

# THE TERM *MUDĀRĪ* IN THE *KITĀB* OF SĪBWAYHI

M. G. Carter

Oslo University

0.1. In this paper I shall look at Sībawayhi's use of the concept of "resemblance" in the *Kitāb* as expressed by the term *mudāra'a* and its verbal cognates. I shall refer to a number of examples in the Table attached, and will discuss briefly the place of *mudāra'a* in the system as a whole, concluding with some remarks on the survival of the term in later grammar and my own speculations as to why it virtually disappeared, except in the well-known sense of "imperfect verb"<sup>1</sup>.

0.2. You will, I hope, be surprised and intrigued by the extent of Sībawayhi's use of *mudāra'a* in the *Kitāb*, which obliges us to take it seriously as a technical term. We can all be grateful to Gérard Troupeau for his *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi* (1976), which has certainly made the preparation of this paper much easier, but at the same time it is necessary to point out that his *Index* only differentiates between two usages of *mudāra'a*, the general but unexplained notion of "resemblance" and the specifically phonological sense of "assimilation" (to which I return later); one would not deduce from Troupeau that the term *mudārī* frequently denotes the imperfect verb *per se*, sometimes absolutely as *al-mudārī* (e.g. Derenbourg I. 3, line 2/Būlāq 4, line 10), but frequently also with explanatory qualifications, which I list in ascending order of length: *al-fi'l al-mudārī* (e.g. I. 78, 9/94, 10), *al-af'āl al-mudārī'a li-l-asmā'* (e.g. I. 363, 11/409, 5) and finally the complete formulation *al-af'āl al-mudārī'a li-asmā' al-fā'ilīn* (e.g. II. 476, 9/426, 5). It goes without saying that when used alone in this sense, the single word *al-mudārī* is always to be taken as a mere shorthand for the full concept, rather as Sībawayhi's term *mawḍī'* always stands for *mawḍī' fi l-kalām*.

1.1. But, as the Table is intended to show, Sībawayhi identified a "resemblance", *mudāra'a*, between many kinds of elements at all levels of analysis, phonological, morphological and syntactical. The Table provides only minimal evidence of the thirty grammatical categories in which *mudāra'a* is involved (a more detailed subclassification might make this arbitrary total even larger). References are to the Hartwig Derenbourg and Būlāq editions respectively, and the line numbers indicate the place where *dāra'a* occurs, not necessarily where the linguistic topic is fully treated. For the sake of consistency *dāra'a* and its derivatives are always translated as "resemble".

---

<sup>1</sup> The traditional term "imperfect verb" is used merely for convenience, the question of its accuracy being of no consequence for this paper.

1.2. Apart from the *locus classicus* of the imperfect verb (no. 13), the Table shows that for Sībawayhi a “resemblance” of one sort or another accounts for the syntax of the agent noun (no. 1), the quasi-participial adjective in annexation (no. 2), adjectival phrases of the type *abū ‘ašratin* (no. 3), and some peculiarities of relative and adjectival phrases (nos. 4, 5). Item 6 shows how some adjectival phrases may take a *damīr al-faṣl* when they are predicates because they resemble proper nouns. The rules for corroboration with *nafs* depend on resemblance in no. 7, and resemblance also justifies the fact that interjections such as *‘alayka* sometimes behave like verbal nouns (n. 8). What may seem a rather forced resemblance explains why only *an* (and not *li-an*) appears after what was in later grammar termed the *lām al-ḡuḥūd* (no. 9). Perhaps the most interesting set of examples is in nos. 10, 11 and 12, where a general resemblance between conditionals and non-assertive sentences (i.e. negatives, interrogatives and imperatives) is invoked by Sībawayhi rather frequently. There is a large scale pragmatic theory here which obviously still needs to be explored.

1.3. In morphology the most conspicuous example of the effects of “resemblance” is the feature of partial inflection (nos. 14, 15, 16) which extends to cover also the complete absence of inflection (nos. 17, 18, 19). But note also that “resemblance” explains the distribution of one and two-letter words (no. 20), the selection and behaviour of certain plural patterns (nos. 21, 22), and the incomplete paradigm of *laysa* (no. 24). Exactly what is in Sībawayhi’s mind in no. 23 is not entirely obvious: the form *umayyī* (orthographically *umayyiyy*, with four *yā’s*) is reluctantly and perhaps only theoretically conceded as acceptable alongside the more familiar *umawī*, which is said to be the *qiyās* “regular form” (II. 70, 12f/74, 20), so it may be that Sībawayhi is here implicitly rejecting the hypothetical *\*siqāyī*, where the *alif* counts as one weak consonant in a cluster of four weak consonants (scil. *siqa’yiyy*), hence it is to be dismissed on the same grounds as *umayyī*.

1.4. At the phonological level there are four straightforward consequences of resemblance: the behaviour of the weak verbal radicals in the *maṣdar* (no. 25)<sup>2</sup>, the prevention of *imāla* (no. 26), the elision of the *hamza* in *aymun* (no. 27) and the reciprocal resemblance of *hamzat al-waṣl* and *hamzat al-qat‘* (no. 28), to which I shall return shortly. Item no. 29 includes several kinds of assimilation, of which part (d) deserves a separate treatment, since it implies a different kind of resemblance from all the other cases, and that too, I will discuss shortly. Finally there is the odd item

<sup>2</sup> In a very perceptive comment from the floor Dr. Aḥmed ‘Omar Muḥtār pointed out that this topic should have been placed among the morphological items. Indeed it would have been just as appropriate (and that is in fact where I had originally put it), but I preferred in the end to emphasize the phonological aspects: a “weak” verb such as *wasala/yaṣilu* also has a weak *maṣdar*, namely *ṣila*. It is a true borderline case.

which accounts for the masculine gender of the verb in the metalanguage on the grounds that it resembles the agent noun pattern (no. 30).<sup>3</sup>

2.1. In looking now at the general use of the term, the first and obvious point to be made is that *mudāra'a* "resemblance" is only one of a cluster of terms all referring to similarity or comparison. It is quite beyond the scope of this paper to try to unravel the relationship between *mudāra'a* and the terms *qiyās*, *qāsa*, *šabbaha*, *ašbaha*, *nazīr*, *ḡarā maḡrā/aḡrā muḡrā*, *mitla* and *ka-*, not to mention *ah/uh/ahawāt*, which Troupeau declares to be synonyms of *nazīr*. One is not much helped in this by Jahn's translation, which tends to reproduce them somewhat indiscriminately by the word *ähnlich* (a good example in I. 112 = *Kitāb* I. 73/87: "das Partizip wird nur ähnlich derjenigen Verbalform behandelt (*šubbiha*), welche ihm ähnlich ist (*dāra'ahu*)!". But to be fair the later Arab grammarians seem to have solved the problem in much the same way: one has the impression that *dāra'a* is often replaced by *šabbaha* (which term, curiously, is used only once by Sībawayhi, II. 314, 17/288, 2: Troupeau obligingly, but without much authority, glosses it as *mudāra'a*).

2.2. We must, however, assume that these terms could not all have been synonymous. Perhaps *nazīr* may be disposed of rather quickly: from the collocation of *nazīr* and *dāra'a* (which occurs more than once) we can deduce that *nazīr* refers to an equivalent and symmetrical item of data while *dāra'a* refers to a process or state of resembling. This is presumably what Sībawayhi means when he says that the plural *bathāwāt* occurs when it is used as a noun "just as they say *šahrāwāt*, and the equivalent (*nazīr*) of that is the plural *abāṭih* which resembles (*dāra'a*) a noun" (II. 222, 14f/213, 3f). Likewise the obliqueness of nouns and the apocopation of verbs are symmetrical, *nazīr*, to the extent that each of them is unique to its own word class (4, 13/5, 15).

2.3. It is also possible to separate the concepts of *qiyās* and *mudāra'a* by interpreting *qiyās* as a systematic term and *mudāra'a* as a descriptive term, by which I mean that while *mudāra'a* refers to empirical resemblances in the data, *qiyās* and its verb denote abstract regularities in the system, principles of analogy which may be used to extend existing patterns. It is illuminating that *qāsa* overlaps very much with *šabbaha*, i.e. to treat as similar, while *dāra'a* often appears in the same contexts as its synonym *ašbaha*, to be similar.

2.4. One significant clue to the difference between *dāra'a* and derivatives of *š-b-h* is found in the striking terminological parallelism between *fīl mudāri' (li-smi l-fā'il)* and *šifa mušabbaha (bi-smi l-fā'il)*. Here both items are compared to the *fā'il*, but in

<sup>3</sup> There is an implicit distinction here between the masculine gender of words referred to as a class in the metalanguage and the gender of words referred to as individual items, which is usually feminine because they are thought of as a "*kalima*". This subtlety is well worth exploring further.

the case of the imperfect verb we have to understand the active participle *mudāriʿ* as implying that the verb inherently resembles the agent while with the quasi-participial adjective the passive *mušabbab* makes it equally clear that the similarity has been imposed on the word by speakers. This is in keeping with what has already been said about *mudāraʿa* being a descriptive term and *šabbaha*, like *qāsa*, a process term.

2.5. The nexus of terms for similarity includes, of course, *miṭla* and *ka-*, expressing the fundamental assumption of the *Kitāb* that language operates on the basis of similarities. However, the picture is not as simple as it seems, for Sībawayhi surprises us by telling us that *ka-*, normally translated innocently enough as “like, as” does not mean the same as *mudāriʿ*! The Arabs treat negative particles the same as interrogatives, imperatives and prohibitives (*uḡriyat muḡrā[hā]*, *šabbahūhā*), he says, because they are all non-assertive. However, “they are not the same as interrogative and conditional particles, they merely resemble them, *laysat ka-ḥurūfi l-istifhāmi wa-l-ḡazāʿi, innamā hiya mudāriʿatun labā*” (I. 61, 11ff/72, 16ff: the difference is that negative particles deny the occurrence of the event while the others simply fail to assert it). This makes it clear that, in the *Kitāb*, at least, *ka-* should perhaps always be understood as meaning “identical, the same as”. Whether this holds true for *miṭla* remains to be established: one would certainly look for inspiration in the Qurʾān commentaries on *laysa ka-miṭlihi šayʿun* (Sūra 42:11, though Sībawayhi himself has nothing to say on the matter).

2.6. This is not the time to attempt a complete analysis of all these closely related terms. We should, however, proceed on the assumption that Sībawayhi was far too good a linguist to use them haphazardly, and that there is indeed a substantial technical difference between them all, considerably more subtle than the elementary distinctions outlined above. There is also the possibility that some apparent synonyms might represent inputs or survivals from differing sources. If *nazīr* and the *ah/uh/ahawāt* group do indeed mean the same, as Troupeau states, they may be seen as representatives of two alternative concepts of linguistic relationships, much in the same way that the pair *isnād/ibtidāʿ* might be explained as a doublet from two different sources, and perhaps even *wasf* and *naʿt*, though these eventually did acquire a independent technical meaning.

3.1. By far the most fascinating aspect of resemblance, however, is that it sometimes operates in two directions: the linguistic behaviour of element A is determined by its resemblance to element B and that of B by its resemblance to A. Thus the imperfect verb resembles the agent noun (no. 13) and the agent noun resembles the imperfect verb (no. 1); conditionals resemble interrogatives and interrogatives resemble conditionals (no. 10); *hamzat al-waṣl* resembles *hamzat al-qaṭʿ* and vice versa (no. 28). Occasionally the reciprocity is implicit, though none the less circular for that: indeclinable nouns that end in *sukūn* resemble verbs, but verbs end in *sukūn* precisely because they do not resemble nouns! (cf. nos. 17, 18)

3.2. In addition to these unmistakably circular relationships, there are a number of chains of resemblance which, to maintain the metaphor, we should perhaps call spiral resemblances. The behaviour of the semi-declinable nouns is determined by their resemblance to verbs which in turn resemble fully declinable nouns (nos. 14, 13); conditional particles resemble the agent nouns in their syntactic flexibility but the flexibility of agent nouns comes from their resemblance to verbs (nos. 12, 1); phrases such as *‘alayka* resemble *maṣḍars* but the ability of a *maṣḍar* to take a free object pronoun derives from its similarity to the imperfect verb (no. 8; note that the similarity of the *maṣḍar* to the verb is this time expressed through *ḡarā maḡrā* not *dāra‘a*, I. 79, 15ff/97, 1ff).

3.3. We can even construct a spiral which appears to end in a circle: the syntax of epithets such as *abū ‘ašratin* (no. 3) is based on their resemblance to the quasi-participial adjectives, which resemble the agent nouns (no. 2), which resemble the imperfect verb (no. 1), whose inflections are due to its resemblance to the agent noun in the first place (no. 13)!

3.4. The obvious image for this situation is the Möbius strip, a continuous surface on which one moves from one face to the other without leaving the circle. It should come as no surprise to us to find that Sībawayhi is well aware of the apparent circularity of *mudāra‘a*. As he puts it when discussing the resemblance between the imperfect verb and the agent noun: “each one goes inside the other”, *kullu wāḥidin minhumā dāḥilun ‘alā šāḥibih* (73, 9/87, 5), perhaps more technically to be translated as “each one belongs to the other one’s set”. Ibn Ğinnī also noticed this paradox when discussing the way Sībawayhi explained *al-ḥasanu waḡḥan* by its resemblance to *dāribun raḡulan* and conversely *aḍ-ḍāribu l-raḡuli* by its resemblance to *ḥasanu l-waḡḥi* (cf. Table nos. 1, 2). He justifies Sībawayhi’s reasoning by saying, “when the Arabs make a similarity between two things (*šabbabat šay‘an bi-šay‘in*), they fix that similarity firmly in their minds and build up the relation between the two: do you not see how, having made the imperfect verb (*al-fi‘l al-mudāri‘*) similar to the noun and given it inflections, they complete that concept (of similarity) between the two by making the agent noun similar to the verb and giving it (verbal) operation?” (Ibn Ğinnī, *Ḥašā‘iṣ* I, 304)<sup>4</sup>

3.5. By Ibn Ğinnī’s time it was impossible to see this as anything but a violation of the hierarchy of *aṣl* and *far‘*, hence the need to defend Sībawayhi against charges of inconsistency: as is well known, the old Baṣran v. Kūfan debate about the priority

<sup>4</sup> The translation is deliberately literal: more precise renderings such as “assimilate” for *šabbaba* carry too many distracting associations.

of inflections was finally resolved by the axiom that nominal inflection was primary, *asl*, and verbal inflection merely secondary, *farʿ*, in an irreversible order.<sup>5</sup>

4.1. In the subsequent history of Arabic grammar the term *dāraʿa* has tended to drop out of the vocabulary, and seems (at least impressionistically) to have been largely replaced by *šabah* and its cognates. Sometimes the survival of the term can be explained as merely the reflection of the author's close dependence on Sībawayhi (e.g. al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāğ), other times perhaps it is not even thought of as a technical term at all, e.g. when Ibn Yaʿīš says that the elision of the *tanwīn* under certain conditions is possible because "it resembles the semi-vowels *w/y* because of its nasality" (Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*: IX. 37 [= *Mufaṣṣal* § 609, end]). As one might expect, with al-Farrāʾ we may have an interesting exception: the seven times he explicitly uses the concept of *mudāraʿa* in the *Maʿānī l-Qurʾān* (which we know thanks to Kinberg's superb *Lexicon*)<sup>6</sup>, reveal a general similarity to Sībawayhi in usage, but only a very slight overlap in the actual cases dealt with by both authors, which suggests that there is still much work to be done on this early phase.

4.2. There are only three prominent survivals of the Sībawayhian terminology, the outstanding one being the imperfect verb, exhibiting what al-Zağğāğī calls *al-mudāraʿa l-mašbūra* "the well-known resemblance", as Versteegh translates it<sup>7</sup>. It is not important to follow the history of this term much further, except to point out that for Ibn as-Sarrāğ it was obviously so familiar as a technical term that he saw no incongruity in using it twice in the same sentence in different meanings, in combinations such as "resembling the imperfect verb" *mudāriʿ li-l-mudāriʿ*<sup>8</sup>, an uncomfortable juxtaposition which Sībawayhi seems consciously to avoid by saying in the same context *dāraʿa l-fiʿl al-mudāriʿ*, e.g. I. 5, 11/6, 12.

4.3. Secondly we note that an expanded vocative of the type *yā ṭālīʿan ḡabalan* has attracted the name *al-mudāriʿ li-l-mudāf* because the two elements are in an operating relationship with each other which resembles *idāfa*. What is most interesting about this is that Sībawayhi does not use the term himself when discussing this very issue, which he treats, with al-Ḥalīl's manifest help, as case of a long compound word (*mamṭūl*) in which the second element structurally completes the first (I. 282f/324f);

<sup>5</sup> See Versteegh 1995: esp. chs. IV and X on the logical priority of parts of speech generally and of nouns over verbs in particular.

<sup>6</sup> al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, now exhaustively indexed by Kinberg 1996. The verb *dāraʿa* is found in I. 175, 8; 409, 7-8; 414, 15; II. 48, 9; III. 6, 5, with a further reference to I. 265, 12 (although not involving *dāraʿa*), and *mudāriʿ* is used in II. 105, 5 and III. 191, 13.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Versteegh 1977: 78, 1995: 129, 143. both from al-Zağğāğī *Idāḥ*: 86.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn as-Sarrāğ, *Uṣūl*: II. 145. It is also true that Ibn al-Sarrāğ uses the expression *dāraʿa l-fiʿl al-mudāriʿ* here too, but that is beside the point.

nor is it found in al-Mubarrad (*Muqṭadab* IV, 224-6). The earliest occurrence may be as early as Ibn as-Sarrāġ (d. 316/929), who uses it both for the vocative and for the categorical negative in similar circumstances (*Uṣūl* I. 328, 344, 390). It looks as if Ibn as-Sarrāġ may have made a creative innovation of his own and, by using it in his elementary pedagogical grammar, wanted it to gain acceptance as a technical term (*Mūġaz*, 45, 47). It is well established in the later grammars, e.g. al-Zamah<sub>š</sub>arī, *Mufaṣṣal* § 48 (*Mufaṣṣal* 18-9), whence it finds its way into Howell and Reckendorf, though, surprisingly, not Wright.

4.4. The other survival is rather more problematical, since it seems to have a specific and self-contained phonological application and, moreover, refers to a process applied to the language by the speakers in contrast with the commonest (though not exclusive) meaning of a perceived empirical similarity between elements. It is used transitively with *bi-* and denotes what might be called partial assimilation, e.g. of [ṣ] to [z] in the context of voiced consonants, thus *mazdar* for *maṣdar* etc. To be sure, the concept of a speaker "making something (phonologically) resemble something else" is well within the general principle that languages operate on the basis of internal similarities as implied by *mudāraʿa* elsewhere in the *Kitāb*, but it is very tempting to look at the purely phonological application as a survival from the vocabulary of an earlier stage of phonetics, rather in the way that other phonetic terminology existed outside the *Kitāb* (Fischer 1985: 194-203). In support of that is the lexical fact that *dāraʿa bi-* is simply not the same word as *dāraʿa* and should not be treated as such. It certainly gave problems to later grammarians<sup>9</sup>, but it does survive in Ibn Ğinnī, for example, though Bakalla omits to identify it as a technical term (Bakalla 1982: 83). In any case Ibn Ğinnī seems to have preferred the more transparent synonym *qarraba* which Sībawayhi also uses in the same context.

5.1. We can sum up by observing that the term *mudāriʿ* almost disappeared, and survived only in a much narrower meaning than it had in Sībawayhi, rather as happened to the term *sabab* and the theoretical principles it represented (Carter 1985: 53-66). Although *mudāriʿ* continued to be used in the three senses described above, it lost the broader implications of its important role in Sībawayhi's general theory of linguistic analogy. That, of course, is a topic which is worth its own investigation: one would have to examine very carefully the different terms for similarity, and one would expect to find interesting parallels with the theory of *qiyās* in legal reasoning. It is not always clear in Sībawayhi whether the analogies he describes are inherent in the structure of the language or imposed on it by the speakers, or indeed whether

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Ibn Yaʿīš, quoted in Jahn's notes to *Kitāb* § 569, referring to his own edition of Ibn Yaʿīš 1392 (= X. 52f in Cairo n.d.): note that Jahn correctly translates it here *angeäbnelt*, to express the fact that it is done by the speaker.

the distinction needs to be made at all, but these are exactly the questions which could not be asked until the legal and theological systems had evolved far enough to be able to frame them: I need only mention Ibn Jinnī's fascinating explorations in this area.

5.2. The paper will end by speculating that it is precisely the bidirectionality of *mudāriʿ* which accounts for the term's disappearance from nearly all grammatical contexts except that of the imperfect verb: subsequent developments in the theory of *qiyās* required a specific *aṣl* from which the *furūʿ* could be correctly derived, and *mudāraʿa* was simply too ambiguous to be accommodated in that system. Another way to put it is that the system itself changed and Sībawayhi's ideas were abandoned: we can note that Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 577/1181) in his *Lumaʿ* (esp. ch. 22.) does not even consider the possibility that resemblances between elements can be reciprocal, because for him there can be no exception to the hierarchical order of *aṣl* and *farʿ*.

## TABLE

### 1. Syntactical

- (1) When the agent noun resembles the imperfect verb it keeps its *tanwīn* and is followed by the *naṣb*, e.g. *hādā dārībun zaydan* (I. 73, 9/87, 6)
- (2) Adjectives resemble agent nouns, and so may agree with their antecedent although they refer to the following noun, e.g. *marartu bi-rağūlin ḥasanin abūhu* (I. 200, 10/233, 15)
- (3) The concord of *marartu bi-rağūlin abī ʿaṣratin abūhu* is based on its resemblance to *marartu bi-rağūlin ḥasanin abūhu* (I. 200, 20/234, 7)
- (4) Adjectives resemble nouns in that they can be qualified, thus *sīra ʿalayhi tawīlun min al-dabr*, like *sīra ʿalayhi sayrun ḥasanun* (I. 96, 19/117, 4)
- (5) In phrases of the type *mālun aṣābū* the relative clause resembles an adjectival complement (which already contains a pronoun), so the referential pronoun may be omitted (I. 34, 11/45, 4)
- (6) *Ḥayrun minka*, *miṭluka* etc. resemble proper names and so are definite enough to be separated from their subjects by the *damīr al-faṣl*, (e.g. *zaydun huwa ḥayrun minka*) (I. 348, 2, 3, 5/395, 14, 16 bis)
- (7) *Nafs* can corroborate oblique pronouns because they resemble the dependent pronoun suffix, i.e. *marartu bika nafsika*, like *raʿaytuka nafsaka* (I. 344, 1/391, 13)
- (8) A free pronoun may occur with expressions such as *ʿalayka iyyāhu* because these resemble (verbal) nouns (I. 334, 14/382, 16)
- (9) The particle *an* is elided after negative *kāna* to make it resemble other cases where only one particle (scil. *sa-*) is used before the verb (I. 362, 25/408, 18)

- (10) (a) Non-assertive sentences resemble conditionals, so interrogatives may be followed by inversion, e.g. *kaḥfa zaydan ra'ayta* (I. 40, 16/51, 14)
- (b) Conditionals resemble interrogatives, and so may have an apodosis with *wa-* or *fa-* and dependent verb (a poetic licence, I. 398, 24/448, 22)
- (11) When the conditionals *man* etc. meaning "whoever, whatever" resemble the assertives *inna* and *kāna*, their verbs remain independent, e.g. *a-tadkuru man ya'tīna na'tībi* (I. 391, 14/440, 16)
- (12) Because conditional particles resemble the agent noun in their syntactic flexibility (*taṣarruf*), they may be separated from their verbs in poetry, e.g. *wa-in ma'mūrubā ḥariba* just as in *daribun 'abdallāhi* the agent noun is separated from its object by *tanwīn* (I. 406, 18/457, 15)

## 2. Morphological

- (13) The imperfect verb resembles the agent noun, and so it has nominal inflection (I. 2, 4ff/3, 7ff and passim)
- (14) (a) Semideclinable nouns do not have complete inflection because they resemble the imperfect verb (I. 5, 11f/6, 12f)
- (b) Some resemble the fully declinable noun, e.g. *min 'alu/'alin*, and so may inflect fully (I. 3, 3f/4, 7f)
- (15) Adjectives of the *af'al* pattern resemble the imperfect verb (II. 268, 16/251, 5)
- (16) Adjectives of the pattern of *'atšān* resemble *ḥamrā'*, hence they are also semideclinable (II. 10, 17, 18/10, 24 bis)
- (17) (a) The invariable nouns *'an*, *qaṭ* and *ladun* resemble the verb more than the noun, so they are unvowelled (I. 340, 9/387, 20)
- (b) *al-āna* resembles *ayna* in being a *zarf* and *ḥīna'idin* resembles *ayna* in being annexed to an uninflected element (II. 48, 1, 2, 3/51, 12 bis)
- (c) *Ḥāzibāzi* is invariable because it resembles *ḥamsata-ʿašara* (II. 48, 3/51, 13)
- (18) Some invariable nouns and verbs also resemble the particle, e.g. *sawfa*, *qad* and the *fa'ala* (*mādī*) verb form (I. 2, 18, 20/2, 20, 21)
- (19) Imperative verbs have no functional resemblance at all to the verb, any more than *kam* etc. have to the fully inflected noun, so they have no inflection (I. 3, 7/4, 10)
- (20) (a) There are no one-letter verb forms (except for weak radicals) because the verbal derivatives include elements which resemble nouns, which therefore must preserve the range of nominal inflections (II. 332, 1/305, 1)

- (b) Indeclinable two-letter nouns are more common than declinable ones because they resemble particles (II. 336, 1, 21-22/309, 1, 18-19)
- (c) Two-letter words which function as verbs are more common than two-letter verb forms because they resemble particles (II. 336, 3/309, 3)
- (d) *Aymu* reduces to *mu-* because it resembles a *ḥarf*, which is also common when two-letter nouns resemble particles (II. 336, 21-2/309, 18-19)
- (21) (a) Plurals which themselves take a plural are fully inflected because they then resemble regular singulars, e.g. *aqwālun/aqāwīlu* (II. 16, 23/16, 23)
- (b) *ʿAduww* is an adjective by its pattern but takes a broken plural because it resembles a noun (II. 201, 23/195, 10)
- (22) (a) The plural pattern *fiʿāl* is fully inflected as a man's name because it is originally a feminine (i.e. broken plural), but since it refers to men it resembles the masc. words without *-at* which always refer to women (II. 21, 13/21, 15)
- (b) Plural patterns such as *fiʿāl* for some adjectives are selected because the singular resembles a noun and is treated as if in the *faʿīl* pattern, e.g. *niyām, jiyāʿ* (II. 214, 21/206, 16)
- (23) *Nisba* suffix: if the *hamza* were not substituted for a weak radical in words like *siqāʿī* (< *s-q-y*) it would come to resemble *umayyī* without the regular *ibdāl* to *umawī* (II. 71, 23/76, 1)
- (24) *Laysa* resembles *layta* so it has no full paradigm (II. 399, 6/361, 15)

### 3. Phonological and Miscellaneous

- (25) The *maṣḍar* functionally resembles the verb (e.g. when you say *saqyan laka*) so it has congruent forms, showing the same weakness as the verb, e.g. *yaşīlu/şīlatun* (II. 395, 2/358, 7)
- (26) *Imāla* in cases such as *yadribuhā qāsim* is prevented by the resemblance of *-hā* to the *alif* in *faʿīl* which retains the *naşb* (here: back vowel quality) if an appropriate consonant is nearby (II. 288, 12/266, 15)
- (27) The initial *hamza* of *aymun* can be elided because the *alif* resembles a *ḥarf* (II. 296, 19/273, 10)
- (28) *Waşl* and *qaṭʿ* may resemble each other, e.g. when you say *yā ʿallāhu* etc. with the *alif* of the article resembling the *alif* which is elided in *alahmar* < *al-ʾahmar* (II. 459, 18/410, 20)
- (29) (a) *Fāʾ* assimilates to *bāʾ* because of its resemblance to *tāʾ* (II. 461, 15, 17/412, 8)

- (b) Final unvowelled *lām* assimilates, e.g. *har-ra'ayta*, where the two letters resemble two from the same *mahrağ* (II. 467, 6/416, 23)
- (c) Final unvowelled *mīm* should not assimilate to *bā'* because by its nasality *mīm* resembles *nūn* (II. 468, 21/418, 17)
- (d) The *-t* agent suffix in *ḥafīttu* < *ḥafīztu* etc. assimilates because it resembles the *-t*- infix of Stem VIII (II. 473, 18/423, 4)
- (e) Some letters are made to resemble each other because of a resemblance in their point of articulation, thus *maşdar* > *mazdar* (II. 476, 18ff/426, 13ff)
- (f) Assimilation (*idğām*) in *iqtatalū* > *qittalū* is correct, like *ja'al-laka* because of the resemblance to doubled roots of the type *iḥmarartu* (II. 459, 22/410, 24)
- (30) Verbs named in the metalanguage are masculine because they resemble the word *fā'il* (II. 32, 17/34, 22)

## REFERENCES

## A. Primary sources

- al-Farrā', *Ma'anī* = Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā b. Ziyād b. 'Abdallāh al-Farrā', *Ma'anī l-Qur'an*. Ed. by Nağātī, A. Y. & M. 'A. an-Nağğār & 'A. F. I. Şalabī, Cairo, 1955-72.
- Ibn al-Anbārī, *Luma'* = Abū l-Barakāt Kamāl ad-Dīn 'Abdarrahmān b. Muḥammad al-Anbārī, *Luma' al-adilla fī uşul an-anḥw*. Ed. by Attia Amer, Stockholm 1963.
- Ibn Ğinnī, *Haşā'is*. Ed. M. 'A. an-Nağğār, Cairo 1952-6.
- Ibn as-Sarrāğ, *Mūğaz* = Ibn as-Sarrāğ, *Kitāb al-Mūğaz fī n-naḥw*. Ed. by M. Chouémi, M. & B. Damerdjī, Beirut 1965.
- Ibn as-Sarrāğ, *Uşul* = Ibn as-Sarrāğ, *Uşul an-naḥw*. Ed. by 'A. H. al-Fatlī. Beirut. 1985.
- Ibn Ya'īş, *Şarḥ* = Abū l-Baqā' Muwaffaq ad-Dīn Ya'īş b. 'Alī Ibn Ya'īş, *Şarḥ Mufaşşal az-Zamahşarī*. Ed. Cairo n.d.
- al-Mubarrad, *Muqtadab* = Abū l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtadab*. Ed. by 'A. H. 'Uḍayma, Cairo 1965-8.
- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* = Abū Bişr 'amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*. = *Le Livre de Sībawayhi*. [*Kitāb Sībawayhi*.] *Traité de grammaire arabe par Sīboūya, dit Sībawayhi*. Text arabe publié d'après les manuscrits du Caire, de l'Escorial, d'Oxford, de Paris, de Saint-Petersbourg et de Vienne. Edited by Hartwig Derenbourg, 2 vols., Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881-89. (Rerp. Hildesheim, 1970.); 2 vols., Būlāq, 1316-18/1898-1900. (Repr. Bagdad, 1965.)

- az-Zağğāğī, *Īdāh* = az-Zağğāğī, Abū l-Qāsim, *Īdāh*. Ed. by M. Mubārak. Cairo 1959.
- az-Zamahšarī, *Mufaṣṣal* = Abū l-Qāsim Ġarallāh Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar az-Zamahšarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī n-naḥw*. ed. by C. Broch. Christianiae. 1879. (Repr. Bagdad n.d.)

#### B. Secondary sources

- Bakalla, M. H. 1982. *Ibn Ġinnī: an Early Arab Muslim Phonetician, an Interpretative Study of his Life and Contribution to Linguistics*. London, Taipei.
- Carter, M. G. 1985. "The term *sabab* in Arabic grammar". *ZAL* 15.53-66
- Fischer, W. 1985. "The Chapter on Grammar in the *Kitāb Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*", *ZAL* 15.94-103.
- Jahn, Gustav, transl. & comm. 1895-1900. *Sībawaihi's Buch über die Grammatik, übersetzt und erklärt*. 2 vols., Berlin 1895-1900. (Repr. Hildesheim, 1969.)
- Kinberg, N. 1996. *A Lexicon of al-Farrā's Terminology in his Qur'ān Commentary with Full Definitions, English Summaries and Extensive Citations*. Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Troupeau, Gérard. 1976. *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris.
- Versteegh, C. H. M. (Kees). 1977. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*. Leiden.
- Versteegh, C. H. M. (Kees). 1995. *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes. Az-Zağğāğī's Theory of Grammar. Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.