

Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic

Diachrony and Synchrony

Edited by

Liesbeth Zack and Arie Schippers



BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON

2012

© 2012 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978 90 04 22229 8

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction: Middle and Mixed Arabic, A New Trend in Arabic Studies	1
<i>Johannes den Heijer</i>	
Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe : premier essai de bibliographie, Supplément n° 1	27
<i>Jérôme Lentin</i>	
Some Remarks about Middle Arabic and Sa'adya Gaon's Arabic Translation of the Pentateuch in Manuscripts of Jewish, Samaritan, Coptic Christian, and Muslim Provenance	51
<i>Berend Jan Dikken</i>	
Linguistic and Cultural Features of an Iraqi Judeo-Arabic Text of the <i>qiṣaṣ al-'anbiyā'</i> Genre	83
<i>Lutz Edzard</i>	
Deux types de moyen arabe dans la version arabe du discours 41 de Grégoire de Nazianze ?	95
<i>Jacques Grand'Henry</i>	
Présentation du livre <i>Le Conte du Portefaix et des Trois Jeunes Femmes</i> , dans le manuscrit de Galland (XIV ^e –XV ^e siècles)	113
<i>Bruno Halflants</i>	
Judeo-Arabic as a Mixed Language	125
<i>Benjamin Hary</i>	
<i>The Story of Zayd and Kaḥlā'</i> —A Folk Story in a Judaeo-Arabic Manuscript	145
<i>Rachel Hasson Kenat</i>	

Towards an Inventory of Middle and Mixed Arabic Features: The Inscriptions of Deir Mar Musa (Syria) as a Case Study	157
<i>Johannes den Heijer</i>	
Qui est arabophone? Les variétés de l'arabe dans la définition d'une compétence native	175
<i>Amr Helmy Ibrahim</i>	
Perspectives ecclésiastiques pour textes en moyen arabe : L'exemple des traités théologiques de Sulaymān al-Ġazzī	187
<i>Paolo La Spisa</i>	
Normes orthographiques en moyen arabe : Sur la notation du vocalisme bref	209
<i>Jérôme Lentin</i>	
Playing the Same Game? Notes on Comparing Spoken Contemporary Mixed Arabic and (Pre)Modern Written Middle Arabic	235
<i>Gunvor Mejdell</i>	
Middle Arabic in Moshe Dar'ī's Judaeo-Arabic Poems	247
<i>Arie Schippers</i>	
Written Judeo-Arabic: Colloquial versus Middle Arabic	265
<i>Yosef Tobi</i>	
Yefet ben 'Eli's Commentary on the Book of Zechariah	279
<i>Kees de Vreugd</i>	
Damascus Arabic According to the <i>Compendio</i> of Lucas Caballero (1709).....	295
<i>Otto Zwartjes and Manfred Woidich</i>	
List of Contributors	335
Index	341

INTRODUCTION:
MIDDLE AND MIXED ARABIC, A NEW TREND IN ARABIC STUDIES

Johannes den Heijer

1. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Throughout its long history, and indeed up to the present day, the Arabic language has functioned in a situation that is often referred to as *diglossia*, i.e. the co-existence of two distinct varieties of one and the same language, each with its own specific domains.

In the case of the Arabic language, the H ('high') variety is known as Classical Arabic (also dubbed Literary or Standard Arabic), and is used in religion, politics, literature, the sciences and, in modern times, various types of mass media. All over the Arabic-speaking world, writing is mostly done in this H variety, which is essentially the same in an entire, vast linguistic area, which includes well over twenty countries. It is also the prestigious object of a long grammatical and philological tradition, which developed as soon as the Arabic language expanded outside the Arabian Peninsula into the Middle East, North Africa and beyond. Reading, writing, understanding and, indeed, speaking Standard Arabic are skills that have to be learned in a more or less formalized setting.

The L ('low') variety of the language is Spoken or Colloquial Arabic, which varies from region to region and is therefore often referred to by the term 'Arabic Dialects'. As the native tongue of all Arabic speakers without exception, it is used for all day-to-day conversation to the extent that it is the usual vehicle for most oral expressions in Arabic. Albeit on a far smaller scale than Standard Arabic, it is also used in writing, e.g. in theatre or film scripts, song lyrics, literature (particularly 'popular' poetry, but sometimes also artistic poetry and prose) and, increasingly, advertising. Although such texts that are written entirely, or preponderantly, in the L variety are rare for any period prior to the nineteenth century, it is important to bear in mind that the H-L dichotomy has existed for at least 1300 years to date (the question of whether it existed before the Arab expansions of the seventh century CE is one of the great debates in Arabic studies).

The scholarly study of the Arabic language and literature has long addressed the H variety exclusively. This is understandable, since its tremendous prestige far transcends the boundaries of the Arab world; after all, Classical Arabic is also cultivated all over the Muslim world as the language of the Koran and the manifold branches of Islamic learning.

Until recently, the L variety of Arabic has received only limited attention, primarily from European and other non-native linguists and philologists. Over the last three decades, however, specialists in Arabic dialectology have significantly increased in number and, moreover, a fair proportion of these scholars now hail from the Arab world itself. This is no mean accomplishment considering the relatively low prestige of Spoken Arabic in its own cultural setting. Many of these scholars meet and exchange research outcomes within the realm of the Association Internationale de Dialectologie Arabe (AIDA).¹

Along with the study of the Classical or Standard language on the one hand, and colloquial Arabic on the other, a new sub-discipline within Arabic studies has arisen from the need to understand what actually goes on *between* these H and L varieties of Arabic. It has been known for some time that the structural differences between the H and L varieties, which have been a permanent reality throughout their history, resulted at some point in the creation and development of intermediate and mixed varieties that were written, and probably spoken as well, in the past as much as they are often used in oral speech today. Particularly with regard to pre-modern language situations, specialists conventionally use the term 'Middle Arabic' for these varieties. Following the publication of some pioneering research in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the study of Middle Arabic evolved into a research field in its own right, primarily due to the work of Joshua Blau which has been published over the last six decades. With regard to mixed varieties in modern times, sociolinguistic analysis has been applied most fruitfully to situations in spoken Arabic since the late 1950s (Ferguson 1959).²

The quality, importance and impact of these two research trends notwithstanding, it was only in the first decade of the twenty-first century that they timidly but seriously started to meet and move towards what should, hopefully, one day result in a combined philological and sociolinguistic approach to pre-modern and modern, written and oral,

¹ For information on publications and past and future conferences, see <http://www.aida.or.at/>.

² See the overview and bibliography in Boussofara-Omar 2006b.

manifestations of Mixed Arabic. This will be an approach that will occupy the central position in Arabic studies it deserves, in line with the historical and geographical dimensions of the phenomenon itself.

In the last ten years, there has been remarkable progress in the collective effort to study these types of Mixed Arabic in a common framework. In May 2004, the first International Conference on the Study of Middle Arabic and the Mixed Varieties of Arabic was held at the Université Catholique de Louvain in Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium). For the first time, the Middle Arabic of mediaeval texts and the Mixed Arabic used in (recorded and transcribed) oral utterances in Arabic today were studied collectively within the same framework—including the creation of the Association internationale pour l'étude du moyen arabe et des variétés mixtes de l'arabe (International Association for the Study of Middle and Mixed Arabic—AIMA)—and, most of all, with a shared awareness that what we are dealing with here are different manifestations of one and the same sociolinguistic phenomenon.³

In the meantime, a further two successful AIMA conferences have taken place: AIMA 2, at the University of Amsterdam, from 22 to 25 October, 2007,⁴ and AIMA 3 at the Università degli Studi di Firenze, from 11 to 14 October, 2010.⁵

In addition, a small-scale workshop was convened at the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo (NVIC), where a number of mainly Cairo-based colleagues working in sociolinguistics discussed several of the papers presented at AIMA 2 and recorded on video, linking the issues raised there to their own ongoing research.⁶ This was a first tentative step towards mobilizing more scholars of this new combined discipline from Arab countries, thus reducing the risk of this approach continuing to be a primarily external way of looking at this important facet of the Arabic language.

More recently, Gunvor Mejdell organized another small workshop at the University of Oslo, this time with the aim of comparing research on Middle and Mixed Arabic with sociolinguistic and diachronic approaches

³ AIMA 1 was organized with financial support from the F.R.S.-FNRS Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique.

⁴ Financial support for this conference was provided by the Koninklijke Nederlandse Academie van Wetenschappen (KNAW).

⁵ AIMA 3 was co-sponsored by the Università di Catania and the Banco Sanpaolo Invest.

⁶ Participants in this workshop were Madiha Doss, Sabine Dorpmueller, Gerda Mansour, Gunvor Mejdell, Marco Hamam, Muhammad al-Sharkawi, Rudolf de Jong, Johannes den Heijer, Zainab Ibrahim, Wafaa Kamel, and Humphrey Davies. The event was sponsored by the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Cairo.

to other languages.⁷ As well as individual publications elsewhere, these efforts have so far resulted in a volume of the proceedings of AIMA 1,⁸ while another containing the AIMA 3 papers⁹ and another based on the Oslo workshop¹⁰ are now in preparation. The present volume in turn contains a collection of articles written in 2010, and is based on papers read in Amsterdam in 2007 at AIMA 2—some of which were presented again and discussed at the 2008 Cairo workshop referred to above.

In a remarkably fortunate, parallel development, the first decade of the twenty-first century has also seen the publication of the monumental and admirable *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, which contains a host of entries that are of direct relevance to our topic in all of its manifold aspects.¹¹

This introduction aims to analyze the articles contained in this volume within the wider research context of all of the encounters mentioned above: the main issues studied in the articles collected here will be discussed with reference, whenever relevant, to papers and discussions from the three AIMA conferences and the two related workshops. The author of

⁷ This workshop was held on 14 and 15 June, 2010, with presentations on Arabic by Gunvor Mejdell, Jérôme Lentin, Madiha Doss, Johannes den Heijer, and Catherine Taine-Cheikh, and on other languages by Tore Janson (Latin, Romance), Ernst Håkon Jahr (Scandinavian languages), Brit Mæhlum (Norwegian), Karen Gammelgaard (Czech), Bernt Brendemoen (Ottoman Turkish), Lutz Edzard (Hebrew), Jan Erik Rekdal (Gaelic, Latin), Jens Braarvig (Tibetan, Chinese), Claus Peter Zoller (Hindi), Ingjerd Hoem (linguistic anthropology) and Kristin F. Hagemann (Latin, Romance).

⁸ Most of the papers presented at the first AIMA conference were published in Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008.

⁹ The theme of AIMA 3 was 'Le moyen arabe et l'arabe mixte : un choix volontaire de registre?'/Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: an Intentional Choice of Register? The proceedings are now being edited by Lidia Bettini, Paolo La Spisa and Cecilia Picchi.

¹⁰ Edited by Gunvor Mejdell and Lutz Edzard, to appear in the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* series.

¹¹ For instance, the following entries: 'Christian Middle Arabic' (J. Grand'Henry); 'Classical Arabic' (W. Fischer); 'Classicism' (H. Palva); 'Code-switching' (G. Mejdell); 'Colloquial' (S. Abboud-Haggar); 'Communal Dialects' (K. Walters); 'Dialect Koine' (C. Miller); 'Dialects: Genesis' (S. Abboud-Haggar); 'Diglossia' (N. Boussofara-Omar); 'Educated Arabic' (K.C. Ryding); 'History of Arabic' (I. Ferrando); 'Hypercorrection' (B. Hary); 'Interference' (D.-W. Wilmsen); 'Judaeo-Arabic' (G. Khan); 'Language attitudes' (K. Walters); 'Media Arabic' (R.M. Effat & K. Versteegh); 'Leveling' (R. Bassiouney); 'Middle Arabic' (J. Lentin); 'Pidginization' (M. Tosco); 'Political Discourse and Language' (N. Mazraani); 'Register' (R. Bassiouney); 'Speech Accommodation' (S. Shiri); 'Substrate' (W. Kusters); 'Variation' (E. Al-Wer). See also the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Online* (<http://brillonline.nl> & <http://brill.nl/eallo>).

these remarks¹² insists on mentioning all these developments in order to underline the momentum that the combined study of Middle and Mixed Arabic has gained in the last few years.

Taken as a whole, the collection of papers presented in this book reflects the remarkable multiplicity of subjects relating to the main topic, which is essentially the Arabic language and its variety of forms and functions. In addition to the issue of variety, several other themes can be regarded as pairs which, at a first glance, might be taken as oppositions or dichotomies, but which in each case can also be read as twofold manifestations of one and the same aspect of the Arabic language and its mixed varieties. These interrelated manifestations are epitomized in the subtitle of this volume, itself another pair: “diachrony and synchrony”.

The first of these two manifestations concerns the study of Mixed Arabic from a chronological point of view, and thus addresses the notions of ‘ancient’ or ‘pre-modern’ and ‘contemporary’ or ‘modern’. In spite of the inevitable problems of demarcation that arise in such an opposition, the importance of a new, common framework for specialists working on older and more recent manifestations of the phenomenon is considerable and has already been sufficiently pointed out.

The element of synchrony, however, needs some fine-tuning, as it is not limited to the mutual interaction of the H and L levels, as set out above. Firstly, both levels are in need of further clarification: H can mean Classical, post-Classical, or (Modern) Standard Arabic, but in the case of a prestige dialect, studies do not always make it clear whether its contact with a different dialect is a question of language contact, code switching or mixing, or both.

The most innovative, but also the most complex, aspect of the various AIMA and AIMA-related encounters has been their aim to use the same methodological outlook to consider written—whether medieval or (early) modern—documents as well as (transcribed recordings of) necessarily recent oral speech. Fluctuation between the H (formal, Classical) and L (colloquial) registers is known to occur in oral speech as well as in written texts. Moreover, other specific standards may interfere in both oral and written Arabic, which are neither Classical/Standard nor regular colloquial. Finally, it may be argued that the boundaries between the written and the oral in any language are not as strict as they may seem.

¹² With thanks to Jérôme Lentin and Jacques Grand’Henry for their insightful remarks and corrections and to Liesbeth Zack for her feedback, support and patience.

The discussions held in this new common framework can be regarded as the beginning of an experiment in cross-fertilization between philological and sociolinguistic research on various types of written texts and oral speech.

Finally, the articles published in this volume reflect an approach that combines thematic coherence, in the sense of the common approaches to a variety of materials just mentioned, with interdisciplinarity: as well as the obvious focus on the main issue, i.e. the interaction between the registers within the Arabic language, the reader will also find a host of observations on textual history and transmission, literary aspects and the cultural and ideological contexts in which authors, redactors, scribes or speakers have produced their written or spoken output. By no means should this diversity of approaches be mistaken for disparity. On the contrary, it underlines the very richness of this collection of studies. Accordingly, all of these aspects will receive due attention in the remainder of this introduction.

2. 'MIDDLE ARABIC' AND 'MIXED ARABIC': TERMINOLOGY, DEFINITIONS, AND THE QUESTION OF A COMMON APPROACH

Whereas the first AIMA conference in 2004 witnessed a vivid debate on the adequacy of the terms 'Middle Arabic' and 'Mixed Arabic', and more particularly of the former, this controversy no longer seemed to be much of an issue in either 2007 or 2010, or indeed at the two workshops. In general, specialists in the field no longer seem to adhere to the old habit of using the term 'Middle Arabic' as an exclusively chronological device for describing a postulated intermediate phase between Old Arabic (often incorrectly identified with Classical Arabic) and the modern Arabic dialects.

This is not to say that among the contributors to this volume, and indeed among the participants at AIMA 2 and 3, there is absolute (implicit) consensus on all of the details of a definition of terms such as 'Middle Arabic' and 'Mixed Arabic'. All of these scholars now tend to agree that the phenomenon covered by both terms is a continuum, or a mix, between the H variety (usually identified as Standard or Classical Arabic) and the L variety (colloquial Arabic, also dubbed Neo-Arabic).¹³

¹³ When Joseph Chetrit in his AIMA 2 paper (not published in this volume) professed to prefer French 'arabe moyen' (as analogous to 'arabe classique' and 'arabe dialectal') to 'moyen arabe', he was referring to a lexical issue that is clearly confined to a limited num-

When it comes to the details, Bruno Halflants, for instance, reminds us in his article that the notion of a continuum (i.e. on a scale between H and L) prevents us from trying to identify a specific level on the scale that corresponds to Middle Arabic. Incidentally, it is important to realize that the concepts of Middle and Mixed Arabic are not yet generally well known, while other terms are coined as well with regard to specific categories of texts, such as *luġat al-ḥikāya* ('story-language'), as Rachel Hasson points out in a footnote.

As well as H and genuine L forms, i.e. features of living speech in colloquial Arabic, Middle Arabic typically has hybrid forms that are proper to neither the H nor the L registers. These are the kinds of features that Joshua Blau and others call pseudocorrections (broken down into hypocorrections and hypercorrections). Moreover, when referring to Middle Arabic texts contained in manuscripts, Paolo La Spisa recalls that these three types of forms may well alternate and co-exist freely on the same folio.

Nowadays, it is mainly the frequent occurrence of hybrid forms in written texts that raises the questions—crucial within our common framework of inquiry—as to whether pre-modern, written Middle Arabic can be understood according to the same criteria as modern Mixed Arabic in its written or oral forms, or to what extent we are dealing here with one and the same sociolinguistic phenomenon as it manifests itself over time and in different settings. Jacques Grand'Henry hints at this problem in passing by highlighting the case of a fundamental rupture between ancient and recent data, as well as an instance of continuity between the two.

Yet it is chiefly to Gunvor Mejdell that we owe the prime pioneering work in this respect. Already at AIMA 1 Mejdell discussed a number of ancient parallels to her own data, which were extracted from debates on cultural issues in contemporary Egypt. In her contribution to the present volume, which is eloquently entitled 'Playing the same game? Notes on comparing spoken contemporary Mixed Arabic and (pre)modern written Middle Arabic', she presents, to the present author's knowledge, the first truly systematic attempt to produce a comprehensive and comparative approach to pre-modern and modern Arabic in their mixed varieties.¹⁴

ber of European languages, and is irrelevant for others (cf. English 'Middle Arabic', German 'Mittelarabisch'), rather than to the conceptual confusion that had reigned earlier. On the concept of 'arabe moyen' as distinct from 'moyen arabe', and referring to contemporary mixed varieties, see e.g. Dichy 1994 and Larcher 2001.

¹⁴ In the Oslo workshop mentioned above, Gunvor Mejdell took a further initiative to consolidate and expand this comparative framework by involving a series of other languages.

In terms of terminology, Mejdell's main point is a typological distinction between Middle Arabic, which she understands as 'Middle Arabic written texts, premodern and modern', and Mixed Arabic, identified as spoken and contemporary. She concludes that comparison between the two is complicated by the fact that "graphic and phonetic representations yield different information", but that, nevertheless, "a structured investigation in the light of code-mixing and code-switching approaches, could and should be conducted across data, but limited to syntactic, collocational, and lexical aspects, which are transparent in both speech and writing."

From the viewpoint of synchrony and diachrony, for the time being, it is certainly helpful to replace the obsolete chronological definition of 'Middle Arabic' with a typological one, applicable to written Arabic of a mixed variety, irrespective of time, while reserving the term 'Mixed Arabic' for oral manifestations of mixed registers of the language. Empirically testing and discussing this solution at future AIMA conferences is recommended. This could be achieved by paying special attention to the typological distinction between, on the one hand, texts written by professional writers (like slogans and commercials) or with a literary intention (dialogues and narration in modern fiction), and, on the other hand, texts written by non-professionals in private letters (where the norm of written Arabic is still present, even if it is not respected) and on internet forums, chat rooms, Facebook pages, etc., where written Arabic can appear as a mere echo of oral performances.¹⁵

While it may be advisable to avoid spending a disproportionate amount of time and energy on a sustained discussion related to matters of definition and terminology, it is nonetheless clear that it is too early to completely discontinue such a discussion at this time. Let us neither forget nor ignore the criticism—whether justified or not—of the terms in question, not only expressed during AIMA 1,¹⁶ but also in several publications on pre-modern and contemporary texts or corpora alike (Toll 1984: 16–17, Boussofara-Omar 2006).¹⁷

¹⁵ This last observation is borrowed with gratitude from the comments of an anonymous reviewer of this collective work prior to its publication.

¹⁶ Only briefly hinted at in 'Objectifs et bilan' (Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008: XVIII), but voiced with fervour in several presentations and discussions, notably by Bo Holmberg and by Clive Holes.

¹⁷ See also Kouloughli, Djamel, 'Moyen Arabe et questions connexes'. *La clé des langues* (http://cle.ens-lyon.fr/1195829205054/o/fiche__article/&RH=CDL_ARA120000), an undated working document for language tutors.

3. DIACHRONY: MIDDLE ARABIC AND THE HISTORY OF THE ARABIC LANGUAGE

Middle and Mixed Arabic, then, has gained recognition as a variety within its own right, in which specific norms and standards can be identified. This feature is quite prominent in this volume, but this recent development should not obscure the fact that, in numerous studies on pre-modern MA phenomena, or on texts written in it, much, if not most, attention is granted to the identification or reconstruction of individual colloquial Arabic (Neo-Arabic) features. In many instances, these are studied—and quite legitimately so—for their own sake and from the perspective of historical linguistics, i.e. irrespective of their textual environment, which may be characterized by an overall predominance of Classical Arabic, or, conversely, by one of the varieties of Middle or Mixed Arabic defined above.

In his pervasive key-note address at the Amsterdam congress, Joshua Blau presented five case studies to illustrate how Neo-Arabic elements in MA texts can help us to understand the history of the Arabic dialects: (1) the very early disappearance in sedentary dialects of the lateral fricative represented by the letter *ḏād*; (2) the adverbial ending *-ā*, a genuine colloquial form that can be distinguished from the Classical Arabic borrowing *-an*; (3) the verbal theme IV (*'af'ala*) as explained by the early history of stress in Arabic; (4) the internal passive (*fu'ila*) as a possibly living feature of early dialects; and (5) the imperfect endings *ūn(a)* (3 pl.) and *īn(a)* (2 sg. f.) as genuine old dialect features rather than classicisms.

With the same purpose in mind, several authors in this volume, such as Jacques Grand'Henry and Lutz Edzard, highlight information on ancient dialects that can be retrieved from their respective materials. Equally, within a chronological framework, Bruno Halflants scrutinizes parts of the *1001 Nights* according to a particular fourteenth or fifteenth century manuscript, as a consequence discovering features known from modern Arabic dialects, which can sometimes be traced back to even earlier witnesses.

The contribution by Manfred Woidich and Otto Zwartjes contains important historical linguistic information on phonological and morpho-syntactic features of colloquial Arabic as spoken in Damascus around 1700 (but containing traits that may hail from elsewhere in the Syro-Palestinian dialect area) and the often problematic notation of these features in a grammar written by a Spanish missionary of that time. Similar research, which is not published in this volume, was carried out by Madiha Doss

and discussed in her AIMA 2 key-note address,¹⁸ and by Liesbeth Zack at the AIMA 3 conference.¹⁹

From a different angle, but also in diachronic terms (albeit concentrating on modern Egypt) Muhammad al-Sharkawi discussed examples, at AIMA 2 and, in more detail, at the Cairo workshop, of the shift of the preference for synthetic to one for analytic constructions, which is so well known from Blau's work on earlier processes of change, in present day written Middle Arabic (political discourse on internet sites).²⁰

4. NORMS AND STANDARDS

As stated briefly above, one of the most significant achievements of the new trend in Middle and Mixed Arabic studies is a fresh emphasis on the norms and standards that can be identified by carefully analyzing and comparing the huge amount of material available. If the norms, and the standards that derive from them, were obviously never codified in the way that those of Classical or Standard Arabic were, their systematic character and their persistence over a long period of time and wide geographical area have nevertheless been demonstrated convincingly (Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008: XVIII–XX). While such norms and standards appear to affect all domains of the language, the articles in this volume principally focus on orthography, which of course has implications for phonetics and phonology.

So far, numerous observations in this field point at deviations from what is perceived to be 'the' norm of Classical Arabic, particularly with regard to spelling conventions. In fact, it should be borne in mind that in general an overall history of Arabic orthography, which only partly overlaps with paleography (a much better documented and studied issue!), is yet to be written. Jérôme Lentin's contribution is an important step in

¹⁸ Title: 'La grammaire de Savary. Réflexions sur la notion d'arabe vulgaire'. Doss's main discovery here was that in an early nineteenth-century French textbook, the notion of 'arabe vulgaire' turns out to be not Cairene or Alexandrian Arabic of the period, but a mix of Standard Arabic with elements of colloquials from various regions in Egypt and the Levant, as well as hybrid elements.

¹⁹ L. Zack, 'Li'b al-Manār: a medieval shadow play from Egypt'. The Arabic reconstructed in this congress paper is Egyptian colloquial as contained in a manuscript of the early eighteenth century, but likely to contain considerably older material. See also Zack 2011 about the same text.

²⁰ M. al-Sharkawi presented 'Middle Arabic as a gate for language development in Arabic' at AIMA 2, and introduced the discussion on 'Definition problems' at the NVIC workshop in Cairo.

this direction in that it offers a new interpretation of one particular phenomenon, namely, vowel signs and their function. Previously, such signs were often thought to make no sense at all whenever they differed from the vocalization system of Classical Arabic orthography. Lentin's analysis has the further merit of being based on a wide range of texts and, in many cases, on the direct consultation of manuscripts.

Various articles draw attention to a mix of codes, H, L and hybrid (or I, meaning intermediary, with Amr Helmy Ibrahim) within the texts under investigation, and hence—mainly implicitly—to a norm that has fluctuations, or a certain degree of flexibility. It is in this light that the observations put forward by Rachel Hasson concerning Judeo-Arabic texts can be read. The same is true for the piece by Benjamin Hary, who analyzes the so-called *šarḥ* genre as seen against the background of the translation process involved; similarly, Lutz Edzard's study of a printed version of a text on religious lore convincingly demonstrates a number of traces of communal dialects from Baghdad. His work also notes that the Hebrew orthography of the text tends to be phonetic (with some noteworthy exceptions) where classicizing orthography is used.

Probably the most important aspect of the issue of norms and standards is the question of to what extent they should be regarded as intentional. By now, it is quite clear that a supposedly inadequate proficiency in the orthography and grammar of Classical Arabic can no longer be viewed as a satisfactory explanation for all of the cases that fail to correspond to these normative systems. Although, from a common-sense, sociolinguistic and historical point of view, certain cases may well be due to precisely such a lack of grammatical training, or the sheer lack of concentration on form during the process of writing, copying or speaking, yet we now know that many other cases must indeed reflect a conscious desire to mix registers and styles. This latter interpretation has been on the AIMA agenda right from the start (cf. Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008: XVIII–XIX) and is now getting an increasing amount of attention.²¹ However, currently, the detailed scrutiny of numerous individual cases is still required before we can formulate empirically founded criteria on how to distinguish between intentional norms and unintentional performances which, from the traditional, normative point of view, might still be taken for unsuccessful attempts at using the H register.

²¹ It was suggested as the main theme of the AIMA 3 conference; see above, Section 1.

In this collection of studies, the conscious character of Middle Arabic usage is underlined by Bruno Halflants with regard to the frequent switch towards colloquial Arabic in dialogues as well as elsewhere in the *1001 Nights*, and by Paolo La Spisa, who refers to the same text corpus as well as to earlier research on the language of authors such as Yāqūt al-Rūmī (1179–1229), al-Tanūxī (941–994) and Abū al-Farağ al-Iṣfahānī (897–967).

Directly linked to the issue of intentional norms and standards is the phenomenon of status. Referring back to Joshua Blau's earlier studies, Yosef Tobi ascribes such status, and to a very high degree at that, to a quasi omnipresent standard in much of the Jewish Arabic literature produced over no less than 1500 years, which is termed 'Medieval Written Judeo-Arabic' (MWJA). In fact, while admitting to a certain amount of variety within MWJA, Tobi does not hesitate to contend that "its status among the Arabic-speaking Jewish communities was like that of literary classical Arabic among the Muslim Arabic speakers". Furthermore, when it comes to Judeo-Arabic, Joseph Chetrit presented at AIMA 2 a survey of varieties, particularly from the fifteenth century and beyond and used mainly in North Africa. All of these varieties were characterized by the frequent occurrence of hybrid features and by the persistent reference to a distinct variety that was regarded as prestigious.²²

Continuing earlier research by Joshua Blau and himself on literary standards within Melkite Middle Arabic literature, Jacques Grand'Henry in his article comes to the conclusion that the text he investigates does not have two distinct standards, but rather two or possibly even three substandard varieties. This increased attention paid to matters of norms and standards in Judeo-Arabic, and to one specific branch of Christian Arabic texts, should encourage more research on other kinds of material, and seems to give fresh impetus to combined linguistic and literary investigations into standards as they are related to styles, including in Classical and Post-Classical Arabic.

When it comes to positively identifying instances of a norm that is used consciously, a particularly strong case in point is poetry. With regard to the material she investigates, Rachel Hasson notes that most of the time "the poetic sections are written in a higher register than the portions of prose". Arie Schippers shows, by meticulously analyzing the metrical structure of the poems he transcribes and translates, which are

²² For the issues raised in Chetrit's presentation (not published in this volume), see Chetrit 2007.

basically composed in Classical Arabic, how colloquial elements alternate with poetic licences to skilfully create what one might describe as Middle Arabic poetry. The example adduced is from the (Karaite) Judeo-Arabic tradition, and it would be very interesting to compare it with examples of the same phenomena in other traditions.

A very promising, albeit highly demanding, line of research when it comes to intentional norms and standards is that of their position within text transmission. Already at AIMA 1, Jacques Grand'Henry had demonstrated how in later versions of a given text, scribes or redactors can display a tendency to produce a type of language that is closer to the norms of Classical Arabic than their *Vorlage*; most importantly, however, that the opposite can also be true (Grand'Henry 2008: 182–183)! In the article mentioned above, which is included in this volume, Grand'Henry continues the examination of textual revision against the background of the reconsideration of Middle Arabic standards. Another precious contribution in this context is that of Berend Jan Dikken, who meticulously analyzes a text in its (Yemenite) Jewish, (Coptic) Christian and Muslim transmissions (on which more below), demonstrating how the Coptic, as well as the Muslim scribes or redactors, produced a standard that contains fewer Middle Arabic features than the Yemenite manuscripts.

The problem of levels or norms in Arabic also has implications for didactics. Manfred Woidich and Otto Zwartjes (see above) discuss this in light of the history of Arabic language teaching in Europe. Accordingly, it is appropriate to recall here the hybrid elements that Madiha Doss discovered, along with elements of the colloquials of various regions in Egypt and the Levant, in a nineteenth century textbook claiming to teach the 'arabe vulgaire' of Egypt. This aspect of norms is thus related to the history of Arabic language teaching in early modern Europe. However, in the future, our improved understanding of the non-codified, but nevertheless frequently used, norms of Middle and Mixed Arabic could very well have a bearing on applied linguistics when it comes to language training, both today and in the future. Indeed, a first step towards exploring this dimension was made at the Cairo workshop, and has so far yielded some preliminary, but promising, insights.

When it comes to our own times and the registers used in spoken Mixed Arabic, a number of factors are involved according to Amr Helmy Ibrahim. Of these, it is appropriate to mention koineization (also highlighted by Gunvor Mejdell, along with the dialect level), the natural and stable diglossic or triglossic character of the language, and the strategies required for switching between codes.

At AIMA 2, Catherine Taine-Cheikh showed in her paper (not submitted to this volume) an aspect of how standards work in the more complex sociolinguistic environment of Mauritania, with particular attention being paid to the intricacies of the oral-written divide, which can be better understood by adding the dimension of ‘auralisation’.

One may also recall, with regard to norms and standards and the status they enjoy, the issue of language attitudes as applied to the choice of register. This issue is present in the background in all of the articles introduced above. Moreover, it was the main theme of a paper presented at AIMA 2, and published elsewhere (Hamam 2011), in which even two highly language-aware and ideologized speakers, with diametrically opposed views on the perceived virtues of the H and L registers, were shown to be unable to stick to their preferred linguistic pole, thus displaying a clear cross movement through the Arabic linguistic continuum.

Finally, Gunvor Mejdell’s aforementioned contribution is also of paramount importance with regard to the question of whether norms and standards work in the same way in written and oral environments. While Mejdell does observe a major difference between the two, namely the fact that hybrid forms “are significantly more prevalent in written Middle Arabic texts than in contemporary mixed speech”, she also points to enough similarities to encourage more research along these lines.

5. LITERARY AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

At the start of this introduction, it was pointed out that literary and other cultural aspects of the environment in which Arabic developed over the centuries, in all its manifold manifestations, figure prominently in this volume. It is also from this angle that Benjamin Hary discusses the literary genre of the *šarḥ*, while Yosef Tobi’s contribution equally contains a significant part on the wide variety of written and oral Judeo-Arabic literature. Rachel Hasson deals with the literary and textual aspects of a popular story in its Judeo-Arabic version, highlighting the techniques of oral transmission that can be found therein, as well as the distinction between the sections in rhymed prose and in poetry, respectively. Arie Schippers comments quite extensively on literary motives in the poem he discusses. Kees de Vreugd’s contribution, meanwhile, is entirely about the literary and historic milieu, in this case that of a Karaite Jewish author and his polemics against his Rabbanite co-religionists. Similarly, the paper Raif Georges Khoury presented at AIMA 2 (to be published elsewhere)

dealt in its entirety with the Classical Arabic language as a vehicle of High Literature.

6. MIDDLE ARABIC AND THE TRADITIONS OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

Another refreshing element in the different AIMA venues is that they have brought together specialists in the various Arabic linguistic and literary traditions that are traditionally defined in terms of religious identity. Indeed, it is rare to find the likes of Joshua Blau, who has worked equally on both Judeo-Arabic and Middle Arabic hailing from a Christian environment, while also systematically referring to the parallel phenomena found in texts by Muslim authors, or even in the Koran itself. While such a comprehensive approach is not uncommon in studies of modern, oral Mixed Arabic and in Arabic dialectology,²³ those of us who primarily work on pre-modern texts in manuscripts generally tend to focus on the output of just one religious community at a time: Jews, Christians or Muslims.

As our modern academic environment is one of increasing specialization, there would be absolutely no point in objecting to a concentration on texts deriving from one particular environment, whether it be confessional or otherwise. Yet because interdisciplinarity is also a key concept today, things do become problematic when specialists in one of the aforementioned confessionally defined fields are reduced to exclusively exchanging ideas and research data with colleagues working in the same area. In this respect, the AIMA initiative, as reflected in the present volume, is a remarkably significant step forward. Even though most of the contributions to this work still specifically concern one of the religious traditions, the opportunity to present these in a shared framework, and to discuss our current research with experts in other sectors, is now clearly beginning to have an impact on our way of looking at the texts we study. Indeed, it enables us to discern the particularities of their linguistic and cultural features, as well as the numerous parallels found in texts produced by authors from the communities we are less familiar with.

²³ In the works by Bassiouney, Mazraani, Mejdell and others, confessional identity can be regarded as an issue of secondary importance. In dialectology, material recorded in Christian communities is often presented within the same context as that hailing from Muslim environments (for one example of many, see Behnstedt and Woidich 1988: 214–225). In studies of communal dialects inspired by the seminal study by Haim Blanc (Blanc 1964, cf. Walters 2006) the approach is usually comparative and inclusive.

Ever since Joshua Blau, with more than an eye on all of the intricacies and complications involved, repeatedly defined Judeo-Arabic in clear terms as “Arabic written by Jews for Jews” and Christian Arabic in analogous wording,²⁴ continued efforts have resulted in further reflections on this matter. In the present volume, definitions or characterizations of Judeo-Arabic are suggested by both Benjamin Hary, who uses the concept of ‘religiolect’ and maintains that the specific style of literal translations helped to assert Jewish identity, and Yosef Tobi, who looks at Medieval Written Judeo-Arabic against the background of Jewish communal dialects. Any such dialect is, he states, in principle the same as those “spoken by the Arab or Muslim majority in a certain country, even if it differs in some respects, such as its Hebrew component and even phonetically, from the majority dialect”. It thus appears that the specificity of written Judeo-Arabic could be explained with similar parameters.

In the introduction to his article, Bruno Halflants describes the Middle Arabic of Jews and Christians as a (deliberately used) identity marker, and that of Muslims as, purportedly, closer to the ideal norm of Classical Arabic due to the religious prestige of the latter.

This highly controversial, confessional question is in urgent need of a further empirical and comparative investigation that is based on a significant amount of data. AIMA 1 included a number of reflections on this issue, but these were limited, for the time being, to the Coptic Christian tradition (den Heijer 2008). There were, however, further elaborations on this topic from a more comparative angle at AIMA 3.²⁵ At AIMA 2, and in this collection of articles related to it, the present author briefly described some features of a corpus of inscriptions located in a (Syrian) Christian monastic setting, some of which contain interesting lexical items and expressions that are known from the Islamic religious culture.

Very striking instances of a Muslim, or general Arab, influence are also highlighted in the studies of Judeo-Arabic texts by Lutz Edzard (reminiscent of the Qur’ānic style, formal references to the *ḥakawāti* genre, a mix of Jewish and Muslim communal dialects in the pronouns and in the verbal system etc.) and Rachel Hasson, whose very object of study is a Jewish version of a story (with some adaptations) that originates from a Muslim environment.

²⁴ Cf. Blau’s more systematic reflections on this terminology: Blau 2000.

²⁵ Title of this paper: “Déconfessionnaliser” l’étude du moyen arabe: nouvelles remarques et questions’.

A truly fascinating case of a shared literary heritage across religious demarcations can be found in Berend Jan Dikken's contribution to this volume. Dikken shows, in great philological detail, how Sa'adya's Arabic translation of the Pentateuch was not only authoritative in Jewish circles, but was also used by Samaritans, expanded and commented upon by Coptic Christians, and transmitted in a manuscript of Muslim provenance from the thirteenth century CE.

7. MIDDLE ARABIC IN CONTACT WITH OTHER LANGUAGES

Virtually all of the contributions discussed in the preceding section implicitly or explicitly deal with forms of contact between Arabic and one or more other languages. Whether as a substrate language that indirectly looms in the background in a variety of ways, or as an immediate *Vorlage* in the case of translated texts, or in a living bilingual or multilingual setting, several languages are presented as influencing the Arabic of specific texts or genres.

The language that receives most attention is Hebrew, since it has long been known to be operational in Judeo-Arabic, which not only uses its script, but also much of its vocabulary. Comparing it to other languages used by Jewish communities, Benjamin Hary approaches Judeo-Arabic as a mixed language from the point of view of contact between a source or primary language and a recipient language. An important observation here is that Hebrew, along with the Aramaic components in Judeo-Arabic, is not restricted to the religious and cultural sphere, but also occurs in the entire lexicon, as well as in phonology, morphology, and syntax. More remarks on the Hebrew (and occasionally Aramaic) components can be found in the articles by Yosef Tobi, Berend Jan Dikken, and Lutz Edzard; in the latter contribution, the mixed nature of the language even appears in the title of the text in question, *Qiṣṣat Yosef ha-ṣādīq—'alav ha-šalom*. In Kees de Vreugd's study, such a Hebrew influence is implicit in many of the text samples. In this case, unlike much of Judeo-Arabic literature, not all of the Karaite texts in question are written in Hebrew characters: several are in the Arabic script, thus prompting the transcription of Hebrew words and expressions. Meanwhile, one of the poems analyzed by Arie Schippers starts with 14 lines in Hebrew (of 35 lines in total).

When it comes to the Christian sphere, various languages are in contact with Arabic. In Egypt, this is mostly Coptic, as pointed out at the

AIMA 1 (den Heijer 2008: 133–134, 138) and AIMA 3 conferences.²⁶ In the present volume, Jacques Grand’Henry uses instances of Greek and Syriac substrates as a criterion of distinction between the different branches of a text tradition.²⁷ The epigraphical corpus studied by Johannes den Heijer also contains numerous cases of Syriac influence, and some of the inscriptions can actually be read as manifestations of a mixed language.

Needless to say, the particular attention paid to language contact in the Jewish and Christian traditions by no means implies that such contact is thought to be limited to these communities. In fact, for centuries Arabic has been, and still partly is, in contact with languages such as Persian, Turkish, Berber and Romance. When it comes to Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic specifically, however, this well-known fact is yet to result in systematic research projects.²⁸ In the same vein, it would be useful for the scholars involved in AIMA to establish more systematic links with the extensive research on contemporary contact between Arabic and languages like English, French, and Spanish.

8. THE STUDY OF THE TRANSMISSION OF MIDDLE ARABIC TEXTS AND THEIR EDITION

A number of observations on text-historical aspects have been mentioned above in other contexts. It is enough to underline the fact that the manuscript transmission of specific texts is especially prominent in the articles by: Jacques Grand’Henry (distinction of various sub-categories of a Middle Arabic standard in the various branches of transmission of the text); Rachel Hasson (analysis of copying mistakes, with a focus on those occurring in the process of transcription from Arabic to Hebrew script or vice versa); Berend Jan Dikken (a meticulous reconstruction of the lines of transmission of the aforementioned Pentateuch version); and Bruno Halflants (reflections on the stemma of the text in question, which take up a significant part of the article).

²⁶ Coptic-Arabic contact figured prominently in Ofer Livne Kafri’s AIMA 3 paper, ‘On a Christian-Arabic version of the Pentateuch from the fourteenth century (MS Paris BN copte 1)’.

²⁷ For various aspects of Greek-Arabic language contact, it seems appropriate to recall the elaborate study by Maria Mavroudi which was presented at AIMA 1 (Mavroudi 2008).

²⁸ In a paper presented at AIMA 2 and published elsewhere (Bauden 2011), Frédéric Bauden presented a letter from a merchant of Persian extraction which contained a number of phenomena that are possibly due to the author’s lack of proficiency in Arabic, but also some that are quite typical of Middle Arabic as found in other texts.

Another very problematic aspect of Middle Arabic as transmitted in manuscripts is the issue of their edition. Indeed, the very recognition of deliberately used Middle Arabic norms and standards confronts editors of written Middle Arabic texts with a problem that is both methodological and practical.²⁹ The quest for a scholarly sound approach to editing texts of such a mixed or hybrid linguistic nature is still far from fulfilled, and a consensus among scholars will probably remain beyond reach for some time to come. The main dilemma, as it is often phrased, is one of authenticity and accessibility: should the editor be scrupulously faithful to the orthography and grammatical features of the original manuscript, document, or inscription, or are at least some of these features to be normalized according to Standard Arabic usage?

His analysis of the use of vowel signs prompted Jérôme Lentin to remind us of the urgency of the need to edit Middle Arabic texts in such a way as to fully account for their spelling. By pointing to a failure to do so by a previous editor (who does respect the linguistic features of his main manuscript, but nevertheless corrects the text by referring to other witnesses), Bruno Halflants subscribes to Lentin's view, albeit by advocating the production of detailed critical editions of texts prior to their linguistic analysis.

Berend Jan Dikken's elaborate case study shows that sometimes text traditions are too complex to allow for the simple reproduction of the spelling of the original; the intricate transmission of the text in question compels him to present it as such according to one manuscript, but in the orthography of another. At AIMA 2, Clara ten Hacken presented a description of the linguistic features of the basic manuscript, from 1380 CE, of an Arabic hagiographical text from the Coptic tradition, with a discussion of the most appropriate edition technique. By comparing several editions of similar texts, Ten Hacken came to the conclusion that certain orthographical adaptations were inevitable.³⁰

The present volume also contains a contribution that is entirely devoted to the problem of editing Arabic texts in general, and Middle Arabic ones in particular. Paolo La Spisa critically reviews the traditional habit of tacitly, or explicitly, normalizing at least the orthography of a text (and often

²⁹ This problem was identified in the introduction to AIMA 1 (Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008: XI–XII, XXI).

³⁰ The contents of Clara ten Hacken's paper at AIMA 2 are to appear in her forthcoming Ph.D. thesis: *The legend of Saint Aûr: the foundation history of a Coptic monastery in the Fayyum* (University of Amsterdam).

much more) according to Classical Arabic rules, with the aim being to present to the reader a text that is intelligible and credibly reflects what is considered to be the original author's thinking. To this principle, La Spisa contrasts the importance, well recognized in other traditions of living languages, of combining the criticism of forms or readings with that of the linguistic aspects of the text to be edited. He confirms the highly critical assessment made in 1988 by Jan Just Witkam, and comes to the sobering conclusion that the methods developed in Classical, Germanic and Romance philology over the last two centuries have rarely been applied to Arabic, with singularly catastrophic results for the treatment of Middle Arabic features. He gives a number of concrete suggestions for improvement and for presenting the linguistic features of multiple versions of a given text in the text body and in a special critical apparatus.

For the immediate future, this crucial issue must remain on the agenda, and numerous other specific problems should also be addressed, such as the restitution of diacritical signs in ambiguous forms. Much of this very basic work remains to be done in this aspect of Arabic studies, and only a sustained collective effort will enable us to make further progress.³¹

9. TOOLS AND THE VARIETY OF MATERIALS

Now that studies of Middle and Mixed Arabic are gaining momentum, a common conceptual framework for processing all relevant phonological, orthographical, morphological and syntactical data is becoming increasingly urgent. So far, studies of (pre-modern) written Middle Arabic texts tend to refer to Blau's classics, as does Bruno Halflants, for instance, in this volume. Johannes den Heijer suggests consulting some other more concise and more recent general accounts of Middle Arabic features as a grid for embedding our observations on the linguistic traits of texts under investigation.

Systematizing, analyzing and comparing the data of spoken Mixed Arabic and written Middle Arabic require large and searchable text corpora, as Gunvor Mejdell rightly states toward the end of her article. In the introduction to AIMA 1, the need for databases or inventories (*répertoires*) was already being underlined in clear terms (Lentin-Grand'Henry 2008: XXII).

³¹ Not only for Arabic, but also for a number of other languages, the *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies* (COMSt) project aims to produce relevant recommendations. See <http://www1.uni-hamburg.de/COMST/>.

One may add to this that such corpora or databases are also in need of appropriate search tools; it is precisely because of their ‘ungrammatical’ character (from the point of view of Standard Arabic) that Middle Arabic texts defy automated analysis by means of most of the available corpus linguistic analysis software. At the Institut Orientaliste of the Université Catholique de Louvain, an indexation and lemmatization programme was designed to address this problem. Its main principles, as well as its application (or applicability) to various types of texts, were demonstrated by Laurence Tuerlinckx at the AIMA 2 conference.³²

A major challenge for the conceptualization and development of such research tools is, of course, the extremely diverse nature of the data under investigation, particularly if we seriously embark on a common approach to written and oral material. However, a further issue relates to the wide chronological, geographical and typological variety within either category. The present volume modestly bears witness to this variety, but the scope of investigation certainly needs to be widened in the future. For instance, the so-called *lahn al-‘amma* treatises have long been recognized as another category of sources of pre-modern neo-Arabic and Middle Arabic data. At AIMA 2, Antonella Gherseti presented an analysis (not submitted to this volume) of one such treatise dated to the twelfth century CE—the *Taqwīm al-Lisān* by Ibn al-Ġawzī—and further research on such treatises is a desideratum.

Furthermore, the relevance of documentary texts to Middle Arabic is well known. However, as far as comprehensive studies are concerned, its recognition has only resulted in a much quoted analysis by Simon Hopkins of the language of early documentary texts in papyri (Hopkins 1984). In a number of highly erudite publications, Werner Diem has commented upon the linguistic features of specific documentary texts, mainly from the same early periods and contained in papyri, although he has also occasionally commented on later material (see, for instance, Diem 1993, 1995 and 2011). Since the study of Arabic papyrology has recently taken off in a way that is quite comparable to the research into Middle and Mixed Arabic, increased contacts may yield a more structural integration of this kind of material within the context of AIMA activities.

Within the same framework, the article by Frédéric Bauden referred to above draws attention to much later texts and concentrates on the

³² L. Tuerlinckx, ‘un programme de lemmatisation adapté à l’arabe non classique’ (création d’index lemmatisés et exploitation des données lexicales; exemple des textes arabes chrétiens); cf. also Tuerlinckx 2004).

language found in the epistolary category of documents, as exemplified by three letters from fifteenth century Egypt. Similarly, Clive Holes' study on much more recent letters from the Gulf, which he presented at AIMA 1 (Holes 2008), should inspire us to also pursue research in this domain.

A different category of modern, written material is considered by Gabriel Rosenbaum in his analysis of mixed styles in the Egyptian press and in the aforementioned remarks on web-based political writing by Muhammad al-Sharkawi.³³

When it comes to spoken Mixed Arabic, the focus thus far has been on specific domains (cultural, social and, above all, political) and a limited number of locations (Egypt, Tunisia, Lebanon, mostly in urban settings). The potential extensions of this scope are almost without limits and will require a huge amount of work.

10. FINAL REMARKS: MAINSTREAMING MIDDLE AND MIXED ARABIC STUDIES IN THE FUTURE

The most appropriate mood in which to conclude this introduction seems to be one of looking forward by referring back to the hope for the future expressed above. The three AIMA conferences and the AIMA spin-off workshop in Cairo have undoubtedly set a new trend by combining the philological study of older Middle Arabic texts, whether of Jewish, Christian or Muslim content and background, with a sociolinguistic approach to modern Mixed Arabic material. Typologically, we can now also consider extending, like Gunvor Mejdell, the notion of 'Middle Arabic' to written Mixed Arabic irrespective of time span, as distinct from spoken Mixed Arabic. The AIMA concept is thus in the process of producing nothing less than a new school of Arabic sociolinguistics and philology, and this has gained considerable momentum in recent years, as can be seen in the present volume.

Nevertheless, the study of Middle and Mixed Arabic is still situated more or less outside the mainstream of Arabic and Islamic Studies. It also still lacks critical mass, due to its conceived marginality. The study of these mixed varieties of Arabic is rarely embedded in academic curricula, and it is no exaggeration to state that generations of Arabists graduate without

³³ On the relevance of these two studies, which are not published here, cf. the judicious concluding remarks in Gunvor Mejdell's contribution to this volume.

having acquired even the slightest notion of this arguably indispensable aspect of the historical and contemporary realities of the Arabic language. This situation certainly holds true for Europe, North America and other places where Arabic is studied from the perspective of an outsider, but at least to the same degree, if not more, for the Arab world itself. In view of the enormous amount of work that needs to be done in terms of editing, recording, transcribing and analyzing the wide range of written and oral material mentioned in this introduction, the further development of our field greatly depends on both quality and critical mass, and requires an exponential growth of the numbers of scholars who are able and willing to perform such tasks. Despite undeniable material, infrastructural, conjunctural and sometimes political obstacles, well-trained native speakers of Arabic have the great potential to contribute proactively to this international and collective enterprise. In this sense, it is gratifying to note that the three successive AIMA conferences have witnessed a gradual growth in participation by Arabic-speaking scholars, although a sustained effort is required if these numbers are to increase further.

The Cairo workshop mentioned several times above may serve as a model that could be emulated at other locations throughout the Arab world, or wherever scholars can be found who have a sustained interest in sociolinguistics, dialectology or philology. For various external reasons, small-scale, informal venues would appear to provide the most suitable climate for meaningful cross-fertilization. Even more importantly, such workshops, irrespective of their geographical setting, as well as future AIMA conferences, should aim to reach out to young colleagues and involve them in planning the future of our field. More Ph.D. candidates should actively participate, while promising students who are not yet institutionally tied to specific projects should also be encouraged to attend and learn on the spot. Those of us who have teaching responsibilities can also report on these scientific events in our classes, while creatively looking for opportunities and means to integrate Middle and Mixed Arabic, a most central and far-reaching field within Arabic studies, into the academic curricula. Investing in future generations is not only a matter of granting Middle and Mixed Arabic their rightful place within the larger field. It is, above all, an urgent necessity. As has been argued in this introduction, much has been achieved in a short period of time, but a tremendous amount of work still needs to be done, and great numbers of trained and motivated specialists are required to carry it out.

Hopefully, the collection of studies in this book can be used as a tool to transmit the knowledge that is necessary for such an achievement, and

as a source of inspiration for numerous future research projects on our multifaceted and fascinating discipline.

REFERENCES

- Bauden, Frédéric. 2011. 'Lam baqā yu'arīḏkum. Analyse linguistique de trois lettres rédigées par un marchand au Caire en 819/1416–820/1417'. Den Heijer, Johannes, La Spisa, Paolo and Tuerlinckx, Laurence (eds.), *Autour de la langue arabe. Études présentées à Jacques Grand'Henry à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (forthcoming).
- Behnstedt, Peter and Woidich, Manfred. 1988. *Die ägyptisch-arabischen Dialekte. 3. Texte. II. Niltaldialekte—III. Oasendialekte*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Blanc, Chaim. 1964. *Communal dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University (*Harvard Middle Eastern monographs* 10).
- Blau, Joshua. 2000. 'Are "Judaeo-Arabic" and "Christian Arabic" misnomers indeed?' *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24. 49–57.
- Boussofara-Omar, Naima. 2006a. 'Neither third language nor middle varieties but diglossic switching'. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 45. 55–80.
- . 2006b. 'Diglossia'. Versteegh, Kees (gen. ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 1. 629–637.
- Chetrit, Joseph. 2007. *Diglossie, hybridation et diversité intra-linguistique. Études socio-pragmatiques sur les langues juives, le judéo-arabe et le judéo-berbère*. Paris, Louvain: Peeters (*Études chamito-sémitiques*).
- Den Heijer, Johannes. 2008. 'Remarques sur le langage de quelques textes copto-arabes médiévaux'. Lentin, Jérôme et Grand'Henry, Jacques (eds.), *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe à travers l'histoire. Actes du premier colloque international (Louvain-la-Neuve, 10–14 mai 2004)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain* 58). 171–181.
- Dichy, Joseph. 1994. 'La pluriglossie de l'arabe'. *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 46. 19–42.
- Diem, Werner. 1995. *Arabische Geschäftsbriefe des 10. bis 14. Jahrhunderts aus der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz (*Documenta Arabica antiqua* 1).
- . 1997. *Arabische Briefe des 7. bis 13. Jahrhunderts aus den Staatlichen Museen Berlin*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz (*Documenta Arabica antiqua* 4).
- . 2011. 'Zwischen hohem Stil und Vulgarismus: Ein Brief aus dem Ägypten des 10.–11. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.'. Den Heijer, Johannes, La Spisa, Paolo and Tuerlinckx, Laurence (eds.), *Autour de la langue arabe. Études présentées à Jacques Grand'Henry à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (forthcoming).
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. 'Diglossia'. *Word* 15. 325–340.
- Grand'Henry, Jacques. 2008. 'Le moyen arabe dans les manuscrits de la version arabe du discours 40 de Grégoire de Nazianze'. Lentin, Jérôme et Grand'Henry, Jacques (eds.), *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe à travers l'histoire. Actes du premier colloque international (Louvain-la-Neuve, 10–14 mai 2004)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain* 58).
- Hamam, Marco. 2011. 'Text vs. comment: some examples of the rhetorical value of the diglossic code-switching in Arabic: a Gumperzian approach'. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association* 21. 41–67.
- Holes, Clive. 2008. 'The 'mixed' Arabic of the letters of 19th and early 20th century Gulf rulers'. Lentin, Jérôme et Grand'Henry, Jacques (eds.), *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe à travers l'histoire. Actes du premier colloque international (Louvain-la-Neuve,*

- 10–14 mai 2004). Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain* 58). 193–229.
- Hopkins, Simon. 1984. *Studies in the Grammar of Early Arabic, based upon papyri datable to before A.H. 300/A.D. 912*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (*London oriental series* 37).
- Kouloughli, Djamel. s.d. 'Moyen Arabe et questions connexes'. *La clé des langues* (http://cle.ens-lyon.fr/1195829205054/o/fiche__article/&RH=CDL_ARA120000).
- Larcher, Pierre. 2001. 'Moyen arabe et arabe moyen'. *Arabica* 48. 578–609.
- Lentin, Jérôme et Grand'Henry, Jacques (eds.). 2008. *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe à travers l'histoire. Actes du premier colloque international (Louvain-la-Neuve, 10–14 mai 2004)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain* 58).
- Mavroudi, Maria. 2008. 'Arabic words in Greek letters: the Violet fragment and more'. Lentin, Jérôme et Grand'Henry, Jacques (eds.), *Moyen arabe et variétés mixtes de l'arabe à travers l'histoire. Actes du premier colloque international (Louvain-la-Neuve, 10–14 mai 2004)*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain* 58). 321–354.
- Toll, Christopher. 1984. 'Dialektale Züge in al-Hamdānī's *Kitāb al-Ġawharatayn*'. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 13. 16–26.
- Tuerlinckx, Laurence. 2004. 'La lemmatisation de l'arabe non classique'. *JADT 2004 : 7^{es} Journées internationales d'Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles*. http://lexicometrica.univ-paris3.fr/jadt/jadt2004/pdf/JADT_105.pdf.
- Walters, Keith. 2006. 'Communal dialects'. Versteegh, Kees (gen. ed.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics* 1. 442–448.
- Zack, Liesbeth. 2011. '*Li'b al-Manār*: an Egyptian shadow play. Some comments on orthography, morphology and syntax'. Den Heijer, Johannes, La Spisa, Paolo and Tuerlinckx, Laurence (eds.), *Autour de la langue arabe. Études présentées à Jacques Grand'Henry à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de Louvain (forthcoming).