



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing

Kossmann, M.G.

### Citation

Kossmann, M. G. (2023). On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing. *Journal Of African Languages And Literatures*, 4, 1-27. doi:10.6093/jalalit.v4i4.10032

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3620360>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



*Research article*

## On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing

**MAARTEN KOSSMANN**

Leiden University  
m.g.kossmann@hum.leidenuniv.nl

### ABSTRACT

The Amazigh (aka Berber) language Tarifiyt has two different roots for 'to see', **zr**, and **wř**, which are in partial complementary distribution depending on the aspect of the verb. In this article, the exact distribution of these verb roots is discussed for one particular variety of Tarifiyt, that spoken in and around the city of Nador. It is shown that there are two, partially overlapping, verbs, one 'to go/come and see', which is always expressed by **zr**, and the other a general 'see' verb, which uses the root **wř** in the Imperfective stems, and **zr** in the Aorist and Perfective stems. However, the distribution is more complicated than that, and in the negation of irrealis events, Imperfective **zr** can also be used with the general 'see' verb. Moreover, it is shown that the choice of the aspect in the general 'see' verb is different in its details from that of other verbs, something that it may share with other verbs of experience perception.

**KEY WORDS:** Tarifiyt, Amazigh linguistics, Berber linguistics, perception verbs, aspect and semantics



MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

**1. Introduction**

**1.1 General information**

Since the seminal article by Åke Viberg (VIBERG 1984),<sup>1</sup> perception verbs have been a major subject in the field of semantic typology (KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM 2008). Viberg's typology showed a common – although far from universal – distinction between experience perception verbs, such as 'to see', 'to hear', and activity perception verbs, such as 'to look', 'to listen'. Moreover, Viberg and following research point to a high degree of variation in the languages of the world regarding the semantic distinctions made between different types of perception (AIKHENVALD and STORCH 2013). Most studies highlighting differences with languages such as English have focused on systems that make less distinctions (e.g., recently VAN PUTTEN 2020). There are also systems where more distinctions are made. In such systems, aspectual factors may play a major role in the definition of these distinctions, a point that was made by WÄLCHLI (2016), and which will be argued for here concerning Nador Tarifiyt.

Tarifiyt is an Amazigh (aka as Berber) language spoken in north-eastern Morocco. While the language has been the subject of a large number of studies (among many others CHAMI 1979; CADI 1987; 2006; LAFKIOUI 2007; 2013; MOURIGH and KOSSMANN 2019), the semantics of perception verbs have not been studied in detail as far I am aware.<sup>2</sup> More in general, detailed analyses of the semantics of perception verbs in Amazigh languages are lacking. NAÏT ZERRAD (2018) provides an overview of the attested forms, but only gives little information about the semantic differences. Moreover, while Amazigh is blessed with a large number of high-quality dictionaries, they tend to be rather short in their definitions and explanations when it comes to verbs of perception.

In this article, I aim to analyze the uses of two verb roots expressing visual experience perception, **zar** (etc.) and **ttwařa** (etc.),<sup>3</sup> which have a particular distribution, that is related to aspect. First an overview of verbs of visual

---

<sup>1</sup> I am deeply indebted to Khalid Mourigh for his expert feedback on an earlier draft of this article. I wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their highly pertinent and constructive criticism. Of course all errors and flaws in the argument are mine.

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, in my copy of the unpublished dictionary by SERHOUAL (2002), the relevant pages for both verbs are missing.

<sup>3</sup> Both roots are also well-attested in Amazigh languages other than Tarifiyt. Among the two, ZR is the most wide-spread, and found all over Morocco, Algeria and Libya (NAÏT ZERRAD 2018: 155-156) The verb WR is less widely attested, but also occurs in Kabyle **wali**, and has cognates with more specialized semantics elsewhere (NAÏT ZERRAD 2018: 157-158).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

perception in Nador Tarifiyt will be provided (section 1.2), followed by a short presentation of the main uses of the aspects (section 1.3). After this, the main part (section 2) will be dedicated to a more detailed description of the use of these two verb roots in various aspectual contexts.

When referring to the two verb roots, I will use the abstract representation  $\text{ZR}$  for **zar** and its various aspectual forms, and  $\text{WR}$  for **ttwařa** and its various aspectual forms.

The present study is based on a corpus of written texts consisting mainly of four sources. The first is the autobiography of Ēali Amaziġ (the writer's name of Ali Oulad Saddik), *Tudunin war itizyen* (2012; 125 p.) (hence: AA); the second is a novel by the prolific prose writer Mohamed Bouzaggou: *Tudart dg under* (2015; 144 p.) (hence: MB), and the third source is the translation of the New Testament produced by DHIMH Multimedia, *Řexbar Ařebřan n Yeccu Lmasiř (Řeahd n Jdid)* (2009; 480 p.) (hence: NT). While the use of translations can be problematic in this kind of study, I would not expect major differences in the use of 'see' verbs due to this. The fourth source consists of a corpus, compiled by the present author, containing about 120,000 words of readers' comments in Tarifiyt on articles in the online journals *nadorcity.com* and, to a lesser extent, *segangan.net*, mostly from 2009–2012.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The transcriptions in AA and NT are cited in their original form, except that sentence-initial capitalization has been omitted; I have not corrected or homogenized their transcriptions, even in cases where this would have been easy. MB uses a similar system of transcription to that of AA and NT, but lacks consistency (e.g., writing **tezrid** in stead of **teřrid**). I have corrected MB's transcriptions where necessary, and adapted them to fit the system of AA and NT exactly. The citations from BEZZAZI and KOSSMANN (1997) and MOURIGH and KOSSMANN (2019) have been adapted to the transcription system of AA. Quotes from the *nadorcity* corpus are provided in their original form followed by an interpretation according to the transcription system of AA and NT. In these transcriptions, italicized elements are direct code switches from Arabic or other languages.

There is little use in providing a full morphological analysis of the forms in the examples; therefore no morphological boundaries are added. This is reflected in the glosses, which use the colon for any intra-word morphology. Only for verb inflection glossing is complete; nominal morphology is irrelevant to the argument in this paper, and will not be reflected in the glosses.

The transcription system of AA and NT is the one most commonly used in Tarifiyt writing. The most salient features are: <c> = IPA [ʃ]; <e> = IPA [ə]; <ħ> = IPA [ħ]; <j> = IPA <ʒ>; <ε> = IPA [ɿ]. The general lenition of ungeminated stops ("spirantization") is not written. Except for <ħ>, a dot below the letter indicates that the consonant is pharyngealized. One should note that, depending on the dialect, single **r** in coda position can be vocalized, which leads to pronunciations such as [zɑ(:)] for **zar** (see LAFKIOUI 2007: 29–37 for details). In Nador Tarifiyt there is large-scale variation as to the presence or absence of **r** vocalization in this context. AA and NT write <r> for **r**

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

These sources all represent the variety of Tarifiyt as spoken in and around Nador. Eali Amaziy belongs to the Iqeřeyen community, and grew up in a village that is now part of the city of Nador and Mohamed Bouzaggou is from the neighboring community of Ayt Seid. On the basis of certain linguistic features, the dialect of the Bible translation can also be identified as representing an Iqeřeyen or Ayt Seid variety (on dialect variation in Tarifiyt, see LAFKIOUI 2007). The nadorcity corpus is more heterogeneous, but the large majority of the posters seem to stem originally from the eastern half of the Rif (Iqeřeyen, Ayt Seid, Ikebdanen). Of course, where necessary, differences between the different sources will be taken into account.

**1.2 Verbs of visual perception in Tarifiyt**

Like other Amazigh languages, Tarifiyt distinguishes between verbs of activity perception and verbs of experience perception. There is one general verb of visual activity perception, **xzar** ~ **yzar** ‘to look’. In other dialects of Tarifiyt other verb stems are used in this meaning, e.g. **swed** in neighboring Ikebdanen, **qqel** in Ayt Iznasen, and **xemm**, **nađur** in varieties more to the west and south (LAFKIOUI 2007: 277). In the present corpus, **xzar**, **yzar** is by far the most common form. The perceived object or person is normally constructed with the preposition **di** ‘in’, as shown in the following examples.

- (1) **uca nxezzar di teffah d lbanan.**  
now 1P:look:IPV in apples and bananas  
‘Then we looked (verb **xzar**) at (**di**) the apples and the bananas.’ (AA 57)

---

in coda position, while <ř> stands for a rhotic cognate to **l** in varieties like Ayt Iznasen. This **ř** is never vocalized and may have a slightly different phonetic realization from \***r** in non-coda contexts. For a short overview of the phonology of Nador Tarifiyt, see MOURIGH and KOSSMANN (2019: 21-24).

The following abbreviations are used:

Sources: AA = AMAZIY (2012); MB = BOUZAGGOU (2015); M&K = MOURIGH and KOSSMANN (2019); NT = DHIMH MULTIMEDIA (2009).

Glosses: ANP = Anaphoric deictic; AO = Aorist; DIST = Distal deictic; DO = Direct Object; IO = Indirect Object; IPV = Imperfective; IMPTV = Imperative; IRR = Irrealis; M = Masculine; NEG = preverbal negation marker; NEG2 = postverbal negation marker; NI = Negative Imperfective; NP = Negative Perfective; P = Plural; PRED = Predicative particle; PRX = Proximal deictic; PTC = Participle (subject relative form); PV = Perfective; Q = Polar question marker; QA = presentative (and other uses); **aqqa**, **qa**; REL = Relative marker; S = Singular; VENT = Ventive (directional particle); WR = verb root (**tt**)**wařa**; ZR = verb root **zar**.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

- (2) **xzarey degg idarn inu.**  
 1S:look:PV in feet my  
 'I looked (verb **xzar**) at (**di**)<sup>5</sup> my feet.' (MB 86)

Another common verb of visual activity perception is **ssijj**,<sup>6</sup> which, according to SERHOUAL (2002: 520) may refer to taking a quick look (exx. (3), (4)), to looking down (ex. (5)), or to looking through a window (etc.) (ex. (6)). Some speakers only accept the furtive reading, but the dictionary and the data in the corpus suggest that the other two meanings also exist in the wider community. The perceived person or object is normally constructed with the preposition **x** 'on, concerning' (ex. (5)).

- (3) **deyya nnuffary degg ij n teymart. (...)**  
 immediately 1S:hide:P in one of corner (...)  
**ssijjey eawed ttwařix tt teqqim.**  
 1S:look:PV again 1S:see(WŘ):IPV 3SF:DO 3S:F:sit:PV  
 'I hid immediately in a corner (...) I took another quick look (verb **ssijj**) and saw that she had sat down.' (MB 98)

- (4) **Sijj dd xafi waha uca tuyurd**  
 IMPTV:S:look:AOR vent on.me just then 2S:go:AOR  
 'Just take a quick look at me (verb **ssijj**) and go.' (MB 47)

- (5) **aqqa issijj Arebbi x weydud nnes.**  
 QA 3S:M:look:PV God on people his  
 'The Lord has looked down (verb **ssijj**) upon his people.' (NT; Luke 7:16)

- (6) **uca ssajjiy zi tbuxxict n řmeftaḥ n tewwurt**  
 then 1S:look:IPV from hole of key of door  
 'Then I would look (verb **ssijj**) through the key hole of the door.' (AA 5)

In order to express visual experience perception, there are two verb roots, **ṢR** and **WŘ**. The perceived object or person is expressed by a Direct Object.

Tarifiyt verbs have different forms in different aspects, which are called aspectual stems. As shown in Table 1, **ṢR** occurs in all aspectual stems, while **WŘ** only occurs in Imperfective stems:

---

<sup>5</sup> **Degg** is an allomorph of **di**, see MOURIGH and KOSSMANN (2019: 88).

<sup>6</sup> **Ssijj** (Imperative **sijj**) is originally a causative verb, but the underived form is not used in Tarifiyt. In other Amazigh languages, both the derived and the underived forms exist, e.g., Central Moroccan Tamazight **agg** 'to see from an elevated place', **ssigg** 'to look at' (TAIFI 1991: 144).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

	ZR	WŘ
Aorist	zar (< *ẓer) <sup>7</sup>	-
Perfective	zri ~ zra (vowels depending on subject marking)	-
Negative Perfective (always combined with a negative preverbal particle)	zri	-
Imperfective	zarr (< *ẓerr)	ttwařa ~ twařa
Negative Imperfective (always combined with a negative preverbal particle)	zarr (< *ẓerr)	ttwiři ~ twiři

Table 1 – Aspectual stems of the two verb roots of visual experience perception

The form **ttwařa ~ twařa** can be interpreted as a verb stem **wařa** preceded by the Imperfective prefix. The variation between **tt** and **t** ([t]) in **ttwařa** and **twařa** is a common feature of this prefix, due to an irregular process of degemination without spirantization occurring in some grammatical morphemes (MOURIGH and KOSSMANN 2019: 26).

Neither ZR nor WŘ allow for an Imperative form. More in general, in Tarifiyt the concept ‘to see’ is never expressed in the Imperative. While this is different from languages like English, the absence of an Imperative form for an experience verb is not unexpected of course.

As one can see from Table 1, much of the paradigm is suppletive – ZR providing the Aorist, Perfective, and Negative Perfective forms of the verb. Only in the Imperfective both verb stems occur. As will be shown below, Imperfective uses of ZR are restricted to a small number of contexts, and most Imperfective meanings are expressed by means of WŘ.

**1.3 A short overview of the aspectual system**

As the difference between ZR and WŘ is obviously related to aspect, it is necessary to provide a short overview of the main usages of the aspects in Tarifiyt.

I will refrain from a general definition of what each aspect means and concentrate on usages. The overview will perforce be incomplete and superficial, but I hope it will be sufficient for the discussion of the issues at stake later on (see also MOURIGH and KOSSMANN 2019: 111-115).

<sup>7</sup>In Tarifiyt, schwa merges with **a** before **r**. The original schwa is confirmed by Ayt Iznasen Tarifiyt, which has not undergone this merger, and which has **ẓer** (Aorist) and **ẓerr** (Imperfective).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

The aspectual system consists of three major poles, largely corresponding to the different morphological stems. Imperatives will be left out of the discussion.

Perfective  
Imperfective  
**ad** + Aorist

In addition, it is possible to combine the preverbal particle **ad** with the Imperfective.

The Perfective appears in two major contexts. In the first place it is the most common form for dynamic, non-repetitive events set in the past. In the second place it is used to convey a state, regardless of the time frame. With most verbs, both interpretations are possible (CHAKER 1995). Verbs of volition (ex. (7)), cognition (ex. (8)), and mental state (ex. (9)) almost always function as stative verbs, and, as a consequence, mostly appear in the Perfective.<sup>8</sup>

- (7) **ad ggey min xsey**  
IRR 1S:do:AO what 1S:want:PV  
'I will do what I want.' (MB 5)
- (8) **tessned aryaz a (...)?**  
2S:know:PV man PRX  
'Do you know this man (...)?' (AA 8)
- (9) **ma tegg<sup>w</sup>ded niy a ɛři ?**  
Q 2S:be.afraid:PV or o Ali  
'Are you afraid, Ali?' (AA 65)

The Imperfective is used for a large range of imperfective meanings. In the first place, it expresses repetition of the event, as found in habitual, iterative and distributive contexts, for example in (10) and (11), which are cited from a sermon.

- (10) **lmanakir i teggen**  
sins REL 3P:M:do:IPV  
**war tent itegg qaε hedd**  
NEG 3P:F:do 3S:M:do:NI entirely anyone  
'The sins they commit [habitually], nobody (else) commits them.' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 171)

---

<sup>8</sup> There is no objection to having them in the Imperfective, though, where they take habitual interpretation.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

---

- (11) **tadfey yar tħuna**  
1S:go.in:IPV to shops  
'I went to the shops (one by one).' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 167)

In addition, the Imperfective is used as a progressive, as in example (12).

- (12) **wellaħma tmeniy akic,**  
not.at.all 1S:fight:IPV with.you  
**qa necc tarzzuy ac řxir**  
QA I 1S:search:IPV 2S:M:IO good  
'I swear I'm not arguing with you, I am only looking<sup>9</sup> for good things for you.' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 176)

A simple Imperfective is normally not used to express continuous duration. Durativity is expressed by means of an auxiliary construction with **qqim** 'to sit, to stay' followed by an Imperfective (ex. (13)).

- (13) **qqimey ssawařey akis**  
1S:stay:PV 1S:speak:IPV with.him  
'I talked with him for some time.' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 170)

Another way of expressing duration is by repeating the Imperfective (ex. (14)):

- (14) **lmuhimm, nđđura nđđura,**  
anyway 1P:walk.around:IPV 1P:walk.around:IPV  
**ařami nufa pařrun**  
until 1P:find:PV boss  
'Anyway, we walked and we walked until we found the boss.' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 168)

**Ad** is a preverbal particle that conveys that the event has not yet taken place; this will be called the irrealis context here.<sup>10</sup> It can express anything from a certain future to an injunction (ex. (15)). It is normally combined with the Aorist aspectual stem. In case the event is repetitive (habitual or iterative), it can also be combined with the Imperfective stem, as in **a dac ntic** 'we will always give you' in ex. (16).

---

<sup>9</sup> **urzu** literally means 'to search'. It is often used in the sense of 'to look for', and, more generally 'to want'. In spite of often being translatable by English 'to look for', **urzu** is not a perception verb.

<sup>10</sup> The normal term in Amazigh linguistics is Non-real or Non-realized. As this may lead to confusion when speaking about negation, I will use Irrealis instead.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

---

- (15) **arwah a neqqim da**  
come! IRR 1P:sit:AO here  
'Come, let's sit over here!' (Tariq ibn Ali, in M&K 170)
- (16) **a dac ntic min zi ya teiced**  
IRR 2S:m:IO 1P:give:IPV what from IRR 2S:live:AO  
'We will always give you what you will live by' (example sentence in M&K 113)

**Ad** + Aorist is very common in complement clauses, especially when the governing verb implies that the complement has not yet been realized (ex. (17); see KOSSMANN *fc.* for an analysis). It is also used after a number of subordinators expressing purpose, such as **hima** 'so that' (ex. (18)).

- (17) **wi ixsen ad isey iseřman zzaywem?**  
who PTC:want:PV IRR 3S:M:buy:AO fish from.you  
'Who among you wants to buy fish?' (AA 71)
- (18) **tteawan tayyutc nnes**  
3S:F:help:IPV donkey her  
**hima a xas tehwen tarwa**  
so.that IRR on.her 3S:F:be.easy:AO birth  
'She was helping her donkey in order to make giving birth easier for her.' (AA 12)

A special use of **ad** + Aorist, which is very common in longer descriptions, is the expression of habits, not unlike English phrases like 'and then I would take him to school' (ex. 19).

- (19) **ijj umur ad beddey ij j umur ad uyurey.**  
one time IRR 1S:stand:AO one time IRR 1S:go:AO  
'Sometimes I would stop and sometimes I would go.' (AA 123)

The situation in negative contexts deserves special consideration. Negations are mostly expressed by means of a preverbal particle **war**, often combined with a post-verbal particle (see LAFKIOUI 1996 for details). In addition, the verb selects a negative aspectual stem. There are two such stems, the Negative Perfective and the Negative Imperfective. The Negative Perfective is used in negative counterparts to affirmative sentences with a Perfective. The Negative Imperfective has two main uses: (1) it provides the negative counterpart to the affirmative Imperfective and (2) it provides the negative counterpart to affirmative **ad** + Aorist and **ad** + Imperfective, as illustrated in example (20). Thus, one common interpretation of **war** + Negative Imperfective is a negated future. The preverbal particle **ad** cannot occur in negations.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

(20) **war tt qqarey uřa i yijjen.**  
 NEG 3S:F:DO 1S:say:NI even to one  
 'I won't tell (it) anyone.' (AA 90)

Table 2 provides an overview of the uses of the main aspectual stems.

	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE (always with <b>war</b> )
Perfective	> Dynamic non-repetitive event in the past > State	> Negated dynamic non-repetitive event in the past > Negated state
Imperfective	> Progressive > Repetitive event (habitual, iterative)	> Negated progressive > Negated repetitive event (habitual, iterative) > Negated irrealis event (future, injunction, etc.)
<b>Ad + Aorist</b>	> Irrealis event (future, injunction, etc.)	

Table 2 – Overview of the uses of the main aspectual stems

**2. The two verb roots of visual experience in different aspectual contexts**

Verbs of visual experience perception are special in Tarifiyt. In the first place, the existence of two different verb roots in the Imperfective begs the question as to how they differ in this context. In the second place, verbs of experience perception function differently when it comes to the use of the Imperfective, in a distribution that is reminiscent of Wälchli's difference between specific and non-specific verbs (WÄLCHLI 2016, see section 3.1).

**2.1 Imperfective contexts**

The discussion will start by contrasting the uses of WŘ and ZR in contexts where one expects the (Negative) Imperfective. As shown above, Imperfective and Negative Imperfective are the only aspects where both verb roots appear. As affirmative contexts function differently from negative contexts, the two will be discussed separately.

In affirmative imperfective contexts, ZR is only used in one interpretation: 'go/come and see', often translatable as 'visit'. This usage does not appear in the corpus, but was confirmed by Khalid Mourigh (ex. (21)).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

---

- (21) **tzarred**            **ḥasan?**  
2S:see(ZR):IPV    Hassane  
'Do you often (go and) see Hassane?' (Khalid Mourigh p.c.)

In all other affirmative contexts, WŘ is used. In the first place it expresses the (in)ability to see, as illustrated in examples (22) and (23).

- (22) **i**    **mammec**    **igga**            **ittwařa**            **řexxu?**  
and how        3S:M:do:PV    3S:M:see(WŘ):IPV    now  
'And how can it be that he can see now?' (NT; John 9: 19)

- (23) **ařami**    **wenni**    **tuřa**    **d**            **adaryañ**    **d**            **agnaw**  
until    the.one    PAST    PRED    blind        PRED    mute  
**idweř**            **issawař**            **u**    **ittwařa.**  
3S:M:become:PV    3S:M:speak:IPV    and 3S:M:see(WŘ):IPV  
'Until the one that used to be blind and mute became able to speak and see.' (NT; Matthew 12:21)

It is also used when referring to habitual events of seeing without visiting, as in examples (24) to (27).

- (24) **farrḥey**            **xminni**    **i**            **twañiy**  
1S:be.happy:IPV    when        REL    1S:see(WŘ):IPV  
**niy**    **tesřiy**            **i**            **wenzar**    **yeccat**  
or 1S:hear:IPV    to        rain        3S:M:hit:IPV  
'I was always happy when I saw or heard the rain fall.' (AA 52)

- (25) **aqqa**    **lmalakat**    **nSEN**    **deg**    **ijenwan**  
QA    angels        their    in        heaven  
**aqqa**    **řebda**    **ttwařant**            **tifras**    **n**    **Baba.**  
QA    always    3P:F:see(WŘ):IPV    face        of    my.father  
'Their angels in heaven always see the face of my Father.' (NT; Matthew 18: 10)

- (26) < mara tfařam khmi twaram chabab yadiya3 salmokhadirat >  
**mařa**    **tfařam**            **xmi**    **ttwařam**            **ccabab**  
if        2P:M:be.happy:PV    when    2P:M:see(WŘ):IPV    youth  
**yeddeyyae**            **s**            **lmuxařirat**  
3S:M:get.lost:IPV    with    drugs  
'If you are happy when you see youth getting lost by drugs, (by God, bravo!)'  
(nadorcity.com 2/9/2009)

- (27) < tora natwara ařartas ra di películas rakho natwarath mobachara >  
**tuřa**    **nettwařa**            **aqarřas**    **řa**    **di**    **películas,**  
PAST    1P:see(WŘ):IPV    shooting    even    in    movies  
**řexxu**    **nettwařa**            **t**            **mubacara**  
now    1P:see(WŘ):IPV    3S:M:DO    live  
'We used to see shootings only in movies, now we see them live.' (nadorcity.com 21/8/2009)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

This may extend to a metaphorical use of WR̥ in the sense of ‘to consider’, as is illustrated in examples (28) and (29).

- (28) < lmkalakh itwara mara iwdan mkalkhin >  
**lemqelleq ittwařa marra iwdan mqellqin**  
sad.one 3S:M:see(WR̥):IPV all people sad:P  
‘One who is sad sees/considers all people sad.’ (nadorcity.com; 26/12/2010)

- (29) < datarika izi tganajad nech twarirchek hsen zi sami yusef. >  
**d țtariqa i zi ttynnjed**  
and way REL from 2S:sing:IPV  
**necc ttwařiy cek řsen zi Sami Yusef**  
I 1S:see(WR̥):IPV 2S:M:DO better from Sami Yusuf  
‘The way you sing I consider you better than Sami Yusuf.’ (nadorcity.com  
15/6/2011)

Similarly, WR̥ is used to refer to repeated events that are not necessarily habitual (ex. 30).

- (30) **ca n twařatin twařiy ca n řexyařat**  
some of times 1S:see(WR̥):IPV some of ghosts  
‘Sometimes I would see some ghosts.’ (AA 4)

A further context where the Imperfective is used is the expression of dynamic events that take place at the same moment as the speech event. With most verbs, this leads to a progressive reading (see 1.3, example 12 above). The verb ‘to see’ is constructed in the same way, and uses WR̥, as in examples (31) and (32).

- (31) **ttwařid macina ya a řři?**  
2S:see(WR̥):IPV train PRX o Ali  
‘Do you see that train, Ali?’ (AA 33)

- (32) **lkitab i da tetwařam zzatwem**  
book REL here 2P:M:see(WR̥):IPV before.you  
‘The book that you see here before you.’ (AA introduction)

This is also very common in metaphorical usage, where WR̥ gets a cognitive interpretation like ‘consider/understand’ (exx. (33), (34) and (35)).

- (33) < mamash twarid shak waaadje yameni etwaran maarra ewdan >  
**mamec ttwařid cekk**  
how 2S:see(WR̥):IPV you  
**wadji amenni i ttwařan marra iwdan**  
is.not like.that REL 3P:M:see(WR̥):IPV all people  
‘The way you see this is not the way everybody sees it.’ (nadorcity.com  
31/12/2010)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifyt verbs of seeing**

---

(34) < mamach atwarir nach alhilar dijan fari9 yasan adyira >

**mamec ttwařiy necc,**  
how 1S:see(WŘ):IPV I

**Al-Hilar d ijj n fariq**  
Al-Hilar PRED one of team

**yessen ad yirar**  
3S:M:know:PV IRR 3S:M:play:AO

'The way I see it, Al-Hilar is a team that knows how to play.' (nadorcity.com 1/2/2010)

(35) < Nech Twarigh Manaya Normal >

**necc ttwařiy manay a normal**  
I 1S:see(WŘ):IPV thing PRX normal

'I consider this normal.' (nadorcity.com 19/9/2009)

It is also found in the common expression **qa ttwařid** 'you see' (ex. (36)).

(36) < iwa 9atwarid allah ya7fad wach itajji 7ad trankir >

**iwa qa ttwařid, llah yehfed,**  
well QA 2S:see(WŘ):IPV God protect

**war c ittejji hedd trankif**  
NEG 2S:M:DO 3S:M:leave:NI anyone calm

'Well, you see, God forbid, nobody leaves you in peace.' (nadorcity.com 10/1/2010)

At this point, there is a major difference between Nador Tarifyt and its neighbor to the east, Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt) – mostly considered part of the Tarifyt continuum (LAFKIOUI 2013: 139-194 and other publications by the same author). Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt) does not use the verb WŘ, and only has the verb ŻR. In situations where the seeing is simultaneous with the speech event, Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt) uses the Perfective of ŻR (exx. (37) and (38)).

(37) **tezřid takemmust inni dihat di lqent**  
2S:see(ŻR):PV pouch DIST over.there in corner

**away tet d**  
IMPTV:S:bring:AO 3S:F:DO VENT

'You see that pouch over there in the corner, bring it here.' (BEZZAZI and KOSSMANN 1997: 18)

(38) **tezřim welmatwem**  
2P:M:see(ŻR):PV your.sister

**tus d tedjiwen**  
3S:F:come:PV VENT 3S:F:be.satiated:PV

'You see that your sister has come here satiated.' (BEZZAZI and KOSSMANN 1997: 30)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

In negative contexts, the situation is more complicated. On the one hand, those negations that correspond to affirmative sentences with the Imperfective, have the same distribution of  $\check{Z}R$  and  $W\check{R}$  as in affirmative contexts:  $\check{Z}R$  is used in the negation of the ‘go /come and see’ interpretation, and  $W\check{R}$  is used elsewhere. Thus, (39) provides a negative counterpart to the ‘ability to see’ context (cf. exx. (22) and (23)), while (40) illustrates the use of  $W\check{R}$  in the negation of a situation where the seeing coincides with the speech event (cf. for its affirmative counterparts, exx. (31) and (32)).

(39) **aqā dewřey war twiřiy**  
 QA 1S:become:PV NEG 1S:see( $W\check{R}$ ):NI  
**isđayř ayi řaz nni i dayi.**  
 3S:M:make.blind:PV 1S:DO hunger ANP REL in.me  
 ‘I have become unable to see, hunger has made me blind.’ (AA 58)

(40) **aqqa tt zzati, x tqiccatt n tinzar inu.**  
 QA 3S:F:DO before.me on top of nose my  
**war tet ttwiřiy.**  
 NEG 3S:F:DO 1S:see( $W\check{R}$ ):NI  
 ‘She is before me, on the top of my nose. I don’t see her.’ (MB 126)

However, **war** + Negative Imperfective is also used in a different context, viz. the (non-repetitive) irrealis – that is, the negated counterpart of **ad** + Aorist (see section 1.3, exx. (15-20) above). In this context, the Negative Imperfective of  $\check{Z}R$  is used. This is illustrated in exx. (41) and (42).

(41) **war dayi tzarrem**  
 NEG 1S:DO 2P:M:see( $\check{Z}R$ ):NI  
**ař i ya tinim...**  
 until REL IRR 2P:M:say:AO  
 ‘You will not see me until you say...’ (NT; MATTHEW 23:39)

(42) **drus n řweqt ead**  
 little of time still  
**uca ddunnit war dayi tzarr ead.**  
 then World NEG 1S:DO 3S:F:see( $\check{Z}R$ ):NI still  
 ‘Just a little while and the world will not see me again.’ (NT; John 14: 19)

The affirmative counterparts to these two sentences would have **ad** + Aorist: **a dayi tzarrem** in (41); **a dayi tzar** in (42).

Summarizing, in affirmative forms of the Imperfective,  $W\check{R}$  is the default choice, both for repetitive (habitual, iterative), and for progressive uses. The verb  $\check{Z}R$  only appears in the Imperfective in a specialized meaning, ‘go/come and see’. In

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

negative sentences, there is a functional split between WŘ for negated repetitive and progressive events, and ŻR for negated irrealis events. This is summarized in Table 3 below.

	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Habitual and iterative ‘see’	WŘ	WŘ
Progressive ‘see’	WŘ	WŘ
Irrealis ‘see’ (non-repetitive)	(no use of Imperfectives)	ŻR
Repetitive (habitual, iterative) and progressive ‘go/come and see’	ŻR	ŻR
Irrealis ‘go/come and see’ (non-repetitive)	(no use of Imperfectives)	ŻR

Table 3 – The distribution of ŻR and WŘ in contexts where Imperfectives are used

**2.2 Irrealis contexts**

When it comes to affirmative irrealis contexts, **ad** + ŻR is the default choice, as illustrated in examples (43) and (44).

(43) **aw dd ad ẓarey waha**  
give! VENT IRR 1S:see(ŻR):AO just  
‘Give it here, I just want to see it.’ (AA 100)

(44) **mafa war ssinen ad yarn**  
if NEG 3P:M:know:NP IRR 3P:M:read:AO  
**a t ẓarn waha**  
IRR 3S:M:DO 3P:M:see(ŻR):AO just  
‘If they can’t read, they will just see it.’ (MB 53)

This includes complement clauses (ex. (45)) and clauses with purpose subordinations (ex. (46)).

(45) **gg<sup>w</sup>dey a dayi ẓar**  
1S:be.afraid:PV IRR 1S:DO 3S:F:see(ŻR):AO  
**xezzary dayes.**  
1S:look:IPV in.her  
‘I was afraid that she would see me looking at her.’ (MB 84)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

- (46) **a nraḥ yar sini n aṛṛuyu**  
IRR 1P:go:AO to cinema of Arroyo  
**ḥima a nzar pirikula nni amirikanu**  
so.that IRR 1P:see(ZR):AO movie ANP American  
'Let's go to the cinema of Arroyo in order to watch this American movie.' (AA 117)

However, when the irrealis event is about ability or repetition, **ad** + **WR̥** is used, as shown in examples (47) and (48) for ability to see, and in (49) for repetition.

- (47) **wenni war izemmaren ad ittwaḥa.**  
he.that NEG PTC:be.able:NI IRR 3S:M:see(WR̥):IPV  
'He who is not able to see.' (NT; Hebrews 11: 27)

- (48) **inna as udaryaḥ**  
3S:M:say:PV 3S:IO blind  
**"(...) ḥima ad ttwaḥiy."**  
(...) so.that IRR 1S:see(WR̥):IPV  
'The blind man said: "(...) so that I may be able to see".' (NT; Mark 10: 51)

- (49) **war xsent ad ttwaḥant**  
NEG 3P:F:want:NP IRR 3P:F:see(WR̥):IPV  
**waxxa arzment.**  
even.though 3P:F:be.open:PV  
'[My eyes] didn't want to see, even though they were open.' (MB 108)

When used to express habitual events (see section 1.3, example (19)), the counterpart of **ad** + Aorist is **ad** + **WR̥** in the meaning 'to see' (exx. (50) and (51)). This is different from usages with other verbs, which have the Aorist after **ad** in this context.

- (50) **uca mkuḥ twaḥa ad twaḥiy buṭeyyeb**  
then every time IRR 1S:see(WR̥):IPV Bouteyyeb  
**ibedd di řweṣt n webrid**  
3S:M:stand:PV in middle of road  
'Then time and again I would see Bouteyyeb standing in the middle of the road.' (AA 67)

- (51) **meḥmi mma i yars beddey**  
when ever REL at.him 1S:stand:PV  
**sdaffarey as tiṭṭawin**  
1S:make.follow:IPV 3S:IO eyes  
**atay ad ttwaḥiy mani i itawi.**  
then IRR 1S:see(WR̥):IPV where REL 3S:M:carry:IPV  
'Whenever I would stand close to it [*scil.* the road], I followed it with my eyes and I would see where it went.' (BOUZAGGOU 2006: 3)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

As will be shown in section (2.5), Mohamed Bouzaggou has a special use of WŘ in the sense of ‘really see’ as opposed to a more superficial way of seeing. In such cases, WŘ can also appear after *ad* (ex. (52)).

- (52) *tittawin inu mmenđarnt id di ttebsi nni*  
 eyes my 3PV:F:get.lost:PV VENT in plate ANP  
*xezzarnt di min war twiřint*  
 3P:F:look:IPV in what NEG 3P:F:see(WŘ):NI  
*maħend ad ttwařant min di war xezzarnt*  
 so.that IRR 3P:F:see(WŘ):IPV what in NEG 3P:F:look:NI  
 ‘My eyes lost themselves in that plate and looked at what they did not see (WŘ) in order to see (*ad* + WŘ) what they didn’t look at.’ (MB 94)

Except for this latter usage, there seems to be a split between the use of *ad* + Aorist ZR and *ad* + Imperfective WŘ, where irrealis contexts get ZR and habitual/repetitive contexts get WŘ. This is similar to negative Imperfective contexts, where *war* + Negative Imperfective ZR is used for the negated irrealis, while *war* + Negative Imperfective WŘ is used for the negation of repetitive events. This is summarized in Table 4 below.

	AFFIRMATIVE NON-‘SEE’	AFFIRMATIVE ‘SEE’	NEGATIVE NON-‘SEE’	NEGATIVE ‘SEE’
irrealis (non-repetitive)	<i>ad</i> + AO	<i>ad</i> + ZR (A)	<i>war</i> + NI	<i>war</i> + ZR (NI)
irrealis (repetitive)	<i>ad</i> + AO ~ <i>ad</i> + IPV	<i>ad</i> + WŘ (IPV)	<i>war</i> + NI	<i>war</i> + WŘ (NI)
habitual <sup>11</sup>	<i>ad</i> + AO	<i>ad</i> + WŘ (IPV)		

Table 4 – Distribution of WŘ and ZR in contexts that have *ad* in affirmative sentences

In the meaning ‘go/come and see’, i.e. ‘visit’, the Imperfective of ZR is used in all irrealis contexts, including habituals (Khalid Mourigh, p.c.).

**2.3 Perfective contexts**

The text corpus consists mainly of narrative texts, and the Perfective – the narrative aspect *par excellence* – is very frequent; as a result, we expect Perfective ZR to be the form of choice in this context. When it comes to the use of Perfective ZR versus (inherently Imperfective) WŘ, there exists an interesting

<sup>11</sup> This row only lists those habitual expressions that have *ad* + Aorist with non-‘see’ verbs. For habitual expressions without *ad* using the Imperfective, see section 2.1.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

difference between on the one hand the translation of the New Testament, and on the other hand the novels by ʕali Amaziɣ and Mohamed Bouzaggou. In the translation of the New Testament, by far the most used form in narratives is, indeed, Perfective ẒR. Cases with narrative WR̥ are exceedingly rare in comparison to cases of Perfective ẒR. At this point the NT confirms our expectations on the basis of other verbs. The situation is different in the novels. Here, there does not seem to be a major difference in frequency between WR̥ and Perfective ẒR.<sup>12</sup> This difference within the corpus could be dialectal – the example mentioned above of nearby Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt) shows that even within a small territory there may be important differences. However, my impression is that it is rather a matter of style. The narration in the New Testament (especially the Gospels) is a matter-of-fact historical account, which does not imply much personal involvement by the narrator. As a result, the narration – and especially its translation – may not explore all stylistic possibilities the language provides. On the other hand, the lively autobiographical narration by ʕali Amaziɣ and the subtle literary works of Mohamed Bouzaggou provide room for a more varied style of narration. As a result, we see WR̥ appear in contexts where, with other verbs, only the Perfective would be possible. Take for example (53) and (54) below:

(53) **ict twaʕa necc d ʕusayen**  
 one time I and Housain  
**netwaʕa ij n waʕtas n tnuyam**  
 1P:see(WR̥):IPV one of many of women.fetching.water  
 ‘One time, Housain and I saw a great number of girls fetching water.’ (AA 47)

(54) **xzareɣ awarn ayi twaʕiy tt**  
 1S:look:PV behind 1S:IO 1S:see(WR̥):IPV 3S:F:DO  
 ‘I looked behind me and saw her.’ (AA 23)

In example (53) WR̥ expresses a single event, explicitly set in the past by **ict twaʕa** ‘one time’. In (54), WR̥ functions as a continuation to Perfective **xzareɣ** ‘I looked’.

What stands out is that – different from most situations studied above – using Imperfective WR̥ in narratives is a matter of choice. It is perfectly possible to have Perfective ẒR in most narrative contexts; but stylistically rich writers may

<sup>12</sup> It should be noted that the autobiography of ʕali Amaziɣ seems to make use of progressive Imperfectives in his story, as if the narration is describing something happening at that moment. This kind of historical present is uncommon in Tarifit narratives otherwise, and seems to be a particular feature of ʕali Amaziɣ’s style. In the following, only passages that are clearly not in this historical present – for example, because the other verbs are Perfectives – have been taken into consideration.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifyt verbs of seeing**

---

choose WŘ in some cases. Thus in the following pair of almost identical sentences by the same writer, example (55) has ZR while example (56) has WŘ. It should be noted that normally clauses subordinated by **meřmi (m)ma** ‘whenever’ take a Perfective, and the use of the Imperfective WŘ is therefore highly unexpected here.

(55) **meřmi ma i dayi tezra**  
 when ever REL 1S:DO 3S:F:see(ZR):PV  
**ict temyart zi đđcar inu**  
 one woman from village my  
**a dayi dd třaya**  
 IRR 1S:IO VENT 3S:F:call:AO  
 ‘Whenever a certain woman from my village saw me, see called me.’ (AA 101)

(56) **uca meřmi mma i dayi tetwařa**  
 then when ever REL 1S:DO 3S:F:see(WŘ):IPV  
**temyart nni a dayi dd třaya.**  
 woman ANP IRR 1S:IO VENT 3S:F:call:AO  
 ‘And then, whenever this woman saw me, she called me.’ (AA 102)

It is of course difficult to make out a specific meaning on the basis of a corpus when there is stylistic variation, as both forms are acceptable in the same context. From the examples that I found, it seems that WŘ emphasizes that the experience of seeing took a certain amount of time. While Perfective ZR is neutral as to duration, WŘ thus seems to convey an element of durativity. As a consequence, WŘ may imply some active choice of the experiencer to prolong the experience. The irrelevance of duration for Perfective ZR fits well with the general semantics of the Perfective. The durational implications of using WŘ fits general ideas of what an imperfective should look like, but is different from the way that Tarifyt expresses durativity in other types of verbs (see section 1.3).

The importance of duration is revealed by a strong tendency to use WŘ when it takes a clausal complement. Clausal complements of perception verbs are mostly constructed by means of a simple finite clause (KOSSMANN *fc.*). Especially when referring to actions, they imply a certain duration to the experience of seeing. This is illustrated in (57) (clausal complement: **ttarjijin**), (58) (clausal complement: **itazzeř**), and (59) (clausal complement: **yecat**).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

- (57) **yesqar. uciy akides itnixsis.**  
3S:M:be.silent:PV 1S:feel:PV with.him 3S:M:sob:IPV  
**twafiy ancucen nnes ttarjijin**  
1S:see(WŘ):IPV lips his 3P:M:tremble:IPV  
'He remained silent. I felt that he was sobbing. I saw his lips tremble.' (MB 68)
- (58) **xzarey dd yars twafiy t**  
1S:look:PV VENT to.him 1S:see(WŘ):IPV 3S:M:DO  
**itazzeř dd yari**  
3S:M:run:IPV VENT to.me  
'I looked in his direction and saw him run towards me.' (AA 106)
- (59) **ssijjey zi řkazi n wexxam nney,**  
1S:look:PV from window of room our  
**twafiy anzar yeccat.**  
1S:see(WŘ):IPV rain 3S:M:hit:IPV  
'I looked through the window of our room and saw the rain fall.' (AA 51)

It should be stressed that, even in contexts where the experience of seeing undoubtedly has a certain duration, it is possible to use Perfective ZR (ex. (60)). This includes sentences where a clausal complement is present, as in example (61) (clausal complement: **tessiridem**) and (62) (clausal complement: **yexs**).

- (60) **uca nřuř yar sini**  
then 1P:go:PV to cinema  
**nezřa pirikula nni mirikanu.**  
1P:see(ZR):PV movie ANP American  
'Then we went to the cinema and watched that American movie.' (AA 81)
- (61) **zřiy kenniw di parađa**  
1S:see(ZR):PV 2P:M:DO in station  
**tessiridem tunubinat niy ıla?**  
2P:M:wash:IPV cars or no?  
'Didn't I see you at the station washing cars?' (AA 111)
- (62) **cekk tezřid ca n bnađem yexs ticcect?**  
you 2S:see(ZR):PV some of man 3S:M:want:PV louse  
'Have you ever seen a man who is in love with a louse?' (MB 74)

**2.4 Some subordinated contexts**

In constructions with subordinating conjunctions, Tarifiyt has strong tendencies as to the choice of the aspect. Almost all such constructions select either a Perfective, or **ad** + Aorist (MOURIGH and KOSSMANN 2019: 142-145).<sup>13</sup> Generally

<sup>13</sup> The main exception is **xmi** (+ variants) 'when (non-past)', which selects either the Imperfective

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

---

speaking, this largely grammaticalized selection of aspects is also found with verbs of visual experience perception. However, one occasionally finds Imperfective WR̥, for example with **maṛa** ‘if’ (exx. (63), (64)).

(63) **uca newjed i tazṛa**  
then 1P:wait.for:PV to rope  
**maṛa ntwaṛa aqeccar nni yarsa.**  
if 1P:see(WR̥):IPV bird.spec ANP 3S:M:be.sitting:PV  
‘Then we would watch that rope whether we would see that *aqeccar* bird sitting there.’ (AA 93)

(63) < bnaḍem mara yetwara yadjiss an familia togha thtalle9 adyini bismillah >  
**bnaḍem maṛa yetwaṛa yedjis n familiya**  
person if 3S:see(WR̥):IPV his.daughter of family  
**ttuya tṭelleq ad yini bismillah**  
PAST 3S:F:be.divorced:PV IRR 3S:M:say:AO *in.God’s.name*  
‘If a person sees that a girl in the family has been divorced, he will say “okay”.’  
(nadorcity.com 26/3/2010)

**2.5 ttwaṛa meaning ‘really seeing something’, ‘visually imaging something’**

Mohamed Bouzaggou sometimes contrasts Perfective ZR with WR̥ in one single passage. In such passages ZR takes the sense of ‘seeing something with one’s eyes’, while WR̥ implies ‘visually imagining something in one’s mind’. Examples (65), (66) and (67) from Bouzaggou’s work provide examples of this:

(65) **ticcect inu war tt zarrey ca.**  
louse my NEG 3S:F:DO 1S:see(ZR):NI NEG2  
**a tt ttwaṛiy waha. a**  
IRR 3S:F:DO 1S:see(WR̥):IPV just IRR  
**a tt ttwaṛiy mammec xsey necc.**  
IRR 3S:F:DO 1S:see(WR̥):IPV how 1S:want:PV I  
‘I won’t see (ZR) my louse. I will just imagine (WR̥) her. I will imagine (WR̥) her the way I want.’ (MB 64)

---

or **ad** + Aorist (MOURIGH and KOSSMANN 2019: 144).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

- (66) **min zriy zriy t,**  
 what 1S:see(ZR):PV 1S:see(ZR):PV 3S:M:DO  
**min war zriy ttwařix t.**  
 what NEG 1S:see(ZR):NP 1S:see(WŘ):IPV 3S:M:DO  
 ‘What I saw (ZR), I saw (ZR); what I didn’t see (ZR), I imagined (WŘ).’ (MB 108)
- (67) **d manay a i t itejjan**  
 PRED thing PRX REL 3S:M:DO PTC:leave:IPV  
**yarexxu i tmuyři**  
 3S:M:let.go:IPV to look  
**a tđu s uswingem nes yar imucan**  
 IRR 3S:F:fly:AO with thought his to places  
**i ittwařa war izri.**  
 REL 3S:M:see(WŘ):IPV NEG 3S:M:see(ZR):NP  
 ‘This was what allowed him to loosen his look so that it could fly with his thoughts to the places that he imagined (WŘ) but didn’t see (ZR).’ (BOUZAGGOU 2006: 37)

In other cases in Bouzaggou’s writing, ZR seems to convey a sense of simply seeing the object, while WŘ focuses on seeing as an emotionally consequential experience. Thus, in such passages, ZR is a short-lived inconsequential visual event, while WŘ implies ‘to really see’ something. This is illustrated in (68) and (69).

- (68) **xsey a cem zary.**  
 1S:want:PV IRR 2S:F:DO 1S:see(ZR):AO  
**a cem ttwařiy...**  
 IRR 2S:F:DO 1S:see(WŘ):IPV  
**niy mařa walu a cem ħadiy.**  
 or if nothing IRR 2S:F:DO 1S:touch:AO  
 ‘I want to see (ZR) you. To [really] see (WŘ) you... Or, if this is impossible, to touch you.’ (MB 67)
- (69) **qae min zriy d taħenjart**  
 entirely what 1S:see(ZR):PV PRED girl  
**degg iyzar uřiři**  
 in valley oleander  
**war tent ittwiři wuř inu.**  
 NEG 3P:F:DO 3S:M:see(WŘ):NI heart my  
 ‘Every girl that I had seen (ZR) in Oleander Valley, my heart hadn’t really seen (WŘ) them.’ (MB 95)

This may be a specific choice of the author, which is, moreover, not followed consistently. Thus, in example (70), the ‘to really see’ reading seems to be conveyed by ZR.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

- (70) **tuya ttwařiy tent**  
PAST 1S:see(WŘ):IPV 3P:F:DO  
**maca eemmars war tent zřiy ař řexxu**  
but never NEG 3P:F:DO see(ZR):NP until now  
'I used to see them (WŘ), but I had never [really] seen (ZŘ) them until now.' (MB 76)

### 3. Conclusions and outlook

#### 3.1 Conclusions

Based on the constructions studied above, one may formulate a number of conclusions.

In the first place, it is useful to distinguish two verbs with similar, but not identical, semantics. One of them is a verb meaning 'to come/go and see'. This is always expressed by means of the verb root ZŘ, regardless the aspectual stem. The other is a verb meaning 'to see', which lacks the directional component of the first verb. Morphologically speaking, this general 'see' verb uses two suppletive verb roots in near-complementary distribution, ZŘ for the Aorist, the Perfective, and the Negative Perfective; and WŘ for the Imperfective and the Negative Imperfective. As the verb root ZŘ is used, both with the 'come/go and see' verb, and with the general 'see' verb, the two verbs are only different in the Imperfective stems.

However, in addition to this relatively simple morphological distribution of the verb roots ZŘ and WŘ, there are a number of complications.

In the first place, the complementary distribution according to (morphological) verb stem in the 'see' verb is not perfect. There is one construction where the Imperfective of ZŘ appears with this verb, *viz.* the negation of (non-repetitive) Irrealis events, which is expressed by means of the construction **war** + the Imperfective stem of ZŘ. As a result, there is an opposition between negated (non-repetitive) irrealis events and negated imperfective events (such as habitual and iterative), not found with any other Nador Tarifiyt verb.

Moreover, it seems that the verb 'to see' – and probably also other experience perception verbs (see section 3.2 below) – has slightly different uses of the aspects than other verbs. The main differences that were discussed above are:

- 1) In non-'see' verbs, the construction **ad** + Aorist can be used in order to convey habits. In the 'see' verb, we always get a construction **ad** + Imperfective (WŘ) in corresponding contexts.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

- 2) In contexts that denote a non-repetitive event in the past, the only choice with non-‘see’ verbs is the Perfective. With ‘see’ verbs, both the Perfective (ẒR) and the Imperfective (WṘ) occur in this context. It was argued above that the use of the Imperfective is a stylistic choice, which adds an element of duration, while the Perfective is possible both with durative, and with punctual events of visual experience. The use of a single Imperfective for duration (without repeating the verb or using an auxiliary) is rare, if not absent, outside perceptual verbs.
- 3) In contexts denoting an event where the moment of seeing coincides with the moment of enunciation, the ‘see’ verb uses the Imperfective (WṘ). This may be considered a sub-type of the progressive use of the Imperfective, well-known from non-‘see’ verbs. However, as the examples from neighboring Ayt Iznasen Tarifiyt show, other varieties make other choices at this point.

The situation found in Tarifiyt is reminiscent of the difference between ‘specific’ and ‘non-specific’ perception verbs, as explained in WÄLCHLI (2016). He writes about the situation in Baltic languages: “The Baltic languages, as other languages in Central, East, and Northern Europe, have specific perception verbs, which are a subtype of opportunistic perception verbs [that is, experience perception verbs, MK], for the expression of restricted exposure” (WÄLCHLI 2016: 53). Tarifiyt seems to have a similar split, but in this case the marked option in the opposition is rather the non-specific perception verb, WṘ, that is, a verb expressing longer exposure. The other member in the opposition, ẒR, is unmarked for specificity, and can express both situations with and without longer exposure.

**3.2 Outlook: Other verbs of perception**

The use of Imperfectives with visual experience perception verbs for expressing a certain duration to the exposure is also found with the auditory experience perception verb *seř* ‘to hear’. Thus, in examples (71), (72), and (73), the Imperfective *tesřa* is used to emphasize that the experience of hearing was prolonged.

(71) *tesřiy i Jamil yar idehhec xafi.*  
1S:hear:IPV to Jamil just 3S:M:laugh:IPV on.me  
‘I heard how Jamil just laughed about me’ (AA 63)

(72) *tesřiy yar wenzar iccaten*  
1S:hear:IPV to rain PTC:hit:IPV  
‘I just heard the rain fall.’ (AA 79)

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

- (73) **uca hwiyy dd**  
then 1S:go.down:PV VENT  
**aked webrid nni d taysirt,**  
with road ANP PRED downhill  
**tesřiy i temyart nni awarn ayi**  
1S:hear:IPV to woman ANP behind 1SG:IO  
**teqqar ayi**  
3S:F:say:IPV 1S:IO  
'Then I went down that road downhill and heard that woman behind me say to me.'  
(AA 88)

The corpus is not very helpful for verbs of sensory experience, as the verb **aca** 'to feel' is mostly attested as an emotion verb rather than as a verb of perception. There is, however, no reason to assume that it functions differently from 'to see' and 'to hear' at this point.

Thus it seems that the exceptional durative use of the Imperfective is a common feature of experiential sensory verbs.

**3.3 Outlook: Dialectal variation**

The present article only focuses on one variety of Tarifiyt. However, even within Tarifiyt, there are differences. One such case is Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt), a variety immediately to the east of Nador Tarifiyt. Here the only general verb is **zer**,<sup>14</sup> which is even used when expressing the ability to see, as illustrated in (74).

- (74) **a yelli ur zerrey**  
o my.daughter NEG 1S:see(ZR):NI  
'O my daughter, I can't see.' (BEZZAZI and KOSSMANN 1997: 104)

Moreover, as already shown above (section 2.1, exx. (37) and (38)), Ayt Iznasen (Tafoghalt) uses the Perfective of **zer** when the event of seeing is simultaneous to the speech event.

Similarly, anecdotal information suggests that in some Tarifiyt varieties more to the west, which also have both **ZR** and **WR**, the two verb roots do not have exactly the same distribution as in Nador (Khalid Mourigh p.c.).

Only a deeper investigation into these questions could shed light on the similarities and differences among the dialects of Tarifiyt.

---

<sup>14</sup> There seem to be dialect differences within Ayt Iznasen as to this point. RENISIO (1932: 286) cites Ayt Iznasen **wala**, Imperfective **twala**. As the variety immediately to the north of Ayt Iznasen, Ikebdanen, makes ample use of **twala**, Renisio's data may reflect a more northern variety than the Tafoghalt variety represented in BEZZAZI and KOSSMANN (1997).

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifit verbs of seeing**

---

**References**

- AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Y. and Anne STORCH (2013). "Linguistic expression of perception and cognition: A typological glimpse", in Alexandra Y. AIKHENVALD and Anne STORCH (eds.), *Perception and Cognition in Language and Culture*, Leiden: Brill, 1-46.
- AMAZIY, Eali (pseudonym of Ali Oulad Saddik) (2012). *Tudunin war itizyen*, Ridderkerk: Wöhrmann Print Service.
- BEZZAZI, Abdelkader and Maarten KOSSMANN (1997). *Berber sprookjes uit Noord-Marokko*, Amsterdam: Bulaaq.
- BOUZAGGOU, Mohamed (2006). *Ifri n Suna. Tinfas*, Berkane: Trifagraphe.
- BOUZAGGOU, Mohamed (2015). *Tudart dg under*, s.l.: Imprimerie Ikraa.
- CADI, Kaddour (1987). *Système verbal rifain. Forme et sens*, Paris: SELAF.
- CADI, Kaddour (2006). *Transitivité et diathèse en tarifite. Analyse de quelques relations de dépendances lexicale et syntaxique*, Rabat: IRCAM.
- CHAMI, Mohamed (1979). *Un parler amazigh du Rif marocain. Approche phonologique et morphologique*, Thèse de 3ème Cycle, Paris V.
- DHIMH Multimedia (2009). *Řexbar Aşebħan n Yeccu Lmasiħ (Řeahd n Jdid)*, www.tarifit.info.
- KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM, Maria (2008). "Approaching lexical typology", in Martine VANHOVE (ed.), *From Polysemy to Semantic Change: Towards a typology of lexical semantic associations*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-52.
- KOSSMANN, Maarten (fc.). "Annexed predicates in Tarifit Berber", in Chris REINTGES and Sabrina BENDJABALLAH (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to Afroasiatic Languages*.
- LAFKIOUI, Mena (1996). "La négation en tarifit", in Dominique CAUBET and Salem CHAKER (eds.), *La négation en berbère et en arabe marocain*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 49-77.
- LAFKIOUI, Mena (2007). *Atlas linguistique des variétés berbères du Rif*, Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- LAFKIOUI, Mena (2013). *Études de la variation et de la structuration linguistiques et sociolinguistiques en berbère du Rif*, Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- MOURIGH, Khalid and Maarten KOSSMANN (2019). *An Introduction to Tarifit Berber (Nador, Morocco)*, Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- NAÏT ZERRAD, Kamal (2018). "Notes sur quelques racines polysémiques en berbère", *Asinag* 13: 151-163.
- PUTTEN, Saskia van (2020). "Perception verbs and the conceptualization of the senses: The case of Avatime", *Linguistics* 58(2): 425-462.
- RENISIO, Amédée (1932). *Étude sur les dialectes berbères des Beni Iznassen, du Rif et des Senhaja de Sraïr*, Paris: Leroux.
- SERHOUAL, Mohammed (2002). *Dictionnaire tarifit-français*, Thèse de doctorat d'Etat, Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi, F.L.S.H. (Tétouan).
- TAÏFI, Miloud (1991). *Dictionnaire tamazight-français (parlers du Maroc central)*, Paris: L'Harmattan-Awal.

MAARTEN KOSSMANN

**On the semantics of Tarifiyt verbs of seeing**

---

- VIBERG, Åke (1984). "The verbs of perception: A typological study", *Linguistics* 21(1): 123-162.
- WÄLCHLI, Bernhard (2016). "Non-specific, specific and obscured perception verbs in Baltic languages", *Baltic Linguistics* 7: 53-135.