A Survey of the Dahalik language, an Afro-Semitic language spoken exclusively in Eritrea

Marie-Claude Simeone-Senelle

To cite this version:

HAL Id: halshs-00319729
https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00319729
Submitted on 10 Sep 2008

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.
November 2005

A survey of the Dahalik language,
an Afro-Semitic language spoken exclusively in Eritrea

Marie-Claude SIMEONE-SENELLE
LLACAN, INALCO - CNRS
simeone@vjf.cnrs.fr

In memory of Idris Abback

Abstract
The Dahalik language was listed for the first time during the 1996 French survey on the island of Dahlak Kebir, in the State of Eritrea. Up to this date the language had totally escaped to linguistic investigation. It is the mother tongue of about 2500 islanders, inhabitants of three islands of the archipelago of Dahlak: Dahlak Kebir, Nora and Dehil. The in-depth research and the linguistic description began only in 2002. In this article, I shall present the sociolinguistic situation on Dahlak Kebir, and salient linguistic features (phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary) of the language spoken on Dahlak Kebir. I shall point at the originality of Dahalik, and I shall try to determine more exactly the status of this language. Although many similitudes with Tigre, Dahalik is not to be considered as a dialect of Tigre, but as an original language within the Afro-Semitic group. This presentation is based of data collected during my fieldworks in Eritrea on Dahlak Kebir, Dehil, Nora, and in Massawa.

Introduction
Dahalik is an Afro-Semitic language spoken in the state of Eritrea, exclusively on three islands of the Dahlak archipelago, off Massawa: Dahlak Kebir (=DK), Nora, and Dehil. It was listed for the first time during the 1996 French exploratory survey on the island of Dahlak Kebir. Up to this date the language, mother tongue of about 2500 speakers, had totally escaped linguistic investigation.

Dahalik [dahålık] is the term used by the native speakers when they refer to their language. Although they claim its originality with regard to Tigre, many of them think that Dahalik is a mixed language based on Tigre, Arabic and Afar. In Eritrea, it is generally admitted that many islanders on DK speak Arabic or a dialect of Tigre. In the nineteenth century, W. Munziger (in Dillmann: 1) wrote that Tigre was the first language of the Dahlak inhabitants, and in 1961 Longrigg confirmed it in the Encyclopédie de l'Islam. However, Antoine d'Abbadie (1890: 26), according to the informations collected in Massawa in 1840, claimed that the language of the islands was close to Tigray [i.e. Tigrinya].

After a sociolinguistic introduction to enlighten the interferences with other languages in contact (Afar and Arabic), I shall present some salient linguistic features (phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary), in order to point at the originality of Dahalik, and to try to determine more precisely the status of this language.
Data

Data were collected during five fieldworks (1996, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005) I have carried out in Eritrea, on DK, Nora, Dehil, and in Massawa. During the 1996 first fieldwork in different villages of DK, only a vocabulary list of about 250 items and very short texts were collected. These data made some lexical comparisons within the Semitic group possible (using the work of Leslau (1987) as reference), and they gave some informations about verbal and nominal morphology. My preliminary analyses suggested that, on the one hand, Dahalik does belong to the Afro-Semitic group, and that, on the other hand, it differs from Tigre and Tigrinya.

The in-depth research and the linguistic description of the language began only in January 2002, in Massawa, with seven native male-speakers from three different villages on DK. Some texts about the traditional and daily life on DK were recorded, transcribed, and commented with the informants. The corpus provided main data concerning phonetics, morphology and syntax, sufficient to begin the work on Dahalik dictionary.

In March 2003, during the fieldwork in the different villages on DK, I recorded a rich corpus including vocabulary, paradigms, narrative and discursive texts, with many Dahalik native speakers: children, women and men of different ages and belonging to different social categories. For the first time, I collected traditional literature (poetry, tales, stories), and I had the opportunity to record women talking about their daily life in the past and in the present time. In Massawa, in February 2004, the study of this corpus in more detail was carried on, and many new items concerning halieutic vocabulary were collected for the dictionary.

I have only few data collected on Nora and Dehil, during a short survey on these islands in 2005. Thus, I shall limit this presentation to the Dahalik language spoken on DK.

Linguistic situation on Dahlak Kebir

The native speakers of Dahalik think that they represent the majority of the population on Dahlak Kebir. The other languages spoken on the island are Arabic and Afar. There is no Tigre community on the islands.

The geographical distribution of languages spoken on the island (Dahalik, Arabic, Afar) depends on the villages. For example, in Durubbishet 98% of the villagers are Dahalik native speakers (2% are Afar or Arabic native speakers). All the villagers of Dasqo are Dahalik native speakers, while in Jimhile, 50% are Dahalik, 50% Afar, and there are no Arabic native speakers. Dahlak Kebir is the village where Afar native speakers are the most numerous; they make up to 70% of the population and the majority lives within their own circumscribed territory of the village. Other inhabitants are Dahalik (25%) and Arabic (5%) speakers.

Arabic is the language of education in all the primary schools of the island. The general situation on the island is characterised by multilingualism: Dahalik, Afar, Arabic. Maybe only very few old women are monolingual.

For professional reasons, the male population, fishermen and traders, are in regular contact with Arabic, Afar, Tigre languages in Massawa. Some of them understand Tigrinya but they do not speak it fluently. They have contact with Afar on the Eritrean coast, and Arabs in Yemen and Saudia Arabia. Besides, a variety of Arabic is the lingua franca along the African Red sea coast. Generally, Arabic, or more exactly, Arabic dialects from Yemen and Saudia Arabia, plays a predominant role on the island. Not only because of the origin of some
islanders, but also because of mixed marriage, schooling, and the influence of television. Albeit rare, TV sets are available on the island and they pick up broadcastings from Eritrea but also from Saudia Arabia and Yemen. There are many Afar-Dahalik mixed marriages but very few intermarriages between Dahalik and Tigre speakers. As far as I know, there are no families in which both father and mother are Tigre and this language is never the only mother tongue for the children. This multilingual situation on the island is comparable with the situation inside the families where mother and father are native speakers of different languages: the children have two mother tongues. Moreover, because of the social organization, when they acquire their first language, they acquire at the same time a second one with parents, relatives, and a third one with their fellows. This contact situation explains the influence of Arabic on Dahalik, the use of code-switching and loans from Arabic. But it cannot explain the similarity between Dahalik and Tigre. Interestingly, Tigre native speakers report that they cannot speak Dahalik, while they understand it without much difficulty. However, according to the Dahalik speakers, Tigre speakers can only understand the vocabulary. The Dahalik native speakers are aware that they speak an original language, but many of them think that their speech is a mixed language based essentially on Arabic, and Tigre (and for some of them, Afar). They consider it a result of contacts on the island between Arabic speakers coming from Yemen and speakers of Afro-Semitic or Cushitic languages coming from the Horn of Africa. I shall quote one of my informants whose mother and father were Dahalik native speakers. His discourse is representative of the picture that many Dahalik speakers have of their language.  

I speak Dahalik. Our speech is a mixture of three speeches: there are in it Tigre, Arabic a little, Tigrinya a little, but it is closer to Tigre. I speak my own Tigre (Tigre variety of mine), and I understand the Tigre variety of Massawa.

The Dahalik native speakers have a very positive attitude towards their mother tongue. They state that it has been used by many generations over more than two thousand years, and that it is very important that it should not be forgotten, in order to save its specificity, and their cultural identity.

In the following, I shall present the features of this specificity that can be deduced at the present stage of my research. The work is not yet completed, so the results I report should be considered as preliminary and, by no means, exhaustive.

**Linguistic characteristics**

1. **Phonology and phonetics**

**Consonants**

| Table of the consonants |
Some specific phonetic features are to be noted:
— Except ð in very few occurrences, there is no ejective consonant in Dahalik, and the
degree of pharyngealization in Ʞ (the ejective in Tigre and emphatic consonant in
Arabic) is weak.
— The fricative uvulars are reflexes of the plosive. In intervocalic position, the
prevailing articulation of the voiceless uvular plosive /q/ is [ʁ] voiced uvular fricative,
and [x] in front of an other fricative:

\[\text{sahasa}\] he laughed, but \[\text{sahaqko}\] I laughed; \[\text{buqhet}\] or \[\text{buxhet}\] tomorrow; \[\text{fanqar}\] uvula.

The uvular fricative and the voiceless uvular plosive q may alternate like in some
Arabic dialects of the Arabian peninsula, and like in Arabic used as a Lingua Franca
by the Dahalik and Afar speakers on the island:

\[\text{baqar}\] or \[\text{bakar}\] cow; \[\text{wadaqa}\] he fell (cf. Te. \text{wädqa}, Ta. \text{wädäqä} to fall, and Arabic
\text{wadaga} to drop); \[\text{qanem}\] sheep (cf. \text{ğanam} in Arabic); \[\text{qadafa}\] he rowed; \[\text{farasa}\] he
shared; \[\text{farraq}\] he shares. The same speaker says \[\text{qalîl}\] or \[\text{şalîl}\] (even \text{Palîl}) little, but in
‘conscious’ borrowings from Arabic: \[\text{luqet}\] language, \[\text{sugul}\] work, business.

Moreover [x] may be the reflex of the voiceless velar plosive /k/:

\[\text{axtar-hum}\] most of them.
— The velar fricative x, not present in the phonological consonant system of Afro-
Semitic languages, occurs only in Arabic loans, as in
\[\text{xudra}\] fruit.
— The palato-alveolar fricative ð (IPA /y/), is articulated by some speakers as [ð̠]:
\[\text{ğiran}\] or \[\text{d’iran}\] crab,
or as a voiced velar stop (maybe only in Arabic loans):
\[\text{gediret}\] island (and \[\text{ğediret}\]); \[\text{gamel}\] camel.
— /z/ is not present in the phonological consonant system, it occurs only in some
borrowings from Arabic, or in the speech of informants in very close and regular
contact with Arabic:

\[\text{azakkar}\] I remember; \[\text{wazana}\] he weighted; \[\text{guzur}\] islands (or \[\text{ğuzur}\]), \[\text{gediret}\] or \[\text{ğeziret},
singular, in the same sentence.

Other relevant phonetic characteristics are:
— Unstable status of /h/ in initial position:
\[\text{alle}\] or \[\text{halle}\] to be, to have;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>plosive</th>
<th>fricative</th>
<th>ejective</th>
<th>nasal</th>
<th>lateral</th>
<th>rolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>labial</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denti-alveolar</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dorso-alveolar</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>(z)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palato-alveolar</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>(ð)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labio-velar</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ʁ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvular</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharyngeal</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and */ʔ/ in intervocalic position:

- **gaʔis** or **gayis** to leave, to go.
- Weakening of the final dental */t/*:
  - beʔ úmm-u (/bēt ummu/) his mother’s house
- Assimilation of *b, t, d, l* as final consonants of a noun followed by a deictic, of a verb or a preposition followed by a personal index, a suffixed pronoun or a noun:
  - bikko (/bil-ko/) I said; binna (/bil-na/) we said; dimmakinet (/dib-makin/) in (the) car; gediredda (/gedīret-da/) this (f.) island.
- Gemination of the initial consonant of the suffix pronoun after a verb or a noun:
  - bilenna (/bile-na/) he said (to) us.
- Gemination of the final consonant of a noun phrase when followed by a suffix pronoun:
  - bēḥāt-tu° (/bēt-ḥat-u/) <house-aunt-pr.3msg> his maternal aunt's house.

**Vowels**

The phonology of the vocalic system remains to be set up.

There are six vocalic timbres: i, e, ã, a, o, u (maybe seven with ñ). ã occurs only in unstressed syllable.

I cannot assert that the length is a relevant feature in the vocalic system of Dahalik. In examples such as:

- amãud guts; bõa inside; Tsa to live; růluq far,

the long vowel can be conditioned by stress or be an allophone of the short vowel, in contact with a pharyngeal or a glottal stop. Moreover this feature seems to depend on the speaker. Some of them say:

- bet, and others bēt, house.

We note that in the phonological system of the Afro-Semitic languages, such as Tigrinya, there are no long vowels (Kogan 1997: 427). In Tigre (Raz 1983: 7) “Long vowels are likely to be found in syllables that carry prominent stress”. But in the languages in contact with Dahalik (Arabic and Afar) the vocalic quantity is relevant.

- Backward vocalic harmony was noted in the data:
  - ḥembirit navel, ḥemburut-u his navel.

**Syllabic structure and stress**

- The most common syllabic structures are Cv and CvC.
- In nominal or verbal phrases, the word limit is reorganized:
  - bet úmm-ā <house/ mother-suf. pr. 3fsg>: [betúm-mā] her mother’s house; cf. above bet ḥat-u = > [beḥāt-tu].

When the first component is disyllabic, its final consonant is articulated as the initial phonem of the second element:

- ḥēnet ublu-ha [ḥēne-tubluha] <specific dance (fsg.)/ they say-suf. pr. 3 fs> they call it hennet dance.
- The gemination of the second radical consonant in the imperfect conjugation can affect another consonant of the root when the personal pronoun is suffixed to the verb:
  - ġāsa tanāššef you (ms) dry fish, and tanašéff-o you dry it.
warred he goes down, he pulls down, and *nawarudd-un* we put them down.

2 Morphology

2.1 Pronominal morphology

It is close to Tigre but there are some differences concerning the independent pronouns and the object / dependent pronouns suffixed to a verb or to a noun.

**Comparative table of personal independent pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dahalik</th>
<th>Tigre (Raz: 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg. 1</td>
<td><em>ana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m.</td>
<td><em>enta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td><em>enti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m.</td>
<td><em>itu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f.</td>
<td><em>ita</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. 1</td>
<td><em>neña</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m.</td>
<td><em>intum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td><em>intun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m.</td>
<td><em>itun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f.</td>
<td><em>itan</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Dahalik speakers have for the 2nd and 3rd pl. *hintum, hintun; hitun, hitan*.

Dependent pronouns suffixed to nouns and verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dahalik</th>
<th>Tigre (Raz: 37-8)</th>
<th>Dahalik</th>
<th>Tigre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-(h)e; -ni -ye; -ni</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m.</td>
<td>-ak</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>-kum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.</td>
<td>-ik</td>
<td>-kan</td>
<td>-kän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>-(h)u</td>
<td>-(h)um*</td>
<td>-om; -wom; -yom; -hom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f.</td>
<td>-(a)</td>
<td>-(h)an</td>
<td>-an; -wan; -yan; -han</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One fifty years old speaker from Jimhile says -(h)un.

*Hū-he* <brother-1sg> my brother; ḥēt-e <sister-1sg> my sister

bayn-e <alone-1sg> myself; bayn-ak yourself (msg.), f. bayn-ik; (3msg) bayn-o, (f.) bayn-a; (1pl) bayn-e-na; (2mpl.) bayn-e-kum, (f.) bayn-e-kan; (3mpl.) bayn-um, (f.) bayn-an (but the 3rd f.pl. is often similar to the 3rd mpl. bayn-um themselves (m. & f.pl.)

There is an epenthetic vowel *i* between the preposition or particle and the suffix pronoun with pronoun suffixed to a particle:

misī-ha (/misī-i-hā/) with her; *'adēr-i-ha* after her; kasmi-l-i-he <like-gemination-epenthetic vowel-suf.pr. 1sg> like me.

2.2 Nominal morphology

The substantives (nouns and adjectives) have two genders, two numbers for nouns, but generally a common plural for adjectives. Gender opposition for adjectives is very often marked by vocalic apophony:

(m.) ḥačer, (f.) ḥačar short; (m.) ḥayir, (f.) ḥaʔar small, young.

-t is the feminine marker for nouns and a few adjectives.
darbet storm (f.); itu dahalâkêy you (m.sg) (are) Dahlaki; (f.) ita dahalâkêyt.

In Dahalik, internal plurals (syllabic or vocalic patterns are different from those of the singular) are widely spread:

(sg. darbet) darâb storms; (msg. haçar) pl. haçyir short

External plurals with suffixes are rare for nouns (more common for adjectives):

(sg. ha?an) ha?an-et children; hayir-in (c. pl.) small, young; fawilin (c. pl.) tall.

2.3 Verbal morphology

The verbal morphology of the basic and derived verbs is close to both Tigre and Tigrinya:

Table of the paradigms of the personal/gender/number indices in the verbal conjugations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix indices at the perfect</th>
<th>Prefix and suffix indices at the imperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 — ko</td>
<td>1 (a)—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m. — ka</td>
<td>2m. tv—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f. — ka</td>
<td>2f. tv—i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m. — a</td>
<td>3m. (i)—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f. — e/êt</td>
<td>3f. tv—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the perfect, the 1sg. personal index is similar to Tigre (Tigrinya -ku). At the imperfect, the vowel timbre (e/a/i/a) of the personal index depends on the adjacent consonants. The verbal personal markers are similar to Tigre and Tigrinya, except for 3m.sg. and 3m.f.pl. However, for some irregular verbs such as bifla to say, which is also used as an auxiliary, the 3rd m.sg PI is i-:

ibil he says; iblu and ibla they (m. & f.) say, (y- in Ta, l- in Tigre) ;

— As in the other Semitic languages, verbs have a basic stem and derived forms (by prefixation of a morpheme). Basic regular verbs can be divided at least into 4 types on the basis of their pattern (as in the Afro-semantic languages): I and II (comparable with A and B in Te), and III & IV (different from C & D types in Te, or Ta).

Type I (perfect / imperfect): \( R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a / R^1 a R^2 R^2 e/i R^3 \) (Type A in Te: \( R^1 a R^2 R^3 a / l-R^1 a R^2 R^2 a R^3 \)). The verbs of type I are the most numerous one.

sakaba / sakkib to sleep; masala / massil to look like; wade / waddi to do; hâba / hayib to bring; nasa?a / nasse? to take.

Type II: \( R^1 a R^2 R^3 R^3 a / R^1 a R^2 R^2 i R^3 \) (Type B in Te: \( R^1 a R^2 R^2 a R^3 a / l-R^1 a R^2 R^2 a R^3 \))

naššafa / našsef to dry (intrs.); fakkara / fakker to think.

Type III: \( R^1 a R^2 R^3 a / R^1 a R^2 R^2 R^3 \) (Type C in Te: \( R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a / l-o-R^1 a R^2 a R^3 \); Ta: \( R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a / y-o-R^1 a R^2 a R^3 \)) :

fahama / fahim to understand;

Type IV: \( R^1 a R^2 (R^3) e / R^1 a R^2 (R^3) i \) (type D in Te: \( R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a / l-o-R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a / l-o-R^1 a R^2 a R^3 a \)):

ha?e / ha?i to marry ; ma?e, me?e / ma ?i to come.

The triliteral verbs are a majority.

Quadriliteral verbs follow the pattern: \( R^1 a R^2 R^3 a R^4 a / R^1 a R^2 R^3 e R^4 \):
ambara / amber to call (so); nafnafa / nafnef to sprinkle.
— The derivative prefixes and the semantic values of derived forms are comparable to Te.

adarasa / adarris to teach (darasa / darris to learn); abde / abdi to lose (bade / baddi to be lost); al’aka / al’aki to send.
— The negative conjugation of the verb is specific to Dahalik. Similarly to Ta, verbs are denied by a discontinuous morpheme which is: yi- prefixed and -ni suffixed to the verb (or to the verb + suf. pr.). In Te, (Raz 1983: 76) “A verb is rendered negative by means of the prefixed particle ??i-”. In Ta (Leslau 1941: 75, 88), the negation of the imperfect is ??ay—n, and y—n in some contexts. In Dahalik the second element -n is reinforced by -i.13

yi-me’e-ki-ni <neg.-he went-2fsg.-neg> he didn't visit you (f.sg.). yi-?ammer-ni <NEG.-to know.impft.3m.sg-NEG> ‘he does not know’; yi-me’e-ki-ni <NEG.-to come.pft.3m.s.-pr.2fsg.(O)-NEG> ‘he didn't visit you(f.sg)’.

The negation of existence is invariable in Dahalik and can be compared to Ta. It is based on a verb /TO BE/, (h)alle:

yi-allê(ni) there is nothing; hente y-allê-ni <one / there is no> there is nobody.

However, in a compound conjugation with the auxiliary ḥaddi, to want, the negation can be expressed by the negative shortened form of (h)alle (without the second element -ni):

a’addim y-elle-ḥaddi <he is quiet/ neg.-BE (pft-3msg.)-want> he does'nt want to be quiet; na’addim yinne ḥaddi we don't want to be quiet; addim yuko15 -ḥaddi <I am quiet/ neg.-BE (pft-1sg)-want > I don't want to be quiet.

3 Syntax
3.1 Syntax of the verb
Tenses and modalities in the verbal system
The verbal system is very complex. It is based on an aspectual opposition, perfect vs imperfect. In addition, compound tenses enrich this basic system. They are based on periphrastic constructions: verb + copula / auxiliary, where both the auxiliary/copula, and the main verb are conjugated. This construction characterizes the relation of the speaker to the process or the relation between two processes inside a text (present, progressive, past, plus-perfect ...). Moreover, these compound conjugations make the expression of many modalities possible (future, inchoative, asserative ...).

Some constructions are close to Te, others are not attested in Te, but in Ta.
— Future may be expressed by imperfect and the suffixed copula (of pronominal origin): msg. -tu, fsg. -ta, mpl. -tun, fpl. -tan.

2sg. m/f: tibil-tu/ta, 2pl. m/f tebelû-tun/tebelâ-tan you will speak.
— Another conjugation is used to express proximal future, progressive and imminence. The conjugation is compounded with the imperfect of the verb + the perfect of (h)alle, to be, to exist, to have (to be at), used as an auxiliary (cf. Tigre, Raz 1983:71).The process is presented as certain, sure.

ma’i halliko (var. ma’illiko) I'm coming, I'll come (that's sure).
tuwallid (h)allet she is about to give birth.

idamo! ana əstaği[h]elliko Be quiet (pl.)! I'm working.

ḥaddi, to want, is used as a modal auxiliary to express an uncertain future, probability.

adabbi l-a-ḥaddi <he sells/ he wants> he wants to sell, he will sell (it's not sure).

— To express past, Dahalik resorts to periphrastic construction with another verb /TO BE/, kūna/kōna, used as an auxiliary. It is attested in Tigriinya, but not in Tigre.

kōna and (h)alle are to be distinguished. The former expresses a past tense, and the latter a present.

ḥumum kunko I was ill, I had been ill (compare to ḫumum (h)alliko I am ill).

The main verb and the auxiliary are at the perfect conjugation:

before 100 riyal he was he gives now 1000 riyal he gives

Before he was giving 100 riyals, now he gives (or he is giving) 1000 riyals.

3.2 Definite Article and deictic

ya- is the definite article. It is invariable, and always prefixed to the noun. Like article la- in Te, “it is used only to recall what has just been mentioned” (Raz 1983: 34-5).

gaw aw- -a-walet gaʔTs. yā-(a)w walet gurum ibil-l-un

to father girl he goes ART-father girl well he says-to-them

He goes to the girl's father. The girl's father speaks to them clearly.

The deictic is variable in gender and number. As a pronoun, it is always suffixed to the preposition. As a determinative deictic, it is more often suffixed to the noun, sometimes reduplicated before the noun (but it is very rarely only prefixed).

digid-da to/for this one

m.s. ḥaʔan (or ḥân)-di / dî ḥān-di this child;

f.s. walet-da [walèdda] / dål walèd-da this girl;

m.pl. ḥaʔanet din [ḥāneddin] / din ḥaʔanet din these children;

f.pl. awâlit-dan [awâliddan] / dan awâlîd dan these girls.

The deictic is used to recall what has been already mentioned in the context, but which is not in the immediate preceding context:

ginniyet-da <ginn (f.)-this(f.)> this ginn (as for the ginn), and just after in the sentence: ya-ginniyet the ginn (which I have just mentioned).

3.2 Syntax of the sentence

— In nominal phrases except for the article and sometimes for some deictics (cf. above), the usual order is Qualified + Qualifier:

be(t)-umm-u <house-mother-3msg.> his mother’s house;

dabbâbat na-maḥmûd <moped /of-Mahmud> Mahmud's moped;

bisíd-da (/bisit-dá/) ʕabbây <woman-this(f.)/ old (f.sg.)> this old woman;

including when the determiner is a relative clause:

nahâr d-elle-ḥaddi
day that-aux.3msg-he wants
The day that he will choose.
— There is a copula in nominal sentences. It varies for gender (and number, depending on the idiolects), and it is suffixed to the predicative nominal:

\[ \text{šuguł-un bahar-tu,} \]

business-suf. pr. 3mpl sea-COP.(msg)

Their business, it is the sea.

\[ \text{luget maxluget-ta} \]

speech mixing-COP.(fsg)

Language (loan from Arabic) is a mixture.

\[ \text{anis-din cabayi-tun} \]

women-these old (pl.)-COP.pl

These women are old

\[ \text{c̄d n̄f̄-ta mingabbi, wa ya-gāmel c̄abi-tu...} \]

village small-cop. (fsg) if and ART.-camel big(msg)-COP.(msg)

If the village is small and (if) the camel is big ...

— In verbal phrases, the usual order is verb (+ suf. pr.) + auxiliary, but this order is not fixed:

\[ \text{eṣṭağel-kunko or kunko eṣṭağel I was working; gayis-kunko I have left; kūnayu c̄asobū-ni they were waiting for me; i-xaderiyu-n-ni darussu they were not able to learn.} \]

— In simple clause, the usual order is S O V:

\[ \text{sab min c̄ad ḡseyu <people/ from/ country/ they went>. People left the country (island/village).} \]

— In conditional subordinate clauses, the subordinating marker is usually at the end of the clause or just before the verb:

\[ \text{ḥalib galil-tu men-gabbi kile ḥabbet affāgir} \]

milk few-cop.(msg) if 2 piece he pulls out

If there is little milk, he gets out two pieces (of cheese).

In other subordinate clauses the order varies:

\[ \text{ana muśo fādi alleko tema?a-n-ne} \]

pr. S. 1sg when free I had you(sg) come-gem.-suf. pr. 1sg

You will come to me when I am available.

\[ \text{fādi nahar ko gabbi? ma?e} \]

free when /alleko/ I became I come

I'll come when I am available.

— Usually in complex sentences, the dependant/subordinate clause precedes the main one, cf. above, and:

\[ \text{itu ra'?iya-ka me'?e <pr. S. 3m.sg/ he sees-suf. pr. 2m.sg/ he came> He came to see you; but kunko ḥaddi c̄addim <I was/ I invite > I wanted to invite ...} \]

\[ \text{ḥadagayu-ha tegayis maraḥeb <they let-suf. pr. 3fsg/ she goes/ bush> They let her to go to the bush.} \]

3.3 Descriptive compounds

In Dahalik, there is a means of verbal creation which is typical to the Afro-semitic languages and to several not genetically linked languages in this area. Depending on the languages, the basis of the new verbal periphrasis may come from either a noun, an adjective, an adverb, an onomatopoeic / ideophonic form, a verb or even a syntagm (Cohen, D. et alii, 2002). In my data, the construction is based on ideophonic or onomatopoeic element followed by the verb bīla, to say. This
composition is a very ancient means of verbal creation (a process for trans- and intra-categorial derivation), attested as far as in old Egyptian. These compound verbs were called ‘descriptive compounds’ by M. Cohen (1970: 262). In Dahalik they are used with an emphatic descriptive value in narrative stories and tales. But this phenomenon is less common than in Tigre and in Afar where it is very widely used.

\textbf{bulluq} and \textbf{tubulluq} (reinforced form): splash! $\Rightarrow$ \textbf{tubulluq bìla} <splash / he said>

He fell into water with a big splash; \textbf{ḥawāt-o tubulluq bileyū-hu} <brothers-suf. pr. 3msg/ splash/ they said-suf. pr. 3msg> His brothers made him fall into water with a big splash; \textbf{sakata, tum bìla} <he was silent/ sh!/ he said> He was silent, he remained silent.

4. Vocabulary

Concerning vocabulary, the roots, with very few exceptions, belong to Semitic, or more precisely to Afro-Semitic vocabulary (cf. Leslau 1987):

\textit{igir} leg, foot (Te. ṣagār, Ta. ṣagīr); \textit{ṭīn} eye (Te. ṣīn); \textit{ṭōf} (Te. ṣof, Ta. ṣof and ṣuf) bird; \textit{ṭāsa} fish (Te., Ta. ṣasa); \textit{ṣād / isād} fire (cf. Agaw ṣāsad but Te. ṣasat); \textit{bīla} he ate (Te. bāl’e, Ta. bāl’ā); \textit{sate} he drank (Te. sāta, Ta. sātāyā); \textit{misi} with (Ta. mās and Te. māsal from Semitic root $<$mā$>$).

There are borrowings from Arabic:

\textit{ṭaw̱īl} long; \textit{xudra} fruit; \textit{warāset} leaf; \textit{ṣuḫul} work, business; \textit{eṣṭaģel} I work, he works; \textit{luğet} language.

Some words are borrowed from European languages, essentially from Italian:

\textit{kūkiyan} mother of pearl (from conchiglia), \textit{salādi} (from soldi).

In my data there are no borrowing from Afar.

Conclusion

The structure of Dahalik language shows a close relationship with Tigre, and similarities with Tigrinya. However, the divergences with Tigre are too important to consider Dahalik as a dialect of Tigre. The features common to Dahalik and Tigre may be explained by their belonging to the same branch of the South Semitic group. The similarities are due to a genetic relationship, but the differences are important and specific enough to exclude the possibility that, today, Dahalik is a dialect of Tigre or a mixed language. Modern Dahalik can be considered as an original unit in the Afro-Semitic set. Dahalik can be considered, synchronically, as an original variety. This classification is based on three sets of arguments: (i) the linguistic characteristics, (ii) the awareness of the native speakers that their language is different from others, and (iii) the degree of non-understanding between Dahalik and Tigre speakers.

Note that I have collected examples which show that variation is attested in phonetics (such as the phenomena of vocalic harmonization), morphology (e.g. conjugations of weak verbs) and vocabulary (more or less important borrowings). On Dahałak Kebir, these variations seem to be due to dialectal or sociolectal differences, according to villages or to generations. An accurate dialectal study is necessary and should include the study of Dahalik spoken on the other two islands, Nora and Dehil. We must investigate the evolution of Dahalik in different
environments, and the consequences of linguistic interferences and contacts with other Semitic languages, and with Cushitic languages.

Research on Dahalik will have to define the status of Dahalik and to decide between two options, whether (i) the Dahalik language is the result of the evolution of an ancient Afro-Semitic language (or more generally of a Southern Semitic language), confined to a small area where for millenia populations of different languages were in contact; (ii) it is a new vernacularized language coming from an ancient and extinguished vernacular.
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