ | "Yemen; the south" | 44r |
| مُجِيَك | muǧyy-k | /muǧiyy-Vk/ | "your coming" | 77v |
| مُجِيّه | muǧyy-h | /muǧiyy-h(u)/ | "his coming" | 31v |
| المُكان | ʾl-mukān | /al-mukān/ | "the place" | 32v; 92r |
| سُوا | suwā | /suwɑ:(ʾ)/ | "except" | 54r |
| نُمن | numn | /numn(a)/ | "they (fpl) fell asleep" | 81r |

The use of *ḍammah* in the context of bilabials suggests that bilabials regularly resulted in the rounding of the proximate vowels, likely to /u/. A few instances of *ḍammah* apparently suggest a backing effect in proximity to emphatics, including pharyngeals. While rare in SAr. 76, such backing is more common in other manuscripts (on which, see discussions below). I interpret this backing as reflecting something like /ɑ/ or /o/. Rounding is likewise present in each of the manuscripts included here, and has been noted by scholars of later corpora, primarily from the Ottoman period,[16] and in fact is well-documented in modern dialects as well.[17]

In addition to instances of etymological *u, *dammah* also occurs in places where we would expect *i:

Table 4

| **Arabic Text** | **Transliteration** | **Reconstruction** | **Translation** | **Folio** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| أحُل | ʾ-ḥul | /ʾaḥull/ | "I loosen, untie" | 20r |
| الكُسر | ʾl-kusr | /al-kus(a)r/ | "the remaining pieces" | 50r |

The occurrence of *ḍammah* in places where, from the perspective of ClAr and its orthography we would expect *i*, is a recurrent phenomenon in the manuscripts studied here. Lentin interprets most non-etymological *ḍammah*s, except those in the context of bilabials, as indicative of a *shewa* /ə/.[18] In this interpretation he cites Blau's interpretation of the *ḍammah* on the imperative أمن, "believe!" as evidence that *ḍammah* indicated a *shewa* /ə/.[19] However, Blau's argument is at times difficult to follow and thus deserves to be

---

16 Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", pp. 220-221.

17 Dominique Caubet, "Labiovelarization", in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. II.* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 621-623, espec. 621-622.

18 Lentin, "Normes orthographique", pp. 220-221.

19 Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, pp. 85-86, n. 7.

spelled out and addressed. First, Blau starts with the observation that the lack of writing of the *hamzah* in early manuscripts is evidence that it was likely absent in Christian Arabic of the area.[20] Bolstering this, Blau claims that "The *regular* use of the dots of *yâ*, even when according to Classical spelling it should serve as *kursî* of *hamza, may* also be interpreted as an additional sign of this phenomenon."[21] From this position, Blau then deduces that any use of *alif* to write what in ClAr would have been a glottal stop – and in the orthographic tradition would use a *yāʾ* or *wāw* as the *kursī* of the *hamzah* – are not indications of *hamzah* retention, but rather attempts "to prevent by this spelling the vernacular pronunciation without the glottal stop".[22] This is frankly confusing; if the intention is to avoid a vernacular pronunciation which he believes lacks a *hamzah*, then the use of *alif* would be precisely indicate a *hamzah*! Following this, in his remarks on يامن (< *ʾāmana) "he believes," Blau again apparently argues the opposite, suggesting "The very fact, however, that this form is so exceptionally frequent, suggests that it does not reflect a particular spelling, but the passage, well attested in modern dialects, of this verb in the imperfect and imperative into the first or rather into the second verbal form".[23] In other words, the fact that the imperfect يامن is so frequent, rather than ClAr يومن suggests that the spelling is not, as he just argued, intended to avoid a colloquial pronunciation, but rather reflects one! Finally, Blau addresses some problematic data for his interpretation, namely the occasional vocalization of the 1sg imperfect as أمن. To account for this, Blau notes that twice the same vocalization is used for an imperative, for which "the only plausible explanation is…to regard all these forms as second verbal form. Accordingly, the *ḍamma* in these forms represents the neutral vowel".[24]

There is much here to unpack. Blau's first conclusion, that lack of writing *hamzah* indicates its absence, presumably confirmed by the use of *yāʾ* with dots in, e.g., active participles of hollow verbs (e.g., قايل instead of قائل) cannot stand scrutiny. The lack of the *hamzah* mark is in fact common in early manuscripts. To my knowledge, the earliest dated manuscript *with* the *hamzah* is Leiden Or. 298, which dates to 252 AH/866 CE.[25] It is not entirely clear when the *hamzah* sign became regular, but its absence in early manuscripts – both Muslim and Christian – argues against drawing any implications. Further, writing the dots of the *yāʾ* even when it would, in ClAr, be the *kursī*, far from being an aberrational practice, is rather the norm in Quranic and ClAr manuscripts (cf. the ibn Bawwāb Qurʾān).

---

[20]  Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 84.

[21]  Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 84 (emphasis in original).

[22]  Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 85.

[23]  Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 85.

[24]  Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, pp. 85-6, n. 7.

[25]  For a description of the manuscript, see Jan Just Witkam, *Inventory of the Oriental Manuscripts of the Library of the University of Leiden, Volume 1 (Manuscripts Or. 1 – Or. 1000: Acquisitions in the Period Between 1609 and 1665. Mainly the Collections of Jacobus Golius (1629), Josephus Justus Scaliget (1609) and part of the Collection of Levinus Warner (1665)*, (Leiden: Ter Lugt Press. 207), pp. 149-152. I think Marijn van Putten for the reference both to the manuscript, as well as Witkam's description.

Indeed, this practice is attested in SAr. 76: <ḥyny'd-in> "at that time" (42r). Thus nothing about orthographic practices Blau observes argues decisively in Blau's favor. Also perplexing is Blau's approach to interpreting the nature of the non-ClAr orthographic features. In one place, the use of an *alif* is interpreted as indicating a desire to avoid a colloquial pronunciation which lacks the *hamzah* (in other words, to prompt a reading with *hamzah*), but in another, the use of *alif* is interpreted to indicate a desired lack of *hamzah*. It is thus not clear whether Blau conceives of the orthography as an attempt to render ClAr for speakers whose vernacular is significantly different than it (as in the case of the use of *alif* to mark *hamzah* in ابانا <'b''n'> /'abā'(a)nā/ "our fathers (acc),") or rather reflects one based on the local vernacular (as in the instance of يامن).

Another problem in Blau's argumentation concerns his interpretation of the non-ClAr vocalization of *'āmana* forms. Blau argues that these forms involve a vernacular spelling; in other words, the *alif* reflects a vernacular *'ə* or perhaps *ā* (if form III). However, it is to my mind likelier that Blau's earlier contention is correct, and that the use of the *alif*, even when we expect orthographically a *kursī wāw*, is intended to reinforce the pronunciation of a *hamzah*. Blau himself illustrates this practice with examples, such as:

ليس نامر <lys n'mr> /lays(a) nu'mar/ "we were not ordered"

ابانا <'b''n'> /'abā'(a)nā/ "our fathers (acc)"

This would account for the spelling of the 1sg imperfect in the few places Blau finds it as أُمن, which could represent underlying /'u'min/ just as ليس نامر presumably reflects /nu'mar/. The imperative forms could represent an analogical extension of the imperative, which maintained the *hamzah*, to the imperative as well. This happens in modern dialects, as well: cf. Syrian and Ḥawrānī Jordanian *ōkil* "eat!" instead of *kul*, presumably based on the imperfect forms *yōkil/tōkil/ōkil*.[26] On the other hand, it is possible that the scribe simply wrote the imperative, which is orthographically identical to the 1cs imperfect, in the same way, whether intentionally or by mistake.

The proposed interpretation makes sense, too, in the context of the orthographic tradition. It is very likely that the Quran originally lacked *hamzah* in many, if not all, contexts.[27] The orthography used in the Quran, which became the basis of the Islamic-era orthographic tradition, was almost certainly developed to write a Hijazi dialect, similar, if

---

[26] Wolfdietrich Fischer and Otto Jastrow (eds.), *Handbuch der Arabischen Dialekte*, col. «Porta linguarum orientalium» 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), p. 67; Enam al-Wer, "Jordanian Arabic (Amman)", in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. II.* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 505-517, espec. 515.

[27] Werner Diem, "Untersuchungen zur frühen Geschichte der arabischen Orthographie I: Die Schreibung der Vokale", in *Orientalia* N.S> 48 (1979), §60-§68; Marijn van Putten, "Hamzah in the Quranic Consonantal Text", in *Orientalia* 87:1 (2018), pp. 93-120.

not identical, to the Quran.[28] According to the grammarians Sibawayh and Al-Farrāʾ, the Hijazi dialects lacked the glottal stop. Thus the combination او would have very likely been associated with /ū/ rather than /uʾ/. Simply because the Quranic orthography eventually became adopted without change, and ClAr phonetic realities applied to it does not mean that, early on, those adopting it, especially non-Muslims, would feel similarly bound to every convention. In fact, even the Quran attests to a certain amount of orthographic variation in places where historically a glottal stop was present. For example, the orthography of the word *šayʾ, "thing," in the Quran is randomly either شی and شای.[29] Interestingly, the epigraphic record provides still another way of writing the same word, namely انك على كل سا قدر :سا "indeed you are able to do all things".[30] Whatever we are to make of يامن and أمن, that one example is not clear enough to prove that unetymological ḍammah need always represent a shewa, rather than some other phonetic realization. Indeed, when dealing with the data from subsequent manuscripts I will argue that it likely indicates several phonetic effects, depending on the context.

Another piece of data that is directly relevant for an interpretation of ḍammah's phonetic significance in SAr. 76 is the realization of tanwīn in the text. All three tanwīn signs (ḍammatān, fatḥatān and kasratān) are used, although with a distribution quite distinct from ClAr. While the details are complex, the general pattern is that adverbs and a few other syntactic roles which would be eligible orthographically to receive tanwīn alif (the alif suffixed to the end of the noun upon which fatḥatān was written), the scribe used fatḥatān; nouns in the same contexts but which are ineligible orthographically to receive tanwīn alif, such as nouns ending in tāʾ marbūṭa, diptotes, and nouns ending in *-āʾv (ـاء), are written with kasratān. In a forthcoming paper, Stokes argues that the most likely cause of this distribution is that the phonetic reality underlying the tanwīn morpheme was the same, as it is for 'dialectal tanwīn' in other pre-modern and modern corpora.[31] Based on parallels in other corpora, the phonetic reality behind tanwīn here could be either /a/ or /i/, but also /ə/. Whatever the case may be, the evidence in SAr. 76 leans toward interpreting ḍammah as representing /u/ or /o/ or even /ɑ/, but likely not /ə/.

In the examples above, where expected i is written with ḍammah, I suggest it is preferable to interpret the data as either indicating a general merger of the high vowels *u and *i to u, or perhaps rather a preference for u vowels in certain verbal roots and patterns. Indeed, such a preference for u has been noted in other corpora, such as medieval Egyptian

---

[28] Marijn van Putten and Phillip W. Stokes, "Case in the Qurʾānic Consonantal Text" in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 108 (2018), pp. 143-179; Ahmad al-Jallad, *The Damascus Psalm Fragment: Middle Arabic and the Legacy of Old Ḥigāzī* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2020).

[29] Van Putten, *Quranic* Arabic, pp. 207. For other examples, see van Putten, "Hamzah in the Quran", pp. 109-111.

[30] Ḥayāt bint ʿAbdallah Ḥussein al-Kilābī, *Al-nuqūš al-ʾislāmiyyah ʿalā ṭarīq al-ḥaǧǧ al-šāmī bi-šamāl ġarb al-mamlakah al-ʿarabiyyah al-ṣaʾūdiyyah (min al-qarn al-ʾawwal ʾilā al-qarn al-ḫāmis al-hiǧrī)* (Riyadh: King Fahd National Library, 2009), p. 283.

[31] Phillip W. Stokes, "Nominal Case in Christian Arabic Gospel Traditions", in *Arabica* (forthcoming); Phillip W. Stokes, "A Fresh Analysis of the Origin and Development of 'Dialectal Tanwīn' in Arabic", in *Journal of American Oriental Society* 140.3 (2020).

Judaeo-Arabic,[32] cf. dialectal *ṭiliʿ* "he went out," spelled טלוע = طلوع ‹ṭlwʿ›, presumably /ṭuluʿ/ based on a *fuʿul* pattern. Combined with the use of *ḍammah* to indicate rounding caused by bilabials, I would suggest that *ḍammah* indicates here /u/ or /o/, rather than /ə/.

The use of *ḍammah* in etymological \*aw diphthongs suggests the monophthongization of these diphthongs, \*aw > *ū*:[33]

### Table 5

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ضُوًّا | ḍuwʾ-an | /ḍuwʾ-an/ or /ḍūʾ-an/ | "light" | 21v |
| مُوْضِع | muw0ḍ-ʿ | /muwḍ(i)ʿ/ | "place" | 31r |
| ضُوّةُ | ḍuww-hu | /ḍuww-hu/ | "its light" | 79r |

In a few places, etymological *a* is instead written with a *ḍammah* when in closed, post-stress syllables, which could be interpreted as indicating the backing of short vowels in this context:

### Table 6

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| فأدهُن رأسك | f-ʾdhun r-ʾs-k | /fa-ʾadhun/ or /fa-ʾadhon/ | "anoint your head" | 27r |
| حدُث | ḥduṯ | /ḥaduṯ/ or /ḥadoṯ/ | "it happened" | 40r; 46r |

Such instances could plausibly be interpreted as representing something approaching a *shewa* vowel was intended; thus, /fa-dhən/ and /ḥVdəṯ/ respectively, although the vowel could have been closer to /o/; it is impossible to determine. We will see that these particular words, especially *ḥdṯ*, are frequently marked with *ḍammah* in the same contexts, even when other instances of the same syllable type are not, and we are likely dealing with a larger tradition – orthographic or orthoepic – within Christian Arabic. I explore this in relevant discussions of the manuscripts below.

---

[32] Gabriel Rosenbaum, "Spoken Jewish Arabic in Modern Egypt: Hebrew and Non-Standard Components", in *Massorot* 12 (2002), pp. 117-148, espec. 37 [Hebrew]; Hary, "Spoken Late Egyptian Judeo-Arabic, pp. 11-36, espec. 16-17, 20-21.

[33] This is documented in other vocalized Christian manuscripts; see, e.g., Bengtsson, *Two Arabic Versions*, p. 105.

*Shaddah*:

First and foremost, the *shaddah* apparently marks etymologically geminate consonants:

Table 7

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مُوْهَّلًا | mw0hhlan | /muʾahhalan/ | "prepared" | 20r |
| ولّما | w-lmmā | /wa-lammā / or /wa-lummā/ | "and when…" | 32v |
| كُلّ | kull | /kull/ | "each, every; all" | 35r; 83r |
| لآنّ | l-ʾnn | /li-ʾann(a)/ | "because" | 40r; 78r |
| قُفّه | quffh | /quffah/ | "basket" | 50v |
| تنبّا | tnbbā | /tanabbā/ | "he prophesied" | 52r |
| أَتّفق | ʾttfq | /ʾattafaq/ | "he agreed" | 60v |

In addition to etymological gemination, *shaddah* seems to indicate that the final consonant of biconsonantal nouns were geminated, presumably via analogy with more common triconsonantal roots:[34]

Table 8

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| أَبّ | ʾabb | /ʾ(a)bb/ | "brother" | 36v |
| أَخّ | ʾaḫḫ | /ʾ(a)ḫḫ/ | "father" | 36v |
| الفُمّ | ʾl-fumm | /al-fumm/ | "the mouth" | 43r; 52r |

---

[34]  It is probable that these were tri-consonantal (III-W) nouns in Proto-Semitic, and like in Proto-Arabic as well; see Aren Wilson-Wright, "Father, brother, and father-in-law as III-w nouns in Semitic", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 79,1 (2016), pp. 23-32. Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, pp. 72-3, argues based on unvocalized Christian texts from south Palestine that nouns such as *\*ʾab* and *\*ʾaḫ* might be realized as /ʾabb/ and /ʾaḫḫ/. This geminated final consonant is widely attested in vocalized Christian manuscripts, including several treated in this paper.

Additionally, as expected, *shaddah* marks gemination that is the result of assimilation, especially of the definite article:

Table 9

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| في السّماء | fy al-ssmāʾi | /fi ssamāʾ(i)/ or /fī ssamāʾ(i)/ | "in heaven" | 26r |
| السّبئل | ʾl-ssby0l | /as-sabīl/ | "the path" | 28v |
| الشّجره الرّديّه | ʾl-ššǧrh ʾl-rrdyyh | /aš-šagarah ar-rɑdiyyah/ | "the bad tree" | 28v |
| الصُّقع | ʾl-ṣṣuqʿ | /aṣ-ṣuqʿ/ | "the region, area" | 50v |
| النّسا | ʾl-nnsā | /an-n(i)sā(ʾ)/ | "the women" | 54r |
| الدّيك | ʾl-ddyk | /ad-dīk/ | "the cock, rooster" | 89v |

Included in the consonants that assimilate with the definite article is the *ǧīm*, indicating its assimilation. In, e.g., modern Cairene Arabic, the definite article assimilates to the *ǧīm*, which is realized as a velar stop /g/ rather than a post-alveolar velar /dʒ/ or fricative /ʒ/. It is therefore not clear from the assimilation alone which of these realizations underlies the *ǧīm* here. However, in modern Cairene, the voiceless velar stop /k/ is also geminated, whereas it never is in SAr. 76.[35] The modern pattern suggests an earlier realization of *ǧīm* in Cairene as /dʒ/ or fricative /ʒ/, triggering assimilation, and a subsequent shift to /g/, followed by analogical extension of the gemination to the voiceless velar /k/ as well. The lack of assimilation with *kāf* in SAr. 76 thus provides some circumstantial evidence for a post-alveolar affricate /dʒ/ or fricative /ʒ/ realization, rather than the velar stop /g/.[36]

---

[35] Manfred Woidich, "Cairo Arabic", in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. I.* (Brill: Leiden, 2006), pp. 323-333, espec. p. 325.

[36] Chaim Blanc, "Egyptian Arabic in the seventeenth century: Notes on the Judeo-Arabic passages of *Darxe Noʿam* (Venice, 1697), in S. Morag, I. Ben-Ami, and N. Stillman (eds.), *Studies in Judaism and Islam presented to Shlomo Dov Goitein.* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1981), pp. 185-202; Benjamin Hary, "The *ǧīm*/*gīm* in colloquial urban Egyptian Arabic", in *Israel Oriental Studies* 16 (1996), pp. 153-168.

Table 10

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| والجسم | w-ʾl-ǧǧsm | /wa-g-gVsm/ | "and the body" | 27r; 37v |
| الجسر | ʾl-ǧǧisr | /ag-gisr/ | "the log, plank" | 28r |
| الجمع | ʾl-ǧǧmʿ | /ag-gVmʿ/ | "the crowd" | 34r |

The distribution of *shaddah* also provides evidence for the common shifts *ūʾ > uww* and *\*īʾ > iyy*:

Table 11

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| صوكم | ṣww-kum0 | /ḍuww-kum/ | "your light" | 23r |
| الرديه | ʾl-rrdyyh | /ar-raḍiyyah/ | "the bad, evil" | 28v |
| نبيّاً | nbyyan | /nabiyy-an/ | "a prophet" | 38r; 39r |
| مشيّه أبي | mšyyh ʾby | /mušiyyat ʾabī/ | "the will of my father" | 44v |
| ضُوّهُ | ḍuww-hu | /ḍuww-hu/ | "its light" | 79r |
| خطيّه | ḫṭyyh | /ḫaṭiyyah/ | "sin" | 42v |
| مملوّه | mmlwwh | /mumluwwah/ | "full" | 50v |

This phonetic change is discussed by the Arabic language grammarians. Sibawayh, for example, not only mentions this change, in his discussion of the word *nabiyy/nabiʾ*, "prophet," he expresses a preference for the form without *hamzah*.[37] Therefore this variant, in which long vowels preceding *hamzah*s /ūʾ/ and /īʾ/ behave rather as /uww/ and /iyy/, is well within the ClAr tradition. In other places in this manuscript, however, a *hamzah* is written, indicating *ūʾ* and *īʾ*, respectively:

---

[37] ʾAbū Bišr ʿUṯmān Sībawayh, *Kitāb Sībawayh*, Edited by ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḫāniǧī, 1988), pp. 547-555.

Table 12

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| العبد السُؤء | ʾl-ʿbd ʾl-swuʾ | /al-ʿabd as-sūʾ/ | "the evil slave" | 80v |
| مُجيء | muḥyʾ | /muǧīʾ/ | "the coming" | 80r |

Clearly these realizations are mutually exclusive from the perspective of dialectology; in other words, they clearly do not both reflect a single variety or dialect. Instead, the most likely conclusion from the use of both is that the scribe is creatively combining variants which were both acceptable in the performative register (or registers) of the scribe.

A very small minority of cases suggest some overlap between *sukūn* and *shaddah*, as in, e.g., معكّم <mʿ-kumm> "with you (mpl)" (95v). While rare in SAr. 76, this is attested in other manuscripts (on which, see further below, especially Sections 4 & 5 on SAr. 80, 82, and 89), and has been documented in other, mainly later corpora from the Ottoman period.[38]

Finally, a *shaddah*-like diacritic is used rarely to indicate a place of articulation assimilation, as in اصّطرِبُوا <ʾṣṭrbuwʾ>[39] (50v; 94v), presumably /Vṭṭarabū/, "they became greatly disturbed." This diacritic is distinct from the *shaddah*s written elsewhere by the inclusion of an extra denticle. Its use here likely indicates that *ḍād* was realized as a an emphatic dental plosive /ḍ/, as in many modern dialects.[40] This is contrary to the phonology of, e.g., the Quran, where the lack of assimilation in the orthography argues strongly in favor of a difference in place of articulation between the *ḍād* and *ṭāʾ*.[41]

*Sukūn*:

The *sukūn* is used to mark the absence of a vowel. In SAr. 76, *sukūn* is written more frequently in some contexts to mark the absence of vowels than others. First, it is written on glides to indicate a long vowel:

---

[38] Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", pp. 223-224.

[39] Note the lack of dot to indicate the *ḍād*, which while uncommon, occurs elsewhere in the manuscript.

[40] Enam al-Wer, "Variability Reproduced: A variationist view of the Daad/Dhaa opposition in modern Arabic dialects", in Kees Versteegh, M. Haak, and Rudolph de Jong (eds.), *Approaches to Arabic Dialectology*. (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 21-31.

[41] Van Putten, "Inferring the Phonetics of the Quran", pp. 3-4.

Table 13

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ملأك | malā0k | /mulāk/ | "messenger" | 18v |
| نَحْوْ | naḥw0 | /naḥw/ or /naḥū/ | "around, about" | 26r |
| هِيْ | hiy0 | /hī/ or /hiy/ | "she, it" | 26r |
| هُوْ | huw0 | /hū/ or /huw/ | "he" | 38v |
| قليْئًا | qly0l-an | /qalīl-an/ | "a little" | 86v |

Note that its use in several of these cases indicates the lack of a short vowel, e.g., <naḥw0> (26r), presumably /naḥw/ or /naḥū/ rather than /naḥwa/. Its regular use to mark the final glides of the 3ms and 3fs independent pronouns suggest that they were read as /hū/ or /huw/ and /hī/ or /hiy/. Similarly, *sukūn* is written on the glide of etymological diphthongs; e.g., اليوم <ʾl-yw0m> "the day" (80v). As noted above in the discussion of *ḍammah*, however, many cases of etymological *aw* are written with a *ḍammah*, thereby suggesting a monophthong realization, e.g., /yūm/ "day."

More idiosyncratically, *sukūn* marks *w* and *y* that would etymologically carry *hamzah* + vowel, or otherwise just vowel:

Table 14

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مؤْهًّلًا | mw0hhlan | /muʾahhal-an/ | "prepared" | 20r |
| المؤْدّي | ʾl-mw0ddy | /al-muʾaddī/ | "the (path) that leads" | 28v |
| السّمؤْات | ʾl-ssmw0āt | /as-samwāt/ | "the heavens" | 29r; 56r |
| الؤْصيّه | ʾl-w0ṣyyh | /al-wuṣiyyah/ or /al-uṣiyyah?/ | "command" | 73v |

146

Further, although rare, *sukūn* marks a consonant that presumably is marked with a short vowel in an open, unaccented syllable:

## Table 15

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| للقُدْماء | l-l-qud0mā' | /lil-qudmɑ:'/ | "to the ancients" | 23v |
| سَمْوات | sam0wāt | /samwɑ:t/ | "heaven" | 56r |

The spelling likely indicates a regular deletion of short vowels in open, unaccented syllables.[42]

Finally, *sukūn* often marks word-final consonants, presumably to make explicit that no final vowels are to be pronounced. In this role the *sukūn* is can occur in any syntactic context:

## Table 16

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الأثنى عَشرْ | 'l-'atnā ʿašr0 | /al-'atnā ʿašar/ | "the twelve" | 35v |
| الحْكمْ | 'l-ḥukm0 | /al-ḥukm/ | "the judgment" | 43v |
| هُمْ | hum0 | /hum/ | "they" | 44v |
| القاريْ | 'l-qāriy0 | /al-qɑ:rī/ or /al-qɑ:ri'/ | "the reader" | 78r |
| أبن البَشَرْ | 'bn al-bašar0 | /'abn al-bašɑr/ | "the son of man" | 79r |
| أنشآ العالمْ | 'nšāā al-ʿālm0 | /'anšā' al-ʿɑ:lam/ | "the establishment of the world" | 83v |

Despite the frequent use of the *sukūn* to mark the absence of word-final vowels on nouns in context, there are contexts in which a case vowel is either marked explicitly, e.g., لله <lillhi> presumably /li-llāhi/ "to God" (56r), or is indicated by the harmonization of the 3ms to the genitive, resulting in -*hi* (or -*hī*; it is impossible to determine whether the length polarization of ClAr is intended or not), e.g., إلى معمُوْديّتِهِ <'lā mʿmuw0diyyt-hi> /'ilā muʿmūdiyyati-hī/ "unto his baptism" (20r). Thus in terms of word-final vowels, and specifically case and mood inflectional morpho-syntax, SAr. 76 is especially intriguing

---

[42]  This is attested in other non-ClAr manuscripts as well; see Blau, *Handbook of Early Middle Arabic*, p. 30.

insofar as it provides explicit evidence for a text that is intended to be read without final vowels, except for in certain specific contexts.

*Hamzah / Glottal Stop*

The *hamzah* sign, originally a miniature ʿ*ayn*, is written either above a carrier consonant (*kursī*) or, in some contexts, by itself, frequently in SAr. 76. Its orthographic execution is, with a few exceptions discussed below, in accordance with the orthographic tradition of Quranic and ClAr manuscripts. We have already noted cases in which etymological \*ʾ is variable, especially \**vvʾ*, which is attested alongside the shift \**vvʾ* > *vww/vyy*. In other places, however, etymological \*ʾ is regular, although, as we will see, there are a number of differences between the contexts in which *hamzah* occurs in SAr. 76 and those in which it occurs in, e.g., ClAr. Further, there are some idiosyncrasies in the execution of certain syllables with *hamzah*. In addition to the *hamzah* diacritic, however, the scribe also regularly notes the presence of a *hamzah* by means of the *maddah*, a tilde written above an *alif* or glide. Finally, SAr. 76 attests the combination of ‑اع to write \**āʾV*, regardless of syntactic context. Each of these practices will be explored in turn.

*ḥamzat al-qaṭʿ* and *ḥamzat al-waṣl*:

It is conventional in discussions of Arabic to distinguish between two types of *hamzah*, namely the *ḥamzat al-qaṭʿ* "cutting *hamzah*" and *ḥamzat al-waṣl* "carrying *hamzah*." In the latter category, the hamzah is not etymological, and is inserted in order to facilitate pronunciation of what would have been an initial consonant cluster without it:[43]

   2ms Impv *(ʾu)ḫruǧ* "go away!" but *fa-ḫruǧ* "so then, go away!"
   3ms Perfect \**ntaqala* > *intaqala* "he moved, journeyed"
   but *fa-ntaqala* "then he journeyed"

In what has become normative or textbook ClAr, the category of *ḥamzat al-waṣl* includes the *hamzah*s of the definite article, form I imperative prefix, the *hamzah*s prefixed to forms VII through X of the perfect verbal conjugations, as well as the nouns *ibn*, "son," and *ism*, "name." The *ḥamzat al-waṣl* was indicated in vocalized texts by a miniature ṣād, to indicate a ṣilah, "link," with the final vowel of the previous word.

In SAr. 76, the categories of *ḥamzat al-qaṭʿ* and *waṣl* align differently than they do in ClAr. The category of *ḥamzat al-waṣl* primarily consists of the definite article, whereas the imperative prefix of form I, the initial *alif*s of forms VII through X, and the nouns *ism* and *ibn*, are each *ḥamzat al-qaṭʿ* in the manuscripts.

---

[43] Wolfdietrich Fischer, *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*, Third revised edition. Translated by Jonathan Rodgers. (New Haven: Yale University Press), pp. 12-13.

The definite article is clearly *ḥamzat al-waṣl*, though the *waṣlah* diacritic is only occasionally explicitly used, most commonly with the word *al-ʿālam*: في آلعالم "in (this evil) age" (78r; 78v; 85r).

Imperatives of form I, the prefixes of the perfects of verbal forms VII through X, and the nouns *ism* and *ibn*, on the other hand, are spelled as *ḥamzat al-qaṭ*, indicated at least by the explicit writing of the *ḥamzah* without vowels, but often with *ḥamzah* and *fatḥah*, indicating a realization of *ʾa* regardless of preceding vowel:

Table 17

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| وأبن البَشَر | w-ʾabn al-bašar | /wa-ʾabn al-bašɑr/ | "the son of man" | 87r |
| الأبن | ʾl-ʾabn | /al-ʾabn/ | "the son" | 40v |
| الأثنى عَشرْ | ʾl-aṯnā ʿašr0 | /al-aṯnā ʿašɑr/ | "the twelve" | 35v |
| بن الأنسان | bn al-ʾnsān | /bVn al-ʾansān/ | "the son of man" | 37r |
| وأشفوا | w-ʾašfw | /wa-ʾašfū/ | "and heal (mpl)!" | 35v |
| وأمض | w-ʾamḍ | /wa-ʾamḍ(i)/ | "and go to" | 32v |
| وأنصرف | w-ʾanṣrf | /wa-ʾanṣɑrVf/ | "and he left" | 47v |
| فأمتَلأً | f-ʾamtalʾa | /fa-ʾamtal(a)ʾa/ | "and it was filled up" | 71v |
| الأهتمام | ʾl-ʾahtmām | /al-ʾaht(i)mām/ | "the interest, concern" | 95v |

While clearly different from normative ClAr, this distribution of *ḥamzat al-qaṭ* and *waṣl* is not unique to SAr. 76. Indeed, in another early Islamic era Christian Arabic text, the Damascus Psalm fragment, a very similar distribution is apparently attested. In his recent book on the fragment, Al-Jallad shows that the definite article elides following a vowel, as in ClAr:[44]

οελναρ /wa-l-nār/ "and the fire (v. 21)
βιλλαυ /bi-llāh/ "by God" (v. 22)
φιλ.βαχερ /fi l-bašar/ "among men" (v. 60)

At the same time, while forms IX and X are not attested in the Psalm fragment, forms VII and VIII are. In both cases, they apparently attest a *ḥamzat al-qaṭ*:[45]

---

44 Al-Jallad, *Damascus Psalm Fragment*, pp. 79-80.
45 Al-Jallad, *Damascus Psalm Fragment*, pp. 80-81.

οααβτελευ /wa-ʾabtalaw/ "and they tempted" (v. 56)

φααναχαλεβ(ο)υ /fa-ʾanqalabū/ "and they turned their backs" (v. 57)

Unlike with the examples of the definite article, these perfect verbal forms attest a ʾa prefixes, indicating the presence of a *hamzat al-qaṭ*ʿ, i.e., *wa-ʾabtalaw* and *fa-ʾanqalabū* instead of ClAr *wabtalaw* or *fanqalabū*. In a forthcoming book on the language of the Quranic consonantal text, Marijn van Putten argues for a similar, though not identical, linguistic situation behind the spelling idiosyncrasies of the earliest manuscripts. Specifically, he argues that despite some morpho-phonological spellings, the definite article was likely *hamzat al-waṣl*. However, the prefix forms of forms VII through X behave differently, resisting elision regardless of proclitic, which suggests that they were realized as *hamzat al-qaṭ*ʿs.[46] Van Putten notes the likelihood of the *alif* of the noun *ibn* was *hamzat al-waṣl*, given its elision to the preposition *bi* in the *basmalah*; however, others, for example that of the noun *imru*ʾ, "man," elided.[47] Finally, numerous modern dialects attest a prefixed *a-* on, e.g., forms VII through X perfects, which are plausibly interpreted as remnants of original *\*ʾa* instead of *\*i*.[48] Thus while the particular distribution of *hamzat al-qaṭ*ʿ and *hamzat al-waṣl* in SAr. 76 is not identical to either the Quranic or early Islamic data on the one hand, nor the modern dialectal data on the other, there are nevertheless significant parallels in both.

Spellings of ʾi & ʾa

One feature which, to my knowledge, is unique to this manuscript is the frequent spelling of word-initial etymological *ʾi* as *ʾa*, that is, with a *fatḥa* written over the *hamza* instead of a *kasra*.[49] Additionally, the *hamza* is often written alone and prior to the *alif* which, traditionally, would have acted as the carrier (Arabic *kursi*) of the *hamzah*. One of the most common words with this initial syllable is the preposition *ʾilā*, as if it were pronounced *ʾalā*:

Table 18

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Folio |
|---|---|---|
| ءَلَي | ʾalay | 36r; 52v; 79v |
| ءَلي | ʾaly | 32v |

---

46  Marijn van Putten, *Quranic Arabic*, pp. 220-222.

47  Marijn van Putten, *Quranic Arabic*, p. 221.

48  Heikki Palva, "Remarks on the Arabic Dialect of the Ḥwēṭāt Tribe", in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 29 (2004), pp. 195-209, espec. 196.

49  It is not, for example, attested in Sinai Arabic 108, the only other manuscript from family Jᶜ to which I have access.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| وَﺈﻟﻰ | w-ʾalā | 36r |
| ﺋﻠﻲ | ʾalā | 40r |

Elsewhere, however, etymological *ʾ*i* was written with a *kasrah* as expected, either with a *hamza + kasrah*, or by a *hamzah* below the *kursī alif* but without the *kasrah*:

Table 19

| | Arabic Text | Transliteration | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *hamzah + kasrah* | إنّ | ʾinn | "emphatic particle" | 40r |
| | إليّ | ʾilyy | "unto me" | 40v |
| | إمراٍ | ʾimrah-in | "a woman" | 47r |
| *hamzah* below *alif* | إلى | ʾlā | "to, toward" | 40r |
| | وإمّا | wa-ʾimmā | "either…or" | 75r |

The scribe is apparently using the combination of *ʾa* as a grapheme to indicate the presence of *hamzat al-qatʿ*, perhaps drawn from the regular occurrence of *ʾa* in other examples of initial *hamzat al-qatʿ*, as we have seen with, e.g., form I imperatives and forms VII through X perfects (see section 2.5 above). This is suggested by the rather odd spelling of *ʾilā*, described here, as well as, e.g., the phrase /min ʾumm-hā/ "from her mother," spelled من ﻋﺌﻤُّﻬﺎ <mn0 ʾammu-hā> (49v). Other examples of this kind of orthographic practice include:

Table 20

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| وَاﻋﻠِّﻢ | w'aʿullm | /wa-ʾuʿall(i)m/ | "And I will teach" | 88r |
| ﺋﺎﺧُﺮ | ʾaḫur | /ʾuḫar/ | "others (mpl)" | 44r |
| رأسُﻚ | r'as-uk | /rɑʾs-uk(V)/ | "your head" | 27r |
| رأسه | r'as-h | /rɑʾs-hV/ | "his head" | 31r |

In each of these cases, the *hamzah* is written to the right of the *alif*, rather than on top of it.

151

In a few places, an opposite phenomenon occurs, where *ʾa is spelled as if it were pronounced ʾi: <l-ʾinn>, presumably /lV-ʾinn(a)/ instead of /li-ʾanna/ "because" (45v; 77v). Alternatively, the spelling of *ʾanna as ʾinna could betray a lack of distinction between *ʾinna and *ʾanna. Finally, the 2ms independent pronoun is typically spelled <ʾant(a)>, but is once spelled <ʾinta> (40r).

It is possible that, much as we will see with the grapheme ءا- <āʾi> (Section 2.5.4 below), ʾv was variably spelled with either ʾa or ʾi, regardless of pronunciation. Another possibility is that the phonetic realization of /a/ and /i/ were close, or perhaps identical in certain circumstances, and this led to a certain variability in which was used. The latter is supported by other bits of evidence from the manuscript, especially the spelling of *i with *fatḥath* instead of *kasrah* in a number of places:

Table 21

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|
| مِن | min | "who" | 41v |
| مَكيَالٍ | makyālin | "measure of grain" | 23r |
| فَسَّر | fassar | "explain!" | 47v |

This overlap in spelling etymological *i and *a could indicate that both were realized as /e/, perhaps especially when unstressed. Such variation is directly parallel to the variable spellings of *tanwīn* in the text, which is primarily determined by orthography, as noted above. The spellings in SAr. 76 are also reminiscent of the kind of spelling in scripts other than Arabic, such as in Coptic transcriptions of *kaḏāka, "thus," as /kiḏāk/, which attest to further variation between the two vowels in open, unaccented syllables.[50]

*Maddah*:

The *maddah* is a diacritic which, in modern usage, marks a long *ā* following a *hamza* (*ʾā), as in *qurʾān*, as well as the long *ā* resulting from the shift of *ʾaʾ > ʾā, as in *ʾaʾkul > ʾākul "I eat".[51] In pre-modern texts, however, it was used in a wider variety of contexts. Specifically, in addition to its use to mark the combination of *hamza* followed by long *ā*, it was

---

[50] Joshua Blau, *A Handbook of Early Middle Arabic.* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2002), p. 29.
[51] Fischer, *Grammar of Classical Arabic*, p. 11.

frequently used to mark long *ā* preceding a word-final *hamza* (e.g., سمآء *samāʾ* "heaven"), in places where any long vowel preceded a *hamza* (e.g., *barīʾ* "innocent, blameless"), or where any long vowel preceded a geminate consonant (e.g., *ḍāllīn* "the lost").[52] While this is today associated mainly with Quranic spelling, it was at one point fairly common in ClAr manuscripts generally.[53]

In SAr. 76, the *maddah* regularly marks word-final long *ā* followed by *hamzah* (*aʾv*):

Table 22

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| طوبا للأنقيآء | ṭūbā ll-ʾnqyāāʾi | /li-l-ʾanq(i)yāʾ(i)/ or /li-l-ʾanq(i)yāāʾ(i)/ | "blessed are the pure" | 22v |
| الأنبيآ | ʾl-ʾnbyāā | /al-ʾanb(iy)āʾ/ or /al-anb(i)yāā/ | "the prophets" | 22v |
| السمآء | ʾl-ssmāāʾi | /as-samɑ:ʾ(i)/ or /as-samɑ::ʾ(i)/ | "heaven" | 23r |
| السمآي | ʾl-smāāy | /as-samɑ:ʾī/ or /as-samɑ::ʾī/ | "the heavenly (father)" | 27r |
| أبرآء | ʾbrāāʾin | /ʾabrɑ:ʾ-in/ or /ʾabrɑ::ʾ-in/ | "innocent (pl)" | 41r |
| أنشآ العالْم | ʾnšāā al-ʿālm0 | /ʾinšɑ:ʾ al-ʿɑ:l(a)m/ or /ʾinšɑ:ʾ al-ʿɑ:l(a)m/ | "the establishment of the world" | 83v |
| أنقضآ الدَّهَر | ʾnqḍāā al-ddahar | /ʾ(i)nq(i)ḍɑ:ʾ/ or /ʾinq(i)ḍɑ::ʾ/ | "the end of the age" | 48r |

It also marks the sequence *\*āʾv* when non-word final:

Table 23

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| حآآت | ḥāāʾt | /ǧāʾat/ | "she came" | 44r |
| جاآت | ǧāʾāāt | /ǧāʾat | "she came" | 94v |

---

52  Fischer, *Grammar of Classical Arabic*, p. 11.
53  Marijn van Putten, "Madd as Orthoepy Rather Than Orthography", in *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 12 (2021), pp. 202-213.

*Maddah* marks *hamzah* when followed by long *ā* (i.e. *ʾā*), either word-initially or following a consonant:

Table 24

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| آيه | ʾāāyh | /ʾāyah/ or /ʾāāyah/ | "a sign" | 54v |
| المرآء | ʾl-mrāā | /al-murʾā/ or /al-murʾāā/ | "the vision" | 57r |

In a few places it marks intervocalic *hamzah* when followed by long vowel other than *ā* (*\*vʾvv*):

Table 25

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| تنبآؤوا | tnbbāāwuw | /tanabbaʾū/ or /tanabbaʾūū/ | "they prophesied" | 39r |
| رآؤه | rāāwʾ-h | /rɑʾū-h(u)/ or /rɑʾūū-h(u) | "they saw him" | 50v |

The *maddah* is also used to indicate sequences of long *ā* + *hamzah* that cross morpheme boundaries:

> *fy āātnāʾi* "during", presumably /fī ʾatnāʾi/ (45r);
> مآءكل /māā ʾkl/ "what I might eat" (83v)

Another example <ʿlāā ydu-h> "by his hand" (85v) is intriguing. If the noun <ydu-h> is interpreted as representing /yad/, then this use of *maddah* is rather unexpected. However, it is possible that the orthography *yd* was read as /ʾīd/, in which case the *maddah* would here also mark the combination of cross-morpheme *āʾ*. The pronunciation of ClAr *yad* as (ʾ)*īd* is of course well-known from modern dialectal Arabic.

Finally, long *ā* is rarely marked even when not adjacent to *hamzah* or a geminate consonant:

Table 26

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| قآل | f-qāāl | /fa-qāl/ or /fa-qāāl/ | "And he said" | 86v |

To sum up, the *maddah* in SAr. 76 is attested when indicating the presence of a *hamzah* when preceded or followed by a long *ā* (*ʾā* and *āʾ*), as well as when long *ā* is followed by a geminated consonant (CāC$^1$C$^1$), both of which are well-known from Quranic and ClAr manuscripts.[54] The examples of cross-morpheme *maddah* marking is reminiscent of the Quranic reading tradition of Warš ʿan Nāfiʿ, where such vowels are recited overlong when followed by a *hamzah*.[55] Further, words of the shape CvvCv are, in all Quranic recitation traditions, treated as CvvC$^1$C$^1$ in pausal position; that is, they are realized overlong, with the predicted absence of the final short vowel. Therefore the very rare writing of *qāl*, "he said," with a *maddah* could reflect a similar kind of overlong realization, although one in which pausal position is no longer relevant.

The use of *maddah* to mark combinations of short vowels and *hamzah* is widespread here, and occurs throughout the manuscripts included in this study. In the latter role, the *maddah* might best be interpreted as an orthographic tool, along with *hamzah*, to indicate the presence of a glottal stop. The use of *maddah* to mark the unwritten presence of a *hamzah*, at least when following a long *ā*, is common in ClAr manuscripts as well (e.g., ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*). Whether or not the *maddah* indicated an overlong vowel, double that of a long vowel, is unclear. In cases where it marks a long *ā* following or preceding *hamzah*, it is possible. The presence of *maddah* to mark cross-morpheme *ā* + ʾ, as well as the occasional spelling of *qāl* as <qāāl>, perhaps lend credence to this. If so, *maddah* can be considered both an orthographic and orthoepic marker in SAr. 76.

While not ubiquitous, the regularity with which the *maddah* marks the word-final sequence *āʾv*, it is striking that *maddah* almost never marks the same sequence when non-word final. For example, active participles do not receive either *hamzah* or *maddah*: الصّايره <al-ṣṣāyrh>, presumably /aṣ-ṣāy(i)rah/ "the (miraculous works) happening" (40r)

Likewise, *maddah* is rarely used to mark the combination non-word final *āʾv* when a pronominal suffix is attached to a word ending in *āʾv*:

---

54  Van Putten, "*Madd as Orthoepy*", p. 212.

55  Van Putten, *Quranic Arabic*, p. 84.

Table 27

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| حدايه | ḥdāy-h | /ḥ(i)dāy-h(V)/ or /ḥidā'i-h(V)?/ | "his sandals (gen)" | 20r |
| اهرايه | 'hrāy-h | /'(a)hrāy-h(V)/ or /'ahrā'i-h(V)?/ | "his granary" | 20r |
| لغُرماينا | l-ġurmāy-nā | /li-ġur(a)mɑ:y-nā/ or /li-ġur(a)mɑ:'i-nā?/ | "those who sin against us" | 26r |
| ورايه | wrāy-h | /w(a)rɑ:y-h(V)/ or /w(a)rɑ:'i-h(V)?/ | "behind him (gen)" | 34r |

The one exception that I have found in the manuscript to this lack of *maddah* in word-internal context is:

احد اعضآيك<'ḥd ''ḍāāy-k>, presumably /'aʕḍɑ:'i-k/ or /'aʕḍɑ:'i-k/ "one of your body members" (24r)

The probability of a variety naturally developing a difference between word-final *ā'v* sequences and word-internal ones seems quite low. Rather, as with, e.g., the combination of vowelless and case-inflecting nouns, or the assimilating and non-assimilating pronouns, the present text attests to a combination of phonological and phonetic practices. These occur less in what might be considered basic, or non-salient aspects of the phonology (cf. the regularity of the occurrences of *ḍammah* indicated above), occurring more in parts of the phonology that might have been salient variables of the performative register (or registers) with which the scribe was interacting.

Final *ā*, *ā'v*, and the *ā'i* grapheme:

In SAr. 76, the combination اء- is frequently used to write word-final *ā'v*, regardless of syntactic context. Because of the fixed nature of the spelling, regardless of context, I consider it a sort of grapheme:

Table 28

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| هُم أبناءِ الخبيْث | 'bnāā'i al-ḫby0ṯ | /'abnā'/ or /'abnāā'/ | "the sons of wickedness" | 47v |
| جآءِ | ğāā'i | /ğā'/ or /ğāā'/ | "he came" | 46v |
| صار المسآءِ | ṣār al-msāā'i | /al-musā'/ or /al-musāā'/ | "evening came" | 50r |
| هاءِ أمّك | hā'i 'umm-k | /hā' 'umm-k/ or /hā 'umm-Vk/ | "here is your mother" | 44v |

| أخد مآءٍ | ʾḫd māā'in | /mɑː'-in/ or /mɑːː'-in/ | "He took water" | 91v |
| سأرسل حُكمآءٍ | s-'rsl 'nā ḥukmā'in | /ḥuk(a)mā'-in/ | "I will send...sages" | 76v |
| هولآءٍ | hwlā'i | /hawlā'(i)/ or /hawlāā'(i)/ | "these" | 38r |

As we will see below, this is common in other Christian Arabic manuscripts, and has been noted in later corpora as well.[56]

It is not clear what precisely the pronunciation of each word written with the ءا- grapheme might be, and several theories have been proposed. Talmon, following Scholz, suggests that it is intended to write word-final *ā with *imālah*: أنشاء <'nšā'i> = /inšē/.[57] Lentin argues instead for two possibilities.[58] One possibility he suggests is that the spelling ءا- is intended to indicate the presence of a glottal stop in classical words or classicisms. In that case, the spelling ءا- is intended to represent /ā'/, and the *kasrah* is purely ornamental. The other possibility Lentin proposes is that both the *hamzah* and *kasrah* are ornamental, and represent an underlying /ā/.

So how might we interpret its use in SAr. 76? It should be emphasized at the outset that the grapheme is clearly a convention already in the 13th century, and, like any orthographic convention, can – and likely has been – used to indicate various phonetic realities. The question here is whether the phonetic reality in SAr. 76 is discernible based on other aspects of the orthography; this could, but need not necessarily mean that later authors who used the grapheme would have read it or intended by it the same thing. With that said, I do think that a fairly strong argument that ءا- would have been read as /ā'/ can be made based on evidence from SAr. 76. First, as argued above (section 2.5.3), the *maddah*, with ءا- spellings and elsewhere, is used to indicate *hamzah*. Second, nouns ending in *ā' and spelled with ءا- frequently take *tanwīn*. In those cases, the *hamzah* is written explicitly:

Table 29

| **Arabic Text** | **Transliteration** | **Reconstruction** | **Translation** | **Folio** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| إنّ أنبيآءٍ | 'nn 'nbyāā'-in | /'anb(i)yā'-in/ or /'anb(i)yāā'-in/ | "prophets" | 45v |
| عَنْ حُكمآءٍ | 'an0 ḥukmāā'-in | /ḥuk(a)mɑː'-in/ or /ḥuk(a)mɑːː'-in/ | "about wise men" | 40r |
| كُلّ أسترخآءٍ | kull 'strḫāā'-in | /'ast(i)rḫā'-in/ or /'ast(i)rḫāā'-in/ | "every infirmity" | 35r |

---

56  Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", pp. 228-229.
57  Raphael Talmon, "19th century Palestinian Arabic: the testimony of Western travellers", in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 29 (2004), pp. 210-280, espec. 225-226.
58  Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", p. 229.

The fact that *tanwīn* is written consistently on a *hamzah* clearly shows that final *hamzah* was present, at least with *tanwīn*.

The question of how the ‍ءا- spelling developed. Why was *kasrah* written instead of *ḍammah* or *fatḥah*? One possibility is that it is drawn from the spelling of هولاء, wherein spoken varieties had lost word-final *hamzah*, but in higher register words it was retained. In that case, the frequent use of هولاء might have led to the generalization of the spelling of all word-final *-āʾ* sequences with the ‍ءا-. The problem with this scenario is that the pronoun itself was variously spelled, both in ClAr and Middle Arabic texts (Table 30). It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which the spelling was made regular for other words, but not for the demonstrative itself.

I propose another origin, which draws on the quality of the vowel of *tanwīn*. In SAr. 76, and indeed elsewhere in vocalized Christian Arabic texts, *tanwīn* is always written with *kasratān* when suffixed to nouns ending in *-āʾ*. Stokes argues that this invariant *-in*, which is also commonly marked on nouns which would not be marked with *tanwīn alif* in the orthography (which in addition to word-final *\*-āʾv* includes the *tāʾ marbūṭah*), indicates a merger of vowels in the *tanwīn* morpheme to /in/ or /ən/, which is attested and known in pre-modern and modern dialects.[59] Generally, when a *tanwīn alif* was required in the orthography, the scribes write *tanwīn* as *fatḥatān* atop *alif maqṣūrah*; elsewhere it is written *kasratān*. The absence of word-final short vowels thus resulted in the paradigm:

> Definite *samāʾ*
> Indefinite *samāʾ-in*

Once the *hamzah* diacritic became widespread, authors of such varieties could have analogized the orthography of the *tanwīn*-bearing form, written with two *kasrah*s to the *tanwīn*-less one, which they would write with a single *kasrah*:

> indefinite سماء > definite السماء

While this is necessarily speculative, it accounts for the otherwise peculiar spelling, and is based on another attested peculiar spelling, which is also quite widespread, that of the *kasratān* in all cases of *tanwīn* written on word-final *hamzah*.

While ‍ءا– is a common means for representing etymological *\*āʾv* sequences, it is hardly the only spelling of the sequence. The following include all alternatives, though this is not an exhaustive list of instances of alternative spellings:

---

59   Stokes, "Case in Christian Arabic Gospels".

Table 30

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| هاؤلاي | hāw0lāy | / hāwlāy / or /hāwlāʾi/ | "these" | 22v; 63v; 65v; 68r |
| هولآي | hwlāāY | /hawlāʾi/ or /hawlāāʾi/ | "these" | 81r |
| هاؤلاY | hāw0lāY | /hāwlāy/ or /hāwlāʾi/ | "these" | 35v |
| هاؤلاى | hāwlāY | /hāwlā/ or /hāwlāʾ(i)/ | "these" | 84r |
| هولآءي | hwlāāʾy | /hawlāʾi/ or /hawlāāʾi/ | "these" | 84r |
| الأنبيآ | ʾl-ʾnbyāā | /al-ʾanb(i)yāʾ/ or /al-ʾanb(i)yāāʾ/ | "the prophets" | 22v; 28v |
| للقُدْما | l-l-qud0mā | /lil-qudmɑ:/ or /lil-qudmɑ:ʾ/ | "to the ancients" | 24r |
| فهُما | fhumā | /fuh(a)mɑ:/ or /fuh(a)mɑ:ʾ/ | "understanding (pl)" | 40r |
| إنشا | ʾnšā | /ʾinšā/ or /ʾinšāʾ/ | "founding, foundation" | 47v |

Thus in addition to the اء- grapheme, *ā'ν sequences are spelled also with آ- and ا- as well. Again, this variation is attested in later corpora from, e.g., the Ottoman period.[60] Perhaps unsurprisingly, the greatest variation is attested in the spellings of the masculine plural demonstrative, ClAr *hāʾulāʾi*. If the above is correct, the spelling ا- would represent a historical one, the base form as found in, e.g., the Quran, and the spellings آ- and اء- (and indeed the combination آء-) represent variants for writing final /āʾ/.

Miscellaneous:

There are several instances in which a word in ClAr with *u* or *i* is spelled with a *fatḥah* in SAr. 76:

---

60  Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", pp. 227-228.

Table 31

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | ClAr Equivalent | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مَنكُمْ | man-kum0 | min-kum | "from among you" | 41v; 60v |
| مَنْهُمُ | man0-hum | min-hum | "from them" | 60r |
| هَناك | hanāk | hunāka | "there" | 30v |
| فسَّر لنا | fssar l-nā | fassir | "explain to us" | 47v |
| أُوليك | ʾawly0k | ʾulāʾika | "to/for those" | 71r |
| الأَثم | ʾl-ʾaṯm | al-ʾiṯm | "the sin" | 78r |

We have already seen this spelling variation in regards to the variation of *a and *i (above, section 2.5.4). At the same time, in the vast majority of cases, spellings in accordance with etymology, and which are identical to normative ClAr spellings, are found in SAr. 76. The tendency for non-etymological spellings to favor *faṭḥah* over either *ḍammah* and *kasrah*, along with the evidence from *tanwīn* and the initial *hamzah* spellings, should likely be interpreted as reflecting an aspect of the phonology of the scribe, in which *a and *i are both close to /e/ when stressed, and perhaps /ə/ when unstressed.

Other possible examples of colloquialisms are attested. For example, *yuʾaddī "he carries out" is spelled يدّي <yddy> (58v) instead of يودّي <ywddy>, and despite elsewhere spelling the active participle from the same root with a *wāw*, i.e., مؤدّي <mw0ddy> /muʾaddī/ (28v). The spelling <yddy> presumably reflects something like underlying /yVddī/, which is still attested in modern dialectal Arabic in, e.g., Cairen *yiddi* "he gives" (Woidich 2006: 331). Also, whereas most imperfect prefix vowels are vocalized as /a/, rarely they attest assimilation to a /u/ theme vowel, e.g., لِيحدُم <lyuḥdum>[61], presumably /li-yuḥdum/ "to serve" (66r) instead of /li-yaḥdum/. Such prefix vowel harmonization is also attested in modern dialectal Arabic.[62]

*SAr. 80*

The manuscript labeled SAr. 80 consists of 194 folia of paper, written by an unknown scribe in the *naskh* script style.[63] The 194 folia contain complete copies of the four

---

[61] The dot of the *ḫāʾ* is omitted here, which is attested rarely in cases of consonants that receive dots to distinguish them from other letters based on the same shape.

[62] Fischer and Jastrow, *Handbuch*, p. 65.

[63] For a discussion of the manuscript, a detailed discussion of the *Vorlangen* from which it draws, as well as a proposal for its relationship to another member of Family Jb (SAr. 106), see Jean Valentin, "Des traces de la vetus syra des évangiles en traduction arabe? Étude critique des variantes significatives en Mc 5,1-20

gospels.[64] SAr. 80 is a member of Kashouh's Family J[b], the so-called 'Melkite Vulgate'.[65] The manuscript was composed at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai in 1469 CE.[66]


Diacritics and Vocalization Marks:


SAr. 80 attests several diacritical marks to mark consonants and vowels. Of the vocalic signs, *ḍammah* is by far the most frequent. *Kasrah* and *fatḥah* are primarily used when marking *tanwīn*, i.e., in the signs *fatḥatān* and *kasratān*. The *shaddah* diacritic is used frequently with a variety of functions, as we will see. Finally, the *maddah* diacritic is used, and the contexts in which it is used will be discussed below (section 3.4). The *sukūn* is not attested in the portion of the manuscript included in this study.

In addition to the vocalization diacritics, and dots which are added to the consonantal skeleton to distinguish certain consonants from others, the scribe used an *ʾihmāl* sign, namely a v-shaped (˅) mark in some instances to indicate a *sīn*. The v-shaped mark is widely attested in medieval manuscripts to indicate a variety of consonants,[67] and elsewhere in the Christian corpus frequently marks, e.g., the *raʾ* (cf. SAr. 76, discussed above). In SAr. 80, however, it is only used to mark *sīn*. In other cases, however, the *sīn* is marked by a superscript horizontal line, or two horizontal lines stacked on top of each other

---

dans le Sinaï arabe 80", in Geert van Oyen (ed.), *Reading the Gospel of Mark in the Twenty-First Century: Method and Meaning.* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), pp. 765-779. While Valentin's argument is convincing, he nevertheless follows the regrettable trend of "correcting" the transcription of the text in accordance with Classical Arabic. I simply do not see any benefit to this practice. First and foremost, such a practice misrepresents what the scribe actually wrote, which should always be the focus, especially of work which aims at understanding the peculiarities of a particular manuscript. Secondly, this perpetuates the problematic notion that Classical Arabic is the norm against which non-Classical texts should be read. Importantly, this is not merely a theoretical matter. For example, in transcribing the third person pronominal suffixes as harmonizing according to standard Classical Arabic (in which third masculine singular, dual, and plural pronouns are realized with a *-u* except when preceded by *-i, -ī,* or *ay*), the actual pattern of harmonization in the manuscript – which is non-Classical but consistent – is missed. Specifically, SAr. 80 attests a pattern in which the third masculine singular suffix harmonizes *only* when suffixed to the preposition *bi*; otherwise, it is realized as *hu*: *bi-hi* "by/with him," but *fī-hu* "in him" and *ʾilay-hu* "to him." For work detailing this and other harmonization patterns attested in vocalized Christian Arabic Gospel manuscripts, see Phillip W. Stokes, "*bi-hī bi-him…fī-hu*? Pronominal suffix harmonization diversity in some vocalized Christian Arabic Gospel manuscripts", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (forthcoming). It is preferable in my view to transcribe the text of the manuscript according to how it appears in the manuscript, as much as possible, and, where necessary, adding footnotes to clarify the text in the few places in which it might cause genuine confusion.

[64] Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 159.

[65] Kashouh, *Arabic Versions*, pp. 185-194.

[66] According to the colophon at 165v, the manuscript was copied at Mt. Sinai with a date of composition of September 6978 AMbyz (Byzantine world era).

[67] Witkam, "The neglect neglected".

(resembling *fatḥatān*) (both also used in manuscripts outside of the Christian corpus). Additionally, a miniature *kāf* is often, though not always, used to mark non-initial *kāf*s.

Vocalization placement is considerably varied, especially when compared with SAr. 76. Both *ḍammah* and *shaddah* are often placed one or several letters removed from their presumed articulation points. There are, however, patterns to their placement, though not hard rules. These patterns will be discussed in the relevant sections. Contrary to the variation in vocalization placement, the v-shaped diacritic is regularly placed above the *sīn*.

*Ḍammah*:

The *ḍammah* in SAr. 80 is attested in a wide variety of contexts, some of which are standard from the perspective of the orthographic tradition and ClAr, while others are to one degree or another unique. As expected, *ḍammah* marks etymological *\*u*, including internal passive verbs in SAr. 80:

Table 32

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| خطبتُ | ḫṭbtu | /ḫutibut/ | "she was betrothed" | 4v |
| كتبُ | ktbu | /kutib(a)/ | "it was written" | 5r |
| اسُلم | ʾsulm | /ʾuslim(a)/ | "He was handed over" | 8r |
| سُمع | sumʿ | /sumiʿ(ɑ)/ | "it was heard" | 6r |
| يعُرف | yʿurf | /yuʿrɑf(u)/ | "it will be known" | 18r |
| خفيُ | ḫfyu | /ḫufī/ or /ḫufiyaʔ/ | "it has been hidden" | 18r |
| الحُلم | ʾl-ḥulm | /Vl-ḥulm/ | "the dream" | 4v |
| مدُن | mḏun | /mudun/ | "cities" | 9r |
| نحنُ | nḥnu | /nVḥnu/ | " We" | 16r; 34r |
| عُمال | ʿumāl | /ʿummɑːl/ | "workers" | 24r |
| كُمل | kmul | /kVmul(a)/ | "it was completed" | 49r |

The placement of *ḍamma* is inconsistent, occasionally occurring in the presumably intended place, and elsewhere occurring one or several consonants removed. This is especially true in the representation of internal passives, where examples of the initial (and etymological) consonant is marked, but most are marked on either the second or final consonant. It is perhaps noteworthy that the scribe's placement of the *ḍammah* appears to be somewhat dependent on a preference for certain consonants over others. For example, in the case of *yuʿraf* (18r), the *ʿayn*, which is the initial consonant of the root, receives the *ḍammah*, whereas with *yuḥraq* (24r), the *rāʾ*, the second consonant of the root, receives the mark instead. The reason for this preference is, as we will see, possibly intersects with other categories which trigger *ḍammah* marking, to which we now turn.

A large proportion of the attestations of *ḍammah* occur in places where, from the perspective of the Quran or ClAr, we would not expect one. The consonantal contexts in which these non-standard *ḍammah*s occur are diverse, but several patterns emerge from a macro-analysis of these data. In perhaps the largest group, the unifying feature (or features) is the presence of a bilabial consonant, either *b*, *m*, or *w*. This suggests the use of *ḍammah* to mark rounding influence from the bilabial consonants, as noted by Lentin in later (Ottoman) texts:[68]

Table 33

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| البُكر | ʾl-bukr | /Vl-bukr/ | "the firstborn son" | 5r |
| بُرية | buryh | /buriyyah/ | "wilderness" | 6v |
| فُم | fmu | /fumm/ | "mouth" | 7v |
| المدُبح | ʾl-mdubḥ | /Vl-mudbuḥ/ | "the alter" | 9v; 40v |
| المُسا | ʾl-musā | /Vl-musā/ or /Vl-musāʾ/ | "the evening" | 14v |
| نمُت | nmut | /numt(a)/ | "You slept" | 23v |
| ابُي | ʾbyu | /ʾaby:/ | "my father" | 29r |
| الجمُل | ʾl-ǧmul | /Vl-ǧamul/ | "the camel" | 33v |

---

68  Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", p. 221.

| الوُيل | ʾl-wuyl | /Vl-wɑyl/ or /al-wayl/ | "woe!" | 41r |
| ذُما | ḏumā | /dumɑ:/ or /dumɑ:ʾ/ | "blood (pl)" | 41r |
| بُنا | bunā | /bunā/ or /bunāʾ/ | "buildling" | 41v |
| المغربُ | ʾl-mġrbu | /Vl-muġrub/ | "The west" | 42v |

In addition to bilabials, *ḍammah* seems occurs rather frequently with emphatics, which includes *rāʾ*, *qāf*, *ʿayn*, and *ḥāʾ*, and thus could indicate some sort of backing effect:

## Table 34

| **Arabic Text** | **Transliteration** | **Reconstruction** | **Translation** | **Folio** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| سُرًّا | suran | /surr-an/ | "secretly" | 4v; 5r |
| العُين | ʾl-ʿuyn | /Vl-ʿɑyn/ | "the eye" | 12r |
| يقدرُ | yqdru | /yVqdur/ | "he is able" | 12r |
| لحُصاده | l-ḥṣuād-h | /li-ḥoṣɑ:d-h(u)/ | "for his harvest" | 17r |
| يكْرُز | ykruz | /yVkruz/ | "he proclaims the gospel" | 19r |
| فسُّر | fssur | /fassur/ | "interpret (impv)" | 27r |
| لُقآه | luqāā-h | /luqɑ:ʾ-h(u)/ | "to meet him" | 43v |
| صُيامً | ṣuyāman | ṣuyyɑ:m-ən | "fasting (pl)" | 28r |
| رُحا | ruḥuā | /rɑḥɑ:/ | "millstone" | 31r |
| الفعُله | ʾl-fʿulh | /Vl-faʿɑlah/ | "the workers" | 34v |
| لقيصُر | l-qyṣur | /li-qayṣɑr/ | "to Caesar" | 39r |

The apparent inclusion of *rāʾ* in this group of emphatics is, from a comparative perspective, unsurprising. Indeed, the *rāʾ* patterns with emphatics in the phonologies of a

number of modern Arabic dialects, especially, e.g., the northern Levant.[69] The fact that the pharyngeal fricatives *ʿayn* and *ḥāʾ* behave similarly is not unexpected, as they naturally pattern with pharyngealized consonants in contemporary dialects insofar as they, e.g., block raising of femining ending *-e/-i* in dialects where *\*-a(h)* is raised in non-emphatic contexts: Levantine *wāḥde* "one (fsg) vs. *ǧəmʿa* "Friday."[70]

In some cases, *ḍammah* occurs where either ClAr has by-forms with *i* and *u*, or otherwise attests ubiquitously *i*:

Table 35

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| السُنّ | ʾl-sunn | /Vs-sunn/ | "tooth" | 10v |
| يَجِدُ | yǧdu | /yVǧud/ | "He will find" | 12v |
| فادفنُ | f-ʾdfnu | /fa-ʾadfun/ | "Then I bury" | 14v |
| النُسآ | ʾl-nusāā | /Vn-nusāʾ/ or /Vn-nusāāʾ/ | "the women" | 28r |
| جُهات | ǧuhāt | /ǧuhāt/ | "angles, sides" | 43r |
| ادنُ | ʾdnu | /ʾ(a)dun(a)/ | "he permitted" | 33r |

This could suggest a general merger of *\*u* and *\*i* to *u* in most phonetic contexts, or perhaps rather a preference for *u* over *i* in many roots. Alternatively, it is possible, as Lentin has argued, that it represents a *shewa* /ə/.

In addition to these contexts, in which it can fairly straightforwardly be read as either, *ḍammah* is also used in contexts whose interpretations are less straightforward.[71]

The marking of *yāʾ* with *ḍammah* is peculiar and deserving of attention. In the vast majority of cases, *ḍammah* marks *yāʾ* when it represents a presumed underlying *ī* or *ay*. When it marks presumed *ī*, it is virtually always in the context of either a bilabial or an emphatic consonant:[72]

---

[69] Fischer and Jastrow, *Handbuch*, pp. 56-57; Stuart Davis, "Velarization", in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. IV*. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 636-638, espec. 637.

[70] Kristen Brustad and Emilie Zuniga, "Levantine Arabic", in John Huehnergard and Naʾama Pat-El (eds.), *The Semitic Languages*, 2nd edition. (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 403-432, espec. 405-408.

[71] Lentin, "Normes orthographiques", p. 220.

[72] There are a very few cases, however, where this is not the case, as in the case of الذُيك /ʾl-ḏuyk/ "the rooster" (49r).

Table 36

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| يديُ | ydyu | /yaday/ | "the (du) hands of (sinners)" | 47v |
| فايُ | f-ʾyu | /fa-ʾayy/ | "so which" | 49v |
| أيلي | ʾuyly | /ʾēlī/ | "My god" | 50v |
| الذُيان | ʾl-ḏuyān | /Vd-dayyān/ | "the judge" | 9v |
| الحيُاه | ʾl-ḥyuā | /Vl-ḥayɑ:h/ or /Vl-ḥayōh/ | "life" | 32r |
| الامِيُن | ʾl-ʾmyun | /Vl-ʾamy:n/ | "the faithful (slave)" | 44v |
| يكتيُبُ | yktyubu | /yVktayb/ or /yVktaʾy:b/ | "he was sad" | 47r |
| ذمُيُ | ḏmuyu | /damy:/ or /damʷī/ | "my blood" | 46v |
| يصُير | yṣuyr | /yaṣy:r/ or /yɑsy:r/ | "It will become" | 16r |

In a few places, a *yāʾ* is marked with a *ḍammah* in III-Y roots where, in ClAr, the word is pronounced with a final *ā*, namely with the *alif maqṣūrah bi-ṣūrat al-yāʾ*:

Table 37

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| اتكيُ | ʾtkyu | /Vttakē/ or /Vttakā/ | "he reclined" | 46v |
| اعميُ | ʾʿmyu | /ʾaʿmy:/ or /ʾaʿmɑ:/ | "blind man" | 21r |
| افترُي | ʾftruy | /Vftarē/ or /Vftarā/ | "he trumped up" | 48v |

Parallel to the use of *ḍammah* before *alif maqṣūrah bi-ṣūrat al-yāʾ* is the use of *ḍammah* before long *ā*:

Table 38

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| خُان | ḫuān | /ḫōn/ | "the time (morning) came" | 49r |
| الاعمُا | ʾl-ʾʿmuā | /Vl-ʾaʿmɑ:/ | "the blind man" | 27r |
| العصُاه | ʾl-ʿṣuāh | /Vl-ʿaṣɑ:/ | "The stick, rod" | 17v |
| غدُا | ġduā | /ġadɑ:/ | "tomorrow" | 12r; 12v |
| الحيُاه | ʾl-ḥyuā | /Vl-ḥayōh/ | "life" | 32r |

Note the variation in spelling the word *\*ʾaʿmā / \*ʾaʿmay*, "blind man," which is spelled with both final *yāʾ* (21r) and *alif mamdūdah* (27r), and both of which are marked with a *ḍammah*. Additionally, both *ʾaʿmā* and *ʿaṣā*, "stick, rod," contain a bilabial and emphatic, respectively.

Finally, in a small minority of cases, the context is either an open or unaccented syllable:

Table 39

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| نلبسُ | nlbsu | /nVlbus/ | "we will wear" | 12v |
| دُنا | dunā | /dunā/ | "he drew near" | 21r |
| حدُثت | ḥduṯṯ | /ḥaduṯat/ | "it happened" | 50v |

Returning to the question of what, if any, phonetic significance – other than /u/ - might have been intended by the use of *ḍammah*, any answer will inevitably be somewhat speculative. The most likely interpretations of usages where a single short vowel is expected based on pattern and etymology are either that it marked /u/ or, as Lentin argued, /ə/. It should be noted as a matter of methodology that some authors used the *ḍammah* to indicate different underlying phonetic realities; there is no reason that the data from one text or corpus must determine its interpretation in another. While both interpretations - /u/ and /ə/ - are *a priori* possible and plausible, I prefer any explanation which can account for the most aspects of its distribution. In SAr. 80, the *ḍammah* is primarily found:

In contexts where etymologically we expect a *\*u*

In phonetic contexts with bilabials

In phonetic contexts with emphatics, especially *rāʾ* and *ṣād*
Before *\*ay* or *\*aya* (the latter written with *alif maqṣūrah bi-sūrat al-yāʾ*)
Before long *ā* in certain words
Occasionally in unstressed syllables

First, as I argued above regarding SAr. 76, the frequent use of *ḍammah* with bilabials, presumably to mark a rounded vowel, is naturally interpreted as /u/ rather than /ə/. The frequency with which the same context is marked in SAr.80, including not only short vowels, but also long vowels, also suggests a role in marking backed or rounded vowels. The fact that the use of *ḍammah* with long *ā* occurs especially after bilabials or emphatics adds weight to this interpretation. If that is the case, the combination of *ḍammah* + *ā* presumably indicates a backed variant of *a*, perhaps to /ɑ/ or /ɒ/, or even /o/. Especially noteworthy in this regard is the use of *ḍammah* with the word *ḥayāh*, "life." In the Quran and other Islamic-era documents, the word is spelled حيوه in absolute, but حاه \ حات in construct. While this has often been interpreted as an old Aramaic orthographic borrowing, Al-Jallad[73] and van Putten[74] separately make convincing cases that the absolute form should rather be interpreted as /ḥayōh/. The present proposal is similar to, e.g., some Levantine dialects, where *\*ā* becomes *ō* in certain environments, including emphatic consonants, e.g., *ṛōs*, "head".[75]

Additional evidence is once again to be found in the spelling of *tanwīn* in the manuscript. Unlike SAr. 76, the default spelling of *tanwīn* in most cases is *fatḥatān*, even when the noun does not take *tanwīn alif*; only one example of *kasratān* occurs in the Gospel of Matthew, for example, compared with approximately 499 examples of *tanwīn alif* and/or *fatḥatān*. The following example illustrates the pattern typical of SAr. 80:

حينيدٍ استدعا هيرودس المجوس سرًّا "Then Herod summoned the Magi secretly" (7v)

In the first case, *\*ḥīnaʾiḏin* is etymologically genitive, but is written with *fatḥatān*. However, the scribe was aware that the word is not typically written with *tanwīn alif*, and therefore omitted it. In the second, the same *tanwīn* is written, this time in the etymological accusative, with the orthographically expected *tanwīn alif*. Whether the realization of *fatḥatān* was /an/ or rather /in/ or /ən/, it seems likely the *fatḥah* or *kasrah* would more likely have represented /ə/ than *ḍammah*; otherwise we might expect some use of *ḍammatān* marking *tanwīn*.

---

73 Ahmad Al-Jallad, "Was it *sūrat al-baqárah*? Evidence for Antepenultimate Stress in the Quranic Consonantal Text and its Relevance for صلوه Type Nouns", in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 167 (1) (2017), pp. 81-90.

74 Marijn van Putten, "The development of the triphthongs in Quranic and Classical Arabic", in *Arabian Epigraphic Notes* 3 (2017), pp. 47-74, espec. pp. 64-67.

75 Peter Behnstedt, "Syria" in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. IV*. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 402-409, espec. 404-405.

I therefore propose that the combination of contexts can be most parsimoniously interpreted by positing that *ḍammah* marks /u/, both etymological instances, as well as rounding in the contexts of bilabials, and backing in the context of emphatics, which include *rāʾ*, and also the voiced and voiceless pharyngeal fricatives, spelled with *ʿayn* and *ḫāʾ*.

It is less certain what to make of the use of *ḍammah* with certain instances of *yāʾ*. As with long *ā*, many non-standard *ḍammah* + *yāʾ* uses occur with either emphatics or bilabials. Further, those that do not occur in these contexts are often where we find the historical diphthong *ay, e.g., فأَيُّ <f-ʾay> (49v), presumably /fa-ʾayy/, "which?" So what are we to make of this phenomenon, and how, if at all, is it related to the other uses of *ḍammah* just considered? One piece of evidence that I believe is crucial for properly interpreting this use of *ḍammah* is its use with II-Y/W (hollow) verbs to mark the passive. Not only is this use directly parallel in terms of orthography, it is also widespread in early Christian manuscripts, which are otherwise rarely vocalized.

*Excursus:* قيُل *qyul "It was said" and the Ḍammah + yāʾ phenomenon*

SAr. 80 attests a spelling of perfect passive hollow (II-Y/W) verbs in which either the initial consonant is marked with a *ḍammah*, primarily with the passive form of the verb *qāl*, "he said": قيُل <qyul> "it has been said" (6v; 9v; 10r; 10v; 36r; 42r). This orthography occurs elsewhere among the manuscripts studied here (SAr. 82, 89, 90, and 91), and is attested already in the earliest Christian Arabic manuscripts produced in south Palestine. In his grammar of Ancient South Palestinian Christian Arabic, Blau notes this spelling and remarks on it in several places, a fact that unfortunately leads to a lack of clarity regarding Blau's view of these verbs. Regarding the spellings with *ḍammah*, Blau first notes its use with the verb *saʾala*, "he asked," in forms like سُلنا /sulnā/ "we were asked," where he speculates that the use of the *ḍammah* could be merely an orthographic device to indicate the passive, with the form representing an underlying /sil-nā/.[76] Later, however, he citing the 3mpl form سُيل <suyl> he argues that *ḍammah* represents underlying /suyila/, with the loss of glottal stop leading to a shift in category from II-ʾ to II-Y, and thus *suʾila > suyila*.[77] We might infer that Blau would thus interpret the 1cp form سُلنا as representing underlying /sul-nā/, but we are not told that explicitly.

Blau takes up the topic a third time when discussing etymological II-Y/W (hollow) verbs and orthographic variation associated with them. He notes that, along with the same spelling combination of *ḍammah* + *yāʾ*, some attest passive forms with a prothetic *alif*: اقيل <ʾqyl/ "it was said" and اسيل <ʾsyl> "I was asked."[78] In these cases, Blau argues that the ClAr form was *qīl*, and due to the difference between these hollow verb forms and the typical passive form of *u-i-a*, "it was reshaped according to [Form IV] pattern (*ʾuqīla*) and

---

[76] Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 63.
[77] Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 95.
[78] Blau, *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 160.

thus passed into the fourth form" (ibid.). To support this reconstruction, Blau notes the occasional passive participles with a *m* prefix, e.g., المقال له <ʾl-mqāl> "he with whom they spoke" and /msʾl/ مسال عن "responsible for".[79]

Several questions emerge based on this discussion. First, to take up the first example Blau cites, namely passive forms of *saʾala*, it is not clear, if the passive form is *suyila* as Blau contends, why it would be reanalyzed as a fourth verb form, since it would fit exactly the typical ClAr internal passive scheme of *u-i-a*. Such a reanalysis would rather suggest that *II-ʾ verbs had merged with *II-Y/W verbs. If that is the case, then we must still explain why third person passives were spelled with a *ḍammah* + *yāʾ*, if it did not represent underlying *suyila*. Second, the spellings of II-Y/W verbs with *ḍammah* but which lack the prothetic *alif*, which constitute the majority of spellings, are still left unexplained. Third, while Blau makes a plausible case for why passive spellings were occasionally spelled with a prothetic *alif*, it should be noted that such a reanalysis apparently only occurred in the passive forms; active forms are not spelled with a prothetic *alif*.

I would argue that another possibility can better account for the orthographic variation, as well as help make sense of the *ḍammah* + *yāʾ* combinations found in SAr. 80 and elsewhere that are otherwise quite perplexing. Contrary to Blau's assertion, *Cīla* was not the only passive form attested in ClAr. Sibawayh, for example, mentions three different internal passives of II-Y/W verbs:[80] *Cūla*, *Cīla*, and a third form which involves ʾišmām, or "lip rounding." Van Putten argues persuasively that this third category involves a rounded high vowel /y/, which he transcribes with *ü*.[81] Crucially, this third form, *qūla*, is actually spelled precisely the same way –not- with a *ḍammah* in some manuscripts – in treatises on the Quranic reading variants as in the Christian manuscripts! See, for example, Ibn Khalawayh's *Kitāb al-Badīʿ*: واذا قُيل بِضَمّ القَاف <wa-ʾiḏā quyl b-ḍamm al-qāf> "And if *qul* with a *ḍammah* on the *qāf*" (Ar 3051, 25v). According to Al-Farrāʾ, the passive form *qīla* is typical of the people of the Hijaz, and this is indeed the basis of the orthography of the Quran.[82] If the internal passive forms of *II-W/Y verbs was of the *qūla* type, we would expect the orthography to show that and be spelled with *wāw*. However, if the pronunciation of the Christian Arabic form was of the third, *qūla* type, the Quranic spelling with a *yāʾ* could predictably be retained, but with a *ḍammah* spelled to note the rounding (ʾišmām). In other words, positing a *qūla*-type internal passive in the Christian variety or varieties can explain the peculiar orthography associated with *II-Y/W verbs, as well as *II-ʾ ones in many cases, attested across centuries of Christian Arabic.

If we accept that early Christians had an internal passive of *II-W/Y verbs of the *qūla* type rather than *qīla*, how do we explain the apparent reanalysis of the passive forms –

---

[79] Blau. *Grammar of Christian Arabic*, p. 161.

[80] Sībawayh, *al-Kitāb*, pp. 342-345.

[81] Van Putten, *Quranic Arabic*, pp. 39-40.

[82] ʾAbū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā al-Farrāʾ, *Kitāb fīh Luġāt al-Qurʾān*. Edited by Ǧābir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Sarī. (Unpublished, freely downloadable, 2014), p. 14. The book is accessible at the following link: https://ebook.univeyes.com/92870/pdf-%D9%84%D8%BA%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%82%D8%B1%D8%A2%D9%86-%D9%84%D9%84%D9%81%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A1

perfectives and participles – that suggest a re-analysis of these forms as form IV rather than form I? I believe one possibility is that the Hijazi form, of the *qīla* type, spread in the area and became prestigious as well. If *qīla* became an increasingly used form, it could have been reanalyzed as Blau suggested, but due to a relative lack of familiarity with it vis-à-vis the *qūla* type. In some cases, this reanalysis was marked orthographically by a prothetic *alif*, and this became a spelling variant, even when vocalization made clear that the *qūla* type was intended. This is indeed attested in the same document frequently, e.g., SAr: قد سمعتم انهُ اقيْل "you have heard that it was said" (10v) but then قد سمعتم انهُ قيْل "idem" (10v) on the same page! So regarding Blau's example of سُيل and سُلنا spellings, I would argue that they represent *sūla* and *sulnā*.

It is against this backdrop, then, that I suggest we interpret the use of *ḍammah* marking *yāʾ* in these manuscripts. As we have already noted, many of the examples of this combination occur when in the context of bilabials. Whether the precise phonetic significance is to indicate lip rounding (i.e., /ʾabʷī/ "my father" , or rather a front rounded vowel /ʾaby:/, is unclear.

Regarding the significance of the *ḍammah* + *yāʾ* in emphatic contexts, the likeliest interpretation is that the *ḍammah* marks a sort of backed/lowered variant of *ī*, which was similar enough to the diphthong /ay/, or, if the dialect of the scribe had only monophthongs, /ē/, that triggered its use in both contexts. This has significant implications for the realization of the *alif maqṣūrah*. While it is of course possible that the use of *ḍammah* was purely orthographic in these cases, it seems at least as likely, if not more so, that the *ḍammah* written on *alif maqṣūrah bi-ṣūrat al-yāʾ* marks a similar sound to the *ay/ē* (and thus also backed *ī*), rather than *ā*. If so, it could indicate that, at least with some verbs, a remnant of an older distinction between III-Y and III-W root verbs was retained.[83] The use of *ḍammah* marking *wāw* in in the word *wayl*, "woe" (41r), to mark a rounding of the following *ay* diphthong, provides supporting evidence for this theory.

However, there is variation in the spelling of etymologically III-Y verbs, a significant number of which are spelled with *alif mamdūdah* instead of *yāʾ*, which could suggest that many of these verbs were pronounced with final *ā*, as in ClAr. The presence of etymological III-Y verbs spelled both with *alif maqṣūrah* marked with *ḍamma*, along with

---

[83] For the historical development of triphthongs, including *aya, see: van Putten, "Triphthongs in Quranic and Classical Arabic". Etymological *ay and *aya were spelled with eta (η) in the Greek transliterations of the pre-Islamic period, likely indicating a realization of /ē/ rather than /ā/; see Al-Jallad, "Graeco-Arabica I: The Southern Levant", in Ahmad Al-Jallad (ed.), *Arabic in Context: Celebrating 400 Years of Arabic at Leiden University.* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 99-186, espec. p. 154. Spellings in the Safaitic script suggest that the dialects of the Ḥarrah in the pre-Islamic period retained *aya sequences; see Al-Jallad, *An Outline of the Grammar of the Safaitic Inscriptions*, col. <<Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics>> 80. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), p. 121. Evidence from Quranic rhyme, in addition to the orthography of the Quranic consonantal text (*rasm*), strongly suggest that III-Y verbs and nouns were realized likewise as /ē/ or perhaps /ay/, rather than /ā/; see van Putten, "Triphthongs in Quranic and Classical Arabic", pp.57-59. The Greek transliteration of Arabic in the Damascus Psalm Fragment, however, shows that even outside of ClAr, other varieties had shifted *aya > ā; see Al-Jallad, *Damascus Psalm Fragment*, p. 16.

other spelled *alif mamdūdah*, if not the result of orthographic variation, is interpretably in two ways. One possibility is that all III-Y verbs were realized with long *ā*, in which case the *alif maqṣūrah* is a historical spelling, and the *ḍammah* perhaps to indicate /ā/ instead of /ay/ or /ē/. Another possibility is that there was a difference between the realizations of III-Y verbs in different registers, and the scribe was engaging in a sort of mixing of these registers, one of which had something like /ē/ for 3ms III-Y verbs, while the other attested the ClAr shift of *\*aya* > *ā*.

The weight of the evidence suggests that, in addition to denoting etymological *u* (realized either /u/ or /o/), the use of *ḍammah* in emphatic and bilabial contexts to mark short vowels suggests either a merger of *\*i* and *\*u* to *u*, or perhaps rather a preference for *u* in certain contexts. Additionally, the use of *ḍammah* to mark long *ā* most likely indicates a backed variant of long *ā*. Finally, I have argued here that the widespread use of *ḍammah* to mark *yāʾ* in various contexts is best explained as marking rounding and backing of *\*ī*, and overlaps with marking etymological *\*ay*, whether it was *ay* or *ē* in actuality, due to the closeness of the rounded and backed variant(s) of *\*ī* on the one hand, and *ē* or *ay* on the other. We can perhaps sum up the evidence by stating that *ḍammah* indicates a high back short vowel, as well as rounding or backing of other vowels.

## Shaddah

The *shaddah* is used very frequently in SAr. 80, in both traditional and non-traditional contexts. In many ways *shaddah* appears to have both orthographic and orthoepic functions. In the latter category, *shaddah* clearly marks etymological gemination. In the former category, we can note its use to mark *dāl*, especially root/word-finally, as well as *rāʾ* and *mīm*. Additionally, *wāw* and *yāʾ*, which are marked in virtually every position, are regularly marked with shadda regardless of whether they represent consonantal *\*y/w*, long vowel *\*ī/ū*, or diphthong *\*ay/aw*. A third group marked with non-etymological *shaddah* includes the *mīm*, and less commonly, *nūn* and *lām*. Finally, there are some contexts in which *shadda* is used in non-geminate contexts in which elsewhere *ḍamma* occurs, which could hint at a role marking either backed or rounded vowel quality.

As we might expect, *shaddah* is used to mark etymologically geminate consonants as well:

Table 40

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| يتعبّد | ytʿbdd | /yVt(a)ʿabbud/ | "He can serve" | 12r |
| يعمدّكم | yʿmdd-km | /yVʿammid-kum/ | "He will baptize you" | 7r |

172

| للنقيّة | l-l-nqyhh | /lin-naqiyyah/ | "for the pure (of heart)" | 9r |
| السُنّ | ʾl-sunn | /Vs-sunn/ | "the tooth" | 10v |
| عدوّك | ʿdww-k | /ʿaduww-Vk/ | "your enemy" | 10v |
| وصّلو | w-ṣṣlw | /wa-ṣallū/ | "so pray!" | 10v |
| الربّ | ʾl-rbb | /Vr-rubb/ | "the master" | 12r |
| جّدا | ǧǧdā | /ǧiddā/ or /ǧiddan/ | "very" | 15r |
| والصمّ | w-ʾl-ṣmm | /waṣ-ṣumm/ | "and the mute (pl)" | 28r |
| الاهّله | ʾl-ʾhhlh | /Vl-ʾahVllah/ | "the diviners" | 30r |
| لمصابيحهنّ | l-mṣābyḥ-hnn | /li-muṣɑ:by:ḥ-hunn/ | "for their (fpl) lamps" | 43v |

The use of *shaddah* to mark glides which etymologically were combinations of long high vowels and the glottal stop, i.e., *ī* or *ū*, suggests that the shift from *ī* > *iyy* and *ū* > *uww* had taken place. Note the placement of *shaddah* in certain cases is not with the geminated consonant, but one of the preferred consonants, listed above, such as *dāl*, *ṣād*, and the glides *wāw* and *yāʾ*.

It is unclear how or why the conventions developed by which non-etymological *shadda* co-occurs with the consonant groups listed above. There are, however, some possibilities worth exploring here. The most immediate explanation for the use of *shadda* to mark consonants like *dāl* and *rāʾ* is that the *shadda* here is a sort of *ʾihmāl* marking. In this case, *dāl* is marked as not *ḏāl* and *rāʾ* is not *zāy*. In other manuscript traditions, the marker of *rāʾ* was a superscript v-shaped marked. This is attested in SAr. 80, however, only to mark *sīn* (and there, not ubiquitously). However, the distinctions between *dāl* and *ḏāl* are blurred in the manuscript; specifically, etymological *d* is often written with a *dāl* pointed with a superscript dot, which originally functioned to mark *ḏ* (i.e., the *ḏāl*). For example, the scribe(s) write the word *al-ʾurdunn*, "Jordan (river)," as <ʾl-ʾrḏn> instead of <ʾl-ʾrdn> (e.g., 8r), and elsewhere the word *mudun*, "cities," is written <mḏun> (9r) and the word *dall*, "he led," is spelled *ḏll* (6v). As noted previously, many of the instances of *shadda* marking *dāl* occur with certain roots (such as *ʾḫḏ* and *wǧḏ*), and occur word- (or at least root) finally, and once, word-initially. It could be that, for purely aesthetic reasons, the scribe marked *dāl* word-initially and word-finally with *shadda*, and word-medially with a dot, but this is pure speculation.

I argue the use of *shadda* to mark *wāw* and *yāʾ*, likewise initially opaque, is explicable as a generalization based on a presumed shift in the underlying phonology of the dialect of the scribe. Namely, we might assume that non-geminated diphthongs had shifted to monophthongs in the dialect of the scribe:

$*ay/aw > \bar{e}/\bar{o}$ OR $\bar{\imath}/\bar{u}$

This shift is well-known from both pre-modern and modern Arabic sources.[84] In such a situation, the only instances of *aw* or *ay* in the dialect would occur when geminated (i.e., *CawwVC* and *CayyVC* forms), such as form II verbal forms or II-Y/W adjectives, e.g.: *qawwā* "he strengthened"; *ṭayyib* "good; delicious." If a scribe who speaks such a dialect were to attempt to write a variety of Arabic in which etymological diphthongs were universally retained, then he might generalize the *shadda*, which would mark the only native diphthongs in his dialect, to all diphthongs in the written register. From there it is not difficult to see a further generalization of the *shadda* to mark *wāw* and *yāʾ* in all contexts.

The third group of consonants which receive non-etymological *shadda* marking, with varying degrees of frequency, includes the *mīm*, *nūn*, and *lām*. As noted above, the *mīm* is by far the most frequently marked of these three, and both *nūn* and *lām* only receive non-etymological *shadda* marking word-finally. This parallels the frequent word-final use of *shadda* elsewhere, especially, e.g., marking the *dāl*. How can the use of *shadda* to mark these consonants be explained? Unlike *nūn* and *lām*, *mīm* was occasionally marked with a superscript *mīm* in some script traditions, such as the *naskh* script,[85] or otherwise a v-shaped mark.[86] Its frequent use with the *mīm* might have something to do with a possible role indicating backed or rounded vowels (on which, see further below). However, there is another possibility which connects the three consonants; namely, they are regularly doubled by assimilation with preceding *nunation*, which is marked in Quranic and ClAr manuscripts. If, as appears to be the case, *nunation* was retained only in certain contexts, it is possible that the scribe used repurposed the *shadda* as a general kind of marker of these consonants. Whatever its origin, word-final *nūn* and *lām* are occasionally marked with *shaddah*, and *mīm* is thus marked both word-medially and word-finally.

In addition to these contexts, *shaddah* also occurs in contexts which parallel uses of the *ḍamma*. Examples of parallel occurrences of *ḍammah* and *shaddah* include:

  i. Combinations of *\*b-nā* spelled with both *ḍammah* and *šaddah* over the *bāʾ*:
   *\*bi-nā* بُنا <bu-nā> "in us" (7r) and *\*banā* spelled بُنا <bunā> "he built" (13r; 41v) but
   *\*banā* spelled بّنا *bbnā* "he built" (13v)

  ii. *\*ʾakbar* "bigger, greater":
   *\*ʾakbarV* spelled اكبُر <ʾkbur> "greater, bigger"(19r) but
   اكبّر <ʾkbbr> (20v)

  iii. Spellings of the 3ms pronominal suffix with both *ḍammah* and *shaddah*:
   راسهُ <rʾs-hu> "his head" (50r) and له <l-hu> "to him, for him" (22v), but

---

84  Tamás Iványi, "Diphthongs", in Kees Versteegh (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, Vol. I.* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 640-643, espec. 641-642.

85  Gacek, *Arabic Manuscripts*, pp. 164-165.

86  Witkam, "The neglect neglected", pp. 407-408.

يدة ‹*yd-hh*› (20v; 50r) and ولدة ‹wld-hh› "his son" (18r).
  iv. Spellings of *ʾaṣl*, "origin, root," with both *ḍammah* and *shaddah*:

اصُل ‹ʾṣul› (22v)

but

اصّل ‹ʾṣṣl› (23r).

  v. Spelling of *faʿalah*, "workers," with both:

فعُله ‹fʿulh› (34v)

but

فعّله ‹fʿʿlh› (34r).

  vi. Spelling of *rabb*, "lord, master," with both:

ربُ ‹rbu› (24v)

but

الربّ ‹ʾl-rbb› (36r).

  vii. Spelling of *fam*, "mouth," with both:

فُ ‹fmu› (7v)

but

الفمّ ‹ʾl-fmm› (21v).

  viii. Spelling 2ms pronominal suffix with both:

سخرُك ‹sḫruk› "he caused you (to go)" (10v)

but

ضلمتّك ‹ḍlmttk› "I have done you wrong" (34v).

  ix. Spelling of *y/taǧid* with both:

يجدُ ‹yǧdu› "He will find" (12v) and فتجدُ ‹f-tǧdu› "and you will find" (31r)

but

يجّد ‹yǧdd› "he (did not) find" (36r).

  x. Spelling of *danā* forms with both:

دُنا ‹dunā› "he drew near" (21r)

but

دّنوا ‹ddnwʾ› "they drew near" (16r).

  xi. the verb *ykrẓ* "he preaches the gospel," is once spelled يكرز /ykruẓ/ (19r) with a *ḍamma*, and once spelled with a *shaddah*. In both cases the meaning is the same, so it seems unlikely that the two represent different verbal forms (form I and form II):

يكرز ‹ykruz› (19r)

but

يكرز ‹ykrrz› (6v)

The number of parallels suggests against randomness. Indeed, the same phonetic contexts in which non-etymological *shaddah* occurs are, as we saw above, the ones in which non-etymological *ḍamma* frequently occurs, namely with bilabials and emphatics (including *rāʾ* and, apparently, *ʿayn*).

If *shaddah* does indeed overlap with *ḍammah* and serve to indicate rounding or backing, this could explain several other infrequent usages of *shaddah* attested in SAr. 80. For example, in a few places, non-geminate *ṣād* is marked with a *shaddah*:

Table 41

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| يصّفح | yṣṣfḥ | /yVṣfaḥ/ | "He will forgive you" | 11v |
| اوصّاهم | ʾwṣṣā-hm | /ʾawṣɑ:-hum/ | "he commanded them" | 17r |
| اصّل | ʾṣṣl | /ʾɑṣl/ | "origin, root | 23r |

If the speculation here, that *shaddah* serves also to mark a backed or rounded vowel is correct, then its use with *ṣād* is to mark a backing effect due to the emphatic. Note, as with *ḍammah*, there is a preference for writing the *shaddah* on certain consonants – here the *ṣād* – and thus on the presumably form I verb from *ṣfḥ* the *ṣād* is marked instead of the *fāʾ* to indicate a backed theme vowel (perhaps /yaṣfaḥ/).

This connection, between *shaddah* and *ḍammah* to indicate backing or rounding of vowels, could in fact explain the usage of *shadda* in some, though certainly not all, of the contexts noted above. We know that the tradition of marking certain consonants, such as *rāʾ* and *dāl*, was a relatively common practice to distinguish these consonants from others with the same shape but which were pointed (*ʾihmāl*). The distribution of *shaddah* in SAr. 80 in terms of the consonants which it marks does appear on certain consonants, but, as shown here, is not simply a marker of those consonants; rather, it combines orthoepic functions with the orthographic distribution of some of the *ʾihmāl* signs. I have argued above that the use of *ḍammah* indicates both etymological *\*u*, as well as backed and rounded vowels. It is possible, then, that the orthographic distribution of both *ḍammah* and *shaddah*, especially the latter, mimics the *ʾihmāl* markings, with certain consonants, if present, marked, regardless of whether or not it was the consonant with which the phonetic function of each mark was to be realized. In that sense, it is a word-level marker, the placement of which was determined by the hierarchy of consonants. Such a system relied on the reader's ability to identify what word was intended and pronounce it accordingly.

To sum up, the function of *ḍammah* was largely orthoepic, while that of the *shaddah* was both orthoepic (when, e.g., it marked gemination or rounding) and orthographic (when, e.g., it marked a *wāw* or *yāʾ*). The distribution – the consonants which were the preferred carriers of both marks – were apparently based on attempts to mimic or imitate *ʾihmāl*. While the specifics are to my knowledge unique to this manuscript, there are parallels that suggest a similar trend in other Christian manuscripts, as we will see.

*Maddah*

The *maddah* diacritic is less common in SAr. 80 than in SAr. 76, but it is not rare. As expected, it is frequently used to mark final *\**ā*ʾv*:

Table 42

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| وجآء | w-ǧāāʾ | /wa-ǧā/ or /wa-ǧāāʾ/ | "and he came" | 6r |
| النسآ | ʾl-nsāā | /Vl-nusā/ or /Vn-nusāāʾ/ | "the women" | 19r |
| فدآء | fdāāʾ | /f(i)dā/ or /f(i)dāāʾ/ | "a ransom" | 29v |
| لُقآه | luqāā-h | /luqāʾ-h(u)/ or /luqāāʾ-h(u)/ | "to meet him" | 43v |
| قرآه | qrāāh | /qurɑ:ʾah/ or /qurɑ::ʾah/ | "a reading" | 17r |

*Maddah* also regularly marks \**ʾā* sequences, such as رآي <rāāy> "he saw" (17r) and الآتي <Vl-ʾāāty> "the coming one" (19r). Additionally, it rarely marks *hamzah* between two long vowels, as in وجآووا <w-ǧāāwwʾ> "and they came" (5v).

While most instances of *maddah* occur to mark combinations of *hamzah* and \**a* or \**ā*, in one case, etymological \**ūʾ* is written with a *maddah*: سوٓ <sūūʾ> "evil, bad" (32v)

Also *maddah* is occasionally used to mark a long *ā* preceding a geminated consonant (CvvC¹C¹): رآبي <raaby> "Rabbi" (22r).

Several cases in which the *maddah* is used have implications for our interpretation of the nature of the *hamzah* in, e.g., the definite article, as well as names such as *ʾyswʿ*, "Jesus." The *maddah* is written atop a final *alif mamdūdah* when it precedes a noun with the definite article prefixed to it: زوايآ الساحات <zwāyāā ʾl-sāḥāt> "the corners of the (temple) compound" (10v). It is possible that the *maddah* here simply marks long *ā*; this is attested elsewhere (see below). However, it is possible that it reflects a *hamzat al-waṣl*, which, since the initial consonant of the noun *sāḥāt* assimilated to the definite article, and is therefore doubled, the syllable reflects a cross-morpheme CVVC¹C¹ type: /zuwa:yā s-sāḥāt/. If true, it strongly suggests that the definite article is a *hamzat al-waṣl*, as we saw in, e.g., SAr. 76. Further, in several places, a \*III-ʾ verb, most commonly \**badaʾa*, "he began," is attested before the name *ʾyswʿ*, "Jesus," with a *maddah* marking the final *alif mamdūdah*: بدآ اسوع <bdāā ʾyswʿ> "Jesus began" (19v). If the *hamzah* were retained, this use of the *maddah* could suggest that the name *ʾyswʿ* began with a *hamzat al-qatʿ*, resulting in the sequence *ʾaʾ* shifting to *āā*, as it does in, e.g., ClAr. If the *hamzah* in *badaʾa* had already been lost, a *hamzat al-qatʿ* in the name *ʾyswʿ* would result in the sequence *āʾ*, which would also be marked with a *maddah*.

Finally, in two places, word-internal *ā is written with *maddah* despite the absence of *hamzah* (as in, for example, Section 2.8): الرآمه <ʾl-rāāmh> "Ramah (place name)" (6r); ارتآبوا<ʾrtāābwʾ> "they doubted" (52r); اخآه /ʾḫāā-h(u)/ "His brother" (17r). Unlike the example of قآل <qāāl> above in SAr. 76, however, in both of these examples the long *ā* is word-internal and followed by another vowel. In both of the present examples the long *ā* is followed by a voiced bilabial, which could have played some role. Given the dearth of examples in the manuscript, however, this must remain speculation.

The question here is whether *maddah* is orthoepic in these contexts, or rather is orthographic. Does the *maddah* indicate the realization of an overlong vowel, or is it purely marking combinations of vowels and *hamzah*? While it is difficult to determine, an argument in favor of orthographic marker is its use in several places to spell etymological *aʾa: امرآه <ʾmrāāh> "woman" (10r); بامرآه <b-ʾmrāāh> (16r). This use of *maddah* to mark *aʾa is used once when it results from a cross-morpheme combination: وآتوا <w-āātwʾ> "and they came" (26v). Further, etymological *iʾa is written with an *alif + maddah* in مآيه <māāyh> "one hundred" (14r). Since the use of *hamzah* is otherwise not common in the manuscript, it is possible that the *maddah* was repurposed to indicate the presence of *hamzah* in these examples. On the other hand, it is conceivable that, as a result of the loss of intervocalic *hamzah*, combinations of *aʾa resulted in the development of a vowel that was longer than etymological *ā*, and which was therefore analyzed as overlong; that is, equivalent to the overlong vowels in Quranic and ClAr in *aʾ, *ʾā, and *CvvC¹C¹ contexts.

### *SAr. 82 & 89*

The manuscript labeled SAr. 82 consists of 245 folia of paper, bound together with a wooden cover and leather spine. According to the manuscript, a monk named *Yrāsmh* (Gerasmus?) is primarily responsible for its production. The script is *naskh* and the manuscript dates to 1287 CE.[87] Manuscript SAr. 89 consists of 194 folia of paper and contains a complete copy of the four gospels. The manuscript was written by *Yrāsmh* (Gerasmus?), almost certainly the same scribe that produced SAr. 82, again in the *naskh* script. The manuscript dates to 1285CE.[88] Both manuscripts were produced at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai. While it is clear that the same hand produced by SAr. 82 and SAr. 89, the scribe employed vocalization signs more widely in this manuscript than in SAr. 82. Both manuscripts are members of Kashouh's Family J^b, the so-called 'Melkite Vulgate'.[89]

---

[87]  According to the colophon, the date of composition was July 6795 AMbyz (Byzantine world era).

[88]  According to the colophon at 163r, the date of composition was May 6793 AMbyz (Byzantine world era); see also Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 178.

[89]  Kashouh, *Arabic Versions*, pp. 185-194.

*Diacritics and Vocalization Marks*

Both vocalization and *ʾihmāl* diacritics are commonly used in SAr. 82 and 89, especially the latter. Among the most frequently used vocalization marks are the *šaddah*, *ḍammah*, and *maddah*. Among the regularly-used *ʾihmāl* markings are a < shaped mark, which is most commonly used to mark the *rāʾ*. Additionally, a tilde mark (˜) is often used to mark *sīn*, although, as we will see, both the *ḍammah* and *šaddah* diacritics are used to mark *sīn* as well, especially in SAr. 89. Finally, a miniature *kāf* is occasionally written atop the *kāf*, especially when non-word final.

*Ḍammah*

Consistent with the previous manuscripts, in both SAr. 82 & 89 *ḍammah* represents etymological *\*u*:

Table 43

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| فسُد | fsud | /fusid/ | "it was spoiled" | 82, 12r |
| الحُلم | ʾl-ḥulm | /Vl-ḥulm/ | "the dream" | 82, 7v |
| كُنت | kunt | /kunt/ | "(if) you are" | 82, 10v |
| تاكُل | tʾkul | /taʾkul/ or /tākul/ | "(the dogs) will eat | 82, 35r |
| تحبُل | tḥbul | /tVḥbul/ | "she will be pregnant" | 89, 3r |
| بعُد | bʿud | /buʿd/ | "distance" | 89, 12v |
| نحُن | nḥun | /nVḥnu/ or /nVḥun?/ | "we" | 89, 13v |
| ليُهلكه | l-yuhlk-h | /li-yuhlik-hu/ | "in order to kill him" | 89, 3v |

Consistent with SAr. 80, but unlike SAr. 76, the placement of *ḍammah* is often determined by a hierarchy of preference for certain consonants. The *sīn*, for example, often receives *ḍammah* marking when it is presumably realized phonetically elsewhere, as in the example فسُد <fsud>. There may also be a dis-preference for writing the *ḍammah* on consonants with a vertical stroke, such as *lām* and *ṭāʾ*, but this requires further investigation and larger data to confirm.

Additionally, *ḍammah* frequently occurs where another vowel is expected in proximity to emphatics, including *rāʾ*, *ʿayn*, and *ḥāʾ*, indicating the emphatic backing of adjacent vowels:

Table 44

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الصُغار | ʾl-ṣuġār | /Vṣ-ṣuġār/ | "the little ones" | 82, 12r |
| هُطل | huṭl | /huṭul/ | "it (rain) fell" | 82, 17r |
| يقدُر | yqdur | /yVqdur/ | "he is able" | 82, 20r |
| ظهُر | ẓhur | /ẓahur/ | "he appeared" | 82, 7v; 37r |
| خُطاب | ḫuṭāb | /ḫuṭɑ:b/ | "speech" | 82, 8v |
| الحُنطه | ʾl-ḥunṭh | /Vl-ḥunṭah/ | "the firewood" | 82, 10r; 29v |
| الدُعه | ʾl-duʿh | /Vd-daʿɑh/ | "the calmness" | 82, 11v |
| يتعُذب | ytʿuḏb | /yVt(V)ʿaḏḏub/ | "he is tormented" | 82, 17r |
| اشعُيا | ʾšʿuyā | /ʾVšʿayā/ | "Isaiah" | 82, 33v |
| حُدثت | ḥudtt | /ḥudaṯat/ | "it (fsg) happened" | 82, 18v; 29r |
| الرُجز | ʾl-ruǧz | /Vr-ruǧz/ | "the punishment" | 89, 4v |
| تُركا | trukā | /tarukā/ | "they (du.) left" | 89, 6r |
| عُطايا | ʿuṭāyā | /ʿaṭāyā/ | "gifts" | 89, 10v |
| الثعُالب | ʾl-ṯʿuālb | /Vṯ-ṯaʿɑ:lab/ | "the foxes" | 89, 12r |

Evidence for rounding of short vowels, and perhaps backing of long vowels, in the context of bilabials is attested, though less frequently than in SAr. 76 and 80:

Table 45

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| المُحال | ʾl-muḥāl | /Vl-muḥḥɑːl/ | "the tempter" | 82, 10v |
| كُمَا | kmuā | /kamɑː/ | "as, like" | 82, 35r |
| اسمُك | ʾsmu-k | /Vsmu-k/ | "your name" | 82, 14r |
| مُظلات | muẓlāt | /muẓɑllāt/ | "tents" | 82, 37r |
| بيت لحُم | byt lḥum | /bayt laḥum/ | "Bethlehem" | 89, 3r; 3v; 4r |
| عويْل | ʿwyul | /ʿɑwyːl/ | "wailing" | 89, 4r |
| المعمُدان | ʾl-mʿmudān | /Vl-muʿmudān/ | "the baptizer" | 89, 4v |
| مُكتوب | muktwb | /muktūb/ | "it is written" | 89, 5v |
| الاسوُاق | ʾl-ʾswuāq | /Vl-ʾaswɑːq/ | "the markets" | 89, 8v |
| الملايُم | ʾl-mlāyum | /Vl-mulāyum/ | "the proper, appropriate" | 89, 9r |
| يسمُعان | ysmuʿān | /yVsmuʿɑːn/ | "they (mdu) listen" | 89, 12v |

Similar to both SAr. 76 and 80, there is orthographic evidence for a shift of *i* > *u*, or perhaps rather a preference for *u* over *i* in certain roots:

Table 46

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| يجُد | yǧud | /yVǧud/ | "he finds" | 82, 23v |
| الحُكمه | ʾl-ḥukmh | /Vl-ḥukmah/ | "the wisdom" | 82, 27v |
| الكُلاب | ʾl-kulāb | /Vl-kulāb/ | "the dogs" | 82, 35r |
| يسُند | ysund | /yVsnud/ | "he reclines (his head)" | 89, 12r |
| السُجن | ʾl-suǧn | /Vs-suǧn/ | "jail" | 89, 7v |

181

| جُناح | ǧunāḥ | /ǧunāḥ/ | "wing; corner of the temple" | 89, 5v |
| المنزُل | ʾl-manzul | /ˀl-manzul/ | "the residence" | 89, 14r |

Additionally, especially in SAr. 89, *ḍammah* frequently marks vowels in unstressed syllables, both open and closed, perhaps indicating a tendency for unstressed vowels to be backed and/or lowered:

Table 47

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| سُقطتهُ | suqtt-hu | /suqṭat-hu/ | "its fall" | 82, 11r |
| وَلكنُها | wa-lknuhā | /wa-lākinnu-hā/ | "but she…" | 89, 8v |
| صُدقتكم | ṣudqt-km | /ṣuduqat-kum/ or /ṣudaqat-kum/ | "your acts of charity" | 89, 8v |
| جُهنم | ǧuhnm | /ǧuhannam/ | "hell" | 89, 7v |

In a few places, a *ḍammah* occurs in places that suggest an analogical change in certain roots. For example, SAr. 89 تُلد <tuld> "she will give birth" (3r) can be interpreted as reflective of an analogical change from form I *talid* "she gives birth," to form IV /tūlid/, perhaps based on the semantic overlap between *walada*, "to give birth" and *ʾawlada*, "to cause to birth." Likewise, SAr. 89 يُزيد <yuzīd> "to increase" (9v) might be interpreted as reflecting reanalysis of form I *yazīd* as form IV, and thus pronounced /yuzīd/.

In a few cases, *ḍammah* is written in open syllables, perhaps indicating a preference for high vowels in open syllables:

Table 48

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الكُتبه | ʾl-kutbh | /ˀl-kutubah/ or /ˀl-kutabah/ | "the scribes" | 82, 12v; 19r |
| الكُذبه | ʾl-kuḏbh | /ˀl-kuḏubah/ or /ˀl-kuḏabah/ | "the liars" | 82, 16r |
| كُتبه | kutbh | /kutubah/ or /kutabah/ | "the scribes" | 89, 7r; 11v |

While it is possible to interpret the use of *ḍammah* in these examples as evidence of backing, it is also possible that an analogical change likewise played a role here. The singular forms *kātib*, "scribe," and *kāḏib*, "liars," both attest plural forms of the pattern *fuʿʿāl*, in addition to *faʿalah*: *kuttāb* "scribes" and *kuḏḏāb*, "liars." Further, *kāḏib* has a plural by-form *kuḏḏab*. It is possible that some cross-pattern contamination resulted in transfer of the initial *u* vowels to these forms as well, resulting in *kutabah* and *kuḏabah*.

As in SAr. 80, the diphthong *ay*, as well as long *ā* and *ī* are occasionally marked by a preceding *ḍammah*:

Table 49

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الحيُاه | ʾl-ḥyuāh | /Vl-ḥayōh/ or /Vl-ḥayɑ:h/ | "life" | 82, 10v |
| الصُيادين | ʾl-ṣuyādyn | /Vṣ-ṣuyyɑ:dayn/ | "the two fishermen" | 82, 11r |
| اعُضاك | ʾʿuḍā-k | /ʾaʿḍɑ:-k/ | "your body parts" | 82, 13r |
| فتحيُا | f-tḥyuā | /fa-taḥyɑ:/ | "and you will live" | 82, 20r |
| عضافير | ʿuṣāfīr | /ʿaṣɑ:fīr/ | "birds" | 82, 23r |
| الثعُالب | ʾl-ṯʿuālb | /Vṯ-ṯaʿɑ:lɑb/ | "the foxes" | 89, 12r |
| اشعُيا | ʾšʿuyā | /ʾVšʿayā/ | "Isaiah" | 82, 33v |
| المذرُى | ʾl-mḏruā | /Vl-muḏrɑ:/ | "the winnowing fork" | 89. 5r |

These combinations are much less frequent than in, e.g., SAr. 80. Given the contexts in which they do occur are the same, namely adjacent to bilabial or emphatic contexts, their interpretation here is likely the same as there: marking backed *ā*, and backed or rounded *ay* and *ī*.

The phonetic contexts in which *ḍammah* is used, just reviewed, once again argues in favor of interpreting *ḍammah* as marking short /u/, /o/, and perhaps /ɑ/, and indicating rounding or backing on *ay* and long *ā* and *ī*. Further evidence that this is the case, rather than, e.g., a *shewa*, is once again found in the orthographic representation of *tanwīn* in SAr. 82 and 89. In both manuscripts, the default when a *tanwīn alif* would orthographically occur is *fatḥatān*; however, when orthographically a *tanwīn alif* is not allowed (e.g., *tāʾ marbūṭah* and final *-āʾ*), the realization is *kasratān*:

واذا صوتًا من السما قايلًا "And behold, a voice from the heavens, saying…" (82, 12)

والشجره السو تصنع ثمرةٍ سو "and the evil tree produces evil fruit" (82, 19)

This likely suggests a phonetic realization like /in/ or /ən/, and certainly against /un/. Thus there seems to be a difference phonetically between /i/ or /ə/ and the vowels written with *ḍammah* in these manuscripts.

In addition to these phonetic usages, SAr. 89 especially utilizes *ḍammah* in some places where the phonetic significance, if any, is difficult to discern. For example, *sīn* is often marked with the *ḍammah*, regardless of phonetic context; *hāʾ* is also frequently marked with a *ḍammah*, even when another vowel, or no vowel, is expected:

Table 50

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|
| وارسُلهم | w-ʾrsul-hm | "And he sent them" | 3v |
| ارسُل | ʾrsul | "he sent" | 6r |
| اسُترخا | ʾsutrḫā | "infirmity" | 6r |
| تفسُيره | tfsuyr-h | "its interpretation" | 3r |
| افليسُت | ʾ-f-lysut | "Is it not" | 6r; 9v |
| الجُهر | ʾl-ǧuhr | "public" | 14r |
| اهُرا | ʾhurā | "granaries" | 15r |
| لهُا | lhuā | "hers" | 21r |

In several instances, e.g., اهُرا <ʾhurā> and اسُترخا <ʾsutrḫā>, *ḍammah* placement parallels *sukūn*, which is not use in SAr. 82 or 89. In others, e.g., افليسُت <ʾ-f-lysut> and ارسُل <ʾrsul>, the *ḍammah* is possibly indicative of backing in an unstressed vowel.

Another possibility is that the *ḍammah* marks *hāʾ* and *sīn* in some of these cases is in imitation of *ʾihmāl* markings. In *naskh* script manuscripts (as well as a few others), the *hāʾ* was often indicated with a miniature *hāʾ* written above, or otherwise a v-shaped one.[90] The v-shaped *ʾihmāl* mark frequently has a shape that is similar to a *ḍammah*. While there is no difference between these *ḍammah*s and those that mark etymological *\*u*, the non-canonical distribution of *ḍammah* might nevertheless be influenced by the practice of *ʾihmāl* pointing. The 3ms suffix is often vocalized explicitly, and in both SAr. 82 and 89, it is ubiquitously -*hu*. It is plausible then that marking *hāʾ* with a *ḍammah* derives from the frequent marking of

---

90   Gacek, *Arabic Manuscripts*, p. 286.

it with *ḍammah* as a suffix. In other words, as argued regarding SAr. 80, once again a combination of orthographic and orthoepic functions characterizes the *ḍammah* here. The same, as we will see, is likely true of the *shaddah*.

   The distribution of *ḍammah* in SAr. 82 and 89 shares many characteristics with SAr. 76 and 80; each, for example, attests the use of *ḍammah* to indicate etymological *\*u*, as well as rounding adjacent to bilabials and backing in emphatic contexts. Further, each manuscript suggests either a merger of *\*u* and *\*i* > *u*, or at least a preference for *u* in certain roots. Another common feature, particularly pronounced in these manuscripts, is the tendency to mark *ḍammah* on certain consonants, even when the marked consonant is likely not the one realized with *ḍammah*. Unlike previous manuscripts, however, it seems that, in some instances, *ḍammah* can serve a purely orthographic function, mimicking *ʾihmāl* markings, on certain consonants, such as the *sīn* and *hāʾ*.

### Shaddah

The *šaddah* is rarely used in SAr. 82. The one instance of it in the portion of the manuscript included in this study is ملكه <mlkk-h> "his kingdom" (37r). In SAr. 89, the *šaddah* is used much more frequently. *Shaddah* is again used as expected, to mark etymological doubling of a consonant. As with *ḍammah* placement, the *shaddah* is often placed on certain consonants, even when those consonants would not receive the gemination phonetically. Preferred consonants include: *ṣād*, *ḍād*, *bāʾ*, and the glides *wāw* and *yāʾ*.

Table 51

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| عّله | ʿʾlh | /ʿVllah/ | "fault, flaw" | 7v |
| ليمجّدوا | l-ymǧǧdū | /li-yVmuǧǧVdū/ | "that they might praise" | 8v |
| هبّت | hbbt | /habbut/ | "it (the wind) blew" | 11r |
| مشيّه | mšyyh | /mušiyyah/ | "will" | 11r |
| تضّل | tḍḍl | /tVḍull/ | "(the sheep who) did not go astray" | 29r |
| الطيّب | ʾl-ṭybb | /Vṭ-ṭayyib/ | "the good (seed)" | 22r |
| النبيّ | ʾl-nbyy | /Vn-nabyy/ | "the prophet" | 19v |
| كُلّهّن | kul-hhn | /kull-hunn/ | "all of them (fpl)" | 41r |

Shaddah also occasionally marks assimilation of the definite article to the initial consonant of a noun:

Table 52

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| السّماء | ʾl-ssmāʾi | /Vs-samɑːʾ/ | "heaven" | 7r; 9v |
| السُّر | ʾl-ssur | /Vs-surr/ | "the secret" | 8v |
| الزّياح | ʾl-rryāḥ | /Vr-ryɑːḥ/ | "the winds" | 11r |

A frequent, and as far as I know unique, use of *shaddah* in SAr. 82 and 89 is to mark a consonant which precedes a long vowel, usually -*ā* but also rarely -*ī*:

Table 53

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ردّاك | rddā-k | /ruddā-k/ | "your robe" | 8r |
| مسحّا | mshḥā | /musaḥɑː/ | "messiahs" | 39v |
| القُصيّا | ʾl-quṣyyā | /Vl-quṣyɑː/ | "the farthest (fsg)" | 42r |
| الشيطّان | ʾl-šyṭṭān | /Vš-šayṭɑːn/ | "the devil" | 5v |
| يتّساله | yssāl-h | /yVsāl-hu/ or /yVsʾal-hu/ | "he asks him" | 10r |
| الانهّار | ʾl-anhhār | /Vl-ʾanhār/ | "the rivers" | 11r |
| المتّسا | ʾl-mssā | /Vl-musāʾ/ or /Vl-musā/ | "the evening" | 12r; 23v |
| اثقّاب | ʾṯqqāb | /ʾaṯqaːb/ | "piercings" | 12r |
| يتكلمهّا | ytklm-hhā | /yVt(V)kallam-hā/ | "he says it (fsg)" | 19v |
| البّكا | ʾl-bkkā | /Vl-bukāʾ/ or /Vl-bukā/ | "weeping" | 22v |

| مُقَيّمِين | muqymmyn | /muqy:my:n/ | "those who dwell (mpl)" | 25v |
| حمّار | ḥmmār | /ḥumɑ:r/ | "donkey, ass" | 29r |
| فاجّاب | f-ʾǧǧāb | /fa-ʾaǧāb/ | "and he answered" | 34v |

Given its uniqueness, at least among the manuscripts included here, it is *a priori* difficult to decide how to interpret this usage, whether purely orthographic or orthoepic. If the latter, the most likely interpretation is that it marks stress. Interestingly, this usage of *shaddah* is normal in the Khwarezmian orthographic adaptation of the Arabic script.[91] Arguing in favor of orthographic marker, however, is the fact that it marks the *hāʾ* of the 3fs suffix *-hā*, which is not typically stressed in known Arabic varieties.

Less frequently, but not uncommonly, *shadda* marks what, in ClAr, would be a diphthong or long vowel marked with a *wāw* or *yāʾ*:

Table 54

| **Arabic Text** | **Transliteration** | **Reconstruction** | **Translation** | **Folio** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| عيّد | ʿyyd | /ʿīd/ | "holiday" | 46v |
| في حيّنها | fī ḥyyn-hā | /fī ḥīn-hā/ | "in its time" | 40v |
| الشيّطان | ʾl-šyyṭān | /Vš-šayṭɑ:n/ | "the devil" | 5v |
| اخيّن | ʾḫyyn | /ʾaḫḫayn/ | "two brothers" | 6r |
| الذيّن | ʾl-ḏyyn | /Vllaḏīn/ | "those who" | 28v |
| تشكيّك | tškyyk | /taškīk/ | "causing doubt" | 34r |
| مصابيّحنا | mṣuābyyḥ-nā | /muṣɑ:by:ḥ-nā/ | "our lamps" | 41r |

Least frequent is its use marking a consonant that would, in ClAr, not be geminated, being either silent (and marked with *sukūn*) or marked with a vowel:

---

Table 55

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| العبّد | ʾl-ʿbbd | /Vl-ʿabd/ | "the slave" | 30r; 40v |
| حسّنًا | ḥssnan | /ḥasan-an/ | "good, well" | 41v |
| هكّذا | hkkḏā | /hākaḏā/ or /hakkaḏā/? | "thusly" | 9r |
| لمسّهُ | lmss-hu | /lamas-hu/ | "he touched him" | 11v |
| بحسّب | b-ḥssb | /bu-ḥasub/ | "according to" | 12r |
| اوجاعّنا | ʾwǧāʿʿnā | /ʾawǧɑ:ʿ-nā/ | "our infirmities" | 12r |
| الفعّله | ʾl-fʿʿlh | /Vl-faʿɑlah/ | "the workers" | 31v |
| لهّذا | l-hhḏā | /li-hāḏā/ | "for this reason" | 34r |

Here again the challenge of how to interpret this usage of *shaddah* is difficult and must remain speculative. The one commonality between each is that each consonant marked with the *shaddah* in these examples is in what we might presume to be the stressed syllable. It is also possible that, at least in some of these examples, the *shaddah* is purely orthographic, decorative even, mimicking *ʾihmāl* diacritics but without their functionality (to mark un-pointed consonants which share the same shape as pointed ones). Other likely examples of this practice are attested in SAr. 89:

Table 56

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|
| الملكّ | ʾl-mlkk | "the king" | 8r |
| وصّيدا | w-ṣṣydā | "And Sidon" | 17v |
| الّ | ʾll | "people" | 25r |
| لم يقّل | lm yqql | "he did not say" | 26r |
| ما ابصّروا | mʾ ʾbṣṣrwʾ | "they did not see" | 27v |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| الخردّل | ʾl-ḫrddl | "mustard plant" | 28r |
| احتمّلنا | ʾḥtmml-nā | "we have born | 32r |

Many of the consonants marked here are commonly marked with *ʾihmāl* diacritics, including *kāf*, *mīm*, and *dāl*. Unlike the usages described above, which are common and regular, these instances are the only ones in which these words are marked with *shaddah*.

Intriguingly, in the same way we noted an overlap between *ḍammah* and *shaddah* in SAr. 80, both SAr. 82 and 89 attest similar overlap, with *sīn* frequently marked with *ḍammah* (see examples above, section 4.2) and *shaddah* where we would not expect either:

الرسّل <ʾl-russl> (ClAr *ar-rusul*) "the apostles" (SAr. 89, 14v) but ارسُل <ʾrsul> (ClAr *ʾarsal*) "he sent" (89, 6r)

Another commonly marked consonant is the *kāf*. For example, in SAr. 89 the *kāf* of the adverb *hākaḏā*, "thus," is in one place marked with a *ḍammah* but in a subsequent instance is marked with a *shaddah*:

هكُذا <hkuḏā> (ClAr *hākaḏà*) "in this manner" (3r) but هكّذا <hkkḏā> (9r)

Other examples of this phenomenon, in which *ḍammah* is used in one manuscript while *shaddah* occurs on the same word in the other, occur. For example, in SAr. 82, the *ǧīm* of the verb *ʾaǧāb*, "he answered," is marked with a *ḍammah*, but in SAr. 89 it is marked with a *shaddah*:

SAr. 82 فاجَاب <f-ʾǧǧāb> (ClAr *fa-ʾaǧāba*) (34v) but SAr. 89 اجاب <ʾǧuāb> (5r)

Both *shaddah* and *ḍammah* thus seem to serve a range of functions, mostly orthoepic, but some purely orthographic. In addition to marking gemination, *shaddah* is used to mark other phonetic indications, such as stress. Finally, in a minority of cases, the use of *shaddah* seems purely orthographic.

*Maddah*

Consistent with the sparse use of other diacritics and vocalization marks in SAr. 82, the *maddah* is used only rarely (four times in the portion of the manuscript included in this study). In four of the five instances of *maddah*, it is used to write *\*āʾV*:

Table 57

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| استرخآ | ʾstrḫāā | /(ʾ)Vstirḫāʾ/ or /(ʾ)Vstirḫāāʾ/ | "infirmity" | 21r |

189

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| سوآ | swāā | /suwāʾ/ or /suwāāʾ/ | "except" | 32v |
| نسآ | nsāā | /nVsāʾ/ or /nVsāāʾ/ | "women" | 32v |
| سآير | sāāyr | /sāʾir/ or /sāāʾir/ | "the rest of" | 15r |

Additionally, in the fifth instance, it marks either etymological *uʾa (if form II) or V'C (if form I or IV): يآلم yāālmm "he suffers" (Form I *yaʾlam; Form II *yuʾallam; Form IV *yuʾlam) (36v). The last usage is open to several possible interpretations. One possibility is that the *maddah* is used here simply to note the presence of *hamzah*, since the latter is not regularly written in the manuscript. Another possibility is that intervocalic *hamzah* had been lost, resulting in a long vowel: *v'v > vv. In that case, the resulting long vowel might have been perceived longer than etymological long vowels, and thus marked with *maddah* (See discussion at Section 3.4 above).

The *maddah* is likewise relatively rare in SAr. 89, though numerically more frequent than in SAr. 82. Like in SAr. 82, *maddah* in SAr. 89 primarily marks *āʾv:

Table 58

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مآء | māāʾi | /mɑ:ʾ/ or /mɑ::ʾ/ | "water" | 5r |
| السمآء | ʾl-smāāʾi | /Vs-samɑ:ʾ/ or /Vs-samɑ::ʾ/ | "heaven" | 6r; 9v |
| هولآء | hwlāʾi | /hawlāʾ(i)/ or /hawlāāʾ(i)/ | "these" | 29r |

The combination of *alif* + *hamza* + *kasra* is used to spell nouns that end in etymological *āʾ regardless of syntactic position:

Table 59

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|
| من المآء | mn ʾl-māʾi | "from the water" | 5r |
| بكا بكآء مُرًّا | bkā bkāʾi murran | "he wept bitterly" | 46r |
| لا مآء فيها | lʾ māʾi | "there is no water in it" | 20v |

190

Elsewhere, the same ending is spelled without *maddah* or *hamza* (+ *kasra*):

Table 60

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| السما | ʾl-smā | /Vs-samɑːʾ/ | "heaven" | 40r |
| الانبيا | ʾl-anbyā | /Vl-ʾanbyāʾ/ | "the prophets" | 10r |

As with both SAr. 76 and 80, interpreting the phonetic significance of *maddah* is difficult. I am inclined to interpret its use in a minority of cases to indicate sequences other than *\*āʾv* as rare examples of its use to indicate *hamzah*. If that is the case, then it seems safe that the glottal stop was realized. The limited use of *maddah*, primarily to indicate *\*āʾv* sequences is a matter of orthography, rather than orthoepy. Whether the *ā* vowel in these contexts would have been realized overlong or not is impossible to determine.

## *SAr. 90 & 91*

Manuscript SAr. 90 was produced by an unknown scribe in 1281CE.[92] It consists of 316 folia of paper, written in a well-executed *naskh* script.[93] Manuscript SAr. 91 was written by an unknown scribe in 1288 CE.[94] The manuscript consists of 262 folia of paper containing a complete copy of the four gospels. The script is a neat *naskh*.[95] Despite the fact that we are ignorant of the name of the scribe who produced SAr. 90 and 91, the hand is nevertheless virtually identical in both that the two were almost certainly the work of the same scribe. These manuscripts are members of Kashouh's Family Jᵇ, the so-called 'Melkite Vulgate'.[96]

---

[92] The colophon on 316r gives the date as 6589 AMbyz, which is 1281 CE.

[93] Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 181.

[94] There is some confusion over the date of this manuscript due to the presence of two mutually incompatible dates in the colophon. The first is given as 6797 AMbyz (Byzantium world era), which is equivalent to 1288 CE. The second one given is (Dec) 1601 AG (*Anno Graecorum*, "era of the Greeks"), which is the equivalent of 1289 CE. Atiya gives 1289 CE as the date; see Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 183. However, a helpful comment by an anonymous reviewer has convinced me that, since AMbyz dates were more common in the 13th century CE, it is more likely to be the correct one.

[95] Atiya, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 183.

[96] Kashouh, *Arabic Versions*, pp. 185-194.

*Diacritics and Vocalization Marks*

In addition to *shaddah*, *ḍammah*, *maddah* etc., they also use v-shaped mark on the *rāʾ*, as well as occasionally on final *hāʾ*. Both manuscripts attest a miniature *kāf* atop *kāf*. The *sīn* is frequently marked with a diagonal line that is similar to a large *fatḥa*. A miniature *ḥāʾ*, written below the letter, is used in both manuscripts. Finally, SAr. 90 makes very limited use of the *sukūn*. Interestingly, it is used only twice in the portion of the manuscript included in this study, both times to mark the glide <w> in the word *yahūd*, "Jews" (90, 87v and 91v).

*Ḍammah*

In SAr. 90 and 91, the *ḍammah* is used to mark a range of context. First and foremost, it is used to write etymological *u*. As in other manuscripts, vocalization marks are occasionally placed orthographically over letters with which, presumably, they are not pronounced, although this is much less frequent than, e.g., SAr. 80, 82, and 89. The majority of cases involve the letters *mīm* and *hāʾ*, although there are other examples:

في الحلمُ <fy al-ḥlmu> presumably /fī al-ḥulm/, "in the dream" (6v); سُيخرج <su-yḫrǧ> presumably /sa-yVḫruǧ/ "he will emerge" (7v).

    Cases of etymological *\*u* are regularly written with *ḍammah* in both SAr. 90 and 91:

Table 61

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| انهُر | ʾnhur | /ʾanhur/ | "rivers, streams" | 90, 36v |
| بالجُمله | b-ʾl-ǧumlh | /bil-ǧumlah/ | "among the whole" | 90, 7v |
| الاردُن | ʾl-ʾrdun/ | /Vl-ʾurdun(n)/ | "the Jordan river" | 90, 10r |
| هُلم | hulm | /halumm(a)/ | "get up!" | 90, 44r |
| خُطبت | ḫuṭbt | /ḫuṭibut/ | "she became engaged" | 90, 6v |
| نُحاس | nuḥās | /nuḥɑːs/ | "brass" | 91, 12v |
| يدخُل | ydḫul | /yVdḫul/ | "it enters" | 91, 24r |
| لهُم | l-hmu | /la-hum/ | "to them" | 91, 54r |
| ذهوبهُما | ḏhwb-hmuā | /ḏuhūb-humā/ | "their (du) going" | 91, 56r |

Regarding the writing of *ḍammah* on the final *mīm* of the plural pronominal suffix, e.g., لهُمْ <l-hmu> while it is possible that this spelling is intended to represent underlying /la-humū/, the so-called long pronominal suffixes, this is made doubtful by spellings of the dual suffix in the same way, e.g., ذهوبهُمَا <ḏhwb-hmuā>.

Consistent with evidence from the other manuscripts, there is evidence for either a merger of \*i and \*u > u, or perhaps rather a preference for *u* in certain roots:

Table 62

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| احُلّ | ʾḥull | /ʾaḥull/ | "I loosen" | 90, 10v |
| تحصُد | thṣud | /tVḥṣud/ | "you reap, harvest" | 90, 18v |
| الحكمُه | ʾl-ḥkmuh | /Vl-ḥukmah/ | "the wisdom" | 90, 32v |
| يهُزّون | yhuzwwn | /yVhuzzūn/ | "They shake" | 90, 88r |
| لاحُلّ | l-ʾḥull | /li-ʾaḥull/ | "in order that I might loosen, destroy" | 91, 2r |
| الكُسر | ʾl-kusr | /al-kus(a)r/ | "the broken (fragments)" | 91, 26v |
| نُصف | nuṣf | /nuṣf/ | "middle (of the night)" | 91, 45v |

Many of the same words in which a \*i is written with *ḍammah* in SAr. 90 and 91 are also attested with such spelling in other manuscripts. For example, *ḥll* "to loosen, untie," and \**ḥikmah*, "wisdom," are both attested in manuscripts studied above (in, e.g., SAr. 82 & 89).

Evidence for rounding with labials is one again attested in both manuscripts, although in line with the less frequent use of *ḍammah* in general, this category is less common than in other manuscripts:

Table 63

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مُخفي | muḫfy | /muḫfiyy/ | "hidden (msg)" | 90, 41r |
| القّمُ | ʾl-ffmu | /Vl-fumm/ | "the mouth" | 90, 46r |
| يجبُ | yǧbu | /yVǧub/ | "it is necessary" | 90, 55v |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| مُجِيّه | muǧyy-h | /muǧiyy-hu/ | "his coming" | 90, 63r; 75r |
| مُبنِيّه | mubnyyh | /mubniyyah/ | "built (fsg)" | 91, 1v |
| مُخفِي | muḫfy | /muḫfiyy/ | "hidden (msg)" | 91, 21r |

A few examples from SAr. 90 of ʿayn backing etymological *a include:

Table 64

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| يعُمدون | yʿutmdwn | /yaʿtamudūn/ | "they get baptized" | 10r |
| يُعِّير | yuʿʿyr | /yaʿīr/ | "he wandered" | 32v |

In the example of يعُمدون, form VIII of the root *ʿmd means "to be baptized." While the likeliest explanation for the *ḍammah* seems to me to be indicative of backing in the context of the ʿayn, it is also possible that it represents a reanalysis of the form as a passive, given the semantics of the verb. As for the case of يُعِّير <yuʿʿyr>, the verb clearly means "to wander, move about," and is usually form I, rather than form II or IV. Further argument against an analysis of the form as representing a *u* prefix vowel of form II or IV is the fact that, if it were to be indicative of form II or IV, it would represent the only instance of writing the prefix vowel in SAr. 90 that I have found. Similarly, in both SAr. 90 and 91, there is one example each of *ḍammah* with an emphatic, namely in the imperfect of *raʾā*, e.g., ثُرى <turā> /turā/, "do you think?" (as in dialectal *yā turā*) (90, 81r; 91, 32v).

A few examples of *ḍammah* where we would expect *a* could constitute evidence for backing in open (unstressed?) syllables from SAr. 90 include:

Table 65

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| حُدثت | ḥudtt | /ḥaduṯat/ or /ḥadaṯat/? | "it happened, occurred | 23v; 88v; 90v |
| الدُجاجه | ʾl-duǧāǧh | /Vd-duǧāǧah/ | "the chicken" | 71v |
| الكُهنه | ʾl-khunh | /Vl-kahunah/ | "the priests" | 7v |

The consistent marking of verbs from the root *ḥdṯ* throughout the manuscripts is suggestive of a shared practice, especially given how infrequently *ḍammah* is used to mark this kind of backing in SAr. 90, and its virtual absence in SAr. 91. Curiously, the *ḍammah* is placed differently in the two examples, once on the *ḥāʾ*, as shown above, and once on the *dāl*: حدُث <ḥduṯ> "it happened," (39r). Both *ḥāʾ* and *dāl* tend to be preferred consonants for *ḍammah* when it occurs in a word, as we have seen across manuscripts, but, in this case, makes interpretation more difficult. I am inclined to interpret the spelling of *ḍammah* on the *ḥāʾ* in the example حُدثت as an example of marking *ḥāʾ* when the *ḍammah* would actually be realized on the *dāl*. If so, then the *ḍammah* in each of these examples marks backing in an unstressed syllable, assuming an antepenultimate stress pattern in a series of short syllables. Another such example is فتحُيا <f-tḥuyā> "and you will live" (90, 26r; 91, 11r), where the *ḍammah* likely marks a backed *ā* vowel. A final piece of that the *ḍammah* placement is mimicking *ʾihmāl* diacritic placement, at least aesthetically, is the fact that the miniature *ḥāʾ*, written below the letter, is also used in both manuscripts.

The *ḍammah* in SAr. 90 and 91 shares many characteristics with SAr. 80, 82, and 89, including its use to mark etymological *u*, rounding of vowels adjacent to bilabials, backing and/or lowering of vowels adjacent to emphatic consonants, as well as a backing effect on long vowels in similar contexts. Further, there is again indication of a preference for *u* in some roots, if not a merger of *\*u, \*i > u*. In both SAr. 90 and 91, *tanwīn* patterns with SAr. 76, 82, and 89, against SAr. 80, in that non-adverbials and nouns which are ineligible to take *tanwīn alif* are regularly marked with *kasratān*, whereas elsewhere *fatḥatān* is used, regardless of function:

هل يُلقط من الشوك عنبًا "Can a grape be picked from among thorns?" (90, 23)

لا يجوز من الناموس والانبيا ايهٍ واحده "not a jot will pass from the law or the prophets" (90, 16)

The contexts in which *ḍammah* is used, in addition to the spelling of, e.g., *tanwīn*, suggests ḍammah marks short /u/, /o/, and /ɑ/, as well as backed variants of ā, and *\*ay*. In terms of execution, the scribe who composed SAr. 90 and 91 likewise has a preference for writing *ḍammah* on certain consonants, although these preferences seem to be fewer in number than previously discussed manuscripts, primarily being *mīm*, *ḥāʾ*, with slight preference in some instances for the *ḫāʾ*. Each, as has been noted throughout this paper, are also commonly marked with *ʾihmāl* diacritics in various script traditions.


*Shaddah*

*Shaddah* is regularly used to mark etymologically geminated consonants:

Table 66

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| عمّانويل | ʿmmānwyl | /ˈimmɑːnuwīl/ or /ˈimmɑːnuʾīl/? | "Emmanuel" | 90, 7r |
| سوّ | suww | /suww/ | "evil, bad" | 90, 13v |
| تامّين | tāmmīn | /tāmmīn/ | "perfect, blameless" | 90, 16v |
| مُرًّا | murr-an | /murr-an/ | "bitter" | 91, 85v |
| الضوّ | ʾl-ḍww | /Vḍ-ḍuww/ | "the light" | 91, 5r |
| فسّر | fssir | /fassir/ | "explain (to us)" | 91, 21r |
| مملوّه | mmlwwh | /mumluwwah/ | "full (fsg)" | 91, 23r; 41v |

As we have seen elsewhere, the use of *shaddah* to mark glides in \*ī̆ʾ and \*ū̆ʾ nouns indicates that the shift \*ī̆ʾ > *iyy*, and \*ū̆ʾ > *uww* is a regular feature of the language of the text.

Shaddah is also used to note the assimilation of the voiceless dental /d/ to the voiceless /t/, as well as a few other processes of assimilation. Unlike, e.g., the example of <m-mn> /mimman/ from above (90, 8v), the assimilated consonant here is written as expected in the orthography, with the *shaddah* to note the phonetic realization resulting from the assimilation. Examples from SAr. 90 include:

Table 67

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| اردّت | ʾrddt | /ˈaratt(u)/ | "I wished, wanted" | 90, 21v; 91, 42v |
| وجدّتموه | wğdd-tmw-h | /wuğattumū-h(u)/ | "you (mpl) found him" | 90, 7v |
| سجدّت | sğddt | /sağatt(u)/ | "I bowed down" | 90, 11v |
| وجدّت | wğddt | /wuğatt(u)/ | "I found" | 90, 22v |
| اخذّتم | ʾḫdd-tm | /ʾaḫatt-tum/ or /ʾaḫat-tum/ | "you have taken" | 28v |
| كلّمن | kul-mmn | /kum-man/ | "everyone who" | Front cover |

Several of these examples require further discussion. First, the apparent assimilation in the root *ʾḫd is unexpected if, as the orthography suggests, the interdental /ð/ was retained, since the assimilation of an interdental /ð/ to a dental stop is /t/ is odd, but a voiced dental stop /d/ assimilating to a voiceless one is common, both linguistically and among the other examples from the manuscripts. The use of *shaddah* suggests that the pronunciation of *dāl* was a dental stop /d/, and thus a pronunciation of /ʾaḫat-tum/. Another example, كُلمّن <kul-mmn> is not a dental, but is also a bit unexpected. It could represent an (ad-hoc?) assimilation of /l/ to /m/, thus /kum-man/. Alternatively, it might be an orthographic analogy based on <m-mmn> /mim-man/ "among whom."

Rarer usages of *shaddah* where consonantal length is not expected do occur, especially to mark a long vowel or diphthong:

Table 68

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الّىحو | ḥwāllā | /ḥuwɑ:lā/ | "around" | 90, 10r |
| بصانعيّ | b-ṣānʿyy | /bi-ṣɑ:n(i)ʿī/ | "(blessed are) the doers (of peace)" | 90, 13r |
| يُعّير | yuʿʿyr | /yVʿīr/ | "he wanders, tours" | 90, 32v |
| قليّلي الايمان | qlyyly al-iymān | /qalīlī/ | "ones of little faith" | 90, 23v |
| اللّيل | ʾl-lyyl | /Vl-layl/ | "the night" | 90, 44r |
| قدمّي | qdmmy | /qadumɑy/ | "the feet of (Jesus)" | 90, 47r |
| يعيروّكم | yʿyrwwkm | /yVʿɑyyirū-kum/ | "they insult, revile you" | 91, 1v |

In most of these cases, the glide itself is marked with the *shaddah*. There only a few exceptions, like قدمّي <qdmmy>, where the *mīm* is marked likely due to the fact that the *yāʾ* is written under the following word. These usages, a *shaddah* written on top of a glide marking etymological diphthongs and long vowels, as well as marking certain consonants before long vowels, are regularly attested in other Christian manuscripts, including, e.g., SAr. 80, 82, and 89, described above.

*Maddah*

The *maddah* is rare in SAr. 90, marking *\*aʾā* in the example اذا رَآيَتمُ <ʾdā rāāy-tmu> "when you (mpl) see" (72v). It also marks *āʾ(an)* in the example بكى بكآ مُرًّا <bkā bukāā-ʾ murr-an> "he wept bitterly" (85v). Note that the *madda* is placed over an *alif* but is also followed by an *alif*, either to mark the presence of a *hamzah*, although it is possible that it was intended to indicate the accusative.

In SAr. 91, the *maddah* is more common and marks a number of different contexts, including ones well-attested in ClAr manuscripts such as the sequence *\*āʾv*:

Table 69

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| انبيآ كذّابون | ʾnbyāā kḏḏābūn | /ʾanbiyāʾ/ or /ʾanbiyāāʾ/ | "false prophets" | 43r |
| هولآءِ | hwlāāʾi | /hawlāʾ(i)/ or /hawlāāʾ(i)/ | "these (mpl)" | 29v |
| هولآ | hwlāā | /hawlāʾ(i)/ or /hawlāāʾ(i)/ | "these (mpl)" | 30r |
| هولآي | hwlāāy | /hawlāʾ(i)/ or /hawlāāʾ(i)/ | "these (mpl)" | 46v |

Note the spelling of the final sequence is variable, with several common historical spellings attested. Despite the variation, the *maddah* is used across the various spelling variants.

A less common, but nevertheless attested pattern of *maddah* to mark *hamzah* preceding a long *ā*, or between two long vowels, are attested in SAr. 91 as well:

Table 70

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| رآي | rāāy | /raʾā/ or /raʾāā/ | "he saw" | 23v |
| رآى | rāāY | /raʾā/ or /raʾāā/ | "he saw" | 37v; 47r |
| جآووا | ǧāʾū | /ǧāʾū/ or /ǧāāʾūū/ | "they came" | 31r; 33v |
| اعمآان | ʾʾmāāʾn | /ʾaʿmɑːʾɑːn/ or /ʾaʿmɑːːʾɑːn/ | "two blind men" | 36r |

As we saw with the example of كبآا <bkāā'> in SAr. 90 (85v), the scribe is not averse to writing two *alifs* in a row. In both cases, it appears that the *alif* + *maddah* is intended to indicate the sequence *āʾ*, and the second *alif* to indicate either the accusative or dual, respectively.

Unlike the patterns attested in the Quran and ClAr, combinations of short vowels and etymological *hamzah* are also marked with *maddah*. For example, the sequence *Cʾv, primarily with words from *sʾl*:

Table 71

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| تسآله | tsāāl-h | /tVsʾal-hu/ | "you ask him" | 22v |
| يسآلون | ysāālwn | /yVsʾalūn/ | "they ask" | 30v |
| مسآله | msāālh | /musʾalah/ | "matter, issue" | 34r |

The sequence *ʾVl is written with *maddah* in the example of آوليك <āāwlyk> "those" (45v). In fact, this example is open to several possible interpretations. It could indicate the realization of the initial syllable as long, i.e., *ʾūl* instead of *ʾul*. Elsewhere (in, e.g., SAr. 76) we noted the spelling of the initial syllable with a diphthong *ʾaw*, rather than the ClAr *ʾul*. If diphthongs had become monophthongs in the variety of the text, then *ʾaw > ʾū* could have been marked by a *maddah*. Another factor is the preceding word, which in the case of this example is اتين <ʾtyn> "they (fpl) came". Etymologically this word was likely *ʾatay-na. If it was intended to pronounce the final short *a* of the preceding verb, then that would result in a cross-morpheme combination of *aʾv*, which as we saw is also marked with *maddah*. Additionally, one instance of *aʾC is written with a *maddah*, e.g., رآي <rāāy> "opinion, thought" (51r).

*Maddah* in SAr. 91 also indicates a long *ā* followed by a geminate consonant (i.e., *āC¹C¹*):

Table 72

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| الضآله | ʾl-ḍāālh | /Vḍ-ḍɑːllah/ or /Vḍ-ḍɑːːllah/ | "the lost (fsg)" | 12r; 30r |
| بكآفه | b-kāāfh | /bi-kāffat/ or /bi-kāāfat/ | "in all of" | 24r |
| الظآل | ʾl-ẓāāl | /Vḍ-ḍɑːll/ or /Vḍ-ḍɑːːll/ | "the lost (msg)" | 30r |

A hybrid form, in which the sequence *aʾaC¹C¹ is marked with *maddah*, is attested as well: كَاۤنكم <kāān-km> "as you are" (50r). While it is tempting to see behind this spelling the loss of intervocalic *hamzah*, resulting in the lengthening of the *ā* vowel which, when followed by a geminate consonant. However, given the data and examples, I suggest that this example is another piece of evidence that *maddah* was used as a general indicator of *hamzah*.

Other uses of maddah are relatively rare. In one instance, *maddah* marks a form II 3fs perfect of a II=III verb: <ẓllt-hm> (presumably *ẓallalat-hum* "it shaded them") (28r). In another place it marks the sequence *ʾa in the word اَمۤ <ʾam> "or" (41r). Perhaps relatedly, long *ā* rarely marks long *ā*, even when no *hamzah* or geminate consonant is present:

Table 73

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| علآنيه | ʿlāānyh | /ʿɑlāniyyah/ | "publicly" | 4r |
| المآل | ʾl-māāl | /Vl-mɑːl/ | "money" | 20r |
| حوآلى | ḥwāālā | /ḥɑwɑːlā/ | "around" | 23v |

Finally, one instance of *maddah* occurs which is difficult to explain. The phrase كلمآ تسلون <kll-māā tslwn> is spelled with a *maddah* over the final *ā* of the relative *mā*. It is possible that this usage of the *maddah* is another example of marking a long *ā* with *maddah*; however, it is perhaps preferable here to interpret it as marking the following verb, which, as we have seen, is frequently written with a *maddah* to indicate *C'a.

*Maddah* in SAr. 90 and 91 is used to mark both traditional and non-traditional combinations. In the category of the former, it marks *-aʾv, *-ʾā and *CāC¹C¹ combinations. Elsewhere, it appears to mark the presence of *hamzah*, regardless of the phonetic context. Finally, it was occasionally extended to mark *alif*s writing long *ā* even when not preceded or followed by a *hamzah* or geminated consonant. In these few instances, the consonant following the long *ā* is usually a liquid or nasal, which might be significant.

*āʾi grapheme:*

The combination of of *alif* + *hamzah* + *kasrah* (-ءا) does not occur in the portion of SAr. 90 included in this study. Etymological *āʾV words are spelled only with final *alif*

*mamdūdah*. However, it is commonly used to write etymological *aʾ* in SAr. 91, regardless of syntactic context:

Table 74

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ولا عصاء | wlā ʿṣāʾi | /wa-lā ʿaṣɑ:ʾ/ | "without a staff" | 12v |
| هولآء | hwlāāʾi | /hawlāʾ/ or /hawlāāʾ/ | "these" | 29v |
| في السماء | fy ʾl-smāʾi | /fī s-samɑ:ʾ/ | "in heaven" | 34v |
| يقوم انبياء كذّابون | yqūm anbyāʾi kḏḏābūn | /ʾanbiyāʾ/ | "false prophets" | 43v |
| بُكاء مرّا | bukāʾi mran | /bukāʾ/ | "he wept bitterly | 51v |
| اخذ ماء | ʾḫḏ māʾi | /mɑ:ʾ/ | "he took water" | 52v |

The characteristics of its distribution in SAr. 91 is similar to previous manuscripts, especially SAr. 76, and is likely interpretable as functioning the same way as there, namely as another grapheme indicating the presence of *hamzah* phonetically. Unlike the *maddah*, however, this grapheme is only used word-finally. The ـاء grapheme is optional in this manuscript as well, and many other instances of word-final *-ā ʾv* are written only with *alif mamdūdah*:

Table 75

| Arabic Text | Transliteration | Reconstruction | Translation | Folio |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| عن الحكُما | ʿn al-ḥkumā | /ḥukamɑ:ʾ/ | "about the sages" | 15v |
| روسا الكهنه | rwsā al-khnh | /ruʾasāʾ/ | "the chief priests" | 39r |
| بنا الهيكل | bnā al-hykl | /bunāʾ/ | "the building (which is) the temple" | 42v |
| ابتدا الخاض | ʾbtdā al-mḫāḍ | /ʾVbtidāʾ/ | "the beginning of the end" | 43r |
| انشا العالم | ʾnšā al-ʿālm | /ʾVnšāʾ/ | "laying the foundations of the world" | 46r |
| في اثنا اكلهم | fy ʾtnā ʾkl-hm | /ʾatnāʾ/ | "while they ate" | 48r |

*General Discussion*

While each of the manuscripts reviewed above is characterized by some amount of unique vocalization markings, nevertheless a significant amount of overlap is attested across the six manuscripts, by four different scribes covering over two centuries. This strongly suggests a common orthographic tradition, rather than randomness or complete idiosyncrasy. An intriguing parallel to what I argue stands behind the production of these Christian manuscripts is found in the earliest Quranic manuscripts (first/seventh century AH/CE). As Adam Bursi has recently shown, the earliest Quranic manuscripts are characterized by partial pointing, with certain consonants and certain words typically marked, even when their consonantal shapes make them less likely to be mis-parsed. Bursi argues persuasively that while there are idiosyncrasies across the manuscript tradition, the overlap is indicative of a shared scribal context in the early Islamic period.[97] I argue that a similar scribal context is responsible for the significant overlap in vocalization patterns attested in these manuscripts.

*Ḍammah* marking in these manuscripts extends beyond marking etymological *\*u* to indicate a number of phonetic effects. Each of the manuscripts attests the rounding influence of bilabials, as well as a common preference for *u* in certain roots, such as *\*ḥll* "to loosen, untie," where, in other Arabic varieties, a *i* is attested, or where there is variability. In each of the six manuscripts, emphatic contexts – including *rā'* and the pharyngeals *ʿayn* and *ḥā'* - attest some backing effect, noted by *ḍammah* where etymologically we would expect either *fatḥah* or *kasrah*. This emphatic backing is especially common in SAr. 80, 82, and 89. In SAr. 76, the manuscript which is most fully vocalized of the six studied here, the use of *ḍammah* consistently to write the diphthong *\*aw*, suggests a shift of *\*aw > ū*.

In addition to indicating these various effects on short vowels, the five manuscripts from Family J[b] attest the use of *ḍammah* to indicate effects of the emphatic and bilabial consonants on long vowels. The most frequent usage across manuscripts is to indicate backing and/or rounding of long *\*ā*. In SAr. 80, and to a lesser degree in SAr. 82 and 89, an additional practice, namely marking some effect – perhaps rounding – on long *ī* was noted. The specifics of *ḍammah* distribution vary from manuscript to manuscript; at the same time, the significant overlap, both in contexts in which it occurs, as well as the ortho-aesthetic preferences for some consonants over others, strongly suggests a common tradition from which each scribe drew. Specifically, it was speculated that one factor influencing the preference for some consonants over others is due to the practice of marking consonants without dots with diacritics (*ʿalāmāt al-'ihmāl*) to distinguish them from consonants with the same shape but which are pointed (e.g., *rā'* and *ḥā'*). In a smaller sub-set, frequent marking of some consonants with *ḍammah*, such as the 3ms pronominal suffix

---

ﻪ -*hu*, could have led to a general practice of marking the same consonant with *ḍammah* elsewhere. These usages help illuminate later practices discussed by Lentin.[98]

*Shaddah* uses in these manuscripts is likewise revelatory, although in many cases the precise significance is less clear than with *ḍammah*. Widely attested is the shift from *$\bar{u}$ʾ > *uww* and *$\bar{\imath}$ʾ > *iyy*, being noted in each manuscript. Outside of etymological gemination, the details of *shaddah* usage vary to a somewhat greater degree than those that characterize the distribution of *ḍammah*. Nevertheless, overlap is still attested, including the overlap of *shaddah* and *ḍammah* when marking bilabials, as well as glides, and, to a lesser degree, consonants followed by long *$\bar{a}$*. Once again, there are indications of a shared set of orthographic practices, although with greater variability.

Another area of significant overlap, but in which the details again vary from manuscript to manuscript, is the use of *maddah*. Unlike modern orthographic practices, in which *maddah* is primarily used to indicate word-initial *ʾ$\bar{a}$, the most common context for *maddah* use in these manuscripts is word-final *-$\bar{a}$ʾ. However, numerous other contexts are marked with *maddah*, both typical of Quranic and ClAr manuscripts in which long vowels adjacent to *hamzah* are marked, as well as long *$\bar{a}$* before a geminate consonant (e.g., ʾ$\bar{a}$, $\bar{a}$ʾ, $\bar{u}$ʾ, $\bar{\imath}$ʾ, and C$\bar{a}$C$^1$C$^1$), but also contexts in which *hamzah* is adjacent short vowels. I have interpreted these various usages as indicative of a practice of using *maddah* to indicate the presence of *hamzah*, the sign of which (ء) was frequently omitted in *naskh* script variants.

In addition to this shared orthographic practice, another was noted across the manuscripts, namely the use of the combination of *alif* + *hamzah* + *kasrah* (ـائ) to write word-final *$\bar{a}$ʾv* sequences regardless of syntactic context. I argued that this represents a grapheme of sorts, which is attested in later, non-Christian corpora as well, and that in these texts the likeliest interpretation is that it is a variant (along with آ and اۤ) for writing word-final *$\bar{a}$ʾ*. This spelling variation is likely the result of the persistence of historical spellings of word-final *$\bar{a}$ʾv* (which ended in *alif*), with the variants of the plural demonstrative *ʾ$\bar{u}$l$\bar{a}$ʾi*. The continued use of (ـائ) outside of the Christian corpora again strongly suggests that the orthographic norms discussed by Lentin[99] were widespread for centuries.

The study of the orthographic practices and their phonological significance in each manuscript also has great potential to illuminate the nature of the question of what register(s) and variety(ies) of language the scribe is interacting with and participating in. Due to its abundant vocalization, SAr. 76 provides several illustrative examples of mixing. The use of both <ḍuwʾ> and <ḍuww>, both "a light, candle," as noted above, strongly suggests intentional use of two variants which cannot both have been regular in the same dialect. Both are acceptable in ClAr according to the grammarians, although the forms with *hamzah* have since become the norm. Elsewhere in the manuscript the presence of *hamzah*s, indicated both by the *hamzah* sign (ء) and the *maddah* is regular; however, *hamzah* in certain

---

98   Lentin, "Normes orthographiques".
99   Lentin, "Normes orthographiques".

contexts, especially non-word final occurrences of *-āʾ*, are conspicuously absent. This could, of course, be a matter of orthographic peculiarity, but given how regularly *hamzah* is indicated in other contexts, this seems unlikely. Its absence more likely reflects an absence of glottal stop in these contexts. The frequent use in certain contexts suggests a deliberate use from another, prestigious variety. Further, the abundant occurrence of *hamzah* in word-final *-āʾ* suggests its use in certain morphemes and lexemes over others.

The other manuscripts each use *maddah* to mark glottal stop in varying contexts; some primarily in word-final *-āʾ* words, while others indicate it more broadly. None indicates it in every context in which etymologically it would have occurred. Here again, while this might be a matter of orthographic peculiarities or randomness, it is methodologically preferable to assume that the variation indicates an intentional pattern. As with SAr. 76, the other manuscripts cluster their *hamzah* representation in certain contexts, such as word-final *-āʾ*, and words. This variation in *hamzah*/*maddah* hints at a situation of creative mixing of features, wherein scribes chose from among variants based on patterned hierarchies.

These hierarchies parallel recent ones, as in the case of *hamzah*-less varieties using *hamzah* in certain contexts to index a higher or prestigious register. However, we must guard against assuming their identity. For example, the distribution of *hamzat al-waṣl* and *hamzat al-qaṭʿ* in SAr. 76 suggests that form I imperatives and forms VII through X perfect prefixes realized as *hamzat al-qaṭʿ* was at least as prestigious, or even preferable, than their realization as *hamzat al-waṣl* as is ubiquitous in ClAr. It is possible that this was a regular part of the scribe's native dialect, but it is also very plausible that it was a broader feature chosen because of its prestige for the community to which the scribe belonged. As noted above, this distribution of *hamzat al-waṣl* and *qaṭʿ* is reminiscent of Hijazi Arabic as attested in the Quranic *rasm*, as well as the Damascus Psalm Fragment. Other aspects of the grammar of these manuscripts suggest a set of prestige features that transcend ClAr, as, for example, with the preference of 3ms pronominal suffix harmonization that is attested in early Quranic manuscripts but is otherwise not mentioned in the grammatical tradition.[100]

Finally, a word is due the question – anticipated in the introduction – of what investigations of manuscripts copied by the same scribe might tell us about how strictly or not each scribe copied the patterns of the exemplar from which he copied. Once again, the lack of stemmata in large text families, such as Family J and Family K, represents a real limitation in this respect. As such, it remains a desideratum and should be a priority moving forward. Interestingly, the manuscripts SAr. 82 and 89, as well as SAr. 90 and 91, attest differences in the frequency of vocalization, with one manuscript typically more vocalized than the other. Further, while the specific practices are quite similar in each manuscript of the pairs, there is little consistency in terms of the same words in the same verse being

---

[100] As is exemplified in the patterns of pronominal suffix assimilation in, e.g., SAr 90 and 91, where the 3ms suffix assimilates to the preposition *bi*, but nowhere else, resulting in *bi-hi* but *fī-hu* and *ʿalay-hu*; this is the subject of an article by Phillip W. Stokes, "Pronominal suffix harmonization diversity in some vocalized Christian Arabic Gospel manuscripts", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (forthcoming).

vocalized across the pair. Since we do not know for sure whether the two manuscripts were copied from the same exemplar, we cannot say for sure that this suggests the scribe deviated from the exemplar.

Similarities between all six suggest a broadly shared scribal tradition, with sub-traditions distinguishing the scribe of SAr. 76 from those of the Family J[b] manuscripts, and scribe-specific practices among those. As mentioned in the introduction above, these shared scribal practices do not always cluster with text type (SAr. 146 and SAr. 112 are both members of Family J[a], but employ significantly different orthographic practices). Further, as we saw above (fn. 49), another member of Family J[c] (SAr. 108) also lacks many of the orthographic features attested in SAr. 76. Thus the fact that the five manuscripts of Family J[b] pattern very closely together, relative to SAr. 76 of Family J[c], could suggest that the scribes who produced manuscripts in this sub-family also formed a distinct scribal school. Whereas text types of Families J[a] and J[c], as well as others (such as Family K – the 'Alexandrian Vulgate') were more broadly popular and copied, Family J[b] seems to have been produced by a single school, perhaps associated with St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai. This lines up with other recent work on scribal and grammatical patterns, which shows that Family J[b] tends to exhibit unique spellings as well as a distinct grammatical tradition.[101]

It is vital, then, that scholars investigating Middle Arabic texts consider all possible parallels and data sets when attempting to understand the linguistic nature of the varieties and registers attested in these manuscripts. Future work should include an expansion of this kind of detailed analysis of the vocalizations, and their distribution, across as many manuscripts as possible. It will be interesting to see whether more manuscripts result in patterns that cluster around text family, or if some other factor emerges as more salient, such as time period, location of composition, or even register or variety of Arabic. Beyond the establishment of scribal orthographic practices, the work on deriving information about phonology from these practices should expand as well, with the same attention to factors around which these features cluster.

**Abstract:** Pre-modern vocalized Arabic manuscripts can reveal a great deal about a variety of linguistic features represented in each text. Recent work has demonstrated the potential that vocalized manuscripts have, specifically for revealing aspects of

**Resumen:** Los manuscritos árabes vocalizados premodernos pueden revelar mucho sobre una variedad de características lingüísticas representadas en cada texto. Trabajos recientes han demostrado el potencial que tienen los

---

[101] On which, see Phillip W. Stokes, "Key to the Kingdom: Variation as a key to Understanding the Arabic Gospel Manuscripts", in *Al-ʿUṣur Al-Wusṭā* (forthcoming).

the phonology of the corpora including the Quran, Judaeo-Arabic, and later 'Middle Arabic' texts. Christian Arabic texts, however, have been less frequently studied in this manner. Blau's grammar of the Christian Arabic of south Palestine in the 9th/10th centuries CE draws primarily on unvocalized manuscripts, and therefore the phonological details he provides are inferred primarily from consonantal orthographic patterns. While a few others have focused on Christian Arabic manuscripts from the medieval period, there has been little work that undertakes a phonological description of vocalized Christian manuscripts in a thorough and systematic way.

manuscritos vocalizados, específicamente para revelar aspectos de la fonología de los corpus, incluidos el Corán, el judeoárabe y los textos posteriores del 'árabe medio'. Los textos árabes cristianos, sin embargo, se han estudiado con menos frecuencia de esta manera. La gramática de Blau del árabe cristiano del sur de Palestina en los siglos IX y X C.E. se basa principalmente en manuscritos no vocalizados y, por lo tanto, los detalles fonológicos que proporciona se infieren principalmente de patrones ortográficos consonánticos. Mientras que algunos otros se han centrado en los manuscritos árabes cristianos del período medieval, ha habido pocos trabajos que lleven a cabo una descripción fonológica de los manuscritos cristianos vocalizados de manera exhaustiva y sistemática.