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The tamazirt (homeland, countryside, village) has become an organizing symbol for Anti-Atlas mountain Ishelhin (Tashelhit-speaking Moroccan Berbers) that helps perpetuate Tashelhit language as an index of ethnic identity. Residents render rural spaces meaningful through gendered material practices and discursive representations. They construct place and gender in the course of their movements between the countryside and the city. I suggest that dislocation may be integral to the cultural process of rendering locations as well as identities meaningful. The subjective connection of Ishelhin to place gives less primacy to place as space than as a location in a nexus of mobile relationships. [anthropology of place, rural–urban relations, ethnicity, verbal expression, Morocco, Imazighen]

Liver, just be patient I have one disappointment
Liver, just be patient I went to the timizern (homelands) and the tiqbilin (tribes)
Liver, just be patient temmara (hard labor) is what people are in, night and day
Liver, just be patient Who is looking in on them! who cares about them?
Liver, just be patient Who knows the goodness of the ancestors!
Liver, just be patient Those who pushed out the colonists with their words and their bodies . . .
After all This is what the times have brought us
Liver, just be patient Today cities are all they care about
Liver, just be patient As for the timizern of the mountains, they belittle them
Liver, just be patient I never saw a paved road reach them . . .

—Mhend El Moussaoui and Mohamed El Qadiri sung tanddamt, Voix Assabil 1999

Rural–urban migration is a pressing issue in Morocco, and not only for migrants. The spread of state institutions into rural areas, the production and increased availability of media images, the increased consumption of market commodities, and discursive representations of the nation-state affect the lives of even those rural residents who stay behind as their family members migrate. With both the Moroccan agricultural economy and local valuations of it rapidly changing, it becomes increasingly important to inquire into the sense people make of the places they call home. Contemporary villages and ancestral lands are more than mere dwelling places or repositories of imagined histories. They are integral to the ways people make sense of the present, and they are crucial sites for negotiating the boundaries of a dispersed community membership and the roles of individuals within it. By considering migration and homeland together, as dialogically related but produced through distinct processes, anthropologists may more fruitfully explore how people endow places with meaning.
when community boundaries and memberships are contested. In such circumstances, gendered and ethnic subjectivities are constituted less in terms of place (or even places) than in terms of movement between places and means of engagement with them.

In Morocco, French Protectorate officials considered Imazighen (or Berbers) as “tribes” who would be “France’s sequoias” and “good savages” (Berque 1967:219). Much scholarly work has portrayed Berbers as deep-rooted, somewhat heroic autochthonous peoples. Malkki (1995) argues that such depictions of indigenous groups justify efforts to preserve endangered indigenous lifeways. Today, the image of rooted Berbers persists, although scholarship on Morocco in the past three decades has largely disregarded ethnicity in Morocco, instead characterizing Moroccan heritage as an undifferentiated mixture of Arab, African, Mediterranean, and Amazigh (Berber) — with the notable exception of Ilahiane 1998. Contemporary state rhetoric represents Moroccan identity in terms of a colorful quilt of discrete, codifiable regional traditions that are reproduced in folklore festivals and summarized in tourism pamphlets.

Yet, the metaphor of the rooted sequoia describes only one half of contemporary identity formation among Ida ou Zeddout and other Ishelhin (sing. m. Ashelhi; sing. f. Tashelhit), the subgroup of Imazighen in southwestern Morocco among whom I worked between 1996 and 1999. For Ishelhin of the Anti-Atlas mountains at the end of the 20th century, migration complemented rootedness. Since early in the French Protectorate period (1912–56), their migration linked commercial towns with native villages. Together, male moving and female dwelling created and sustained the tamazirt, a concept that during the time of my fieldwork meant homeland, countryside, village, or place (pl. timizern). Indeed, a fundamental characteristic of being an Ashelhi or Tashelhit person at that time was an active relationship with a tamazirt.

Ishelhin are one of the three main subgroups of Imazighen, a sociocultural and linguistic group that comprises almost half of Moroccans. Although an individual’s classification as Ashelhi or Arab sometimes shifted over the course of a lifetime, or from one generation to the next, and although an individual could claim to be Arab and Ashelhi simultaneously, the categories of Ashelhi and Arab remained central to the ways people in southwestern Morocco classified themselves and others. Ishelhin shared a sense of Moroccan nationhood with those they called Arabs, who included rural Moroccan Arabic speakers as well as urban, educated Moroccans in general (Crawford and Hoffman 2000). With the concurrent urbanization and Arabization trends of the 1970s and 1980s, Moroccan towns increasingly became places where Tashelhit speakers metamorphosed into bilingual or even monolingual Arabic speakers. The countryside or homeland thus increased in value in many male migrants’ eyes, for it remained a Tashelhit-speaking place where being Ashelhi lacked the stigma that often marked it in the ethnically mixed (xaldn) cities.

In this rural homeland, in contrast to Moroccan cities and provincial administrative centers, Tashelhit was the uncontested lingua franca. As such, the tamazirt had become an organizing symbol as well as a place for perpetuating the Tashelhit language as an index of ethnic identity. Migration did not erode the aspects of Ashelhi identity specific to locale or grounded in language. Rather, migration led to an Anti-Atlas understanding of community as comprising present and absent members. In this way, men and women dialogically related absence and presence. The song text opening this article suggests as much; one could hardly mention the timizern without reference to the cities. Cities materially sustained village populations, while villages morally nourished the urban Ashelhi population, a mutual reliance documented in other
ethnographic cases (Ferguson 1997; Williams 1973). For people from the Anti-Atlas mountains, this set of evaluations was mapped onto material practices and discursive representations, the two domains on which I focus my discussion of homelands. The production of these practices and representations is historically situated, and, thus, the “cultural territorializations” (Gupta and Ferguson 1997:4) I describe here likewise should be understood as products of their particular political economy at the historical moment when I documented them, although some may remain true today.

The significance of locality for the people of Ida ou Zeddout took on a different meaning for those who were emigrants (in Casablanca, Marrakesh, and, occasionally, France) estranged from their lands than for those who were year-round residents; that is, married women, their unmarried daughters and preadolescent sons, and the occasional male shepherd or truck driver who lived in most villages. For migrants—mostly men—the tamazirt was an almost fictive place, a land that in reality they visited once or twice a year. For rural women, on whom the labor of socially reproducing the tamazirt largely fell, the tamazirt was a place of decidedly unsentimental hard labor (temmara), contingency, and anxiety. Women carried this responsibility with an abiding ambivalence. The demographic distribution of Ishelhin between cities and villages followed this gendered pattern, although more families reportedly relocated to the cities in the 1970s in order to school their children and withdraw from the pressures of maintaining a rural home. Even for those who followed the prevalent pattern, men’s and women’s investments in the land may have shifted throughout their life cycles and according to their individual fortunes.

What, then, made a place a tamazirt, and how did Ishelhin perceive its distinctiveness? How were place distinctions involved in the ways Ishelhin of the Anti-Atlas mountains classified themselves and others into distinct social groups? What was it about tamazirt that made it such a potent “home” that was “conceived and lived in relation to practices of coming and going? How, in such instances, does (women’s) ‘dwelling’ articulate, politically and culturally, with (men’s) ‘traveling’?” (Clifford 1997:6).10 The ebb and flow of people, mostly men, between the mountains and the cities made women acutely aware of their dwelling in the tamazirt, that is, of their nonmovement.

My discussion of the role of homeland in Ashelhi Berber identity is organized into three sections. In the first section, I explore the material and demographic constitution of the tamazirt through dwelling, gendered hard laboring, and rural reliance on urban goods. In the second section, I elaborate the objectification of tamazirt as a concept and the ways this reflects a gendered migration experience. In the third section, I present discursive constructions of tamazirt in talk and song. I close with a suggestion that anthropologists endeavor to understand better the internal variation among indigenous groups such as Ishelhin who are spread across vast territories and who are variegated in their contributions to place and identity making. My goal is to suggest how dislocation may be integral to the cultural process of rendering locations and identities meaningful.

**the material and demographic constitution of the tamazirt**

The Ida ou Zeddout lived in the dry, low rolling hills of the Anti-Atlas located about seventy kilometers southeast of the provincial capital, Taroudant. Unlike Ishelhin in the Sous Valley, whose villages neighbor Arab villages, the Ida ou Zeddout were what city and plains residents called “mountain people” (ibudarn), squarely situated in the tamazirt.11 A disintegrating one-and-a-half lane paved road ran from Taroudant through the market town of Igherm south to Tata, with linked dirt roads
leading to several Ida ou Zeddout villages such as the one where I worked. Official statistics set the number of residents in these villages at between a hundred and four hundred, but as I explain below, it was unclear where migrant men fit into such calculations. State services were few and far between; a few villages alongside the road had electricity, but solar-powered batteries and panels were more common energy sources. Each cluster of hamlets shared a single primary school; boys tended to leave for the northern cities after completing their fifth or sixth year, and almost all girls dropped out by their fifth year. Women and their children coordinated domestic and agricultural tasks according to their needs and the parents’ aspirations for their children. The nearest middle school was far enough away to require boarding, but it lacked facilities for girls. A modest health clinic opened in 1999 in the market center of Oulqadi.

Ida ou Zeddout land was owned by the Ida ou Zeddout, not by outside commercial agricultural interests that operated in much of the Sous Valley. The land the Ida ou Zeddout owned yielded little, however, and so their migration and wage-labor activities brought about changing relations between these mountain horticulturalists, their land, and state institutions.

The Ida ou Zeddout ascribed to the perspective that [as] (Arabic 'asl, “roots”) was a crucial explanatory source for an individual’s behavior, morality, and ideas (cf. Abu-Lughod 1986:41–46; Geertz et al. 1979; Rosen 1984:21–25). On the other hand, as in many other societies, Ishelhin believed that the places where people dwell weigh heavily on the ways they live their lives. Places, in their view, had moral characters that reflected the histories of those who occupied them, and town and village dwellers frequently evaluated the moral characters of various places they had either visited or heard about from others, an approach documented elsewhere (Ferguson 1997). For example, village mothers told me that emigrant young men behaved respectfully with their daughters during nighttime socializing hours outside in common spaces on Ida ou Zeddout land, but they surmised that these same young men probably harassed young women on the streets in Casablanca. Many Ida ou Zeddout claimed that people’s behavior was conditioned by the places in which they dwelled, albeit somewhat according to their ‘asl. People’s ‘asl and places’ characters were in constant tension.

The tamazirt, in contrast to the city, was understood to be a wholesome and moral place. Its moral character came not so much from the behavior of its inhabitants—for they ranged in actions and conviction as do people anywhere—but because of the understanding that people in the tamazirt were the opposite of xalhn (ethnically mixed). Although mountain dwellers occupied a range of socioeconomic positions, the crucial point in this assessment was that they, collectively, were not er-abn (Arabs), a category that encompassed urban bureaucrats and Western Sahara residents alike. People in the tamazirt were all one, in some sense, in that they were all Ishelhin, with some shared understanding that, unlike in much of Moroccan society, there was no disadvantage to being Ishelhin in that space. In the tamazirt, most residents placed a high value on Ashelhiness; some even argued for its superiority. In a very tangible way, the tamazirt was the one space where the cultural, linguistic, and moral hegemony of Arab urbanity that pervaded public and private spaces throughout Morocco was absent. It is clear, then, why such a place would attract its migrants back year after year to celebrate the religious feasts, weddings, and harvests that socially reproduced the community.

Next to this appealing moral and social universe, however, were the grim realities of the tamazirt. These realities explained the repulsion toward the tamazirt felt by
many of those who lived or visited there as well as those who refused to visit. When an urban Arab called someone a șilh (Arabic f. șilḥa, pl. șilḥu), it signaled that the person referred to was a native Tashelhit speaker who lived in the tamazirt, or at least used to. That residence history meant that Ishelhin, although perhaps retaining a more solid sense of roots than people who had abandoned their places of origin, inherently lacked the quality of urbanness that urban Arabs demanded of fellow Moroccan citizens. A set of lifestyle characterizations was indexed in the label Ashelhi. Ashelhi meant an agricultural existence compromised by consistently disappointing yields from rain-fed barley fields and dependent on outside goods for survival. It meant uncertain income, with men working in far-away places that women were rarely allowed to visit. It meant a dearth of modern conveniences, such as electricity and running water. It meant limited access to fresh produce and meat from markets and restrictions on women’s public movements that forced women to rely on the few available men and boys to procure the market goods required by their households. For men, it meant temperance in financial matters and oversight in domestic affairs despite long absences from the village. For women and girls, most of all, living in the tamazirt entailed an expectation of temmara (hard labor): gathering wood, hauling water, baking bread in open ovens, and weaving blankets for brutal winters. It meant gashed legs, sore backs, burned hands, and scratched, leathered faces.

**laboring—temmara makes a tamazirt**

Within the space of the tamazirt, a series of repeated activities, acts of labor (temmara), constituted the routine activity of rural dwellers. Tending the land, collecting fodder for donkeys and cows, and preparing four daily meals were crucial subsistence chores. Although female labor assured the maintenance of rudimentary material conditions, its importance extended to the normative moral order of Ashelhi society. Respect for the fields (igran) and willingness to exert oneself physically to ensure their upkeep comprised a normative work ethic. The constant contact with the land was what women and girls told me they desired to flee, and for which city-dwelling male emigrants told me they were nostalgic. For both, however, women’s labor was understood as central to the social reproduction of the tamazirt.

Increasing numbers of young male Ishelhin in the late 1990s balked at agricultural work in favor of urban wage labor. Many women I knew who remained tied materially to the land shared their pessimistic assessment of the land’s productive capability. There was a symbolic dimension, however, in that many Ishelhin saw these weakened (and for some men, weekend) ties to the land as indicative of a break with the place and their ancestors. In an increasingly market-oriented economy, the barley Ida ou Zeddout grew had become the poor family’s substitute for the more sought-after soft wheat. The moral overtones of this economic shift permeated narratives like the one from a grandmother living just outside the market town of Igherm. Her critique was targeted at young people as well as her peers who embraced the market orientation of the younger generation:

When I was young we planted for over a month, not like the week we plant these days. Back then, if you didn’t plant, you didn’t eat. There was no cooking gas, no electricity, no ovens. You hauled wood on your back to make bread. In the morning, we ate meal and made couscous. There was no wheat flour—everything was barley, barley, barley. The market [in Igherm] was held on Friday then, until the French exiled the king to Madame Gascar [Madagascar]; then they changed the market day to Wednesday. People wanted to pray on Friday—they didn’t want to go to market. The market wasn’t
so big then; there weren’t all the trucks there are now. Now every Wednesday is like a
festival!

Now few people care about planting and harvesting. They work a week or two. That’s
all. They don’t care at all. Like these girls, even the men and the boys who have gone
to school, they don’t want to work the land. If you go and look at it, you’ll see a lot of
land left fallow. They say, “Look, there’s bread in the market. There’s crushed barley
and wheat, what more do you want.” They want to let it go.

The “they” in the grandmother’s critique were young women and older women, as
well as men, who valued state education over agricultural labor, the mass produced
over the homemade. She used her description of horticultural activities in her youth to
come the present (“They don’t want to work the land”) and to project into the
future (“They want to let it go”) (cf. Basso 1996; Stewart 1996). Such assessments
bridged temporalities, constructing a moral order in which physical laboring was not
only endured but positively valued (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992).

Whether women and girls “let go” of their fields, or instead planted and har-
vested for a week or a month each year, temmara extended beyond work in the fields.
Most mornings, girls and women headed out of the village into the “forest” (tagant) of
sparsely uninhabited land to gather weeds for their donkeys and cows. Several times a
week, girls pushed out further beyond the mountain for firewood. Wood collection
for their open clay ovens was left to adolescent and teenaged women whenever possi-
ble, who set out in pairs, singing as they walked up the hillsides and out of view. From
the village, one could hear them laughing on the paths below as they headed for the
fields. They spaced their destinations so as to favor their success in finding weeds and
small trees on the dry lands where little grew; one pair would head in the direction of
the saint’s tomb; the other pair, with their scythes and ropes, would go beyond the
river. Their yelled greetings were audible from the village; they called out to other
young women collecting atop other hillsides. The occasional man spotted on a trail
became a target for their heckling. Collecting wood was the worst of their temmara.
The heavy loads on their backs ripped through their first layers of clothing; the weight
exhausted them.

The women and girls took turns handling household chores. Shortly after sunrise,
one with breakfast duty fired up the wood stove, over which she heated water for
washing in a three-foot-high copper jug, prepared the barley and olive oil porridge
(azzkif) and the sweet coffee, and then baked the barley bread (tanurt) for the late-
morning breakfast. Smoke rose from the smokestacks across the village. Young
women returned for the late-morning breakfast with swollen tamelheft wraps over
their backs, filled with fodder or wood. Returning from the path by the river, they
stopped to rest momentarily on the dirt ledge that they called “our mountain airport.”
They headed back into the village, where they dispersed to their homes, some to con-
tiguous stone homes in the village core, others to palatial pink-painted cinder-block
structures on the village margins. Whether they walked through wooden or metal
doors, these girls and women dropped their loads of grass and wood the same way,
baked bread in open ovens the same way, and laid out their blankets on the floor to
sleep in the same manner. Discrepancies in wealth visible in domestic architecture
disguised similarities in work activities inside and outside domestic walls.

Temmara was considered by both the women and men I knew to be a female ac-
tivity. When fathers, brothers, and sons were home from their urban jobs, they were
only marginally involved in lightening the laboring load. Men scoffed at the idea that
they might assist in wood and fodder collection. The tasks of cutting and carrying
wood were activities that men considered characteristic of Tashelhit female identity.
This point was illustrated for me a few weeks after a storm. The village women had chopped down some of the trees that the strong wind of a few weeks before had shredded. The approximately 50-year-old Lalla Rqia and I headed out with a handsaw the size of a bow and a few yards of rope to chop some of the trees that the wind had downed. The wood we cut was on her fields, but because we had worked together, custom dictated that we split the wood. Half of it we hauled on our backs to the house of Hajja, her cousin, where I was considered part of the household. We dropped our load on the back path in front of Hajja’s courtyard. Lalla Rqia called out to her adult son, home from Tangiers, to bring the donkey from Hajja’s house and secure its metal saddle designed for hauling heavy loads. The son looked embarrassed when he brought out the donkey and geared her up, snickering that he was doing women’s work. We led the donkey back to the riverbed and hauled branches out of the fields as we walked. It was not so much the weight of the wood that was hard to bear, but that the branches bit into our backs and shoulders, finding our every soft spot. The son’s role in the task was holding the donkey still; he did not saw branches or haul wood. All the while he wore a lightweight jacket that looked as if it would have torn had he lifted the slightest branch. Even then, Lalla Rqia and I decided how to load the donkey with each six-foot-tall stack of wood.

When I loaded up the first of three stacks of wood on my back, Lalla Rqia apologized as women conventionally do when a guest or high-status person labors: “I’m sorry I’m making you work.” I answered conventionally, as well, saying it was no problem, and, as I expected, she made no further comment on my participation in the task at hand. Her migrant son, on the other hand, offered a running commentary on my participation in the chore, with such comments as, “You’re going to carry wood?” then “Oh look you’re carrying wood!” and finally “Was it hard to carry wood?” Uncomfortable with his suggestion that my laboring was unusual by virtue of my social identity as an educated foreigner, I tried to downplay the novelty of the situation with such non sequiturs as “Work is work” and “The world is full of work.” Lalla Rqia said to me, “I’m used to work and you’re not yet.” Her use of “yet” seemed to imply that I would eventually get used to the work or maybe that I was able-bodied but not yet experienced. Lalla Rqia’s son headed back to the village steering the loaded donkey. Lalla Rqia handed me a few sprigs of a bitter grass to nibble as we strolled through the fields. She led, pointing to the plants on the right and left saying, “There are so many names for the greenery.”

Lalla Rqia approached the task at hand as a chore to accomplish, and I was available to help. Her migrant son, in contrast, indicated through actions and words that only certain categories of people were appropriate participants in the task. As an outsider who broke through those conventions, then, I was behaving in a way that elicited assessment—my actions framed labor as an aspect of dwelling that characterized a Tashelhit woman.

Although the activities of gathering and cooking were ongoing in the countryside, agricultural activities were part of an annual cycle. The phrase išwa aṣugg “as (lit., “the year was/is good”) characterized a bountiful harvest. Ida ou Zeddout villagers no longer plowed and harvested collectively, as villagers told me they used to do. Each household (takat) worked its own land with family members or hired workers, especially darker-skinned workers from Tagmout near the pre-Saharan outpost of Tata. As one young woman explained to me, the reason for this shift from collective to household-centered labor was that families with little land no longer wanted to work the land of the larger landowners. Every household thus determined for itself how much labor its fields required. Some villagers told me that working collectively
without the assistance of hired workers simply took too long. Under the household-based system, most groups finished in two to four weeks; when they used the collective harvesting system (*twiza*), a longer period was required. Moreover, as one young woman explained, collective harvesting was messy: it conflated the spheres of working and playing (*lhwá*; cf. Caton 1990) that should remain temporally distinct. The Ida ou Zeddout strove to keep each activity in its place, whereas for those who practiced *twiza*, as the young woman explained, “You look at them and you can’t tell whether it’s their harvesting season, or their wedding season, or what it is. It’s all messed up [mxarbaq]. People are coming in from the fields dirty and then going to weddings.” In an orderly community, villagers finished harvesting and then celebrated.

In the Anti-Atlas, the cyclical anticipation for the arrival of men and boys for the Aid Mqorn (the Great Sacrifice) and the August wedding season, and their inevitable departure, brought about ritualized interactions surrounding comings and goings. Families tended to keep to themselves, and visitors timed their arrivals and departures so as to encounter the fewest villagers possible. When visitors left the village, family and close friends accompanied them to the foot of the village to say their goodbyes. Ideally they left quietly, and there was little insistence to stay. The silent resignation of the village women at these departures differed notably from the insistence of women in the towns and plains that the visitor should not be in such a hurry, that a longer stay would be more reasonable. Mountain women made no such plaints, respecting a visitor’s timing and presuming the person knew his or her constraints better than they did. Most of those who left in this way were emigrant men visiting what they called their homes; they were the ones who procured and paid for the consumable and material goods that came into the home. Among the many Ishelhin who called the tamazirt home, however, only a fraction were year-round village residents. Women joked that they were better fit than men to take the harsh conditions of the village.

Central to my concern, then, is the question of who comprised the village community and the distinction between tamazirt residents and those individuals who called the tamazirt their “home.” How was the gendered experience of moving and dwelling wrapped up in the making of residents and homes? How had migration and ideas about urbanity transformed what it meant to be rural, and vice versa; that is, how were ideas about the tamazirt implicated in what it meant to be urban? Indeed, would there have been a tamazirt in the Anti-Atlas without emigration? Before addressing the question of how the mountains emotionally and morally sustained emigrants, I turn to issues of marital patterns and the material ways in which towns facilitated life in the mountains.

*homelands inhabited by strangers*

> Mother and father you must bury me  
> we’ve left your hands, we’re strangers’ children  
> a imni d-baba qntat irhamt-inu  
> nluq-awn ilessn, nga tarwa n-mddn  
> —Ida ou Zeddout tazrrat [recorded September 1997]

Judging by discursive constructions of the tamazirt as a place into which one’s roots burrow, the tamazirt would seem to be a place to which residents could trace their ancestral origins. In a broad sense, this was true; in the mountains, Ishelhin seldom married Arabs as did Ishelhin living in the plains and towns. The Ida ou Zeddout were largely endogamous; in Ait Musi, the Ida ou Zeddout *farqa* (tribal fraction) with
which I am most familiar, there was only one native Arabic-speaking woman living in
the tamazirt, married to a shepherd whose roots were allegedly in “the Sahara.”20
Others called the couple “Arabs”; they had been accused on more than one occasion
of using magic to ruin weddings. Whether this couple had malicious intentions to-
ward the Ishelhin is less important for my purposes than the fact that their being “Ar-
abs” made their Ishelhin neighbors distrust them. Beyond the primary social distinc-
tion of native language, however, what were the boundaries of “there” in the
countryside?

Many of the people who occupied a given tamazirt went there through the typi-
cally once-in-a-lifetime movement that accompanied marriage. Because few men re-
sided full-time in their native villages, their wives and young children largely popu-
lated the mountains. These women were only rarely natives of the village, but they
were usually from the same taqbilt (tribe) or a neighboring one.21 In the late 1990s, a
young woman in her twenties or thirties was likely to marry a man from a place geo-
graphically connected to her own—someone who lived along the same path or road,
a construction worker originating in another region of Morocco, or a relative of a fam-
ily member’s husband, to cite a few of the pairings I witnessed during fieldwork. The
women in any village lived there because they married men with roots (and land) in
that village. Each woman perpetuated her husband’s fortune, small or large, and
raised his children. The women who worked and socialized alongside one another,
borrowed buttermilk from each other, and cooked annual meals in honor of the local
saint were not related, and usually they did not know each other before they became
neighbors. Their husbands, in contrast, grew up together, each going his own way to
provide for his family. The men were estranged by choice or necessity. The women
were brought together by circumstance, fate (rzq), or God’s will, which they said gov-
erns where each person will spend her days.

Given this residency pattern, it was striking that adolescent girls and young
women who talked about marriage, as they did frequently, did not talk about the
women among whom they would live. Instead they talked about the wealthy migrants
who would whisk them away to Casablanca and remove them definitively from their
dreaded annual planting and harvesting labor. They talked, joked, teased each other,
and sang about good, attractive men who were ṭaḳqul (straight and honest). Shortly af-
ter each young woman married, however, her husband returned to the city. The new
bride then had to adjust to a village full of unfamiliar women, a household with a
mother-in-law, sisters-in-law, and older wives of brothers-in-law whose wishes and
habits took precedence over hers. For brides, then, the moral character of her groom’s
tamazirt was conditioned by networks of women residents.

Older women who had experienced their own dislocation and that of their
daughters and other female relatives were aware of the importance of female village
networks. The transcript below captures the rude awakening that awaited the stranger
bride and the importance of garnering allies in the groom’s village where she would
assume a subservient role to female in-laws according to their number and ages. The
conversation was nestled between long sessions of singing in the first day of a two-day
wedding in Ida ou Zeddout. The 20-year-old bride, Saadia, sat on the floor, shrouded
by a white sheet and red face veil that marked her liminal status between virgin and
wife, surrounded by female friends and family members. Women came to her to wish
her well, relieve her worries, and offer advice on marital life. Two elderly women,
Lalla Aisha and Lalla Awish, offered Saadia assurances that the groom’s village, Issdrim,
was full of good women who would look after her. They reminded Saadia, however,
of her impending low status in the groom’s household and suggested how she might modify her behavior to ensure good relations.

Transcript 1

Lalla Aisha: ((bending down at the waist to address the bride)) You’re not on your own anymore.
Saadia: I hear what you say, safi
Lalla Aisha: There’s only your mother-in-law in the [husband’s] house, right?
Saadia: two of them [=older female relatives]!
Lalla Aisha: Two of them!
Saadia: Yeah
Lalla Aisha: Don’t get mad at her until she dies. Because it will be difficult.
Saadia: Oh no
Lalla Aisha: Well, may God protect you. ((Standing up; to Awish, and directly to Saadia))
She’s just getting a taste of it now; their bad side hasn’t come out now. When it does she’ll remember me.
Saadia: Yeah
Lalla Aisha: ((leaning down, to Saadia)) I said to your mother, I said, “Aisha.” She said “yes.” I said to her, “For the sake of God, give your daughter to [a suitor in] [the nearby village of] Issdrim. You’ll be near her. If you die, she’ll be by your side. She’ll even drop water in your mouth. If you’re sick, she’ll run to your side. All your daughters will be together there.” She said to me, “Oh, my sister, may God help you.” ((to Saadia)) You’ll do what’s good. Ad-ag isemah rbbi. ((Stands up))
Saadia: May God help you. May God help you.
Lalla Aisha: ((Leaning down again)) I said to your mother, I said, “Aisha.” She said “yes.” I said to her, “For the sake of God, give your daughter to [a suitor in] [the nearby village of] Issdrim. You’ll be near her. If you die, she’ll be by your side. She’ll even drop water in your mouth. If you’re sick, she’ll run to your side. All your daughters will be together there.” She said to me, “Oh, my sister, may God help you.” ((to Saadia)) You’ll do what’s good. Ad-ag isemah rbbi. ((Stands up))
Saadia: Amen, dear one, Lalla Awish, may God accept your gifts.
Lalla Aisha: ((bending down, to Saadia)) Pull your head together. Pull your head together. Pull your head together. Pull your head together. ((Stands up))
Saadia: Okay. Thanks.
Awish: Pull your head together. Don’t go around, “ha ta ta ta ta” [chatting]. If you come in, like to here?
Saadia: Yeah?
Lalla Awish: Be quiet, that’s all. Shut your mouth. Watch. Check things out. Notice what they do. Look out. Whatever you’re going to do, announce it first to your mother-in-law. Ask her if you can do it. My daughter-in-law always waits on me. How many meals has she made for me! ((Stands up))
Saadia: As for me, if she’ll be patient with me, I’ll leave her alone.
Lalla Aisha: Yeah, all the time. Until you’ve borne a lot of children. Well, may God make things good for you. ((Both elderly women turn to leave))
Saadia: Amen, Lalla Awish
Saadia: Amen
Lalla Aisha: If you enter a place, don’t be overly enthusiastic. Keep this shut ((pointing to lips)). Just keep your mouth shut. Pull your head together. The chicken said, this is what they say happened [signaling a proverb]; it pecked at shells; it thought it was corn. It got it caught in his beak. They say this really happened. May God help you.
Saadia: Amen
Lalla Aisha: Hey, times are hard! Don’t act as though they are easy.
Saadia: (emphatically) It’s not easy! It’s not easy!
Lalla Aisha: May God pardon us.
Saadia: ((to Lalla Aisha)) Amen, dear Lalla Awish. May God accept what you offered. ((Lalla Aisha and Lalla Awish leave.))
Saadia: ((with worried expression, to unmarried friend Kiltum who overheard the conversation)) Am I really going to have to ask before I do everything?

Kiltum: Well, there you are. [recorded August 1997]

The elderly women rose to leave numerous times, each time granting God’s wishes on the bride, then thought of something else she was compelled to add. Saadia accepted the advice without hesitation, at least until the elderly women were out of earshot. At that point, she confided her surprise to her peer at the suggestion she might have less freedom than she was accustomed to: “Am I really going to ask before I do everything?” Her friend offered a neutral response in empathy. The strangers in Saadia’s husband’s village, like those of each new bride, would socialize her into the ways of maintaining her husband’s tamazirt. In Issdrim, as in other Anti-Atlas villages, women comprised the demographic core. The responsibility for perpetuating a tamazirt, an inhabited place made meaningful through laboring, rested on these women’s shoulders.

**back and forth of goods and symbols: sustaining the mountains through the cities**

Up to this point, I have argued that the tamazirt was not just any land but a named land, occupied through manual labor, which raises the question of which individuals were understood to be its occupants. I hinted earlier that despite the hard labor required of tamazirt dwellers, fields produced only a fraction of foodstuffs and materials required by a household. For everything else, Ishelhin relied on markets. In the present section, I describe the material relations between Anti-Atlas villagers and urban emigrants before turning to a discussion of the discursive construction of the tamazirt. Although I stress the movement between social spaces, I want to emphasize that Anti-Atlas villagers and urban emigrants coconstituted each other through their dwelling places. As Lefebvre states, “Social spaces interpenetrate one another and/or superimpose themselves upon one another. They are not things, which have mutually limiting boundaries and which collide because of their contours or as a result of inertia” (1991:86–87). Although I maintain that Ishelhin conceived of the tamazirt as a “thing,” a particular kind of rural space, the boundaries of specific timizern expanded and contracted as state authorities shuffled administrative borders (Hoffman 2000b). It is not so much that these rural social spaces “interpenetrated” or “superimposed themselves upon another” but, rather, that they coexisted and sometimes collided in popular imaginations.

If the Anti-Atlas mountains ever sustained the local population, no one I knew remembered those times. Reliance on homegrown grain, however, diminished only in the course of the last generation. Dependence on other market goods and on migrant work remittances goes further back. The first documentation of the Ida ou Zeddout, a tribal report compiled under the French Protectorate Office of Indigenous Affairs prior to the construction of dirt roads in the region, notes that as early as the 1920s local men engaged in long-distance trading and commerce to ensure their families’ survival (Clement 1949). By the late 1990s, the procurement, delivery, and payment for household staples were organized and relatively reliable. The system’s smooth functioning depended at every stage on men. Mail, food staples, and fresh produce from the cities were delivered to the rural market centers. Each cluster of villages had one or two men who crucially linked villagers with goods and information. These drivers of small trucks served as intermediaries between the inhabitants of Ida ou Zeddout
and Casablanca. Migrant men in Casablanca periodically boxed supplies of canned fish, soap, and flour for delivery to their village households; some sent four-foot-tall woven baskets of vegetables. The truck drivers turned a good profit, according to villagers, who frequently expressed to me their bitter resignation at the drivers’ exigencies and erratic schedules. Each driver serviced a set of villages and occasionally kin in other locations, and he delivered goods directly to the villages or dropped them off in the Ida ou Zeddout market hub of Oulqadi for distribution. Migrants in France assigned a family member in a Moroccan city to handle the procurement of household goods. The foreign emigrant sent a money order to an urban-dwelling relative or deposited the funds into a Moroccan bank account. Emigrants who visited the village assessed whether goods indeed arrived and what might still be needed, then they reported back to the emigrants’ relatives to order further shipments. Emigrants also brought goods with them when they visited.

This system secured the basic household necessities for most mountain dwellers. Little has been written about Anti-Atlas households, with the few sources describing material and architectural changes that migrant revenues have facilitated. Alahyane (1990), for example, argues that migrant remittances have altered what he calls “traditionally tribal” communities. As the migrants periodically return to their villages with gifts, Alahyane states, both domestic aesthetics and architectural styles in the villages change. In addition, these gifts bring about further mutations in rural dwellers’ economic interactions with the cities, although Alahyane does not consider means other than gifts through which goods enter the villages. For example, rural women are more likely to save the few almonds from their own trees to sell at market when they can serve their guests market-bought peanuts and hard cookies. This introduction of material goods, Alahyane contends, has fueled rural girls’ dreams of marrying into an easier urban life. Men I spoke with, however, found that young village women were increasingly less-appealing marriage partners because their austere living conditions and rural laboring had not prepared them for the housekeeping responsibilities of urban wives. Alahyane claims that the seduction of television, powered in many places by solar-charged batteries, exacerbates young women’s frustrations, for it neither responds to rural needs nor reflects the non-Arab half of the Moroccan population. As a result, young women fail to situate themselves in the Moroccan national public, yet they long to experience the world beyond the village they inhabit.

Financially successful migrant workers tended to announce their prosperity by building ostentatious homes in their native villages. Yet scholarly attention to rural gentrification risks overshadowing the more mundane contours of the countryside’s dependence on urban centers. Although Alahyane usefully identifies material goods introduced into Anti-Atlas communities as their populations have shifted from subsistence horticulture and pastoralism to migrant revenue dependence, he fails to account for the socioeconomic diversity of mountain villages. In the Ida ou Zeddout village where I worked, there were two stone homes for every cinder block house under construction. Cement rarely replaced stone altogether, but rather seemed to creep up around the village edges. Some of the massive villas built over the past two decades comfortably housed three generations or seated 500 wedding guests. Yet, the literal stone core of each village remained inhabited, each wall melting into the next, with roofs of varying ages, their wood-burning stove holes topped with the chipped lids of clay stewpots (tajin-s), fastened to rock and mud, punctuating the village’s skyline.

Several Moroccans explained to me that if only rural places were equipped with urban conveniences such as electricity and running water, fewer men would flock to the cities. Others pointed out that there were advantages to rural living: exhaust-free
air; neighborly familiarity; and little of what Moroccans characterized as the urban plagues of drugs, alcohol, sexual promiscuity, and juvenile delinquency. From the perspective of those men who moved in and out of the tamazirt, life was getting better in the countryside in numerous ways. Older men recalled the days of dissidence (siba), intertribal warring, brutal caids (Protectorate-appointed regional rulers), famine, illness, nakedness, and widespread ignorance about religion. Older women recalled those times, as well, yet they did not contrast them optimistically with the present as did men. Carrying out their temmara day in and day out was still oppressive to women; they told me they were becoming less patient for its rewards.

objective of the homeland

For emigrant men, it was precisely this female temmara, as well as distance from urbanity, that made a place a tamazirt. Among those emigrants who objectified a singular tamazirt, there were gradations between timizern. An assessment offered by one young emigrant illustrates this point. Returning from the village of Tikiwin where he attended all-night wedding festivities, the young man exclaimed, “Tikiwin: now that’s a tamazirt! It has a great view (Arabic mandal), a two and a half-hour walk by foot from the road, no truck access, perched on a steep hill.” The village of Tikiwin fit his perception of what a tamazirt should be—difficult to access, with a beautiful view (it was in the mountains, after all). It was a hard land where, nonetheless, people still gathered socially.

By locating timizern on an implicit continuum between city and country, the young man used a distancing mechanism unfamiliar to most rural-dwelling women. There was a gendered difference in what men and women considered the qualities of a tamazirt, gendered more because of the different ways men and women engaged with the countryside than with anything inherent in an Ashelhi “sex/gender system” (Rubin 1975). The young emigrant emphasized “traditional” practices and accessibility as the characteristics that made Tikiwin a tamazirt, as I illustrate in the following section of this article. For women, a tamazirt was instead characterized by who filled up the place, how they were related to other families, the quality and quantity of hard labor that life there entailed, how villagers dressed and spoke, and what they ate—that is, how the place felt up close. For them, there was no relative scale of tamazirt-ness; any occupied, named place in the mountains was a tamazirt. The term itself had a neutral valuation in women’s usage.

As people grounded their fortunes less exclusively in one place, the concept of place, and more specifically of a homeland, became more developed and symbolically loaded. The homeland as symbol was increasingly objectified or “thingified” (Taussig 1992) by rural–urban emigrants who were primarily but not exclusively men, turning tamazirt into a discursive construction as much as a geographical location. In addition, Amazigh activists in Morocco and abroad, as well as Radio Agadir programming in Tashelhit, presented and represented the Tashelhit-speaking community to itself and to Arab Moroccans, drawing heavily on images and sounds from the countryside to do so (Hoffman 1999) and erasing distinctions between individual villages. In rural areas, residents were more discerning of differences between villages and tribal fractions. Only more recently, however, have Iseedhin begun developing solidarity with other Berbers whose first language is not Arabic (Crawford and Hoffman 2000).

Representations of an objectified homeland in the media, school texts, and everyday discourse influenced how rural dwellers outside of direct urban and state influence understood the constitution of their local identities and the boundaries of their communities. That is, the objectification of the homeland entailed a concurrent process
of subjectification (Heidegger 1977), meaning that Ishelhin became part of the tamazirt at the same time that the tamazirt became part of what it meant to them to be Ishelhin. It was in this nexus between the self and the world, through the care with which Ishelhin linked here and there, and present with both past and future, where the tamazirt became meaningful. With this perspective in mind—that people in out-of-the-way places apply their own logics to puzzle through broader socioeconomic trends—it becomes possible to explore how cultural and linguistic assimilation of Ishelhin into an urban, Arabic-speaking citizenry was far from inevitable, at least for those who maintained ties to the tamazirt. It was not only material and personal ties to a tamazirt that fueled migrant men’s nostalgia. The discursive construction of tamazirt, as a concept even more than a place, was likewise responsible.

discursive constructions of the homeland

Having considered how the tamazirt was constructed in part through female labor and male remittances, I turn now to their complement, the discursive construction of tamazirt. I noted above that female agriculturalists and male migrants were differently linked to the material realities of the land. As such, they had different conceptual frameworks for understanding what constituted the tamazirt. In this section of my argument, I examine gendered song and talk to explore “discourse” about the tamazirt in two related senses: as a cultural domain of knowledge (Foucault 1990) and as a way of talking (Sherzer 1987).

As illustrated in the example above, emigrant men were more prone to objectifying the homeland, whereas year-round mountain residents (primarily women) used the term tamazirt to reference an inhabited land or a place that could be as small as a hamlet or as large as a foreign nation-state (such as the United States or France). What migrant men talked about as the tamazirt was for year-round residents a highly diversified conglomeration of multiple timizern or multiple inhabited places. As one village girl made clear as she called out names of villages visible from the hillside where we walked, even the next village over was “another tamazirt,” provided people considered it substantively distinct in its social networks, material practices, or topography.

Still, women used sung and spoken registers to express contradictory, albeit complementary, attitudes toward the tamazirt in general and specific timizern in particular. Normative conventions governed the stances toward rural lands that were permissible in each verbal genre and by each gender. The dissonant discourses among the Ida ou Zeddout operated much as those Abu-Lughod (1986) noted for the Awlad Ali people of the Egyptian Western Desert, whose spoken discourse stressed modesty and strength and whose poetic discourse permitted talk about vulnerability and love. Like Abu-Lughod, I do not see one discourse as more true than another. Rather, for the Ida ou Zeddout on whom I focus this discussion, discourses comprised a communicative repertoire from which individuals drew to express ambivalent attitudes toward their dwelling places.

Ida ou Zeddout women used the term tamazirt differently in song and speech. Women talked informally (at least with outsiders like myself) about how much they wanted to flee their hard labor for the conveniences of Casablanca. But their public, sung voicings on the tamazirt implied no urban counterpoint. In song, that is, tamazirt simply meant “place” and had to be qualified further.
tamazirt in song

women’s song

Place is sensed collectively, rather than individually, as Basso points out: “Relationships to place are lived most often in the company of other people, and it is on these communal occasions—when places are sensed together—that native views of the physical world become accessible to strangers” (1996:109). His view echoes Boas’s conviction that places are social constructions par excellence (Basso 1996:74). In this section, I examine representations of these social constructions as found in women’s community song that I recorded. The verses here were improvised to suit the context, combining fixed forms and creative inspiration. Ida ou Zeddout sung verses engaged contexts—histories of people, places, and gathering occasions—as much as they indexed earlier performances from similar occasions. Community song provided women an opportunity for socially condoned commentary on community identity, place, and morality. Such genres of folk music, Lomax observes, “produce a feeling of security for the listener by voicing the particular quality of a land and the life of its people” (Bohlman 1988:52).

Not surprisingly, then, tamazirt was a recurring theme in women’s song. Verses signaled a tamazirt and not the tamazirt, where the indefinite article a indexed a neutral use of the term, in contrast to the definite article the that pointed to an affect-loaded concept. Definite and indefinite articles are not necessarily marked directly in Tashelhit but must be inferred from surrounding words and contexts. For example, in the first verse below warning that one should pause before entering a tamazirt “until the people of that tamazirt welcome you there,” the term ait tamazirt was used to refer to the inhabitants of a village or place, the owners of the land on which one should not trespass. In that sense, the verse referred to a tamazirt and not to the countryside in general. Clearer yet was a verse in which the vocalist took the voice of the new bride, plaintively observing that she was given to a land where she knew no one and had no one to show her around. This bride presumably moved from one rural village to another, rather than from the city to an undifferentiated countryside. Such contextual cues hint at most female vocalists’ understandings that timizern were distinct from one another and that their particularities evoked homesickness in a new bride.

I recorded the following tizrrarin (sung verses; sing. tazzrrart) at sunset during wedding festivities in August and September 1997 while men sat in a domestic courtyard waiting for coffee and, later, for dinner. The first verse was sung just after the arrival of women from the bride’s village; they indicated publicly yet subtly that they had not been welcomed with coffee. The verse draws on an Anti-Atlas aphorism on normative guest behavior:

\[
\text{iğ ikm yen ini n-tamazirt irad adar} \\
\text{ard-as nan ait tamazirt marhaba serk}
\]

If you arrive at a tamazirt edge pull back your foot until the people of that tamazirt welcome you there.

In the following verses, as well, each sung separately, tamazirt referred to particular hamlets or clusters of villages:

\[
\text{a farhan lerbat n-tamazirt} \\
\text{a han ingbin ikšn d-imawan-s} \\
\text{ahya a g"mna tamazirt lli saq nan} \\
\text{iga gis užđdg n-flayo ta'liyiin}
\]

Entranceways to the tamazirt are happy for guests have entered through its doors.

Oh brother, here is the tamazirt they told us about there are a lot of peppermint flowers there.
Bismillah is for when one is going to leave you tamazirt and enter another.25

In the following verse, a grandmother in her mid-fifties took the voice of the bride:

ha-iyi ḳiğ i-timizar ur xalida
ur iyyi gis baba ula immi qand
ur iyyi gis id dada mağ immaln
Here I am, given to a tamazirt I’m not familiar with
my father isn’t here, my mother isn’t here, I’m lonely
there’s no older brother to show me how to behave.

For many women, the most significant move they undertook was from their parents’ home to their groom’s home. Marriage in rural Morocco seemed to me to be more about this change of residence than about romance. The common Tashelhit way of saying “She is going to marry a boy in a place called Tililit” was tra Tililit, literally “She wants Tililit” and meaning “She is going to Tililit.”26 The theme of movement was reflected in wedding verses, reinforced by their being sung at liminal moments such as during the bridal procession.

In the following verse, another woman from the groom’s village addressed the bride, urging her to relax now that the day she anticipated had arrived:

a ṣbi Ḳaṣla lkr iyg ira yen
a Ḳiwnt ḳiğ a tamazirt ikṣm i-tayad
“Please be well” is for when one wants to leave you tamazirt and enter another.

In the following verse, another woman from the groom’s village addressed the bride, urging her to relax now that the day she anticipated had arrived:

a Ḷbi ṣba Ḳaṣla lkr iyg ira yen
a Ḳiwnt ḳiğ a tamazirt ikṣm i-tayad
Here you always anticipated [your] destiny
so you’ve arrived; find your rest.

The tizrrarin singled out here from an ever changing repertoire were among scores strung together over the course of a single wedding night. They shared not only the theme of relocation, or mention of tamazirt, but an articulation of community boundaries. They served as examples of public voicings most prevalent during the summer wedding season. Such stylized verbal expressions engaged themes of movement and dwelling found in more mundane conversation, evoking competing normative moral universes.27 A woman in the groom’s village may have sung to the new bride, “Find your rest,” but as Lalla Aisha demonstrated in her speech to the bride Saadia in Transcript 1, the young bride was expected to behave otherwise: “Shut your mouth. Watch. Notice.”

men’s song

The gendered discursive constitution of place distinguished men’s song from women’s song. In men’s collective song (ahwas) and the accompanying solo sung poetry verses (tinddamn), men were granted license to sing about tamazirt as an object of discursive analysis.28 One example strikingly illustrated this license. During an August 1997 ahwash wedding performance in Ida ou Zeddout by a group of men from neighboring Ida ou Knsus, the sung refrain was “tama-tamazirt/amerg amerg-ay,” linking homeland (tamazirt) and music/mood/longing (amerg). Stringing these two concepts together was telling because the tamazirt was precisely a place of amerg, of music and nostalgia. The phrase “The amerg of my tamazirt ails me” means that I long for my homeland. Ishelhin also said, “Your amerg pains me” (lit., “your mood/music pains me”), implying that your absence hurts or, more simply put, “I miss you.” Galand-Pernet brings the word amerg back to its root, w-r-g, “to dream” (1987). In other words, amerg may mean “that which brings together dreams” or “the realm of
visions, the play of imagination, of illusions” (Olsen 1997:30, my translation from the French). In the refrain tama tamazirt/amerg amerg-ay, amerg was a mood, a music, a dream, not simply a conglomeration of clapping hands, legs, and shoulders pressed together and swaying in unison, heads alternatively held high to call out verses then chins down to the ground as if to wait through the call’s response. Together, the words baldly celebrated the intertwined tamazirt and amerg that brought the men to the gathering in the first place, linking two identificatory symbols absent in their emigrant lives in northern Arab cities.

Indeed, the homeland and music were again explicitly linked in a sung poetry duel in 1998 by two Anti-Atlas poet-composers, Omar Aznag and Hassan Ben Oukrim, and recorded for local commercial distribution.29 The singers verbally took the roles of two childhood friends, one who moved to the capital city of Rabat and the other who remained in the village. Through these roles the men debated the relative virtues of rural and urban dwelling. The villager, sung by Omar, taunted his friend for his luxurious lifestyle, then questioned the migrant’s right even to stand in the song circle and duel him, asking:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{isahl-d fllkek rbbi temmara tukik} & \quad \text{God made your labors easy, you have no more troubles} \\
\text{mami trit imurig-ad} & \quad \text{what do you want with this music-making [amerg]} \\
\text{akn sul ishil} & \quad \text{why are you still concerned with it?}
\end{align*}
\]

In public song, then, Ashelhi men engaged the concept of the tamazirt as an entity for contemplation and public commentary. Women’s public sung voicings referred to tamazirt in its more conventional meaning of a place or a village. Lacking the voice to turn tamazirt into an object of discursive analysis, women were effectively precluded from commenting publicly on rural places, on rurality as a state of being, and thus, on women’s roles in these places and states of being. Such public commentary was relegated to men; for women, critique of the tamazirt was appropriate only in informal dialogue with other women.

tamazirt in informal talk

Conversationallly, women referred to the tamazirt as place or village, as illustrated in the tizrrarin sung poetry above. But they also used the term in informal conversation much as men do in song, to refer to rurality more generally, and to the vast rural expanse marked by agricultural labor. This spoken discourse on the tamazirt mirrored somewhat the objectified sense in which men used the term in the ahwa’s refrain above. For men, the concept connoted nostalgia and homecoming—which they actively sought in their annual return from the city. For women, in contrast, it connoted hard labor and difficult times—from which they often expressed desire to escape.

women’s talk

The transcript below illustrates the link women made between rural hardships and particular household items that they considered markers of ruralness. Mountain women distinguished between homemade and market-bought goods, most often valuing the latter. White market bread was particularly valued, not only because it was made with bleached soft wheat, rather than barley and the tougher hard wheat flour, but also because it could be purchased ready-made.30 The countryside (Arabic bled), after all, is what gives its name to the adjective bldi (country), as opposed to
romi (European). A bldi cow is sturdy but small, whereas a high-maintenance romi cow is a large Holstein variety that eats incessantly, requires shade, but in exchange produces large quantities of milk. Some town dwellers valued, for example, bldi eggs as more flavorful than larger romi eggs. Mountain dwellers, especially teenage girls, in contrast, seemed more unequivocally endorsing of just about anything that came from the market rather than the home.

I learned this through activities like weaving. Having seen striking striped blanket-rugs (aεban) of homespun, subtly colored, vegetable-dyed wool in several families’ homes and remarked on their attractiveness, my host mother asked me if I would like them to make one for me. I eagerly accepted, but when I went to the Igherm market that February to buy wool, I found only cheaply made, brightly colored synthetic yarn. Ramadan had just ended, and the cold of winter made it an unpopular time for women to weave; homespun wool was scarce. We bought six kilos of sul romi (European wool) of uncertain origins. I selected two kilos of navy blue, one of royal blue, one of white, and two of a berry burgundy. When I returned to the village with the wool, the women made their disappointment clear, for the colors did not suit their taste for bright, flashy rugs. The first hands (iiffessn) or stripes a hand’s width that they wove juxtaposed burgundy, white, and blue, a combination their eyes saw as too maudlin. To brighten it up, women scavenged leftover bits of yellow, orange, and bright green-dyed wool from their modest supplies and began weaving in slivers of vibrant color between the somber thick stripes. I sat quietly, upset over our disagreement on the color scheme. The women scolded me for my reclusiveness, asking each other, “Why isn’t she talking? God gave us so much to talk about.”

Talk during weaving turned several times to metacommentary on our motivations for making the rug. The women and girls associated the activity of weaving with a lifestyle they were trying to abandon. It seemed that the foreign anthropologist en-amored of village handicrafts mystified them. Apparently, I was for them the ultimate symbol of material things, new, foreign, reliant on the market, and therefore good, a contrast with things old and local. It seemed to puzzle them that I, the urban educated outsider, found some redeeming quality in their tamazirt goods (as in their barley couscous). It was unclear to them why someone like me would prefer to sleep atop stacked wool rugs on the floor (as most mountain people did), rather than on a raised foam cushion under a blanket (as many urban Moroccans did). Unmarried 20-year-old Ftuma opened this debate with a rhetorical question directed to me. Her 55-year-old mother Hajja piped in, as did Lalla Zohra, a decade Hajja’s junior.

Transcript 2

Ftuma: What do you want with an aεban. A kaša (market-bought blanket) will keep you warm if you sleep. What do you want to smell the smell of an aεban for, you know Katrin?
Katherine: What?
Ftuma: I said to Lalla Zohra, we don’t want your aεban. Because we aren’t up for it. We just want a kaša and a mattress.
Hajja: Ah! Each to her own.
Ftuma: We’ll sleep on it, but tamazirt, no ((laughing)).
Katherine: Tamazirt how’s that?
Ftuma: We don’t want the tamazirt.
Katherine: Why?
Hajja: Well look here, even [unclear] a blanket [unclear] we want to go to Casablanca or Taroudant.
Katherine: What would you do there?
Hajja: My daughter and her reason [eqfl]. There’s nowhere she won’t go. . . .
Ftuma: We want to go to Casablanca, and we don’t find a way there.
Katherine: Yeah.
Ftuma: We don’t know when we’re going to go there.
Hajja: Being in Casablanca is hard, how many people are there.
Ftuma: I’m always asking for God’s mercy to get us there, just like [we ask for mercy to get us to] the haj.\textsuperscript{31}

Getting to Casablanca seemed as unlikely to Ftuma as going on the haj, the holy pilgrimage to Mecca, and both were worth asking God for.

Zohra: Like a beehive of people all of them are doing like this ((gesturing with fingers moving like swarming bees)). It’s all like this all the people [in Casablanca] are doing like this.
Katherine: What’s that?
Zohra: There are a lot of people. There’s a ((stammering)) crowd \textit{jumhur} of people.
Katherine: Yeah, there are a lot of people, a lot of people from the village.
Zohra: A lot, yeah a lot . . .
Ftuma: There it’s nice. Casablanca Casablanca is where people want to go. We’re fed up with the tamazirt.
Hajja: Watch it, because is here like there?\textsuperscript{32}

That is, Hajja asked rhetorically, is there even a basis of comparison between city and country? Ftuma continued:

Ftuma: Casbalanca [Dar Bayda] is where we want to go. Tamazirt don’t want it.
Zohra: dadadadad
Ftuma: ((to Zohra)) Don’t be so annoying. ((to K)) I was saying to you, we don’t want the tamazirt. ((to Hajja)) She said when you marry you’ll go to the city \textit{lmdint}.
Hajja: She’s right, maybe \textit{lmdint} n tašeyxt (the saint’s graveyard) ((laughs))\textsuperscript{33}

The pun Hajja made here was cleverly suited to the discussion: \textit{lmdint} is both the Tashelhit assimilated borrowing of the Arabic “city” \textit{(al medina)} and the Tashelhit word for “grave.” Here, Hajja mentioned the local female saint, or tašeyxt (from Arabic sheykh\textit{a}), to refer to the graveyard adjoining her tomb where women frequently strolled and talked in the late afternoon hours. In other words, it was likely that Ftuma would visit the graveyard (“the one [lmdint] that is forever”) before she would make it to the city (lmdint).

Katherine: How’s that?
Hajja: \textit{dar tašeyxt} (at the saint’s place).
Ftuma: I always say I want to go to the city, I want to go to the city, I want to go to the lmdint, until I go to the real one. Until I go to the one that is forever . . .
Zohra: Tamazirt tamazirt is tamazirt hey you ((to Katherine, stuttering)) Katrin.
Ftuma: Oof! Oof to tamazirt oof! May God bring it some disaster.
Katherine: How’s that, “oof”?
Zohra: It’s [tamazirt is] not good.
Ftuma: We’re fed up with it is oof.
((2.0))
Oof, ah Katrin, it’s not good like this.

[recorded February 1997]

Young women increasingly set their sights on Casablanca, hoping to join the wives of financially successful merchants. These young women saw two ways for Tashelhit women to dwell in the world: they either worked the fields, or they “sat” at
home. They did not consider urban employment options; they rarely pursued adult literacy programs. One young woman summed up what several others told me repeatedly: “Tashelhit women don’t work [for wages]. It’s shameful. That’s just how it is.” Given the choice between a life of physical hardship and less-strenuous domestic servitude, their preference was clear. They did not seek to emulate urban ways within the village, but rather to appropriate the status of selected urban elements as their own.

Among younger and older women who dwelled in the tamazirt, there was no nostalgia, no praising of the amerog of the tamazirt as in the men’s song. There were certainly aspects of rural life that women preferred to what they heard or saw about city life. What they seemed to want was to take the good and be rid of the bad. Women conducted their everyday lives according to a hierarchy of women residing in the village—but within parameters established by the absent males. I asked Hajja once whether she missed her husband, who visited from France once a year for ten days. She responded by gesturing with a wide sweep of her arms around the inner courtyard of her cinder block house: “He makes all of this possible. Without him, we wouldn’t have so much as sugar or tea.” Without the migrant worker, her response suggested, there would be no tamazirt. Likewise, for married men, keeping their wives in the village allowed them to substantiate claims to a homeland where their honor was upheld despite Ishelhin’s marginal status in the national Moroccan citizenry.

**men’s talk**

Movements of people into and out of the mountains and markets were part of what made times good; places were “filling up,” and “full” places were good places. In collective taxis and pickup trucks between mountain villages and towns, passengers were often attentive to villages and fields by the roadside, and they exchanged assessments of places as well as news about their residents. Ishelhin guardedly monitored the dissemination of information about themselves and their communities, as much as they esteemed those who brought them news about other places (Hoffman 2000b). Thus, conversations like the one below tended to be limited to men with shared histories, to the exclusion of women passengers (including the foreign anthropologist). I traveled frequently around the Moroccan southwest, so I was privy to a number of these discussions. The following conversation took place between a truck driver, in his mid-forties, and one of his male passengers, a dignified yet chatty man in his sixties. If times were bad, men would not go to market because they would have little purchasing power and thus little clout. The older man made small talk as we headed down the mountains toward the Sous plains, all of us peering around the road’s curves to the villages below, whose growth these men had watched for decades. The two men alternated their comments, each agreeing with the other. The driver addressed his comments to his male passenger.

*Times are good, God has sent us goodness. Look at how many people are coming and going. Did you see the market in Igherm yesterday? Full! You couldn’t fit another person. Look at all the buses full, the taxis. There are a lot of people in these times. It’s not like it used to be. Now whatever you want, it’s there in the market. Used to be there was no money, but now there’s money.*

The older man replied:

*Yes, look at all the houses in the tamazirt that are just locked. Their owners built them then come to spend two or three days there and then return to Casablanca. Things are*
good; people don’t want any more. Thank God there is money now; all you have to do is work and there’s money. Look at the saint’s festival [moussem] they’re going to have in the village. We’re going to slaughter a cow. Times are good.

This older man asked the driver how his own village’s moussem went. He answered, “God gave [a lot of] bounty/goodness, God gave [a lot of] meat, God gave [a lot of] people.”

An assessment of material conditions, an overview of general trends throughout the land beyond the confines of an individual’s home—these were men’s affairs. In tangible terms, paving the road did not lighten women’s daily labors much; they tended the same fields, fed the same animals, hand washed the same clothes, and cooked the same number of meals. Yet, roads meant an increased quantity of goods entered their homes. Trucks brought vegetables, clothes, furniture, bleached white bread, and the candy bars whose wrappers littered the dry riverbed. Vendors who lived in nearby villages continued to arrive on donkey back: the silver jewelry merchant, the herbalist, the blind egg vendor. Moreover, paved roads impacted village residency patterns, because with increased transportation, men departed more easily. Women did not outright fault the country’s infrastructure for their men’s absences. Indeed, some women told me that they were indifferent whether the men came or went, so long as they sent back goods and money.

According to some women who were candid with me, however, the men sent home little. The younger generation, in particular, rarely returned to the village, sometimes because they had accumulated little money to contribute to their households or fund their transportation. A few women told me that they had no idea how much money the men actually made. As one mother in her early thirties said, remarking on gifts her older brother brought on his previous visit, “All we see is what they want to give us. But I hear them talking. I know some of the men are making big money, living well in Casablanca, and then they don’t let us come to see all that they’ve built. All we know is what they want to show us.” Many women complained that “times are hard” (tšqa loqt). Men occasionally did too, but they used the phrase rhetorically, not literally, as a sign of empathy with someone experiencing a difficulty, not as a general assessment. Women’s hard labor continued, along with a hefty dose of anxiety about managing a household while remaining uncertain about where their men were and unsure about what resources were forthcoming.

**Conclusion**

The philosopher Edward Casey writes that “a place is more an event than a thing to be assimilated to known categories . . . places not only are, they happen” (Casey 1996). In this article, I have explored the specificity of one kind of place, the tamazirt, as Ida ou Zeddout Ishelhin of the Anti-Atlas mountains in southwest Morocco constructed it in the late 1990s. I have stressed that these Ishelhin made their lands into dwelling places through the purposeful, interested, and participatory engagement that Heidegger (1977) contends constitutes the “care” of human existence. Individual instances of engagement with the tamazirt, explored in this article, contextualized the speaking present within memories from the past as well as anxieties and desires projected into the future. The ways that the Ida ou Zeddout sensed place invoked multiple temporalities and bridged rural and urban spaces.

In its multiple meanings—homeland, countryside, place of moods—tamazirt was a focal point for Moroccan Ishelhin of the Anti-Atlas mountains. Whereas recent scholarly discussions about homelands have focused on source societies and diaspora
populations, I propose an analytical approach that situates identity not only in specific places but in individuals’ relations to those places. Looking at the links between Ishelhin and land in a specific historical moment—whether focusing on estrangement or quotidian engagement—it becomes clear that urban emigrant men and rural-dwelling women, ostensibly from the same places, endowed land differently with meaning. In other societies, as well, the processes of migration, homeland making, and gender construction should be considered in tandem in investigations of modern processes of identity formation and subjectivity. Gupta and Ferguson (1997) argue that “imaginings of place” shift under changing political circumstances. I suggest likewise that men’s and women’s differing engagements with political economies impact their “senses of place” (Feld and Basso 1996). When the senses of place practiced by social groups clash, the tension may point to the “topographies of power” in play (Gupta and Ferguson 1997). For the overwhelmingly monolingual and nonliterate women who populated the Moroccan countryside in the late 1990s, home connoted hard labor, not nostalgia. Nostalgia was rare even among the minority of women who had accompanied their fathers and husbands to the city, throwing into question whether the nostalgic impulse necessarily accompanies modernity (Ivy 1995).

It should come as no surprise that women in patriarchal societies question the presumption that “home” is the “safe place” where “there is no need to explain oneself to outsiders” (Kondo 1996:97). Yet, even lesbian and other minority scholars who attempt to claim rights to their “homes” consider the concept malleable enough to incorporate conflicting interests shaped by national origin, sexual orientation, economic role, and gender (Martin and Mohanty 1986; Rathzel 1994). The case study of homeland making among Ishelhin of the Moroccan Anti-Atlas suggests to me, however, that the presumption that the “home” should be tranquil results from an (utopian) ideological wish rather than empirical data. The presence of ethnographers in the “homeland” has the potential to valorize a status quo that naturalizes women’s place in the countryside. Such a valorization frowns on Berber cultural assimilation into an Arab-dominant Moroccan society and favors the spatial gendering promoted by (overwhelmingly male) Amazigh intellectuals and activists as well as the migrant merchants I have discussed here. In the mountains on which urban Amazigh activists model their discursive productions, moralizing discourses about the tamazirt remain suspended between nostalgia and sweat.

In the song verse opening this article, the male singer–poet addresses his liver, the Berber repository of affect, begging for patience as he abides the derision he senses for the homelands and their inhabitants. Such ancestral places are morally laudable, he suggests, for they were the last holdouts against the French military incursions and home to many of the nationalists who “pushed out the colonists with their words and with their bodies.” However, even if “today cities are all [people] care about,” city and countryside are not so mutually exclusive as the lyrics at first suggest. Instead, as I have argued here, the Ashelhi tamazirt is generated demographically, materially, and symbolically in relation to the city, as people move between and dwell in both spaces.

The Ishelhin among whom I researched were aware that their relationship to their ancestral land was loaded (symbolically and morally) and contingent (materially and demographically). Although Appadurai calls the making of locality “an inherently fragile social achievement” (1996:179), the persistence of locality making in the Anti-Atlas mountains, through moving and dwelling, suggests that the arrangement might not have been as fragile as it first appears. It was, however, highly contested. The question I often heard mountain residents, both women and men, ask visitors to
their villages, whether foreign anthropologists or urban relatives, was “is tšwa tamaz-ir?” (“Is the tamazirt good/nice?” or “Do you like it here?”). Although rather abstract, the query suggested to me that tamazirt was different from other places and, as such, deserved assessment. If the visitor responded in the affirmative, the resident sometimes laughed, maybe pointing to a burn on her wrist or a rip in her clothing or uttering a list of all the countryside lacked: faucets, electricity, rest, schooling. Posed by tamazirt dwellers, then, the question appeared rhetorical—the resident expected a negative response. Yet it may also have been a phatic plea for assurance that the countryside and its women would not be forgotten by those who tested their fates elsewhere, those they sustained morally and on whom they depended materially.
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1. As Crawford and I noted in a previous publication (2000), the use of the terms Berber, Amazigh, and Berber speaker are vigorously debated in contemporary discussions of ethnic and cultural identity. Here I use Imazighen (sing. m., Amazigh, sing. f., Tamazight) to refer to Berber speakers (Berbers) as a whole. In other publications, Imazighen may refer more specifically to Moroccan Middle Atlas Berbers who call their language Tamazight or to activists in the cultural and linguistic rights movement. Some prefer the term Tamazight to refer to all varieties of spoken Berber, but because this is also the term for the Middle Atlas vernacular, which differs in important respects from the Tashelhit of the Anti-Atlas, I refrain from the term Tamazight here, for the sake of clarity. I agree with Sadiqi’s (1997:7–21) suggestion that the English term Berbers does not have the negative connotations of its Latin etymological root, barbaros, meaning persons foreign to Greek society and language. Moreover, I maintain, the French ethological term les berbères retains more of a colonial flavor than the English Berbers. In this article, I use the terms Ashelhi/Ishelhin for Tashelhit speakers for two reasons: (1) these are indigenous terms; and (2) the political and gendered economies I describe, as well as migration patterns and discursive forms, are specific to Ishelhin rather than Imazighen in general. Indeed, they are even more specific to the Anti-Atlas subset of Ishelhin that includes the Ida ou Zeddout people; they are less relevant to Ishelhin of the High Atlas and those of the Sous Plains because of their dissimilar political economies.

2. By the late 1990s, a self-conscious rootedness was celebrated in popular Tashelhit song as well as sung poetry. Take, for example, the following verse from the commercially recorded song “Awizanim a Tamazight [Struggle for you, oh Tamazight]” by the well-known and roundly praised singer–songwriter Fatima Ta’abamrant (1998). The lyrics urged Ishelhin to awaken to their shared history and future, anchored in their pan-Amazigh language (Tamazight) with its deep roots in the land:

I waited until I could wait no more. We sat until we could sit no more. All my rags tore right off of me. For the sake of God, who will tell us to get up from there.
We sat in the flowing river; it didn’t take us away.
Because our roots go down into the earth, we are still alive.
I weigh more than the rocks; the river believes it.
If it wants to shake us, we’ll leave our place [=go elsewhere]

3. This article is part of a broader project on land, ethnicity, and verbal expression in the Moroccan Sous. My research methods included participant-observation; open-ended interviews; and 150 hours of taped and selectively transcribed conversation, recitation, narrative, and song, mostly in Tashelhit but also in Moroccan Arabic (ed-derija). Tashelhit was my primary research language in the Anti-Atlas mountains and Sous Valley; I spoke Moroccan Arabic with Arabs both in those locations and in the town of Taroudant where I was based. Transcription assistance was skillfully provided by Latifa Asseffar. The young women of Ida ou Zeddout kindly offered assistance with song texts.

For an account of male migration from the Sous region in Casablanca, see Waterbury 1972a and 1972b. For an excellent historical overview of the economic and social forces leading to this migration, see Benhlal 1981.

4. In this article, Tashelhit and Moroccan Arabic words are italicized per AAA style at first occurrence. Arabic borrowings are indicated in parentheses where relevant.

The question “What is your tamazirt?” when addressed to foreigners, elicited responses such as “France” or “America.” Likewise, on Tashelhit-language news programming, phrases such as “tamazirt n-Turkiya” were used. Although tamazirt could refer to a nation-state, like Turkey, it differed from the Arabic al-watān (nation) on both affective and conceptual levels. A high school educated young woman found it humorous, for instance, that I suggested that Nub al-watān (Arabic) and Nub n-tamazirt (Tashelhit), which both ostensibly meant “love of country,” would be equivalents. The Arabic al-watān conveyed patriotism and to her, the idea of being patriotic to a rural place was absurd.

Algerian Kabyles, speaking Taqbaylit, distinguish between tamazirt as a physical, agricultural land and tamurt as homeland (Paul Silverstein, personal communication, April 2000). This usage might reflect earlier changes in the ways Algerians engaged with the land. No such distinction was made in Moroccan Tashelhit in the late 1990s. See Genevois 1975 for the agrarian calendar and Kabyle agricultural practices. I thank Jane Goodman for calling my attention to this document.

5. There are no official statistics on the number of Imazighen or Berber speakers in Morocco. Official government policy long denied ethnic, linguistic, and cultural distinctions between Moroccan citizens, stressing instead their shared Arabo-Muslim identity, albeit acknowledging that, as school history books used to state, “The Berbers (beraber) were our ancestors.” This official stance is slowly changing. In October 2001, King Mohamed VI announced the creation of the Royal Institute of Tamazight Culture to standardize Tamazight writing and plan the introduction of Tamazight language into Moroccan public schools. His father, King Hassan II, announced his intention to do the same in 1994, but he failed to implement the plan prior to his death in 1999. Outside of state sponsorship, widespread urbanization since the 1970s has led to a language shift away from the Berber vernaculars (Tashelhit, Tamazight, and Tarifit) to Moroccan Arabic. The specific contours of ethnolinguistic differentiation vary regionally, often leading to bilingualism and biculturalism.

6. An alternative construction of place pervades the scholarly literature on Morocco: the bled el-makhzen–bled es-siba distinction between lands under the sultanate’s control (for tax and military purposes) and lands outside governmental control. The most widely read elaborations of the makhzen–siba distinction are Bidwell 1973, Gellner 1969, and Montagne 1973. Yet, as Hart notes, Moroccans on each side of this divide conceived of themselves and the other group in these terms; they were relative rather than absolute characterizations. For scholars and makhzen officials, however, the so-called tribal areas fell into the bled es-siba, where the Sultan was acknowledged as the spiritual but not temporal head, meaning that the rural tribes rarely paid their taxes (Hart 1972:27–28; see also Hart 2000). Seen in this light, the makhzen–siba distinction is only one of many possible constructions of place, indeed one that privileges monarchical discourse and political organizations of places and peoples. The categories should not,
then, be taken to represent fixed, place-based identities. On the French historian Henri Terrasse’s role in conceptualizing the makhzen–siba antagonism, and its inadequacy for understanding the complex relations between tribes and government, see Burke 1972:180, 1976:12; Dunn 1972:106; Rosen 1979, 1984; Seddon 1972:117; and Tapper 1990.

7. The transcription system I have developed for Tashelhit uses one grapheme per pho-

9. The rural–urban dichotomy is one of the most prevalent leitmotifs in folk music, ac-

In the song lyrics particular to Tashelhit is igran, and thus appear landless; but she may neglect to mention the lbur she works that, in local ethnographer concerned with land use. A plains dweller, for example, may state that she has no different uses for the land. This variability in agricultural terminology complicates the task of the plains and the mountains thus employed the same terms but in ways that corresponded to their used for rain-fed land; irrigated plots for growing produce were called igran. People in the French

11. Pl., ibudrarn (sing. m., abudrar); ab (man) + udrar (mountain); f., tabudrart.

12. I do not mean to suggest that Ishelhin were a homogenous lot. Indeed, relations be-

13. Here I retain the distinction Ishelhin made between labor (temmara) and work (stådmnt, from the Arabic al-xedma). The manual labor I describe here fell under the category of temmara, a term that stressed the physicality of the activity more than its financial compensation. I am grateful to David Crawford for calling my attention to this distinction (personal communication 1999).

14. In local taxonomies, land ownership and land use were important indexes of group membership. In the Anti-Atlas mountains, which relied on rain for irrigation, the term used for agricultural land was igran. Vegetable plots that villagers watered, in contrast, were called tar-

10. The Moroccan Arabic correlate to tamazirt, bled, did not carry the emotional charge of tamazirt, nor did it have the connotations of a coherent community, although it did share the meaning of “not urban.”
practices, is considered insignificant and tended only twice a year for a modest barley harvest. A
mountain dweller, in contrast, may call her igran those rain-fed barley fields that are owned by
her husband or father and tended by her.

15. Nostalgia has been elaborated as a product of modernity and late capitalism in recent
I am grateful to an anonymous AE reviewer for questioning whether Ashelhi modernity evoked
such nostalgia or instead challenged the prevailing scholarly view, and for centering my atten-
tion on gendered connections between nostalgia and modernity.

16. The French military officer Clement (1949) noted the seasonal presence of laborers
from Taggmout, Tata, and Aqqa from the midsummer barley-harvesting season through the
early-fall date-harvesting season in the pre-Saharan villages. I found the same pattern 50 years
later. Many laborers were young women, but some were grown men. If an employee was hard
working and good natured, he or she stayed on; if not, the employer sent the person away after
as few as two or three days. Seasonal laborers were outsiders and considered by Ida ou Zeddout
residents to be of lower socioeconomic class, although some young women were temporarily
integrated into Ida ou Zeddout households where they assisted the young women with chores.
Seasonal workers generally fell outside the gendered division of labor I describe here. Men not
engaged in urban commerce, such as shepherds, had significantly lower status than migrant
men.

17. The twiza (collective laboring) system (called twizi in some regions) was in place in
some Ashelhi mountain communities such as Ida ou Finisse neighboring Ida ou Zeddout, some
Western High Atlas villages such as Riyad and Had Imoulas, and some Sous Plains villages near
the foothills such as Toureight. For twiza, village girls and women collectively harvested the
fields of one household or those owned by the village, usually considered the property of the
mosque. The host household fed the workers for the duration of the harvest and then on com-
pletion thanked them with a special meal. The women maintained a festive atmosphere
throughout these periods of collective labor, often drumming and singing during meal breaks,
which several told me helped them turn the work into a celebration. Under twiza, some lands
were not harvested until the fall; by procuring outside workers, in contrast, people in Ida ou
Zeddout finished harvesting by midsummer. For a discussion of twiza in the Ziz Valley of south-
eastern Morocco, see Ilahiane 1998. Montagne 1973 also contains a brief discussion of twiza.

18. There were practical reasons for completing the harvest in early summer, as well,
while there was still enough wind to separate the hay from the chaff, and before the intense Au-
gust still heat. If the barley sat in the fields in the summer sun, it became very brittle so that the
shaft fell apart and dispersed its grain. Moreover, it became more difficult to work long days as
the temperature rose. For all of these reasons, villagers told me, each family worked alone or
with its hired workers to harvest as quickly as possible. The seasonal workers lived in their em-
ployers’ houses, and the employers fed them and paid them according to the season’s going
wage: in 1996, 40–50 dirhams per day; and in 1997, around 100 dirhams per day (because of
heavy rains). In 1998, there was insufficient rainfall for even a modest harvest; the Ida ou Zed-
dout did not employ outside workers that year.

19. Tashelhit sung poetry commonly shifts between first person singular and plural pro-
nouns (here, me and we). Euphony supercedes strict adherence to grammar rules governing
conversational speech (Hoffman 2002). In verses such as this one, where the singer took the
voice of the bride, she simultaneously spoke for the particular and the collective, and her shift
reflected this move. I translate “bury me” literally because Ishelhin compared moving with dy-
ing. This theme recurred in other expressive domains because, they said, you could no longer
count on a woman who married outside the village or a person who migrated.

20. The four Ida ou Zeddout farqa-s were Ait Musi, Ait Tafraout, Ait Ourgummi, and Ait
Nihit. I cannot offer statistics on the number of Ait Musi migrant men who married Arab women
and remained in the cities; the only information I have is on the women who spent at least part
of the year in their husbands’ native villages. Migration statistics for the Ida ou Zeddout are
scarce. For an account from the Protectorate period, a tribal report on the Ida ou Zeddout, see
Clement 1949. The only previous ethnographic study of the Ida ou Zeddout, focusing on wed-
ding songs, is by Olsen (1984).
21. Of the 26 women who married men in the village where I primarily worked, 19 were from other villages in the Ait Musi fraction, three were from villages belonging to other Ida ou Zeddout fractions (including two from Aghgmi and one from Taghravat), and four were from neighboring taqibilt (“tribes”) in the Igherm area: three from Ida ou Nadif and one from Mrayt. There were occasional marriages to Indouzel, as well, topographically separated from Ida ou Zeddout by the Tisfane mountain. Although farqa and taqibilt classifications are no longer recognized by the state, they were commonly used by rural Ida ou Zeddout people during my field research (Hoffman 2000b).

22. Safi is used in both Tashelhit and Moroccan Arabic as a marker of agreement, signaling the end of a discussion or concurring with a point just made. It can also mean “that’s all”; for example, a woman might respond to the question, “How many children do you have?” with “I have one, safi.” Here, Saadia signaled that she recognized that this was the end of her days of being on her own.

ad-ağ isema Nṛbbi, “May the Lord forgive us,” was said in the place of goodbye when people had been speaking frankly, talking about someone not present, or saying something that might anger the interlocutor.

The phrase “May God accept your gifts” was offered to a visitor bearing a gift of sugar, money, or advice.

23. See note 6, above, for further scholarly writings on the bled el-makhzen–bled es-siba distinction that was understood slightly differently by rural Ishelhin than by scholars and French Protectorate officials. The Anti-Atlas mountains were ruled by Caid Tiouti during the Protectorate period. In vernacular usage I encountered, the word siba meant fighting, chaos, and lawlessness; it referred to a period more than a place, a time when, as one elderly man explained to me describing the early Protectorate period when Hayda Mouwis was pasha of Taroudant, “They go to some tamazirt, they surround it, they take their animals, they kill people.” (It remained unclear whether the “they” referred to Hayda Mouwis’s people or just groups of armed men.) The absence of a strong central ruler at certain historical moments was sufficient for some insiders to claim that a specific location was in a state of siba. See, for example, the late 19th-century letters between the “State of Tazerwalt” of the saint Sidi Hmed u Musa and the makhzen or central government (Ennaji and Pascon 1988:178, 198).

24. A fuller discussion of the moral economy of women’s tizrrarin and generational change is treated in Hoffman 2002. Further analysis of song texts is found in Hoffman 2000a. The only commercially available audio recordings of tizrrarin are included in Olsen’s CD Chants et Danses de l’Atlas (1997) distributed by Cité de la Musique/Actes Sud. No cassettes of tizrrarin are commercially available in Morocco, although amateur recordings are periodically aired on Radio Agadir’s Tashelhit programming (Hoffman 1999).

25. Peppermint flowers (in the 2nd verse) symbolize virgin girls.

26. The conflation in Tashelhit between “to want to” and “to go” makes it difficult to express the idea of wanting to go somewhere (or do something) but not being able to. For example, I wanted to attend the moussem of Moulay Brahim three years in a row, and each year there was a scheduling problem. When the woman who expected me to accompany her asked, “is trit Moulay Brahim?” she meant “do you want [to go]/are you going to Moulay Brahim.” I answered each time, “riː g ad duːg, miːs ur żdaːg,” meaning “I want to go but I am not able to go.” The response was as often as not, “But I thought you wanted to join us/were going to join us!” (gaːlīg is trit ad inaɡ tmunt!) I tried to use intonation to express my desire, yet inability, to join them: “I do want to go along” (riːːːːːɡ ad munɡ). For many Ishelhin, people’s intentions are implied in their actions. When someone would eventually ask, “so are you going or not?” (is trit ad tmunt niːɡd uhu), I would just say uhu (no) and sense that my intention was not understood.

27. See Irvine 1979 for the argument that scholars have used the characterizations “formal” and “informal” too loosely. “Informal” contexts are not necessarily less rule governed than “formal” contexts, Irvine argues; ethnographic descriptions of public oratory suggest that the difference lies more in the extent to which events or interactions are rule governed.

28. See Bouzid 1996 for an exhaustive inventory of aḥwas genres and the groups in the Sous and Anti-Atlas who perform them. According to Philip Schuyler, this publicly voiced
reflection on tamazirt in song is relatively recent (personal communication 1999). In his ethnomusicological study of professional rwaïs (itinerant Ashelhi musicians) of the Western High Atlas, the topic did not surface in musicians’ repertoires (Schuyler 1979). Lyrics about migration to France do occasionally emerge, however (Lefebure 1992). The prevalence of the discursive construction of tamazirt 20 years later, I suggest, is further evidence of the shift in Ashelhi identity and public representations of that identity. An increase in political openness in the 1990s permitted the articulation of non-Arab identities; the political context thus frames what can and cannot be voiced (cf. Boukous 1995; Chaker 1990; Crawford and Hoffman 2000; El Aissati 1993; Sadiqi 1997). For a discussion of the theme of migration in Tashelhit popular music, see Lefebure 1986.

29. See Hoffman 2000a:221–304 for a full translation of this tandam, other tinddamin, and a discussion of the mutual influences between this genre and other Ashelhi sung genres.

30. Soft wheat, also called bread wheat, was introduced under the French Protectorate with seed imported from Algeria. French settlers in Morocco preferred soft wheat because it had greater market value than hard wheat and because the Protectorate’s Agricultural Division loaned soft-wheat seeds beginning in 1915. For an account of Protectorate wheat policy, see Swearingen 1987:15–35.

31. Sleeping with a wool rug to keep warm was a marker of rurality. Ftuma considered blankets cleaner and preferable.

Hajja used the term ٠ql (Arabic ‘aql) ironically to comment on their collective wistfulness. The Arabic term ‘aql has a range of meanings in the Muslim world, from “reason” or “social sense” to “intelligence” and, especially in the Moroccan Sous, “responsibility” (Abu-Lughod 1986:90; Dwyer 1978; Dwyer 1982; Eickelman 1985:138–141; Rosen 1984).

32. Zohra stammered while she searched for another word for “crowd,” because I indicated I did not know tamlelt (beehive), even though I nodded my head signaling that I understood her hand gestures. The word she selected, jumhur, is a Standard Arabic word prevalent in Moroccan news and television programming and used to describe crowds of people.

“We’re fed up”: tu geli-iyyi ٠ixf is literally “it’s gone up to my head.”

33. “Don’t be so annoying”: “Don’t ts?a”: Ftuma played with the d-b-d consonants of Dar Bayda and the verb sd?a (lit., “to trouble, to make noise, to be annoying”). She repeated the sounds “d-b”; “Don’t be a pain in the neck” was what she meant. Zohra repeated the sounds from a word Ftuma had just uttered, in an attempt to keep the floor (Goffman 1981). I heard the term sd?a used to refer to children who made noise, the Polisario that clamored for Western Sahara’s independence from Moroccan rule, women who ask too much of their husbands, and guests who visit too frequently.

34. Buying and selling was only one part of what men did at the weekly markets in Morocco, where socializing, exchanging information, completing administrative matters, and soliciting opinions were equally important. Times may have been so good in Ida ou Zeddout that local men deemphasized this sociality; men may have exchanged information quickly while they made purchases and sales.

35. My analysis here is inspired by anthropological work on the sociocultural construction of place (Bloch 1995; Feld and Basso 1996; Gray 1999; Myers 1986), some of which identifies the central role of language practices in place making (Basso 1996; Dominy 2000; Duranti 1992; Povinelli 1993; Rodman 1992; Stewart 1996). The concept of landscape as historically constituted has been a complementary approach (Baker and Bigger 1992; Bender 1993). Following Barth’s (1969) influential essay on ethnicity, ethnographers have been attentive to the historically situated boundary-marking devices that groups use to negotiate membership (Balzer 1999; Bunham 1996; Durham 1999; Galaty 1982; Hensel 1996; Herzfeld 1987; Jackson 1982; Malkki 1995). Ethnomusicologists and anthropologists have examined verbal performances as sites for negotiation and representation of collective identities (Coplan 1994; James 1999; Parkes 1987; Stokes 1997; Waterman 1990). Language as practice rather than representation informs linguistic anthropological work on the intersection of material and ideological constructions (Caton 1990; Friedrich 1989; Gal 1989; Hill 1985; Irvine 1989; Krokskity 1993; Schieffelin 1990). Drawing on Ashelhi understandings of human activities as well as this scholarly literature, I extend the notion of performance beyond that of representation in order to analyze
manual labor practices alongside discursive practices. Negotiation and contestation pervade performances of both “speech and sweat” (Povinelli 1993:32), conditioning which individuals perform authoritatively, what they should perform, who can critique others’ performances, and what role performances play in constructions of place and identity in the wider context of a diversely constituted nation-state.

36. Although the Protectorate officially dates from 1912, the Ait Abdullah people of the mountains just south of Ida ou Zeddout successfully staved off French advances until 1934; an Office of Indigenous Affairs had been established in Igherm in 1928. Although Western scholars are keen to distinguish between French colonial occupation of Algeria, Tunisia, and other countries and the Protectorate status of Morocco, I found that the legal distinction did not resonate for Moroccans, who referred to the Protectorate period and by extension, domination of any outsider group over them, as colonialism (istiymar).

references cited

Abu-Lughod, Lila

Alahyane, Mohamed

Appadurai, Arjun

Aspinion, Robert


Balzer, Marjorie M.

Barth, Fredrik

Basso, Keith

Bender, Barbara, ed.

Benhlal, Mohamed

Berque, Jacques

Bidwell, Robin

Bloch, Maurice

Bohlman, Philip

Boukous, Ahmed
Bouzid, Ahmed
Burke, Edmund, III
Burnham, Philip
Casey, Edward S.
Caton, Steven C.
Chaker, Salem
Clement, Capitaine
Clifford, James
1997 Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Coplan, David B.
Crawford, David, and Katherine E. Hoffman
Destaing, E.
Dominy, Michelle
2000 Calling the Station Home: Place and Identity in New Zealand’s High Country. Lan-ham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Dunn, Ross
Duranti, Alessandro
Durham, Deborah
Dwyer, Daisy
Dwyer, Kevin
Eickelman, Dale

El Aissati, Abderrahman

El Moujahid, El Houssain
1993 Syntaxe du groupe nominal en berbère Tashelhhiyt (Parler d'Igherm, Souss, Maroc). Ph.D. dissertation, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mohamed V University, Rabat.

El Mountassir, Abdallah

Ennaji, Mohamed

Ennaji, Moha, and Pascale Pascon

Feld, Steven, and Keith H. Basso, eds.

Ferguson, James

Foucault, Michel

Friedrich, Paul

Gal, Susan

Galand-Pernet, Paulette

Galaty, John G.

Geertz, Clifford, Hildred Geertz, and Lawrence Rosen

Gellner, Ernest

Genevois, Henri
1975 Le calendrier agraire et sa composition. Le Fichier Périodique 125(1).

Goffman, Erving
Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Goodwin

Gray, John

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson

Hart, David

Heidegger, Martin

Hensel, Chase

Herzfeld, Michael

Hill, Jane H.

Hoffman, Katherine E.

Ilahiane, Hsain

Irvine, Judith T.

Ivy, Marilyn

Jackson, Jean
James, Deborah

Jameson, Fredric
1984 Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Imperialism. New Left Review 146:53–92.

Joseph, Roger, and Terri Brint Joseph

Jouad, Hassan

Justinard, Lt.

Kondo, Dorinne

Kroskrity, Paul

Laoust, Emile

Lefebvre, Claude

Lefebvre, Henri

Lomax, Alan

Malkki, Liisa

Martin, Biddy, and Chandra Mohanty

Montagne, Robert

Myers, Fred

Olsen, Miriam Rovsing
Parkes, Peter
Paul-Margarette, Lucie
Povinelli, Elizabeth A.
Rathzel, Nora
Rodman, Margaret C.
Rosen, Lawrence
Rubin, Gayle
Sadiqi, Fatima
Saib, Jilali
Schieffelin, Bambi B.
Schuyler, Philip D.
Seddon, David
Sherzer, Joel
Stewart, Kathleen
Stokes, Martin
Swearingen, Will D.
Ta’abamrant, Fatima

Taifi, Mohamed

Tapper, Richard

Taussig, Michael

Tilmatine, Mohamed

Waterbury, John

Waterman, Christopher

Williams, Raymond

Youssi, Abderrahman 1990

Katherine E. Hoffman
University of Illinois at Chicago
1007 West Harrison Street
2102 BSB (mc 027)
Chicago, IL 60607-7139
khoffman@uic.edu

accepted June 27, 2001
final version received December 3, 2001