



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“The Arabic dialect of Mosul in a diachronic perspective:
a lexical study”

verfasst von / submitted by

Paola Magno

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2021 / Vienna, 2021

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 066 676

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Arabische Welt: Sprache und
Gesellschaft

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Assoz. Prof. Mag. Dr. Veronika

Ritt-Benmimoun

Mitbetreut von / Co-Supervisor:

Preface

The present work aims to investigate the current linguistic status and the diachronic evolution of Maṣlāwī, the Arabic spoken in Mosul. My interest for this dialect developed during the dialectology course of Professor Procházka, where I had the chance to study in detail the modern Arabic dialects. Maṣlāwī caught my attention because, being reminiscent of the Arabic spoken in Iraq at the Abbasid time, it displays some very old features such as the pronunciation of /r/ as /ġ/ and the preservation of the uvular stop /q/¹. This, together with my passion for linguistics, persuaded me to dedicate my final academic work to this Iraqi dialect.

In order to carry out my research, I decided to collect my data by interviewing at least one native speaker. Though finding Maṣlāwī people in Vienna was difficult, I had the chance to meet two informants, a Muslim and a Christian man, who accepted to be interviewed for my master's thesis. I owe both of them a special thank you for their precious collaboration. My Muslim informant in particular, who has now become a good friend of mine, provided a significant contribution in determining the current and past use of certain Maṣlāwī words and expressions. For this reason and for the considerable amount of time that he dedicated to my research, I am very grateful to him.

A special thank you also goes to my supervisor Professor Ritt-Benmimoun. Her constant support and advice have been essential to achieve this goal and to improve the quality of my academic work.

I would also like to thank all my beloved ones, whose presence has been fundamental during the realization of this project. In the first place, my parents, Raffaella and Michele, who constantly made me feel supported and believed in me and in my capacity.

I thank from my heart my study buddy Ginevra, with whom I had, in the past year, a daily exchange on the progression of my work. Sharing our goals and difficulties helped me keeping up with the writing process.

I also thank Yerko and my cousin Valeria for discussing with me the methodology part, which helped me find a more efficient way to organize my data.

In the end, I would like to thank my cousin Francesca and my friends Greta, Hanna, Enza and Camilla for their love and support.

I would also like to thank myself. Writing my master's thesis has not only represented an academic work but also a unique experience in terms of personal and human growth.

¹ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 416.

Affidavit

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this work. No assistance other than that which is permitted has been used. Ideas and quotes taken directly or indirectly from other sources are identified as such. This written work has not yet been submitted in any part.

Vienna, November 2021

Paola Magno

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paola Magno', with a stylized, cursive script.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	8
2. Context and state of art	10
2.1 Mosul: historical background and current status	10
2.1.1 Current size, status and demographics	10
2.1.2 From the pre-Islamic era to the Safavid conquest.....	11
2.1.3 From the Ottoman Empire to the British Mandate.....	12
2.1.4 Mosul in the 20th century.....	14
2.1.5 The ISIL occupation.....	15
2.2 Maşlāwi: classification in the modern Arabic dialectal landscape.....	17
2.2.1 The Mesopotamian group.....	17
2.2.2 The <i>qaltu</i> and <i>gilit</i> subcategories.....	19
2.2.3 Communal dialects of Mosul: a valid hypothesis?.....	20
2.3 State of art and current linguistic situation	21
3. Purpose of the investigation	24
3.1 Research question	24
3.2 Methodology.....	25
4. Dialectal features of Maşlāwi.....	28
4.1 Phonology.....	28
4.1.1 Consonants	28
4.1.2 Vowels.....	29
4.1.3 Other phonological characteristics	30
4.2 Morphology	31
4.2.1 Independent pronouns	31
4.2.2 Pronominal suffixes.....	32
4.2.3 Demonstrative pronouns	33
4.2.4 Indefinite marker	33
4.2.5 Definite article and relative pronoun.....	34
4.2.6 Basic stem	34
4.2.7 Derivation.....	36
4.3 Syntax	37
4.3.1 Possession.....	37
4.3.2 Verb modifiers.....	37
4.3.3 Copula	39
4.3.4 Anticipatory pronoun	39

4.3.5	Negation	39
5.	Presentation and analysis of the results	41
5.1	Organization and classification of the data collected	41
5.2	Loanwords from other languages	43
5.2.1	English loanwords	43
5.2.2	Persian and Kurdish loanwords	46
5.2.3	Turkish loanwords	49
5.2.4	European loanwords	53
5.2.5	Aramaic influence	54
5.3	Phonological phenomena	55
5.3.1	The shift /r/ to /ġ/: peculiarities	55
5.3.2	The shift /r/ to /ġ/: related phenomena	57
5.3.3	Short vowels other than /a/ and /ə/	57
5.3.4	Medial Imāla	58
5.3.5	Final Imāla	60
5.4	Morphological phenomena: peculiarities of the verbal patterns	62
5.5	Syntactic phenomena: the genitive marker	63
6.	Diachronic analysis	65
6.1	Research question, methodology and sources employed	65
6.2	Presentation and discussion of the results of the diachronic analysis	67
6.2.1	Organization of the results: the diachronic categories	67
6.2.2	Preservation of the words occurring in the old sources	69
6.2.3	Phonological and morphological changes in a diachronic perspective	71
6.2.4	Words fallen into disuse	72
6.2.5	Semantic changes: shift, reduction and extension	74
6.2.6	Accommodation towards Muslim Baghdadi	80
7.	Summary and conclusion	85
	List of references	87
	Appendix 1	92
	Appendix 2	122
	List of images	193
	Abstracts	194

List of abbreviations

1. Languages

OA	Old Arabic	CA	Classical Arabic
MSA	Modern Standard Arabic	CM	Christian Maṣlāwī
MM	Muslim Maṣlāwī	JM	Jewish Maṣlāwī
MB	Muslim Baghdadi	CB	Christian Baghdadi
JB	Jewish Baghdadi	qD	<i>qəltu</i> dialects
Turk.	Turkish	Pers.	Persian
Engl.	English	Kurd.	Kurdish

2. Bibliographical references

SO	Socin, Albert. 1882. „Der arabische Dialekt von Mōṣul und Märdīn.“ <i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> 36, 238-277.
WAD	including the volumes I, II, II: Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2011. <i>Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte</i> . Band I. <i>Mensch, Natur, Fauna und Flora</i> . Leiden [u.a.]: Brill. Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2012. <i>Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte</i> . Band II. <i>Materielle Kultur</i> . Leiden [u.a.]: Brill. Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2014. <i>Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte</i> . Band III. <i>Verben, Adjektive, Zeit und Zahlen</i> . Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
WB	Woodhead, Daniel R. and Beene, Wayne. 1967. <i>A Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: Arabic – English</i> . Ed. by Daniel R. Woodhead and Wayne Beene. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

3. Grammar

<	derived from	pl.	plural
>	becomes	sg.	singular
f.	feminine	ps.	person
m.	masculine		

1. Introduction

The present master's thesis proposes a lexical study of the Arabic dialect of Mosul, a city in the North of Iraq.

The dialect of Mosul, also known as Maṣlāwi, belongs to the Mesopotamian group, and in particular to the so-called *qeltu* dialects. These hark back to the vernacular Arabic spoken at the Abbasid time. As the name *qeltu* suggests, their distinguishing features are the preservation of the uvular stop *qāf* and of the inflectional suffix *-tu* of the 1. ps. sg. perfect².

I first approached the study of Mosul Arabic in 2018, in a paper dedicated to the Muslim speech. This primary investigation revealed that the literature on Maṣlāwi has benefitted so far of a few contributions. The first publication on this topic is an article by Albert Socin entitled *Der arabishe Dialekt von Mōṣul und Mārdīn*. This work, appeared in 1882, includes a collection of texts in Mosul Arabic³. Socin's article, however, was not followed by systematic research. After 1882 in fact, the academic works shedding light on Maṣlāwi were Blanc's study of 1964 *Communal dialects in Baghdad* and the articles of Otto Jastrow, published from 1979 onwards. While Blanc's focus on Mosul is secondary as the main object of his work are the dialects spoken in Baghdadi, Jastrow proposes several texts in Jewish, Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi. A detailed analysis of the phonology, morphology and syntax though, is carried out only for the Muslim variety⁴. The phonological and morpho-syntactic features have been the object of more recent inquiries, usually conceived as comparative studies of Maṣlāwi with Modern Standard Arabic and with Muslim Baghdadi - Iraq's prestige dialect- as well as with other *qeltu* dialects⁵. Concerning the lexical aspect, it has received even less attention. To my knowledge, this has been tackled in three Arabic publications, namely the dictionary of Al-Bakrī and the works of Al-Čalabī regarding the Persian and Aramaic loanwords in Maṣlāwi⁶.

As can be seen, the studies that took Maṣlāwi into consideration as main object of their analysis have been so far scarce. The research on the lexical aspect, in particular, benefitted from only three contributions. Therefore, I decided to focus my work on the lexicon of Mosul Arabic.

² Cf. Talay 2011, pp. 909-911.

³ Cf. Socin 1882, pp. 1-53.

⁴ Cf. Blanc 1964 and Jastrow 1979, 1989, 1991, 2001, 2004.

⁵ Cf. Mohammed Abbas & Kadir Mugair 2018; Albuarabi 2018; Procházka 2019; Abu Haidar 2004; Levin 2000.

⁶ Cf. Al-Bakrī, 1972 and Al-Čalabī, 1935 and 1960.

As the title of my work suggests, the analysis will be developed in a diachronic perspective. In particular, the aim of the investigation is to answer the following questions:

- Having Socin's texts and Al-Bakrī's dictionary as old references, which Maṣlāwī lexical items underwent a diachronic change in a time span going from 1882 to 2015⁷?
- To what extent has Maṣlāwī accommodated to Muslim Baghdadi, Iraq's prestige variety?

My investigation will be based on a set of 504 words of everyday use. This represents an adaptation of the questionnaire designed by Behnstedt and Woidich as a survey tool for their work, *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. This set of words was submitted in form of a questionnaire to two informants from Mosul, a Christian and a Muslim. They were asked to translate the terms from German into Maṣlāwī and their answers were then recorded and transcribed in Latin letters. The data collected was then analysed in the light of the research questions.

In the first part of the master's thesis, I will provide a historical introduction on the city of Mosul and the framing of Maṣlāwī as a modern Arabic dialect. An in-depth description of the state of art, of the research questions and of the methodology employed will be also displayed, followed by a detailed sketch of the linguistic features of Mosul Arabic, based on the existing literature.

The second part of the master's thesis will focus on the analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire. These are organized in a table, including the information on the single entry. In particular, the borrowings from foreign languages and the phonological and morpho-syntactic phenomena occurring in the speech of the two informants will be identified and discussed. This analysis will be followed by the diachronic investigation. The single lemmas in the set of words are searched in the old sources and the results are then compared to the questionnaires in order to determine the diachronic changes that the Maṣlāwī lexicon underwent in a time span of almost one hundred and forty years. As the second research question suggestion, one goal of the diachronic investigation is to identify which Maṣlāwī words accommodated to Muslim Baghdadi, Iraq's prestige form.

⁷ The year 2015 was chosen since the Muslim informant left Mosul in this year. Further detail in section 3.3.

2. Context and state of art

2.1 Mosul: historical background and current status



Fig. 1: The city of Mosul

2.1.1 Current size, status and demographics

Mosul, in Arabic *ḥal-Mawṣil* (المَوْصِل), is the capital of the Nineveh governorate and the second largest city in Iraq after Baghdad. Located in the Northeast, it is divided into two parts, respectively Right Bank and Left Bank, by the Tigris River⁸.

Mosul constitutes the most populated city of the Nineveh Governorate. The current number of inhabitants is hard to estimate due to the recent ISIL occupation, which took place from 2014 to 2017. The last reliable statistic dates back to 2014, counting 1.337.000 people. At that time, the population was constituted by a majority of Arab Sunnis (80%), followed by Kurds (Sunnis), Christians (including Assyrians, Armenians and Chaldeans), Turkmen (Sunnis and Shiites), Shabak (Shiites) and Yazidis⁹.

⁸ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 13, accessible at https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/download-manager-files/UN-Habitat_MosulCityProfile_LowRes_170409_V6.pdf [29.10.2021]

⁹ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 21.

This cultural diversity was and is - today only partially - reflected on the linguistic level. The languages spoken within the city are numerous. Among them are Kurdish, Turkman and Neo-Aramaic. Maşlāwī, the vernacular Arabic of Mosul and the object of the present master's thesis, constitutes the lingua franca employed by the different communities¹⁰.

On the economic level, oil export and agriculture have been the main activities of the last decades. Together with them, the industries of cement, textile and food processing also constitute the main drivers of the local economy¹¹.

The social and economic structure presented was deeply uprooted during the years of the ISIL regime. However, in the light of the present study, it is worth analysing how the society of Mosul appeared prior to 2014. The city had gathered for centuries different ethnic and religious groups, reflecting in a way Iraq's cultural diversity. This was the product of a millennial history, involving the succession of different dynasties and yet, the preservation of social diversity. The following sections will provide a detailed historical background, spanning from the Assyrian age to the present day. The aim being to focus on those events, which appear relevant in relation to the history of Mosul Arabic.

2.1.2 From the pre-Islamic era to the Safavid conquest

Details on Mosul in the pre-Islamic era are today largely unknown. A fortress on the western bank of the Tigris, the town constituted a suburb of the Neo-Assyrian capital Nineveh, located on the opposite side of the river. The roles of importance reversed following Nineveh's sack in 612 BC, which determined the decline of the Neo-Assyrian capital and the rise of Mosul's prestige. From this moment on, different dynasties succeeded for centuries in taking control over this area¹². At the time of the Arab conquest in the 7th century, Mosul was part of the Sasanian Empire. Under the rightly guided caliph ʿUmar, the commander ʿUtba Bin Farqad conquered Nineveh in 641 AD. After the capture, the administrative centre shifted from Nineveh towards Mosul, which then became a camp city (*miṣr*)¹³. This marked the beginning of the Arab rule in this territory, which reached the zenith in the 8th century. Under the Umayyads, Mosul became the most important centre of North Mesopotamia¹⁴.

¹⁰ Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 246 and Jastrow 2007, p. 414.

¹¹ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 29.

¹² Cf. Hanson 2012, p. 129.

¹³ Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 413

¹⁴ Cf. Hanson 2012, p. 130.

On the linguistic level, Persian and Aramaic were the dominant languages in the Mosul area prior to the Arab invasion. From the 7th century onwards, Arabic started affirming as the prestige language, replacing Aramaic and to a lesser degree, Persian¹⁵. This process, however, was slow, spanning over the following centuries and it remains, to the present day, scarcely documented¹⁶. In the early 11th century, the city fell under control of the Saljuqs, a Turkic tribe, who though were soon removed by another Turkic dynasty, the Zengids. One of the Zengids' leader, Imād Al-Dīn Zangī, became Atabeg, namely governor, of Mosul in 1127. Under his rule, the city's buildings were restored and beautiful gardens embellished its surroundings¹⁷.

The Zengids ruled over Mosul until the Mongols' invasion of Iraq in the mid-thirteenth century. In contrast to Baghdad and to the southern regions, where the population was massively slaughtered, North Mesopotamia was spared from the Hulagu massacres. This historical event will have a huge impact on the evolution of Iraqi Arabic. The survival of the Northern population in fact, will allow the preservation of some dialectal features harking back to this stage. Mesopotamian Arabic will then split into two categories, the *qeltu* dialects, derived from the 13th century layer, and the *gilit* ones, referring to the Bedouin dialects spoken by the tribes, who repopulated Baghdad and Southern Iraq after the Hulagu massacres¹⁸. The Mongol domination lasted until the early 16th century, when the Turkmen dynasty Aq Qoyunlu established in Mosul. The Turkmen hegemony, however, was meant to end soon since the Safavids took over the Northern province in 1508¹⁹.

2.1.3 From the Ottoman Empire to the British Mandate

In the 16th century, the provinces of Baghdad, Basra and Mosul were incorporated into the Ottoman Empire. Mosul represented the first territory conquered by the Ottomans, who captured the city in 1515²⁰. In that historical moment, the population of Mosul already constituted a cultural mix, composed of Arabs, Turkmens, Kurds, Christians and Jews, together with the Yazidis, a Kurdish-speaking community dwelling on the city's outskirts. On the economic level, the province had a flourishing agriculture and represented a key place on the trade routes

¹⁵ Cf. Procházka 2018, pp. 243-244.

¹⁶ Cf. Holes 2007, p. 123.

¹⁷ Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 414.

¹⁸ Cf. Holes 2007, pp. 130-131.

¹⁹ Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 415.

²⁰ Cf. Al-Tikriti 2007, p. 201.

connecting the Middle East with the Mediterranean since the third millennium BC²¹. Following the Roman example, the Ottomans established an indirect rule in the three provinces, allowing local notables to govern their area on behalf of the Empire. Regarding Mosul, it fell under the control of a Christian family from Diyarbakir, the Al-Ğalili, whereas in the surrounding areas, Kurdish principalities, like the Baban dynasty, wielded the power. Along with these, Sufi orders also played a key role in granting the observance of Islam in Northern Iraq²². On the linguistic level, the new rulers did not impose Ottoman Turkish in the dominated territories. The only fields, where it was widely spread were the army, the central administration and among the rulers²³. Although Arabic remained the most prevalent language in the Arab provinces, research shows that most of the Turkish loans in colloquial Arabic hark back to the Ottoman period rather than deriving from the Turkmens of Iraq²⁴. Indeed, an interesting aspect in the light of the analysis of Mosul Arabic.

The system of indirect rule underwent a change in the early 19th century, when the Ottomans decided to centralize the power, determining the decline of local authorities. The main instruments employed to restore the control over Mesopotamia were the Land Law of 1858 and the Vilayet Law of 1864. The latter, in particular, defined the borders of Iraq and its provinces as they appear to the present day²⁵. These years were also crucial in reshaping the economic balances in the three districts. With the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, Mosul lost its prominence as a commercial hub and Baghdad became first in economic importance on the Iraqi territory²⁶.

The Northern Province will newly acquire prestige in 1927, with the discovery of oilfields in the area of Kirkūk²⁷. At this time, the Ottoman Empire had already collapsed and Mosul, as the rest of Iraq, fell under the British influence. One of the aims of Great Britain was to unify the three provinces in a unique nation, an objective that was finally achieved in 1921 with the foundation of the Kingdom of Iraq²⁸. The new-born Turkish Republic, however, still claimed the former Ottoman province of Mosul, in Turkish *Mosul Vilayet*, as part of the Turkish territory.

²¹ Cf. Al-Tikriti 2007, pp. 201-202 and Tripp 2007, p. 10.

²² Cf. Al-Tikriti 2007, p. 204 and Tripp 2007, pp. 9-10.

²³ Cf. Strauss 2017, p. 116.

²⁴ Cf. Procházka 2009, p. 589.

²⁵ Cf. Tripp 2007, pp. 13-15.

²⁶ Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 415.

²⁷ Cf. Tripp 2007, p. 69.

²⁸ Cf. Tripp 2007, pp. 31-32 and 47.

The Brits managed to retain the Northern district and Iraq finally achieved independence in 1932²⁹.

2.1.4 Mosul in the 20th century

With the independence of Iraq and the designation of Baghdad as capital, Mosul lost much of its prestige. After Britain occupied Iraq again in 1941, new struggles for independence followed, which though did not affect the Northern Province as they affected Baghdad and Basra³⁰. A new political order was established in 1958, when the king was overthrown and the officer ʿAbd Al-Karīm Qāsim took the power. Among the laws introduced, Qāsim promoted an agrarian reform, which de facto represented a threat to the Iraqi landowners. This situation pushed some Maṣlāwī families like the Šammar and Šallāl, who possessed most of the lands surrounding the city, to join the Arab nationalists in the coup of March 1959. Qāsim was not overthrown but a revolt took place in Mosul, involving fights between different ethnic and religious groups and two-hundred casualties³¹.

In these years, Mosul acquired the aspect of a modern city. In 1939 it was connected to the Iraqi railway and in 1967 the University of Mosul was founded. On the administrative level, the province was split into two districts in 1969, Duhūk and Nineveh, the latter having Mosul as capital³². In the 20th century Iraq also witnessed massive population displacements, which contributed to reshaping the social composition of many areas. This was also the case of Mosul. Between 1950 and 1951, the city lost almost completely the Jewish community due to the exodus of Iraqi Jews towards Israel³³. As a result, today there is no report of Jews living in Iraq³⁴. Other minorities were massively displaced under the Baathist regime. In office from 1968, the Baathist party aimed to unify Iraq under the Arab identity and therefore introduced a non-official policy of *Taʿrīb*, “Arabisation”. Many ethnic groups were expelled and Non-Arab cultures oppressed. In the Nineveh plain, Kurds, Turkmens and Yazidis were forced to leave and Arab

²⁹ Cf. Ibid., pp. 57 and 65.

³⁰ Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 416.

³¹ Cf. loc.cit.

³² Cf. Bosworth 2007, p. 416.

³³ Cf. Jastrow 1989, p. 284.

³⁴ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 414.

communities from Central and Southern Iraq took their place. The city of Mosul, though, was less affected by this phenomenon, since most inhabitants were Arab Sunnis³⁵.

The Baathist regime ruled until 2003, when its leader Saddam Hussein was captured in Tikrīt by the American army. This marked the end of the first US-Iraq conflict, which took place in the years preceding the fall of the regime. Regarding the Nineveh district, and thus Mosul too, it was included in the “no-fly zones” of the Kurdish territories for the period going from 1991 until 2003³⁶. The decline of the Baathist regime left a political vacuum in Mosul, which brought about the rise of Kurdish leaders. As a reaction to the previous Arabisation, the Kurds initiated a so-called *Takrīd* or Kurdicisation of the territory, often implying the use of violence³⁷. The Kurdish leadership was reaffirmed in the elections of 2005, which were boycotted by the Arab Sunnis. The conflict between the two factions culminated in the division of the city in two parts, separated by the Tigris River. The Right Bank, more developed, hosted the minorities including Kurds, Christians and Turkmens meanwhile the Left Bank was dwelled by the Arab Sunnis. The struggle for power between Arabs and Kurds marked also the 2009 elections³⁸. Against the backdrop of these political events, different armed groups had established in the Nineveh governorate, concentrating in its capital and producing instability in the area. One of the most powerful was the Islamic State of Iraq, which will be then responsible for capturing Mosul in 2014³⁹.

2.1.5 The ISIL occupation

In June 2014, the self-declared Islamic State of Iraq and the Levante attacked Mosul, defeating the Iraqi army and taking over the city. Its control will last until 2017 and shape irreversibly the city and its population. During this time, the Old city of Mosul was completely destroyed as well as many cultural and religious sites. Among the most important are Jonah’s and Seth tombs, together with the Mosul Museum and Mosul library⁴⁰. In addition to this, several minorities were persecuted. The Christians and the Yazidis in particular, who inhabited Mosul and its periphery, are today no longer part of the city’s population⁴¹. A drastic reduction of the

³⁵ Cf Unhabitat 2016, pp. 77-78.

³⁶ Cf. Ncci 2010, p. 5, accessible at https://www.ncciraq.org/images/infobygov/NCCI_Ninewa_Governorate_Profile.pdf [29.10.2021]

³⁷ Cf. Ibid., p. 5.

³⁸ Cf. Ibid., p. 6.

³⁹ Cf. Ncci 2010, p. 8 and Unhabitat 2016, p. 11.

⁴⁰ For detailed information on the sites destroyed, see maps 27-28 in Unhabitat 2016, pp. 82- 83.

⁴¹ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 21.

Christian minority, however, had already started in the aftermath of the 2003 war⁴². In 2008, 2,270 Christian families left the city following a series of killings and threats targeting them. Most of them found shelter in the Nineveh plain and in the Kurdish regions of Iraq. The remaining Christians were forced to convert to Islam or leave the city. As a result, at the end of July 2014, the Christian community had almost disappeared⁴³. In the same way, other ethnic groups such as the Yazidis, the Shabaks and the Turkmens were persecuted. Parallel to this phenomenon, new groups of people, namely rural migrants from the city's surroundings, Syrian refugees and ISIL families, established in the city⁴⁴.

Mosul was liberated by the Iraqi forces in July 2017⁴⁵. After a three-year occupation, most of the city was destroyed and its social and economic structures deeply uprooted. Several minorities, which had for centuries contributed to the city's cultural diversity, had disappeared, leaving room for a new social configuration⁴⁶.

⁴² Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 246.

⁴³ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 22.

⁴⁴ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 21.

⁴⁵ Prickett 2017, "In Mosul, Revealing the Last ISIS Stronghold", accessible at <https://www.ny-times.com/2017/08/01/world/middleeast/mosul-isis-survivors-rights.html> [9.10.2021]

⁴⁶ Cf. Unhabitat 2016, p. 11.

2.2 Maṣlāwi: classification in the modern Arabic dialectal landscape

2.2.1 The Mesopotamian group

Mosul Arabic belongs to the group of the Mesopotamian dialects. This represents one of the five groups into which the modern Arabic dialects are categorized, the others being the dialects of Maghreb, Egyptian and Sudanese, Syro-Palestinian and the dialects of the Arabian Peninsula⁴⁷.

Mesopotamian dialects are spoken in Iraq and in the North-East of Syria, as well as in some non-Arab regions such as South-eastern Turkey and Iranian Khuzestan. Arabic speakers of this group can be also found in Uzbekistan, in Afghanistan and in the Iranian region of Khorasan⁴⁸. The denomination and classification of Mesopotamian dialects is attributed to the studies of the Israeli scholar Haim Blanc. In his masterly work *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*, Blanc identifies two types of Mesopotamian dialects, the *qeltu* and the *gilit* dialects⁴⁹.

The distribution of these varieties relates to geographical and social criteria. If we imagine a line connecting the cities of Samarra and Fallūḡa in North-Iraq, the *gilit* dialects are spoken by sedentary Muslims dwelling below this line and by nomadic, semi-nomadic and Beduinized groups in the whole country. The *qeltu* dialects, on the other hand, are spoken by non-Muslims (Christians and Jews) everywhere in Iraq and by sedentary Muslims living above the Samarra-Fallūḡa line⁵⁰. According to this classification, Maṣlāwi falls into the *qeltu* category.

The two types of Mesopotamian Arabic hark back to different linguistic stages. The *qeltu* dialects are descendants of the vernacular Arabic spoken in Iraq at the Abbasid time. The *gilit* dialects instead, are the varieties spoken by the Bedouins and those derived from the Bedouinization of the urban dialects in central and southern Iraq. The population of these areas was in fact decimated following the Mongol sacks of 1258 and 1400. During the Ottoman Empire, Baghdad and the cities of Lower Iraq started being repopulated by rural tribes, who presumably spoke a *gilit* dialect. This resulted in a Bedouinization process of the dialect, which continued in the second half of the 20th century with the sedentarization of nomadic and semi-nomadic groups in Iraq and Syria⁵¹.

⁴⁷ Cf. Talay 2011, p. 909.

⁴⁸ Cf. loc.cit.

⁴⁹ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 414.

⁵⁰ Cf. loc.cit.

⁵¹ Cf. Talay 2011, 910.

- the imperfect suffix *-n* for the 2. ps. sg. f. as in *təktəbīn*, “you write (f.)”, and the 2. and 3. ps. pl. as in *təktəbūn*, “you write (pl.)”, *yəktəbūn*, “they write”;
- the indefinite marker *fad* (with several allomorphes);
- the genitive marker *māl*;
- the shibboleth *aku/maku*, “there is/there is not”;
- the object marking with *l-*.

These features are detectable also in Mosul Arabic⁵⁵.

2.2.2 The *qəltu* and *gilit* subcategories

Both *gilit* and *qəltu* dialects have a number of subcategories. Regarding the former, they have been scarcely investigated since certain Iraqi areas were hardly accessible in the past decades. The only exception is represented by Muslim Baghdadi, which has been object of several studies (Erwin 1963, Malaika 1963, Woodhead and Beene 1967). The *gilit* group can be classified as follows⁵⁶:

- I. Northern Mesopotamian group: Syrian *Šāwi* dialects (including Urfa and Raqqa); Rural dialects of northern and central Iraq.
- II. Central Iraqi group: Muslim Baghdadi; Sunni area around Baghdad.
- III. Southern Iraqi and Khuzestan Arabic: Urban dialects (*ḥaḍar*); Rural dialects (*ṣarab*); Marshland dialects.

The *qəltu* dialects, on the other hand, have been thoroughly researched. The majority of the studies were carried out by Otto Jastrow (see Jastrow 1978 and 1981), who has identified four *qəltu* groups, each one displaying subcategories⁵⁷:

- I. Anatolian group: Mardin; Siirt; Diyarbakir; Kozluk-Sason-Mus.
- II. Tigris group: Mosul and surroundings; Tikrīt and surroundings; Baghdad and Southern Iraq (Jews and Christians).
- III. Euphrates group: Xawētna; Dēr iz-Zōr; Ṣāna and ʔAlbu Kmāl; Hīt.

⁵⁵ Further details on the dialectal features of Mosul Arabic will be provided in chapter 4.

⁵⁶ Cf. Talay 2011, p. 912.

⁵⁷ Cf. Talay 2011, p. 911. For an in-depth description of the *qəltu* subcategories, cf. Jastrow 1994, pp. 121-122.

IV. Kurdistan group (Jews): Northern Kurdistan; Southern Kurdistan.

As the classification shows, Mosul and its surrounding villages, including Bəḫzāni, Baḡṣīqa and ʿAyn Səfne, constitute a distinct subcategory called Tigris group⁵⁸. It has been also observed that, among the Tigris dialects, Maṣlāwi shares the most similarities with Christian Baghdadi, presumably due to a common origin of the two varieties⁵⁹. But what is to be understood by the term Maṣlāwi? In this regard, it is worth noticing that the “Mosul” subcategory includes the dialects of the Muslims, Christians and Jews dwelling the city as well as those of the Christians and Yazidis of two villages close to Mosul, Bəḫzāni and Baḡṣīqa⁶⁰. In the next section, I will describe the peculiarities of the speech of Muslims, Christians and Jews of Mosul.

2.2.3 Communal dialects of Mosul: a valid hypothesis?

Blanc first noticed the linguistic differences between Jewish Maṣlāwi and the other two varieties, the Christian and the Muslim one. These discrepancies though, were not attributed to the religious affiliation, rather to diatopic and diastratic factors⁶¹. Jastrow’s later works proved this thesis wrong, highlighting the peculiarity of Jewish Maṣlāwi and its affinity to the Anatolian group⁶². This is evident from the analysis of several texts collected by Jastrow⁶³. Muslim Maṣlāwi, on the other hand, was described in detail by Jastrow in an article presenting a dialect sketch and a short collection of texts. In the same way, one single article has been dedicated to the Christian variety, including two brief texts and a few observations on the phonology of this variety⁶⁴.

According to Jastrow, Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi converge on those points, where they differ from the Jewish variety. Furthermore, the differences observed between the Christian and the Muslim speech are minor and thus considered not related to the communal affiliation⁶⁵. However, since the investigation on the single varieties has been scanty, the researcher should not exclude *a priori* that the divergence between Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi is based on the

⁵⁸ Cf. Talay 2011, p. 911.

⁵⁹ For further details in this regard, cf. Holes 2007, p. 130.

⁶⁰ As mentioned in chapter 1, the Jewish community emigrated to Israel in the 1950s. For the dialect classification, cf. Jastrow 1994, p. 121.

⁶¹ Cf. Blanc 1964, pp. 10-11.

⁶² Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 141-142.

⁶³ Cf. Jastrow 1989, 1990, 1991, 2001.

⁶⁴ For the article on Muslim Maṣlāwi, see Jastrow 1979. For the article on Christian Maṣlāwi, see Jastrow 2004.

⁶⁵ Cf. Procházka 2018, pp. 246-47. Further details on the single variety will be provided in chapter 4.

communal affiliation. My Muslim informant also confirmed this hypothesis, identifying several differences in the speech of Christians and Muslims. As Jastrow stated in his article on Christian Maṣlāwi: „Ob sich...überhaupt eindeutige Divergenzen zwischen Christlich- und Muslimisch-Maṣlāwi werden etablieren lassen, bleibt als Frage für die Zukunft“⁶⁶. This aspect clearly requires further examination.

2.3 State of art and current linguistic situation

The previous chapter shed a light on the classification of Maṣlāwi as a modern Arabic dialect. In this context, Blanc and Jastrow stand out as the major contributors to the research on the North-Iraqi dialects. The investigation on Mosul Arabic, though, started in 1882, when Albert Socin published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* the article „Der arabische Dialekt von Mōṣul und Mārdīn“. This included a collection of seven texts in Maṣlāwi with a related transcription in Latin letters and a translation into German⁶⁷. However, this initial contribution was followed by a long silence of the Western Arabists, only interrupted with the issue of Blanc’s *Communal dialects in Baghdad* of 1964. Though Blanc’s focus clearly lied on the dialects of the Iraqi capital, his sparse commentaries on Mosul Arabic have the merit to stem from the collaboration with Mosul informants⁶⁸.

After Blanc, Jastrow carried out the major investigation on Maṣlāwi. As has been mentioned in section 2.3, he published a dialect sketch and a text collection on the Muslim variety (Jastrow 1979), one article on the Christian dialect (Jastrow 2004) and a series of texts in Jewish Maṣlāwi, including a few considerations on the linguistic discrepancies between this variety and the other two⁶⁹. Another contribution is represented by an unpublished master’s thesis including a dialect sketch and a glossary of Jewish Maṣlāwi (Kelm 1999), which unfortunately I could not examine.

In more recent times, Maṣlāwi was taken into account in several comparative studies, which analysed specific phonological and morpho-syntactic features within the varieties of Iraqi Arabic (Abu-Haidar 2002, Mohammed Abbas and Mugair 2017), in the *qeltu* group (Levin 2000) and in the modern Arabic dialects (Hanitsch 2019). Other studies proposed a comparison of

⁶⁶ Jastrow 2004, p. 142.

⁶⁷ Cf. Socin 1882, pp. 1-53.

⁶⁸ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 4.

⁶⁹ For the texts in Jewish Maṣlāwi, see Jastrow 1989, 1990, 1991, 2001. The discrepancies will be discussed in chapter 4.

Mosul Arabic with the other *qəltu* dialects (Abu-Haidar 2004, Procházka 2018), with the Iraqi varieties (Jastrow 2007) and even with Modern Standard Arabic (Albuarabi 2018). It is worth noticing that most of the above-mentioned works are based on the data collected by Blanc and Jastrow⁷⁰.

The lexical aspect has received even less attention. To my knowledge, this was tackled solely in a few Arabic publications, namely the dictionary of Al-Bakrī issued in 1972 and the works of Al-Čalabī regarding the Persian and Aramaic loanwords in Mašlāwī, published in 1960 and 1935 respectively⁷¹. Another work that is worth mentioning is the *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte* of Behnstedt and Woidich. This includes 490 words of daily use, as spoken in the modern Arabic dialects. Though the dialect of Mosul has been included in the atlas, its data are based on some of the above-mentioned literature, in particular on Jastrow (1979, 2004), Abu-Haidar (2004) and Blanc (1964), and on information taken from the Internet⁷². The use of own data for Mosul is attested only for six lexical items: “river”, “potatoes”, “watermelon”, “hospital”, “bottle” and “to give”⁷³. Furthermore, the dictionary of Al-Bakrī and the article of Socin were not considered, the latter only being mentioned twice for the verbs “to come” and “to see”⁷⁴.

These considerations show that from 1882, the research on Mašlāwī has benefitted from contributions, mostly based on the preexisting data and often very distant in time from each other. In particular, the lack of systematic investigation on the lexicon induced me to focus on this aspect.

Before approaching the research, it is essential to take a look at the current linguistic situation in the city. As stated before, the different religious communities used to speak a *qəltu* variety. The past tense is employed here since the Jews emigrated from Mosul in the 1950s, whereas most of the Christian and Yazidi families disappeared during the ISIL occupation⁷⁵.

On the linguistic level, this implied a gradual decrease of the *qəltu* speakers. At the same time, the number of *gilit* speakers has steadily increased in the last decades. These are represented by the farmers of the rural areas surrounding Mosul, known as *ğaryāwī*, who established in the city

⁷⁰ The authors providing new data are Procházka (2018), Hanitsch (2019) and Mohammed Abbas and Mugair (2017). I could not clarify whether Abu-Haidar (2004) used her own data on Mosul.

⁷¹ Regarding the latter, I do not have access to them but they were included in Blanc’s analysis (1964).

⁷² The authors affirmed to include in the investigation reliable Internet data. However, they do not provide any further specifications. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. xiii.

⁷³ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 424, 460, 512, Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 19 and 157, Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 408.

⁷⁴ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, pp. 89 and 335.

⁷⁵ For further details on the displacement of minorities, which took place in the 20th century, see section 2.1.

during the 1990s, and by southern Iraqis of mixed confessions, emigrating towards North-Iraq after 2003⁷⁶.

According to Hassan, the coexistence of *gilit* and *qeltu* speakers resulted in two main consequences: the accommodation of lexical and phonological features of Maṣlāwī towards Standard Iraqi Arabic, namely Muslim Baghdadi, and the tendency of Maṣlāwī men to speak a *gilit* dialect in the public space. Such a behaviour is due to the fact that Maṣlāwī is perceived as sissy from the *gilit* speakers, thus many boys are encouraged to use the manly *ḡaryāwī* dialect outdoor⁷⁷. This tendency was also confirmed by my Muslim informant.

The phenomena presented seem to reflect two of the five patterns, described by Miller, for the urban vernacular variation related to migration. In one of these, the old urban centre witnessed a population renewal and the newcomers preferred to the old urban dialect, perceived as effeminate, the national urban koine. The urban dwellers are then compelled to use their old urban dialect at home and the national urban koine, Muslim Baghdadi in the case of Iraq, in the public spaces⁷⁸.

In the second pattern, the urban vernacular and the dialect of the migrant population coexist side by side, the latter playing an important role and hence influencing the former⁷⁹.

It could be then supposed that, next to the process of dialect levelling towards Muslim Baghdadi, Maṣlāwī men tend to accommodate to the dialect of the newcomers, undergoing a *gilization*. With this term, I intend to refer to the process of dialect levelling towards the *gilit* varieties of the migrants. This entails the avoidance of stigmatized Maṣlāwī features and the adoption of lexical and phonological items typical of the *gilit* group⁸⁰.

The comprehension of the linguistic dynamics taking place in Mosul is essential in order to frame the investigation on the Maṣlāwī lexicon. This will be carefully formulated in the next section.

⁷⁶ Cf. Hassan 2019, pp. 1-2.

⁷⁷ Cf. Ibid., p. 2.

⁷⁸ Cf. Miller 2004, p. 194.

⁷⁹ Cf. loc. cit.

⁸⁰ Research on the contact between two languages or dialects show that the phonological and lexical features are the first to be borrowed. Cf. Palva 2012, p. 35.

3. Purpose of the investigation

3.1 Research question

The previous section shed a light on the state of research in Mosul Arabic as well as on the phenomena of dialect contact and dialect levelling, which have been taking place in the city. As mentioned in section 2.3, the lack of investigations on the lexicon induced me to focus on this aspect. Furthermore, since the phonological and lexical items are the first to be borrowed in the context of dialect contact, the study on the lexicon will provide a clearer picture of the variation that occurred in Mosul Arabic⁸¹.

As the title of the work suggests, the analysis will be developed in a diachronic perspective.

Two major sources will be investigated to carry out this research: the texts collected by Socin in his 1882 article and Al-Bakrī's dictionary of 1972 *Dirāsāt fī 'l-ʔalfāḍ al-ḡammīya 'l-mawṣilīya: wa muqāranatuhā maʿa 'l-ʔalfāḍ al-ḡammīya fī 'l-ʔaqālīm al-ḡarabīya*. In particular, the aim of the investigation is to answer the following questions:

- Having Socin's texts and Al-Bakrī's dictionary as old references, which Maṣlāwī lexical items underwent a diachronic change in a time span going from 1882 to 2015⁸²?
- To what extent has Maṣlāwī accommodated to Muslim Baghdadi, Iraq's prestige variety?

Concerning the first research question, the investigation will include the identification of the diachronic phenomena that affected the lexicon, including the conservation, the falling into disuse and the linguistic development of specific lexical items.

The second question is based on the assumption that, on the phonological and lexical level, Mosul Arabic has been accommodating to Standard Iraqi, namely Muslim Baghdadi. The decision to restrict the field of investigation to this dialect, without considering the influence of the ḡaryāwī and on the Southern-Iraqi varieties, lies in two reasons: on one hand, the literature on the *gilit* dialects, and in particular on these varieties, has been so far very scanty; on the other, the necessity to optimize my research by focusing on one object of analysis⁸³.

⁸¹ Cf. Palva 2012, p. 35.

⁸² The year 2015 was chosen since the Muslim informant left Mosul in this year. Further detail in section 3.2.

⁸³ See section 2.2.2 for the state of research on the *gilit* dialects.

Therefore, the aim of the second research question is to identify which phonological and lexical items typical of Muslim Baghdadi occur in today's Mosul Arabic. As a reference for this part of the diachronic analysis, I will use the *Sprachatlas* of Behnstedt & Woidich⁸⁴.

In addition to the diachronic study, the phonological and morpho-syntactic changes, which might appear analysing the lexicon, will be discussed. Being also the first linguistic features to be borrowed in dialect contact, together with the lexicon, the phonological ones will receive particular attention⁸⁵.

Having defined the research questions, I will outline in the next section the methodology chosen for the investigation.

3.2 Methodology

My research is based on a set of 504 words of everyday use, which is designed on the survey tool used by Behnstedt and Woidich for their *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*⁸⁶. In the *Sprachatlas*, the lemmas are divided in multiple categories: men (including kinship terms), persons, professions, body parts, human qualities and defects, animals (including domestic animals and other animals), nature and cardinal points, plants, palm-trees and their parts, constructions, domicile, house and utensils, clothes, food, drinks, agriculture (including agricultural tools and activities), commerce, vehicles, communication, materials, verbs, adjectives, numerals and time, functional words (including interrogation words, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions), indefinites, reflexive pronoun, genitive exponents and other various words.

The set of words has been partly modified. I added the words “camel”, sg. (lemma 100), “domicile” (lemma 190), “hungry” (lemma 419), together with the numbers from 1 to 10 (lemma 421), the week days (422) and the month names (lemma 426). I also changed lemma 397 from “bring!” to “bring me!”. Lemma 483, corresponding to “or”, was both asked as an isolated word and in the sentence “Coffee or tea?”.

As mentioned in section 2.3, Mosul Arabic is occasionally mentioned in the *Sprachatlas*, relying on data taken from the existing literature and from the Internet. For Baghdad and Basra, on

⁸⁴The word *Sprachatlas* is used in the whole work as a synonym for *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*.

⁸⁵ Cf. Palva 2012, p. 35.

⁸⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, 2012, 2014.

the other hand, the information was obtained by interviewing Iraqi informants coming from these two cities⁸⁷.

Hence, I decided to submit this set of words, in the form of Behnstedt and Woidich's questionnaire, to two informants from Mosul, one Christian and one Muslim.

The Muslim informant is a 34-year-old man, who was born in Mosul and lived there until 2015. He studied English and Arabic at the University of Mosul and worked as a journalist and as an English teacher. He came to Vienna in 2015, where he has been learning German for two years. He is fluent in both English and German.

The Christian informant is a man presumably in his late sixties - when I asked him, he did not want to say his exact age. He lived and studied in Mosul and left the city to come to Austria forty years ago, namely in the early 1980s. He currently lives in Vienna, where he has a commercial activity. He masters both English and German very well.

The words in the questionnaire were presented to the informants in German and they were asked to translate them into Maṣlāwī. The answers were recorded and written in Latin letters, using the DMG transcription, which is employed as a transcription method in the present work.

Before approaching the analysis of the data, a sketch of the dialectal features of Maṣlāwī, based on the existing literature, is provided. This will serve as a reference to identify the linguistic phenomena occurring in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī.

The data collected will be organized in a table, including the 504 words in English and their relative translation in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī. In this list, I will specify loanwords, missing translations, multiple translations as well as the phonological, morphological and lexical differences between the Christian and the Muslim speech⁸⁸.

The results of the questionnaire will be also presented and discussed in a chapter of the present work, including an in-depth description of the loanwords and of the linguistic phenomena documented in the speech of the informants.

This first part of the investigation will be followed by the diachronic analysis. In the case of Socin's article, I first searched in the German texts for the lemmas in my set of words and I then referred to the respective Arabic translation to see if this corresponds to the answers provided by the informants. In the second stage, I searched for the words provided by the informants in the Arabic texts of Socin and in Al-Bakrī's dictionary.

The results are then evaluated from a diachronic perspective to highlight the lexical changes occurred in the different historical moments.

⁸⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, 2012, 2014.

⁸⁸ The list can be found as an attachment to the master's thesis.

The investigation of the old sources will be followed by the search of the Muslim Baghdadi forms in the *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. The terms provided by the Christian and the Muslim informant will be compared to their equivalents in Muslim Baghdadi and they will be evaluated to detect possible phenomena of phonological and lexical accommodation to Iraq's prestige dialect.

It is worth mentioning that a part of this investigation could not be carried out with the *Sprachatlas*, since the last volume of this work was published in 2021, when I already concluded the search in the sources. This volume includes the following categories: functional words (including interrogation words, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions), indefinites, reflexive pronoun, genitive exponents and various other words. In order to investigate these terms, I employed alternative sources, represented by the article *Baghdadi Arabic* (Abu-Haidar 2006), the article *Iraq* (Jastrow 2007), the work *Communal dialects in Baghdad* (Blanc 1964) and two dictionaries of Iraqi Arabic, *the Georgetown dictionary of Iraqi-Arabic* (Maamouri 2013) and *A Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: Arabic – English* (Woodhead & Beene, 1967). In some cases, I double-checked the results in the sources with a Muslim informant from Baghdad, in order to confirm the current use of certain words.

4. Dialectal features of Maṣlāwī

4.1 Phonology

4.1.1 Consonants

Inventory of the consonants in Maṣlāwī⁸⁹:

	Bilabial	Labio-dental	Inter-dental	Dental-alveolar	Palatal	Velar	Uvular	Pharyngeal	Glottal
Plosive									
voiceless	p			t ṭ		k	q		(ʔ)
voiced	b			d		g			
Affricate									
voiceless					č				
voiced					ğ				
Fricative									
		f							
voiceless			ṯ	s ṣ	š	x		ħ	h
voiced			ḏ ḍ	z		ġ		ʕ	
Nasal									
	m			n					
Lateral									
				l ḷ					
Trill									
				r ɾ					
Approximant									
	w				y				

The phonemes /p/, /g/ and /č/ were introduced via borrowings from foreign languages, such as Turkish, Persian, Kurdish but also English, for example *čōl*, Turk. “desert”, *pīs*, Turk. “dirty”; *laga*, Kurd. and Turk. “tub”; *parda*, Pers. “curtain”; *pančar*, Engl. “puncture, flat tire”. The interdental fricatives /ṯ/, /ḏ/, /ḍ/, are retained as in the other Iraqi Arabic dialects⁹⁰.

⁸⁹ Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 248 and Jastrow 2007, p. 416.

⁹⁰ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 416 and Wadie 2004, pp. 42-43.

A hallmark of Maṣlāwī is the shift of the Old Arabic phoneme /r/ to the velar fricative /ġ/. This linguistic feature characterizes the *qəltu* dialects of the Tigris group and harks back to the Arabic spoken at the Abbasid time⁹¹.

This shift has induced several phonemic changes. One of these is the elision of /ġ/ and the lengthening of the short vowel in the sequence *vġC*, e.g. *qōṣa* < *qəġṣa*, “loaf”, *ōbṣa* < *ōbaṣa* < *aġbaṣa*, “Wednesday”. Another phenomenon is the assimilation of /ġ/ in contact with certain consonants like /q/, e.g. *aqqabi* < *aqġabi*, “scorpion”, or its disappearance, as in the word *lbēḥa* < *lbēġḥa* < *lbēriḥa* “yesterday”. It is worth mentioning that in Socin’s article OA /r/ is not reported as /ġ/ in any occurrence⁹².

According to Jastrow, another trait characterizing Maṣlāwī is the devoicing of the consonant at the end of the word. This occurs when the final phoneme is either /b/ or /d/⁹³. However, my findings on Muslim Maṣlāwī of 2018 showed that those consonants are retained in the final position, both in pausal and non-pausal form, e.g. *əḥtidāb*, “curve”, *šarbat zbīb*, “raisin juice”, *taqālīd*, “traditions”, *wēḥəd*, “one (person)”.

4.1.2 Vowels

Maṣlāwī displays, as the other *qəltu* dialects, two short phonemic vowels: /a/ and /ə/. The former represents the Old Arabic /a/, whereas the latter is the result of the merging of Old Arabic /i/ and /u/: *əmm* < *umm*, “mother”, *kəmmi* < *kimma* “hat”⁹⁴.

The inventory of the long vowels, on the other side, is composed of five phonemes: /ā/, /ē/, /ī/, /ō/, /ū/. Whereas /ā/, /ī/, /ū/ hark back to the corresponding OA phonemes, the long vowels /ē/ and /ō/ became part of the long vowel inventory through different processes:

- Monophthongization of the diphthongs *ay* and *aw* to /ē/ and /ō/ respectively, e.g. *tnēn*, “two”, *yəḥkōn*, “they tell”⁹⁵;
- Loans from foreign languages, e.g. Turk. *čöl*, “desert” and *mēz*, “table”⁹⁶;

⁹¹ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 416.

⁹² Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 38 and Blanc 1964, p. 22.

⁹³ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 41.

⁹⁴ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 39 and Jastrow 2007, p. 417.

⁹⁵ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

⁹⁶ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 417.

- Lowering of the long vowels /ī/ > /ē/ and /ū/ > /ō/ in contact with /x/, /ğ/, /q/, /ħ/ and /ʕ/ as well as with emphatic consonants, e.g. *sōq*, “Markt”, *ṭabēx*, “gekochtes Essen”⁹⁷.

4.1.3 Other phonological characteristics

In addition to the above-mentioned processes, the phonemes /ī/ and /ē/ can result from the shift of the Old Arabic /ā/ to /ī/, in the vicinity of an OA /i/ or /ī/. This phenomenon, named by the Arab grammarians *Imāla*, literally “inclination”, characterizes all *qəltu* dialects. We can distinguish between medial *Imāla* – the shifted phoneme is in the middle of the word – and final *Imāla* – the shifted phoneme is at the end of the word⁹⁸.

In Maṣlāwi, the medial *Imāla* has two forms: the phoneme /ā/ shifts to /ē/ when in the adjacent syllable an OA /i/ occurs, e.g. *ḡawēməʕ* < OA *ḡawāmiʕ*, and to /ī/ when an OA /ī/ occurs, i.e. *basītīn* < OA *basātīn*, respectively. It is worth noticing that this pattern characterizes both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi. Jewish speakers follow the Anatolian model, displaying an *Imāla* towards /ē/ in proximity of an OA /ī/: (JM) *ṭamēnīn* < OA *ṭamānīn*, (MM, CM) *ṭamīnīn* < OA *ṭamānīn*, “eighty”⁹⁹.

Word-final *Imāla* occurs when final /a/ is preceded neither by an emphatic nor by a back consonant. Again, Jewish Maṣlāwi follows the Anatolian pattern, in that the final /a/ shifts to /e/, whereas Christian and Muslim speakers display an *Imāla* towards /i/: (JM) *kəbbe* < OA *kubba*, (CM, MM) *kəbbi* < OA *kubba*, “typical dish made of meat”¹⁰⁰.

A third kind of *Imāla*, peculiar to Maṣlāwi and to the Anatolian dialects, is what Blanc denoted as productive *Imāla*. This occurs when a suffix including an /i/ or /ī/, is attached to a word containing the phoneme /ā/, determining the shift of /ā/ towards /ē/. In Mosul Arabic, recurring suffixes of this kind are the Turkish endings *-li* and *-çi*: *bəstān*, “garden” > *bəstēnçi*, “gardener”; *Baḡdād*, “Baghdad” > *baḡdēdli*, “a Baghdadi”¹⁰¹.

Two other phonological processes are anaptyxis in word-final clusters and stress shift. Anaptyxis in the sequence CvCC# occurs in both *gilit* and *qəltu* dialects. The latter have /ə/ as

⁹⁷ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

⁹⁸ Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 248.

⁹⁹ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40 and Jastrow 2004, p. 142.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. loc. cit.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 47.

anaptyctic vowel, though with a different distribution in the *qəltu* subcategories¹⁰². Muslim Maṣlāwi shows the same pattern as Christian Baghdadi and Christian Maṣlāwi, having an epenthetic /ə/ introduced in every final cluster of two consonants: (CB) *dağəb*, “way”, *mələh*, “salt”, *bənət*, “daughter”¹⁰³; (CM) *əşşəbəh*, “the morning”, *laḥəm*, “meat”¹⁰⁴. This contrasts with Jewish Maṣlāwi, where, in the same way as in the Anatolian dialects, an /ə/ is inserted only when the final consonant is either *m*, *n*, *l* or *r*, i.e. *laḥəm*, *dəhən* but *bənt* and *məlḥ*¹⁰⁵.

Regarding the stress shift, this occurs when a pronominal suffix is attached to a verb or a noun. In this situation, the stress shifts to the word’s last syllable, as the following examples show: *mašākəl* “problems” > *mašākələm*, “their problems”; *qəşša*, “story” > *qəşşəti*, “my story”¹⁰⁶.

4.2 Morphology

4.2.1 Independent pronouns

3rd	sg. masc.	<i>huwwa</i>	3rd	pl.	<i>humma</i>
	sg. fem.	<i>hīya</i>			
2nd	sg. masc.	<i>ənta</i>	2nd	pl.	<i>əntəm</i>
	sg. fem.	<i>ənti</i>			
1st	sg.	<i>ana</i>	1st	pl.	<i>əḥna (nəḥna)</i>

The table shows the independent pronouns for Muslim Maṣlāwi. In Jewish Maṣlāwi, the third persons slightly differ: 3. sg. m. *hūwe*, 3. sg. f. *hīye*, 3.pl. *həmme*¹⁰⁷.

It is worth noticing that the Muslim Baghdadi forms *huwwa* (3rd sg. m.) and *humma* (3rd pl.) replaced the Maṣlāwi pronouns *hīnu* (3rd sg. m.) and *hīyəm* (3rd pl.). The latter developed by

¹⁰² Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 418.

¹⁰³ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 41.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Jastrow 2004, p. 143/26, 28.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Jastrow 1989, p. 287.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 249.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 419.

the suffixation of the 3. ps. sg. f. basis *hīy-* with the bound pronouns *-nu* and *-əm*¹⁰⁸. My recordings also showed that the Maṣlāwī form of the 1. ps. pl. *nəḥna* was replaced by *əḥna*¹⁰⁹.

Independent pronouns of the third person are also used as a second pronominalized object when they are suffixed to verbs. In this case, they often appear in a shortened form: *ʕaṭētūk-uwwa*, “I gave it (m.) to you”; *ʕaṭētūk-īya*, “I give it (f.) to you”; *ʕaṭētūk-īyəm*, “I gave them to you”¹¹⁰ but also *mā-nəḥī-ki-hīyəm*, “we do not give them to you”¹¹¹.

4.2.2 Pronominal suffixes

		after C	after V			after C	after V
3rd	sg. masc.	<i>-u</i>	<i>-nu</i>	3rd	pl.	<i>-həm</i>	<i>-əm</i>
	sg. fem.	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ha</i>				
2nd	sg. masc.	<i>-ak</i>	<i>-k</i>	2nd	pl.	<i>-kəm</i>	<i>-kəm</i>
	sg. fem.	<i>-ki</i>	<i>-ki</i>				
1st	sg.	<i>-i</i>	<i>-yi (-ni)</i>	1st	pl.	<i>-na</i>	<i>-na</i>

A particular suffix is the allomorph of the 3. ps. sg. masc. *-nu*. It originated from the imperfect forms of the 3. ps. pl. followed by the suffix *-u*, like *yšūfūnu*, “they see him”, which has been re-elaborated as *yšūfū-nu*, with *-nu* as bound pronoun. The pronominal suffix *-nu* is typical of the Tigris group and occurs especially after long vowels, as in *abūnu*, “his father” or *nsammīnu*, “we name it”¹¹². A significant feature, identified by Jastrow as distinctive of Jewish Maṣlāwī, is the replacement of *h* by a glide in the 3. ps. sg. f. *-ha*, when the suffix is preceded either by /ī/ or /ū/, as in *abūwa*, “her father” or *nsammīya*, “we name her”¹¹³. This phenomenon can be also detected among Muslim speakers, as the following examples show: *bīya*, “in it (f.)”; *yaḥmalūwa*, “they make it (f.)”; *kānu yustaxdimūwa*, “they used it (f.)”¹¹⁴. Christian Maṣlāwī,

¹⁰⁸ The Maṣlāwī forms of bound pronouns are presented in the following section. Also, cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 42. In my recordings of September 2018, the only form occurring is *əḥna*.

¹¹⁰ Jastrow 1979, p. 43.

¹¹¹ Jastrow 2004, p. 143/ 8.

¹¹² Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 419.

¹¹³ Cf. loc. cit.

¹¹⁴ Examples from my recordings of September 2018.

on the other hand, only displays the form with /h/: *kəlla axaḏūha mənəna*, “they took all from us”, *kānət bīha ssāʕa īdaʕəš*, “it was 12 here”¹¹⁵

4.2.3 Demonstrative pronouns

“this”	“that”
sg. m. <i>hāda</i>	sg. m. <i>hadāk</i>
sg. f. <i>hāyi</i>	sg. f. <i>hadīk</i>
pl. <i>hadōl(i)</i>	pl. <i>hadōk(i)</i>

The forms presented in the table are typical for Muslim Maṣlāwī¹¹⁶. Jewish Maṣlāwī differs only in the plural demonstrative pronoun of proximity, *hōde* (instead of *hadōli*)¹¹⁷.

4.2.4 Indefinite marker

A hallmark of both *gilit* and *qəltu* dialects is the indefinite marker *fad*, which harks back to the Old Arabic *fard*, “one, a single”. According to Blanc, Mosul Arabic displays this particle in the forms *fadd* and *faḡəd*¹¹⁸. However, *faḡəd* is the only one attested in Jastrow’s findings: (MM) *faḡəd šaxəš*, “a man”; (JM) *faḡəd sāʕa*, “an hour”; (CM) *faḡəd tāt sāʕāt arbaʕ sāʕāt*, “about three, four hours”; (CM) *faḡəd sāʕtēn*, “a couple of hours”¹¹⁹. As the examples show, *faḡəd* can also precede nouns in dual and plural, as well as numerals and convey the meaning of an approximate indication.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Jastrow 2004, p. 143/ 7, 23.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 44.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Jastrow 1989, p. 287.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Blanc 1964, pp. 118-119.

¹¹⁹ (MM) Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 8; (JM) Jastrow 1989, p. 291/ 8; (CM) Jastrow 2004, p. 144/ 27. It is also worth mentioning that the indefinite marker does not appear at all in my recordings of September 2018.

4.2.5 Definite article and relative pronoun

The definite article is *əl* for all *qəltu* dialects. It is assimilated to the following consonant, when this is a sun letter: (MM) *ən-nāġ*, “the fire”; (CM) *mən əš-šāḥina*, “from the van”; (JM) *əl-laḥəm*, “the meat”¹²⁰.

The relative pronoun is *əlli*. It introduces relative clauses referring to a definite head noun: *xālətna əlli təskən b-əmḥall-ət əl-ġūlāq*, “our aunt, who lives in the Ġūlāq neighbourhood”¹²¹. An allomorph of *əlli* is *əl*, which is identical to the definite article and also undergoes assimilation with sun letters: (MM) *əš-šənnānu*, “(the one) that we took”¹²². In some cases, the head noun appears unmarked, as in the following examples: (MM) *waqt əlnākəlu*, “when we (want to) eat it”, *waqt əddənākəlu*, “when we want to eat it”¹²³. These expressions show a certain resemblance to the construct state, in which the governing noun does not display a definite article. This similarity is detected also in some fixed noun-plus-qualifier constructions, where the head noun is left unmarked: (MM) *ʕazimət əlləxx*, “the other invitation” and *marrt əlləxx*, “another time”¹²⁴. The absence of the definite article in noun-plus-qualifier and in noun-plus-relative clause structures is also characteristic of other *qəltu* dialects, for instance Christian and Jewish Baghdadi: (CB) *šbāʕa ləkbīgi*, “the big finger”, *yōm əssāfar*, “the day he left”; (JB) *šlāt ləġdīdi*, “The Great Synagogue”, *šēn laġīdu*, “the thing I want”¹²⁵.

4.2.6 Basic stem

Mosul Arabic displays, as the other *qəltu* dialects, two patterns for form I of the strong verbs: *faʕal* and *fəʕəl* for the perfect, *yəʕəl* and *yəʕʕal* for the imperfect. These forms hark back to the OA transitive *faʕala* and intransitive *faʕula/ faʕila* patterns¹²⁶. Examples of the two paradigms are presented below:

¹²⁰ (MM) Jastrow 1979, p. 70/ 29; (CM) Jastrow 2004, p. 142/ 4; (CM) Jastrow 1989, p. 291/ 1.

¹²¹ Cf. Procházka 2018, pp. 258-259.

¹²² Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

¹²³ Jastrow 1979, p. 70/ 31, 32.

¹²⁴ Jastrow 1979, p. 62/ 12 and p. 64/ 9.

¹²⁵ Blanc 1964, pp. 127-28.

¹²⁶ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 423.

		sg.	pl.		sg.	pl.
Perfect	1.	<i>qataltu</i>	<i>qatalna</i>		<i>msaktu</i>	<i>msakna</i>
	2. m.	<i>qatálət</i>	<i>qataltəm</i>		<i>msəkət</i>	<i>msəktəm</i>
	2. f.	<i>qatalti</i>			<i>msəkti</i>	
	3. m.	<i>qatal</i>	<i>qatalu</i>		<i>məsək</i>	<i>məsku</i>
	3. f.	<i>qátalət</i>			<i>məskət</i>	
		sg.	pl.		sg.	pl.
Imperfect	1.	<i>aqtəl</i>	<i>nəqtəl</i>		<i>amsak</i>	<i>nəmsak</i>
	2. m.	<i>təqtəl</i>	<i>təqtəlūn</i>		<i>təmsak</i>	<i>təmsakūn</i>
	2. f.	<i>təqtəlīn</i>			<i>təmsakīn</i>	
	3. m.	<i>yəqtəl</i>	<i>yəqtəlūn</i>		<i>yəmsak</i>	<i>yəmsakūn</i>
	3. f.	<i>təqtəl</i>			<i>təmsak</i>	

As can be seen in the table, there is no gender distinction in the plural form. The final *-n* of the 2. ps. sg. f. *-īn* and of the 2. and 3. ps. plural *-ūn* is elided when a pronominal suffix is attached to the verb: *yəqšaʕūn*, “they see” becomes *yəqšaʕū-k*, “they see you (sg. m.)”¹²⁷. Another feature peculiar to the *qəltu* dialects, including Maşlāwi, is a special paradigm for the defective verbs of the type $R_3 = yāʔ$ ¹²⁸. This contrasts with the *gilit* dialects, in which those verbs and the regular verbs display the same inflectional endings¹²⁹.

¹²⁷ Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 251.

¹²⁸ For an example of this paradigm, cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 46.

¹²⁹ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 423.

4.2.7 Derivation

Mosul Arabic has nine derived forms. Form II displays as inflectional bases *CaCCaC* for the perfect and *-CaCCəC* for the imperfect, as in *kammal*, *ykamməl*, “to accomplish something”. It is usually causative, transitive or intensive of form I but it also can be denominative, in relation to an Arabic or non-Arabic noun¹³⁰. Quadriconsonantal roots follow the conjugation of form II, appearing in the perfect as *C₁aC₂C₃aC₄* and in the imperfect as *yC₁aC₂C₃əC₄*¹³¹.

Form III is characterized by an /ē/ instead of the expected /ā/, as in the verb *ṣēdaq*, *yṣēdaq*, “to befriend someone”. Diachronically seen, /ē/ first appeared in the imperfect form, where an Imāla occurred in the presence of the /i/ of the adjacent syllable: *-CāCiC* > *-CēCiC*. Since the perfect and imperfect of the derived forms present a different vowel only in the second syllable, the perfect form acquired an /ē/ in a later stage, in order to avoid asymmetry¹³².

Form V is reflexive or intransitive of form II, differing only for the prefix *t-*: *qayyaz*, “to change”, *tqayyaz*, “to change oneself”. The inflectional bases are the same in perfect and imperfect: *tkayyaf*, *yatkayyaf*, “to be happy for something”. This is also true for form VI, as can be seen in the verb *tṣāwən*, *yātṣāwən*, “to help each other”. Form VI is in most cases reciprocal of form III, whose perfect base pattern is identical except for the prefix *t-*: *ṣēwən* > *tṣāwən*. Interestingly, the long /a/ of form VI did not undergo the Imāla¹³³.

Form IV disappeared both in the *gilit* and *qəltu* dialects, surviving only in some fossilized forms like *aṣbah*, *yāṣbah*, “to become”¹³⁴. In the same way, there is no trace of the internal passive, so the passive voice is expressed through form VII: *qatal*, “to kill”, *nqatal*, “to be killed”. The prefix *n-* can be assimilated to the following letter, if this is either *p*, *b* or *m*: *mmalak*, “to be engaged to someone”. The inflectional bases are different in perfect and in the imperfect: *nCaCaC*, *-nCəCəC*. The same occurs in form VIII, in which the infix *-t-* is inserted after R₁, *CtaCaC*, *-CtəCəC*, as in *ftaham*, *yāftəhəm*, “to understand”¹³⁵.

Form IX is related to colours and to infirmities and displays the same inflectional bases in perfect and imperfect, *C₁C₂aC₃C₃*, as in *ḥmarṛ*, *yəḥmarṛ*, “to turn red”. Regarding form X, it does

¹³⁰ Jastrow relates the derivation system in Mosul to that of the *qəltu* dialects. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 47. For form II, cf. Jastrow 1978, pp. 163-165.

¹³¹ Cf. Jastrow 1978, pp. 172-174.

¹³² Cf. Ibid., pp. 174-175.

¹³³ Cf. Jastrow 1978, pp. 183-186.

¹³⁴ Only in Dēr izZōr there are still traces of form IV. Cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 180.

¹³⁵ Cf. Jastrow 1978, pp. 187-191.

not occur so frequently in the *qeltu* dialects. It is characterized by the prefix *sta-*, *staCCaC* and *yastaCCaC*, as in *staxdam*, *yastaxdam*, “to use”¹³⁶.

4.3 Syntax

4.3.1 Possession

Possession is expressed either through a construct state or through the genitive marker *māl*, allomorph *mālāt*¹³⁷. The construct state is a noun-plus-noun or noun-plus-pronominal suffix construction, having the head noun morphologically unmarked, except for feminine nouns: (CM) *sīyār-t al-pōlīs*, “the police car”; (MM) *šakl al-walad*, “the young man’s appearance”; (JM) *kabbat albaḡāl*, “bulgur meatballs”¹³⁸.

In the analytical constructions with *māl*, both nouns are definite if the whole expression is definite, so the head noun has a definite article, i.e. (MM) *alḡarād māl lbēt*, “the effects of the household”¹³⁹. The genitive particle can also be followed by a pronominal suffix, as in *al-kagši māl-u*, “his paunch”¹⁴⁰. In some cases, the head noun has no article but the expression is still definite: (CM) *ʔaqwāl mālāt-na*, “our testimonies”¹⁴¹. In the indefinite expressions, on the other hand, both nouns are unmarked: (CM) *ʔdām māl ḡanam*, “sheep bones”¹⁴².

4.3.2 Verb modifiers

Mosul Arabic has a set of verb modifiers, which differ according to the tense and the aspect of the verb. Present progressive can be expressed simply by the imperfect or by the construction *qa-* + imperfect. The prefix *qa-*, *qad-* with the 1. ps. .sg., harks back to the active participle *qāʔid*, “sitting”, and is peculiar to the Tigris group: *qa-yfattlūnu b-əs-sōq* “they are showing him around the market”¹⁴³. According to Hanitsch, *qa-* is known and employed by all three religious groups of Mosul. In addition to this, the Christians display the prefix *ka-*, allomorph

¹³⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, pp. 193-195. The example of form X is taken from my recordings of 2018.

¹³⁷ Cf. Jastrow 2001, pp. 419-20.

¹³⁸ (CM) Jastrow 2004, p. 142/ 5; (MM) Jastrow 1979, p. 49; (JM) Jastrow 1989, p. 291/ 1.

¹³⁹ Jastrow 1979, p. 60.

¹⁴⁰ Jastrow 2004, p. 144/ 33.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 143/ 7.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 144/ 28.

¹⁴³ Jastrow 1979, p. 47.

kad-, which also expresses an ongoing action, when followed by the imperfect¹⁴⁴. A similar form is attested in Socin as *kē-*, allomorph *kil-* with the 1. ps. sg., for instance *kē-ndauwir*, “we search” and *kil-edauwir*, “I search”¹⁴⁵.

Muslim Maşlāwi, on the other hand, has its own verb modifier for the present progressive, namely *ʕa-*, allomorph *ʕad-*¹⁴⁶. Constructions with this prefix appear in my recordings of the Muslim speech: *ʕad-aḥāwəl*, “I am trying”, *mā-ʕad-aṭīq aḡība*, “I cannot do it” (in this moment)¹⁴⁷. In one occurrence of my corpus, both the Christian and the Muslim informant display this verb modifier: *aš ʕa-tḡīd?*, “What do you want?”.

Concerning the future, it is also expressed by the imperfect preceded by a modifier. Jastrow indicates the prefix *də-* (*d-* with 1.sg.) to denote a future action but also an intention, a wish or a possibility: *balki dəyəbʕat*, “maybe he will send”. He also mentions *kawi*, which precedes an imperfect, with or without *də-*: *kawi ʔaḡōḥ*, *kawi daḡōḥ*, “I will go”¹⁴⁸. Another future modifier, appearing in Christian Maşlāwi, is *ḡayyəḥ*: *ḡayyəḥ tḡōḥūn ʕala xxx*, “you will go to xxx”¹⁴⁹. It is also worth mentioning the future construction *ḡāḥ* + imperfect, which is common to all *qəltu* dialects, except the Anatolian one. Hanitsch suggests that the Muslim speakers use this construction with specific verbs¹⁵⁰. In my findings on Muslim Maşlāwi *ḡāḥ* + imperfect is the only construction attested, as in the expression *ḡāḥ-aḥkīlkum*, “I will tell you”¹⁵¹.

Concerning the past tense, the verb *kān*, inflected and followed by an imperfect, denotes continuous or habitual past: (CM) *ana kəntu qabəl aṣṭaḡəl xayyāṭa*, “I used to work as tailor before”; (MM) *kənnə nəxbəz*, “we were baking bread”¹⁵². When the inflected *kān* precedes a verb in the perfect, it is translated as past perfect: *kān qallu qabəl*, “he had told him before”. The present perfect, on the other hand, is rendered by the invariable prefix *kən* plus a perfect: (MM) *kənrakkaba ʕala ḡahḡu*, “he let her sit on his back (where she is still sitting)”; (CM) *b-ēma sani kənəzzawwaḡtu*, “in which year I have got married”¹⁵³.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Hanitsch 2019, p. 57.

¹⁴⁵ Socin 1882, p. 5.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Hanitsch 2019, pp. 61-62.

¹⁴⁷ Recordings of Muslim Maşlāwi of September 2018.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 47.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Jastrow 2004, p. 143/ 10.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Hanitsch 2019, pp. 61-62.

¹⁵¹ Recordings of Muslim Maşlāwi of September 2018.

¹⁵² Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 47 and Jastrow 2004, p. 142/ 1.

¹⁵³ (MM) Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 48. (CM) Jastrow 2004, p. 143/ 16.

4.3.3 Copula

The use of a copula in nominal sentences characterizes only Jewish Maṣlāwī, as well as the other Jewish dialects of northern Iraq. The copula is expressed by an independent pronoun, often in a shortened form, which is attached to the predicate as an enclitic particle: *malīh-ūwe*, “he is good”, *malīha-ye*, “she is good”¹⁵⁴.

4.3.4 Anticipatory pronoun

A typical Iraqi feature, which also appears in Maṣlāwī, is the marking of a definite object noun through a pronominal suffix. The pronoun is suffixed to the verb and agrees in gender and number with the object, and the object itself is introduced by the preposition *l-*: *ndəqq-u lāda lhabəg*, “we crushed this lean meat”; *gabbət-u ləlwalad*, “she raised the boy”. In some cases, *l-* is lacking, as in the following example: *nənqaʕu səmmāq*, “we macerate the səmmāq”¹⁵⁵.

The anticipatory pronominal suffix can also be attached to the first term of a noun-plus-noun annexation, e.g. *šəklū l-əl-walad*, “the appearance of the boy”. This construction, spread in Mosul as well as in the Syrian area, is particularly common with kinship terms, for example *ʕammu ləflān*, “someone’s uncle”. In addition to this, the anticipatory pronoun can appear -though in rarer cases- with prepositions, as in the sentence *yqəllu labu lbənət*, “he told the girl’s father”¹⁵⁶.

4.3.5 Negation

The particle used to negate a verb in the perfect and imperfect is *mā*: *mā-ʔalaʕ yaʕni mā tḡīdu əmmu*, “he didn’t come up as his mother wanted”; *mā-təʕḡəf bəl-bərgəl?*, “don’t you know the Burghul?”. According to Jastrow, this particle is also employed to negate nominal sentences, as in the following examples: *ab mā-ʕəndu*, “he does not have a father” and *mā-əmmi hāyi*, “this is not my mother”¹⁵⁷. However, according to Abu-Haidar, non-verbal constructions are negated by *mū* as in the sentence *mū-əsmā Salwa maḡt axūnu*, “his brother’s wife is not called

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

¹⁵⁵ Jastrow 1979, p. 49. The mentioned examples refer to Muslim Maṣlāwī. I could not find any examples of anticipatory pronouns in CM and JM (cf. Jastrow 1989, 2004).

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, pp. 49-50 and Blanc 1964, pp. 131-132.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 2 and Jastrow 1989, pp. 289-290.

Salwa”¹⁵⁸. Jastrow also noticed a difference between Muslim and Jewish Maṣlāwi. The latter has two shortened forms of *mā-*, namely *ma-* in nominal sentences and with perfect, and *mə-* with imperfect: *ma-kān mawġūd*, “it did not exist”; *ma-mzawwaġ*, “he is not married”; *mə-tāxəd*, “you don’t take”¹⁵⁹.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Abu-Haidar 2002, p. 5.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Jastrow 1989, p. 290.

5. Presentation and analysis of the results

5.1 Organization and classification of the data collected

The present chapter will focus on the presentation of the data obtained via the questionnaire and on the description and classification of the linguistic phenomena observed.

As mentioned in section 3.2, the results of the questionnaires are organized in a table, which can be found as an attachment to the present work. The table, named Appendix 1, displays the list of words in English, with the respective translation in Muslim and Christian Maṣlāwi. Next to each lemma, I indicated whether the two translations diverge on the phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical level. Furthermore, I identified loanwords from foreign languages and missing translations in each dialect.

The table also shows that the informants often provided more than one translation for a word. In these cases, I included a commentary on the context of use of each term, based on the information provided by the informants. For example, the word 16, “tribe”, is translated by the Muslim informant in three ways: *ṣašīra*, *bayt*, *ṣāḥilta*. According to him, *ṣašīra* is employed to refer to Non-Maṣlāwi people, whereas *bayt* and *ṣāḥilta* are used to refer to Maṣlāwi families.

The occurrences of the above-mentioned phenomena can be then summarized as follows:

- In 320 cases the word is identical in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi. This includes those cases, where one or both informants provided more than one translation for a word and one of these translations is identical. For example, the word “dumb” has been translated by the Christian informant as *ḥaṭwal*, and by the Muslim informant in three ways, *ḡabi*, *ḥaṭwal* and *ḡaḥəš*. As can be seen, in one case the translation is identical.
- In 139 cases a lexical difference between Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi can be identified;
- In 34 cases a phonological difference can be identified;
- In 18 cases a morphological difference can be identified;
- In 5 cases a syntactic difference can be identified;
- In 20 cases the Christian informant could not provide a translation;
- In 10 cases the Muslim informant could not provide a translation;
- In 70 cases the Muslim informant provided more than one translation for a term;
- In 18 cases the Christian informant provided more than one translation for a term;

- In 72 cases the words provided are borrowings from a foreign language. These can be classified as follows: 25 Turkish loanwords, 21 English loanwords, 13 Persian loanwords, 4 borrowings from European languages, 3 Kurdish loanwords and 6 loanwords, whose origin is still unclear. The Persian and Turkish borrowings also include those words, which were borrowed via these languages¹⁶⁰.

Further considerations on this categorization are required. In six cases, the Christian informant seems to have provided a wrong translation. The word “sole” is translated as *kaʕb*, which is actually the correct translation of the word “heel”. The word “kuskus”, was translated as such. The informant should have indicated the cereal, which constitutes the base of the Maṣlāwī cuisine. As known, the *kuskus* is typical of North Africa whereas the typical cereal in northern Iraq is *burgul*. The word “raisins”, was presumably mistaken with “apricots”, since the translation provided is *məšməš*. The word “pap” is translated as *ʕaḡīn*, referring to the bread dough¹⁶¹. In three more cases, the informant translated a verb by providing a noun. These are the words *ḡalli* for “to harvest”, *darrāsa* for “to thresh” and *širāʔ* for “to buy”. Regarding the lemma “stuff”, the question posed was wrong so that both informants were asked to translate the term “tool”. I could pose the question to my Muslim informant once again and he provided the right translation. A lexical item, which has also been possibly translated in the wrong way by both informants is “to go down to the street”. The cases of wrong translations are indicated in the Appendix 1.

In addition to this, it is worth noticing that the set of words, which I submitted to the informants, diverges in some aspects to that employed in the *Wortatlas*. In addition to my modifications mentioned in section 3.2, I detected some discrepancies by comparing my list with the terms appearing in WAD. This is due to the fact that I employed a printed form of the questionnaire, which was used by a researcher prior to the publication of the *Wortatlas*. Unfortunately, the questionnaire had already been submitted to the informants when these differences were noticed. For this reason, the following words are lacking from my list: bananas, place/site, market, sandals, slippers, trousers, paper, to go up (in my list there is “to go upstairs”), to look for, to find, to begin, to bite (snake), autumn, summer, lunar months¹⁶².

In the same way, some terms, included in my list, are absent from the *Wortatlas*: father! (vocative), mother! (vocative), gullet (in WAD there is “Kehle/throat”), difference between

¹⁶⁰ Further information on the Persian and Turkish loanwords can be found in sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.

¹⁶¹ See Wehr 1976, p. 594 s. r. “ʕ-ḡ-n”.

¹⁶² Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, 2012 and 2014.

male/female kid, difference between male/female calf, brook, domicile, difference between modern table and traditional table (in WAD there is only “table”), bag and shopping bag (in WAD there is only “sack”), kuskus/bulgur, palm-garden, plough-beam, plough-sole, plough-stert, water-wheel, steam-boat, timber, to work in a field¹⁶³. Considering these modifications and those mentioned previously, the set of words submitted to the informants is then counting 530 lexical items.

In the following sections, the loanwords and the most significant phenomena occurring on the phonological, morphological and syntactic level will be presented and discussed.

5.2 Loanwords from other languages

5.2.1 English loanwords

Atawneh describes borrowing as the product of the language contact between two communities, which speak a different language. This occurs in case of colonization or when a language displays a lexical gap that can be filled with a word borrowed from the contact language. Another crucial reason for borrowing is the prestige of a certain language in a particular context, for example English in Iraq¹⁶⁴.

As mentioned in the historical introduction, many languages have been coexisting in Mosul and in the areas surrounding the city for several centuries: Arabic, Aramaic, Turkic languages, Persian and Kurdish. In addition to these, European loans also made their way into Mosul Arabic, often transferred by another language. In the following sections, I will present the foreign loans, which appeared in the questionnaire, and analyse their phonological and semantic adaptation into Mosul Arabic.

Concerning English, it represents the most important foreign language in Iraq, with a high prestige status among Iraqi people. This is due to the relevance that it acquired during the British Mandate and today as a key language in the commercial field¹⁶⁵. Also, it served to fill the lexical gaps in the domains of science and technology both in the Arabic dialects as well as in Standard Arabic¹⁶⁶.

¹⁶³ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, 2012 and 2014.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Atawneh 2007, p. 29.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Bițună 2014, p. 67.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Atawneh 2007, p. 30.

Within the words provided by the informants, 21 are English loanwords. These belong to different semantic fields. Thirteen lemmas relate to the car industry domain: (CM and MM) *pāš* < Engl. “bus”; (CM and MM) *lōri* < Engl. “lorry”; (CM and MM) *hōrən* < Engl. “horn”; (CM) *ṭawwāṭa*, “horn”, derived from “to toot”; (CM and MM) *stēren* < Engl. “steering-wheel”; (CM) *kḷač* and (MM) *klēč* < Engl. “clutch”; (CM and MM) *gēr* < Engl. “gear”; (CM) *gēr māl rağṣa*, “reverse”, a combination of the Engl. “gear” and the Ar. “of going back”, so lit. “the gear to go back”; (MM) *bāk* < Engl. “back”, meaning “reverse”; (CM) *brēk* < Engl. “brake”; (MM) *aṣṭāb* < Engl. “stop”, meaning “brake”; (MM) *gzōz*, “exhaust”, derived from the same English word; (CM and MM) *tāyər* < Engl. “tyre”; (CM and MM) *pančar* < Engl. “puncture”; (MM) *fawwāl-yafawwil*, “full tank!”, derived from Engl. “full”¹⁶⁷.

This result should not surprise, since the car industry is the field from which male speakers usually borrow the majority of words, followed by the domain of electronic machines¹⁶⁸.

Five words relate to the domain “house- and kitchenware”: (MM) *tēblām* < Engl. “table lamp”, indicating in Maṣlāwī a “modern lamp”; (MM) *glōbāyi* < Engl. “globe”, meaning “electric light”; (CM) *glāš čāy*, “tea-glass”, a combination of the Engl. “glass” and the Ar. “tea”; (CM and MM) *boṭal* < Engl. “bottle”; (CM) *guniyyi* < Engl. “gunny sack”, indicating a “big sack for food”.

One word, (CM) *mōbāyil*, (MM) *mūbāyil* < Engl. “mobile phone”, relates to the technology field and another one, (MM) *tanki* < Engl. “tank”, meaning “cistern”, to agriculture.

On the phonological level, the sounds /g/, /p/ and /č/ of the English loans, are usually retained in Maṣlāwī, as can be detected in the words *gēr*, *glāš čāy*, *glōbāyi*, *gūniyyi*, *kḷač* and *pančar*. An interesting phenomenon is the shift of the voiced bilabial stop /b/ to the voiceless /p/ in the word *pāš*, “bus”. This change usually occurs in the English loanwords beginning with /b/ and followed by the vowel /a/¹⁶⁹. Abu-Haidar also attests the form *pāš*, “bus”, in Mosul as well as *pāysəkəl*, “bicycle”¹⁷⁰. It is worth noticing that this shift can also occur in loans from other languages, as in (MM) *panzīnxāna* < *banzīnxāna*, “gas station”, a compound of Turkish origin¹⁷¹.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Biṭunā 2014, pp. 67-75.

¹⁶⁸ These data relate to a survey among Palestinian speakers. The results, however, seem to match with my data. Besides, the car industry appears as the highest shared field by both men and women. Cf. Atawneh 2011, pp. 33-34.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Biṭunā 2014, p. 68.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Abu-Haidar 2004, p. 4.

¹⁷¹ In Turkish and Persian loanwords borrowed into Iraqī the shift /b/ > /p/ is less common. Reinkowski attests one single case for Turkish: *baston* > *pāṣṭōn*. Cf. Reinkowski 1995, p. 92.

When /p/ is not in the initial position, it usually +shifts to the voiced /b/, as in the word *aṣṭāb* < Engl. “stop”, meaning “brake”. It can be noticed how this lemma also displays a prosthetic vowel, which is often inserted when a word begins with /s/ and is followed by another consonant¹⁷².

Regarding the vocalic adaptation, a stressed syllable is usually rendered with the lengthening of the vowel in it, as in *lōri* < “lorry”, *hōrān* < “horn”, *stēren* < “steering-wheel”, *tāyār* < “tyre”¹⁷³. Long vowels are also inserted to replace a sound or a group of sounds not appearing in the Maṣlāwī phonetic inventory. For instance, the group of sounds [eɪ] in “brake” and [ɪə] in “gear”, are replaced by a long /e/, as can be seen in their Maṣlāwī versions *brēk* and *gēr*.¹⁷⁴

The introduction of an epenthetic vowel /ə/ in final consonant clusters is also detected in English borrowings. This can be observed in the terms *boṭal*, “bottle”, *tāyār*, “tyre” and *hōrān*, “horn”¹⁷⁵. In other cases, the final consonant(s) is elided, as the /p/ in *tēblām*, from Engl. “table lamp” and the /g/ in *stēren*, “steering-wheel”¹⁷⁶.

Relevant considerations can be also drawn on the lexical aspect. In some cases, only one part of an English compound is borrowed, as in *stēren* < Engl. “steering-wheel” and in *gūniyyi* < Engl. “gunny sack”¹⁷⁷. In the second borrowing, the material is employed to name the object made of it. Regarding the origin of the word *gūniyyi*, it is worth mentioning that other sources identify it as Persian loan, from Pers. *guni*, “sack or tent canvas”¹⁷⁸.

On the morphological level, verbs can be created from an English noun. These usually appear in the basic, in the second and in the tenth stem. In this regard, two examples are found in the corpus of words, belonging to the second stem. One is *fawwāl-yāfawwīl*, “full tank”, which comes from *fūl*, the Arabic equivalent of the Engl. “full” and “fuel”. A noun, which is obtained through the same process, is *ṭawwāṭa*, coming from the Engl. “to toot”. In this case, the Engl. “to toot” is rendered in Arabic as *tūt*, from this derives the verb in the second stem *ṭawwaṭ - yṭawwiṭ*, “to toot” and then the noun *ṭawwāṭa*, “horn”¹⁷⁹.

Loanwords are often employed in a metonymic sense. An example is the word *glōbāyi*, composed of the Engl. *glōb*, suffixed with the morpheme *-āyi* to form unit nouns. The word *glōb*,

¹⁷² Cf. Biṭunā 2014, pp. 68-69.

¹⁷³ This phenomenon also occurs in borrowings from other languages. See sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Atawneh 2011, p. 32.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Biṭunā 2014, p. 71.

¹⁷⁶ For similar examples in Muslim Baghdadi, cf. Biṭunā 2014, pp. 70-71.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Biṭunā 2014, p. 72.

¹⁷⁸ Behnstedt and Woidich in first place, provide two possible derivations, English and Persian. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 187 and Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 435 s.v. “gūniyyi”.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Biṭunā 2014, pp. 74-75.

which in Arabic means “light bulb”, derives etymologically from the Engl. “globe”, indicating any spherical object, for instance the glass cover of light bulbs¹⁸⁰. According to my Muslim informant, *glōbāyi* is employed with the meaning of “electric light” in sentences like “Can you turn on the light?”. A similar use of *glōb* is attested in Basra in the sentence “Turn on the light!”¹⁸¹.

Another kind of borrowing concerns names of notorious brands, employed to indicate objects of common use. An example of this phenomenon is the word used by the Muslim informant to indicate a modern cooking-pot, *tīfāl*, derived from the French brand of cookware *Tefal*¹⁸².

5.2.2 Persian and Kurdish loanwords

The impact of the Persian language and culture has been more important in spoken Iraqi than in the other Arabic dialects and in the classical language¹⁸³. This is not merely due to the geographical neighbouring of the two countries. Persian and Arabic in fact, coexisted in North Iraq already before the advent of Islam. At that time, Persian was one of the dominant languages and even if Arabic slowly replaced it after the Arab conquest¹⁸⁴, Iranian words were still borrowed into Arabic to fill lexical gaps in different semantic fields¹⁸⁵.

Regarding Mesopotamian Arabic, it has been acquiring Persian words from the Abbasid time to the present day, particularly those relating to the material culture and the cuisine. The borrowing process further affected ordinary vocabulary and specific phonological features, such as certain consonants absent from the Iraqi inventory¹⁸⁶. In addition to this, the presence of Kurdish-speaking communities in North Iraq, from the 10th century onwards, contributed to enriching Mosul Arabic with even more Iranian terms¹⁸⁷.

It is thus evident that the Iranian words could have entered Maṣlāwi in many ways and that the term “Persian loanwords” encompasses a range of languages, going from Old and Middle Persian to the Iranian lemmas transmitted via Turkish¹⁸⁸. Regarding the last case, studies on the

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 433 s. v. “glōb”.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 82.

¹⁸² Cf. Biṭunā 2014, p. 72.

¹⁸³ Cf. Gazsi 2011, p. 1017.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Procházka 2018, pp. 243-244.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Gazsi 2011, pp. 1016-1017.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Procházka 2020, p. 89.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Procházka 2020, p. 86.

¹⁸⁸ The exact provenance of the loanwords remains difficult to trace in many cases.

Ottoman linguistic heritage in Syrian and Egyptian Arabic have shown how the Persian lemmas, which are also present in the Turkish vocabulary, were most likely transmitted via Ottoman Turkish¹⁸⁹.

Though to a lesser extent, this is also true for today's spoken Iraqi. In fact, clear hints of a Turkish transmission can be spotted in the phonological changes and in the semantic shifts that the Iranian vocabulary underwent once acquired by the Turkish speakers¹⁹⁰. For instance, the word “pears”, *ṣarmūt*, was borrowed from the Turk. *armut*, which in turn derives from the Middle Persian *urmōd*¹⁹¹. An example of semantic shift can be observed for the adjective “rich”, in Maṣlāwī *zangīn*, derived from the Turk. *zengin*. This was borrowed in turn from the Pers. *sangin*, meaning “heavy”. The adjective acquired in Turkish an additional meaning, namely “wealthy, rich”, which was then transferred to Iraqi Arabic¹⁹².

Within the words provided by the informants, 23 are of Persian origin and they belong to different semantic fields¹⁹³. As expected, the majority of borrowings relate to the fields of cuisine and houseware: (CM and MM) *mēz*, “table, traditional table”; (CM and MM) *dūlāb*, “wardrobe”; (CM) *taxat*, “bed”; (MM) *zūliyyi*, “carpet”; (CM and MM) *dəsət*, “cooking-pot”; (MM) *dōlka*, “water-jar”; (CM) *qūri ma-č-čāy*, (MM) *qūri ma-č-čāy* and *qūri əč-čāy*, “tea-pot”; (CM) *(i)stikān*, (MM) *peyālat əč-čāy* and *ṣistikānət əč-čāy*, “glass of tea”¹⁹⁴; (CM and MM) *ḡām*, “glass (material)”¹⁹⁵. Three words refer to plants and animals: (MM) *rōbyān*, “shrimps”; (CM) *šādi*, “ape”; (CM and MM) *ṣarmūt*, “pears”¹⁹⁶. Two more lexical items are related to the category “clothing and accessories”: (CM and MM) *ḡəzdān*, “wallet”; (CM and MM) *ḡōḡābi*, “sock(s)”, pl. *ḡowēḡəb* (CM), *ḡawēḡəb* (MM). One word also refers to food: (CM) *šakar* and (MM) *šakar*, “sugar”¹⁹⁷. One borrowing refers to the category “persons”: (CM and MM) *mgaddi*, “beggar”. Another word, (CM) *xərda*, meaning “change”, relates to the field

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 241.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Reinkowski 1998, pp. 241-242. Further examples of the linguistic phenomena regarding Persian words borrowed via Turkish will be analysed in the section 5.2.3.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Asbaghi 2008, p. 582.

¹⁹² Cf. Reinkowski 1995, p. 106.

¹⁹³ This number includes the Persian words borrowed via Turkish, which will be discussed in the following section. The Persian borrowings that were not borrowed via Turkish are 13.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 103, 105, 110, 116, 146, 152, 159, 164. Regarding the origin of *stikān*, Jastrow identifies it as a borrowing from the Russ. *стакан*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 62, fn.55.

¹⁹⁵ Behnstedt and Woidich refer to *ḡām* as an old Persian borrowing, already integrated in Classical Arabic. However, they also indicate a possible transmission from the Turkish *cam* in the case of Iraqi dialects. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 472.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 340, 391, 500.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 219, 183, 260.

“commerce and economy”¹⁹⁸. Two adverbs are also of Persian origin: (CM and MM) *hamm*, “also” and (CM and MM) *balki*, “perhaps”¹⁹⁹.

In addition to this, three Kurdish words can be detected in the corpus: (CM) *mbōr*, “because of”, which is a copy of the Kurdish expression *ji ber*²⁰⁰; (CM) *čingār*, “fork”, from the Kurd. *čingāl*; (CM) *yābāzār* - *bāzar*, (MM) *bāzağ* - *yābēzağ*, “to bargain”, from the Kurd. *bazar*, “shop, trade”²⁰¹.

As in the English and Turkish borrowings, the sounds /p/, /č/ and /g/ of the Persian loans have been integrated into Mašlāwi, as in the words *čingār* (< Kurd. *čingāl*), *peyālat ač-čāy* (< Pers. *piyāle*²⁰²), *mgaddi*, derived from the verb *gadda* “to beg for alms” (< Pers. *gedye*)²⁰³. An interesting phenomenon is the replacement of the lateral /l/ with the vibrant /ɾ/ in the loan *čingār*, coming from the Kurd. *čingāl*. Such a shift usually occurs in the Turkish loanwords, especially those borrowed from Turkish vernaculars²⁰⁴. Interestingly, this replacement does not appear in the other Iraqi dialects, where this word preserved the lateral /l/: (JB and CB) *čəngāl*, (MB) *čingāl*. It is worth noticing that this lemma has a different meaning in each dialect. In Christian Mašlāwi, as well as in Jewish and Christian Baghdadi, it is translated as “fork”, whereas in Muslim Baghdadi and in Muslim Mašlāwi it indicates a “hook”. The word “fork”, on the other hand, is translated in Muslim Baghdadi with the Turkish term *çatal*, the same form occurring in Muslim Mašlāwi²⁰⁵. This example shows how a lexical difference in Christian and Muslim Mašlāwi can be attributed to the religious affiliation.

Regarding the vocalic adaptation, most of the loanwords adapted to the short vowel inventory of Mosul based on the sounds /a/ and /ə/. The exception to this rule can be observed in *čingār*, *peyālat ač-čāy*, (*i*)*stikān* and *ğōğābi*, pl. in CM *ğowēğāb*, presenting short /i/, /e/ and /o/. In some cases, the presence of those sounds results from a direct borrowing from the foreign vocalic inventory as in *ğōğābi* (< via Turk. *çorab*, which in turn is from Pers. *gorab*) and in *čingār* (< Kurd. *čingāl*). In other cases, they result from a re-analysis of the original sounds: (*i*)*stikān* (< Pers. *istakān*), *peyālat* (< Pers. *piyāle*). Similar examples can be found also in borrowings from other languages, for instance the Engl. *boṭal*, “bottle” and *stēren*, “steering-wheel”, from

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 71 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 413.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 158 and Reinkowski 1995, p. 100.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Procházka 2020, p. 101.

²⁰¹ The Persian origin is also attested in the work of Al-Čalabi on the Persian loanwords. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 18. Another possible etymology is from the Turk. *pazar*, also meaning “shop, trade”. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 400.

²⁰² Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 164.

²⁰³ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 155.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Procházka 2005, p. 155.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 138 and Blanc 1964, pp. 149-150.

Muslim Baghdadi or from Standard Arabic. However, it is arguable that these sounds have not acquired a phonemic status in Maṣlāwī²⁰⁶.

In the same way as in the English borrowings, final consonant clusters can be separated by an epenthetic /ə/, as *taxət* (< Pers. *taxt*), and *dəsət* (< Pers. *tašt*).

Concerning the lexical changes, semantic shifts and reductions occur in the majority of the borrowings. Among the most relevant are: *dūlāb*, “wardrobe”, indicating in Persian a water-wheel but also a cupboard with a round form; *taxət*, “bed”, having multiple meanings in Persian such as “bed, throne, coffin”; *dəsət*, “cooking-pot”, from Pers. *tašt*, “bowl, basin”. An interesting phenomenon is also the borrowing process of the term *xərda*, “change”, which derives from the Pers. *pūl xorde*, lit. “small coins”. Here, an elliptical construction can be recognized, in that only one word of the two, namely the adjective *xord*, “little”, has been borrowed to designate the whole expression²⁰⁷.

5.2.3 Turkish loanwords

Similarly as in Persian, the Turkish language had a huge impact on spoken Iraqi, especially that of North-Iraq. Though studies focusing on the Turkish influence on these particular dialects are lacking, it is correct to suppose that the Arabic spoken in this area has retained way more Turkish lemmas than that spoken in central and southern Iraq²⁰⁸.

The presence of Turkish speakers in Iraq is attested from the 9th century onwards²⁰⁹. Historically, Mosul was dominated by different Turkish dynasties and eventually came under the control of the Ottomans in the 16th century. Though the Ottoman rule in Iraq ended at the end of World War I, the Turkish influence over the Mosul area continued in the following years, leaving traces in the culture and language²¹⁰. In addition to this, Turkish-speaking minorities, known as Turkmens, have been dwelling in Iraq since the 11th century²¹¹. Unfortunately, the lack of

²⁰⁶ As can be seen in section 4.1.2, the only short vowels, which are part of the phonemic vowel inventory of Mosul Arabic, are /a/ and /ə/.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 105, 110, 146, 413.

²⁰⁸ In his study on Turkish loanwords in Baghdadi, Reinkowski submits his results to three Iraqi informants. The one coming from North Iraq recognizes more Turkish words than the other two. Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 249.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 239.

²¹⁰ For more information, see the historical introduction of the present work.

²¹¹ It is unclear whether these communities established in this area during the Seljuq rule or in earlier times. Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 239.

information on the sociolinguistic situation of these communities makes it difficult to investigate the mutual influence between their language and spoken Iraqi²¹².

As is the case with Persian, the definition “Turkish” encompasses loans from Ottoman and Modern Turkish. The former is particularly significant, since most of the Turkish borrowings, which can be detected in Standard Arabic as well as in the modern Arabic dialects, are considered a heritage of the Ottoman Empire. Regarding Iraq, the Turkicisms are estimated between 200 and 500 words. This number though, has dramatically decreased in the last 70/80 years, due to the changes in life conditions, particularly in connection with the end of the Ottoman Empire²¹³.

Within the words provided by the informants, 21 are Turkish loanwords or foreign terms borrowed via Turkish. As mentioned in the previous section, Turkish played a crucial role for the transmission of Persian words and this can be spotted by observing the phonological and semantic changes that foreign terms underwent in the process of integration into Arabic²¹⁴.

Many European loans were also borrowed via Turkish, due to the fact that Iraq first came in contact with Europe, in particular with England, after the First World War. For example, the term *bazālya*, “peas”, which originally comes from the Italian *piselli*, was transmitted from Greek to Turkish and then to Iraqi²¹⁵.

Based on these observations, the Turkish loanwords, attested in the questionnaire, can be classified as follows:

- 1) Turkish words: (CM and MM) *qēsi*, “dried apricots” < Turk. *kayısı*, “apricot”; (CM) *šillēk*, “strawberries” < Turk. *çilek* “strawberry”; (CM and MM) *ʔōḍa*, “room” < Turk. *oda*, “room, chamber, office”; (MM) *čatal*, “fork” but also “sling” in both CM and MM < Turk. *çatal*, “fork”; (MM) *čaṇṭa*, “bag” < Turk. *çanta*, “any kind of bag”; (MM) *bərgəl*, “crashed wheat” < Turk. dialect *burgul*; (CM and MM) *qamčī*, “whip” < Turk. *kamçı*, “whip”²¹⁶; (CM and MM) *šarabāna*, “cart” < Turk. *araba*, “a wheeled vehicle of any kind”; (CM) *banzīnxāna*, (MM) *panzīnxāna* < Turk. *benzin*, “gas” + Turk. *-hane*, “house”²¹⁷.

²¹² Cf. Procházka 2020, p. 87.

²¹³ Cf. Procházka 2005, p. 150.

²¹⁴ Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 240.

²¹⁵ According to Reinkowski, this borrowing process did not affect those European words, which are widespread in every Arabic dialect and in Standard Arabic, as the word “orange”, *purtaqāl* in Christian Mašlāwī, *purtuqāl* in Muslim Mašlāwī. Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 242.

²¹⁶ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, pp. 97-114.

²¹⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 423, 459 and Procházka 2005, p. 155.

- 2) Persian words borrowed via Turkish/ Ottoman-Turkish: (CM and MM) *ḡarmūt*, “pears” < via Turk. *armut*, from Middle Pers. *urmōd*²¹⁸; (CM and MM) *dūlāb*, “wardrobe” < via Turk. *dolap*, originally from Pers. *dūlāb*; (CM and MM) *ḡōḡābi*, “sock” < Turk. *çorab*, originally from Pers. *gorab*²¹⁹; (CM and MM) *zangīn*, “rich” < via Turk. *zengin*, “rich”, from Pers. *sangin*, “heavy”; (CM and MM) *balki*, “perhaps” < via Turk. *belki*, “perhaps”, originally a compound of Ar. *bal* and Pers. *ke*²²⁰.
- 3) European words borrowed via Turkish: (CM and MM) *qanḡara*, “shoe” < via Ottoman Turkish *kundura*, originally Greek *κόθορνος*; (CM and MM) *qanḡarči*, “shoemaker” < Turk. *kundura*, originally from Greek, combined with the Turkish suffix to designate professions -*či*; (MM) *qaryōla* < from Turk. *karyola*, “steel cot”, originally Sicilian or Span. *carriola*, “rollaway bed”; (CM) *ṣammūnāyi*, “loaf of bread” < Ottoman-Turk. *somun*, “a loaf of bread”, originally from Gr. “bread”, combined with the Maṣlāwi suffix to form unit nouns -*āyi*²²¹; (CM) *purtaqāl*, “orange” < via Ottoman-Turk. *portokal*, presumably borrowed in turn from Arabic²²²; (CM and MM) *lahāna*, “cabbage” < via Turk. *lahana*, originally from Gr. *λάχανον*; (MM), *bazālya*, “peas” < Turk. *bezelye*, “peas”, in turn borrowed via Greek, originally from It. *piselli*²²³; (CM) *qarnabīt*, (MM) *qaḡnabīt*, “cauliflower” < via Ottoman-Turk. *karnabit*, originally from Gr. *κράμβη*, “cabbage”²²⁴.

The exact origin of some words, though, remains ambiguous. One of the Muslim words for grandmother, *nēna*, originally comes from the It. *nonna*²²⁵ and is attested both in Ottoman-Turkish as *nine* and in Persian as *nāna*²²⁶. The Christian word for hospital, *xastaxāna*, is attested in both Modern Turkish and Persian and was probably integrated via Ottoman-Turkish. The term (MM) *qanṣōḡ*, “wardrobe”, resembles the Engl. “counter” and Germ. “Kontor”, possibly borrowed via Turk. *kontör*, “counter”; (MM) *dōlka*, “water-jar”, originally from Pers. *dawraq* but is also present in Ottoman-Turkish; (CM and MM) *ḡazdān*, “wallet”, is originally Persian

²¹⁸ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 500 and Asbaghi 2008, p. 582.

²¹⁹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 105, 138, 219, 459.

²²⁰ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, pp. 100 and 106.

²²¹ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 73.

²²² Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 423. The borrowing process presumably resembles that described by Jastrow for Kinderib: *pərtaqāl* < Turk. *portokal* < Ar. *burtuqāl*. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 494.

²²³ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, pp. 99, 107, 109-111.

²²⁴ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 485 and Halasi-Kun 1982, p. 204.

²²⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 24.

²²⁶ Cf. Halasi-Kun 1982, p. 253 and Al-Čalabī 1960, p. 191.

ğozwe-dān and is attested in Ottoman-Turkish as *ğüzdān* with the meaning “folder”. In Modern Turk. *cüzdan* means “wallet”; (CM and MM) *čāy*, “tea” was borrowed either via Turkish, *çay*, or via Persian *čāy*²²⁷.

As can be noticed, the numerous loanwords belong to different semantic fields. Most of them relate to the material culture, including house- and kitchenware, food and everyday objects. Vegetables and fruits are also common, especially among the European loanwords borrowed via Turkish, as attested by the terms *lahāna*, *qarnabīt* and *bazālya*. Only one borrowing indicates an agricultural tool, *qamči*. As for Persian, the presence of adjectives, like *zangīn*, and of adverbs, like *balki*, is a further proof of the prolonged contact between Turkish and Arabic²²⁸. Being assimilated into Arabic via Turkish, these borrowings are treated as Turkish words. Therefore, many phenomena of linguistic adaptation detected in the loans of the first group, can also be found in those of the second and third group.

Regarding the phonology, the following changes can be observed. As is the case with English and Persian loanwords, the sound /č/ has been integrated into Mašlāwī. In one case though, it shifted to /š/ as in *šillēk* < *çilek* and in other one to /ğ/ as in *ğōğābi*, < *çorab*, these shifts being common both in the Arabic dialects as in the Standard language²²⁹. The sound /p/ has also become a stable phoneme. However, the shift to the voiced /b/ can still be observed in some cases: *ğōğābi*, < *çorab*; *dūlāb* < *dolap*²³⁰.

A common phenomenon is the velarisation of the consonants in those Turkish borrowings, displaying one or more back vowels (/a/, /o/, /u/, /ɪ/)²³¹. This can be detected in the majority of the loans, for instance *ʔōḍa* < *oda*, *čatal* < *çatal*, *šammūnāyi* < *somun*, and it is reflected especially in the shift /k/ > /q/: *qarnabīt* < *karnabit*, *qaryōla* < *karyola*, *qanḍara* < *kundura*, *qamči* < *kamçı*. Also, Turkish words beginning with an /a/ usually acquire an /ʕ/ in Arabic, as in *ʕarabāna* < Turk. *araba* and *ʕarmūt* < via Turk. *armut*²³².

On the vocalic level, the Turkish sound /e/ is usually re-elaborated as /a/²³³, like in *balki* < *belki*, *zangīn* < *zengin*, *bazālya* < via Turkish *bezelye*. An exception is represented by the word *šillēk* < *çilek*, where the short /e/ is lengthened instead of shifting to /a/, because it is within the stressed syllable²³⁴. This occurs because short closed syllables, which are stressed and in final

²²⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 18, 105, 152, 183, 289.

²²⁸ Cf. Procházka 2005, p. 153.

²²⁹ Cf. Procházka 2009, p. 590.

²³⁰ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, p. 92.

²³¹ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, p. 91.

²³² Cf. Procházka 2009, p. 591.

²³³ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, p. 93.

²³⁴ As mentioned in section 4.1.2, the long /e/ is part of the Mašlāwī phonemic inventory.

position, acquire a long vowel in Iraqi²³⁵: *ṣarmūt* < *armut*; *ṣammūnāyi* < *somun*; *zangīn* < *zengin*, *qarnabīt* < *karnabit*.

Concerning the morphology, most of the Turkish borrowings did not undergo extreme deformation in order to adapt to the Arabic nominal patterns. Nouns ending with /a/ have been reinterpreted as feminine, like *ṭōḍa*, *qaryōla*, *qanḍara* for instance. Nouns referring to fruits and not ending with /a/, have been reinterpreted as collectives: *qēsi*, “dried apricots”, *šillēk*, “strawberries”, *ṣarmūt*, “pears”. Though with an exception to this rule: *bazālya*, “peas”.

As mentioned previously, the Turkish suffix *-çi* is employed to designate professions and negative characterizations. Though being very productive in spoken Iraqi²³⁶, it is attested in my list only once in the word *qanḍarçi*, “shoemaker”.

Another construction of Turkish origin can be detected in the words *banzīnxāna*, “gas station” and *xastaxāna*, “hospital”. The second constituent *-xāna* designates in Turkish a “house or place”, whose purpose is determined by the first constituent of the compound²³⁷. In this case, the Turk. *xaste*, “ill” and *benzin*, “gas”. Interestingly, the word *banzīnxāna* is probably a form created in spoken Iraqi, since it is not attested in Turkish²³⁸. The word *xastaxāna*, on the other hand, was possibly borrowed via Ottoman-Turkish.

On the lexical level, semantic shifts and reduction are widespread. These can be observed in the following words: *ṭōḍa*, “room” < Turk. “room, office”, originally indicating a “big tent”; *ṣarabāna*, “cart” < Turk. *araba*, “a wheeled vehicle of any kind”; *qanṣōḡ*, “wardrobe” < probably from the Engl. “counter”, via Turk. *kontör*; *ṣammūnāyi*, “loaf of bread” < Ottoman-Turk. *somun*, “a loaf of bread, a rough slab”²³⁹.

5.2.4 European loanwords

In the previous section, it has been pointed out how the majority of the European words in the list, excluding the English loans, were borrowed into Iraqi via Turkish or Persian.

A couple of lemmas of European origin, though, are not ascribed to this group. These are the words (CM) *daktūr*, “doctor”, (MM) *ṣṭabəl*, “stable” and (MM) *farawla*, “strawberry”.

²³⁵ Cf. Reinkowski 1995, pp. 95-96.

²³⁶ Cf. Reinkowski 1998, p. 248.

²³⁷ These kinds of constructions are also attested in Persian. Cf. Woodhead and Beene 1967, s.v. “xaana”, pp. 127-128.

²³⁸ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 459.

²³⁹ Reinkowski 1995, p. 107.

Concerning the latter, it originally derives from the It. *fravola*, “strawberry”, and was probably spread from Egypt to the rest of the Levante. It is worth noticing that this form appears in Muslim Maṣlāwī as well as in Muslim Baghdadi²⁴⁰. The word *ṣṭabəl* comes from the lat. *stabulum*, and was later acquired in Greek and Aramaic²⁴¹. Regarding the word *dəktūr*, no information was found on its origin.

Another borrowing of Greek origin is the word *lampa*. This is also attested in Turkish as *lamba*, however, no information is available on how it entered Maṣlāwī²⁴².

5.2.5 Aramaic influence

Aramaic constitutes one of the languages, which had the longest contact with Arabic in Iraq. As mentioned in the historical introduction, it was the dominant language, together with Persian, prior to the Arab conquest²⁴³. After the 7th century, it remained widespread, particularly among the Christian and Jewish communities²⁴⁴. Abu-Haidar affirms that “for a long time the Arabic spoken in the province of Mosul consisted only of *qəltu* dialects, spoken along with varieties of Neo-Aramaic”²⁴⁵. Today, the latter are still spoken in some villages surrounding Mosul and in the areas in the North of Iraq²⁴⁶.

Contact phenomena between Aramaic and Arabic are then expected on different linguistic levels. Concerning the lexicon, several sources such as Al-Čalabī (1960), Al-Bakrī (1972) and the *Sprachatlas* of Behnstedt and Woidich, prove the existence of Aramaisms in Mosul Arabic²⁴⁷. However, the loans mentioned in these sources are not attested in the Maṣlāwī words collected via questionnaire²⁴⁸.

One lemma, whose etymology has been attributed to Mandaic Aramaic, is the existential particle *aku*, negative form *maku*. It is though worth noticing that the debate on the origin of this particle is still open²⁴⁹.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 509.

²⁴¹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 372.

²⁴² Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 83-85.

²⁴³ Cf. Procházka 2018, pp. 243-244.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Procházka 2020, pp. 85-86.

²⁴⁵ Abu-Haidar 2004, p. 2, f.n. 5.

²⁴⁶ Cf. Retsö 2006, p. 178.

²⁴⁷ In the work of Al-Čalabī of 1935, I could not find any term corresponding to my words. Further indications of Aramaisms are provided by Procházka 2020 and Al-Bakrī 1972.

²⁴⁸ Aramaisms, which first entered Classical Arabic and then the dialect are not taken in account.

²⁴⁹ Cf. Holes 2018, pp. 120-122.

Two syntactic constructions, derived from the Aramaic substratum, are those with the anticipatory pronoun²⁵⁰. Both types, one marking a definite object noun and the other expressing the analytic attribution of a noun, appear in my recordings of Muslim Maṣlāwī of 2018:

- 1) *aḷḷa yərḥamu l-ğəddi*, “God have mercy (on him) on my grandfather”;
- 2) *ala giğlēnu əl-wēḥəd*, literally “on the legs (his) of someone”.

5.3 Phonological phenomena

5.3.1 The shift /r/ to /ğ/: peculiarities

One of the hallmarks of the Tigris group is the shift of the Old Arabic /r/ to /ğ/. This feature was already attested in the 9th century in Iraq as a distinguishing characteristic of prominent and educated people. Today it is perceived as a typical non-Muslim trait in the cities of central and South Iraq²⁵¹.

Analysing the lemmas in the questionnaires, it is evident that the shift is peculiar to both informants. In some categories of words, though, the sound /r/ is usually retained. First of all, this can be observed in English borrowings as well as in Turkish and Persian loanwords, including those European words loaned via these languages²⁵². Three exceptions in this sense are the borrowings (CM and MM) *ğōğābi*, (MM) *qanşōğ* and (MM) *qağnabīt*.

The sound /r/ is also retained in loans from Modern Standard Arabic, for instance (MM) *naḡḡāra*, “eye-glasses”; (CM and MM) *sayyāra*, “car”; the term *ḥaḡīra* in (CM) *ḥaḡīra māl baqağ*, “cowshed” and (CM) *ḥaḡīra māl xēl*, “horse stable”; (CM) *markab buxāri* and (MM) *saḡfina buxāriyya*, “steam-boat”; (MM) *ḡarnab barri*, “hare” and (MM) *mubāšara*, “immediately”²⁵³.

Loans from Muslim Baghdadi, where the shift /r/ > /ğ/ did not occur, also display the sound /r/. A few examples in this sense are (MM) *ḡozayrān*, “June”; (MM) *nahar*, “river”; (MM) *mahar*, “dowry”²⁵⁴.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 130.

²⁵¹ Cf. Blanc 1964, pp. 20-22.

²⁵² Blanc first described this phenomenon for Mosul. Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 20.

²⁵³ See Appendix 2 for the MSA forms in the list.

²⁵⁴ For the acquisition from Muslim Baghdadi, see section 6.2.6.

Furthermore, a consistent bulk of words, retaining the OA /r/, does not fit into this classification. In this regard, Jastrow had already observed how some lemmas of Arabic origin, as the verb *rəkəb*, “to mount, to board”, preserved the /r/, though without finding a clear explanation for this phenomenon²⁵⁵. Blanc identifies a similar situation in Christian and Jewish Baghdadi, in some terms, which are clearly not borrowed from another language such as *ġarb*, “west” and *šarq*, “east”²⁵⁶. These forms also appear as such in Christian and Muslim Mašlāwi. One could then suppose that there is a number of fixed lemmas of Arabic origin, which did not undergo the shift /r/ > /ġ/.

Another factor that seems to play a very important role in the occurrence of the OA /r/ as /ġ/, is the speaker’s idiolect. In some cases in fact, one person pronounces the same term alternately with /r/ and /ġ/. This was observed in several occasions in the speech of the Muslim informant: *tannōġ/tannōr*, “traditional oven”, *ktīġ / ktīr*, “much, very”, *šāġ / šār*, “to become”, *yaḥġəf / yaḥrəf*, “he knows”, *ħarat / ħaġat*, “to plough”, *mnāġa / manāra*, “minaret”. In Christian Mašlāwi this is detected in only one case: *ġəqəṣ / yərqəṣ*²⁵⁷.

From these observations, it is clear that the above-mentioned categories serve only partially to explain the absence of the shift /r/ > /ġ/, since other factors need to be considered.

The Christian informant displays a lemma with /r/ in 54 cases, whereas the Muslim one in 68 cases. In 34 cases, the lemma is the same, in 16 cases the word containing the sound /r/ is peculiar to the Christian informant and in 23 cases to the Muslim one. The cases in which the informants display the same words with a different pronunciation of /r/ are eight: (CM) *faġas*, (MM) *faras*, “stud”; (CM) *ʔaġnabi*, (MM) *ʔarnab*, “rabbit”; (CM) *qarnabīt*, (MM) *qaġnabīt*, “cauliflower”; (CM) *yəbāzər / bāzar*, (MM) *bāzaġ / yəbēzaġ*, “to bargain”; (CM) *mahəġ*, (MM) *mahar*, “dowry”; (CM) *ʔaḍāġ*, (MM) *ʔaḍār*, “March”; (CM) *ʔayyāġ*, (MM) *ʔayyār*, “May”; (CM) *ħziġān*, (MM) *ħozayrān*, “June”²⁵⁸.

As can be seen, the differences in the occurrences of /r/ in the Muslim and Christian speech are not so significant in order to justify a diverging pattern in the two varieties.

An aspect that should be considered is the tendency of the Muslim informant to pronounce some words alternately with /r/ and /ġ/, where the shift from OA /r/ > /ġ/ is expected. This might

²⁵⁵ Cf. Jastrow 1979, pp. 38-39.

²⁵⁶ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 20.

²⁵⁷ The examplei in Muslim Mašlāwi are taken from the questionnaire as well as from my recordings of 2018. A similar investigation could not be extended to Christian Mašlāwi since each word in the questionnaire was uttered by the informants one single time. An investigation of Jastrow’s text on Christian Mašlāwi did not show the same alternance as in the speech of my Muslim informant. Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 142-145.

²⁵⁸ As can be seen, this list also contains a word, which displays a morphological difference, *ʔaġnabi*, (MM) *ʔarnab*.

suggest that the shift is effectively dropped in certain circumstances, for instance when the informant interacts with *gilit* speakers. Indeed, other factors, such as the idiolectal variation and the influence of Standard Arabic, cannot be excluded but it would be interesting to observe whether this phenomenon occurs in the speech of other Maṣlāwi men²⁵⁹.

5.3.2 The shift /r/ to /ġ/: related phenomena

In section 4.1.1, it has been pointed out that the shift of /r/ to /ġ/ produced two phonemic changes. One of these is the assimilation of /ġ/ in the proximity of the consonants /q/, /x/ and /ħ/. This can be observed in several examples from the questionnaire: (CM) *ʔaqqaʕ* (< *ʔaqqaʕ < OA ʔaqraʕ) “bald”; (CM and MM) *ʕaqqōqa* (< *ʕaqqōqa < *ʕaqrōqa, probably from Syriac *ʕaqrūqā*²⁶⁰), “frog”; (CM and MM) *ʔaxxas* (< *ʔaxġas < OA ʔaxras), “mute”. The second phenomenon is the elision of /ġ/ and the lengthening of the short vowel in the sequence *vġC*, which occurs in two examples taken from the corpus of words: one is the above-mentioned *ʔlbēħa* (< *lbeġħa < *lbēriħa < OA *al-bāriħa*), “yesterday”, and the other is (CM) *xūfēn* (< *xəwfēn < *xəġfēn < *xirfēn < OA *xirfān*)²⁶¹, pl. of “sheep”. It is interesting to notice that MM displays the form *xuġfēn*, where the lengthening of the vowel has fully not taken place yet²⁶².

5.3.3 Short vowels other than /a/ and /ə/

Many lemmas in the list of words display short vowels other than /a/ and /ə/ in non-final position. In most cases, these sounds appear in a borrowing from another language.

As was illustrated in section 5.2., the short vowels /i/, /e/, /o/ and /u/ entered the Maṣlāwi lexicon via English, Persian and Turkish loanwords. In some cases, these sounds are directly borrowed from the foreign vocalic inventory, as the /o/ in *boṭəl* < Engl. “bottle”, the /i/ in *čingār* < Kurd. *čingāl*, “fork”, the /i/ in *šillēk* < Turk. *çilek*, “strawberry”, the /u/ in *purtaqāl*, “orange”, borrowed via Ottoman-Turkish from Greek. In other cases, the original foreign sounds are not preserved but replaced by one of the afore-mentioned short vowels, like the /i/ in *stikān*

²⁵⁹ The influence of Standard Arabic can be detected also in other words, for instance in the verbal inflection. Cf. section 5.4.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 154.

²⁶¹ Cf. Ibid., p. 22.

²⁶² The /ġ/ in (MM) *xuġfēn*, though, is barely audible.

originally an /a/ in Pers. *istakān*, “tea-glass”, the /e/ in *peyāla* < originally /i/ in Pers. *piyāle*, “tea-glass”, the /e/ in *stēren* < Engl. “steering” of “steering-wheel”²⁶³.

The short vowels /i/ and /u/ are also found in borrowings from Modern Standard Arabic, as can be seen in the following terms: *dāʔiman*, “always”, *muṣāq*, “lame”, *markab buxāri* and *saḥna buxāriyya*, “steam-boat”, *mubāšara*, “immediately”. This also concerns those verb forms, whose set of vowels is influenced by Standard Arabic, as (MM) *yugarbāl*, “he winnows”, (CM) *yəštaḡil*, “he works”²⁶⁴.

In the same way, borrowings from Muslim Baghdadi display the sounds /i/ and /u/, as the terms (MM) *iskāfi*, “shoemaker”, (MM) *diḡāḡa*, “hen”, (CM) *yaftihim*, “he understands”, (MM) *gubaḷ*, “straight ahead”²⁶⁵.

In three cases, words, which are not borrowings, display the short vowels /o/, /e/, /i/ and /u/, when an /a/ or /ə/ is expected: (CM) *ḡowēḡəb*, “socks”, (MM) *hozayrān*, “June”, (MM) *herbā?*, “chamaeleon”. Though being known and employed by the Maṣlāwi informants, these short vowels do not seem to have a phonemic status in Mosul Arabic.

5.3.4 Medial Imāla

In section 4.1.3, a basic introduction was provided on the phenomenon of the Imāla in Mosul Arabic. As illustrated, the medial Imāla can be of two types: in one type, the OA /ā/ has shifted to /ē/ due to the vicinity of OA /i/ as in *ḡawēməʕ* < OA *ḡawāmiʕ*, “mosques”; in the other type, the OA /ā/ has shifted to /ī/ due to the proximity of OA /ī/, as in *basītīn* < OA *basātīn*, “gardens”. According to Jastrow, there are specific nominal and verbal patterns, which usually display a medial Imāla. These are the OA plural forms *CiCāC*, *CiCCāC*, *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCīC*. This can be observed in several examples in the list of words: (MM) *ḥawēḡib* < OA *ḥawāḡib*, “eyebrows”; (CM and MM) *šafēyaf* < OA *šafāyif*, “lips”; (CM and MM) *šawēḡəb* < *šawārib*, “moustache”; (CM and MM) *zanībīḡ* < OA *zanābīr*, “wasps”; (CM and MM) *ʕašīfīḡ* < OA *ʕašāfir*, “sparrows”; (CM and MM) *ḡmēl* < OA *ḡimāl*, “camels”; (CM and MM) *ḡəbbēn* < OA *ḡibbān*, “flies”; (CM) *xūfēn* and (MM) *xuḡfēn* < OA *xirfān*, “sheeps”. Interestingly, only the

²⁶³ See section 5.2.

²⁶⁴ One would expect the forms *yəḡarbāl* and *yəštaḡəl* in Maṣlāwi.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 80 and 310. See also section 6.2.6.

substantives with the pattern *CiCāC* underwent this shift but not the adjectives: (MM) *kbāg* < OA *kibār*, “big, pl. masc.”²⁶⁶.

Concerning the verbs, a shift from OA /ā/ to /ē/ can be observed in the imperfect, imperative and active participle of Form III, due to the presence of the short /i/ in these OA forms: *yuCāCiC*, *CāCiC* and *muCāCiC*²⁶⁷. In some dialects, as it is the case for Muslim Maṣlāwī, the shift affects also the perfect form due to analogy with the imperfect²⁶⁸.

Of the three verbs in Form III found in the questionnaire, only one displays the Imāla in both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī, namely *xēlaq* / *yxēlaq*, “to insult”. The verb “to bargain”, derived from the Kurdish *bazar*, behaves differently: in Muslim Maṣlāwī, the Imāla appears in the imperfect but not in the perfect, *bāzağ* / *yəbēzağ*, whereas in Christian Maṣlāwī it does not occur at all, *yəbāzər* / *bāzar*. Also, the verb “to return” is pronounced by the Muslim informant in one occasion as *dāwara* / *yədāwər* and in another one as *dēwər* / *yədēwər*. Further examples in my recordings of 2018 and Jastrow’s texts in Muslim Maṣlāwī confirmed that the distribution of the Imāla in Form III is less homogeneous than expected: *ṣād-aḥāwəl*, “I am trying”, *sāṣəd ṣadīqu*, “he helped his friend”²⁶⁹; *ysāṣəda*, “he helps her”; *lēqanu*, “he met him”²⁷⁰.

Concerning the distribution of the Imāla in the OA pattern *fāṣil*, both Muslim and Christian Maṣlāwī show similarities with Jewish Maṣlāwī. According to Levin, in the Jewish speech the OA /ā/ shifts to /ē/ in the active participle of the basic stem²⁷¹. This can be seen also in the following examples in the other two dialects: (MM) *sēkən/sēknīn*, “he is living/ they are living”; (MM) *qēṣəd*, “he is sitting”, (MM) *kētəb*, “he is writing”; (CM) *qēṣde*, “she is sitting”. An exception in this regard, is the form (CM and MM) *lāzəm*, “(it is) necessary”²⁷².

Regarding the adjectives of the type *fāṣil*, some of them display a shift towards /ē/, whereas others preserved the OA /ā/, as in the following examples: (CM and MM) *fārəğ*, “empty”; (CM) *nūm ḥāməd*, “lemons”; (MM) *bēğəd*, “cold”; (MM) *ğēməd*, “frozen”²⁷³.

²⁶⁶ Example taken from my recordings of Muslim Maṣlāwī of 2018. For the Imāla in the adjectives, cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 66.

²⁶⁷ Cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 66.

²⁶⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

²⁶⁹ Examples from my recordings of Muslim Maṣlāwī of 2018.

²⁷⁰ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 2 and p. 58/ 13. Verbs of Form III were not found in Jastrow’s text on Christian Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 142-145.

²⁷¹ All cases presented for the pattern *fāṣil* are described by Levin as typical for Jewish Maṣlāwī. Cf. Levin 2000, p. 100.

²⁷² The examples in MM are taken from my recordings of 2018. For the one in CM, cf. Jastrow 2004, p. 143/ 14. The last one, *lāzəm*, is taken from the corpus of words.

²⁷³ The last two examples are from my recordings on Muslim Maṣlāwī of 2018.

A similar situation obtains for the substantives, though in most examples from the list of words the OA /ā/ is retained: (CM and MM) *šārəʕ*, “street”; (CM and MM) *ḥādət*, “accident”; (CM and MM), *ṭābəʕ*, “stamp”; (MM) *ḡēməʕ*, “mosque”, (MM) *yēbas*, “dry tea”²⁷⁴.

To this pattern also belong the cardinal number one, pronounced *wēḥad* in both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi. Another number, displaying an internal Imāla is “eight” in the Christian speech, *ṭmēni*. Interestingly, the Muslim informant has *ṭmāniya* instead, which resembles the Muslim Baghdadi form²⁷⁵.

What Blanc defines as productive Imāla, described in section 4.1.3, is not observed in any of the words in the questionnaire due to lack of examples of this type. When asked to translate some words containing the suffixes *-či* and *-īn*, the Muslim informant displayed a shift of the OA /ā/ to /ē/ with the first suffix but not with the second one: *bəstēnči*, “gardener”, *qaṣṣābīn*, “butchers”, *xayyāṭīn*, “tailors”. In comparison, Jewish Maṣlāwi has *qaṣṣēbīn* and *xayyēṭīn*²⁷⁶.

Regarding the morpheme *-āyi*, it displays, according to Jastrow, two forms, one of these with an Imāla of the /ā/ > /ē/, as in *ḡahabēyi*²⁷⁷. The examples in the list of words only show forms without Imāla: (CM) *tamḡāyi*, “raceme”; (MM) *ṣaḡwāyi*, “stone”; (MM) *glōbāyi*, “electric light”; (CM) *ṣammūnāyi*, “loaf of bread”; (MM) *daṣmāyi*, “accident”.

5.3.5 Final Imāla

In section 4.1.3, the final Imāla in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwi is described as follows: the allomorph of the feminine ending is /i/, when this is neither preceded by an emphatic nor by a back consonant (*x, ḡ, q, ʕ, ḥ, h, ʔ*). In the other cases, the ending is /a/. This rule applies to most of the words in the list, as in (CM and MM) *ʔaḡmali*, “widow”; (CM and MM) *ḡəkbi*, “knee”; (CM and MM) *ṣaqqōqa*, “frog”; (CM and MM) *bazzūni*, “cat”; (CM and MM) *ḥənṭa*, “wheat”. Some words, which belong to particular categories, do not follow this rule. It can be observed how in the borrowings from foreign languages the allomorph /i/ of the feminine ending does not occur²⁷⁸: (MM) *qaryōla*, “bed”, (MM) *dōlka*, “water-jar”, (CM) *xərda*, “change”, (CM) *xastaxāna*, “hospital”; (CM and MM) *lahāna*, “cabbage”.

²⁷⁴ The word *yēbas* can be found in Jastrow 1979, p. 75/44, whereas *ḡēməʕ* is part of my recording of 2018.

²⁷⁵ For the Muslim Baghdadi form, cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

²⁷⁶ Cf. Levin 2000, p. 101. In Jewish Maṣlāwi, the OA /ā/ shifts to /ē/ in the vicinity of /i/, see section 4.1.3.

²⁷⁷ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

²⁷⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 72.

The same can be said for borrowings from Modern Standard Arabic, as evident in the words (MM) *naḍḍāra*, “eye-glasses”, (MM) *saḥna buxāriyya*, “steam-boat”, the word *ḥaḍīra* in (CM) *ḥaḍīra māl baqaḡ*, “cowshed” and *ḥaḍīra māl xēl*, “horse stable”.

Also the loans from other dialects, like those from Muslim Baghdadi, always have /a/ as allomorph of the feminine ending, as in (MM) *diḡāḡa*, “hen”, (MM) *ḡaḡūza*, “old woman”²⁷⁹. It is worth noticing that in the Muslim speech, the numbers all display a final -a, contrasting with those in Christian Maṣlāwi: (MM) *xamsa*, (CM) *xamsi*, “five”; (MM) *satta*, (CM) *satti*, “six”; (MM) *tmāniya*, (CM) *tmēni*, “eight”. According to my Muslim informant, the forms with the -i ending are typical of the Christian speech. The Muslim speech displays a resemblance to the Muslim Baghdadi forms: *xamsa*, “five”, *sitta*, “six”, *tmāniya*, “eight”²⁸⁰. This evidence suggests an acquisition from Muslim Baghdadi into the Muslim speech, representing in this research the latest stage of Maṣlāwi²⁸¹.

Concerning the distribution of the final Imāla, an interesting case is represented by those words, whose feminine ending is preceded by /ḡ/. In the *qaltu* dialects, the feminine ending is /i/, when preceded by a /ḡ/ < OA /r/. Mosul Arabic, on the other hand, has the ending /a/, as in the terms (CM and MM) *fāḡa*, “mouse”, (CM and MM) *siḡaḡa*, “tree”, (CM and MM) *baqaḡa*, “cow”²⁸². The only exception in this regard, is represented by the adjectives of the pattern *CaCīC*, which display alternately the allomorphs /a/ and /i/. According to Jastrow, it is the shift from /r/ to /ḡ/ that led to a new distribution of the feminine suffixes, often determined by analogy with the words rather than by the presence of an emphatic or back consonant. Therefore, two versions of the same word, one ending with /a/ and the other with /i/, might co-exist in Mosul Arabic and differ among the city areas and the different religious communities²⁸³.

The examples in the list and in my recordings of 2018, as well as those from Jastrow’s texts (Jastrow 1979, 2004), confirm an irregular distribution of the Imāla ending for the adjectives of this pattern:

- Jastrow - (CM) *zḡēḡi*, “little”, *kbīḡi*, “big”;
(MM) *zḡēḡi*, “little”, *kbīḡi*, “big”, *faḡīḡa*, “poor”²⁸⁴.
- my data - (CM and MM) *zḡēḡi*, “little”, (CM) *kbīḡi*, “big”;

²⁷⁹See section 6.2.6.

²⁸⁰Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

²⁸¹For the accommodation towards Muslim Baghdadi, see section 6.2.6.

²⁸²Cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 72.

²⁸³Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

²⁸⁴Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40 and Jastrow 2004, p. 144/ 26, 29.

(MM) *kīḡa*, “large”, (MM) *kbīḡa*, “big”, *faqīḡa*, “poor”²⁸⁵.

It can be observed that Christian Maṣlāwī always displays the allomorph /i/, whereas Muslim Maṣlāwī has an alternation of the endings /a/ and /i/.

5.4 Morphological phenomena: peculiarities of the verbal patterns

Observing the words in my corpus, it can be noticed that both informants occasionally display verbs, whose patterns diverge from the typical Maṣlāwī ones, namely *qatal* / *yəqtəl*, *məsək* / *yəmsək*, *bana* / *yəbni*, *nəsi* / *yənsa*²⁸⁶.

In some cases, an influence from Standard Arabic is detected, as in (CM) *yəštaḡil*, “he works (in a factory)”, displaying the same set of vowels of MSA imperfect base of form VIII, *yaštaḡilu*. Other verbs show the MSA imperfect prefix for the 3. ps. sg. m. *ya-* instead of the Maṣlāwī *yə-*: (CM) *yasqi*, “he irrigates”, (MM) *yaḡīš*, “he lives”, (MM) *yaḡmāl*, “he makes”. The Muslim informant also exhibits the final *-a* of the MSA perfect base in three occasions: *rakaba ḡa-l-ḡaṣān*, “to mount a horse”, *dāwara*, “to return”, and *ḡaṣṣala*, “to get”.

One verb, (CM) *yafṡihim*, “he understands”, reflects the influence of the Muslim Baghdadi form *yifṡihim* in the set of vowels, though the prefix resembles more the MSA *ya-*²⁸⁷.

Other cases of deviation from the Maṣlāwī patterns are detected in the Muslim speech: *nəzəl* / *yanzəl mən as-sayyāra*, “to descend from a car”, *nəzəl* / *yanzəl mən lə-ḡaṣān*, “to dismount from a horse” but *nəzəl* / *yənzəl*, “to go down (from a hill)”. In comparison, CM displays in all three cases the correct Maṣlāwī forms *nəzəl* / *yənzəl*.

The examples proposed, being isolated, are not representative of the Maṣlāwī dialect as a whole. They are rather due to the setting of the recording, in which each term is uttered in its pausal form. Also, the interview setting often influences the informants, who unconsciously employ Standard Arabic forms instead of the dialectal ones.

In other cases, though, the deviations from the Maṣlāwī verbal patterns show consistency and cannot be simply attributed to the influence of Standard Arabic or Muslim Baghdadi. One example is represented by the forms *məši* / *yəməši*, meaning “to walk” in MM and “to go down to the street” in CM in the expression *məši* / *yəməši bə-š-šārəḡ*. This verb is detected with the same

²⁸⁵ The examples in MM are from my recordings of 2018.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, pp. 45-46. For a complete list of the derived forms, cf. paragraph 4.2.7.

²⁸⁷ For the MB form, see Woodhead and Beene 1967, p. 361 s.r. “f-h-m”.

set of vowels in Jastrow's text on Muslim Maṣlāwī, *māši* / *yāmši*, "to go by walking", which attests it as a typical Maṣlāwī form²⁸⁸.

In addition to this, it can be observed that both the Christian and the Muslim informant display a basic stem in the form *faʕal* / *yafʕal*. This can be identified in the following verbs: (CM) *rağaf* / *yərğaf*, "to return"; (MM) *sabaḥ* / *yəsbaḥ*, "to swim", (CM) *şanaʕ* / *yəşnaʕ*, "to make sth.", (CM and MM) *dafaʕ* / *yədfaʕ*, "to pay", (CM and MM) *fataḥ* / *yəftaḥ*, "to open", (CM and MM) *ʕalaʕ* / *yəʕlaʕ*, "to go out, to go upstairs", (CM) *saʔal* / *yəsʔal*, "to ask" and (MM) *baʕaʕ* / *yəbʕaʕ*, "to send". Interestingly, all these forms hark back to the CA basic stem *faʕala* / *yafʕalu*, the only exception being the verbs *rağaf* and *ʕalaʕ*.²⁸⁹ Another common trait is that, in these verbs, either the second or the third radical is a guttural sound, like the pharyngeals ḥ and ʕ and the glottal stop ʔ.

5.5 Syntactic phenomena: the genitive marker

The genitive marker *māl* is a hallmark of the modern Iraqi dialects²⁹⁰. Several constructions with *māl* appear in my corpus, mostly in the Christian speech.

The Christian informant in fact, displays eight expressions with the genitive marker against one single occurrence for the Muslim one: (CM) *xēmi māl badū*, "tent"; (CM and MM) *qūri ma-č-čāy*, "tea-pot"; (CM) *qəndara ma-n-nəswān*, "women shoes"; (CM) *kīs māl məswāq*, "shopping bag"; (CM) *bēt māl ġēğ*, "hen-house"; (CM) *ḥaḍīra māl baqağ*, "cowshed"; (CM) *ḥaḍīra māl xēl*, "stable"; (CM) *xaliyya māl naḥəl*, "bee-hive". On the contrary, the Muslim informant displays eight *iḍāfa* constructions, whereas the Christian informant only one: (MM) *ʔasfal əl-ğəğəl*, "sole"; (MM) *qağaf əl-ğabal*, "pumpkin"; (MM) *ğadaʕ ən-naxli*, "stem" (of a palmtree); (MM) *ʔistikānət əč-čāy*, *peyālat əč-čāy*, "tea-glass"; (MM) *kīs əl-məswāq*, "shopping bag"; (MM) *ʔaḥōnat māy*, "water-wheel"; (MM) *xalīt naḥəl*, "bee-hive"; (CM) *glāş čāy*, "tea-glass"²⁹¹.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/ 12.

²⁸⁹ Of these verbs, *ʕalaʕ* can be found both in the past and present tense in Jastrow's works. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 2, p. 58/ passim and Jastrow 2004, p. 142/ 6 and p. 144/ 34.

²⁹⁰ Another form, and most probably the feminine form of *māl*, is *mālət*, which does not occur in my corpus. Cf. Procházka 2018, p. 253.

²⁹¹ Concerning the word "pumpkin", *qağaf əl-ğabal*, it does not occur in Behnstedt & Woidich. However, it also seems like a fixed expression. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 478.

Those *idāfa* constructions, which constitute fixed expressions, are not taken into account in this discussion: (CM) *ʔabu xsēm*, “lizard”; (CM) *qūz əl-qazaḥ*, “rainbow”; (MM) *ʔabū brēs*, “gecko”; (MM) *ʔabu l-ʕabəd*, “black man”; (MM) *qawz quzaḥ*, “rainbow”.

The absence of the genitive marker in the speech of the Muslim informant is further attested in my Muslim Maṣlāwī recordings of 2018, where annexation is expressed only by *idāfa* constructions, like in the following examples: *ššōn ḥadbət əḍ-ḍahəg*, “like the curve of the back”; *šarbat əz-zbīb*, “raisin juice”; *taqsīmāt ələ-byūt*, “house proportions”.

An interesting phenomenon is the contraction of the genitive marker in those constructions, where *māl* is followed by a substantive beginning with a sun letter, which is in turn preceded by the definite article. In these cases, *əl-* assimilates to the sun letter, the final *l* of *māl* disappears and the long *a* is shortened. The stages of this process are: *qūri māl əč-čāy* > *qūri mā-č-čāy* > *qūri ma-č-čāy*²⁹².

Two examples of this contraction are found in my corpus: (CM and MM) *qūri ma-č-čāy*, “tea-pot”; (CM) *qəndara ma-n-nəswān*, “women shoes”.

Concerning the constructions, where *māl* is followed by a substantive beginning with a moon letter, the absence of examples in my data does not allow me to draw any conclusions in this regard. Looking at this kind of constructions in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī²⁹³, it can be noticed that *māl* is never contracted, neither when followed by a sun letter nor by a moon letter: *māl əl-bēt*, *māl əl-xaṣab*, *lkammīyi māl əč-čāy*²⁹⁴.

These examples might suggest that the contraction does not occur systematically in the presence of sun letters.

²⁹² In Jastrow’s texts (2004, 1979), there is one single occurrence of *māl* followed by a noun that begins with a sun letter. In this case, the definite article is assimilated but the genitive marker does not undergo any changes: *lkammīyi māl əč-čāy*, “the amount of tea” (Jastrow 1979, p. 75/45).

²⁹³ In Jastrow’s text on Christian Maṣlāwī, there are no examples of such constructions. Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 142-145.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Jastrow 1979, pp. 60/ 7, 64/ 2, 75/ 45.

6. Diachronic analysis

6.1 Research question, methodology and sources employed

The research question of this work concerns the diachronic analysis of the corpus of words collected in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī. In particular, it aims to detect how many words in the list underwent a change in a time span going from 1882 to 2015.

As mentioned in section 3.2, the two sources employed to carry out the diachronic analysis are the article of Albert Socin, dating 1882, and the dictionary of Al-Bakrī, published in 1972. These works constitute the main references for the diachronic analysis, which then considered the state of Mosul Arabic in four different historical moments: 1882, 1972, the late 1980s and 2015.

The last two dates refer to the moments, in which the Christian and the Muslim informant respectively, left Mosul. As mentioned in section 3.2 and as evident from the analysis of the data, the discrepancies between the terms in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī could, in some cases, be attributed to religious affiliation, whereas in others to a diachronic change. The Christian informant often provided a word, which he himself or the Muslim informant considered obsolete and which had already fallen into disuse. In these cases, then, the information provided by the two informants constitute a hint on the diachronic change, as their speech reflects the state of Mosul Arabic in two different historical moments.

In addition to the above-mentioned sources, three works have been employed as secondary references, especially for those lexical items that occurred neither in Socin nor in Al-Bakrī. These are the dictionary of Al-Čalabī on the Persian loanwords in Mosul Arabic, dating 1960, Jastrow's article on Muslim Maṣlāwī of 1979 and Blanc's *Communal dialects in Baghdad* of 1964. As can be seen, the publication of these works precedes or follows that of Al-Bakrī's dictionary of almost a decade. In the light of the analysis, they will be then considered as contemporaries of Al-Bakrī's work.

Prior to the presentation and discussion of the results of the first research question, I will briefly introduce the works of Socin and Al-Bakrī, the aim being to highlight those aspects, which are important in the light of the research.

Concerning the article of Albert Socin, it includes a collection of seven texts in Maṣlāwī. The texts are written both in Arabic and Latin transcription and translated into German. Being the first work ever written on Mosul Arabic, the validity of Socin's article was often questioned by different authors. Jastrow doubted the authenticity of the texts and detected some

inconsistencies in the transcription²⁹⁵, whereas Blanc noticed the absence of details on the informants as well as of explanatory notes on the text²⁹⁶. Nonetheless, both researchers used it as a reference for their investigation on the Iraqi dialects, which persuaded me to include it in my research²⁹⁷.

Among the peculiarities of Socin's text is the absence of shift /r/ > /ġ/ as well as of the sound /ə/. The short vowels occurring in the text are /a/, /i/, /u/, /o/ and /e/, together with /ä/, /ö/ and /ü/. In some cases, these are written in superscript, presumably to mark a less perceptible sound, as in the word *l^elātä*, "three"²⁹⁸.

Regarding the type of texts in the article, those from I to VI can be considered as folk tales, in that they depict men's wisdom and stupidity. In one case, the protagonists are animals and in the others a group of people, usually Kurds. Text VII, on the other hand, describes the preparation of *burgul* and of other Maşlāwi dishes.

Concerning the second source, Al-Bakrī's *Dirāsāt fī 'l-ʔalfāḍ al-ḡammīya 'l-mawṣilīya: wa muqāranatuhā maʿa 'l-ʔalfāḍ al-ḡammīya fī 'l-ʔaqālīm al-ḡarabīya*, it has been already employed in studies on Mosul Arabic and on the Mesopotamian dialects, such as Jastrow (1979) and Procházka (2020).

In comparison to Socin, which reported the texts in Arabic and German, Al-Bakrī's dictionary is written entirely in Arabic. A crucial detail of this work is the absence of words beginning with the interdentals /t̪/, /d̪/ and /ð/, and the presence of words beginning with the sounds /p/, /č/ and /g/, rendered with the following Arabic letters: پ , چ , گ²⁹⁹. The author also indicates the lowering of the long /u/ and /i/ by using the term *Imāla*, as in the following examples:

³⁰⁰ *ʔabū xsēm* (بإمالة الياء) أبو خُصيم

³⁰¹ *maḥfōḡa* (بإمالة الواو) محفوغه

In comparison to Socin, Al-Bakrī includes the shift /r/ > /ġ/, though not consistently in the whole work.

Another salient feature of the dictionary is the specification of borrowings from foreign languages. Among these are loanwords from French, English, Italian, Aramaic, Hebrew, Turkish, Latin, Kurdish, Greek and Indian.

²⁹⁵ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 36.

²⁹⁶ Cf. Blanc 1959, p. 451.

²⁹⁷ Cf. Jastrow (1979) and Blanc (1964).

²⁹⁸ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 17/ 15.

²⁹⁹ The words in Al-Bakrī have been transcribed using the DMG transcription, which has been employed in the whole master's thesis.

³⁰⁰ Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 36 s. v. "ʔab".

³⁰¹ Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 456 s. v. "maḥfōḡa".

The author also provides the translation of each lemma in one or more Arabic dialects, including Baghdadi, Egyptian, Syrian, Kuwaiti, Tunisian, Moroccan and Nağdi.

The description of each source and its peculiarities should provide significant hints on the kind of words encountered during the research.

In the next sections, the results of the diachronic analysis will be presented and discussed, starting from the process of acquisition and organization of the data.

6.2 Presentation and discussion of the results of the diachronic analysis

6.2.1 Organization of the results: the diachronic categories

The aim of the research question is to investigate how the lexical items in my corpus have changed in a time span going from 1882 to 2015. In order to answer this question, I searched for the 530 lemmas in Socin's article and in Al-Bakrī's dictionary. When a term could not be found in these two works, I examined the three secondary sources in order to detect it.

As can be hypothesized, only a part of the lexical items in the corpus have been documented in the written sources. The analysis has been then carried out only for those lexical items, which are attested at least in one of the older sources.

Within the 530 lexical items in the corpus, 127 are detected in Socin and 121 in Al-Bakrī. In addition to this, 14 words are detected in Socin with the same form as CM and/or MM but with another meaning, the same can be said of 18 terms in Al-Bakrī.

The results of this search have been organized in a table, named "Appendix 2", which can be found as an attachment to the present work.

The table includes 6 columns, which contains the following information: lemma in English, translation of the lemma in Christian Maşlāwī, translation of the lemma in Muslim Maşlāwī, occurrence of the lemma in Socin, occurrence of the lemma in Al-Bakrī, diachronic change that can be observed for the lemma. The occurrence of a term in one of the secondary sources is also indicated in the table by means of a footnote.

Concerning the transcription of the terms in Socin's article, it is worth mentioning that the set of vowels employed by the author has been reported as such, since it was not possible to find a one-to-one correspondence with the vowel system employed in my work³⁰².

³⁰² For the set of vowels employed in Socin, cf. section 6.1.

In Al-Bakrī, on the other hand, the words in Arabic script are not always vocalized. In these cases, the word has been transcribed as it will appear in MSA, using as a reference the forms indicated in Wehr's dictionary³⁰³. In other cases, a *sukūn* is placed on the first letter of a word or two *sukūn* are found on the last two letters. In these cases, the *sukūn* is transcribed with /ə/ as in the words خَشَّة, transcribed as *xəšša*, and خَشْم, transcribed as *xašəm*, both meaning “nose”³⁰⁴. Regarding the words attested in Al-Bakrī, it has to be mentioned that a consistent part of them was detected in the first place in the *Wortatlas*. This concerns those words, whose form diverges from that attested in Christian Maṣlāwī, in Muslim Maṣlāwī and in Socin. As can be hypothesized, most of these terms are indicated in WAD as typical Iraqi forms. An example in this sense is represented by the word *dabank*, “fool, stupid”. This occurs both in the *Sprachatlas* and in Al-Bakrī but not in CM, in MM and in Socin³⁰⁵.

During the search and acquisition of the lemmas in the two sources, it became evident that certain categories recurred, each one reflecting a different type of diachronic change. The categories are the following: preservation of a term, phonological and morphological changes that occurred diachronically, semantic shift, semantic reduction, semantic extension, falling into disuse of a term, accommodation towards Muslim Baghdadi.

The above-mentioned cases are reported in the table with acronyms, which are explained in the key at the beginning of the Appendix 2³⁰⁶. In the key, it has been also indicated whether a term is not documented in any source and therefore, a diachronic analysis could not be carried out. In a few other cases, a term occurs in the same form as in Christian Maṣlāwī and/or Muslim Maṣlāwī, though displaying a different meaning. As can be seen from the table, some of these terms are semantically related, as it is the case of CM *fəṭaḡ* - *yəṭṭaḡ*, “to have breakfast”, and Al-Bakrī's *faṭaḡ*, “to crack, to break something”³⁰⁷.

In addition to the diachronic changes, the table also shows whether the difference between two terms can be attributed to other factors such as the influence of Modern Standard Arabic, the religious difference and a wrong translation.

At this point, it is necessary to take a closer look at the types of diachronic changes that have been observed, in order to define them, to determine their occurrences and to analyse the most relevant cases among them.

³⁰³ Wehr, H., & Cowan, J. M. (1976). *A dictionary of modern written Arabic*: [Arabic - English dictionary] (3. ed.). Spoken Language Service.

³⁰⁴ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 192 s. v. “xašim”.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 213 s. v. “dabank” and Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 127. For the forms in CM, MM and in Socin, see Appendix 2.

³⁰⁶ The phonological changes are the only category, which is not indicated with an acronym.

³⁰⁷ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 366 s. v. “faṭaḡ”.

6.2.2 Preservation of the words occurring in the old sources

The first pattern observed in the light of the diachronic analysis is the preservation of a word. A lemma is preserved when it occurs in the same form in both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāw and in one or more sources employed for the diachronic analysis. This is for example the case of the word “beggar”, which appears as *mgaddi* in the Christian and Muslim speech as well as in Al-Bakrī’s dictionary.

This case is extended to those lemmas that are documented neither in Socin nor in Al-Bakrī but that occur in one of the secondary sources employed as reference, namely Blanc (1964), Al-Čalabī (1960) and Jastrow (1979).

The preservation of a word is also observed, when a lemma displays the same form in Muslim Maṣlāwi and in one or more of the above-mentioned sources. As mentioned in section 6.1 in fact, the speech of the Muslim informant is considered in the present work as representative of the latest stage of Maṣlāwi.

It has been observed that, within the words attested in the diachronic sources, 277 are preserved in today’s Mosul Arabic. 22 of these terms convey a more specific semantic nuance of the lemma in the corpus. An example is the term *čahra*, which does not merely refer to a “face” but it describes in Al-Bakrī an “ugly, stupid face”. Another mention of *čihra* can be found in the *Wortatlas*, where it is employed as an insulting form for “face”, typical of Muslim Baghdadi. According to the Muslim informant, *čahra* is also found in Maṣlāwi with a derogatory meaning, namely “bad, ugly face”³⁰⁸.

In addition to this, 9 terms that are not present in the corpus have been preserved in the Mosul dialect. These are words that appear in the same form in one or more older sources and in the speech of one or both informants but that have a different meaning. For instance, the term *yāba* occurs in Socin with the meaning of “my friend!” and in the Muslim speech as “father!”³⁰⁹. The form *yāba* is also attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi and in the Woodhead & Beene dictionary with the same meaning as in Socin³¹⁰. When asked about this term, the Muslim informant confirmed that in Maṣlāwi, *yāba* is a vocative form, which both means “father!” and “friend!”.

It is worth noticing that some lemmas were categorized as “preserved”, though one or more phonological differences are detected between the form in the written sources and that of the

³⁰⁸ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 159 and Al-Bakrī, p. 160 s. v. “čahra”.

³⁰⁹ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 13/ 2.

³¹⁰ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/ 9 and Woodhead & Beene 1967, p. 506 s. v. “yā”.

informants. These differences are not taken into account, when they refer to one of the following phenomena: the absence of shift /r/ > /ġ/, the use of a different set of short vowels and the absence of anaptyctic vowel due to the occurrence of a word in context. For instance, the lemma *tōġ* is classified as “preserved”, though it appears as *tōr* in Socin and as *tōġ* both in CM and MM³¹¹.

In other cases, though, a phonological or morphological difference might be indicative of a diachronic change. These cases will be discussed in section 6.2.3.

As can be seen in the table, a lexical item in the set of words is often translated with different Arabic terms. In order to determine whether these forms were preserved or not in today’s Mosul Arabic, I submitted them to my Muslim informant, who not only provided information on the preservation but also on the diachronic change that these words underwent. His information constitutes in several cases the only reference, as I could not find any evidence in the written sources, and is referred to in the table with the acronym MM.

Among the cases of preservation are some worth discussing. One of these concerns the term “tree”, which displays an interesting linguistic evolution. Both the Christian and the Muslim informants translated this word as *siġaġa*. Similarly as in the forms *šiġra* and *šiġara*, of Basra and Baghdad respectively, the back vowel /a/ in the first syllable was raised to /i/³¹². In addition to this, Mašlāwi displays a shift of the voiceless fricative /š/ to /s/, which does not occur in any other Iraqi dialect. This dissimilation, though, is attested in the North-East of Syria as well as in Anatolia³¹³, suggesting a similarity with the other *qəltu* dialects. The dissimilation of /š/ had already taken place at Socin’s time, since in his texts “tree” is translated as *seġara*³¹⁴. In the same way, the presence of /e/ in the first syllable shows that the raising of the back vowel /a/ had also occurred.

In some cases, the diachronic preservation of a word might not occur in each religious group. This can be observed for the lexical items *čaṭal* and *čingār*. The former is attested in Al-Bakrī as “fork” and is preserved as such in Muslim Mašlāwi³¹⁵. The latter, on the other hand, is translated as “fork”, from the Kurd. *čingāl*, in the Christian speech³¹⁶. The word *čingāl* is attested in Al-Čalabī with the meaning of “hook”, the same translation provided by the Muslim informant,

³¹¹ Cf. Socin 1882, pp. 19 and 21, *passim*.

³¹² Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 449.

³¹³ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 448.

³¹⁴ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 9/ 8.

³¹⁵ Cf. Al-Bakrī, p. 155 s. v. “čaṭal”.

³¹⁶ See section 5.2.2 for the origin and the phonological change of this word.

when asked about this term³¹⁷. This suggests that *čingāl* has been preserved with the meaning of “hook” in the Muslim speech, whereas the Christian minority adopted it with the meaning of “fork” in a certain period.

Another case of preservation, which developed differently in each religious group, is observed for the adverb “there”. This has almost identical forms in CM and in Socin, *hōnək* and *hōnik* respectively, whereas it is *hnūk* in MM. The form *hnūka* is indicated by Blanc as typical for the Muslim speakers of Mosul, whereas *hōnek* is attributed to the Christian and Jewish speakers³¹⁸. This is confirmed in Jastrow’s text on Christian Maṣlāwī, in which only the form *hōnek/hōnak* appears³¹⁹.

A particular case of preservation is observed for the lemma “landlord”. This is translated by CM and MM with a construct state, whose second constituent is *əl-bēt*, “the house”, whereas the first can be *šāḥəb*, *ʔab* or *mālik*³²⁰. As can be seen in the table, in the old sources “landlord” does not occur. The terms *šāḥəb* and *ʔab*, though, appear with the meaning of “owner”. Thus, one could recognize the preservation of the two lemmas with this meaning, as it is evident that *šāḥəb əl-bēt* and *ʔabu l-bēt* can be literally translated as “the owner of the house”.

6.2.3 Phonological and morphological changes in a diachronic perspective

In section 6.2.2, it has been pointed out that the same word can occur in Maṣlāwī as well as in one or more older sources and yet differ on the phonological or morphological level. Some of these cases are worth discussing, as the differences detected are relevant in the light of the diachronic analysis.

The word “water” for instance, is translated as *māy* in both CM and MM and as *moi*, *moyi* in Socin. At first glance, the differences in the two words could appear as mere phonological. More likely though, *moi* and *moyi* are diminutive forms of *māy*, similar to the form *moyyi*, attested in Syrian³²¹. These were employed at Socin’s time with the meaning of “water”.

Two other lemmas in Socin seem to represent a stage prior of the CM and MM forms. This is the case of the word “yesterday”, which is translated by both informants as *əlbēḥa*, whereas in

³¹⁷ Cf. Al-Čalabī 1960, p. 64.

³¹⁸ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 139.

³¹⁹ Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 142-145 passim. In Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī (1979) the word “there” does not occur.

³²⁰ As can be seen in Appendix 2, MM provides the form *əl-mālik*, where there is no specification.

³²¹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 421.

Socin it appears in the forms *elbērḥa* and *elbēreḥa*. As explained in the section 5.3.2, *albēḥa* derives from **lbeḡḥa* < **lbēriḥa* < OA *al-bāriḥa*. Assuming that the sound /r/ was pronounced as /ḡ/ at Socin's time, though not indicated, one could suppose that *elbērḥa* represents an intermediate stage between the shortening of /ē/ and the assimilation of the sequence v_C, with C as /ḡ/. It can be observed that the assimilation had already taken place at Al-Bakrī's time, since the same term appears in the dictionary as *ilbēḥa*³²².

In the same way, the interrogative pronoun "how?", *aššōn* in CM and MM, might represent an evolution of Socin's equivalent *aš-lōn*. The /l/ of *lōn* could have been assimilated to the preceding /š/, in analogy to the assimilation of the sound /l/ of the definite article, when followed by a sun letter.

6.2.4 Words fallen into disuse

The second type of diachronic categorization relates to those terms that can be classified as old-fashioned or that have already fallen into disuse.

Within the words attested in the older sources and in the Christian speech, 19 are classified as obsolete or as not in use anymore, including the cases in which the demise of a word is only hypothesized.

As for the first category, the Muslim informant provided a consistent contribution in identifying the terms fallen into disuse. In some cases, though, indications on the use of a certain form can be found in the sources for the diachronic analysis. This is for example observed for the term *ḥabb ḡḡēt*, "peas", occurring in the work of Al-Čalabī on the Persian loanwords in Maṣlāwī. Al-Čalabī in the first place describes *ḥabb ḡḡēt* as an old Maṣlāwī form, which has been replaced by the European loan *bazālya*³²³. It is possible to identify a parallelism with the forms provided by the informants. In the Christian dialect, representing the older stage of Maṣlāwī, we find the form *ḥabb ḡḡēt*, whereas in the Muslim one, representing a more recent stage of Maṣlāwī, occurs the form *bazālya*.

A similar case is documented for the word "lemons", which is attested neither in Socin nor in Al-Bakrī but appears in Al-Čalabī. Here, it is pointed out that "lemons" is translated in Baghdadī as *nūmi ḥāmāḍ* and in Maṣlāwī as *nūm ḥāmāḍ*³²⁴. The latter corresponds to the CM form,

³²² Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 51 s. v. "ilbēḥa".

³²³ In Al-Čalabī it appears in the form *bāzalya*. Cf. Al-Čalabī 1960, p. 13.

³²⁴ Cf. Al-Čalabī 1960, p. 179.

whereas the MM form is *laymūn*, which is found in the Levante and in the *qəltu* dialects such as Anatolian Arabic³²⁵. When asked about the CM form, the Muslim informant replied that *nūmi ḥāməd* is employed, parallel to the form *laymūn*. This suggests that, at least in the Muslim speech, the old form *nūm ḥāməd* has possibly fallen into disuse. The Muslim Baghdadi form *nūmi ḥāməd*, on the other hand, has entered Mosul Arabic, used parallel to *laymūn*.

Another word fallen into disuse is the isolated form of the number four, which is *ōbʕa* in Maṣlāwi, as indicated in Jastrow's text of 1979. The form *ōbʕa* was already considered obsolete by one of Blanc's informants from Mosul, as it is by the Muslim informant³²⁶.

In both the Christian and the Muslim speech, "four" is translated in the pausal form as *arbaʕa*. This is the same form detected in Socin's text in the expression *arbʕat iyyām*, "four days"³²⁷. As can be seen, in Socin the number is not isolated but is followed by a noun. The form *arbaʕa* in combination with a noun, is the same provided in Jastrow's text on Muslim Maṣlāwi, *arbaʕ nəsawān*, "four women", and has, according to the Muslim informant, preserved as such until today³²⁸.

The falling into disuse of certain numerals can be also observed by comparing the numbers in isolated forms in Jastrow's text on Muslim Maṣlāwi and those provided by the Muslim and the Christian informant. For those numbers, where a final Imāla is expected, CM has the same forms as those given in Jastrow's text: *ṭāṭi*³²⁹, "three", *xamsi*, "five", *sətti*, "six", *ṭmēni*, "eight"³³⁰. The Muslim informant, on the other hand, provided the numerals without final Imāla: *tlāṭa*, "three", *xamsa*, "five", *sətta*, "six", *ṭmāniya*, "eight". It can be noticed that the MM forms are identical to the numerals in Muslim Baghdadi: *tlāṭa*, "three", *xamsa*, "five", *sitta*, "six", *ṭmāniya*, "eight"³³¹.

As mentioned in section 5.3.5, the Muslim informant recognizes the numerals ending with *-i* as peculiar to the Christian speech. In this sense, a contradiction can be detected, as in Jastrow's text on Christian Maṣlāwi, "eight" is always given as *ṭmāniya*, though the expected form would be *ṭmēni*³³². Being an isolated case, however, together with the lack of details on when Jastrow's informant left Mosul, it is difficult to draw any conclusion on the diachronic changes of the

³²⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 497.

³²⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 48 and Blanc 1964, p. 22.

³²⁷ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 11/18.

³²⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 48.

³²⁹ Though the number "three" belongs to this category, the form *ṭāṭi* has survived in certain Muslim Maṣlāwi's expressions. Cf. section 6.2.5.

³³⁰ For the numerals in Jastrow, cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 48.

³³¹ For the numerals in Muslim Baghdadi, cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

³³² Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 142-145 and Jastrow 1979, p. 48.

numerals in Christian Maṣlāwī³³³. Therefore, a diachronic change and an accommodation towards the Muslim Baghdadi forms can be attested only in the Muslim speech.

Several lemmas that are identified as old-fashioned, did not always fall into disuse but survived in certain expressions or shifted their meaning. The next section will serve to illustrate the semantic shifts, reductions and in a few cases extensions that affected some of the lexical items in the corpus.

6.2.5 Semantic changes: shift, reduction and extension

On the diachronic level, three types of semantic changes have been observed: shift, reduction and extension. These phenomena affect those words, appearing in the Christian speech and/or in the older sources, which have preserved their morphological forms in current Maṣlāwī. However, in comparison to their use in the past, the terms have taken on a different meaning (shift), they are used with more meanings or in a greater number of contexts (extension) or in a limited number of contexts or with fewer meanings (reduction).

As it was the case for the other diachronic categories, the Muslim informant was asked about the current use of certain words. This information, together with the indications of the *Wortatlas* and of the old sources, helped in determining how the meaning and the use of a term varied during the time span taken into account in this work.

Within the words detected in the older sources are attested 11 semantic reductions, 12 semantic shifts and three semantic extensions.

For some of these words, an in-depth analysis is required. The word “hand”, for example, is translated in Christian Maṣlāwī and in Socin as *īd*, whereas in Muslim Maṣlāwī as *kaff*. The MM term is related to CA *kaff*, “palm of the hand”, as also mentioned in Al-Bakrī’s dictionary, where *kaff* is described as *rāḥat al-yadd*³³⁴. At some point, a shift from “palm of the hand” to “hand” occurred. This can be observed not only in Maṣlāwī but also in certain Arabic dialects such as Syrian and the Bedouin dialects of Jordan, Syria and Saudi Arabia, which also employ *kaff* to say “hand”³³⁵.

It is interesting to notice that in Syria, the sedentary dialects differ from the nomadic ones in that the same term is employed to say “hand” and “arm”³³⁶. This linguistic situation also obtains

³³³ Cf. Jastrow 2004, p. 140 and Jastrow 1979, p. 37.

³³⁴ Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 415 s. v. “kaff”.

³³⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 140 and 142.

³³⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 144.

in Baghdad, where the word *īd* is used to indicate both these body parts³³⁷. Considering that “hand” is translated as *īd* in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī³³⁸ and that my Muslim informant translated “arm” as *īd*, it cannot be excluded that the same linguistic situation obtaining in Muslim Baghdadi does not also occur in the dialect of Mosul. The term *īd* was possibly translated both as “hand” and “arm” and, at a certain point, *kaff* entered Maṣlāwī, perhaps under the influence of a Bedouin dialect, first establishing as a synonym of *īd* and then replacing it completely. In this case, the word *īd* underwent a semantic reduction and today it only refers to “arm”.

A similar situation obtains for the words “leg” and “foot”. In Socin, the former is translated as *riġl*, whereas the latter is expressed with a periphrasis such as *riġlēnu min-asfal* and *riġl^{le}ltēnu min-taḥī^t*, literally “the bottom of his legs”³³⁹. In Jastrow’s text of 1979, the word “foot” is more accurately translated as *ġaġal*³⁴⁰. It could be then supposed that for the pair “leg/foot” obtained a similar situation as for the pair “hand/arm”, where a single term indicated two different body parts. In this case, *ġaġal* designated both the leg and the foot. From a diachronic perspective, *ġaġal* has been preserved with the meaning of “leg” and it is today occasionally used with the meaning “foot”, whereas the primary form for “foot” is *qadam*³⁴¹. It is worth mentioning that this phenomenon is also occurs in the other Iraqi dialects as those of Baghdad and Basra³⁴².

Another case of semantic reduction is detected for the numeral “three”, which is *tāṭi* in CM and *tlāṭa* in MM, both in the pausal form. In Socin, the form *tāṭi* also appears in combinations with a noun, as in the expression *tāṭiⁱ krād*, “three Kurds”, and isolated in *čāġūnēn tāṭe*, “two, three strokes”³⁴³. In another example, a form close to Modern Standard Arabic can be detected: *l^elāṭā mdāndālīn*, “three hanging men”³⁴⁴. This should not be mistaken with the MM *tlāṭa*, which, on the other hand, resembles the MB form *tlāṭa*³⁴⁵, in that the same dissimilation *t̤ > t* is displayed. The CM form *tāṭi* is also attested in Jastrow’s article on Muslim Maṣlāwī³⁴⁶, both in the pausal form and in context, showing that this form was also dominant in the Muslim speech. The form *tāṭi*, though, has not disappeared yet. According to my Muslim informant in fact, *tlāṭa* is

³³⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 142 and 145.

³³⁸ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/9.

³³⁹ Apparently, it is the author’s choice to translate it as “feet”. Cf. Socin 1882, p. 17/ 13, 15.

³⁴⁰ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/ 9.

³⁴¹ Information provided by my Muslim informants. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 165.

³⁴² It is worth noticing that the information on Baghdad is taken from the Woodhead & Beene dictionary. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 165.

³⁴³ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 15/ 19.

³⁴⁴ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 17/ 16.

³⁴⁵ For the MB numerals, cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

³⁴⁶ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 48.

employed both isolated and followed by a noun, whereas *tāṭi* appears only in specific contexts. One of these is the time expression *sāḥa tāṭi*, “three o’clock”. This shows that *tāṭi* underwent a semantic reduction.

A similar case is documented for the word “lion”. This is translated as *sabəḥ* in CM, as *sābḥ* in Socin and as *ḥasad* in MM. In the *Wortatlas*, reflexes of the CA words *ḥasad* and *sabḥ*, are both identified as typical Iraqi, though without a specification for Baghdadi³⁴⁷. When asked about *sabəḥ*, my Muslim informant recognized it as an old form, which is today employed exclusively as a metaphor to describe a brave person, as in the sentence *huwwa sabəḥ*, “he is brave”. In a similar way, my Muslim informant from Baghdad said that *sabəḥ* is used today with the metaphorical meaning of “strong” and that “lion” is translated as *ḥasad*. Thus, in both Muslim Baghdadi and Muslim Maṣlāwī, “lion” is primarily translated as *ḥasad*, whereas *sabəḥ* shifted to a metaphorical use.

Another example of semantic reduction concerns the term “man”. This is translated in both CM and MM as *ḡəḡḡāl*, whereas it is *zelme* in Socin³⁴⁸. Reflexes of the root *z-l-m* are indicated in the *Wortatlas* as synonyms of *raḡḡāl/riḡḡāl* for both Iraq and Syria. Regarding the origin of this term, Behnstedt and Woidich analyse different sources, in which the meaning of *zalama* varies from “strong, active boy” to “pedestrian, foot soldier”, then extended to “man” and to “strong, virile man”³⁴⁹. Another nuance in the meaning is detected in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī, where the plural *ḥzlāmu*, sg. *zalma*, refers to “henchmen, vassals”³⁵⁰. Al-Bakrī also includes the word *zalmah*, indicated as a term of Syrian origin designating a “child, young person with a robust structure, who is beyond the adolescence and entered his manhood”³⁵¹. This virility aspect is also recognized by my Muslim informant, who identifies *ḡəḡḡāl* as the mainstream form for “man”, whereas *zlima* denotes a “strong, masculine man”. In this sense, a semantic reduction can be attested.

A case of semantic reduction is also detected for the word “street”, which is *šārəḥ* in CM and MM and *sikke* in Socin. This last term is related to MSA *sikka*, meaning “road, sidestreet, lane..narrower than *šāriḥ*” and also to *sikka al-ḥadīd*, “railroad”³⁵². A similar definition is detected in Al-Bakrī, where *sikki* is defined both as “*darb, ṭarīq* in Egyptian” but also as “*sikkat*

³⁴⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 335.

³⁴⁸ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 17 passim.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 12-13.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/ 11 and fn. 47.

³⁵¹ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 247 s. v. “*zalamah*”.

³⁵² Cf. Wehr 1979, p. 485 s. r. “*s-k-k*”.

al-qiṭār (railroad)”³⁵³. In today’s Maṣlāwī only the second meaning survived as *sikki* indicates, according to my Muslim informant, the railway. This reflects the situation in Baghdad, where *sikka* has been preserved with the same meaning³⁵⁴. In this sense, Maṣlāwī agrees with Muslim Baghdadi.

Another case of semantic reduction regards the adjective *qaḥa*. This describes in Al-Bakrī a person, who is “fat, big (both adjectives also mean gross, bad), with a big and fat body”. It can also refer to a way of speaking, as in “*kalāmū qaḥā*: he utters bad words without courtesy and respect...”³⁵⁵. This wide range of semantic nuances is also documented in WAD for spoken Iraqi (Basra and Baghdad), where the adjective *qaḥa* is translated as “enormous, mean, gross”³⁵⁶. In WB it is employed to describe something ugly, such as a *sayyāra qaḥa*, “an ugly car”, *ṣōt qaḥa*, “an unpleasant voice”³⁵⁷. According to my Muslim informant, *ṣōt qaḥa*, translated as “a high, disturbing voice”, is the only context in which Maṣlāwī speakers currently use this adjective, showing that a reduction of the semantic range and context of use of *qaḥa* occurred.

A semantic reduction is also identified for the term *bōyā*. This a Turkish borrowing, whose meaning in WB is “paint”, whereas both the Christian and the Muslim informant provided as translation for “paint” *ṣabāḡ*³⁵⁸. Both *ṣabāḡ* and *bōyā* appear in Al-Bakrī. The latter is described as “paint or dyed oil, which covers the surface of the objects to make them beautiful”, whereas the former is the substance that “penetrates the surface of an object, changing its colour”³⁵⁹. From this description, it is evident that *bōyā* refers to different substances, oily or coloured, employed to improve the aspect of an object. The wide semantic range of *bōyā* is also documented in the *Wortatlas*, where the Turkish loan is referred to as “dye, paint, coat, shoe cream”³⁶⁰. When asked about this word, my Muslim informant said that today *bōyā* is only employed with the meaning of “shoe cream”, showing that the term underwent a semantic reduction in Mosul’s dialect.

Regarding the word “lamp”, it is given in both CM and in Al-Bakrī as *lampa*. This term refers in Al-Bakrī to a “petroleum lamp” as well as to a “modern electric lamp”³⁶¹. The Christian

³⁵³ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, pp. 270-271 s. v. “*sikki*”.

³⁵⁴ Cf. Woodhead & Beene 1967, p. 221 s. v. “*sikka*”.

³⁵⁵ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 378 s. v. “*qabā*”.

³⁵⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 557.

³⁵⁷ Cf. Woodhead & Beene 1967, p. 365 s. v. “*qaḥa*”.

³⁵⁸ Cf. Woodhead & Beene 1967, p. 48 s. v. “*bōyā*”.

³⁵⁹ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 94 s. v. “*bōyā*”.

³⁶⁰ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 478.

³⁶¹ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 446 s. v. “*lampa*”.

informant also translates “lamp” as *lampa*, referring to a modern one³⁶². The Muslim informant, on the other hand, affirmed that *lampa* refers to the old petroleum lamp, whereas for the electric lamp one would use the Engl. borrowing *tēblām*. This shows that there has been a semantic reduction of *lampa*, which now refers only to the old lamps.

Concerning the semantic shifts, one can be identified for the term “ass (animal)”. CM and MM have for this word reflexes of *ḡaḥš*, which in Al-Bakrī’ is referred to as “little ass”. This corresponds to the original meaning of *ḡaḥš*, which designates a “young ass”, distinct from the adult ass, *ḥimār*. Thus, from a diachronic perspective, *ḡaḥš* shifted its meaning from “young ass” to “adult ass”. This phenomenon can be also observed in other Iraqi dialects, where the word *ḡaḥš* is currently used to designate an adult animal. Regarding the term *muṭi*, it occurs in WB with the meaning of “donkey, ass” and is attested in Al-Bakrī’ as a Baghdadi term, referring to a “little *ḥimār*”³⁶³. This same description is used by my Baghdadi informant that defines *muṭi* as a “little donkey”. The Muslim informant also displays *muṭi* with the meaning of “ass”, showing that an acquisition from the Baghdadi dialect has possibly occurred. Also in this case, a semantic shift can be observed, since the term is described in the old source and in Muslim Baghdadi as “little donkey”, whereas the Muslim informant uses it to refer to an adult ass³⁶⁴.

A semantic shift is also detected for the word “tail”, which is *dēl* in both CM and MM and *ṣaṣṣōṣ* in Socin. Interestingly, *dēl* has another meaning in Socin, namely it denotes “the hem of a skirt”³⁶⁵. The other Iraqi dialects are in agreement with Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī, in that they also display *dēl* for “tail”³⁶⁶. The term *ṣaṣṣōṣ*, on the other hand, is related to CA *ṣaṣṣaṣ*, “coccyx”, also vocalized as *ṣaṣṣuṣ*, and is attested in Al-Bakrī with the meaning “*dānab* of the animal, *dēl*..”³⁶⁷. The presence of *ṣaṣṣōṣ* in both Socin and Al-Bakrī suggests that this word might have been previously used in Mosul Arabic with the meaning of “tail”. A further evidence in this sense is that, according to my Muslim informant, *ṣaṣṣōṣ* is employed today to indicate a ponytail, next to the CA meaning of “coccyx”. This makes it plausible to think that *ṣaṣṣōṣ* originally referred in Maṣlāwī to the tail of an animal and then its use shifted to “ponytail”, referring to the hair style. In the literature, Anatolian Arabic is the only dialect in which *ṣaṣṣōṣ* is employed with the meaning of “tail”³⁶⁸. The affinity of this *qeltu* dialect with Jewish Maṣlāwī

³⁶² The informants were asked to translate the word “lamp”, implying a modern one.

³⁶³ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 465.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 465.

³⁶⁵ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 13/10.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 331.

³⁶⁷ Cf. Al-Bakrī 1972, p. 337 s. v. “ṣaṣṣōṣ” and Wehr 1979, p. 721 s. v. “ṣuṣṣuṣ”.

³⁶⁸ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 331.

might also suggest that *ḥaṣṣōṣ* was probably peculiar to this religious group among the Mosul speakers³⁶⁹.

Another case of possible semantic shift concerns the particle *-ze*, meaning “also, too”. The informants provided the word *hamm*, which is peculiar to the Iraqi dialects³⁷⁰.

In Socin, the adverb “also” is expressed by the enclitic particle *-ze*, as in *ána-ze*, “me too”³⁷¹ and is an abbreviation of **zyēde* < OA *ziyāda*³⁷². This particle also appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī, which might suggest that its use was spread among the Muslim speakers. When asked about this particle, the Muslim informant identified *-ze* as a particle used to emphasize the meaning of a sentence as in *taḥāl-ze*, “Come!” or in *ze ašnu hāda?*, “What is that?”. According to him, its position can vary since it can be put at the beginning as well as the end of a sentence. Assuming that this particle and the one in Socin have the same origin, this would imply not only a semantic but also a syntactic shift of *-ze*, in that it does not only act like a suffix.

The cases of semantic extension are only three. One worth discussing regards the word *ḍeḥa*, which is found in Socin with the meaning of “village”. As pointed out in WAD, the urban speakers often employ the term “village” to indicate the rural areas, which is exactly what happens in Maṣlāwī, as the two informants translate the expression “in the countryside” as *bə-ḍ-ḍeḥa*³⁷³. This word appears in Socin with the meaning of “village” and is also recognized by the Muslim informant as a synonym of *qarya*³⁷⁴. This suggests that the term *ḍeḥa* might have been semantically extended from “village” to “village, countryside”.

³⁶⁹ Cf. Jastrow 2004, pp. 141-142.

³⁷⁰ Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 423.

³⁷¹ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 5/3. The particle *-ze* can be found in many places in the texts.

³⁷² Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60, fn. 50.

³⁷³ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 30-31.

³⁷⁴ Cf. Socin 1882, p. 11/ 5 and 19/ 16.

6.2.6 Accommodation towards Muslim Baghdadi

The final part of the diachronic analysis concerns the identification, among the words provided by the informants, of the terms that accommodated to Standard Iraqi, namely Muslim Baghdadi. As mentioned in section 3.2, the accommodation to Muslim Baghdadi and the tendency, in particular of male speakers, to speak a *gilit* dialect in the public spaces, is primarily having an effect on the lexical and phonological features of Mosul Arabic. Therefore, both these aspects will be taken into account in this part of the investigation.

In this context, I regarded as a reference Palva's article on the diachronic change of Muslim Baghdadi from a *qəltu* to a *gilit* variety. Muslim Baghdadi in fact, was originally a *qəltu* dialect, which underwent a process of Bedouinization as a consequence of the long-term contact with *gilit* speakers³⁷⁵. In this process, specific *gilit* features have been integrated in the Muslim Baghdadi speech, including the following phonological traits: /g/ as a reflex of OA /q/; the affrication of OA /k/ in the proximity of front vowels; the raising of the OA /a/, occurring in open stressed syllables, to /u/ in the proximity of back, emphatic or labial consonants and in the rest of the cases to /i/³⁷⁶.

Concerning the lexicon, some lemmas characterised as typical Bedouin have been integrated into Muslim Baghdadi, such as the personal pronouns of the 1. ps *āni*, "I", and *əhna*, "we", the adverb *hnā*, "here", and other Bedouin lexical items like *zēn*, "good", *yamm*, "beside", *bāčər*, "tomorrow", *mūzēn*, "bad", *nəta* "to give"³⁷⁷.

It has to be pointed out that Palva's study relates to a period of dialect contact stretching over centuries, whereas in Mosul the presence of *gilit* speakers is attested since the 1990s³⁷⁸. Therefore, the degree of Bedouinization expected is not comparable to that described for Muslim Baghdadi. However, the occurrence of phonological phenomena and of lexical items referred to by Palva as typical *gilit* can be regarded as a hint of the accommodation of Maṣlāwi towards Muslim Baghdadi. In addition to this, other phonological aspects characterizing Muslim Baghdadi will be considered, including the appearance of short vowels other than /a/ and /ə/, the preservation of the OA /r/ and the absence of the final Imāla³⁷⁹.

Since the speech of the Muslim informant reflects the current status of today's Maṣlāwi, the changes in relation to the accommodation are expected to appear in his set of words.

³⁷⁵ Cf. Palva 2012, pp. 35-37.

³⁷⁶ Cf. Ibid., pp. 24-27.

³⁷⁷ Cf. Ibid., pp. 27-29.

³⁷⁸ Cf. Hassan 2019, pp. 1-2 and Palva 2012, pp. 31-33.

³⁷⁹ For more details on the Maslawi dialectal features, see chapter 4.

In order to detect the lexical acquisitions from Standard Iraqi, the words in Muslim and Christian Maṣlāwī have been compared with those indicated in the *Wortatlas* for Muslim Baghdadi. This comparison showed that, in the majority of the cases, the same word occurs in the three dialects, adapted to the phonological features of each one. For example, this can be observed for the words “shoulder” and “woman”, translated in both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī as *kaṭāf* and *maḡa*, and in Muslim Baghdadi as *ṣitīf* and *maṛa*³⁸⁰.

In the remaining cases, three scenarios are possible: in both Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī occurs the same form, which differs from the Muslim Baghdadi one; in Muslim Maṣlāwī and in Muslim Baghdadi a similar or identical form occurs, whereas Christian Maṣlāwī displays another word. Only in a few cases Christian Maṣlāwī and Muslim Baghdadi has the same form, whereas Muslim Maṣlāwī differs from both of them.

It can be then assumed, that the cases to be considered for the study of accommodation are those in which the Muslim Maṣlāwī form is identical to the Muslim Baghdadi one. This evidence alone, though, is not sufficient to justify an accommodation.

From a diachronic perspective, an acquisition has possibly occurred, when a term provided by the Muslim informant is identified as Baghdadi both in an old source and in the *Sprachatlas*³⁸¹. When the information in WAD was only based on the existing literature on Baghdad, I double-checked the words with my Muslim Baghdadi informant. The terms belonging to this category are the following: *iskāfī*, “shoemaker”; *xaṣām*, “nose”; *ṭīz*, “ass (body part)”; *muṭi*, “ass”; *abu brēṣ*, “gecko, lizard”; *nūmi ḥāmāḍ*, “lemons”; *mahar*, “dowry”; *fakk*, “to open”; *taras*, “full tank”; *tlāṭa*, “three”; *xamsa*, “five”; *satta*, “six”; *ṭmāniya*, “eight”, *hammīna*, “also”³⁸².

Most of these usually differ from a typical Maṣlāwī form, which may or may not be still in use: *mnaqqil*, “shoemaker”; (CM and MM) *ḡaḥḡ*, “ass (body part)”; (CM) *ḡabu xsēm*, “gecko, lizard”; (CM) *nūm ḥāmāḍ*, “lemons”; *naqdīyi*, “dowry”; *ṭāṭi*, “three”; *xamsi*, “five”; *satti*, “six”; *ṭmēni*, “eight”³⁸³.

³⁸⁰ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 15 and 154.

³⁸¹ This is true except for the current forms of the numerals, which can be found in Jastrow’s article “Iraq”. Cf. Jastrow 2007, p. 420.

³⁸² For the references to the old sources, see Appendix 2. For the Muslim Baghdadi forms, cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 80, 177, 178, 288, 367, 497, Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 417 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 298 and 325. The words *fakk*, “to open”, *muṭi*, “ass”; *abu brēṣ*, “gecko, lizard”, were provided by my Muslim Baghdadi informants, since the information provided in WAD relates to the Woodhead & Beene dictionary. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 362 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 298.

³⁸³ For the occurrence of these words in the old sources and their status in current Mosul Arabic, see Appendix 2.

Regarding the adverb *hammīna*, this occurs in the forms *hammēn* and *hammēna* in Woodhead & Beene and in Blanc. These are described as typical Muslim Baghdadi forms³⁸⁴. The Muslim informant also provided a form with the lowering of /ī/ to /ē/.

Two more Muslim Maṣlāwi words can be considered an acquisition from Muslim Baghdadi, though they are not mentioned in the old surces. These are *diğāğa*, “hen”, and *farawla*, “strawberry”. The lemma “hen” is translated by the Muslim informant in two ways, *diğāğa* and *dğēgi*. According to him, the former refers to a “big hen”, the latter to a “small hen, weighing less than one kilo”. The second form is close to the CM form and to those of the *qaltu* dialects, usually characterized by the Imāla of /ā/ > /ē/. The word *diğāğa*, on the other hand, with the raising in the first syllable of the back vowel /a/ to /i/, is denoted as a typical *gilit* form, attested both in Baghdad and Basra³⁸⁵. This shows that the word has been possibly acquired from a *gilit* dialect and was established next to the typical Maṣlāwi form with the Imāla.

In the same way, the Muslim Maṣlāwi word for “strawberries”, *farawla*, is identical to that of Baghdad. Concerning the CM form, *šillēk*, this is also documented in WAD as a typical Iraqi form³⁸⁶. My Muslim informant confirmed that *šillēk* is also used in Maṣlāwi. He specified that this word is usually employed at home, whereas *farawla* is used outside. This suggests that *farawla* is possibly a term understood by both Maṣlāwi and Non-Maṣlāwi speakers and hence, a possible acquisition from Muslim Baghdadi.

In the remaining cases, where the Muslim Maṣlāwi word is identical or similar to the Muslim Baghdadi one, an acquisition is plausible for those terms, which display one or more of the afore-mentioned phonological features peculiar to Muslim Baghdadi. The terms belonging to this group are the following: (MM and MB) *ṣağūza*, “old woman”; (MM and MB) *nahar*, “river”; (MM and MB) *gubaḷ*, “straight ahead”; (MM) *ḥozayrān*, (MB) “June”³⁸⁷.

In all the cases mentioned, the Christian informant displays a different form. Interestingly, in five cases his forms are identical or similar to those in Muslim Baghdadi, whereas Muslim Maṣlāwi has another word: (CM and MB) *fayy*, (MM) *ḡall*, *xayāl*, “shadow”; (CM and MB) *šiğar*, (MM) *qağar*, “courgette”; (CM) *yasrāwi*, (MB) *yisrāwi*, (MM) *yasrāwi*, “left-handed”; (CM) *yaftihim*, (MB) *yiftihim*, (MM) *yəftəhəm*, “he understands”; (CM) *tafal*, (MB) *tifal*, (MM)

³⁸⁴ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 150 and Woodhead & Beene, 1967 p. 483 s.v. “hamm”. This word was also double-checked with my Muslim Baghdadi informant.

³⁸⁵ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 310.

³⁸⁶ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 509.

³⁸⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 32, 424, and Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 203. and Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 678. The word *gubaḷ* was provided by my Muslim Baghdadi informant.

taffal, “to cough”; (CM and MB) *maḥḥad*, (MM) *wala wēḥad*, “nobody”³⁸⁸. According to the Muslim informant, three of these words are employed in today’s Maṣlāwī, namely *fayy*, *maḥḥad* and *yasrāwī*, whereas the others are recognized as Non-Maṣlāwī. The term *ṣiḡar* in particular is identified as Baghdadi.

In other cases, the Muslim Maṣlāwī words have the same form as in Modern Standard Arabic and in Muslim Baghdadi, so that it is hard to determine whether the term was acquired from the former or the latter: (MM and MB) *ṣāʔila*, “family”, (MM and MB) *ṣašīra*, “tribe”, (MM and MB) *ḡarnab*, “rabbit”, (MM and MB) *ḡurfā*, “room”, (MM and MB) *ḥiḍāʔ*, “shoe”; (MM and MB) *risāla*, “letter”³⁸⁹.

The adoption of a Standard Arabic form in several dialects is identified by the fact that the loan preserves its phonology in most of them. For instance, this can be observed for the word *qarya*, “village”, which occurs in this form in Basra and in Mosul, though one would expect in the former a shift from /q/ to /ḡ/ and in the latter the shift of /r/ to /ḡ/³⁹⁰. The form *qarya* is also attested in Muslim Baghdadi³⁹¹.

As can be seen, the terms categorized as possible acquisitions from Muslim Baghdadi, display phonological features peculiar to this dialect, such as the anaptyctic vowel /a/ in the words *mahar* and *nahar* and /g/ as reflex of the OA /q/ as in *gubal*³⁹². In addition to this, the absence of final Imāla, the preservation of the OA /r/ and the occurrence of short vowels other than /a/ and /ə/ are also attested in these terms, as well as in the words in the corpus identified as MSA and foreign loans. Aside from these borrowings and of a few cases mentioned in section 5.3.1, both speakers have preserved the typical Maṣlāwī phonology³⁹³.

In addition to this, a phenomenon in the Muslim speech might suggest a possible adaptation to Standard Iraqi. This is the pronunciation of the same word alternately with /r/ and /ḡ/, where the shift /r/ > /ḡ/ is expected³⁹⁴. Such a phenomenon could be a consequence of the interaction with the *gilit* speakers, whose effect, according to Hassan, is the dropping of typical *qaltu* features³⁹⁵.

³⁸⁸ For the Muslim Baghdadi terms, cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 222, 419, 480 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, pp. 227 and 372. For the term *maḥḥad*, see Maamouri 2013, p. 947 s. v. “nobody”. My Muslim Baghdadi informant also provided the term *maḥḥad*, when asked to translate “nobody”. For the verb *yifihim*, see Woodhead and Beene 1967, p. 361 s.r. “f-h-m”.

³⁸⁹ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, pp. 50, 54, 323 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, pp. 67, 204 and 463.

³⁹⁰ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 33.

³⁹¹ Cf. Maamouri 2013, p. 1135 s.v. “village”.

³⁹² Cf. Jastrow 2007, pp. 416-418.

³⁹³ Cf. section 5.3.1 and 5.3.3.

³⁹⁴ Cf. section 5.3.1.

³⁹⁵ Cf. Hassan 2019, p. 2.

Furthermore, two of the lexical items regarded by Palva as typical Bedouin, occur in the Muslim speech. These are *yamm*, “beside”, and the personal pronoun of 1 ps. sg. *əḥna*. The last term is not part of the questionnaire but appears in my recording of 2018 on Muslim Maṣlāwī.

It is worth noticing that in Socin both forms *əḥna* and *nəḥna* occur alternately, whereas Jastrow indicates *nəḥna* as the typical Maṣlāwī pronoun of the 1. ps. sg. pl. in the Muslim and Christian speech³⁹⁶. Based on the speech of the Muslim informant, it can be then inferred that the Bedouin form *əḥna* is now the primary form, at least in Muslim Maṣlāwī.

³⁹⁶ Cf. Socin 1882, pp. 1-21, Jastrow 1979, p.42 and Jastrow 2004, pp. 141-142.

7. Summary and conclusion

The present work has proposed a linguistic study of Mosul Arabic and an in-depth analysis of the diachronic changes that the lexicon underwent in a time span going from 1882 to 2015. The collection of 530 words of everyday use in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī can be considered *per se* a contribution to the field of Arabic studies and in particular to the *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. My corpus of words in Christian and Muslim Maṣlāwī would add to the set of words collected for Baghdad and Basra, which are included in the *Sprachatlas*³⁹⁷.

The comparison of the Christian and Muslim terms showed that in 320 cases, the informants display the same word. In the remaining cases, a word is missing from one dialect or a linguistic difference is detected between Muslim and Christian Maṣlāwī: 139 lexical differences, 34 phonological differences, 18 morphological differences, 5 syntactic differences, 31 missing translations in Christian Maṣlāwī and 10 missing translations in Muslim Maṣlāwī³⁹⁸.

As evident, the lexical and linguistic discrepancies between the two varieties are considerable. In those cases, where the reason of this difference could be identified, this was attributed to one of the following factors: different confession, a different stage of Maṣlāwī, a wrong translation, different forms equally employed in current Maṣlāwī, influence of Modern Standard Arabic and of Muslim Baghdadi.

The presence of borrowings from a foreign language is also considerable, as 72 loanwords have been detected.

The linguistic analysis of the lexical material collected showed that on the phonological, morphological and syntactic level both informants display the typical Maṣlāwī and *qeltu* features. Concerning the diachronic analysis, the results show that, within the terms attested in the old sources and in the Christian speech, representing an older stage of Maṣlāwī³⁹⁹, the diachronic changes are classified as follows: 277 terms have been preserved in today's Mosul Arabic, 19 words are identified as obsolete or fell into disuse, 11 words underwent a semantic reduction, 12 underwent a semantic shift and 3 a semantic extension.

It can be then inferred that the majority of the lexicon attested in the old sources and in the Christian speech has been preserved in today's Maṣlāwī and that only a small part underwent a diachronic change in the time span taken into account.

³⁹⁷ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, 2012, 2014.

³⁹⁸ The sum of the occurrences is not expected to equate the total number of lexical items, namely 530, since the informants often provided more than one translation.

³⁹⁹ As mentioned in section 6.1, the Christian speech represents an older stage of Mosul Arabic because the informant left Mosul in the late 1980s.

In regard to the lexical analysis proposed and to the methodology applied, some observations are necessary. As mentioned in chapter five, the information on the current use of the terms attested in the old sources and in the Christian speech, was in most cases provided by my Muslim informant. This contribution was essential in order to carry out the diachronic analysis but it has to be considered that important data stemmed from a single informant.

In the same way, it has to be considered that the speech of the two informants not only related to different stages of Mosul Arabic but also to two different religious groups. Though in several cases it could be identified whether a lexical difference was to attribute to one of these two factors, the difference of confession often made it difficult to provide an objective analysis of the diachronic changes related to the Christian and Muslim forms.

In order to support the results of the analysis proposed, it would be then interesting to submit the questionnaire used in my work to a higher number of male Maṣlāwī speakers, including old and young men from the same religious group.

Regarding the accommodation of Muslim Maṣlāwī towards Muslim Baghdadi, the results showed that 20 words could be considered as an acquisition from Standard Iraqi. These borrowings display phonological characteristics peculiar to Muslim Baghdadi, in particular the vowels /a/, /i/ and /u/, the preservation of OA /r/, /g/ as reflex of OA /q/ and the absence of final Imāla.

Aside from these few lexical acquisitions, the Muslim speech display on the phonological, morphological and syntactic level the typical Maṣlāwī features. The only ambiguity is represented by the pronunciation of the same word in alternance with /r/ and /ġ/, where the shift from OA /r/ to /ġ/ is expected. This could be indicative of the dropping of a stigmatized Maṣlāwī feature during the interaction with the *gilit* speakers.

These results are not significant enough to justify an accommodation of Mosul Arabic to Muslim Baghdadi. However, it cannot be excluded that this represents the initial stage of a Bedouinization process and that in the future, more *gilit* features would be integrated in the Maṣlāwī dialect.

In this regard, it would be interesting to submit the questionnaire to a higher number of male speakers of Muslim religion currently living in Mosul. The investigation could be repeated some years later in order to observe how the interaction between the immigrants, speaking a *gilit* dialect, and the native Maṣlāwīs induce an accommodation towards Iraq's prestige variety and the dropping of *qaltu* features in favour of the *gilit* ones.

List of references

- Abu-Haidar, Farida 2002. "Negation in Iraqi Arabic." In *Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es! Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Arnold and Bobzin. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1-13. ?
- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 2004. "The Arabic of Rabīṣa: A *qeltu* dialect of north-western Iraq." In *Approaches to Arabic dialects: A collection of articles presented to Manfred Woidich on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Ed. by Martine Haak, Rudolf de Jong & Kees Versteegh. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 1-12.
- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 2006. "Baghdad Arabic." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 1, 222-231. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Asbaghi, Asya. 2008. "Persian loanwords." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 3, 580-584. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Atawneh, Ahmad. 2007. "English loanwords." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 2, 29-35. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- al-Bakrī, Ḥāzim. 1972. *Dirāsāt fī 'l-ḥalfāḍ al-ṣāmmīya 'l-mawṣilīya: wa muqāranatuhā maʿa 'l-ḥalfāḍ al-ṣāmmīya fī 'l-ḥaqālīm al-ṣarabīya*. Ed. by Ḥāzim al-Bakrī. Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat Asʿad.
- Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2011. *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. Band I. *Mensch, Natur, Fauna und Flora*. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2012. *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. Band II. *Materielle Kultur*. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Behnstedt, Peter; Woidich, Manfred. 2014. *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. Band III. *Verben, Adjektive, Zeit und Zahlen*. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Biṭūnā, Gabriel. 2011. "The Assimilation of English Loan-Words in Spoken Arabic of Baghdad." In *Alf Lahḡa Wa Lahḡa: Proceedings of the 9th Aida Conference. Neue Beihefte Zur Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Des Morgenlandes*. Ed. by Olivier Durand and International Arabic Dialectology Association. Band 8. Wien [u.a.]: Lit-Verl., 67-77.
- Blanc, Haim. 1964. *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Blanc, Haim. 1959. "Iraqi Arabic studies." *Middle East Journal* 13, No. 4, 449-453.
- Bosworth, E. C.; Honigmann, E.; Sluglett, P. 2007. "Mosul." In *Historic Cities of the Islamic World*. Ed. by Bosworth, Edmund. C. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill, 412-417.

- al-Čalabī al-Mawṣilī, Dā'ud. 1935. *al-ʔĀṭār al-ʔaramiyya fī luġat al-Mawṣil al-ṣāmmiyya*. Mosul.
- al-Čalabī al-Mawṣilī, Dā'ud. 1960. *Kalimāt fārisīya mustamala fī ṣāmmīyat al-Mawṣil wa-fī 'anhā' al-ṣirāq: talīhā kalimāt kurdīya wa-hindīya*. Baġdād: Maṭbaʿat al-Ṣānī.
- Gazsi, Dénes. 2011. "Arabic-Persian Language Contact." In *The Semitic Languages: an International Handbook*. Vol. 36. Ed. by Stefan Weninger. Berlin-Boston: DE GRUYTER, 1015–21.
- Halasi-Kun, Tibor. 1982. "The Ottoman elements in the Syrian dialects." *Archivum Ottomanicum* VII, 117-267.
- Hanson, Katharyn A. 2012. *Considerations of cultural heritage: Threats to Mesopotamian archaeological sites*. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Hassan, Qasim. 2019. *Female Pragmatic expressions in the qeltu-dialect of Mosul*. Unpublished paper of the presentation held on 09.04.2019 at the Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Vienna.
- Holes, Clive. 2007. "Colloquial Iraqi Arabic." In *Languages of Iraq, ancient and modern*. Ed. by Postgate, John Nicholas. British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 123–134.
- Holes, Clive. 2018. "The Arabic dialects of the Gulf: Aspects of their historical and sociolinguistic development." In *Arabic historical dialectology: linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches*. Ed. by Clive Holes. 1st Edition. Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1978. *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qeltu-Dialekte. I: Phonologie und Morphologie*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1979. „Zur arabischen Mundart von Mossul.“ *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 2, 36-75.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1989. "Notes on Jewish Maṣlāwī." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 12, 282-293.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1991. „Brotbacken: Ein Text im arabischen Dialekt der Juden von Mossul.“ *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 23, 7-13.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1994. "The qeltu dialects of Mesopotamian Arabic." In *Actas del congreso internacional sobre interferencias lingüísticas arabo-romances y paralelos extra-iberos: celebradas en Madrid del 10 al 14 de diciembre de 1990*. Ed. by Jorge Aguadé, Federico Corriente and Marina Marugán. Zaragoza: Navarro & Navarro, 119-123.
- Jastrow, Otto. 2001. "Three Anecdotes in Jewish Maṣlāwī." In *Linguistic and Cultural Studies on Arabic and Hebrew: Essays presented to Professor Moshe Piamenta for his eightieth birthday*, Ed. by Judith Rosenhouse and Ami Elad-Bouskila. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 61-70.

- Jastrow, Otto. 2004. „Jüdisches, christliches und muslimisches Arabisch in Mossul.“ In *Approaches to Arabic Dialects: A Collection of Articles Presented to Manfred Woidich on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. by Martine Haak, Rudolf de Jong, Kees Versteegh. Leiden- Boston: Brill, 135-150.
- Jastrow, Otto. 2007. “Iraq”. In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. Kees Versteegh, Vol. 2, 414-424. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Levin, Aryeh. 2000. “The ’imāla in the modern qāltu dialects.” In *Aspects of the dialects of Arabic today. Proceedings of the 4th Conference of the International Arabic Dialectology Association (AIDA), Marrakech, Apr. 1–4, 2000; in honour of Professor David Cohen*. Ed. by Abderrahim Youssi, Fouzia Benjelloun, Mohamed Dahbi & Zakia Iraqui-Sinaceur. Rabat: Amapatril, 98–104.
- Procházka, Stephan. 1993. *Die Präpositionen in den neuarabischen Dialekten*. Wien: VWGÖ.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2005. “The Turkish Contribution to the Arabic Lexikon.” In *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Ed. by Éva Ágnes Csató, Bo Isaksson and Carina Jahani. 1st Edition. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 150-158.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2009. “Turkish loanwords.” In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 4, 589-594. Leiden [u.a.]: Brill.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2018. “The Arabic dialects of Northern Iraq.” In *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: an aerial perspective*. Ed. by Geoffrey Khan. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 237-266.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2020. “Arabic in Iraq, Syria and southern Turkey.” In *Arabic and contact-induced change*. Ed. by Christopher Lucas and Stefano Manfredi. Berlin: Language Science Press, 83-114.
- Maamouri, Mohamed. 2013. *The Georgetown Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: Arabic-English, English-Arabic*. Ed. by Mohamed Maamouri. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press.
- Miller, Catherine. 2004. “Variation and Changes in Arabic Urban Vernaculars.” In *Approaches to Arabic Dialects: Collection of Articles presented to Manfred Woidich on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. by Martine Haak, Rudolf de Jong and Kees Versteegh. Amsterdam: Brill, 177- 206.
- Palva, Heikki. 2009. “From qāltu to gilit: Diachronic notes on linguistic adaptation in Muslim Baghdad Arabic.” In *Arabic Dialectology. In Honour of Clive Holes on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. Enam Al-Wer & Rudolf de Jong. Leiden: Brill, 17-40.
- Reinkowski, Markus. 1995. „Eine phonologische Analyse türkischen Wortgutes im

bagdadisch-arabischen mitsamt einer Wortliste.“ *Folia Orientalia* 31, 89–115.

Reinkowski, Markus. 1998. „Türkische Lehnwörter im Bagdadisch-Arabischen: Morphologische Adaption an die arabische Schemabildung und Bedeutungsveränderung.“ In *Turkologie heute – Tradition und Perspektive: Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Leipzig, 4. - 7. Oktober 1994*. Ed. by Nurettin Demir and Erika Taube. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Komm., 239–253

Retsö, Jan. 2006. “Aramaic/Syriac loanwords.” In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 1, 178-182. Leiden - Boston: Brill.

Socin, Albert. 1882. „Der arabische Dialekt von Mōṣul und Mārdīn.“ *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 36, 238-277.

Strauss, Johann. 2017. “Language and power in the late Ottoman Empire.” In *Imperial Lineages and Legacies and in the Eastern Mediterranean Recording the Imprint of Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman Rule*. Ed. by Rhoads Murphy. New York: Routledge, 115-42.

Tripp, Charles. 2007. *A history of Iraq*. Ed. by Charles Tripp. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Al-Tikriti, Nabil. 2007. “Ottoman Iraq.” *Journal of The Historical Society* 7(2), 201-211.

Talay, Shabo. 2011. “Arabic dialects of Mesopotamia”. In *Semitic languages: an international handbook*. Ed. by Stefan Weninger. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 909-920.

Wadie-Baumann, Hiam. 2004. *Der "Māslāwi"-Dialekt des Arabischen im Vergleich mit der arabischen Hochsprache*. Diplomarbeit, Universität Wien.

Wehr, Hans; Cowan, J. Milton. 1976. *A dictionary of modern written Arabic: (Arabic - English dictionary)*. Ed. by J. Milton Cowan. 4th Edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Woodhead, Daniel R. and Beene, Wayne. 1967. *A Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: Arabic – English*. Ed. by Daniel R. Woodhead and Wayne Beene. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Internet sources

Unhabitat. “*City Profile of Mosul, Iraq: Multi-sector assessment of a city under siege*.” October 2016, https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/documents/2019-04/un-habitat_mosulcityprofile_lowres_170409_v6.pdf, Access: 29.10.2021.

Ngo Coordination Committee for Iraq. “*Ninewa Ncci Governorate Profile.*” December 2010, https://www.ncciraq.org/images/infobygov/NCCI_Ninewa_Governorate_Profile.pdf, Access: 29.10.2021

Prickett, Ivor. “In Mosul, Revealing the Last ISIS Stronghold” In *The New York Times*, 01.08.2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/01/world/middleeast/mosul-isis-survivors-rights.html>, Access: 09.10.2021

Appendix 1

Word	CM	MM	Notes
1. Men			
1. man	ğəğğāl	ğəğğāl	identical translation
2. woman	mağa	mağa	identical translation
3. my father	ʔabūyi	ʔabūyi	identical translation
4. father!	bāba	yāb yāba	lexical difference
5. my brother	ʔaxūyi	ʔaxūyi	identical translation
6. my mother	ʔəmmi	ʔəmmi	identical translation
7. mother!	māma	yōm əmm	lexical difference
8. grandmother	səttā ğədda	səttāʔ nēna ğədda	one identical translation (MM): <i>səttāʔ</i> and <i>nēna</i> are vocative; <i>ğədda</i> is used to refer to someone else's grandmother. <i>nēna</i> : borrowing via Persian (?)
9. grandfather	sədā ğəddu	sədō ğədd	phonological difference morphological difference two words in CM and in MM (CM) <i>sədā</i> and (MM) <i>sədō</i> are forms of address.
10. old man	ğəğğāl əkbīg	ʕağūz	lexical difference
11. old woman	mağa kbīgi	ʕağūza	lexical difference

12. child(ren)	walad, pl. wlād	walad, pl. wlād ṣaḡi, pl. ṣaḡiyān	one identical translation (MM): <i>ṣaḡi</i> , pl. <i>ṣaḡiyān</i> is used to refer to annoying, disturbing children.
13. baby	raḏīṣa	ṭəfəl	lexical difference
14. widow	ʔaḡmali	ʔaḡmali	identical translation
15. family	ṣāʔila	ʔahəl	lexical difference
16. tribe	faxəḏ	ṣašīra bayt ṣāʔilta	lexical difference (MM): <i>ṣašīra</i> refers to non-Maṣlāwi people; <i>bayt</i> and <i>ṣāʔilta</i> refer to Maṣlāwi families.
17. nigger	ṣabid	zingī ʔaswad ʔabu l-ṣabəd	lexical difference (CM): <i>ṣabid</i> is insulting. (MM): <i>zingī</i> is insulting; <i>ʔaswad</i> used to describe a black person; <i>ʔabu l-ṣabəd</i> is politically correct.
2. Persons			
18. guest	xəṭṭār	ḏēf	lexical difference
19. host	məḏyāf	maṣazzəm	lexical difference
20. friend	ṣadīq	ṣadīq xawi	one identical translation
21. landlord	ṣāḥəb əl-bēt ʔabu l-bēt	mālik əl-bēt əl-mālik	lexical difference
22. beggar	mgaddi	mgaddi	Persian borrowing identical translation
23. thief	ḥaḡāmi	ḥaḡāmi	identical translation
3. Professions			

24. butcher	qaşşāb	qaşşāb	identical translation
25. shoemaker	qəndarçi	qəndarçi iskāfi	one identical translation <i>qəndarçi</i> : Turkish borrowing
26. hairdresser	hallāq	hallāq	identical translation
27. doctor	dəktūr	ṭabīb	lexical difference <i>dəktūr</i> : European borrowing
28. pharmacist	şaydali	şaydalāni	lexical difference
29. tailor	xayyāt	xayyāt	identical translation
4. Body parts			
30. head	ġās	ġās	identical translation
31. forehead	ġbīn	gəşşa	lexical difference
32. face	wiċċ	wiċċ	identical translation
33. eyebrow	hāġəb	hāġəb, pl. hawēġib	identical translation
34. ear	ʔəḍən	ʔəḍən, pl. ʔaḍān	identical translation
35. lobe of the ear	/	ḥalami	missing word in CM
36. nose	ʔənəf	xaşəm	lexical difference
37. cheek	xadd	xadd	identical translation
38. chin	ḥanak	ḥanak	identical translation
39. neck	ḥalaq	ḥalaq	identical translation
40. nape of the neck	ġaqqabi	ġaqqabi	identical translation
41. mouth	təmm	təmm	identical translation
42. gullet	/	balʕōm	missing word in CM
43. lip	şafēyəf	şəffi, pl. şafēyəf	identical translation
44. moustache	şawēġəb	şawēġəb	identical translation

45. hand	īd	kaff	lexical difference
46. arm	drāṣ	īd	lexical difference
47. elbow	ṣākəs	ṣakəs	phonological difference
48. finger	ṛəṣbaṣ	ṛəṣbaṣ	identical translation
49. breast	ṣadəḡ	ṣadəḡ	identical translation
50. shoulder	kətəṣ	kətəṣ	identical translation
51. back	ḍahəḡ	ḍahəḡ	identical translation
52. belly	baṭən	baṭən	identical translation
53. leg	ḡəḡəl	ḡəḡəl	identical translation
54. foot	qadam	qadam	identical translation
55. knee	ḡəkbi	ḡəkbi	identical translation
56. sole	kaṣb	ṛasfal əl-ḡəḡəl	lexical difference (CM) wrong translation
57. heel	kaṣb	kaṣb	identical translation
58. ass	ḡəḥəḡ	ḡəḥəḡ ṭīz	one identical translation (MM): no different nuances in the meaning of the two words
59. heart	qaləb	qaləb	identical translation
60. skin	ḡələd	ḡələd	identical translation
5. Human qualities and defects			
61. fat	smīn	smīn	identical translation
62. thin	ḍaṣīṭ	ḍaṣīṭ	identical translation
63. blind	ṛaṣmi	ṛaṣmi	identical translation
64. one-eyed	ṛaṣwaḡ	karīm əl-ṣēn	lexical difference

65. cross-eyed	ṛaḥwal	ṛaḥwal	identical translation
66. bald	ṛaqqaf	ṛaṣlaf	lexical difference
67. deaf	ṛatḡaš	ṛatḡaš	identical translation
68. mute	ṛaxxas	ṛaxxas	identical translation
69. stutterer	yəxaḡḡəs	yətaṛtaṛ - taṛtaṛ bə-l-ḥaki	lexical difference In MM and in CM the adjective is expressed through a verb.
70. hunchbacked	ṛaḥdab	ṛaḥdab	identical translation
71. limping	yaṣḡəḡ	ṛaṣḡaḡ	lexical difference In CM the adjective is expressed through a verb.
72. lame	mašlūl	muṣāq	lexical difference CM and MM both employ MSA forms
73. left-handed	yasrāwi	ṛaṣsar	lexical difference
74. dumb	ṛaṭwal	ḡabi ṛaṭwal ḡaḥəš	one identical translation
75. stingy	baxīl	baxīl ḡəldayy	one identical translation
6. Animals			
6.1 Domestic animals			
76. cattle	ṣaḡūl	rabəṭ	lexical difference
77. herd	qaṭīṣ	qaṭīṣ	identical translation
78. sheep	xūfēn	xuḡfēn	phonological difference

		ġanam	two words in MM
79. ewe	xaġūf	ġanami xaġūf naŋġi	one identical translation three words in MM
80. ram	/	kabəš	missing word in CM
81. lamb (f.)	ṭəli	fīma	lexical difference
82. lamb (m.)	ṭəli	ṭəli	identical translation
83. lambs	ṭaliyān	ṭaliyān	identical translation
84. goats	ŋanūz	maŋz	lexical difference
85. (one) goat	ŋanzi	maŋza maŋzi	lexical difference
86. billy-goat	tēs	tēs ġədi	one identical translation
87. kid (m.)	ŋanzi zġēġi	ŋanzi zġēġi	no male/female distinction identical translation
88. kid (f.)	ŋanzi zġēġi	ŋanzi zġēġi	identical translation
89. cow	baqaġa	baqaġa	identical translation
90. bull	tōġ	tōġ	identical translation
91. calf (m.)	ŋəġəl/ŋaġəl	hōli	lexical difference
92. calf (f.)	ŋəġəl/ ŋaġəl	hōli	lexical difference no male/female distinction
93. ass	ġaḥəš	ġaḥaš/ġaḥəš muṭi	one identical translation
94. she-ass	ġaḥša	ġaḥša maṭīyyi	two words in MM one identical translation
95. foal of ass	kərr	kərr	identical translation
96. horses	ḥašan	ḥašan	identical translation
97. stallion	ḥṣān	ḥṣān	identical translation

98. stud	fağas	faras	phonological difference
99. camels	ğmēl	ğmēl	identical translation
100. camel (one)	ğamal	ğamal	identical translation
101. hen	ğēği	diğāğa dğēği	lexical difference (MM): <i>diğāğa</i> refers to a big hen; <i>dğēği</i> refers to a small hen, weighing less than 1 kg.
102. cock	dīk	dīk	identical translation
103. chick	farəx	şōşi	lexical difference
104. ducks	baṭṭ	baṭṭ	identical translation
105. geese	wazz	wazz	identical translation
106. hare	ʔağnabi	ʔarnab barri	lexical difference
107. rabbit	ʔağnabi	ʔarnab	phonological and morphological difference
108. cat	bazzūni	bazzūni	identical translation
109. tail	dēl	dēl	identical translation
6.2 Other animals			
110. lion	sabəʕ	ʔasad	lexical difference
111. fish	samak	samak	identical translation
112. shrimps	/	rōbyān	missing word in CM <i>rōbyān</i> : Persian borrowing
113. bees	naḥəl	naḥəl	identical translation
114. wasp	zanbōğ	zanībīg	morphological difference
115. cockroaches	şoğşoğ	şagēşəğ	morphological difference
116. flies	dəbbēn	dəbbēn	identical translation
117. sparrows	ʕaşıfīg	ʕaşıfīg	identical translation

118. stork	laqlaq	laqlaq	identical translation
119. bat	xəffāš	xəffāš	identical translation
120. lizard	ʔabu xsēm	ḥayyi slēmāniyyi	lexical difference
121. gecko	/	ʔabū brēš	missing word in CM
122. chamaeleon	ḥarbāʔ	ḥerbāʔ	phonological difference
123. snail	ḥalazōn	ḥalazōn	identical translation
124. turtle	səlḥafāt	sulḥafāt	phonological difference
125. frog	ʕaqqōqa	ʕaqqōqa	identical translation
126. mouse	fāga	fāga	identical translation
127. rat	ğəğdi	ğəğdi	identical translation
128. ape	šādi	qarəd	lexical difference <i>šādi</i> : Persian borrowing
129. fox	talʕab	talʕab	identical translation
130. pig	xanzīg	xanzīg	identical translation
131. hedgehog	qənfəd	qənfəd	identical translation
7. Nature			
132. sun	šaməs	šaməs	identical translation
133. moon	qamağ	qamağ	identical translation
134. clouds	ğēm	ğēm	identical translation
135. rain	maṭağ	maṭağ	identical translation
136. rainbow	qūz əl-qazaḥ	qawz quzaḥ	phonological and syntactic difference
137. shadow	fayy	ḍəll xayāl	lexical difference
138. water	māy	māy	identical translation

139. river	šatt	nahar	lexical difference
140. brook	xōsağ	sāqi	lexical difference
141. mountain	ğabal	ğabal	identical translation
142. heat	hağğ	hağğ	identical translation
143. fire	nāğ	nāğ	identical translation
144. cold	bağəd	bağəd	identical translation
7.1 Cardinal points			
145. north	šimāl	šimāl	identical translation
146. south	ğanūb	ğanūb	identical translation
147. west	ğarb	ğarb	identical translation
148. east	šarq	šarq	identical translation
8. Plants			
149. tree	siğaga	siğaga	identical translation
150. grass	hašiš	hašiš	identical translation
151. clover	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
152. flowers	wağəd	wağəd	identical translation
153. potatoes	baṭāṭa	baṭāṭa	identical translation
154. tomatoes	ṭamāṭa	ṭamāṭa	identical translation
155. carrots	ğəzağ	ğəzağ	identical translation
156. eggplants	badəngān	badəngān	identical translation
157. artichokes	/	/	missing in CM and MM
158. wheat	hənta	hənta qaməḥ	one identical translation
159. rice	ğəzz	təmmən ğəzz	one identical translation

160. pumpkin	qāḡaṣ	qāḡaṣ əl-ḡabal	lexical difference
161. courgette	šiḡar	qāḡaṣ	lexical difference
162. cabbage	lahāna	lahāna	identical translation Greek word borrowed via Turkish
163. cauliflower	qarnabīt	qāḡnabīt	phonological difference Greek word borrowed via Ottoman-Turkish
164. peas	ḡabb dḡēt	bazālya	lexical difference <i>bazālya</i> : It. word borrowed via Turkish
165. chickpeas	ḡəmməṣ	ḡəmməṣ	identical translation
166. parsley	baqdūnəs	baqdūnəs	identical translation
167. thyme	zaṣtaḡ	zaṣtaḡ	identical translation
168. coriander	kəzbaḡa	kəzbaḡa	identical translation
169. sesame	səmsəm	səmsəm	identical translation
170. figs	tīn	tīn	identical translation
171. oranges	purtaqāl	burtuqāl	phonological difference word borrowed via Ottoman-Turkish
172. lemons	nūm ḡāməd	laymūn	lexical difference
173. pears	ṣarmūt	ṣarmūt	identical translation <i>ṣarmūt</i> : Persian loan borrowed via Turkish
174. plums	ṣanḡās	mrakkab ṣanḡās	one identical translation (MM): <i>mrakkab</i> are the black plums; <i>ṣanḡās</i> the yellow ones.
175. peaches	xōx	xōx	one identical translation

		tīn šawki xōx šawki	(MM): <i>tīn</i> / <i>xōx šawkī</i> refers in other Arab countries to the prickly pear. The prickly pear is not common in Mosul.
176. apricots	məšməš qēsi	məšməš qēsi	identical translation <i>qēsi</i> : Turkish borrowing, “dried apricots”.
177. strawberries	šillēk	farawla	lexical difference <i>šillēk</i> : Turkish borrowing <i>farawla</i> : European borrowing
178. watermelons	šəmzi	šəmzi	identical translation
179. honeydew melons	baṭṭīx	baṭṭīx	identical translation
8.1 Palm-tree			
180. stalk with leaves	saṣfi	saṣfi	identical translation
181. stalk without leaves	/	saṣf	missing word in CM
182. leaves	saṣf	ṭawrāq	lexical difference
183. raceme	tamḡāyi	/	missing word in MM
184. stem	ḡəḍaṣ	ḡəḍaṣ ən-naxli	lexical difference
185. stone	ṣaḡu	ṣaḡwāyi	morphological difference
9. Constructions			
186. minaret	bnāḡa	mnāḡa	phonological difference
187. bridge	ḡəsəḡ	ḡəsəḡ	identical translation
188. hospital	mustašfa xastaxāna	mustašfa	one identical translation <i>xastaxāna</i> : Ottoman-Turkish borrowing (?)
189. cemetery	maqbaḡa	maqbaḡa	identical translation
10. Domicile			

190. domicile	maskan maḥalli	maskan	one identical translation
191. countryside	bə-ḍ-ḍeṣa	bə-ḍ-ḍeṣa	identical translation
192. village	qarya	qarya	identical translation
193. quarter (small)	maḥalli	ḥayy	lexical difference
194. street	šārəf	šārəf	identical translation
195. way	ṭarēq dağəb	ṭarīq	phonological difference
196. pist	/	sāḥat siyāqa	missing word in CM
197. lane	ṣawḡi	zuqāqa	lexical difference
198. tent	xēmi māl badū	xēmi	lexical difference
11. House			
199. house	bēt	bēt	identical translation
200. room	ōḍa	ḡurfa ōḍa	one identical translation <i>ōḍa</i> : Turkish borrowing
201. kitchen	maṭbax	maṭbax	identical translation
202. window	šibbāk	šibbāk	identical translation
203. baking oven	tannōḡ (tradi- tional) fəḡən (modern)	tannōḡ (tradi- tional) fəḡən (modern)	two identical translations
204. refrigerator	ṭallāḡi	ṭallāḡi	identical translation
205. electric light	ḍaww	ḍaww ḡlōbāyi	one identical translation <i>ḡlōbāyi</i> : English borrowing According to MM, <i>ḡlōbāyi</i> refers to the light bulb but it is also used in sentences like “Can you turn on the light?”
206. lamp	lampa	tēblām	one identical translation

		lampa	<i>tēblām</i> : English borrowing <i>lampa</i> : European borrowing (Greek) (MM) <i>lampa</i> refers to old lamps, whereas <i>tēblām</i> refers to the modern ones.
207. water tap	ḥanafī	ḥanafī	identical translation
11.1 Utensils			
208. furniture	aṭāt	aṭāt	identical translation
209. bed	taxət manām	manām qaryōla	lexical difference one identical translation (MM): <i>manām</i> refers to a bed made of wood; <i>qaryōla</i> refers to a bed made of iron or metal. <i>qaryōla</i> : Turkish borrowing- <i>taxət</i> : Persian borrowing
210. table	mēz	mēz	identical translation <i>mēz</i> : European borrowing via Persian
211. traditional table	mēz	mēz	identical translation
212. wardrobe	dūlāb	dūlāb qanşōğ	one identical translation <i>dūlāb</i> : Persian borrowing borrowed via Turkish <i>qanşōğ</i> : European loan via Turkish(?)
213. carpet (not for praying)	maḥfōga	maḥfōga zūliyyi	one identical translation <i>zūliyyi</i> : Persian borrowing
214. broom	maknasi	maknasi	identical translation
215. knife	səkkīn	səkkīni	morphological difference
216. fork	čingār	čaṭal	lexical difference

			<i>čingār</i> : Kurdish borrowing <i>čaṭal</i> : Turkish borrowing
217. spoon	maṣlaqa	maṣlaqa	identical translation
218. plate	şaḥən	şaḥən	identical translation
219. tea-pot	qūri ma-č-čāy	qūri əč-čāy qūri ma-č-čāy	one identical translation <i>qūri</i> : Persian borrowing
220. tea-glass	(i)stikān glāš čāy	ʔistikānət əč-čāy peyālat əč-čāy	lexical difference <i>(i)stikān</i> and <i>peyāla</i> : Persian borrowings <i>glāš</i> : English borrowing
221. bottle (of water)	boṭəl	boṭəl	English borrowing identical translation
222. key	məftāḥ	məftāḥ	identical translation
223. matches	šəxxāṭ	šəxxāṭa ōd šəxxāṭa	morphological difference (MM): <i>šəxxāṭa</i> refers to a box of matches and <i>ōd šəxxāṭa</i> to a single match.
224. lighter	maqdaḥa	maqdaḥa	identical translation
225. cooking-pot	dəsət	dəsət tīfāl	one identical translation <i>tīfāl</i> : borrowing of the brand name Tefal (MM): <i>tīfāl</i> refers to the modern cooking-pots. <i>dəsət</i> : Persian borrowing
226. water-jar	šaḡbi	dōlka	lexical difference <i>dōlka</i> : Persian borrowing (?)
12. Clothes			
227. clothes	ḥwās	ḥwās	identical translation
228. shoe (modern, men)	qəndara	qəndara ḥidāʔ	identical translation <i>qəndara</i> : Turkish borrowing
229. shoe (modern, women)	qəndara ma-n-nəswān	ḥidāʔ	lexical difference

230. sock(s)	ğōğābi, pl. ğowēğəb	ğōğābi, pl. ğawēğəb	phonological difference <i>ğōğābi</i> : Persian loan borrowed via Turkish
231. shirt	qamīş	qamīş	identical translation
13. Different objects			
232. thing	şē	şē	identical translation
233. stuff	ʕağaq	ʕaddi	lexical difference (CM and MM) wrong translation
234. watch	sāʕa	sāʕa	identical translation
235. eye-glasses	mandāra	mandāra naḍḍāra	one identical translation
236. wallet	ğəzdān	ğəzdān	identical translation Persian borrowing (?)
237. bag	kīs	čanṭa	lexical difference <i>čanṭa</i> : Turkish borrowing
238. shopping bag	kīs māl məswāq	kīs əl-məswāq	syntactic difference
239. sack (big one, for food)	gūniyyi	gūniyyi kīs	lexical difference <i>guniyyi</i> : English borrowing/Persian borrowing
240. sling	čatal	čatal	<i>čatal</i> : Turkish borrowing identical translation
14. Food			
241. food	ʔakəl	ʔakəl	identical translation
242. breakfast	futğa	fṭōğ tağyōqa	lexical difference
243. bread	xəbəz	xəbəz	identical translation
244. loaf of bread	lōf şammūnāyi	lōf	one identical translation <i>lōf</i> : English borrowing <i>şammūnāyi</i> : Greek borrowing borrowed via Turkish
245. kuskus	kuskus	bərgəl	(CM) wrong translation

		dšīši	<i>bərgəl</i> : Turkish borrowing
246. pap	ʕaḡīn	mahrūs	lexical difference (CM) wrong translation
247. flour	ṭaḥīn	ṭaḥīn	identical translation
248. eggs	bēḍ	bēḍ	identical translation
249. meat	laḥəm	laḥəm	phonological difference
250. salad	nzalāṭa	zalāṭa	phonological difference
251. spices	bahārāt	tawābəl	lexical difference
252. chillies	fəlfəl ḥāḡḡ	fəlfəl ḥād fəlfəl aḥmaḡ	lexical difference
253. pepper	fəlfəl	fəlfəl əswad	lexical difference
254. oil	dəhən zēt	zēt	one identical translation
255. sugar	šəkar	šakar	phonological difference <i>šakar</i> : Persian borrowing
256. raisins	məšməš	zbīb	lexical difference (CM) wrong translation
15. Drinks			
257. tea	čāy	čāy	identical translation Persian word borrowed via Ottoman-Turkish (?)
258. milk	ḥalīb	ḥalīb	identical translation
259. wine	xaməḡ	nbīḍ	lexical difference
260. carbonated soft-drink	məšḡūba ḡāziyya	məšḡūba ḡāziyya	identical translation
16. Agriculture			
261. field	ʔaḡd zirāʕiyya	mazraʕa	lexical difference
262. farm	mazraʕa	mazraʕa	identical translation
263. orchard	bəstān māl fawākəh	bəstān	lexical difference
264. palm-garden	bəstān naxīl	bəstān naxīl mazraʕat naxīl	one identical translation
16.1 Agricultural tools			

265. hoe	qazma maṅḡal	/	missing word in MM
266. sickle	ḡaḡḡaḡ maḥrāt	miṅḡāl	lexical difference
267. plough	/	fəddān	missing word in CM
268. plough-share	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
269. plough-beam	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
270. plough-sole	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
271. plough-stert	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
272. drover's whip	qamči	qamči	<i>qamči</i> : Turkish borrowing identical translation
273. yoke	maḡḡam	əlḡām	lexical difference
274. well	bīḡ	bīḡ	identical translation
275. cistern	/	tanki	missing word in CM <i>tanki</i> : English borrowing
276. water-wheel	naṣōḡ	ṭaḥōnat māy	lexical difference
277. threshing place	/	/	missing word in CM and MM
278. hen-house	bēt māl ḡēḡ	qənn	lexical difference
279. cowshed	ḥaḍīra māl baqaḡ	maṣlaf	lexical difference
280. stable	ḥaḍīra māl xēl	sṭabəl	lexical difference <i>sṭabəl</i> : European borrowing (Greek)
281. bee-hive	xaliyya māl naḥəl	xalīt naḥəl	syntactic difference
16.2 Agricultural activities			
282. to irrigate	saqa - yasqi	saqa - yəsqi	phonological difference
283. to plough	ḥaraṭ - yaḥrəṭ	ḥaraṭ / yəḥrəṭ	phonological difference
284. to harvest	ḡalli	ḥaṣad - yəḥṣəd ḡana - yəḡni	(CM) wrong translation (MM): <i>ḥaṣad</i> is used only in relation to wheat.
285. to thresh	darrāsa	/	missing word in MM (CM) wrong translation
286. to winnow	/	ḡarbal - yuḡarbəl	missing word in CM

17. Commerce			
287. shop	dəkkān	dəkkān maḥall baqqāl	three words in MM one identical translation
288. to bargain	yəbāzər – bāzar	bāzağ - yəbēzağ	phonological difference <i>bāzar</i> : Kurdish borrowing
289. to buy	širā?	ʔištağa - yištaği	lexical difference (CM) wrong translation
290. money	flūs	flūs	identical translation
291. change	xərda	nawēʕəm (a little of something) flūs nēʕmi	lexical difference <i>xərda</i> : Persian borrowing
292. customer	maʕmīl	maʕmīl	identical translation
293. dowry	mahəğ	mahar	phonological difference
18. Vehicles			
294. car	sayyāra	sayyāra	identical translation
295. bus	pāş	pāş	English borrowing identical translation
296. cart	ʕarabāna	ʕarabāna dūba	one identical translation <i>ʕarabāna</i> : Turkish borrowing
297. lorry	lōri	lōri	identical translation English borrowing
298. horn	hōren ṭawwāṭa	hōren	one identical translation <i>hōren</i> and <i>ṭawwāṭa</i> : English borrowings
299. steering wheel	stēren	stēren	identical translation English borrowing
300. clutch	klač	klēč	phonological difference English borrowing
301. gear	gēr	gēr	identical translation English borrowing
302. reverse	gēr māl rağʕa	bāk	lexical difference

			<i>gēr</i> and <i>bāk</i> : English borrowings
303. brake	brēk	əştāb	lexical difference <i>brēk</i> and <i>əştāb</i> : English borrowings
304. exhaust	ʕādəm	gzōz	lexical difference <i>gzōz</i> : English borrowing
305. tyre	tāyər	tāyər	English borrowing identical translation
306. puncture	pančar	pančar	English borrowing identical translation
307. accident	ḥādət	ḥādət daʕmāyi	lexical difference (MM): <i>daʕmāyi</i> is used only for accidents of vehicles (car accidents for example); <i>ḥādət</i> has a more general meaning.
308. gas station	banzīnxāna	panzīnxāna	phonological difference <i>banzīnxāna</i> : Turkish compound
309. steam-boat	markab buxāri	safīna buxāriyya	lexical difference
19. Communication			
310. letter	maktūb	risāla	lexical difference
311. stamp	ṭābəʕ	ṭābəʕ	identical translation
312. cellular	mōbāyil	mūbāyil	phonological difference English borrowing
20. Material			
313. glass	ġām	ġām	identical translation <i>ġām</i> : Persian loan borrowed via Turkish
314. wood	xašab	xašab	identical translation
315. timber	xašab bināʔ	şūf	lexical difference
316. paint	şabəġ	şabəġ	identical translation

21. Verbs			
317. to go (to school)	ġāḥ - yġōḥ ʕa-l-madrasi	ġāḥ - yġōḥ ʕa-l-madrasi	identical translation
318. to go for a walk	tamašša - yəṭmašša	məši - yəmši	lexical difference
319. to go away	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	identical translation
320. to set out/go away	twakkal - yəṭwakkal	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	lexical difference
321. to enter	fāt - yfūt	fāt - yfūt	identical translation
322. to go out (from a place)	ṭalaʕ - yəṭlaʕ	ṭalaʕ - yəṭlaʕ	identical translation
323. to go down (from a hill)	nəzəl - yənzəl	nəzəl - yənzəl	morphological difference
324. to go downtown	nəzəl - yənzəl ʕa-l-balad	ġāḥ - yġōḥ ʕa-l-madīna	lexical difference
325. to go down to the street (from the house)	məši - yəmši bə-š-šārəʕ	nəzəl - yənzəl nihāyət ə-š-šārəʕ nəzəl - yənzəl ʔasfal ə-š-šārəʕ	lexical difference possibly wrong translation in CM and MM
326. to go upstairs	ṭalaʕ - yəṭlaʕ (ad-daġayyagħ)	ṭalaʕ - yəṭlaʕ	identical translation
327. to board (car)	rəkəb - yərəkab bə-s-sayyāra	šaʕad - yəšʕad as-sayyāra	lexical difference
328. to mount (horse)	rəkəb - yərəkab ʕa-l-ḥəṣān	rakaba - yərəkab ʕa-l-ḥəṣān rakaba - yərəkab lə-ḥəṣān	morphological difference
329. to descend from a car	nəzəl - yənzəl mən as-sayyāra	nəzəl - yanzəl mən as-sayyāra	phonological difference
330. dismount from a horse	nəzəl - yənzəl mən lə-ḥəṣān	nəzəl - yanzəl mən lə-ḥəṣān	phonological difference

331. to return	rağaf - yərğaf	rağaf - yərğaf dāwara - yədāwər	one identical translation
332. to go home	ğāḥ - ygōḥ ʕa-l-bēt	ğāḥ - ygōḥ ʕa-l- bēt	identical translation
333. to come	ğā - yəği	ğā - yəği	identical translation
334. come! (2 nd pers. sg. m.)	taʕāl	taʕāl	identical translation
335. to arrive	wəʕəl - yəʕal	wəʕəl - yəʕal	identical translation
336. to pass by	marr - ymurr	marr - ymərr mən yammu	lexical difference
337. to jump (over a ditch)	čatt - yčətt	čatt - yčətt	identical translation
338. to fall	waqaf - yəqaf	waqaf - yəqaf	identical translation
339. to dance	ğəqəʕ - yərqəʕ	raqəʕ - yərqəʕ dabak - yədbək	morphological difference
340. to swim	səbəḥ - yəsbaḥ	sabaḥ - yəsbaḥ	morphological difference
341. to get up (from the bed)	qaʕad - yəqʕad (əʕ-şəbəḥ)	qaʕad - yəqʕad	identical translation
342. to sit down	qaʕad - yəqʕad	qaʕad - yəqʕad	morphological difference
343. to stop	məsək - yəmsak	wəqəf - yəqaf	lexical difference
344. to stay	baqi - yəbqa ḍall - yəḍəll	baqa - yəbqa	morphological difference
345. to sleep	nām - ynām	nām - ynām	identical translation
346. to have breakfast	fəṭəğ - yəftəğ	tğayyaq - yətgay- yaq	lexical difference
347. to drink water	šəğəb - yəšğab māy	šəğəb - yəšğab māy	identical translation
348. to cook	ṭabax - yəṭbəx	ṭabax - yəṭbəx	identical translation
349. to bake bread	xabaz - yəxbəz	xabaz - yəxbəz (əl-xəbəz)	identical translation
350. to kindle a fire	ʕalaq - yəʕləq an- nāğ	ʕalaq - yəʕləq an- nāğ	identical translation

351. to hunt	şād - yşīd	şād - yşīd	identical translation
352. to pour (tea into a glass)	şabb - yəşəbb (māy)	şabb - yəşəbb (čāy)	identical translation
353. to spill (water on the ground)	taşš - yətaşš māy	taşš - yətaşš māy	identical translation
354. to smoke	daxxan - /	daxxan - ydaxxan	identical translation
355. to see	ğəşəf - yəğšaḥ ṭallaḥ - yəṭallaḥ	ğəşəf - yəğšaḥ	one identical translation
356. look!	daḥḥaq ṭalləḥ, ṭallaḥ	daḥḥaq	one identical translation
357. to show	ğawwa - yğawwi	ğāššaḥ - yəğāššaḥ	lexical difference
358. to wait	standəğ - yəstandəğ	standəğ - yəstandəğ	identical translation
359. to speak	ḥaka - yəḥki	ḥaka - yəḥki	identical translation
360. to call	şayyaḥ - yşayyaḥ	şayyaḥ - yşayyaḥ	identical translation
361. to look for	dawwağ - ydaw-wəğ	dawwağ - ydaw-wəğ	identical translation
362. to work (in a factory)	štağal - yəštağil	štağal - yəštəğəl	morphological difference
363. to work (in a field)	falaḥ - yəflaḥ	štağal - yəštəğəl	lexical difference
364. to make/ to do	şanaḥ - yəşnaḥ	ʕamal - yaʕməl	lexical difference
365. to bite (dog)	ʕadd - yəʕadd	ʕadd - yəʕadd	identical translation
366. to catch (with the hand)	məsək - yəmsak (bi-īdu)	məsək - yəmsak	identical translation
367. to catch (a thief)	məsək - yəmsak (əl-ḥağāmi)	məsək - yəmsak	identical translation
368. to throw (sth. on the floor)	zatt - yəzətt (ʕa-l-ʔəğəḍ)	zatt - yəzətt	identical translation
369. to shoot (with a gun)	ḍəğab - yəḍğəb (bə-l-musaddas)	ḍəğab - yəḍğəb	identical translation
370. to get out (sth. of a place)	ṭallaḥ - yəṭalləḥ	ṭallaḥ - yəṭalləḥ bağga	identical translation

371. to close (a door, a shop)	sadd - yəsədd	qafal - yəqfəl	lexical difference
372. to open	fataḥ - yəftaḥ	fataḥ - yəftaḥ	identical translation
373. to pull (an animal)	ğəğğ - yəğğəğğ (əl- hēwān)	ğəğğ - yəğğəğğ	identical translation
374. can / to be able to	tāq - yṯīq	tāq - yṯīq	identical translation
I cannot come	mā-aṯīq ṯaḡi	mā-aṯīq ṯaḡi	
375. to be able to	/ - yəṯḡəf	tāq - yṯīq	lexical difference
He cannot swim	mā - yəṯḡəf yəsbaḥ	mā - yṯīq yəsbaḥ	lexical difference
376. to understand	ftaham - yaftihim	faham - yəfham- ftaham - yəftəhəm	morphological difference
377. must	lāzəm	lāzəm	identical translation
You must come	lāzəm tiḡi	lāzəm tiḡi	identical translation
378. to want	/ - yḡīd	ḡād - yḡīd	identical translation
What do you want?	aṣ ṯa-tḡīd?	aṣ ṯa-tḡīd?	
379. to let	tarak - yətrək	tarak - yətrək	identical translation
380. leave	/	xalla - yxalli	identical translation
Leave the door open!	xalli l-bāb maftūḥ!	xalli l-bāb maftūḥ!	
381. to ask (a question)	saṯal - yəsṯal	saṯal - yəsṯəl	morphological difference
382. to snore	šaxaḡ - yəšxəḡ	šaxxaḡ - yəšaxxaḡ	lexical difference
383. to burp	ttariyaṣ - yəttaraṣ	taryaṣ- yəttaryaṣ	lexical difference
384. to cough	saṣal - yəsṣəl	qaḥḥ - yəqəḥḥ	lexical difference
385. to spit	tafal - yətfəl	taffal - yətaffəl	lexical difference
386. to cry	bəka - yəbki	baka - yəbki	morphological difference
387. to quarrel (to be high at words)	tqātəl - yəqtātəl	tṣāyəḥ - yəṣāyəḥ	lexical difference
388. to quarrel (have a fight)	əddāḡab - yəddāḡab	tqātəl - yəqtātəl	lexical difference
389. to insult	xēlaq - yxēlaq	xēlaq - yxēlaq	identical translation

390. to be left (one person)	fəḍəl - yəḍḍal	tarak - yətrək xalla - yxalli	lexical difference
391. to be born	ğā - yəği ʕa-d-dinyi	ğā - yəği ʕa-ddinyi	identical translation
392. to become	ṣāğ - yəṣīğ	ṣāğ - yṣīğ	identical translation
393. to live in a place	sakan - yəskən	ʕāš - yaʕīš	lexical difference
394. to hide	xataba - yəxtabi	xabba - yxabbi	lexical difference
395. to give	ʕaṭa - yaʕṭi	ʕaṭa - yaʕṭi	identical translation
396. to bring	ğāb - yğīb	ğāb - yğīb	identical translation
397. bring me!	ğīb lī	ğīb lī	identical translation
398. to take away (with)	axad - yāxəd	axad - yāxəd ğāb - yğīb	one identical translation
399. to get (sth.)	ʔaxad - yāxəd	ḥaṣṣala - yəḥaṣṣəl	lexical difference
400. to pay	dafaʕ - yədfaʕ	dafaʕ - yədfaʕ	identical translation
401. to count	ʕadd - yəʕədd	ʕadd - yəʕədd	identical translation
402. to put (sth. on the table)	ḥaṭṭ - yḥəṭṭ	ḥaṭṭ - yḥəṭṭ	identical translation
403. to send (a letter)	baʕaṭ - yibʕaṭ (əl-maktūb)	baʕaṭ - yibʕaṭ	identical translation
404. to steal (a person's money)	bāq - ybūq	bāq - ybūq	identical translation
405. full tank	ʕabba - yəʕabbi əl-banzīn	fawwəl - yəfawwəl “fawwəl!”	lexical difference <i>fawwəl</i> : verb derived from the Engl. “full, fuel”, Ar. <i>ḥūl</i>
22. Adjectives			
406. good	malīḥ	malīḥ	identical translation
407. beautiful	ḥəlu	ḥəlu	identical translation
408. bad	mā-malīḥ	mā-ḥəlu	lexical difference
409. ugly	qabīḥ	yəlʕab ən-nafəs	lexical difference
410. tired	taʕbān	taʕbān	identical translation
411. sick	wəğṣān	wəğṣān	identical translation

412. rich	zangīn	zangīn	identical translation <i>zangīn</i> : Turkish borrowing
413. poor (has no money)	faqēg	faqīg	phonological difference
414. empty	fārəg	fārəg	identical translation
415. free (from work)	məʕaʔtāl mən əššəgəl	ʕaʔtāl baʔtāl ʕaʔtāl baʔtāl	lexical difference MM says that there is no difference in the meaning of the three words.
416. black	ʔaswad	ʔaswad	identical translation
417. small	zīgīg	zīgīg	identical translation
418. thirsty	ʕaʔšān	ʕaʔšān	identical translation
419. hungry	gūʕān	gūʕān	identical translation
420. hot	hāgīg	hāgīg	identical translation
23. Numerals and time			
421. numbers (1-10, isolated)			
One	wēhəd	wēhəd	identical translation
Two	ṭnīn	ṭnīn	identical translation
Three	ṭāṭi	tlāṭa	lexical difference
Four	arbaʕa	arbaʕa	identical translation
Five	xamsi	xamsa	phonological difference
Six	sətti	sətta	phonological difference
Seven	sabʕa	sabʕa	identical translation
Eight	ṭmēni	ṭmāniya	lexical difference
Nine	təsʕa	təsʕa	identical translation
Ten	ʕašgā	ʕašgā	identical translation
422. three times	ṭaṭ marrāt	tlāṭ marrāt	lexical difference
423. days of the week			
Monday	əṭ-ṭnēn	ṭnēn	syntactic difference
Tuesday	ṭāṭā	ṭlāṭā	lexical difference
Wednesday	ʔarbaʕa	al-ʔarbiʕā	lexical difference
Thursday	xamīs	xamīs	identical translation

Friday	ğəmfa	ğəmfa	identical translation
Saturday	sabət	sabət	identical translation
Sunday	ʔaḥad	ʔaḥad	identical translation
424. week	ʔəsbōf	ʔəsbōf	identical translation
425. year	sani	sani	identical translation
426. names of the months			
January	kānūn ət-tāni	kānūn ət-tāni	identical translation
February	šbāt	šbāt	identical translation
March	ʔadāg	ʔadār	phonological difference
April	nīsān	nīsān	identical translation
May	ʔayyāg	ʔayyār	phonological difference
June	ḥzigān	ḥozayrān	phonological difference
July	tammūz	tammūz	identical translation
August	ʔāb	ʔāb	identical translation
September	ʔaylūl	ʔaylūl	identical translation
October	tišrīn əl-ʔawwəl	təšrīn əl-ʔawwəl	phonological difference
November	tišrīn ət-tāni	təšrīn ət-tāni	phonological difference
December	kānūn əl-ʔawwəl	kānūn əl-ʔawwəl	identical translation
24. Functional words			
24.1 Interrogation			
427. who?	mənu	mənu	identical translation
428. what?	aš - ašnu	aš - ašnu	identical translation
429. why?	lēš?	lēš?	identical translation
430. where?	wēn	wēn	identical translation
431. where? (to go in a direction)	wēn	wēn	identical translation
Where are you heading?	wēn b-tgōḥ?	wēn gēyah?	lexical difference
432. from where?	mnēn	mən wēn	lexical difference
433. when?	aš waqət	ēmeti aš waqət	lexical difference
434. how?	ʔaššōn?	ʔaššōn	identical translation
435. how much?	ašqad	ašqad	identical translation

24.2 Adverbs			
436. here	hōni	hōni	identical translation
437. there	hōnək	hnūk	lexical difference
438. outside	bağğa	bağğa	identical translation
439. inside	ğawwa	ğawwa	identical translation
440. left	yasāğ	yasāğ	identical translation
441. right	yamīn	yamīn	identical translation
442. straight ahead	ʕadəl	ʕadəl gubal	one identical translation
443. above	fōq	fōq	identical translation
444. beneath/below	taḥət	taḥət ğawwa	one identical translation
445. early	şubuh	mən waqət	lexical difference
446. now	hassa	hassa	identical translation
447. yesterday	əlbēḥa	əlbēḥa	identical translation
448. today	halyōm	əlyōm	lexical difference
449. tomorrow	ğada	ğada	identical translation
450. always	kəll waqət	dāʔiman ʕala tūl	lexical difference
451. last year	ʕām l-awwəl	haḏīk əs-sani	lexical difference
452. next year	santi-ğ-ğayy	əl-sani lə-ğayy	syntactic difference
453. never	ʔabadan	walā marra	lexical difference
454. often	kəll waqət	dāʔiman al-ʔağlab	lexical difference
455. not anymore	mā baqa	mā ʔaktāğ	lexical difference
I have not seen him any- more	ana mā baq ğəşəʕtūnu	şāğ-lī fatra mā- qad-ğəşəʕtūnu	
456. still	baʕəd	baʕəd	identical translation
457. only	bass	bass	identical translation
458. also / too	hamm	hamm	identical translation <i>hamm</i> : Persian loan borrowed via Turkish
459. already	/	/	missing word in CM and MM

I have already found it.	hada ššē, laqqētūnu.	laqqētūnu.	(CM): the syntax of the sentence clarifies the meaning. (MM): the intonation of the sentence clarifies the meaning.
460. immediately	ḥālan	hassa mubāšara	lexical difference
461. afterwards	baʕdēn	baʕdēn	identical translation
462. so	hākəḍ	li-hāḍa ka-ḍālik	lexical difference
463. much (in the meaning “much money”)	ktīg	ktīg	identical translation
464. very	kəlleš	ktīg	lexical difference
465. not at all	ṁāku	ʕala ʔaṭlāq ṁāku	lexical difference
466. perhaps	balki	balki	identical translation <i>balki</i> : Persian loan borrowed via Turkish
24.3 Prepositions			
467. under	taḥət	ğawwa	lexical difference
468. on (the table)	fōq	ʕala	lexical difference
469. in (the house)	b-əl-bēt	b-əl-bēt	identical translation
470. in the middle of (the house)	b-nuṣṣ əl-bēt	bə-l-wasaṭ əl-bēt	lexical difference (local adverb)
In the middle of summer	b-nuṣṣ əṣ-ṣēf	b-nuṣṣ əṣ-ṣēf	identical translation
471. in front of	qəddām	qəddām qabəl	one identical translation
472. behind	xaləf	xaləf wəga	one identical translation
473. at /near (the station)	ʕənd	ʕənd	identical translation
474. close to (the table)	kəlliš qaḡībi əl-mēz	yamm əl-mēz	lexical difference

475. in the direction of (the hospital)	şōb əl-mustaşfa	qagîb mən əl- mustaşfa bə-ttiğāh əl-mus- taşfa	lexical difference
476. between	bēn	bēn	identical translation
477. after	baʕəd	baʕəd	identical translation
478. with (a person)	maʕa	maʕa	identical translation
479. without	bala	bala	identical translation
480. like (a child)	məṭəl	məṭəl	identical translation
481. because of	mbōr	bə-s-sabab lə-hal sabab	lexical difference <i>mbōr</i> : Kurdish borrowing
24.4 Conjunctions			
482. but	lākin	lākin bass	one identical translation
483. or	ʔaw	ʔaw	identical translation
Coffee or tea?	čāy wəlla qahwi?	čāy wəlla qahwi?	When asked to use <i>or</i> in a sentence, both MM and CM used <i>wəlla</i> instead of <i>ʔaw</i> .
484. when (I was young)	ləmmān (kəntu walad zġīġ)	mən kān ṭəfəl	lexical difference
485. if	iḍa	iḍa	identical translation
486. in order to	ḥatta	ʕala mūd	lexical difference
487. until	ʔila ʔan	ʔila ʔan	identical translation
25. Indefinites			
488. somebody	wēḥəd	wēḥəd šaxəş	one identical translation
489. some people	kam wēḥəd	kam wēḥəd šwayyət nās	one identical translation
490. something	šē	šē	identical translation
491. nobody	maḥḥad	wala wēḥəd	lexical difference
492. nothing	māku šē mā-šē	māku	lexical difference
26. Reflexive pronoun			

493. reflexive pronoun	nafs + bound pronoun	nafs + bound pronoun	
I asked myself	ʔana saʔaltu nafsi	ʔana saʔaltu nafsi	identical translation
27. Genitive exponent			
494. genitive exponent	māl	māl	identical translation
my father's car	sayyārət ʔabūyi əs-sayyāra māl ʔabūyi	sayyārət ʔabūyi hādī əs-sayyāra māl ʔabūyi	
28. Varia			
495. yes	ē	ē	identical translation
496. no	la	la	identical translation
497. to have been for...			
I have been in Egypt for three years.	ana bə-Məʃr mən tāt snīn	ana bə-Məʃr mən tlāta snīn	identical translation
498. This does not concern you	mā-yəxaʃʃək	mā-yəxaʃʃək mā-lak ʕalāqa	one identical translation
499. there is / there is not	aku / māku	aku / māku akūš / mākūš	one identical translation
500. How are you?	aššōnak?	aššōnak?	identical translation
501. by force	bə-l-quwwi	bə-l-quwwa	phonological difference
502. hurry up!	ʔəstaʕǧəl	ʔəstaʕǧəl	identical translation
503. thank you	šukran	šukran	identical translation
504. enough!	yikaffi!	bass! kaffi!	morphological difference

Appendix 2

Key

PR preserved word

SR semantic reduction

SE semantic extension

SS Semantic shift

AMB acquisition of a MB form

MM information of the Muslim informant

DM same form, different meaning

/ absence of translation

DI fallen into disuse

ND Not documented

Word	CM	MM	Socin	Al-Bakrī ⁴⁰⁰	Diachronic categorization
1. Men					
1. man	ġəġġāl	ġəġġāl	zel ^c me p. 17/11,14	p. 247 <i>zalmah</i> , “Syrian...child, young person. with a robust structure, who is beyond adolescence and entered his manhood”	<i>ġəġġāl</i> = PR ⁴⁰¹ <i>zlima</i> , <i>zalama</i> = SR from “man” to “viril man” ⁴⁰²
2. woman	maġa	maġa	mara p. 19/3 passim as “wife”		<i>maġa</i> = PR

⁴⁰⁰ The definitions in Al-Bakrī have been translated from Arabic into English by the author of the thesis.

⁴⁰¹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/6.

⁴⁰² For more details on this case, cf. section 6.2.5.

3. my father	ʔabūyi	ʔabūyi		p. 34-35 <i>ʔab</i> , “the father, (<i>al-wālid</i>)”	the word occurs in the source not as “my father” but as “father”
4. father	bāba	yāb yāba	yāba, “my friend” p. 13/2		(MM) <i>yāba</i> , “my friend” = PR <i>yāb /yāba</i> , “father!” = ND <i>bāba</i> = ND
5. my brother	ʔaxūyi	ʔaxūyi			ND
6. my mother	ʔəmmi	ʔəmmi		p. 51 <i>ʔumm</i> , “the mother (<i>al-wāliḍa</i>)”	<i>ʔəmmi</i> = PR ⁴⁰³
7. mother!	ṁāṁa	yōm əmm		p. 512 <i>yōm</i> , “an expression to call out the mother with the vocative meaning (<i>yā ʔumma</i>)”	<i>yōm</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṁāṁa</i> = PR <i>əmm</i> = ND
8. grandmother	səttā ğədda	səttāʔ nēna ğədda		p. 97 <i>bībi</i> , “Baghdadi, grandmother”. p. 480 <i>nēna</i> , “Persian, <i>bībi</i> in Baghdadi..grandmother”	<i>nēna</i> = PR <i>səttā/ səttāʔ</i> = ND <i>ğədda</i> = ND
9. grandfather	sədā ğəddu	ğədd sədō			<i>ğədd / ğəddu</i> = ND <i>sədā / sədō</i> = ND
10. old man	ğəğğāl əkbīg	ʕağūz			<i>ʕağūz</i> = ND <i>ğəğğāl əkbīg</i> = ND

⁴⁰³ This word is included in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī, appearing in several places in the form *əmmi*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56-59.

11. old woman	maġa kbīġi	ṣaġūza			<i>ṣaġūza</i> = AMB <i>maġa kbīġi</i> = ND
12. child(ren)	walad, pl. wlād	walad, pl. wlād ṣaġi, pl. ṣaġiyān: refers to annoying, bad-mannered children.	wälād, “son” p. 5/16	p. 334 <i>ṣaġi</i> , “a person of bad moral, lacking manners....also someone who has no mother” <i>ṣaġi aš-šūm</i> : “a child, who had no mother during his childhood and thus was brought to the bad, the harm. and he lacks good manners”	(MM) <i>walad</i> , “son” = PR ⁴⁰⁴ <i>ṣaġi</i> = PR, to “bad-mannered child” <i>walad</i> , “child” = ND
13. baby	raḍīṣa	ṭəfəl			<i>ṭəfəl</i> = ND <i>raḍīṣa</i> = ND
14. widow	ṛaġmali	ṛaġmali			ND
15. family	ṣāṛila	ṛahəl	āhl p. 15/8, ahl p. 17/8, “family, affiliates”		<i>ṛahəl</i> = PR ⁴⁰⁵ (MM) <i>ṣāṛila</i> = PR ⁴⁰⁶
16. tribe	faxəḍ	ṣašīra bayt ṣāṛilta			<i>ṣašīra</i> = ND <i>bayt</i> = ND <i>ṣāṛilta</i> = ND <i>faxəḍ</i> = ND

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Behnstedt and Woidich 2011, p. 35. This information was also confirmed by the Muslim informant.

⁴⁰⁵ This form is also attested in Jastrow’s texts on Muslim Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/7,8.

⁴⁰⁶ In WAD *ṣāṛila* and *ahl* are both indicated as Iraqi variants. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 50. MM also confirmed that *ṣāṛila* is used parallel to *ahl*.

17. black man	ṣabid	zingī ʔaswad ʔabu l-ṣabəd	aswad, “black (colour)”, p. 17/4		<i>ṣabid</i> = ND <i>zingī</i> = ND <i>ʔabu l-ṣabəd</i> = ND <i>ʔaswad</i> = DM, see 416
2. Persons					
18. guest	xəttār	ḍēf			<i>ḍēf</i> = ND <i>xəttār</i> = ND
19. host	məḍyāf	maṣazzəm			<i>məḍyāf</i> = ND <i>maṣazzəm</i> = ND
20. friend	ṣadīq	ṣadīq xawi	ṣadīq p. 15/4		<i>ṣadīq</i> = PR <i>xawi</i> = ND
21. landlord	ṣāḥəb əl-bēt ʔabu l-bēt	mālik əl-bēt əl-mālik	ṣāḥib, “owner” p. 11/ passim	p. 35 <i>ʔab</i> : “owner or vendor”	<i>ṣāḥib</i> and <i>ʔab</i> = PR ⁴⁰⁷ (MM) <i>ṣāḥəb əl-bēt</i> , <i>ʔabu l-bēt</i> , <i>mālik əl-bēt</i> = current Maṣlāwi forms ⁴⁰⁸
22. beggar	mgaddi	mgaddi		p. 469 <i>mgaddi</i> , pl. <i>magāda</i> , <i>mğaddi</i> in Baghdadi, from it derives the	<i>mgaddi</i> = PR

⁴⁰⁷ A further analysis on this case can be found in section 6.2.2.

⁴⁰⁸ In WAD the forms *ṣāḥəb əl-bēt* and *ʔabu l-bēt* are also indicated as typical Iraqi. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 69.

				verb <i>gadda.. šahhād mutasawwil</i> “a beggar begging” ⁴⁰⁹	
23. thief	ḥaḡāmi	ḥaḡāmi		p. 168 <i>ḥarām xūr</i> , “...not a reliable person..he does not refrain from spending the forbidden money in any way”	<i>ḥaḡāmi</i> = ND <i>ḥarām xūr</i> = DM
3. Professions					
24. butcher	qaṣṣāb	qaṣṣāb			ND
25. shoemaker	qəndarči	qəndarči iskāfi		p. 475-6 <i>mnaqqil</i> , “shoemaker (<i>raggāf</i>), Bagh. <i>iskāfi</i> ...he puts right old shoes and patches/mends them”	(MM) <i>mnaqqil</i> = DI (MM) <i>qəndarči</i> = ND (MM) <i>iskāfi</i> = ND
26. hairdresser	ḥallāq	ḥallāq			ND
27. doctor	dəktūr	ṭabīb			(MM) <i>dəktūr</i> = PR <i>ṭabīb</i> = ND
28. pharmacist	şaydali	şaydalāni			<i>şaydali</i> = ND <i>şaydalāni</i> = ND
29. tailor	xayyāt	xayyāt			ND
4. Body parts					

⁴⁰⁹ The word *mgaddi* is also indicated in the work of Al-Čalabi as a Persian loan into Maşlāwi. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 171 and 185.

30. head	ġās	ġās	rās p. 11/9 and p. 19 passim		ġās = PR
31. forehead	ġbīn	gəṣṣa		p. 433 <i>gaṣṣa</i> , “the front part of the (ġabīn) and the part (ġabha) of the face above the eyebrows. And it comes from the term forelocks (<i>qiṣāṣ al-šaṣr</i>)”	<i>gəṣṣa</i> = PR (MM) <i>žbīn</i> ⁴¹⁰ = PR
32. face	wiċċ	wiċċ		p. 160 <i>čahra</i> , “Persian...typical Kurdish and Baghdadi, face of the human being (in its shape and appearance)...it is said usually to make something/someone look foolish...(a face), with a stupid appearance and shape”	<i>wiċċ</i> = PR ⁴¹¹ (MM) <i>čahra</i> = “bad, ugly face”, PR ⁴¹²
33. eyebrow	ḥāġəb	ḥāġəb, pl. ḥawēġib			ND
34. ear	ʔəḍən	ʔəḍən, pl. ʔaḍān			ND
35. lobe of the ear	/	ḥalami			ND

⁴¹⁰ The Muslim informant pronounces /ğ/ as /ž/. According to Jastrow, when /ğ/ precedes a consonant is often pronounced as /ž/. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58, fn. 44.

⁴¹¹ Though absent in Socin and Al-Bakrī, this term is attested in Blanc for the qD, which means that it has been employed at least since 1964. Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 159.

⁴¹² This word is also attested in Al-Čalabi with the meaning “human shape, appearance”. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 65.

36. nose	ʔənəf	xəšəm		p. 192 <i>xəšim/ xəšm</i> , “Baghdadi, Kurdish, Nağdi, nose (al-ʔanf)... it is an alteration of the word <i>xušūm</i> ..the Bedouins call it <i>xəšša</i> ”	<i>xəšəm</i> = AMB ⁴¹³ <i>ʔənəf</i> = typical qD form ⁴¹⁴ Possibly a religious difference
37. cheek	xadd	xadd			ND
38. chin	ḥanak	ḥanak			ND
39. neck	ḥalaq	ḥalaq			ND
40.nape of the neck	ḡaqqabi	ḡaqqabi			ND
41. mouth	təmm	təmm		p. 93 <i>būz</i> , “Pers., Kurd., Egypt., originally Persian: the front part with mouth and nose of an animal..it is called <i>xatm</i> .. the word is borrowed to describe a mouth protruding forward..as well as who has been silent in a state of rage and resentment and has tightened his lips that is <i>ambawwaz</i> ..”	(MM) <i>būz</i> = “angry mouth”, PR <i>təmm</i> = ND
42. gullet	/	balʕōm			ND

⁴¹³ Cf. section 6.2.6.

⁴¹⁴ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 110.

43. lip	šafēyəf	šəffi, pl. šafēyəf		p. 76 <i>burṭm</i> , “Kurd., thick lips...”	(MM) = PR, <i>burṭm</i> pl. <i>barāṭim</i> , “thick lips” <i>šəffi</i> / <i>šafēyəf</i> = ND
44. moustache	šawēgəb	šawēgəb			ND
45. hand	īd	kaff	īd, passim	p. 415 <i>al-kaff</i> , “the palm of the hand (<i>yad</i>)...”	<i>kaff</i> = SS from “palm of the hand” to “hand” (MM) <i>īd</i> = SR from “arm, hand” to “arm”
46. arm	ḍrāṣ	Īd	īd, “hand”, passim		<i>ḍrāṣ</i> = ND
47. elbow	ḡəkəs	ḡəkəs			ND
48. finger	ḡəṣbaṣ	ḡəṣbaṣ			ND
49. breast	šadəg	šadəg			ND
50. shoulder	kətəf	kətəf			ND
51. back	ḡahəg	ḡahəg	bḡahrum, “on their back”, p. 19/10		<i>ḡahəg</i> = PR
52. belly	baṭən	baṭən		p. 37 both forms, <i>baṭn</i> and <i>kirš</i> , are included in the definition of <i>ḡabū baṭnayn</i> , “who eats a lot or who has a big belly and thus a <i>kirš</i> ”	<i>baṭən</i> = PR (MM) = <i>kirš</i> , as “big belly”, PR ⁴¹⁵

⁴¹⁵ According to Behnstedt & Woidich, *kirš* is a parallel form of *baṭn* and has mostly a derogatory meaning. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 158.

53. leg	gəğəl	gəğəl	riğlājji, “my (two) legs”, riğlēna, “our legs”, p. 15 passim		<i>gəğəl</i> = PR ⁴¹⁶
54. foot	qadam	qadam	periphrasis: <i>riğlēnu min- asfal</i> and <i>riğleltēnu min- tahit</i> , “the bottom of his legs” p. 17/13, 15.		<i>qadam</i> = primary form (MM) <i>gəğəl</i> = PR, used parallel to <i>qadam</i> ⁴¹⁷
55. knee	gəkbi	gəkbi			ND
56. sole	kaʕb	ʔasfal əl-gəğəl			<i>ʔasfal əl-gəğəl</i> = ND <i>kaʕb</i> = wrong translation
57. heel	kaʕb	kaʕb			ND
58. ass	ğəhəğ	ğəhəğ ṭiz		p. 141 <i>ğuhur: ṭiz</i> in Baghdadi, Kurd. Nağdi: the rump of a human be- ing..”	<i>ğəhəğ</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṭiz</i> = AMB ⁴¹⁸
59. heart	qaləb	qaləb		p. 393 <i>qalb/qalib</i> , Pers. word mean- ing “false, mistaken”	<i>qalb</i> = DM
60. skin	ğələd	ğələd			ND

⁴¹⁶ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁴¹⁷ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. section 6.2.6.

5. Human qualities and defects					
61. fat	smīn	smīn		p. 37 <i>ʔabū baṭnayn</i> which is used to indicate “who eats a lot or who has a big belly and thus a <i>kirs̄</i>”. p. 378 <i>qabā</i>, “Turk...fat, big (both adjectives also mean gross, bad) with a big and fat body....<i>kalāmū qabā</i>: he utters bad words without courtesy and respect...<i>ḥəssū qabā</i>, his voice is raucous, rude”	<i>smīn</i> = PR⁴¹⁹ <i>qabā</i> = SR from “big, fat, mean, ugly” to “unpleasant” in the expression <i>ṣōt qaba</i>, “high, disturbing voice” (MM) <i>ʔabū baṭnayn</i> = old, used by the elder people
62. thin	ḍaṣīf	ḍaṣīf			ND
63. blind	ʔaṣmi	ʔaṣmi			ND
64. one-eyed	ʔaṣwaḡ	karīm əl-ṣēn	ʔaṣwar p. 13 and 15 passim		(MM) <i>ʔaṣwaḡ</i> = PR (MM) <i>karīm əl-ṣēn</i> = euphemism for <i>ʔaṣwaḡ</i>
65. cross-eyed	ʔaḥwal	ʔaḥwal			ND
66. bald	ʔaqqaf	ʔaṣlaṣ			ND
67. deaf	ʔatḡaš	ʔatḡaš			ND

⁴¹⁹ This adjective is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī, though not referring to a human characteristic but to meat. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 64/ 7.

68. mute	ʔaxxas	ʔaxxas			ND
69. stutterer	yəxaǧǧəs	yətaʔtəʔ - taʔtaʔ bə-l-ḥaki			yəxaǧǧəs = ND yətaʔtəʔ - taʔtaʔ bə-l-ḥaki = ND
70. hunchbacked	ʔaḥdab	ʔaḥdab			ND
71. limping	yaʕǧǧəǧ	ʔaʕǧǧəǧ		p. 269 <i>saqaʔ</i> , “a man, who has a physical defect or disability, possibly he is limping or mute or another thing...or anything that can become a defect and not be restored..”	(MM) <i>saqaʔ</i> = PR of ʔaʕǧǧəǧ ʔaʕǧǧəǧ / yaʕǧǧəǧ = ND
72. lame	maʕlūl	muʕāq			maʕlūl = ND, MSA form muʕāq = ND, MSA form
73. left-handed	yasrāwi	ʔaʕsar			ʔaʕsar = ND (MM) <i>yasrāwi</i> = PR ⁴²⁰
74. dumb	ʔaṭwal	ǧabi ʔaṭwal ǧaḥəš	aḥmaq p. 15/6	p. 39 <i>ʔaṭwal</i> “suffering from a temporary or chronic state of stupor so that he appears foolish in his words, thinking and behaviour” connected to a disease affecting the ewes, which lose control of themselves”	(MM) <i>dabank</i> = PR ʔaṭwal = SS from “mad, confused” to “dumb” (MM) <i>aḥmaq</i> = unknown ǧabi = ND ǧaḥəš = ND

⁴²⁰ Cf. section 6.2.6.

				p. 213 <i>dabank</i> , “of little understanding, lacking faculty of understanding, slow in understanding..originally Persian”	
75. stingy	baxīl	baxīl ğəldayy			<i>ğəldayy</i> = ND <i>baxīl</i> = ND
6. Animals					
6.1 Domestic animals					
76. cattle	şağūl	rabəṭ		p. 213 <i>dbaš</i> , “domesticated animals like cows, sheeps, asses and their similars”	(MM) <i>dbaš</i> = unknown <i>şağūl</i> = ND <i>rabəṭ</i> = ND
77. herd	qaṭīṣ	qaṭīṣ			ND
78. sheep	xūfēn	xuğfēn ğanam		p. 190 <i>xarfān</i> , “an old man, senile and feeble-minded...or in Baghdadi, plural of <i>xarūf</i> ”	<i>xūfēn</i> / <i>xuğfēn</i> = ND <i>ğanam</i> =ND
79. ewe	xağūf	ğanami xağūf naṣḡi			<i>xağūf</i> = ND <i>ğanami</i> = ND <i>naṣḡi</i> = ND
80. ram	/	kabəš			ND
81. lamb (f.)	ṭəli	fīma		p. 325 <i>fīma</i>	<i>fīma</i> = PR

					CM has the same form for “lamb” f. and m.
82. lamb (m.)	ṭəli	ṭəli		p. 325 <i>ṭili</i> , “..ḥamal, the little <i>xarūf</i> that is not one year old...pl. <i>ṭliyān</i> , f. <i>faṭīma</i> ”.	<i>ṭəli</i> = PR
83. lambs	ṭaliyān	ṭaliyān		p. 325 <i>ṭliyān</i>	<i>ṭaliyān</i> = PR
84. goats	ṣanūz	maʕz		in <i>tēs</i> p. 137, the mention is “the male of the <i>māʕiz</i> ”.	(MM) <i>māʕiz</i> and <i>maʕz</i> = PR <i>ṣanūz</i> = ND
85. (one) goat	ṣanzi	maʕza maʕzi			<i>ṣanzi</i> = ND <i>maʕza</i> / <i>maʕzi</i> = ND
86. billy-goat	tēs	tēs ğədi		p. 137 <i>tēs</i> , “the male of the <i>māʕiz</i> ”.	<i>tēs</i> = PR <i>ğədi</i> = ND
87. kid (m.)	ṣanzi zğēği	ṣanzi zğēği			ND
88. kid (f.)	ṣanzi zğēği	ṣanzi zğēği			ND
89. cow	baqağa	baqağa			ND
90. bull	tōğ	tōğ	tōr p. 19 and 21 passim		<i>tōğ</i> = PR
91. calf (m.)	ṣəğəl/ṣağəl	ḥōli		p. 183 <i>ḥōli</i> , “the young of the cow (described as <i>ṣiğl al-baqar</i>), which is not older than one year...feminine <i>ḥōliyyi</i> ”	<i>ḥōli</i> = PR <i>ṣəğəl</i> = ND

92. calf (f.)	ḥəḡəl/ ḥaḡəl	ḥōli		p. 183 <i>ḥōliyyi</i>	<i>ḥōli</i> = PR, though no distinction of f./m. <i>ḥəḡəl</i> = ND
93. ass	ḡaḥəš	ḡaḥaš/ ḡaḥəš muṭi	ḡaḥeš, ḡaḥ ^ʕ š, p. 11 and 13 passim	p. 465 <i>muṭi</i> , “Baghdadi, “the little <i>ḥimār</i> ”, (<i>ḡaḥš</i>), the animal that one rides”	<i>ḡaḥaš</i> = SS from “little ass” to “ass” ⁴²¹ (MM) <i>muṭi</i> = AMB, possible SS from “little ass” to “ass”
94. she-ass	ḡaḥša	ḡaḥša maṭīyyi			<i>ḡaḥša</i> = ND <i>maṭīyyi</i> = ND
95. foal of ass	kərr	kərr	kurriš p. 13/11 form used to call the animal ⁴²²	p. 406 <i>kurr</i> , “the Baghdadi <i>zmāl</i> ”, the son of the ass in his first year of life (<i>ḡaḥaš</i>)...perhaps the expression was distorted from Farsi <i>kur-raḡ....</i> ”	<i>kərr</i> = PR
96. horses	ḥašan	ḥašan			ND
97. stallion	ḥṣān	ḥṣān			ND
98. stud	faḡas	faras			ND
99. camels	ḡmēl	ḡmēl			ND
100. camel (one)	ḡamal	ḡamal			ND
101. hen	ḡēḡi	diḡāḡa: big hen			<i>ḡēḡi</i> = ND

⁴²¹ The employ of *ḡaḥš*, originally referring to a little donkey, to indicate an adult ass is also attested in WAD in other Iraqi cities such as Širqāṭ. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 288.

⁴²² The use of this form to call the animals is also indicated in the *Wortatlas*. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 293.

		dġēġi: a small hen, less than 1kg.			<i>diġāġa</i> = AMB ⁴²³ <i>dġēġi</i> = ND
102. cock	dīk	dīk			ND
103. chick	farəx	šōši		p. 214 is <i>daġ</i> , “Aramaic..the chicks of a hen (<i>daġāġa</i> , not vocalized)”	<i>šōši</i> = ND <i>farəx</i> = ND (MM) <i>daġ</i> = unknown
104. ducks	baṭṭ	baṭṭ		p. 495 <i>wardak</i> , “ducks (<i>baṭṭ</i>)”	(MM) <i>wardak</i> = unknown <i>baṭṭ</i> = ND
105. geese	wazz	wazz			ND
106. hare	ʔaġnabi	ʔarnab barri			<i>ʔarnab barri</i> = ND, MSA form <i>ʔaġnabi</i> = ND
107. rabbit	ʔaġnabi	ʔarnab			<i>ʔarnab</i> = ND <i>ʔaġnabi</i> = ND
108. cat	bazzūni	bazzūni		p. 81 <i>bazzūni</i> , “Aramaic word.... in Baghdadi <i>bazzūna</i> ”	<i>bazzūni</i> = PR
109. tail	dēl	dēl	ʕaʕʕōš p. 7 passim dēl, “hem of the skirt” p. 13/10	p. 337 <i>ʕaʕʕōš</i> , “tail (<i>dānab</i>) of the animal, <i>dēl</i>”	(MM) <i>ʕaʕʕōš</i> = SS from “tail of animal” to “ponytail” <i>dēl</i> = current Maṣlāwi form ⁴²⁴

⁴²³ Cf. section 6.2.6.

⁴²⁴ Cf. section 6.2.5.

6.2 Other animals					
110. lion	sabəṣ	ʔasad	säbṣ ^e p. 5-11 passim	p. 37 <i>abu xmayyis</i> , “lion”	<i>sabəṣ</i> = SR from “lion, brave” to “brave” ⁴²⁵ (MM) <i>abu xmayyis</i> = used today in the surroundings of Mosul (MM) <i>ʔasad</i> = current Maṣlāwi form ⁴²⁶
111. fish	samak	samak			<i>samak</i> = PR ⁴²⁷
112. shrimps	/	rōbyān			<i>rōbyān</i> = PR ⁴²⁸
113. bees	naḥəl	naḥəl			ND
114. wasp	zanbōḡ, pl. za-nabīḡ	zanbōḡ, pl. zanībīḡ		p. 252 <i>zanbōḡ</i> , “Aramaic... <i>al-dabbūr</i> (a syn. for “wasps”)	<i>zanbōḡ</i> = PR
115. cockroaches	šoḡšoḡ	šaḡēšoḡ		p. 308 <i>šaḡšaḡ</i> , “..a stingy person...”	<i>šaḡšaḡ</i> = DM
116. flies	ḏəbbēn	ḏəbbēn			ND
117. sparrows	ʕaṣīfīḡ	ʕaṣīfīḡ			ND
118. stork	laqlaq	laqlaq		p. 443 <i>laqlaq</i> , many definitions... one of these “ <i>al-laqlaq</i> .. some pronounce it <i>laglag</i> ...foreigner bird	<i>laqlaq</i> = PR

⁴²⁵ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁴²⁶ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁴²⁷ The word *samak* is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68.

⁴²⁸ The word *rōbyān* occurs in the work of Al-Čalabi on the Persian loans. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 93.

				with a long neck...by the Iraqi people called <i>ʔabū ḥudayḡ</i> ”.	
119. bat	xəffāš	xəffāš		p. 192 <i>xəššāf ʔal-lēl</i> , “ <i>al-waṭwāt</i> ...the flying mouse and in Cl. Arabic <i>xuffāš</i> ”	(MM) <i>waṭwāt</i> = PR, bigger than <i>xəffāš</i> (MM) <i>xəššāf ʔal-lēl</i> = unknown <i>xəffāš</i> = ND
120. lizard	abu xsēm	ḥayyi slēmāniyyi		p. 36 <i>abu xšēm</i> , “Baghdadi: <i>abu brēš</i> ,...someone calls him also <i>ʔabu šxēm</i> .”	(MM) <i>ʔabu xsēm</i> = PR, “gecko” (MM) <i>ḥayyi slēmāniyyi</i> = ND
121. gecko	/	abū brēš			<i>abū brēš</i> = AMB ⁴²⁹ (MM) <i>ʔabu xsēm</i> = “gecko”, PR
122. chamaeleon	ḥarbā?	ḥerbā?			ND
123. snail	ḥalazōn	ḥalazōn			ND
124. turtle	səlhafāt	sulḥafāt			ND
125. frog	ʕaqqōqa	ʕaqqōqa			ND
126. mouse	fāḡa	fāḡa			ND
127. rat	ḡəḡdi	ḡəḡdi			ND
128. ape	šādi	qarəd		p. 278 <i>šādi</i> , “ <i>šādiyya</i> in Aramaic, small monkey (<i>qird</i>) with a long	(MM) <i>šādi</i> = PR <i>qarəd</i> = ND

⁴²⁹ Cf. Woodhead & Beene 1967, p. 31 s. v. “brēš”.

				tail... and in Persian this word means happiness and gayness..”	
129. fox	taʕlab	taʕlab	taʕleb p. 5-11 passim	p. 36 as <i>abū l-ḥiṣnān</i> , “fox”.... for Naǧdi they indicate the form <i>abū l-ḥuṣayn</i>	<i>taʕlab</i> = PR (MM) <i>abū l-ḥiṣnān</i> = PR
130. pig	xanzīġ	xanzīġ			ND
131. hedgehog	qənfəd	qənfəd		p. 219 <i>daʕlaġ</i> , “ <i>nīṣ</i> .. an animal similar to the hedgehog (<i>qunfuḍ</i>) and of the same family...his body is covered with a type of hard and needle-like thorns”.	<i>qənfəd</i> = ND MM referred to <i>daʕlaġ</i> as a bigger version of <i>qənfəd</i> (MM) <i>daʕlaġ</i> = “porcupine”, PR
7. Nature					
132. sun	šaməs	šaməs	šems p. 21/4		<i>šaməs</i> = PR
133. moon	qamaġ	qamaġ			ND
134. clouds	ġēm	ġēm			ND
135. rain	maṭaġ	maṭaġ			ND
136. rainbow	qūz əl-qazaḥ	qawz quzaḥ			ND
137. shadow	fayy	ḍəll xayāl			(MM) <i>fayy</i> = PR ⁴³⁰ <i>xayāl</i> = ND <i>ḍəll</i> = ND

⁴³⁰ Cf. section 6.2.6.

138. water	ṁāy	ṁāy	moi p. 15/ passim moji p. 21/ passim		(MM) <i>moji</i> , <i>moi</i> = diminutive forms ⁴³¹ , not PR
139. river	šatt	nahar			<i>šatt</i> = ND <i>nahar</i> = AMB
140. brook	xōsaḡ	sāqi			<i>xōsaḡ</i> = ND <i>sāqi</i> = ND
141. mountain	ḡabal	ḡabal	ḡebel p. 13/17 ḡebel, “hill” p. 17/12	p. 140 <i>ḡabal</i> “mountain”, pl. <i>ḡibāl</i>	<i>ḡabal</i> = PR
142. heat	ḥaḡḡ	ḥaḡḡ			ND
143. fire	nāḡ	nāḡ			ND
144. cold	baḡəd	baḡəd			ND
7.1 Cardinal points					
145. north	šimāl	šimāl			ND
146. south	ḡanūb	ḡanūb			ND
147. west	ḡarb	ḡarb			ND
148. east	šarq	šarq			ND
8. Plants					
149. tree	siḡaḡa	siḡaḡa	seḡara p. 9/8		<i>siḡaḡa</i> = PR
150. grass	ḥašiš	ḥašiš			ND

⁴³¹ Cf. section 6.2.3.

151. clover	/	/			ND
152. flowers	wağəd	wağəd			ND
153. potatoes	baṭāṭa	baṭāṭa			ND
154. tomatoes	ṭamāṭa	ṭamāṭa		p. 361 <i>franġi</i> , “in Syrian <i>bandūra</i> , the reknown tomato (<i>ṭamāṭa</i>)...”	(MM) <i>franġi</i> = unknown, possibly DI <i>ṭamāṭa</i> = PR ⁴³²
155. carrots	ğəzağ	ğəzağ			ND
156. eggplants	baḍəngān	baḍəngān	baḍingān p. 21/11		<i>baḍəngān</i> = PR
157. artichokes	/	/			
158. wheat	ḥənṭa	ḥənṭa qaməḥ	ḥönṭa p. 21 passim		<i>ḥənṭa</i> = PR <i>qaməḥ</i> = ND
159. rice	ğəzz	təmmən ğəzz			<i>ğəzz</i> = PR ⁴³³ <i>təmmən</i> = ND ⁴³⁴
160. pumpkin	qağaf	qağaf əl-ğabal			<i>qağaf</i> = ND <i>qağaf əl-ğabal</i> = ND
161. courgette	šiğar	qağaf			<i>šiğar</i> = ND, MM identifies it as a MB form ⁴³⁵ <i>qağaf</i> = PR ⁴³⁶

⁴³² This term appears in Jastrow’s article on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/ 22 and p. 70/ 26.

⁴³³ This term appears in Jastrow’s article on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/ passim.

⁴³⁴ Blanc describes *temman* as a typical Iraqi word, whose origin is unknown. There are though, in the old sources, no specific reference about its use in Maşlāwi. Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 148.

⁴³⁵ This can be also attested in WAD. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2011, p. 480.

⁴³⁶ The word “courgette” is attested in the form *qağaf* in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. According to Jastrow, the full form is *qağaf kōsa*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 66, fn. 77.

162. cabbage	lahāna	lahāna			ND
163. cauliflower	qarnabīt	qaḡnabīt			ND
164. peas	ḥabb ḡḡēt	bazālya			<i>ḥabb ḡḡēt</i> = old form, DI ⁴³⁷ <i>bazālya</i> = current Maṣlāwi form
165. chickpeas	ḥəmməṣ	ḥəmməṣ			ND
166. parsley	baqdūnəs	baqdūnəs			<i>baqdūnəs</i> = ND (MM) <i>kaḡafəs</i> = celery, possible SS ⁴³⁸
167. thyme	zaṣtaḡ	zaṣtaḡ			ND
168. coriander	kəzbaḡa	kəzbaḡa			ND
169. sesame	səmsəm	səmsəm			ND
170. figs	tīn	tīn			ND
171. oranges	purtaqāl	burtuqāl			ND
172. lemons	nūm ḥāməḍ	laymūn			(MM) <i>nūmi ḥāməḍ</i> = AMB ⁴³⁹ <i>laymūn</i> = ND <i>nūm ḥāməḍ</i> = possibly DI ⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁷ Cf. section 6.2.4.

⁴³⁸ The term *kaḡafəs* is attested in Jastrow's text on Muslim Maṣlāwi as "parsley". It is worth noticing that this word is translated in the majority of the Arabic dialects as "celery", which provides a hint on a possible semantic shift of this term. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 70 and Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 270.

⁴³⁹ Cf. section 6.2.6.

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. section 6.2.4.

173. pears	ḡarmūt	ḡarmūt		p. 335 <i>ḡarmūt</i> , “Turk. ..in Syrian <i>ḡinḡāṣ</i> , also <i>kummaṭra</i> ” (no vocalisation)	<i>ḡarmūt</i> = PR
174. plums	ḡanḡāṣ	mrakkab ḡanḡāṣ		<i>ḡinḡāṣāyi</i> p. 345 “the fruit of plum (<i>ḡiḡḡāṣ</i>)...in size and shape similar to a lump (<i>dummal</i>)”	<i>ḡanḡāṣ</i> = PR <i>mrakkab</i> = ND
175. peaches	xōx	xōx tīn ṣawki or xōx ṣawki			<i>xōx</i> = ND <i>tīn ṣawki</i> = ND <i>xōx ṣawki</i> = ND
176. apricots	məṣməṣ qēsi	məṣməṣ qēsi			<i>məṣməṣ</i> = ND <i>qēsi</i> = PR ⁴⁴¹
177. strawberries	ṣillēk	farawla			<i>farawla</i> = AMB (MM) <i>ṣillēk</i> = PR ⁴⁴²
178. watermelons	ṣəmzi	ṣəmzi		p. 298 <i>ṣimzi</i> , described as “ <i>raqqi</i> , typical Iraqi for “watermelon”.	<i>ṣəmzi</i> = PR
179. honeydew melons	baṭṭīx	baṭṭīx			ND
8.1 Palm-tree					

⁴⁴¹ The term is mentioned in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/17.

⁴⁴² See section 6.2.6.

180. stalk with leaves	saʃfi	saʃfi			ND
181. stalk without leaves	/	saʃf			ND
182. leaves	saʃf	ʔawrāq			ʔawrāq = ND saʃf = ND
183. raceme	tamḡāyi	/			ND
184. stem	ḡədaʃ	ḡədaʃ ən-naxli			ND
185. stone	ʕaḡu	ʕaḡwāyi		p. 334 ʕaḡwāyyi, “nāwa... the hard pit of a fruit or vegetable...”	ʕaḡwāyi = PR, with the suffix for unit noun -āyi ⁴⁴³ CM ʕaḡu possibly collective form
9. Constructions					
186. minaret	bnāḡa	mnāḡa	b ^c nāra p. 13/13		(MM) bnāḡa = PR mnāḡa = ND
187. bridge	ḡəsəḡ	ḡəsəḡ	ḡis ^c ḡ p. 13/3		ḡəsəḡ = PR
188. hospital	mustašfa xastaxāna	mustašfa		p. 191 xasta “Turk., Kurd, Pers., sick, ill...from this xastaxāna, the house of sick people, hospital (mustašfa)”	(MM) xastaxāna = DI ⁴⁴⁴

⁴⁴³ Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 73.

⁴⁴⁴ This term is also indicated in WAD as an obsolete form, attested in Baghdad and Mosul. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 19.

189. cemetery	maqbağa	maqbağa			ND
10. Domicile					
190. domicile	maskan maḥalli	maskan			<i>maskan</i> = ND <i>maḥalli</i> = ND
191. countryside	bə-ḍ-ḍēḥa	bə-ḍ-ḍēḥa	ḍēḥa, “village” p. 11/5 and p. 19/16		<i>ḍēḥa</i> = SE from “village” to “country-side” ⁴⁴⁵
192. village	qarya	qarya	ḍēḥa, “village” p. 11/5 and p. 19/16		(MM) <i>ḍēḥa</i> = PR <i>qarya</i> = ND, MSA form
193. quarter (small)	maḥalli	ḥayy			(MM) <i>maḥalli</i> = PR, as “small neighborhood” <i>ḥayy</i> = ND
194. street	šārəḥ	šārəḥ	sikke p. 11/6	p. 270-71 <i>sikki</i> , “Eg. <i>darb</i> , <i>ṭarīq</i> ...also railroad (<i>sikka al-qitār</i>)”.	(MM) <i>sikki</i> = SR from “street, way, railroad” to “railway”
195. way	ṭarēq dağəb	ṭarīq	dārb p. 5/11 and p. 11/ pas-sim		(MM) <i>dağəb</i> = PR <i>ṭarīq</i> / <i>ṭarēq</i> = ND
196. pist	/	sāḥat siyāqa			ND
197. lane	ḥawḡi	zuqāqa		p. 346 <i>ḥawḡi</i> , “ <i>darbūna</i> in Baghdad, <i>zuqāq</i> in Syrian...narrow way	(MM) <i>ḥawḡi</i> = PR <i>zuqāqa</i> = ND

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. section 6.2.5.

				between the houses and the quarters, one of the deviations...”	
198. tent	xēmi māl badū	xēmi			ND
11. House					
199. house	bēt	bēt	bēt p. 5-19 passim		<i>bēt</i> = PR
200. room	ōda	ğurfa ōda		p. 60 <i>ōda</i> , “room in Eg. and Sy., <i>gubba</i> in Bagh., <i>huğra</i> in Kurd. from Turkish”	<i>ōda</i> = PR <i>ğurfa</i> = ND
201. kitchen	maṭbax	maṭbax			ND
202. window	šibbāk	šibbāk	šibbāk p. 13/ 7,10		<i>šibbāk</i> = PR
203. baking oven	tannōğ (traditional) fəğən (modern)	tannōr/ tannōğ (traditional) fəğən (modern)			<i>tannōğ</i> = PR ⁴⁴⁶
204. refrigerator	ṭallāği	ṭallāği			ND
205. electric light	ḍaww	ḍaww glōbāyi		p. 433 <i>glōb</i> , “Bagh. Kurd., light bulb, the word is originally English ... it was associated with the light bulb because its shape resembles a sphere”	<i>ḍaww</i> = ND <i>glōbāyi</i> = SE from “light bulb” to “light bulb, electric light” ⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴⁶ This term appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 40.

⁴⁴⁷ According to the Muslim informant, *glōbāyi* indicates both the light bulb and the electric light.

206. lamp	lampa	tēblām lampa		p. 446 <i>lampa</i> : “Bagh. <i>lāmp</i> in Eng. petroleum lamp with a long piece of glass (now referring to the modern electric lamp)..”	<i>lampa</i> = SR from “petroleum lamp, electric lamp” to “old lamp” <i>tēblām</i> = ND
207. water tap	ḥanaḥi	ḥanaḥi		p. 321 <i>ṭurumba</i> , Turk. “hand or mechanic pump with water or without it...also indicating the water tap (<i>ḥanaḥiyya</i> and <i>ṣunbūr al-mā</i>)	(MM) = <i>ṭurumba</i> , old form, DI <i>ḥanaḥi</i> = ND
11.1 Utensils					
208. furniture	aṭāt	aṭāt			ND
209. bed	taxət manām	manām qaryōla		p. 385 <i>qaryōla</i> , “Turk. metal bed (<i>sarīr</i>) for one person or two” p. 154 <i>čarpāya</i> , “Pers. Kurd. from <i>čārpāya</i> , having four legs, and it is the bed (<i>sarīr</i>)”	<i>qaryōla</i> = PR (MM) <i>čarpāya</i> , “metal bed” = PR (MM) <i>taxt</i> = wooden bed, PR ⁴⁴⁸ <i>manām</i> = ND
210. table	mēz	mēz		p. 477 <i>mēz</i> “Syrian <i>ṭāwla</i> , Eg. <i>ṭarabēza</i> , this is the bench (<i>naḍad</i>) and they distorted the name and they made it in <i>miṇḍada</i> (a common mistake)...Non- Arabs are not able	<i>mēz</i> = PR

⁴⁴⁸ This term appears in Al-Čalabi with the meaning of “bed”. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 37.

				to pronounce the <i>ḏād</i> so they said <i>minzada</i> , then the word was modified a second time and it became <i>mēz...</i> ”	
211. traditional table	mēz	mēz		p. 477 <i>mēz</i>	<i>mēz</i> = PR
212. wardrobe	dūlāb	dūlāb qanšōḡ		p. 227 in another definition, <i>dūlāb</i> as “water-wheel”; p. 397 <i>qanšōr</i> , “Bagh. <i>kantōr</i> , wooden wardrobe, whose spaces are used to keep the clothes”	<i>qanšōḡ</i> = PR <i>dūlāb</i> = SS from “water-wheel” to “wardrobe” ⁴⁴⁹
213. carpet (not for praying)	maḥfōḡa	maḥfōḡa zūliyyi		p. 456 <i>maḥfōḡa</i> , “(<i>maḥfūra</i>) Aram., in Pers. <i>zūliyya</i> , in Syr./Eg. <i>siḡḡāda</i> ,...and it is the well-known carpet (<i>siḡḡād</i>) particularly famous in Iran...”	<i>maḥfōḡa</i> = PR, typical Maṣlāwī ⁴⁵⁰ <i>zūliyyi</i> = PR, typical Mesopotamian ⁴⁵¹
214. broom	maknasi	maknasi			ND

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. section 5.2.2 “Persian and Kurdish loanwords”.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 117.

⁴⁵¹ The term *zūliyya* is attested for Mosul in Al-Čalabi’s work on the Persian loanwords in Maṣlāwī. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 106. The word is characterized in WAD as typical Mesopotamian. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 116.

215. knife	səkkīn	səkkīni	sikkīn p. 19/18 and 21/12		(MM) <i>səkkīn</i> = old form, DI ⁴⁵²
216. fork	čingār	čaṭal		p. 155 <i>čaṭal</i> , many meanings, one of these is “fork (<i>šawka</i>)”.	(MM) <i>čaṭal</i> = PR (CM) <i>čingār</i> = “fork”, Kurd. borrowing (MM) <i>čingāl</i> = PR as “hook” ⁴⁵³ difference in each religious group
217. spoon	maḡlaqa	maḡlaqa			<i>maḡlaqa</i> = PR ⁴⁵⁴
218. plate	ṣaḥən	ṣaḥən			<i>ṣaḥən</i> = PR ⁴⁵⁵
219. tea-pot	qūri ma-č-čāy	qūri ma-č-čāy qūri əč-čāy		p. 400 <i>qūri</i> , “pot to make tea, with a round shape, usually made of baked clay or of metal”	<i>qūri</i> = PR
220. tea-glass	(i)stikān glaš čāy	ʔistikānət əč- čāy peyālat əč-čāy		p. 110 <i>piyyāla</i> , “Pers., in Bagh. <i>isti-kān</i> , small glass made of glass to drink tea”.	<i>peyāla</i> = PR (i) <i>stikān</i> = PR ⁴⁵⁶
221. bottle (of water)	boṭəl	boṭəl		<i>buṭul</i> p. 84, indicated as Eng. and Bagh.	<i>boṭəl</i> = PR
222. key	məftāḥ	məftāḥ			ND

⁴⁵² The word *čingāl* appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī and in the work of Al-Čalabi, in both cases with the meaning of “hook”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 66/10 and Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 64.

⁴⁵³ Cf. section 6.2.2.

⁴⁵⁴ This term appears in Jastrow’s article on Muslim Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/ 8.

⁴⁵⁵ This term appears in Jastrow’s article on Muslim Maṣlāw. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 61/8.

⁴⁵⁶ This word is attested in Al-Čalabi’s work of 1960 as *istikān* and in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī as *stikān*. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 6 and Jastrow 1979, p. 63, fn. 55.

223. matches	šəxxāṭ	ōd šəxxāṭa šəxxāṭa (box)		<i>šaxat</i> , “trace a sign on a paper or on a board or on the ground...also to rub a matchstick on the sulphuric part of the matches box (<i>šixxāṭa</i>) to set up ignition”. Here, the matches are indicated as <i>kabrīt</i> .	(MM) <i>šəxxāṭa</i> = PR as “box of matches” <i>šəxxāṭ</i> = ND <i>ōd šəxxāṭa</i> = ND
224. lighter	maqdaḥa	maqdaḥa			ND
225. cooking-pot	dəsət	dəsət tīfāl		p. 217 <i>disit</i> or <i>dst</i> , “Syr. <i>ṭanğara</i> , Kurd. Bagh. <i>ğidr</i> ... cooking-pot for food” (also other meaning)	<i>dəsət</i> = PR <i>tīfāl</i> = ND
226. water-jar	šaḡbi	dōlka		p. 87 <i>baḡniyyi</i> , “Baghd. <i>pastūka</i> , Eg. <i>ğarra</i> , a ceramic jar.... used for pressing and working pickles olives and cheese... also used to store butter (<i>samn</i>), honey ..” p. 228 <i>dōlka</i> , “Pers., Bagh. <i>šarrāḥiyya</i> , water-jar” p. 426 <i>kūz</i> , “Syrian, water mug”	<i>dōlka</i> = PR (MM) <i>baḡniyyi</i> = PR as “water-jar”, possibly SS ⁴⁵⁷ (MM) <i>kūz</i> = PR (MM) <i>šaḡbi</i> = PR

⁴⁵⁷ It is worth noticing that *baḡniyyi* is indicated in WAD as a typical Maṣlāwi expression for “water-jar”.

				p. 288 <i>šaḡbi</i> , “Bagh. <i>tunga</i> ...Eg. <i>qulla</i> , a small jar made of clay from which they drink water...”	
12. Clothes					
227. clothes	ḥwās	ḥwās		p. 40 <i>iḥwās</i> , “clothes”	<i>ḥwās</i> = PR
228. shoe (modern, men)	qəndara	qəndara ḥiḍā?		p. 419 <i>klāš</i> , “Pers. a light shoe with a sole made of thick leather (buffalo leather), ...and there is a kind, which is woven with silk threads, named <i>gēwa</i> , for which Iran is a famous producer”	<i>qəndara</i> = ND <i>ḥiḍā?</i> = ND (MM) <i>klāš</i> = PR as “shoe” (MM) <i>gēwa</i> = PR as “shoe”
229. shoe (modern, women)	qəndara ma-n-nəswān	ḥiḍā?			<i>ḥiḍā?</i> = ND <i>qəndara ma-n-nəswān</i> = ND
230. sock(s)	ḡōḡābi, pl. ḡowēḡəb	ḡōḡābi, pl. ḡawēḡəb		p. 150 <i>ḡōḡābi</i> , “Syr. <i>calsa</i> , one of <i>ḡawārīb</i> , in pl. <i>ḡawīḡəb</i> ...arabicized word”.	<i>ḡōḡābi</i> = PR
231. shirt	qamīš	qamīš			ND
13. Different objects					
232. thing	šē	Šē	šē, “a thing”, p. 19/12		<i>šē</i> = PR

233. stuff	ṣaḡaq	ṣaddi	ḡrāḏ, “things” p. 11/8	p. 189 <i>xurda</i> , “Pers. small things and pl. <i>xurdawāt</i> ; p. 394 <i>qilēqil</i> : “used, consumed things, which are currently useless. Isolated and stranded in a corner of the house or shop”	(MM) <i>ḡrāḏ</i> = PR ⁴⁵⁸ (MM) <i>qalīqīl</i> = PR, same root as <i>qilēqil</i> <i>ṣaḡaq</i> = “tool”, wrong translation <i>ṣaddi</i> = “tool”, wrong translation (MM) <i>xurda</i> = old word for “change”, see 291
234. watch	sāṣa	sāṣa			ND
235. eye-glasses	maṇḏara	maṇḏara naḏḏāra			<i>maṇḏara</i> = ND <i>naḏḏāra</i> = ND, MSA form
236. wallet	ḡəzdān	ḡəzdān		p. 142 <i>ḡizdān</i> , “... Pers. a small wallet for the cash and small bank-notes to keep in the purse”	<i>ḡəzdān</i> = PR
237. bag	kīs	čanṭa		p. 159 <i>čanṭa</i> , “Baghdadi... garment bag, suitcase”	<i>čanṭa</i> = PR <i>kīs</i> = ND
238. shopping bag	kīs māl məswāq	kīs əl-məswāq			ND
239. sack (big one, for food)	gūniyyi	kīs gūniyyi	ḥüm ^{el} , “sack for food” p. 17/3,4 ḥüm ^{el} , “burden” p. 11/5	p. 435 <i>gūnīyyi</i> , “Pers. in Eg. <i>šuwāl</i> ...burlap sack made with the threads of the jute plant”.	<i>gūniyyi</i> = PR (MM) <i>ḡerāb</i> = unknown, possibly DI (MM) <i>ḥüm^{el}</i> = “burden” <i>kīs</i> = ND

⁴⁵⁸ This term is also attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī as *ḡarāḏ*, “things”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/9.

			ğerāb, “leather sack for food” p. 19/2,3		
240. sling	čatəl	čatəl		p. 155 <i>čatəl</i> , “Bagh. <i>mişyāda</i> , a piece of wood or metal with two adjacent branches, resembling the number seven (Ar.). At the bottom it has a grip. In these two branches a rubber band is fixed... a small stone is placed in it and thrown to the birds to hunt them”	<i>čatəl</i> = PR
14. Food					
241. food	ʔakəl	ʔakəl	ak ^ɛ l p. 7/10		<i>ʔakəl</i> = PR
242. breakfast	futğa	fṭōğ tağyōqa		p. 324 <i>tağyōqa</i> , “Bagh. <i>riyūg</i> , breakfast meal and what is eaten in the morning on an empty stomach”	<i>tağyōqa</i> = PR <i>fṭōğ</i> = ND <i>futğa</i> = ND
243. bread	xəbəz	xəbəz			<i>xəbəz</i> = PR ⁴⁵⁹
244. loaf of bread	lōf şammūnāyi	lōf			<i>lōf</i> = ND <i>şammūnāyi</i> = ND
245. kuskus	kuskus	bərgəl	burğul p. 21/3	p. 76 <i>burğl</i> , “...Pers. <i>pārxūl</i> , Turk. <i>parqul</i> , the principal food of the	<i>kuskus</i> = wrong translation <i>bərgəl</i> = PR

⁴⁵⁹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/ 23.

		dšīši (smaller in comparison to bərgəl)		Mašlāwi family. It is made of a poach of crude wheat and afterwards it is peeled and crushed...”	<i>dšīši</i> = PR ⁴⁶⁰
246. pap	ʕaḡīn	mahrūs			<i>mahrūs</i> = ND, possibly MSA form <i>ʕaḡīn</i> = possibly wrong translation
247. flour	ṭaḥīn	ṭaḥīn	daqīq p. 19/ passim		(MM) <i>daqīq</i> = unknown <i>ṭaḥīn</i> = PR ⁴⁶¹
248. eggs	bēḍ	bēḍ			ND
249. meat	laḥəm	laḥəm	laḥəm p. 21/16	p. 499 <i>habḡāyi</i> , “Bagh. <i>širiḥ</i> , piece of red muscular meat, pl. <i>habḡ</i> ...”	<i>laḥəm</i> = PR (MM) <i>habəḡ</i> = “bruise”, attested as “lean meat”, possibly SS ⁴⁶²
250. salad	nzalaṭa	zalāṭa			<i>nzalaṭa</i> = ND <i>zalāṭa</i> = ND
251. spices	bahārāt	tawābəl			<i>tawābəl</i> = ND <i>bahārāt</i> = ND
252. chillies	fəlfəl ḥāḡḡ	fəlfəl ḥād fəlfəl aḥmaḡ			<i>fəlfəl ḥād</i> = ND <i>fəlfəl aḥmaḡ</i> = ND <i>fəlfəl ḥāḡḡ</i> = ND

⁴⁶⁰ Both forms *dšīši* and *bərgəl* are attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Mašlāwi. Here, it is indicated that *dšīši* is *bərgəl*, which has not been sieved. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 64/5,6.

⁴⁶¹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Mašlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 72/39.

⁴⁶² The word *habəḡ* is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Mašlāwi with the meaning of “lean meat”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 38.

253. pepper	fəlfəl	fəlfəl əswad		p. 370 <i>fulful</i> , “grain of the renowned hot spice”	<i>fəlfəl</i> = PR
254. oil	dəhən zēt	zēt			<i>zēt</i> = ND <i>dəhən</i> = ND ⁴⁶³
255. sugar	šəkar	šakar			<i>šakar</i> = PR ⁴⁶⁴
256. raisins	məšməš	zbīb	z ^c bīb p. 17/4		<i>məšməš</i> = wrong translation <i>zbīb</i> = PR
15. Drinks					
257. tea	čāy	čāy			<i>čāy</i> = PR ⁴⁶⁵
258. milk	ḥalīb	ḥalīb			ND
259. wine	xaməḡ	nbīḏ			<i>xaməḡ</i> = ND <i>nbīḏ</i> = ND
260. carbonated soft-drink	məšḡūba ḡāziyya	məšḡūba ḡāziyya			ND
16. Agriculture					
261. field	ʔaḡḏ zirāfiyya	mazraʕa		p. 369 <i>fiḷḥān</i> , “Aramaic, the fields (<i>al-arāḏi al-zirāfiyya</i>) that the	<i>mazraʕa</i> = ND, MSA form ⁴⁶⁶ <i>ʔaḡḏ zirāfiyya</i> = ND

⁴⁶³ The form *dəhən* is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi with the meaning “fat”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/ 25.

⁴⁶⁴ This word is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi and in Al-Čalabi’s work as *šakar*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 66, fn.83 and Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 123.

⁴⁶⁵ The word is attested as such in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi and in the work of Al-Čalabi. It is worth noticing that in the last case, it refers to tea leaves. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 56. and Jastrow 1979, p. 75 passim.

⁴⁶⁶ According to WAD, the borrowing of *mazraʕa* from Modern Standard Arabic is common among the urban speakers. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 298.

				owner works in (<i>falah</i>)...he plows them and prepares them to plant barley and wheat”.	(MM) <i>filhān</i> = PR
262. farm	mazraʿa	mazraʿa			ND
263. orchard	bəstān māl fawākəh	bəstān	bistān p.7 and 9 passim bustān p. 9/4 büstān p. 9/ 11		<i>bəstān</i> = PR
264. palm-garden	bəstān naxīl	bəstān naxīl mazraʿat naxīl			<i>bəstān naxīl</i> = ND <i>mazraʿat naxīl</i> = ND
16.1 Agricultural tools					
265. hoe	qazma manğal	/			<i>qazma</i> = ND <i>manğal</i> = ND
266. sickle	ğagğag maḥrāt	mingāl		p. 142 <i>ğarğar</i> , “different meanings...one of these is threshing machine pulled by the animals...”	<i>ğagğag</i> = DM <i>mingāl</i> = ND <i>maḥrāt</i> = ND
267. plough	/	fəddān			ND
268. plough-share	/	/			ND

269. plough-beam	/	/			ND
270. plough-sole	/	/			ND
271. plough-stert	/	/			ND
272. drover's whip	qamči	qamči		p. 395 <i>qamči</i> , “Turk. word, long whip with a long grip.... used to incite the animals to move”	<i>qamči</i> = PR
273. yoke	malğam	əlğām			ND
274. well	bīg	bīg			ND
275. cistern	/	tanki			ND
276. water-wheel	naʕōğ	ṭaḥōnat māy		p. 227 in another definition, <i>dūlāb</i> as “water-wheel”;	<i>dūlāb</i> = SS from “water-wheel” to “wardrobe” ⁴⁶⁷ <i>ṭaḥōnat māy</i> = ND <i>naʕōğ</i> = ND
277. threshing place	/	/		p. 142 <i>ğarğar</i> , “different meanings...one of these is threshing machine pulled by the animals...”	
278. hen-house	bēt māl ġēğ	qənn			<i>qənn</i> = ND <i>bēt māl ġēğ</i> = ND

⁴⁶⁷ For this semantic shift, cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2012, p. 105.

279. cowshed	ḥaḍīra māl baqağ	maʕlaf		p. 181 <i>ḥaḍīga</i> , “a children space to play between the houses”	<i>maʕlaf</i> = ND <i>ḥaḍīra māl baqağ</i> = ND
280. stable	ḥaḍīra māl xēl	sṭabəl		p. 34 from the Turk. <i>ahır</i> , <i>āxūr</i> “ <i>iṣṭabil</i> , indicated as Bagh. Turk. Pers., some pronounce it <i>yāxūr</i> ”	<i>ḥaḍīra māl xēl</i> = ND <i>sṭabəl</i> = ND (MM) <i>āxūr</i> = unknown
281. bee-hive	xaliyya māl naḥəl	xalīt naḥəl		p. 213 <i>dabbīye</i> , “Pers... referring to the artificial one”	<i>reflexes of xaliyya</i> = ND (MM) <i>dabbīyi</i> = DM, “big jar”
16.2 Agricultural activities					
282. to irrigate	saqa - yasqi	saqa - yəsqi			ND
283. to plough	ḥaraṭ - yaḥrəṭ	ḥaraṭ / ḥağat- yəḥrəṭ			ND
284. to harvest	ğalli	ḥaṣad - yəḥşəd ğana - yəğni			<i>ḥaṣad - yəḥşəd</i> = ND <i>ğana - yəğni</i> = ND <i>ğalli</i> = wrong translation
285. to thresh	darrāsa	/			<i>darrāsa</i> = wrong translation
286. to winnow	/	ğarbal - yuğarbəl			ND
17. Commerce					
287. shop	dəkkān	dəkkān maḥall	baqqāl, “merchant” p. 11 and p. 13 passim		(MM) <i>baqqāl</i> = SE from “merchant” to “merchant, shop”

		baqqāl			<i>dəkkān</i> = ND <i>maḥall</i> = ND
288. to bargain	yəbāzər – bāzar	bāzaġ - yəbēzaġ		p. 80 <i>bazār</i> , “transaction (<i>muḥāmala</i>) and agreement between the seller and the buyer on the price of the goods....”	<i>bāzaġ</i> - <i>yəbēzaġ</i> = PR ⁴⁶⁸
289. to buy	širā?	ʔištaġa – yištaġi	tištari, “you buy (sg. m.)” p. 11/8 ištara, “he bought” p. 13/9		<i>širā?</i> = wrong translation <i>ʔištaġa</i> - <i>yištaġi</i> = PR
290. money	flūs	flūs	fʕlūs p. 11/ 14		<i>flūs</i> = PR
291. change	xərda	nawēʕəm (a little of something) flūs nēʕmi		p. 189 <i>xurda</i> , “Pers. in trade, pieces of small value” (not clearly referred to money)	(MM) <i>xurda</i> = DI ⁴⁶⁹ <i>nawēʕəm</i> / <i>flūs nēʕmi</i> = ND
292. customer	maʕmīl	maʕmīl		p. 238 <i>zabūn</i> , “the one, who buys a thing from the market...”	(MM) <i>zabūn</i> = PR, scarcely used

⁴⁶⁸ This verb is attested in the form *bāzar* - *yibāzir* in the work of Al-Čalabi. Apart from the shift /r/ > /ġ/ and the Imāla in the imperfect, which are not detected, the lemma has been preserved. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 18.

⁴⁶⁹ This word is attested in In Al-Čalabi with the meaning of “change, small coins”. Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 71.

293. dowry	mahəg	mahar		p. 488 <i>naqdīyi</i> , “Turk. <i>naqd</i> , bridal money (<i>mahr az-zōḡa</i>)”	(MM) <i>naqdīyi</i> = PR ⁴⁷⁰ <i>mahar</i> = AMB
18. Vehicles					
294. car	sayyāra	sayyāra			ND
295. bus	pāṣ	pāṣ			ND
296. cart	ṣarabāna	ṣarabāna dūba			<i>ṣarabāna</i> = PR ⁴⁷¹ <i>dūba</i> = ND
297. lorry	lōri	lōri			ND
298. horn	hōren ṭawwāṭa	hōren			<i>hōren</i> = ND <i>ṭawwāṭa</i> = ND
299. steering wheel	stēren	stēren			ND
300. clutch	klač	klēč			ND
301. gear	gēr	gēr			ND
302. reverse	gēr māl raḡṣa	bāk			<i>gēr māl raḡṣa</i> = ND <i>bāk</i> = ND
303. brake	brēk	əṣṭāb			<i>əṣṭāb</i> = ND <i>brēk</i> = ND
304. exhaust	ṣādəm	gzōz			<i>gzōz</i> = ND

⁴⁷⁰ The form *naqdīyi* is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 as a typical Maṣlāwī form, differing from the Baghdadi *mahar*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/5.

⁴⁷¹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/9.

					<i>ṣādām</i> = ND
305. tyre	tāyər	tāyər			ND
306. puncture	pančar	pančar			ND
307. accident	ḥādət	ḥādət daṣmāyi			<i>daṣmāyi</i> = ND <i>ḥādət</i> = ND
308. gas station	banzīnxāna	panzīnxāna			<i>panzīnxāna/ banzīnxāna</i> = ND
309. steam-boat	markab buxāri	safīna buxāriyya			<i>safīna buxāriyya</i> = ND, MSA form <i>markab buxāri</i> = ND, MSA form
19.Communication					
310. letter	maktūb	risāla			<i>risāla</i> = ND <i>maktūb</i> = ND
311. stamp	ṭābəṣ	ṭābəṣ		p. 109 <i>pūl</i> , “Turk., post stamp”	(MM) <i>pūl</i> = DI
312. cellular	mōbāyil	mūbāyil			ND
20. Material					
313. glass	ḡām	ḡām		p. 139 <i>ḡām</i> , “Pers. Turk. word, panel of glass for the windows, the initial meaning was the drinking glass...”	(MM) <i>ballūl</i> = PR <i>ḡām</i> = PR ⁴⁷²

⁴⁷² In Al-Čalabi, the Persian borrowing *ḡām* both indicates a “glass” and the material (*ballūr*, *zuḡāḡ*). Cf. Al-Čalabi 1960, p. 48.

				p. 91 <i>ballūl</i> , “Turk. word, <i>ḡām</i> in Pers., Kurd., Bagh., <i>qizāz</i> in Syr. and in the Standard Arabic <i>zuḡāḡ...</i> ”	
314. wood	xašab	xašab			ND
315. timber	xašab binā?	ṣūf			<i>ṣūf</i> = ND <i>xašab binā?</i> = ND
316. paint	ṣabəḡ	ṣabəḡ		p. 94 <i>bōyā</i> , “paint or dyed oil, which covers the surface of the bodies /objects to make them beautiful. If it penetrates the pores of the body and change its colour then it is called <i>ṣabəḡ</i> ”	(MM) <i>bōyā</i> = SR to “shoe cream”, PR <i>ṣabəḡ</i> = PR
21. Verbs					
317. to go (to school)	ḡāḥ - yḡōḥ ṡa-l-madrasi	ḡāḥ - yḡōḥ ṡa-l-madrasi	rāḥ ṡala p. 9 and p. 11 pas-sim	p. 349 <i>ḡāḥ</i> , “indicated as future particle, syn. of <i>sawfa</i> , and also as act of going (<i>rawāḥ</i> and <i>dahāb</i>)	<i>ḡāḥ ṡala</i> = PR
318. to go for a walk	tamašša - yəṭmašša	məši - yəmši	yəmši, “he went” p. 11/11 ḡmši, “go! (you sg.) p. 5/14 and p. 7/19	<i>tamxaṭaḡ</i> p. 132 as “Syrian/Eg., arrogant and cocky gait (<i>andatura</i>)” <i>sardaḥ</i> p. 265 “slow gait in a state of daze”	(MM) <i>məši - yəmši</i> = PR as “to go, to walk” (MM) <i>sardaḥ</i> = “to walk alone” (MM) <i>tamxaṭaḡ</i> = “to walk slowly”

					<i>tamašša - yəتماšša</i> = ND
319. to go away	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	rāḥ ṣala p. 9 and p. 11 passim		<i>ġāḥ</i> only documented with the preposition <i>ṣala</i>
320. to set out/go away	twakkal - yətwakkal	ġāḥ - yġōḥ	misiku dārbu and misiku eddārb p. 11 and p. 13 passim		(MM) <i>misiku ed-darb</i> = PR (MM) <i>da-twakkal!</i> , “go away! (you sg.)” = PR as imperative form <i>ġāḥ - yġōḥ</i> = ND
321. to enter	fāt - yfūt	fāt - yfūt	yfūt, “to pass by”, p. 15 /13 ġāz, “to go inside, to enter” passim		<i>fāt - yfūt</i> = SS from “to pass by, to cross” to “to enter” ⁴⁷³ (MM) <i>ġāz</i> = “to be possible”, MSA form <i>ġāz</i> = “to enter”, possibly DI
322. to go out (from a place)	ṭalaṣ - yəṭlaṣ	ṭalaṣ - yəṭlaṣ	ṭalaṣ / yitlaṣ p. 7 and 9 passim		<i>ṭalaṣ - yəṭlaṣ</i> = PR
323. to go down (from a hill)	nəzəl - yənzal	nəzəl - yənzal			
324. to go down-town	nəzəl - yənzal ṣa-l-balad	ġāḥ - yġōḥ ṣa-l-madīna	nizil ṣalmōṣəl, “he went to Mosul” p. 11/17		(MM) <i>nizil ṣa-l-balad</i> = not used, possibly DI <i>ġāḥ - yġōḥ ṣa-l-madīna</i> = ND

⁴⁷³ In WAD, the semantic shift is also indicated from “to cross the door sill” > “to enter”. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 73.

					(MM) <i>nizil ʕa-l-madīna</i> = rare
325. to go down to the street (from the house)	məši - yəmši bə-š-šārəʕ	nəzəl - yənzal nihāyət ə-š-šārəʕ nəzəl - yənzal ʔasfal ə-š-šārəʕ			<i>məši - yəmši bə-š-šārəʕ</i> = possibly wrong translation <i>nəzəl - yənzal nihāyət/ʔasfal ə-š-šārəʕ</i> = possibly wrong translation
326. to go upstairs	ʔalaʕ - yəʔlaʕ (ad-dağayyəğ)	ʔalaʕ - yəʔlaʕ	ʔalaʕ ʕalb ^e nāra, “he went up to the minaret”, p. 13/13		<i>ʔalaʕ - yəʔlaʕ</i> = PR, “to go up”
327. to board (car)	rəkəb - yərkab bə-s-sayyāra	şaʕad - yəşʕad as-sayyāra			<i>şaʕad - yəşʕad as-sayyāra</i> = ND <i>rəkəb - yərkab bə-ssayyāra</i> = ND
328. to mount (horse)	rəkəb - yərkab ʕa-l-ħəṣān	rakaba - yərkab ʕa-l-ħəṣān rakaba - yərkab lə-ħṣān			<i>rəkəb - yərkab ʕa-l-ħəṣān</i> = ND <i>rakaba</i> = MSA form <i>yərkab lə-ħṣān</i> = ND
329. to descend from a car	nəzəl - yənzal mən as-sayyāra	nəzəl - yanzəl mən as-sayyāra			ND
330. dismount from a horse	nəzəl - yənzal mən lə-ħṣān	nəzəl - yanzəl mən lə-ħṣān	nizil essultān min ʕala dāb-betū, “the sultan dismounted from his mount”, p. 15/15-16		<i>nəzəl - yənzal mən</i> = PR

331. to return	raḡaḥ - yərḡaḥ	raḡaḥ - yərḡaḥ (to come back from a place as in <i>huwwa raḡaḥ min əl-kurs</i> , “he came back from the class” <i>dāwara</i> / <i>yədāwər</i> (to return to a same place)	reḡaḥa, “he replied” p. 5/ 5 mā-ḡa ḡaḥšu, “his ass did not return” p. 11/13 ḡa ḥala bēt el-qāḍi, “he returned to the judge’s house” p. 13/10		<i>raḡaḥ</i> = DM, according to MM also preserved as “to answer”, PR (MM) <i>ḡa ḥala</i> = “to come”, DM
332. to go home	ḡāḥ - yḡōḥ ḥa-l-bēt	ḡāḥ - yḡōḥ ḥa-l-bēt	rāḥ ḥala p. 9 and p. 11 passim		<i>ḡāḥ - yḡōḥ ḥala</i> is documented but not specifically to say “to go home”
333. to come	ḡā - yəḡi	ḡā - yəḡi	yīḡi/ḡa passim		<i>ḡā - yəḡi</i> = PR
334. come! (2 nd pers. sg. m.)	taḥāl	taḥāl	taḥāl p.7/7		<i>taḥāl</i> = PR
335. to arrive	wəṣəl - yəṣal	wəṣəl - yəṣal	wuṣəl p. 7/1 wuṣil p. 13/5		<i>wəṣəl - yəṣal</i> = PR
336. to pass by	marr - ymurr	marr - ymərr mən yammu			ND

337. to jump (over a ditch)	čatt - yčətt	čatt - yəčətt	natt, “to jump in, to burst” p. 15/12 and p. 17/11 yirq ^ə dūn, “they jump” p. 17/5		(MM) <i>natt</i> = Syrian form (MM) <i>raqaḏ</i> = unknown <i>čatt</i> - <i>yəčətt</i> = ND
338. to fall	waqaḥ - yəqaḥ	waqaḥ - yəqaḥ	waqaḥu, “they fell down” p. 17/17	p. 269 <i>saqaṭ</i> , “different meanings, one of these is past tense of the verb <i>ṣāqīt</i> , meaning <i>rābis</i> , particularly related to those who fail in an exam or competition”, p. 318 <i>ṭabb</i> , “to hit, also to fall (<i>waqaḥa</i> , <i>ṣaqaṭa</i>)”	<i>waqaḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>saqaṭ</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṭabb</i> = PR
339. to dance	ğəqəṣ - yərqəṣ	raqaṣ - yərqəṣ dabak - yədbək			<i>raqaṣ</i> - <i>yərqəṣ</i> = ND <i>dabak</i> - <i>yədbək</i> = ND
340. to swim	səbəḥ - yəsbaḥ	sabaḥ - yəsbaḥ			<i>sabaḥ</i> - <i>yəsbaḥ</i> = ND
341. to get up (from the bed)	qaḥad - yəqḥəd əṣ-ṣəbəḥ	qaḥad - yəqḥəd	qaḥad yākel, “he is eating” p. 11/14		<i>qaḥad</i> = syntactic particle, DM
342. to sit down	qaḥad - yəqḥəd	qaḥad - yəqḥəd	nöqḥod, “let’s sit” p. 15/12		<i>qaḥad</i> - <i>yəqḥəd</i> = PR
343. to stop	məsək - yəmsək	wəqəf - yəqaf	waqfu, “stop (you pl.)” p. 17/16		<i>wəqəf</i> - <i>yəqaf</i> = PR <i>məsək</i> - <i>yəmsək</i> = DM, see 320 and 366
344. to stay	baqi - yəbqa ḏall - yəḏəll	baqa - yəbqa ḏall - yəḏəll	ḥaṣa, as “to stay, to remain” passim	p. 88-89 <i>baqa</i> , “Syr. Egy. a distinctive word of the Maṣlāwi dialect”,	(MM) <i>ḥaṣa</i> = SR from “to stay, to be stuck” to “to be stuck”

			“to be stuck” p. 17 passim ḍall-yḍull and baqa- yibqa, as “to stay, to remain” passim	a particle used to intensify the verb and also it is said <i>baqa</i> when the speaker wants the addressee to stay”	<i>ḍall</i> - <i>yəḍall</i> = PR <i>baqa</i> - <i>yəbqa</i> = PR
345. to sleep	nām - ynām	nām - ynām			ND
346. to have breakfast	fəṭəḡ - yəfṭaḡ	tḡayyaq - yəṭḡayyaq		p. 366 <i>fəṭaḡ</i> , “the crack/splitting of an object in pieces without the sep- aration of this object in pieces like the cracking of a wall, of a glass or of a watermelon...	<i>tḡayyaq</i> - <i>yəṭḡayyaq</i> = ND <i>fəṭəḡ</i> - <i>yəfṭaḡ</i> = DM
347. to drink wa- ter	šəḡəb - yəšḡab māy	šəḡəb - yəšḡab māy			ND
348. to cook	ṭabax - yəṭbəx	ṭabax - yəṭbəx	yəṭbuxūn, “they cook” p. 21/15		<i>ṭabax</i> - <i>yəṭbəx</i> = PR
349. to bake bread	xabaz - yəxbəz	xabaz - yəxbəz (əl-xəbəz)			ND
350. to kindle a fire	ḡalaq - yəḡləq an- nāḡ	ḡalaq - yəḡləq an-nāḡ			ND
351. to hunt	šād - yšīd	šād - yšīd			ND
352. to pour (tea into a glass)	šabb - yəšəbb (māy)	šabb - yəšəbb (čāy)			ND

353. to spill (water on the ground)	ṭašš - yəṭəšš māy	ṭašš - yəṭəšš māy		p. 323 <i>ṭašš</i> , “ <i>čabb</i> in Baghdadi, to spill (<i>sakaba</i>) a liquid”	<i>ṭašš - yəṭəšš</i> = PR
354. to smoke	daxxan - /	daxxan – ydaxxan			ND
355. to see	ġəšəf - yəġšaḥ ṭallaḥ - yəṭallaḥ	ġəšəf - yəġšaḥ	šāf - yšūf, passim ġišōf, “to find, to see” p. 13/7,8	p. 49 <i>igšaḥ</i> “imperative, in Baghd. <i>bāwaf</i> , <i>šūf</i> in Naġdi, <i>ṭallaḥ</i> in Kurd... from the verb <i>gašaḥa</i> , namely “to see” (<i>raʔā</i>)	<i>ġəšəf - yəġšaḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>šāf - yšūf</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṭallaḥ - yəṭallaḥ</i> = Kurd. form, used in CM and in the surroundings of Mosul
356. look!	daḥḥaq ṭalləḥ, ṭallaḥ	daḥḥaq	šūf, p. 7/ 3,15	p. 49 <i>igšaḥ</i> “imperativo, in Baghd. <i>bāwaf</i> , <i>šūf</i> in Naġdi and Kurdish, <i>ṭallaḥ</i> in Syrian... from the verb <i>ġšəf</i> , namely “to see” (<i>raʔā</i>) p. 49 <i>iṭṭammaš</i> , “it is the past and imperative form...to see (<i>raʔā</i> , <i>ta-farraġ</i>) from the Pers. <i>tamāša</i> “the seeing” p. 215 <i>daḥḥaq</i> , “to see, to perceive (<i>naḍara</i>), originally <i>ḥaddaq</i> ”	<i>daḥḥaq</i> = PR (MM) <i>igšaḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>iṭṭammaš</i> = PR (MM) <i>šūf</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṭallaḥ</i> = Kurd. form, used in CM and in the surroundings of Mosul
357. to show	ġawwa - yġawwi	ġaššaḥ - yəġaššaḥ	yerwil, “he shows” p. 13/11		<i>ġaššaḥ - yəġaššaḥ</i> = ND <i>ġawwa - yġawwi</i> = ND

					(MM) <i>yerwil</i> = unknown
358. to wait	standağ - yəstandəğ	standağ - yəstandəğ	naṭar, “he waited” p. 11/13		<i>standağ</i> - <i>yəstandəğ</i> = ND (MM) <i>naṭar</i> = old, used by elder women
359. to speak	ḥaka -yəḥki	ḥaka -yəḥki			<i>ḥaka</i> - <i>yəḥki</i> = PR ⁴⁷⁴
360. to call	ṣayyah - yṣayyəḥ	ṣayyah - yṣayyəḥ	y ^c sayyih, “he calls” p. 17/6 ṣāḥ, “to call” p. 19/6,7		<i>ṣayyah</i> - <i>yṣayyəḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṣāḥ</i> = PR
361. to look for	dawwağ - ydaw- wəğ	dawwağ - ydawwəğ	dauwir ḥala, dauwer ḥala, p. 5 and p. 13 passim	p. 228 <i>dawwağ</i> , “to search into and research...also said <i>xawwağ</i> and others say <i>dawwuğ</i> and <i>xawwuğ</i> ”.	<i>dawwağ</i> - <i>ydawwəğ</i> = PR
362. to work (in a factory)	štağal - yəštağil	štağal - yəštəğəl			<i>štağal</i> - <i>yəštəğəl</i> = PR ⁴⁷⁵
363. to work (in a field)	falaḥ - yəflaḥ	štağal - yəštəğəl		p. 369 <i>falaḥ</i> , “to work in a field” in the definition of <i>filḥān</i> , “fields”	(MM) <i>falaḥ</i> = PR
364. to make/ to do	ṣanaḥ - yəṣnaḥ	ḥamal - yaḥməl	sawwa passim yaḥməl, “he does”, p. 11/16 aṣ naḥmāl?, “what do we do?”, p. 19/17		(MM) <i>sawwa</i> = typical MB, possibly DI <i>ḥamal</i> - <i>yaḥməl</i> = PR

⁴⁷⁴ This verb is attested both in perfect and in imperfect in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 1,5.

⁴⁷⁵ This verb is attested in the perfect form in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 2,5.

					<i>šanaŋ</i> - <i>yəšanaŋ</i> = ND, possibly wrong translation ⁴⁷⁶
365. to bite (dog)	ŋaɗɗ - yəŋaɗɗ	ŋaɗɗ - yəŋaɗɗ			ND
366. to catch (with the hand)	məsək - yəmsak (bi-īdu)	məsək - yəmsak	yimsäk, misik rās iğgebel, “to catch the mountain’s tip” p. 17/12,14	p. 506 <i>hamaš</i> , “...catch the thing in a fast way”	<i>məsək</i> - <i>yəmsak</i> = PR (MM) <i>hamaš</i> = unknown
367. to catch (a thief)	məsək - yəmsak (əl-ḥagāmi)	məsək - yəmsak	yimsäk, misik rās iğgebel, “to catch the mountain’s tip” p. 17/12,14		<i>məsək</i> - <i>yəmsak</i> = PR
368. to throw (sth. on the floor)	zatt - yəzətt (ŋa-l-ḡagəd)	zatt - yəzətt		p. 319 <i>ṭarr</i> “to throw something far away” p. 238 <i>zatt</i> “throw something from your hand...”	<i>zatt</i> - <i>yəzətt</i> = PR (MM) <i>ṭarr</i> = PR
369. to shoot (with a gun)	ḍaḡab - yəḍḡəb (bə-l-musaddas)	ḍaḡab - yəḍḡəb			ND
370. to get out (sth. of a place)	ṭallaŋ - yəṭalləŋ	ṭallaŋ - yəṭalləŋ baḡḡa	ṭēleŋ, “he took out”, p. 7 and p. 19 passim		morphological difference <i>ṭallaŋ</i> - <i>yəṭalləŋ</i> = ND
371. to close (a door, a shop)	sadd - yəsədd	qafal - yəqfəl		p. 263 <i>sadd</i> , “among several meanings (verb) <i>qafala wa aḡlaqa</i> (to	(MM) <i>sakk</i> = unknown (MM) <i>sadd</i> = PR <i>qafal</i> = ND

⁴⁷⁶ This form is not attested in any dialects in the *Wortatlas*. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 243.

				close)..and it is said close (<i>sadd</i>) the door” p. 270 <i>sakk</i> , “close (<i>aḡlaqa wa sadd</i>) a thing accurately”	
372. to open	fataḥ - yəftaḥ	fataḥ - yəftaḥ	fataḥ, “he opened”, p. 13/10	p. 368 <i>fakk</i> , “Baghdadi for <i>fataḥ</i> , as in <i>fakk il-bab</i> , close the door...”	<i>fataḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>fakk</i> = PR, AMB
373. to pull (an animal)	ḡaḡḡ - yəḡḡḡḡ (əl-ḥēwān)	ḡaḡḡ - yəḡḡḡḡ			<i>ḡaḡḡ - yəḡḡḡḡ</i> = ND
374. can / to be able to	ṭāq - yṭīq	ṭāq - yṭīq	mā-ṭāq ḡa, “he could not come”, p. 11/8 mā-ṭāqet ṭēlaṣāt idēʔa, “she could not take her hands out”, p. 19/5,6		<i>ṭāq - yṭīq</i> = PR
I cannot come	mā-aṭīq ʔaḡi	mā-aṭīq ʔaḡi			
375. to be able to	/ - yəṣḡəf	ṭāq - yṭīq		p. 316 <i>ṭāq</i> , “in Turk. <i>naḡḡam</i> , to be able to, the ability, faculty... <i>yṭīq</i> in the imperfect”	(MM) <i>ṭāq - yṭīq</i> = PR (MM) <i>yəṣḡəf</i> = PR
He cannot swim	mā - yəṣḡəf yəsbaḥ	mā - yṭīq yəsbaḥ			
376. to understand	ftaham - yafti-him	faham - yəfham	iftaham, “to think, to understand”, p. 11 passim		<i>ftaham - yəftəhəm</i> = PR <i>faham - yəfham</i> = ND

		ftaham yəftəhəm	-		
377. must	lāzəm	lāzəm	šē-llāzim, “the necessary stuff”, p. 13/2		<i>lāzim</i> = DM in Socin, PR ⁴⁷⁷
You must come	lāzəm tiġi	lāzəm tiġi			
378. to want	/ - yġīd	ġād – yġīd			
What do you want?	aš ʕa-tġīd?	aš ʕa-tġīd?	aš terīd?, p. 13/18 äiš bīk?, p. 15/2		<i>yġīd</i> = PR
379. to let	tarak - yətrək	tarak - yətrək	xalla, as “to let”, p. 5 and passim		(MM) <i>xalla</i> = PR <i>tarak - yətrək</i> = ND, possibly influence of MSA ⁴⁷⁸
380. to leave	/	xalla - yxalli	xallētni ʕtʕaddeb, “you left me suffering”, p. 11/19	p. 270 <i>sayyab</i> , “leave a thing and let it go down from his hand”	<i>xalla - yxalli</i> = PR (MM) <i>sayyab</i> = PR, “to leave”
Leave the door open !	xalli l-bāb maftūḥ!	xalli l-bāb maftūḥ!			
381. to ask (a question)	saʔal - yəsʔal	saʔal - yəsʔal	saʔal, p. 5 passim nešed, p. 5/1	p. 484 <i>našdi</i> “question, from it the verb <i>našad</i> that means to ask and implore (<i>saʔala and nāšada</i>)	<i>saʔal - yəsʔal</i> = PR (MM) <i>našad/nešed</i> = MSA form, possibly DI

⁴⁷⁷ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 58/ 10.

⁴⁷⁸ Though the use of *tarak* is not excluded, this seems a Standard Arabic form. In WAD the majority of the Iraqi dialects, such as those of Baghdad, Basra, display *xalla* with the meaning of “to let”. It is also worth noticing that the verb was asked not in the context of a sentence so when I had the chance to meet my Muslim informant again, he confirmed that *xalla* is the most common form to translate “to let” instead of *tarak*. Cf. Behnstedt & Woidich 2014, p. 512.

			nāšād, p. 7 and p. 13 pas-sim		
382. to snore	šaxaġ - yəšxəġ	šaxxaġ - yəšaxxəġ			šaxxaġ - yəšaxxəġ = ND šaxaġ - yəšxəġ = ND
383. to burp	əttariyaḥ - yəttar- yaḥ	taryaḥ- yəttar- yaḥ		p. 120 <i>taryuḥa</i> , “...eructation and exit of stomach gas from the mouth accompanied by a long vibrating sound”	same root, ND as a verb
384. to cough	saḥal - yəṣḥəl	qaḥḥ - yəqəḥḥ		p. 380 <i>qaḥḥ</i> , “Syrian, cough in a whooping intermittent way and with a bad breath, some say <i>ḥaḥḥ</i> ”	(MM) <i>qaḥḥ</i> = PR (MM) <i>saḥal</i> - <i>yəṣḥəl</i> = “to sneeze”
385. to spit	tafal - yətfəl	taffal - yətaffəl		p. 125 <i>tafal</i> , “Baghdadi... <i>bazaqa</i> in Syrian, namely to spit (<i>baṣaqa</i>)”	(MM) <i>tafal</i> = unknown
386. to cry	bəka - yəbki	baka - yəbki			ND
387. to quarrel (to be high at words)	tqātəl - yəṭqātəl	tšāyəḥ - yəṭšāyəḥ			<i>tqātəl</i> - <i>yəṭqātəl</i> = PR as “to quarrel” <i>tšāyəḥ</i> - <i>yəṭšāyəḥ</i> = ND
388. to quarrel (have a fight)	əddāḡab - yəddāḡab	tqātəl - yəṭqātəl	yitqāt ^l lūn, “they fight”, p. 5/17		<i>tqātəl</i> - <i>yəṭqātəl</i> = PR as “to quarrel” <i>əddāḡab</i> - <i>yəddāḡab</i> = ND
389. to insult	xēlaq - yxēlaq	xēlaq - yxēlaq			ND

390. to be left (one person)	fəḍəl - yəfḍəl	tarak - yətrək xalla – yxalli			<i>fəḍəl - yəfḍəl</i> = ND <i>tarak - yətrək</i> = ND
391. to be born	ğā - yəği ʕa-d- dinyi	ğā - yəği ʕa-d- dinyi			ND
392. to become	ṣāğ - yəṣīğ	ṣāğ - yṣīğ	ṣār, passim	p. 306 <i>ṣāğ</i> with other meanings but not as a verb	<i>ṣāğ - yṣīğ</i> = PR
393. to live in a place	sakan - yəskən	ʕāš - yaʕīš			<i>sakan - yəskən</i> = ND <i>ʕāš - yaʕīš</i> = ND
394. to hide	xtaba - yəxtabi	xabba - yxabbi			<i>xtaba - yəxtabi</i> = ND <i>xabba - yxabbi</i> = ND
395. to give	ʕaṭa - yaʕṭi	ʕaṭa - yaʕṭi	ṭaʕa, “to give”, p. 15/7, p. 17/8		<i>ʕaṭa</i> = ND (MM) <i>ṭaʕa</i> = PR ⁴⁷⁹
396. to bring	ğāb - yğīb	ğāb - yğīb	ğāb - yğīb, p. 9-7 passim waddānu lʕbētu, “he took/brought him to his house”, p. 11/12 yewaddauʔa, “it is brought” p. 21/5	p. 138 <i>ğāb</i> , “Baghdadi, Kurdish, Nağdi, <i>adda</i> in Egyptian...to bring (<i>ğalaba</i>), and its origin <i>ğāʔa bihi</i> ...” p. 492 <i>wadda</i> : “to take the thing and take it to another person or place...”	<i>ğāb - yğīb</i> = PR (MM) <i>wadda</i> = PR
397. bring me!	ğīb lī	ğīb lī			ND

⁴⁷⁹ The presence of a metathetic form in the imperfect is also detected in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60, fn. 52.

398. to take away (with)	axaḍ - yāxəḍ	axaḍ - yāxəḍ ğāb - yğīb	axaḍ, “to take”, passim ğāb - yğīb, “to bring”, p. 9-7 passim		<i>ḡaxaḍ</i> = PR as “to take” <i>ğāb – yğīb</i> = DM
399. to get (sth.)	ḡaxaḍ - yāxəḍ	ḡaṣṣala - yəḡaṣṣəl			<i>ḡaṣṣala</i> = MSA form <i>yəḡaṣṣəl</i> = ND <i>ḡaxaḍ - yāxəḍ</i> = ND
400. to pay	dafaṣ - yədfaṣ	dafaṣ - yədfaṣ			ND
401. to count	ṣadd - yəṣədd	ṣadd - yəṣədd			ND
402. to put (sth. on the table)	ḡatt - yḡətt	ḡatt - yḡətt	ḡattu, “he put it”, p. 13/10 yḡəttūnu, “they put it”, p. 21/14	p. 171 <i>ḡatt</i> , “Syrian, Egyptian....to drop something from one’s hand and place it calmly...”	<i>ḡatt - yḡətt</i> = PR
403. to send (a letter)	baṣaṭ - yibṣaṭ (əl-maktūb)	baṣaṭ - yibṣaṭ	baṣaṭ, p. 11 and p. 13 passim		<i>baṣaṭ - yibṣaṭ</i> = PR
404. to steal (a person’s money)	bāq - ybūq	bāq - ybūq		p. 66 <i>bāq</i> , “in Baghdadi <i>bāg</i> , to steal... (<i>saraq</i>)..”	<i>bāq - ybūq</i> = PR
405. full tank	ṣabba - yəṣabbi əl-banzīn	fawwəl - yəfawwəl “fawwəl!”		p. 118 <i>taras</i> , “Baghdadi...fill the container or the empty space...”	<i>ṣabba - yəṣabbi əl-banzīn</i> = ND (MM) <i>taras</i> = AMB <i>fawwəl - yəfawwəl</i> = ND
22. Adjectives					

406. good	malīḥ	malīḥ	xōš (+ noun), p. 15/10 and p. 17/14 melīḥ, “well (adv.)”, p. 21/14	p. 201 xōš, “Persian...good (<i>ğay-yid</i>), a nice (<i>ğamīl</i>) or good (<i>ḥasan</i>) thing”	xōš = PR malīḥ = PR ⁴⁸⁰
407. beautiful	ḥəlu	ḥəlu			ND
408. bad	mā-malīḥ	mā-ḥəlu		p. 228 <i>dūni</i> , “...bad, dishonest and vile...” also p. 378 <i>qabā</i> , “Turkish...fat, big (both adjectives also mean gross, bad) with a big and fat body... <i>kalāmū qabā</i> : he utters bad words without courtesy and respect...”	(MM) <i>dūni</i> = PR (MM) <i>qabā</i> = SR from “big, fat mean, ugly” to “unpleasant” only in the expression <i>šōt qaba</i> , “high, disturbing voice”
409. ugly	qabīḥ	yəlḥab ən-nafəs		p. 378 <i>qabā</i> , “Turkish...fat, big (both adjectives also mean gross, bad) with a big and fat body... <i>kalāmū qabā</i> : he utters bad words without courtesy and respect...”	<i>yəlḥab ən-nafəs</i> = ND <i>qabīḥ</i> = ND (MM) <i>qabā</i> = SR from “big, fat mean, ugly” to “unpleasant” only in the expression <i>šōt qaba</i> , “high, disturbing voice”

⁴⁸⁰ In Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maṣlāwī, the adjective *malīḥa* is documented with the meaning “good”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/17, 23.

410. tired	taʕbān	taʕbān			ND
411. sick	wəǧʕān	wəǧʕān			ND
412. rich	zangīn	zangīn		p. 254 <i>zangīn</i> , “Turk. Pers...very rich person...and <i>zangana</i> is the wealth and from the verb is derived <i>zangana</i> , to be wealthy”	<i>zangīn</i> = PR
413. poor (has no money)	faqēǧ	faqīǧ			ND
414. empty	fārəǧ	fārəǧ			ND
415. free (from work)	məʕaʔʔal mən əš-šəǧəl	ʕaʔʔāl baʔʔāl ʕaʔʔāl baʔʔāl	ʕaʔʔal, “to delay someone”, p. 11 and p. 13 passim		<i>məʕaʔʔal mən əš-šəǧəl</i> = ND <i>ʕaʔʔāl</i> = ND <i>baʔʔāl</i> = ND <i>ʕaʔʔāl baʔʔāl</i> = ND
416. black	ʔaswad	ʔaswad	aswad, “black (colour)”, p. 17/4		PR
417. small	zǧīǧ	zǧīǧ			ND
418. thirsty	ʕaʕšān	ʕaʕšān	ʕöteš, p. 19/14		<i>ʕaʕšān</i> = ND (MM) <i>ʕateš</i> = PR
419. hungry	ǧūʕān	ǧūʕān	ǧōʕān, p. 5/18		<i>ǧūʕān</i> = PR without the lowering of the long /u/
420. hot	ḥāǧǧ	ḥāǧǧ	ḥarr, p. 21/15		<i>ḥāǧǧ</i> = PR

23. Numerals and time					
421. numbers (1-10, isolated)					
One	wēḥəd	wēḥəd			ND
Two	ṭnīn	ṭnīn			ND
Three	tāṭi	tlāṭa	tāte, tāṭi passim tāt ⁱ , passim t ^e lātā p. 17/15		tlāṭa = AMB (MM) tāt ⁱ = SR to specific contexts ⁴⁸¹
Four	arbaṣa	arbaṣa	arb ^a ṣat iyyām, “four days”, p. 11/18		ṛarbaṣ = PR as form in context, preceding the noun arbaṣa = pausal form, replaced the old form ōbṣa ⁴⁸²
Five	xamsi	xamsa	xamsamit, “five hundred”, p. 15/7		xamsi = old MM form ⁴⁸³ xamsa = AMB
Six	sətti	sətta			sətti = old MM form sətta = AMB
Seven	sabṣa	sabṣa			sabṣa = PR

⁴⁸¹ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁴⁸² Cf. section 6.2.4.

⁴⁸³ For the diachronic changes regarding the numbers, cf. section 6.2.4.

Eight	ṭmēni	ṭmāniya	ṭmēni, p. 9/1		<i>ṭmēni</i> = old MM form <i>ṭmāniya</i> = AMB
Nine	təsʕa	təsʕa			<i>təsʕa</i> = PR
Ten	ʕašga	ʕašga	ʕaš ^a ra, p. 19/9		<i>ʕašga</i> = PR
422. three times	ṭāt marrāt	tlāt marrāt	ṭāt ⁱ krād, “three Kurds”, p. 15/9	p. 489 <i>nōbi</i> , “Baghdadi <i>nōba</i> , one time and the plural <i>nōbāt</i> ...”	(MM) <i>nōbi</i> = “time”, PR (MM) <i>kaḡga</i> = “time”, PR ⁴⁸⁴ (MM) <i>ṭāt</i> + noun = DI, replaced by <i>tlāt</i> + noun ⁴⁸⁵
423. days of the week					
Monday	ət-ṭnēn	ṭnēn			ND
Tuesday	ṭātā	tlātā			<i>tlātā</i> = ND <i>ṭātā</i> = ND
Wednesday	ʔarbaʕa	al-ʔarbiʕā			<i>al-ʔarbiʕā</i> = ND <i>ʔarbaʕa</i> = ND
Thursday	xamīs	xamīs			ND
Friday	ḡəmʕa	ḡəmʕa	n ^ʕ hār eḡḡumʕa, p. 13 /12		<i>ḡəmʕa</i> = PR
Saturday	sabət	sabət			ND
Sunday	ʔaḥad	ʔaḥad			ND

⁴⁸⁴ This form is indicated in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 38.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. section 6.2.5.

424. week	ʔəsbōʕ	ʔəsbōʕ		p. 173 <i>hafta</i> , “week or seven days, from Pers. /Kurd. <i>hafta</i> , meaning “seven”	(MM) <i>hafta</i> = unknown <i>əsbōʕ</i> = PR ⁴⁸⁶
425. year	sani	sani			ND
426. names of the months					
January	kānūn ət-tāni	kānūn ət-tāni			ND
February	šbāt	šbāt		p. 282 <i>šbāt</i> , “last month of the winter season, it is the month in which the cats usually copulate”	<i>šbāt</i> = PR
March	ʔadāg	ʔadār			ND
April	nīsān	nīsān			ND
May	ʔayyāg	ʔayyār			ND
June	ḥziḡān	ḥozayrān			<i>ḥozayrān</i> = AMB <i>ḥziḡān</i> = ND
July	tammūz	tammūz			ND
August	ʔāb	ʔāb			ND
September	ʔaylūl	ʔaylūl			ND

⁴⁸⁶ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 62/10.

October	tišrīn əl-ʔawwəl	təšrīn əl-ʔawwəl			ND
November	tišrīn ət-tāni	təšrīn ət-tāni			ND
December	kānūn əl-ʔawwəl	kānūn əl-ʔawwəl			ND
24. Functional words					
24.1 Interrogation					
427. who?	mənu	mənu			<i>mən/mənu</i> = PR ⁴⁸⁷
428. what?	aš - ašnu	aš – ašnu	äiš/aš, precedes the verb, as in aš terīd?, “what do you want?”, p. 13/18 äiš ʔtʔrīdūn?, “what do you (pl.) want?”, p. 5/15	p. 45-46 <i>aš</i> , “is an expression for interrogation and it means what. It derives from <i>ʔayy šayʔ</i> and it was reduced to <i>ēš</i>	<i>aš</i> = PR, precedes the verbs <i>ašnu</i> = PR ⁴⁸⁸
429. why?	lēš?	lēš?	lēš, passim	p. 45 sub voce <i>ʔaš</i> , there is <i>lēš</i> , which comes from <i>li-ʔayy šayʔ</i>	<i>lēš</i> = PR

⁴⁸⁷ The form *mən* is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Mašlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45.

⁴⁸⁸ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Mašlāwi in the question *hāda ašnu?*, “what is this?”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45.

430. where?	wēn	wēn	wēn, p. 5/20		<i>wēn</i> = PR
431. where? (to go in a direction)	wēn	wēn	ēṣōb, p. 11/2 and p. 13/16		(MM) <i>ēṣōb</i> = PR in the forms <i>ēṣab</i> and <i>wēṣab</i> ⁴⁸⁹ <i>wēn</i> = ND
Where are you heading?	wēn b-tgōḥ?	wēn gēyah?			
432. from where?	mnēn	mən wēn			<i>mən wēn</i> = ND <i>mnēn</i> = PR ⁴⁹⁰
433. when?	aš waqət	ēmeti aš waqət		p. 61 <i>ēmati</i> , “ <i>imti</i> in Egyptian, <i>imti</i> in Aramaic, corresponding to <i>mata</i> as interrogative”	(MM) <i>ēmeti</i> = PR <i>aš waqət</i> = PR ⁴⁹¹
434. how?	ʔaššōn?	ʔaššōn	aš-lōn, p. 7/6 and p. 9/7		phonological change ⁴⁹² <i>ʔaššōn</i> = PR ⁴⁹³
435. how much?	ašqad	ašqad	ašqad, p. 15 and p. 17 passim		<i>ašqad</i> = PR ⁴⁹⁴
24.2 Adverbs					

⁴⁸⁹ Both forms *ēṣab* and *wēṣab* are attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi and is confirmed by my Muslim informant. According to Blanc, Socin’s form *ēṣōb* is wrong, as for Mosul it would be expected *ēṣab*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45 and Blanc 1964, p. 138.

⁴⁹⁰ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maṣlāwi as well as it is used by my Muslim informant, parallel to *mən wēn*. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45.

⁴⁹¹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45.

⁴⁹² Cf. section 6.2.3

⁴⁹³ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/7.

⁴⁹⁴ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 45.

436. here	hōni	hōni	hōni, passim	p. 507 <i>hōni</i> , “Turkish, meaning here (<i>hnā</i>)...”	<i>hōni</i> = PR
437. there	hōnək	hnūk	hōnik, p. 9/3		<i>hnūk</i> = PR in MM ⁴⁹⁵ <i>hōnək</i> = PR in CM religious difference
438. outside	bağğa	bağğa	barra, p. 13/3		<i>bağğa</i> = PR
439. inside	ğawwa	ğawwa	ğawwa, p. 7/3 and p. 13/7		<i>ğawwa</i> = PR
440. left	yasāğ	yasāğ			ND
441. right	yamīn	yamīn			ND
442. straight ahead	ʕadəl	ʕadəl gubaḷ			<i>ʕadəl</i> = ND <i>gubaḷ</i> = AMB
443. above	fōq	fōq			<i>fōq</i> = DM, see 468
444. beneath/be- low	taḥət	taḥət ğawwa	táhit, “below” p. 17/15		<i>taḥət</i> = PR <i>ğawwa</i> = PR ⁴⁹⁶
445. early	şubuh	mən waqət	eşşub ^h , p. 21/8		<i>mən waqət</i> = ND (MM) <i>şubuh</i> = unknown
446. now	hassa	hassa	ussāʕ, p. 15/17		<i>hassaʕ</i> = PR ⁴⁹⁷ (MM) <i>ussāʕ</i> = unknown

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. section 6.2.2.

⁴⁹⁶ The adverb is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 72/35.

⁴⁹⁷ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 5 and p. 68/ 18. It is worth noticing that in both CM and MM the articulation of the final /ʕ/ is barely perceivable.

447. yesterday	əlbēḥa	əlbēḥa	elbērḥa, p. 13/3 elbēreḥa, p. 7/13	p. 51 <i>əlbēḥa</i> , “ <i>imbāriḥ</i> in Syrian, Kurdish and Naḡdi... <i>l-bāriḥa</i> , that means the day of yesterday (“ <i>yawm amsī</i> ”)	phonological change ⁴⁹⁸ <i>əlbēḥa</i> = PR from 1972
448. today	halyōm	əlyōm			<i>əlyōm</i> = PR ⁴⁹⁹ <i>halyōm</i> = ND
449. tomorrow	ḡada	ḡada	ḡada, p. 7/16		<i>ḡada</i> = PR
450. always	kəll waqət	dāʔiman ʕala tūl			<i>kəll waqət</i> = ND <i>ʕala tūl</i> = ND <i>dāʔiman</i> = MSA form
451. last year	ʕām l-awwəl	haḏīk əs-sani			both ND
452. next year	santi-ḡ-ḡayy	əl-sani lə-ḡayy			both ND
453. never	ʔabadan	walā marra			both ND
454. often	kəll waqət	dāʔiman al-ʔaḡlab			<i>kəll waqət</i> = ND <i>al-ʔaḡlab</i> = ND <i>dāʔiman</i> = MSA form
455. not anymore	mā baqa	mā ʔakṭaḡ			ND
I have not seen him anymore	ana mā baq ḡəšəʕtūnu	ʕāḡ-lī fatra mā- qad-ḡəšəʕtūnu			

⁴⁹⁸ Cf. section 6.2.3.

⁴⁹⁹ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 60/ 1.

456. still	baʕəd	baʕd			ND
457. only	bass	bass		p. 81 <i>bass</i> , “Persian, Baghdadi, Kurdish, Nağdi... it is used in the imperative form <i>kaḫī</i> , and the origin of this word is from the Ital. <i>basta</i> , whose meaning is Stop! or It suffices...”	<i>bass</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁰
458. also / too	hamm	hamm	enclitic particle – <i>ze</i> p.5/ passim	p. 505 <i>ham</i> , “Bagh. <i>hammīna</i> , <i>kamān</i> in Syrian and Egyptian meaning also”	<i>hamm</i> = PR (MM) <i>hammīna</i> = AMB – <i>ze</i> = possibly SS from “also” to emphasizing particle ⁵⁰¹
459. already	/	/			ND
I have already found it.	hāda laqqētūnu.	ššē, laqqētūnu.			
460. immediately	ḫālan	hassa mubāšara			<i>hassa</i> = ND <i>ḫālan</i> = ND <i>mubāšara</i> = ND, MSA form
461. afterwards	baʕdēn	baʕdēn			<i>baʕdēn</i> = PR ⁵⁰²

⁵⁰⁰ This form is attested with the meaning “only” in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 64/ 5.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. section 6.2.5.

⁵⁰² This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 64/ 3.

462. so	hākəḍ	li-hāḍa ka-ḍālik	hākəḍ, p. 9/5 and p. 13/1		<i>hākəḍ</i> = PR ⁵⁰³ <i>li-hāḍa</i> / <i>ka-ḍālik</i> = MSA forms
463. much (in the meaning “much money”)	ktīg	ktīg	ak ^ɛ l keṭīr, “a lot of food”, p. 7/10		<i>ktīg</i> = PR
464. very	kəlleš	ktīg			ND
465. not at all	māku	ʕala ʔaṭlāq māku			ND
466. perhaps	balki	balki	bālki p. 17/9	p. 91 <i>balkī</i> , “Pers./Turk., Bagh. <i>bal-kat</i> ...maybe (<i>rubbama</i>)... some pronounce it as <i>barkat</i> ”	<i>balki</i> = PR
24.3 Prepositions					
467. under	taḥət	ğawwa taḥət	taḥt, p. 19/10		<i>taḥət</i> = PR <i>ğawwa</i> = DM, see 439
468. on (the table)	fōq	ʕala	ʕala dābbetū, “on his mount”, p. 15/16		<i>ʕala</i> = PR <i>fōq</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁴
469. in (the house)	b-əl-bēt	b-əl-bēt	bilbēt, p. 5/7		<i>b-əl-bēt</i> = PR

⁵⁰³ The Muslim informant displays this form in my recordings of 2018.

⁵⁰⁴ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī in expressions such as *fōq əl-laḥəm*, “on the meat”, *fōq əl-ḥāmya*, “on the bamya”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 68/ 19, 20.

470. in the middle of (the house)	b-nuṣṣ əl-bēt	bə-l-wasaṭ əl-bēt			<i>bə-l-wasaṭ əl-bēt</i> = ND <i>b-nuṣṣ əl-bēt</i> = ND
In the middle of summer	b-nuṣṣ əṣ-ṣēf	b-nuṣṣ əṣ-ṣēf			ND
471. in front of	qəddām	qəddām qabəl	quddām, “towards”, p. 5/14		<i>qəddām</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁵ <i>qabəl</i> = ND
472. behind	xaləf	xaləf waḡa	xalf, p. 7/1		<i>xaləf</i> = PR <i>waḡa</i> = ND
473. at /near (the station)	ṣənd	ṣənd	ṣänd baqqālna, “at our merchant’s”, p. 11/6 ṣandi and ṣandak, “I have, you have”, p. 5 passim		<i>ṣənd</i> = PR
474. close to (the table)	kəlliṣ qaḡībi əl-mēz	yamm əl-mēz	qarīb, p. 5/20	p. 511 <i>yamm</i> , “Baghdadi..meaning in the side of and towards..”	<i>yamm</i> = “close to, on the side of”, AMB ⁵⁰⁶ <i>kəlliṣ qaḡībi əl-mēz</i> = ND
475. in the direction of (the hospital)	ṣōb əl-mustašfa	qaḡīb mən əl-mustašfa bə-ttiḡāh əl-mustašfa			<i>ṣōb əl-mustašfa</i> = ND <i>qaḡīb mən əl-mustašfa</i> = ND <i>bə-ttiḡāh əl-mustašfa</i> = ND

⁵⁰⁵ This form appears in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maṣlāwī with the meaning “in front of”. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 56/ 7.

⁵⁰⁶ This preposition is also identified by Blanc as typical of Muslim Baghdadi, meaning “toward, near”. Cf. Blanc 1964, p. 123.

476. between	bēn	bēn	bēnātna, “between us”, p. 5/16		<i>bēn</i> = PR
477. after	baʕəd	baʕəd			<i>baʕd</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁷
478. with (a person)	maʕa	maʕa	maʕi, p. 5/17	p. 496 <i>wiyyā</i> , “Baghdadi for <i>maʕa</i> ”	<i>maʕa</i> = PR
479. without	bala	bala			ND
480. like (a child)	məṭəl	məṭəl	miṭel, p. 21/14		<i>məṭəl</i> = PR
481. because of	mbōr	bə-s-sabab lə-hal sabab		p. 486 <i>muwud</i> : “because of.... it is also said I did so and so <i>ʕala mūdū</i> meaning because of him and for the feminine form is <i>ʕala mūda</i> and the plural is <i>ʕala mūdum...</i> ”	(MM) <i>ʕala mūd</i> = PR (MM) <i>mbōr</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁸ <i>bə-s-sabab</i> = ND <i>lə-hal sabab</i> = ND (MM) <i>muwud</i> = unknown
24.4 Conjunctions					
482. but	lākin	lākin bass	lākin, p. 9/7 bäs, “but”, p. 5/12	p. 81, “Persian, Baghdadi, Kurdish, Nağdi... it is used in the imperative form <i>kafī</i> , and the origin of this word is from the Ital. <i>basta</i> , whose meaning is Stop! or It suffices...”	<i>lākin</i> = PR <i>bass</i> = PR

⁵⁰⁷ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text on Muslim Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 62/ 10.

⁵⁰⁸ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maşlāwi. The Muslim informant also confirmed that it is still used in Maşlāwi. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 64, fn. 73.

483. or	ʔaw	ʔaw			ʔaw = MSA form
Coffee or tea ?	čāy wəlla qahwi?	čāy wəlla qahwi?	illa, passim		(MM) <i>illa</i> = unknown <i>wəlla</i> = ND
484. when (I was young)	ləmman (kəntu walad zġiġ)	mən kən ʔəfəl	lūmin šāf əs-sultān, “as the sultan saw”, p. 17/7		(MM) <i>ləmman/ləmman kən ʔəfəl</i> = PR <i>mən kən ʔəfəl</i> = ND
485. if	iḏa	iḏa			<i>iḏa</i> = PR ⁵⁰⁹
486. in order to	ḥatta	ʕala mūd	xāṭir, p. 7 and p. 19 passim	p. 486 <i>muwud</i> : “because of... it is also said I did so and so <i>ʕala mūdū</i> meaning because of him and for the feminine form is <i>ʕala mūda</i> and the plural is <i>ʕala mūdum...</i> ”	(MM) <i>xāṭir</i> = PR (MM) <i>ḥatta</i> = PR, followed by verbs (MM) <i>ʕala mūd</i> = PR, “because of, in order to”
487. until	ʔila ʔan	ʔila ʔan	lūmma + verb, p. 9/14 lūm(m)in + verb, passim		(MM) <i>ləmman/ləmman</i> = PR <i>ʔila ʔan</i> = MSA form
25. Indefinites					
488. somebody	wēḥəd	wēḥəd šaxəş	wēḥid, p. 17/10, wāḥid, p. 11/11		<i>wēḥəd</i> = PR <i>šaxəş</i> = ND
489. some people	kam wēḥəd	kam wēḥəd šwayyət nās		p. 305 <i>šwayya</i> , “Bagh., Kurd., Syr., Egypt., Turk. a little of something,	<i>šwayya</i> = PR <i>kam wēḥəd</i> = ND

⁵⁰⁹ This form is attested in Jastrow’s text of 1979 on Muslim Maşlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 72/ 36 and p. 75/41.

				some people pronounce it <i>šwayyūnī</i>	
490. something	šē	šē	šē, “a thing”, p. 19/12		DM
491. nobody	maḥḥad	wala wēḥəd			<i>wala wēḥəd</i> = ND (MM) <i>maḥḥad</i> = PR ⁵¹⁰
492. nothing	māku šē mā-šē	māku			<i>māku</i> = ND <i>māku šē</i> = ND <i>mā-šē</i> = ND
26. Reflexive pronoun					
493. reflexive pronoun	nafs + bound pronoun	nafs + bound pronoun	xallšū nāfsūm, “they free themselves”, p. 11/3		<i>nafs + bound pronoun</i> = PR
I asked myself	?ana sa?altu nafsi	?ana sa?altu nafsi			
27. Genitive exponent					
494. genitive exponent	māl	māl	eğğērāb māl eddaqīq, “a sack of flour”, p. 19/2,3		<i>māl</i> = PR

⁵¹⁰ Cf. section 6.2.6.

my father's car	sayyārət ʔabūyi əs-sayyāra māl ʔabūyi	sayyārət ʔabūyi hādī əs- sayyāra māl ʔabūyi	bēt al-qāḏī, “the house of the judge”, p. 13/7 <i>iḏāfa</i> constructions passim		
28. Varia					
495. yes	ē	ē	ē, p. 11/10		<i>ē</i> = PR
496. no	la	la	la, p. 9/18		<i>la</i> = PR
497. to have been for...					
I have been in Egypt for three years.	ana bə-Məṣr mən ʔat snīn	ana bə-Məṣr mən tlāṭa snīn			ND
498. This does not concern you	mā-yəxaṣṣək	mā-yəxaṣṣək mā-lak ʕalāqa			ND
499. there is / there is not	aku / māku	aku / māku akūš / mākūš	akoš, p. 9/19	p. 50-51, <i>akū</i> , “ <i>fī</i> in Syrian, Eg., Turk., there is...it is one of the dis- tinguishing feature of the Iraqi dia- lect.....sometimes a shin is	<i>aku</i> = PR (MM) <i>akūš</i> = PR (MM) <i>mākūš</i> = PR <i>māku</i> = PR ⁵¹¹

⁵¹¹ This form is attested in Jastrow's text on Muslim Maṣlāwī. Cf. Jastrow 1979, p. 70/ 27.

				attached to so that they say <i>akūš</i> and they negate by saying <i>mākūš...</i> ”	
500. How are you?	aššōnak?	ʔaššōnak?			ND
501. by force	bə-l-quwwi	bə-l-quwwa			ND
502. hurry up!	ʔəstaŋgəl	ʔəstaŋgəl			ND
503. thank you	šukran	šukran			ND
504. enough!	yikaffi!	bass! kaffi!		p. 81, “Persian, Baghdadi, Kurdish, Nağdi... it is used in the imperative form <i>kafî</i> , and the origin of this word is from the Ital. <i>basta</i> , whose meaning is Stop! or It suffices...”	<i>bass</i> = PR <i>yikaffi!</i> = ND <i>kaffi!</i> = ND

List of images

Figure 1: “The city of Mosul”: Unhabitat 2016, p. 9, source: https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/download-manager-files/UN-Habitat_MosulCityProfile_LowRes_170409_V6.pdf),

Access: 29.10.2021.

Figure 2: “The Mesopotamian dialect area”: Blanc 1964, p. 2.

Abstracts

English

The present master's thesis is a lexical study of the Arabic dialect of Mosul (Maṣlāwī). The aim of the investigation is to detect the diachronic changes that occurred in Mosul Arabic in a time span going from 1882 to 2015. One of these changes regards the accommodation to Iraq's prestige dialect, Muslim Baghdadi. The survey tool employed for the research is a set of 530 words of everyday use, designed by Behnstedt & Woidich for the *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte*. The survey was submitted in form of a questionnaire to a Christian and to a Muslim informant from Mosul. The lexical items collected were then compared to the words included in the old sources selected for the investigation.

The results show that the majority of the words attested in the old sources have been preserved in today's Maṣlāwī. Nineteen words fell into disuse and in 26 cases a semantic shift is detected. On the phonological and morpho-syntactic level, both informants preserved the typical Maṣlāwī features. The Muslim speech, which represents today's Mosul Arabic in this work, does not include enough phonological and lexical elements that would justify an adaptation to Muslim Baghdadi.

German

Die vorliegende Masterarbeit stellt eine lexikalische Analyse des arabischen Dialektes von Mossul (Maṣlāwī) dar. Das Ziel der Arbeit ist die Beschreibung der diachronen Änderungen im Maṣlāwī -Lexikon, die in einer Zeitspanne von 1882 bis 2015 stattgefunden haben. Eine von diesen Änderungen ist die Anpassung an den Prestigedialekt des Iraks, nämlich Muslimisch-Baghdadisch. Als Forschungsmethode wurde eine Liste von Alltagswörtern eingesetzt, die auf dem *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte* von Behnstedt & Woidich basiert. Die Liste wurde als Fragebogen einem christlichen und einem muslimischen Maṣlāwī -sprechenden Informanten vorgelegt. Die gesammelten Wörter wurden in Folge mit Wörtern aus ausgewählten älteren Quellen verglichen.

Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass die Mehrheit der Wörter, die in den älteren Quellen vorkommen, ihre Form in der heutigen Maṣlāwī -Mundart bewahrt hat. In 19 Fällen ist ein Wort als veraltet gekennzeichnet und in 26 Fällen ist eine semantische Änderung zu erkennen. Auf der phonologischen und morpho-syntaktischen Ebene, weisen beide Informanten die typischen Maṣlāwī -

Merkmale auf. Die muslimische Varietät, die in dieser Arbeit die heutige Mundart darstellt, zeigt zu wenige phonologische und lexikalische Elemente, die eine Anpassung an Muslimisch-Baghdadisch rechtfertigen könnten.