

Paweł Siwiec

**The so-called *verba hamzata*, *verba infirma*¹
and *verba mediae geminatae*² in the dialect of Baghdad**

Even the earliest Arab grammarians emphasized the distinctiveness of the verb stems with hamza and *w* or *y* as one of the root consonants. Similar attention was paid to the verbs of which the second and third radical are identical. A quite substantial part of Sībawaihi's (750-793) *Al-Kitāb* deals with these issues³. Sībawaihi presents in detail all the possible phonetic changes that result from such configurations of consonants in the Arabic verb stems. He does not limit himself to a rigid and strictly normative description. When drawing the boundaries of linguistic correctness, he takes into consideration local colors of the Arabic tongue of Naǧd in the east and that of Al-Ḥiǧāz in the west. When describing the mechanism of phonetic transformations, he often points to the reasons that lie behind them. Not infrequently, he resorts to examples from the spoken Arabic.

In Sībawaihi's days the linguistic phenomena connected with verbal stems, which are the subject of this paper, were symptoms of already pretty much advanced processes. In the written language the processes were later slowed down and even stopped due to codification of the linguistic correctness rules. But in dialects they were expanding unceasingly, assuming various shapes.

Hence, the origin of changes that affected the weak verbs as well as the verbs of which the second and third radicals are identical in the dialect of Baghdad dates back to the earliest stages of the evolution of Arabic language. Many of these changes are of common nature and can be observed in

¹ Called in Arabic *Al-'af'āl al-mu'talla* (weak verbs) that include *al-miṭāl* - verbum primae *w//y* (VP*w//y*), *al-'awǧaf*—verbum mediae *w//y* (VM*w//y*) and *an-nāqis* - verbum ultimae *w//y* (VU*w//y*).

² Called in Arabic *Al-'af'āl 'al-muḍā'afa* (VMG).

³ See, for example, Sībawaihi, *Al-Kitāb*, ed. 'Abd as-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Bayrūt 1975, vol. iv, pp. 330-481.

majority of the contemporary Arabic dialects. Others are a specificity of the Arabic spoken in the land of Tigris and Euphrates, including the dialect of Baghdad⁴.

I. Verba hamzata

Nearly all the changes that, on the ground of the dialect of Baghdad, occurred in the verbal stems with hamza as one of the root consonants are an effect of the hamza lenition process. The process, called *tahfif al-hamza* or *tashīl al-hamza* by the medieval Arab philologists, began very early. In the sedentary population of Al-Ḥiǧāz hamza had been, as early as in the 7th century, almost completely eliminated, both in the internal and final positions of the word. And at the turn of the 7th and 8th centuries it started to disappear also in the onsets of words. In the mainly nomadic population of Najd the process began later and proceeded at a much slower pace⁵.

After the emergence of a literary form of the Arabic language before Islam, realization of hamza must have probably been considered as an exponent of linguistic correctness. And, through the Koran, it ultimately was recognized as a norm of the classical Arabic.

One of the specific features of the Eastern Arabic of Naǧd was the so-called *'an'ana*, i. e. reinforcement of hamza. It consisted in replacing hamza with the pharyngal *'ayn*, e.g.: *ḥaba'a* instead of *ḥaba'a*—"to hide" and *'i'tanafa* instead of *'i'tanafa*—"to resume"⁶.

One can distinguish the following types of *tahfif al-hamza*:

a) *Suqūṭ al-hamza* or *al-ḥaḍf*, i. e. elision of hamza. It can occur in the middle position before a consonant, like in *'iṣmanantum* instead of *'iṣma'nantum*—"you (m. pl.) have calmed down"⁷, or in an intervocalic position as in *yaṭūna* instead of *yaṭa'ūna*—"they (m.) tread", or *muttakīna* instead of

⁴ To illustrate the phonetic changes observed in the dialect of Baghdad, the classical Arabic language has been used here. It does not mean, however, that the author of this paper suggests direct genetic connection between the classical Arabic and dialectal forms. The undoubtedly older classical Arabic forms have been used here as reference only.

⁵ On the lenition of hamza in the cl. Ar., see K. Vollers, *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, Strassburg 1906, pp. 9, 83-87, 120; W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Bayrūt 1974., pp. 76-77; Ibrāhīm Anīs, *Fī al-laḥǧāt al-'arabiyya*, Al-Qāhira 1973, pp. 75-80.

⁶ Al-Maṭlabī, *Lahǧat Tamīm wa-'āṭāru-hā fī al-'arabiyya al-muwaḥḥada*, Baǧdād 1978, pp. 86-90.

⁷ See, Vollers op. cit. p. 49.

muttaki'ina—“the leaning” (plur.)⁸ as well as in unstressed onsets of words as in *Sāma* instead of *'Usāma*⁹.

b) *Ibdāl al-hamza*, i. e. replacement of hamza with *w* or *y* in the middle and final positions of the word. In verbal stems hamza₃ was most susceptible to this change. As a result of the disappearance of flexional endings, it became the final sound of the word. So, instead of, for example, *yaqra'u* > *yaqra'* people began to pronounce it *yaqrā* similarly to VUy. Then, by analogy, the change expanded to the Perfect forms, i.e. *qara'a* > *qara'* was replaced by *qarā*. Consequently, the original VUH became VUy. The effect of this process is the parallel occurrence of forms with hamza₃ and without it in medieval Arabic, for instance *kafa'a* beside *kafā*—“to be enough”¹⁰.

In the intervocalic position *u-a* hamza began to be replaced with *w* as in *fuwādun* instead of *fu'ādun*—“heart”, or *yuwāḥidu* instead of *yu'āḥidu*—“to blame”. Then again, by analogy, the change that originally took place in the Imperfect forms expanded to the Perfect paradigm. Hence, *wāḥada* instead of *'āḥada*¹¹. While in the intervocalic position *i-a*, hamza was most frequently replaced with *y*, as for example in *riyā'un* instead of *ri'ā'un*—“hypocrisy” or *ḥāsiyan* instead of *ḥāsi'an*—“vilely”¹².

c) *Tashīl al-hamza bayna bayna*. It consists in weakening of hamza in an intervocalic position to so much a degree that it practically disappears as in *'a-raaytu-kum* for *'a-ra'aytu-kum*—“Did I see you?” It never occurs in positions where hamza is not vocalized¹³. Neither does it occur in onsets of words, since the Arabic language does not tolerate purely vocalic onsets. What can happen to hamza in the onset position is only the weakening of its articulation. And that, irrespective of how weak the articulation is, has no significance because what really matters here is the glottal catch itself and not its strength.

It seems that the term *bayna bayna*, which signified a sound that is neither a glottal stop nor a pure vowel but something halfway, was invented by the early Arab philologists to describe the hiatus that results from the weakening of hamza in intervocalic positions.

The following table illustrates phonetic transformations connected with the process of lenition of hamza.

⁸ Ibrāhīm Anīs op. cit. p. 80. In both cases the disappearance of hamza is accompanied by elision of the preceding vowel.

⁹ Vollers op. cit. p. 90.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 84-86.

¹¹ Ibrāhīm Anīs op. cit. p. 79.

¹² Ibidem., p. 80.

¹³ Ibrāhīm Anīs, *Al-Aṣwāt al-luḡawiyya*, Al-Qāhira 1975, pp. 90-91.

Table 1

No.	Dialect of Baghdad	Classical Arabic
1. a)	'ahad/'ihad – he took	'ahada
b)	yāhud – he takes	ya'huḍu
c)	'uhud / hud – take! (m.)	hud
2. a)	'ekel – he ate	'akala
b)	yākul – he eats	ya'kulu
c)	'ukul / kul – eat! (m.)	kul
3. a)	'umar / 'amar – he ordered	'amara
b)	yu'umur / yi'mur – he orders	ya'muru
c)	'u'mur / 'i'mur – order! (m.)	mur
4.	wenn – he groaned	'anna
5.	wahhar – he removed	'ahhara
6. a)	'ahhar – he delayed	
b)	'a'ahhir / 'aahhir – I delay	'u'ahhiru
7.	weddā – he conveyed	'addā
8. a)	'eddā – he performed, fulfilled	
b)	yi'eddī / yiddī – he performs, fulfills	yu'addī
9.	wennes – he amused	'annasa
10. a)	'edden	
b)	wedden – he called to prayer	'addana
11.	wāsā – he comforted, consoled	'āsā
12.	twahhar – he moved aside	ta'ahhara
13. a)	t'ahhar – he was late	
b)	ta'ahhur / taahhur – a delay	ta'ahhur
14.	twennes – he amused himself	ta'annasa
15.	t'āmar – he conspired, plotted	ta'āmara
16.	twālef – he made friends (with s. o)	ta'ālafa
17.	tānā – he awaited	ta'anā
18. a)	nwuḥed / nwiḥed	
b)	nniḥed	
c)	nhād	
d)	n'iḥed – it was taken	'uḥida
19. a)	nwukel / nwikel	
b)	nnikel	
c)	nkāl	
d)	n'ikel – it was eaten	'ukila
20. a)	tteḥed / ttiḥed	
b)	ntiḥed – he took on, assumed	'ittahaḍa
21.	'tilef – he became united	'i'talafa
22.	ste'ger – he rented	'ista'gara
23.	stānes – he enjoyed himself	'ista'nasa
24. a)	ste'nef	
b)	stānef – he resumed	'ista'nafa
25.	stennā – he waited	'ista'annā (?)
26. a)	si'el / se'el – he asked	sa'ala

b)	<i>sāyil</i> – asking (m.)	<i>sā'il</i>
c)	<i>su'āl / suāl / suwāl</i> – a question	<i>su'āl</i>
27.	<i>nāš</i> – he touched	<i>na'aša</i>
28.	<i>'eyyes</i> – he despaired	<i>ya'isa</i>
29.	<i>nāwaš</i> – he handed, passed	<i>nā'aša</i>
30.	<i>rāwā</i> – he showed	<i>rā'ā</i>
31.	<i>tnāwaš</i> – he grabbed	<i>tanā'aša</i>
32.	<i>trāwā</i> – he seemed	<i>tarā'ā</i>
33.	<i>nsi'el</i> – he was asked	<i>su'ila</i>
34.	<i>nnāš</i> – he was touched	<i>nu'iša</i>

The following transformations can be observed in the above data, compared with adequate forms in classical Arabic:

1. Disappearance of hamza followed by lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in examples 1b, 2b, 23 and 24b.

This change can be observed in the word forms with hamza in the internal position between a vowel and an unvocalized consonant, i.e. —V'C-. In verbal forms the change is limited to VPH, as in *yāḥud*, *yākul*, *stānes* and *stānef*. It occurs also in the nomina verbi especially when lexicalized as in *tārīḥ* instead of *ta'rīḥ*—“date”. This kind of absorption of hamza occurs in a regular way particularly in nominal stems of the type CVCC, e.g. *rās* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ra's^{un}*—“a head”, *bīr* ÷ Cl. Ar. *bi'r^{un}*—“a well”. Relatively infrequent cases in which hamza has been retained as the first radical (mainly the words derived according to the *stef'al* pattern) can be explained as the influence of classical Arabic. What backs up such a view is the prevalence of forms without hamza as well as the fact that the unproductive pattern *stef'al* is mostly replaced with other derivatives, e.g. *'eğger* instead of *ste'ger* or *twennes* instead of *stānes*.

2. Tashīl al-hamza bayna bayna as in examples 6b (second variant), 13b (second variant) and 26c (second variant).

It occurs as a facultative variant in the following cases:

- a) 1st pers. sing. of the VPH Imperfect forms of the *fa'al* pattern, e.g. *'aahḥir* beside *'a'ahḥir*;
- b) In nomina verbi of the VPH formed on the base of the *tfa'al* pattern, e.g. *taahḥur* beside *ta'ahḥur*.
- c) In the VPH Perfect paradigm of the basic stems as well as *fa'al* forms where hamza stands directly before the final vowel of a preceding word, e.g. *huwwa aḥaḍe* beside *huwwa 'aḥaḍe* ÷ Cl. Ar. *huwa 'aḥaḍa-hu*—“he took

it”, or *'intū aḥḥartū* beside *'intū 'aḥḥartū* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'antum 'aḥḥartumū-hu*—“you (pl.) delayed him”.

d) In some nominal VMH derivatives, e.g. *suāl* beside *su'āl*.

3. Complete elision of hamza, as in examples 1c (second variant), 2c (second variant), 8b (second variant), 17 and 25.

It can be found in those forms in which the original hamza was preceded directly by a derivative suffix. For instance, in the verb *tānā* which most probably developed from **t'ānā*. Then, after elision of hamza₁, it assimilated to the *fā'al* pattern as can be seen from its Imperfect paradigm, e.g. *yitānī* instead of expected **yitānā*.

The form *stennā* derived from the same root as above resulted also from the elision of hamza₁. But it should be rather regarded as a borrowing from one of the neighboring dialects. Because structures that combine stems and functions of two different derivative patterns, namely *fa'al* and *stef'al*, are uncommon in the dialect of Baghdad and the verb *stennā* is their only representative¹⁴.

The disappearance of hamza in the Imperative forms of the verbs *'aḥad* // *'iḥad* and *'ekel* has different grounds. The variants *ḥud* and *kul* could have originated from absorption of hamza₁ by the vowel of the preceding Imperfect prefix, i.e. **ya'ḥud* > *yāḥud* and **ya'kul* > *yākul*. This, in turn, resulted in *ḥud* and *kul* as a natural consequence of the prefix reduction typical to Imperative forms, similarly to their equivalents in the Cl. Ar. As for the variants *'uḥud* // *'iḥid* and *'ukul* // *'ikil*, they must have appeared as a result of accentuation rules in the dialect of Baghdad, on one hand, and intolerance of the morphological system to short monosyllables, on the other hand. Since in the stressed position the dialect accepts only such monosyllables that are either hyper long, i.e. C \bar{V} C or double closed, i.e. CVCC, each of the forms *ḥud* and *kul* had to be supplemented with an extra initial syllable composed of hamza plus a short vowel. Hence the forms *'uḥud* and *'ukul*. In the Imperfect forms of the verb *'umar*//*'amar* hamza has been preserved. So, consequently, it also has not dropped out in the Imperative form, e.g. *'u'mur*.

¹⁴ Such word formation means are relatively widespread, for example, in the dialects of Syria and Lebanon. See Anis Frayha, *Mu'ğam al-alfāḍ al-'āmmiyya*, Bayrūt 1973, p. ().

4. Replacing hamza₁ and hamza₂ with *w* as in examples 4, 5, 7, 9, 10b, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18a, 19a and with *w*₂ as in examples 26c (third variant), 27, 29, 32.

Conversion of hamza into *w* could ensue when hamza occurred in the intervocalic position *u-a*. Therefore, the change can be observed most frequently in those VPH stems which are based on the *fa‘l* and *fā‘al* patterns, and subsequently in their derivatives *tfa‘l* and *tfā‘al*. Just in the VPH Imperfect forms of the patterns *fa‘l* and *fā‘al* hamza occurred between the *u* of the prefix and the $V_1=a/\bar{a}$. Consequently, original forms like **yu‘ahḥir* or **yu‘āsī* evolved into the currently used *yiwahḥir* and *yiwāsī*. Then, by analogy, the change spread to the Perfect stems as well as to other derivatives, e.g. *twahḥar* and *twālef*. It is quite probable that hamza of the type *bayna bayna* was a transitional form in that process, as it can be seen in the currently used dialect, e.g.: *su‘āl / suāl / suwāl* lub *fu‘ād / fuād / fuwād*.

There is also another explanation of the above illustrated changes, i.e. that words like *yu‘ahḥir* or *yu‘annis* were originally pronounced **yuwahḥir* and **yuwannis*. Then, however, the hypothetically original *w*₁ changed into hamza *bayna bayna* as a result of glottalization of the diphthong —*wa*—. So, according to this conception, the verbs mentioned above simply regained their initial shapes¹⁵. In some cases, the coexistence of forms with hamza₁ and those in which hamza₁ changed into *w*₁ resulted in semantic diversity, e.g.: *‘ahḥar*—“to delay” ÷ *wahḥar*—“to remove”, *‘eddā*—“to perform” ÷ *weddā*—“to convey”.

In quite a number of verbs hamza₂ has also been changed into *w*, e.g.: *nāwaš, rāwā, tnāwaš, trāwā*. Like in case of VPH, the change must have begun in the Imperfect forms based on the patterns of *fa‘l* and *fā‘al*. This time, however, the modification was a result of a kind of harmonic assimilation. It means that, for instance, original **yunā‘iš* changed into **yunāwiš*, where the transformation of hamza₂ into *w* was influenced by the prefix vowel. Otherwise, hamza₂, when in the intervocalic position *a-i*, should have been replaced by *y*₂, like in *sāyil*.

5. Replacement of hamza₂ by *y*₂, as in example 26b.

6. Disappearance of hamza₁ accompanied by the doubling of the preceding consonant, as in examples 18b, 19b, 20 and 28.

¹⁵ Czapkiewicz A., *The Verbs with Hamza as Third Radical in Modern Arabic Dialects*, “Folia Orientalia”, vol. XVIII, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1977, pp. 41-42.

The verb *ttehed* // *tthēd* is the only instance of the VPH *fta'al* stem that assumed the form of VPw//y. It must have developed on the basis of the pattern *'itfa'ala* rather than *'ifta'ala*¹⁶, as in the case of its Cl. Ar. counterpart and the VPw//y *fta'al* stems. The change that occurred here consisted in the disappearance of hamza₁ accompanied by the doubling of the consonant that directly preceded it. Forms like *šaṭṭ* > **šaṭ'* ÷ Cl. Ar. *šaṭ'un*—“river”¹⁷, as well as *marr* instead of *mar'*—“man” or *ğuzz* instead of *ğuz'*—“part”¹⁸ show that the change could not have been limited to the *fta'al* forms only. The same kind of modification occurs in the forms of *nnihed* and *nnikel*.

One can assume that the verb *'eyyes* must have also come into being as a result of the above described process. First, C₁=y in the Imperfect forms was doubled, following the disappearance of hamza₂, i.e. *yay'as* > **yayyas*. Then, by analogy to the *fa'l* pattern forms, the stem was supplemented with hamza₁ and hence *'eyyes* in the Imperfect.

The form *ntihed* could have developed from *tthēd* as a result of dissimilation, since the *thd* root does not exist in the dialect of Baghdad.

7. Disappearance of hamza₁ accompanied by lengthening of V₂, as in examples 18c and 19c.

Lengthening of V₂ that follows the disappearance of hamza₁ in *nhād* and *nkāl* can be explained as a result of the system's predilection to stick to the tri-radical root pattern, on one hand, and of preventing that the *n-* suffix be identified with C₁ on the other hand. It can be illustrated as follows: **yin'ihed* > **yinihed* than *yinhād* to avoid possible **yinhed*; and the same with the verb *nkāl*.

VUH, after replacement of hamza₃ by y₃, assimilated completely to VUy group, e.g.: *bidā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *bada'a*—“to begin”, *hennā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *hana'a*—“to congratulate”, *twaḏḏā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *tawadda'a*—“to perform ritual ablutions”, *nṭifā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'intaḏa'a*—“to be extinguished”, *ḥtibā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'ihtaba'a*—“to hide”. In some isolated cases hamza₃ is changed to the pharyngal *'ayn*, e.g. *'il-Qur'ān* beside *'il-Qur'ān* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'al-Qur'ān* and *qarā'a* beside *qirā'a* or *qirāya* ÷ Cl. Ar. *qirā'atun*.

Relatively in many cases hamza has been retained as the first root consonant, e.g.: *'a/iḥad*, *'ekel*, *'u//amar*, *yu//i'mur*, *'aḥḥar*, *'a'aḥḥir*, *'eddā*, *yi'eddā*, *'edden*, *t'aḥḥar*, *ta'aḥḥur*, *t'āmar*, *'ilef*, *ste'ger*, *ste'nef*¹⁹. In the

¹⁶ Vollers op. cit. p. 120.

¹⁷ Comapre cl. Ar. *šāṭi'un*—“riverside, bank”.

¹⁸ Vollers op. cit. pp. 92-93. Compare also *ğeyye*—“arrival” in the dialect of Baghdad (cl. Ar. *ğay'atim*).

¹⁹ See Table 1 above.

Perfect paradigm of the basic stem it is realized in the first three of the above mentioned verbs. Whereas, in the Imperfect, only in the last one out of the three, i.e. *yu/i'mur*. In the Perfect $C_1VC_2VC_3$ stems, hamza₁ = C₁ can be affected by apheresis, if occurring after a vowel ending of a preceding word, e.g.: *ma-ḥaḍte* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ma-'aḥaḍtu-hu*—"I did not take it"²⁰, or it can be realized as *bayna bayna*, e.g. *ma-aḥaḍte*.

The fact that hamza has been preserved in the Imperfect Indicative as well Imperative forms of the verb *'u/amar* results from its relatively infrequent usage in everyday speech, which makes it less susceptible to changes. The disappearance of hamza in verbal nouns consists either in its absorption by a preceding vowel, e.g. *tāmīn* beside *ta'mīn* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ta'mīnun*—"insurance", or in assuming of the of *bayna bayna* shape, e.g. *taahḥur* beside *ta'ahḥur*.

In some cases, especially in the stems based on the *stef'al* pattern, two parallel variants of the same verb are used without difference in meaning; one with and the other without hamza₁, e.g.: *'edden* // *wedden* or *ste'nef* // *stānef*. Sometimes, however, such parallel forms are semantically diversified, e.g.: *'eddā*—"to perform" ÷ *weddā*—"to convey".

Forms like *t'āmer* or *'tilef* have resisted the process of lenition, probably due to their limited usage. Since in the patterns *fā'al*, *tfā'al*, *nfa'al* and *fta'al* hamza₁ is normally not retained in the dialect of Baghdad. The forms *n'iḥeḍ* and *n'ikel* seem to be archaic and their usage in everyday speech is also very limited.

As for the VMH, only *si'el* has remained in use, along with its derivatives and a few other verbs, e.g. *ṭi'er* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ṭa'ara*—"to take blood revenge", *zi'er*—Cl. Ar. *za'ara*—"to roar" (lion), *si'em* ÷ Cl. Ar. *sa'ima*—"to be weary". The verb noun *ṭār* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ṭa'run*—"blood revenge", formed according to the $C_1VC_2C_3$ pattern, is an example of the absorption of hamza by the preceding vowel a which is typical in such structures.

The analysis of the hamza lenition process in the dialect of Baghdad allows us to draw the following conclusions:

- a) All the changes connected with the lenition of hamza in verbal stems originated in the Imperfect forms;
- b) Analogy played an essential role in the expansion of the lenition process;
- c) *'ibdāl al-hamza* constitutes the overwhelming majority of the modifications that affected *verba hamzata*. Hamza₃ regularly turns into *y₃*, while

²⁰ Regular elision of V₁ in this position (e.g. *ma-ktebte* instead of *ma kitebte* ÷ cl. Ar. *mā katabtu-hu* – "I did not write it") was undoubtedly a conducive factor.

hamza₁ and hamza₂ are replaced by *w*₁ and *w*₂ respectively, except *nomina agentis* forms;

d) The hamza lenition process has considerably reduced the number of *verba hamzata* in the dialect of Baghdad and it has not ended yet. However, as education becomes widespread, the process can be substantially slowed down under influence of the literary language.

II. *Verba infirma* (weak verbs)

A common feature of this class of verbs in all the Arabic dialects is further development of the monophthongization process particularly with regard to the diphthongs *aw* and *ay*. They were also subject to many other transformations presented below:

1. *Verba primae w//y*

Table 2

No.	Dialect of Baghdad	Classical Arabic
1.	<i>wugaf</i> – he stopped <i>yōgaf</i> – he stops <i>yōgfūn</i> – they (m.) stop <i>'ōgaf</i> – stop! (m.)	<i>waqafa</i> <i>yaqifu</i> <i>yaqifūna</i> <i>qif</i>
2.	<i>wuga'</i> – he fell <i>yōga'</i> – he falls	<i>waqa'a</i> <i>yaqa'u</i>
3.	<i>yibes</i> – it dried up <i>yeybes</i> // <i>yēbes</i> – it dries	<i>yabisa</i> <i>yaybasu</i>
4.	<i>nwiled</i> – he was born	<i>wulida</i>
5.	<i>stōḥaš</i> // <i>stāḥaš</i> // <i>stawḥaš</i> – he felt lonely	<i>'istawḥaša</i>

The diphthong *aw* has turned into the long vowel *ō*, e.g.: *yōm* < **yawm* ÷ Cl. Ar. *yawm*^{um}—“day”, *dōḥa* < **dawḥa* ÷ Cl. Ar. *dawḥat*^{um}—“dizziness”, *sōde* < **sawdā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *sawdā*^u—“black” (fem.). The change affects also the Perfect suffix of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. when the verb takes verbal suffixes that denote the Accusative, e.g.: *kitbō-hā* instead of **kitbaw-hā*²¹ ÷ Cl. Ar. *katabū-hā*—“they (fem.) wrote it”.

²¹ In the dialect of Baghdad *-aw* is a regular 3 pers. plur. masc. Perfect suffix for all types of verbs.

The VPw Imperfect paradigm of the basic stem has become uniform, i.e. $y\bar{o}C_2a/iC_3 < *yawC_2a/iC_3$, e.g.: $y\bar{o}gaf \div$ Cl. Ar. $yaqifu$ or $y\bar{o}ga' \div$ Cl. Ar. $yaqa'u$. It indicates that in the very early stages of dialect evolution the forms with w_1 in the Imperfect were the standard or at least prevailed.

The Imperative, which in the dialect of Baghdad has the form of $'\bar{o}C_2a/iC_3$, e.g. $'\bar{o}gaf$, is produced according to the same mechanism as in classical Arabic. In both cases it is formed by cutting off the Imperfect prefix, e.g.: $t\bar{o}gaf > '\bar{o}gaf \div$ Cl. Ar. $taqif > qif$ ²².

In the VPw stems based on the *staf'al* pattern the diphthong *aw* is either preserved or regularly replaced by \bar{o} or \bar{a} . It often happens that one verb is realized by three facultative variants, e.g.: $st\bar{o}ha\check{s} // st\bar{a}ha\check{s} // stawha\check{s}$.

2. Verba mediae w/y

Long vowels, both before a stressed syllable or after it, are usually relatively shortened. This is a common feature in all the Arabic dialects²³. It is also a consequence of a general phonetic rule according to which the strengthening of one group of sounds in a word (i.e. by stress) weakens the position of the other ones²⁴. Hence in the dialect of Baghdad, for instance, $y\check{i}sil\bar{u}n$ instead of $y\check{i}šil\bar{u}n \div$ Cl. Ar. $yašil\bar{u}na$. Similar examples can be found in classical Arabic, e.g. $'am\bar{u}d$ beside $'\bar{a}m\bar{u}d$ —“post, column”.

In the Imperfect forms of three verbs, namely $g\bar{a}l \div$ Cl. Ar. $q\bar{a}la$ —“to say”, $r\bar{a}d \div$ Cl. Ar. $'ar\bar{a}da$ —“to want” and $r\bar{a}h \div$ Cl. Ar. $r\bar{a}ha$ —“to go”, the long vowel can even fall out even when in an unstressed syllable. The change is limited to the 2nd pers. sing. masc. as well as 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. masc., e.g. $yigl\bar{u}n$ beside $yigul\bar{u}n$, $tird\bar{u}n$ beside $trid\bar{u}n$ and $tirh\bar{u}n$ beside $truh\bar{u}n$. Two factors could have caused this modification: natural weakening of the vowel in an unstressed position and exceptionally frequent usage of the three verbs in every day speech. At the first stage, the long vowels \bar{u} and \bar{i} were shortened in unstressed positions, e.g. $yig\bar{u}l\bar{u}n > yigul\bar{u}n$, $*tirid\bar{u}n > tirid\bar{u}n$, $*tiruh\bar{u}n > tiruh\bar{u}n$ and thus became subject to falling out. Then, due

²² In the Cl. Ar. it actually consists in cutting off the prefix from the Jussive. In the dialect of Baghdad, as in other Arabic dialects, moods like Jussive or Subjunctive do not formally exist. However, a trace of the former Jussive can be seen in the sing. fem. and plur. masc. Imperative forms. It manifests itself in the absence of the consonant *n* in the Imperfect suffix, e.g. $kitb\bar{i}$, $kitb\bar{u}$ instead of $*kitb\bar{i}n$, $*kitb\bar{u}n \div$ Cl. Ar. $'uktub\bar{i}$, $'uktub\bar{u}$.

²³ Dawūd 'Abduh, *Abhāt fī al-luġa al-'arabiyya*, Bayrūt 1973, p. 143.

²⁴ Otto von Essen, *Fonetyka ogólna i stosowana*, Warszawa 1967, pp. 204-205.

Table 3

No.	Dialect of Baghdad	Classical Arabic
1.	<i>gilit</i> – I said <i>gitle // gilitle</i> – I told him <i>gittūlhum // giltūlhum</i> – you (fem. plur.) told them (masc. plur.) <i>gelle</i> – he told him <i>gelkum // gellilkum</i> – he told you (masc. plur.) <i>gellōlthe // galōlthe</i> – they (masc.) told her <i>yiglūn // yigulūn</i> – they (masc.) say <i>yigullek</i> – he tells you (masc.) <i>yigulhum // yigullilhum</i> – he tells them (masc.) <i>yiglūlhum // yigullūlhum // yigulūlhum</i> – they (masc.) tell them (masc.) <i>gūl</i> – say! (masc.) <i>gulle</i> – tell (masc.) him <i>gulhum // gullilhum // gūlilhum</i> – tell (masc.) them (masc.) <i>yiglen, tiglen</i> <i>yigūlen, tgūlen</i> – they (fem.) say, you (fem.) say	<i>qultu</i> <i>qultu lahu</i> <i>qultum lahum</i> <i>qāla lahu</i> <i>qāla lakum</i> <i>qālū lahā</i> <i>yaqūlūna</i> <i>yaqūlu laka</i> <i>yaqūlu lahum</i> <i>yaqūlūna lahum</i> <i>qul</i> <i>qul lahu</i> <i>qul lahum</i> <i>yaqulna, taqulna</i>
2.	<i>tirdūn</i> – you (masc. plur.) want <i>yirden, tirden</i> <i>yirīden, trīden</i> – they (fem.) want, you (fem.) want	<i>turīdūna</i> <i>yuridna, turidna</i>
3.	<i>tirḥīn // truḥīn</i> – you (fem.) go <i>yirḥen, tirḥen</i> <i>yirūḥen, trūḥen</i> – they (fem.) go <i>šīl</i> – carry, remove! (masc.) <i>nām</i> – sleep! (masc.)	<i>tarūḥīna</i> <i>yarūḥna, tarūḥna</i> <i>šīl</i> <i>nam</i>
4.	<i>nhān^vēt</i> <i>nhinit</i> – I was insulted	<i>'uhintu</i>
5.	<i>ḥtāḡ^vētu</i> <i>ḥtiḡtu</i> – you (masc. plur.) needed	<i>'iḥtaḡtum</i>
6.	<i>sti/erāḥ^vēt</i> <i>sti/erāḥit</i> – I took a rest	<i>'istarāḥtu</i>

to frequent usage, they finally fell out. Hence, *yigulūn* > *yiglūn*, **tirdūn* > *tirdūn*, **tiruḥīn* > *tirḥīn*. Then, by analogy, the change expanded to those conjugational forms in which the long vowel should remain stressed, and as such, preserved. So, beside the regular Imperfect forms of the 2nd and 3rd

pers. plur. fem., i.e.: *yigūlen*, *tgūlen*, *yirīden*, *trīden*, *yirūḥen*, *trūḥen*, there appeared parallel shortened variants, i.e.: *yiglen*, *tiglen*, *yirden*, *tirden*, *yirḥen*, *tirḥen*.

An interesting situation occurs when, by means of the preposition —l—²⁵, a suffixed pronoun is attached as an indirect object to the verb *gāl* // *yigūl*. What draws attention here is the reduction of the long vowel in a stressed position, e.g. *yigullek* instead of *yigūllek* or *gelle* instead of *gālle*. It seems that the change could have originated in the unsuffixed conjugational forms.²⁶

Enclitization of the preposition and one of the suffixed pronouns attached to it (1st and 2nd pers. or 3rd pers. sing. masc.), i.e. —lī, —lek, —lič, —le²⁷, could have played a decisive role.

Due to similarity between the consonant of the enclitic preposition and the final root consonant of the verb, the former was absorbed by the latter. At the same time, by analogy to VMG patterns, the quantity of the stem vowel was reduced. Hence, *yigullek*, *gulle* or *gelle* similarly to VMG patterns, e.g. *yigurrek*—“he pulls you” (masc.), *ḡurre*—“pull him”, *ḡarre*—“he pulled him”. Then, the modification expanded, comprising structures with the remaining suffixed pronouns, e.g. *yigulhum*, *gulhum*, *gelkum* by analogy to *yigurhum*—“he pulls them” (masc.), *ḡurhum*—“pull (masc.) them” (masc.), *ḡarkum*—“he pulled you” (masc. plur.). In this way the preposition became totally absorbed by the unsuffixed conjugational forms of the verb *gāl* which eventually assimilated to the VMG patterns.

This, in turn, released a defense mechanism of the language that resulted in the revival of the preposition in the above mentioned modified structures, i.e. *gāl* + enclitic. Therefore, apart from forms like *yigulhum*, *gulhum* or *gelkum*, there appeared variants like *yigullilhum*, *gullilhum* and *gellilkum*. Thus again, by analogy, the change expanded to the suffixed forms of both conjugations, e.g. *yigullulhum* beside *yiglūlhum* and rarely *yigulūlhum*, *gel-lōlhe* beside *galōlhe*.

The vocalism of the first root consonant in the 1st and 2nd pers. forms of the VMw/y has practically been unified. As a rule, it is the vowel *i*, e.g. *gilit* ÷ Cl. Ar. *qultu*, *činit* ÷ Cl. Ar. *kuntu*. The vowel *u* occurs irregularly,

²⁵ Before a consonant it becomes *'il*, e.g. *'il-Baḡdād* ÷ cl. Ar. *'ilā Baḡdād*, whereas before a vowel it is *li-*, e.g. *li-l-Baṣra* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'ilā 'l-Baṣra*.

²⁶ I.e.. *yigūl*, *tgūl*, *'agūl*, *gūl*, *gāl*.

²⁷ Due to reduction of vowel endings, older bisyllabic forms, i.e. *la-hu*, *la-ka*, *la-ki* became monosyllabic **la-h* > *la*, *lek*, **lik* > *lič*, thus losing their stress and merging into one accentual entity with the preceding verb.

mostly in the context of labial consonants, e.g. *gumit* ÷ Cl. Ar. *qumtu*, *ḥufit* beside *ḥifit* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ḥiftu*.

Table 4

No.	Dialect of Baghdad	Classical Arabic
1. a)	<i>liḡ^yēt</i> – I found	<i>laqītu</i>
b)	<i>yilgī</i> // <i>yilgā</i> – he finds	<i>yalqā</i>
2. a)	<i>ḥiĉ^yēt</i> – I told	<i>ḥakaytu</i>
b)	<i>yihĉī</i> – he tells	<i>yaḥkī</i>
3. a)	<i>di^yēt</i> – I invited	<i>da‘awtu</i>
b)	<i>yid‘ī</i> // <i>yid‘ū</i> – he invites	<i>yad‘ū</i>
4. a)	<i>niḡ^yētū</i> – you (masc.) survived	<i>naḡawtum</i>
b)	<i>yinḡe</i> // <i>yinḡū</i> – he survives	<i>yanḡū</i>
5. a)	<i>riḡ^yēt</i> – I asked	<i>raḡawtu</i>
b)	<i>yirḡū</i> // <i>yirḡī</i> – he asks	<i>yarḡū</i>

3. Verba ultimae w//y

The diphthong *ay*, on the other hand, has been replaced by the long vowel *ē* which is regularly preceded by a glide sound. Thus, it sounds like a raising diphthong *ye*, e.g. *b^yēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *bayt^{un}*—“a house”. One can presume that the reason that lay behind such an additional “diphthongization” in the dialect of Baghdad was to make a clear distinction between the new monophthong *ē* and the short vowel *e* being a facultative variant of the phoneme *a*, like in *bidet-he*—“she started it” ÷ *bid^yēt-he*—“I started it”.

The shift *ay* > *ē*(^y*ē*) expanded gradually to all the VUw//y Perfect forms, e.g. *giḡ^yēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *qaḏaytu*—“I spent”, *liḡ^yēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *laqītu*—“I found”. But before the process was accomplished, the VUw//y must have undergone a unification process on the basis of analogy. As a result, out of the two original VUy basic form Perfect stems, namely *C₁aC₂ā* and *C₁aC₂iya*, only the first one remained in use with slightly modified vowel order, i.e. *C₁VC₂ā*. Hence, the above mentioned *liḡ^yēt* instead of anticipated **liḡit*, or, for example, *buqā* ÷ Cl. Ar. *baqiya*—“he stayed”. In addition to that, nearly all the VUw changed to VUy, e.g. *yid‘ī* ÷ Cl. Ar. *yad‘ū*—“he invites”, *niḡ^yētū* ÷ Cl. Ar. *naḡawtum*—“you survived”²⁸.

²⁸ The verb *riā* maintained its original Imperfect form. However, sometimes it also is replaced by its derivative *traā*.

The 3rd pers. plur. fem. structure of the VUy Perfect conjugation, i.e. C_1VC_2en as in *ligen*—“they found” as well as the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. fem. of the VUy Imperfect conjugation, i.e. $yi//tiC_1C_2en$, as in *yi//tilgen*—“they//you find”, show some irregularity. Because, in view of the phonetic rules observed in the dialect of Baghdad, one could rather expect something like $*C_1VC_2ēn$ in the Perfect conjugation, i.e. $*ligyēn$ and $*ji//tiC_1C_2īn$ or $*ji//tiC_1C_2ēn$ in the Imperfect conjugation, i.e. $*ji//tilgīn$ or $*ji//tinsyēn$. Therefore, it seems to be quite probable that this time the factor of analogy played again its significant role. This means that VUy were partly subordinated to the strong verb conjugational patterns, i.e. $C_1VC_2C_3en$ for the Perfect and $yi//tiC_1VC_2C_3en$ for the Imperfect Tense, according to which the final syllable which contains the conjugational suffix should not be stressed.

Table 5

Person	Singular		Plural	
	Variant I	Variant II	Variant I	Variant II
3rd masc.	ǧā	'iǧe	ǧaw // ǧawwi	'iǧaw // 'iǧawwi
3rd fem.	ǧet // ǧetti	'iǧet // 'iǧetti	ǧen // ǧenni	'iǧen // 'iǧenni
2nd masc.	ǧyēt	'iǧyēt	ǧyētū	'iǧyētū
2nd fem.	ǧyētī	'iǧyētī	ǧyēten	'iǧyēten
1st	ǧyēt'i	ǧyēt	ǧyēnā	'iǧyēnā

The verb *ǧā // 'iǧe* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ǧā'a*—“to come” deserves special attention—not only for the changes it has undergone, but also because of its structural differentiation. The latter feature is illustrated in Table 5, which contains the full Perfect conjugation of the verb with all possible variants.

The basic difference, as compared with the classical Arabic forms, consists here in the disappearance of hamza₃. As a result of this change, the above verb assumed a non-typical shape of a bi-radical VUy and adjusted itself to adequate conjugational schemes. As shown in Table 5 the process was accompanied by the following additional modifications:

a) Appearance of hamza in the onset of the Perfect forms, followed by the short vowel *i* (as in the variant II),

b) Additional variants of the 3rd pers. sing. fem. and 3rd pers. plur. with doubled consonants of the conjugational endings followed by the short vowel *i*.

c) Shifting of the stress to the first syllable in the unsuffixed Imperfect conjugational forms, e.g. *yiǧī, niǧī* ÷ Cl. Ar. *yaǧī'u, naǧī'u*.

Disappearance of hamza₃ in the Perfect conjugation of the verb *ǧā'a* resulted in short monosyllabic conjugational forms CV or CVC, e.g. *ǧā* and *ǧet*. Since the morphological system of the dialect of Baghdad does not tolerate monosyllabic forms as meaningful words, they were supplemented with an additional prothetic syllable²⁹.

Two tendencies were followed here: extension of the word stem (item 'a') or extension of the word ending (item 'b').

Then, by analogy, the process spread also to those forms which meet the requirements of accentuation and does not need such modifications, e.g.: *'iǧyēt* or *'iǧyēna*. In some cases, the two tendencies overlapped, e.g. *'iǧetti* alongside *'iǧet* and *ǧetti*.

The diphthongs *aw* and *ay* in the spoken language of Baghdad, like in many other Arabic dialects, have undergone contraction. The long vowels *ō* and *ē/ē* that are the products of that contraction became, in the dialect of Baghdad, phonologically relevant, e.g. *dōrī*—"my turn" ÷ *dūrī*—"turn around!" (sing. fem.) ÷ *dawrī*—cyclic; *d'ēn*—"debt" ÷ *dīn*—"religion"; *b'ētī*—"my home" ÷ *beytī*—"domestic".

Monophthongization *aw* > *ō* and *ay* > *ē* is not, of course, an exclusive Arabic feature. It is an all-Semitic process. One cannot even rule out that its occurrence in the Arabic dialects was influenced by the neighboring western Semitic languages like Aramaic, in which the process took place much earlier³⁰. Also the above described "secondary diphthongization" *ē* > *yē* is not a characteristic of the dialect spoken in Baghdad. The same phenomenon can be found in the classical Ethiopian language³¹.

In some individual cases *w*₂ and *y*₂ can be retained, e.g. *'uwaǧ* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'awiǧa*—"to be crooked", *stehyef*—"to regret". Sometimes the forms with the retained C2=*w/y* and without it are used as parallel variants. There are, however, cases in which these parallel forms have been semantically differentiated, e.g. *sterwah*—"to go smelly" ÷ *sterāh*—"to take a rest".

In the 1st and 2nd pers. of some Perfect VM*w/y* derivatives, namely *nfa'al*, *fta'al* and *staf'al*, there developed forms in which the long vowel of the stem was retained and at the same time the Perfect ending was diphthongized, e.g. *nhān yēt* beside *nhinit*—"I was offended", *htāǧyēt* beside *htīǧit*—"I needed" and *sti/erāhyēt* beside *sti/erāhit*—"I took a rest".

²⁹ The dialect of Baghdad favours CVC or CVCC as monosyllabic stressed words. Hence, for example, *'ebb* ÷ cl. Ar. *'ab^{um}*—"father" *'ahh* ÷ cl. Ar. *'ah^{um}*—"brother", *dem* ÷ cl. Ar. *dam^{um}*—"blood".

³⁰ Moscati S., *Wykłady z językoznawstwa semickiego*, Warszawa 1968, p. 87.

³¹ Brzuski W. K., *Gramatyka języka gyyz*, Warszawa 1972, p. 19.

It seems that the reason of it is a tendency towards unification of the conjugational paradigm according to the scheme: regular stem + affix. This tendency is stimulated by the similarity of some verbal stem syllabic structures. Verbs like *ḥteġġ* and *ḥtāġ* or *ste'add* and *ste'ād*, although derived from different roots, share one structural feature: all of them end with a hyper long syllable. The fact that in one case it is CVCC and in the other CVC does not make any difference because both types of syllables are functionally equivalent.

As for the VP_y, they are practically absent in the spoken Arabic of Baghdad. There are, indeed, some isolated instances still in use like *yibes* ÷ Cl. Ar. *yabisa*—“to wither” or *yi'es* ÷ Cl. Ar. *ya'isa*—“to be in despair”, but their usage is very infrequent. Moreover, they are regularly replaced by other derivatives, namely *tyebbes* and *'eyyes*.

The VP_w in the dialect of Baghdad, unlike their counterparts in classical Arabic, retain the weak consonant in the *nfa'al* derivative form, e.g. *nwiled* ÷ Cl. Ar. *wulida*—“to be born”. Most probably, the reason is that the *nfa'al* pattern has taken over the function of the apophonic passive voice which has nearly completely vanished from the spoken language.

Table 6

No.	Dialect of Baghdad	Classical Arabic
1. a)	<i>šedd</i> – he fastened	<i>šadda</i>
b)	<i>šedd^yēt</i> – I fastened	<i>šadadtu</i>
2.	<i>qāṣaṣ</i> – he punished	<i>qāṣa</i>
3.	<i>tqāṣaṣ</i> – he was punished	<i>taqāṣa</i>
4. a)	<i>nġešš</i> – he was cheated	<i>'inġašša</i>
b)	<i>nġešš^yētū</i> – you (masc.) were cheated	<i>'inġašaštum</i>
5. a)	<i>ḍṭarr</i> – he was compelled	<i>'uḍturra</i>
b)	<i>ḍṭarr^yēt</i> // <i>ḍṭarrēt</i> – I was compelled	<i>'uḍturirtu</i>
6. a)	<i>stiġell</i> – he made use of	<i>'istaġalla</i>
b)	<i>stiġell^yēt</i> – I made use of	<i>'istaġaltu</i>

III. *Verba mediae geminatae* (Verbs of which the second and third radicals are identical)

In the 1st and 2nd pers. of the VMG Perfect conjugation the root consonants C₂=C₃ are not separated as it is the case in the classical Arabic. Instead, the Perfect suffix is preceded with the diphthongized long vowel *yē*,

e.g. *šedd^yēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *šadadtu*, *nġešš^yētū* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'inġašaštum*, *qtarrēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'uḏturirtu*, *stiġel^yēt* ÷ Cl. Ar. *'istaġlaltu*. This change could have originated as a result of dissimilation. It is well known that one of the characteristic features of the dialect of Tamīm was the replacing of $C_3=C_2$ with *y* in suffixes that begin with consonants, e.g. *qašayt* instead of *qašašt*, - “I have cut”, *'amlayt* instead of *'amlalt*—“I vexed”, or *taḏannayt* instead of *taḏannant*—“I surmised”³². Similar instances of dissimilation are reported also in the dialects of Hijaz, famous for the regular separation of $C_2=C_3$, e.g. *ġalā*, *yaġlū*—“to be exalted” instead of *ġalla*, *yaġillu*, like in Tamīm. In later sources, forms with non-separated $C_2=C_3$ and an additional diphthong preceding the suffix can be found, e.g. *maddayt* < **madadt(u)*.

The VMG derivatives formed according to the *fā'al* and *tfā'al* patterns are, in the dialect of Baghdad, consistent with the strong tri-radical verb structure, i.e. $C_1\bar{a}C_2aC_3$, as in *qāšaṣ* ÷ Cl. Ar. *qāšša* and $tC_1\bar{a}C_2aC_3$, as in *tqāšaṣ* ÷ Cl. Ar. *taqāšša*.

To sum up, the changes that in the dialect of Baghdad affected the weak verbs as well as the verbs of which the second and third root consonants are identical, can be divided into the following types:

- a) Reduction and elision of the long vowel in VMw//y;
- b) Reduction of the stem vowel and modification of the verb structure in the enclitic phrase of *gāl* + —*l*— + suffixed pronoun;
- c) Monophthongization *aw* > *ō*;
- d) Monophthongization *ay* > *ē*//*yē*;
- e) Monophthongization *aw* > *ā*;
- f) Unification of the VMw//y Perfect forms and disappearance of VUw;
- g) Partial assimilation of the VMw//y Perfect conjugational forms of the derivatives based on the patterns *nfa'al*, *fta'al* and *staf'al* to adequate VUy forms;
- h) Partial assimilation of the VMG Perfect conjugational forms of the basic stems as well as derivatives based on the patterns *nfa'al*, *fta'al* and *staf'al* to adequate VUy forms;
- i) Assimilation of the VMG *fā'al* and *tfā'al* patterns to the strong verb stems.

³² Lebedew W. W., *Pozdnyj sredenearabskiy yazyk (XIII-XVIII ww.)*, Moscow 1977, pp. 46-47; Al-Maṭlabī, op.cit., pp. 116-118; 'Abd at-Tawwāb, *At-Taṭawwur al-luġawī...*, Al-Qāhira 1981, pp. 37-46.

Abbreviations

Cl. Ar.—Classical Arabic
masc.—masculine
fem.—feminine
plur.—plural
sing.—singular
VMG—verba mediae geminatae
VMH—verba mediae hamzatae
VMw//y—verba mediae w//y
VMw—verba mediae w
VMy—verba mediae y
VPH—verba primae hamzatae
VPw—verba primae w
VPy—verba primae y
VUH—verba ultimae hamzatae
VUw—verba ultimea w
VUy—verba ultimae y
V—short vowel
V̄—long vowel
C—consonant

References

- ‘Abbās Ḥasan, *An-Naḥw al-wāfi*, Al-Qāhira 1975.
- ‘Abd at-Tawwāb, *At-Taṭawwur al-luḡawī...*, Al-Qāhira 1981.
- Al-Dališī, *Al-‘Amṭāl aš-ša‘biyya fi al-Baṣra*, Baḡdād, vol. i—1968, vol. ii—1972.
- Al-Bakrī, *Dirāsāt fi al-‘alfāq al-‘ammiyya al-mawṣiliyya*, Baḡdād 1972.
- Al-Ḥanafī, *Mu‘ḡam al-luḡa al-‘ammiyya al-baḡdādiyya*, Baḡdād, vol. i—1972, vol. ii—1982.
- Al-Maṭlabī, *Lahḡat Tamīm wa-‘ātāru-hā fi al-‘arabiyya al-muwaḥḥada*, Baḡdād 1978.
- Anīs Frayha, *Mu‘ḡam al-‘alfāq al-‘ammiyya*, Bayrūt 1973.
- Blanc H., *The Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins*, Jerusalem 1970.
- Brzuski W. K., *Gramatyka języka gyyz*, Warszawa 1972
- Cleveland R. L., *A Classification for the Arabic Dialects of Jordan*, BASOR 171 / 1963, pp. 56-63.
- Czapkiewicz A., *The Verbs with Hamza as First or Third Radical in Modern Arabic Dialects*, “Folia Orientalia”, vol. XVIII, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1977.
- Czapkiewicz A., *The Verb in Modern Arabic Dialects as an Exponent of the Development Processes Occurring in Them*, Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej 11, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1975.
- Essen O. von, *Fonetyka ogólna i stosowana*, Warszawa 1967.
- Ibn Maṇḍūr, *Lisān al-‘Arab al-muḥīt*, ed. Yūsuf Ḥayyāt, Bayrūt, n.d.
- Ibrāhīm Anīs, *Al-‘Aṣwāt al-luḡawiyya*, Al-Qāhira 1975.
- Ibrāhīm Anīs, *Fī al-lahḡāt al-‘arabiyya*, Al-Qāhira 1973.
- Kaye A. S., *Chadian and Sudanese Arabic in the Light of Comparative Arabic Dialectology*, Hague-Paris 1976.
- Lebedew W. W., *Pozdnyy srednearabskiy yazyk (XIII-XVIII ww.)*, Moscow 1977.
- McCarthy R. J., Raffouli F., *The Spoken Arabic of Baghdad*, Bayrūt 1964.
- Moscato S., *Wykłady z językoznawstwa semickiego*, Warszawa 1968.
- Penrice J., *A Dictionary and Glossary of the Kor-an*, Bayrūt, n.d.
- Salonen E., *On the Arabic Dialect Spoken in Sirqut (Assur)*, Helsinki 1980.
- Segert S., *Altaramaische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*, Leipzig 1980.
- Sībawayhi, *Al-Kitāb*, ed. ‘Abd as-Salām Muḥammad Ḥārūn, Bayrūt 1975, vol. i-iv.
- Tafsīr al-Ġalālayn*, Bayrūt, n.d.

Trubiecki N. S., *Podstawy fonologii*, Warszawa 1970.

Tyloch J. W., *Gramatyka języka hebrajskiego*, Warszawa 1980.

Vollers K., *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, Strassburg 1906.

Wright W., *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Bayrūt 1974.

Zaborski A., *Biconsonantal Verbal Roots in Semitic*, "Zeszyty Naukowe UJ" 35, Kraków 1971.