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Abstract

This article discusses theories designed by medieval Arabic grammarians to explain one of the most puzzling topics in Arabic grammar, mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf (diptotes). The mainstream theory of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf probably took on its definitive form in the early 4th/10th century; it differs from Sībawayhi’s (d. ca 180/796) theory, yet consists of a generalisation of features found in the latter. A later modification, which retained its basic elements, was presented to the mainstream theory probably during the 7th/13th century. A radically different theory was presented by al-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185), who harshly criticised the mainstream theory as inadequate and arbitrary.
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Résumé

Cet article analyse les théories élaborées par les grammairiens arabes médiévaux pour expliquer l’un des phénomènes les plus surprenants de la grammaire arabe, le mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf (diptotes). La théorie classique du mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf a probablement été finalisée au début du 1er/xe siècle; elle différe de la théorie de Sibawayhi (m. v. 180/796), dont elle généralise cependant les principales caractéristiques. Une modification ultérieure a été apportée à cette théorie classique, probablement durant le 11er/
XIIIe siècle, qui a néanmoins conservé ses éléments de base. Cependant, une théorie radicalement différente a été proposée par al-Suhaylī (m. 581/1185), qui critique féroce-ment la théorie classique, la décrivant comme inadéquate et arbitraire.
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Introduction

One of the most puzzling aspects of Arabic is, no doubt, the class of al-mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf (the so-called “diptotes”). It is difficult to see any order in the highly heterogeneous group of classes of nouns that are deprived of tanwīn and take the vowel -a in the genitive, in lieu of -i; these comprise, for instance, words taking the augment -ān (but not all), some patterns of “broken” plurals (but not all), some classes of proper names (but not all), adjectives of the pattern afʿal, etc.

This state of affairs presents Arab grammarians with the very challenging task of finding the common denominator of all, and only, these classes, and, at a higher level, of explaining the causal link between this necessary and sufficient condition and the special behaviour of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns.

Since the theory of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf accepted by the vast majority of Arab grammarians has been long known in modern scholarship, we shall not

1 A concise version of this article, which also discussed theories put forward by several modern scholars in addition to the medieval grammarians dealt with here, was read at 33. DOT, Jena, September 19, 2017.

We would like to thank the anonymous referees for insights and helpful suggestions.

2 The so-called “triptotes” will be referred to henceforth as munṣarif. The Arabic as well as the Western terms will be discussed below.

3 We shall follow here the customary practice of using the term “noun” in a broad sense, as designating the entire part of speech ism. Where the term “noun” is used in contradistinction to adjectives, this will be indicated explicitly. See Almog Kasher, “The Term ism in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Hyponym of Itself,” Journal of Semitic Studies, 54 (2009), p. 459-474.

present the various theories in chronological order, but rather take the mainstream theory as our point of departure for the following discussion of, first, a later internal development thereof, secondly, its early transformations, and, finally, an alternative theory; these three are ordered according to their relative respective “distances” from the mainstream theory.

The mainstream theory is presented in detail in section 1, based on the lucid and detailed discussion, in Ibn Yaʿīš’s (d. 643/1245) Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal. Section 2 describes a late internal development of the mainstream theory, whose earliest extant account can be found, as far as we know, in Ibn al-Nāẓim’s (d. 686/1287) commentary on his father’s celebrated Alfiyya.

Since the earliest extant grammar that contains the mainstream theory is Ibn al-Sarrāǧ’s (d. 316/928) famous al-Uṣūl fi l-naḥw, our next task, in section 3, is to study the transformations the theory regarding mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf underwent, starting with Sībawayhi (d. ca 180/796), through al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898)—a teacher of Ibn al-Sarrāǧ—until it took its final shape. Here we also discuss Mā yanšarifu wa-mā lā yanšarifu by al-Zaǧǧāǧ (d. 311/923), a contemporary of Ibn al-Sarrāǧ as well as a student of al-Mubarrad; as we shall see, al-Zaǧǧāǧ’s theory regarding mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf is indeed very similar to Ibn al-Sarrāǧ’s, although it differs from it in several important aspects.

The variations among the abovementioned grammarians’ theories notwithstanding, they share the same basic underlying views regarding the tanwīn and the nature of deviation in mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. In section 4 we analyse an alternative, dissenting, theory of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, put forward by a grammarian

---

well known for his originality, al-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185), in a masʿāla he dedicates to this issue.6

1 The Mainstream Theory: Ibn Yaʿīš (d. 643/1245)

Underlying Ibn Yaʿīš’s account of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf is a well-known principle, that words are expected to behave in a certain way, depending on the class to which they belong; behaviour of this sort is taken to be the default case, so that any deviation therefrom needs an explanation, such as similarity to a different word class.7 Thus nouns, by default, carry the three case markers and the tanwīn,8 for those which do not meet this expectation an explanation must be furnished.

As for case markers, iʿrāb is explained as aimed at differentiating between syntactic functions,9 and is therefore a nominal feature: on the one hand, there are non-nouns that are muʿrab, namely imperfect verbs, whose iʿrāb is explained by their resemblance to nouns, in particular to active participles; on the other hand, indeclinable nouns, i.e. nouns with invariable endings (mabnī), are said to resemble, or to incorporate the sense of particles, which

---


8 Note the multifaceted nature of tanwīn in Arabic grammatical tradition, the tanwīn taken by munsarif nouns, named tanwīn al-tamakkun (on this term, see in what follows), al-tamkīn, al-amkānīyya, al-makāna or al-ṣarf, being but one of several types, to each of which a different function is assigned (some of the other types of tanwīn will be mentioned below). See Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ Yaʿīš b. `Alī Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal li-l-Zamaḫšarī, ed. Imīl Badīʿ Yaʿqūb, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 2001, V, p. 153 ff. See also Carter, Arab Linguistics, p. 16 ff. (but cf. ibid., p. 74); Versteegh, The Explanation of Linguistic Causes, p. 171 ff.; Georgine Ayoub, “Tanwīn,” Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics.

are inherently indeclinable, or to fill the position of a *mabnī* verb.\textsuperscript{10} Other nouns are *mutamakkin* (firmly established [in noun-ness]);\textsuperscript{11} these are entitled to *iʿrāb* by dint of their noun-ness.\textsuperscript{12}

*Tanwin*, according to Ibn Yaʿīš, is a marker of “lightness” (*ḫiffa*),\textsuperscript{13} which is why it is suffixed to indefinite nouns, being “basic” (*ašl*), “lighter” (*aḥaff*)

\begin{itemize}
\item Elsewhere, however, Ibn Yaʿīš (*Šarḥ*, 1, p. 88) states that the function of *tanwin* is to differentiate between *mā yanṣarif* and *mā lā yanṣarif*. See also *ibid.*, 111, p. 189; V, p. 154, 159. On the notion of “lightness” vs “heaviness” in Arabic grammatical tradition, see Ramzi Baalbaki. “Some Aspects of Harmony and Hierarchy in Sibawayhi’s Grammatical Analysis,” *Zeitschrift für arabischen Linguistik*, 2 (1979), p. 15; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 179 ff.; Chairet, “*Ḫiffa, ṣṭiqal* et *tamakkun*”; Arik Sadan, “The Technical Terms *ḫiffa* and *ṭiqal* in the Usage of the Arabic Grammarians,” *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, 48 (2008), p. 58-74. Danecki makes the following noteworthy remark in this connection: “One should notice here that Sibawayhi uses the term marker (*ʿalāma*) to denote *tanwin*, which is in turn the marker of the unmarked term in the opposition.” Danecki, “The Notion of *tamakkun*,” p. 128. On the notion of “(un)markedness,” see Owens, *The Foundations of Grammar*, p. 199 ff. Note, however, that in his discussion of *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* under this framework, Owens (*ibid.*, p. 209) regards the *tanwin* as “indefinite -n,” claiming that *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* “lack the -n if indefinite” (the latter being true only if what is meant by “indefinite” is the lack of a definite article, and, furthermore, only if one restricts oneself to common nouns; neither is the case in Arabic grammatical thought). See also Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”
\end{itemize}
and “more established” (amkan) than definite nouns; it is also the reason why verbs, considered “heavier” than nouns (verbs need nouns in order to form a complete sentence, but not vice versa, which makes the former more frequent than the latter and verbs require subjects and objects, which renders them complex) and “subsidiary” (furūʿ) to them (verbs are derived from verbal nouns and require nouns), do not carry tanwīn. But there are also nouns that are “subsidiary” to other nouns, which renders them similar to verbs, thus reducing their level of tamakkun, and are therefore deprived of the marker of “lightness” (tanwīn). According to Ibn Yaʿīš, it is tanwīn that these nouns are deprived of in the first place, whereas the loss of the specific genitive marker (-ī) only follows it in this respect, since both are properties, unique attributes (ḥaṣṣa), of nouns. Another view these nouns are deprived of both tanwīn and a specific marker of the genitive in the first place, since verbs lack both. This class of nouns is termed ġayr munṣarif, in contrast with nouns that carry tanwīn as well as a specific marker for each case, and are termed


16 To express this feature grammarians often say that the nouns in question “lack ġarr.” For this facon de parler see Almog Kasher, “The Terminology of Vowels and iʿrāb in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition,” Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 37 (2010), p. 139-161.

17 On this term in al-Astarābāḏī’s (d. 688/1289?) Šarḥ al-Kāfiya, see Beata Sheyhatovitch, “The theory of definition in Šarḥ al-Kāfiya by Radi l-Dīn al-ʿAstarābāḏī” (in preparation).

18 Another explanation, on the authority of Abū ʿAli (sc. al-Fārisī [d. 377/987]), maintains that had these nouns terminated with -ī (without tanwīn), one would have mistaken them for mabnī, e.g. amsī (yesterday). Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, 1, p. 167.

19 Ibid., 1, p. 165-166. Cf. ibid., 1, p. 168. See also Versteegh, The Explanation of Linguistic Causes, p. 128-129, 171. For a discussion on the question of whether or not mamnūʿ min
munṣarif; the property at stake is named ṣarf.\textsuperscript{21} As we have seen above, all declinable nouns are subsumed under mutamakkin, but the munṣarif nouns are said to be amkan (more established [in noun-ness]).\textsuperscript{22} Ibn Yaʿīš emphasises that it is not the case that every resemblance whatsoever to the verb entails such consequences; in the case at hand, (at least)\textsuperscript{23} two out of nine traits of “subsidiarity” (or one “recurring” trait, on which see below) are needed for the “heaviness” of the verb to pass to the nouns in question.\textsuperscript{24} Ibn Yaʿīš also states that by dint of possessing two “subsidiary” traits nouns become similar to verbs, which are “subsidiary” to nouns in two aspects (see above).\textsuperscript{25}

In what follows we shall discuss the nine traits of “subsidiarity” and the eleven classes of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns resulting from combinations thereof. The numbers assigned here to the members of the former list and the lowercase letters assigned to the members of the latter will be used for further reference in this article.

The nine traits of “subsidiarity”:

\textit{al-ṣarf} nouns taking the definite article or in status constructus are to be classified as munṣarif, see Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, I, p. 166-167 (see also \textit{ibid.}, IV, p. 216).

\textsuperscript{21} The centrality of tanwīn in the grammarian’s notion of ṣarf is the reason why we refrain from using the somewhat misleading terms “diptosis” and “triptosis” in the study of Arabic grammatical tradition. Carter considers the imposition of the concept of declensions upon Arabic, and the use of the term “diptotes” in particular, as “a relatively Minor sin.” See Michael George Carter, “The Seven Deadly Sins of Arabic Studies,” in \textit{Approaches to the History and Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher}, eds Manuel Sartori, Manuela Elisa Bibiana Gioifo and Philippe Cassuto, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics”, 88), 2017, p. 523-524.

Note the discrepancy between the prima facie literal meaning of ṣarf (divergence) and the central property differentiating, according to Ibn Yaʿīš, between munṣarif and ġayr munṣarif, to wit, the tanwīn. A straightforward identification between the two is found, for example, in Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik: al-ṣarf tanwīn (Ibn al-Nāẓim, Šarḥ, p. 449), and in al-Širbīnī’s following statement: fa-yumnaʿu l-ṣarf allaḏī huwa l-tanwīn (Carter, \textit{Arab Linguistics}, p. 18; see also \textit{ibid.}, p. 74). See also Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, \textit{Kleinere Schriften}, Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1885-1888, 1, p. 306-309; Carter, \textit{Arab Linguistics}, p. 73; Versteegh, \textit{The Explanation of Linguistic Causes}, p. 173. For discussions on the etymology of the technical term ṣarf, see Silvestre de Sacy, \textit{Grammaire arabe}, Tunis, Société anonyme de l'imprimerie rapide (“Bibliothèque de l'Institut de Carthage", 4/5), 1904-1905\textsuperscript{5}, 1, p. 397-398; Fleischer, \textit{Kleinere Schriften}, 1, p. 306-309; Versteegh, \textit{The Explanation of Linguistic Causes}, p. 173-174; \textit{id.}, “Ṣarf,” \textit{EF}; Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”

\textsuperscript{22} Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, I, p. 164-165, 167.

\textsuperscript{23} Following Abū Iṣḥāq (sc. al-Zaǧǧāǧ), against al-Mubarrad and Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912 or 320/932), Ibn Yaʿīš (\textit{ibid.}, 111, p. 51) maintains that a combination of three or more traits does not render nouns invariable (mabnī).

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, 1, p. 166-168; 5, p. 453.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Ibid.}, 1, p. 167-168.
(1) Being a definite proper name: definiteness is “subsidiary” to indefiniteness; nouns’ basic state (aṣl) is indefiniteness; the type of definiteness pertinent to mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf is that of proper names.26

(2) Femininity: (grammatical) femininity is “subsidiary” to masculinity; the type of femininity pertinent to mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf is the “inherent” (lāzim) rather than the “accidental” (ʿārid) kind, thus excluding cases in which the feminine suffix marks the distinction between a masculine and a feminine, e.g. qāʾīm vs qāʾīma (standing up [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]) and imrāʾ (man) vs imraʾa (woman), or between a collective noun and a nomen unitatis, e.g. šaʾīr (barley) vs šaʾīra ([a single] barleycorn).27

(3) Taking a verbal pattern: such patterns are restricted, or at least characteristic, to verbs, hence their “subsidiarity.”28

(4) Adjectivity: adjectives (waṣf, ṣifa) are “subsidiary” to the noun (in the narrow sense)29 they modify (mawṣūf), since the former require the latter,30 just as a verb requires its subject;31 adjectival attributes are preceded by their head;32 adjectives are derived, just like verbs, and are therefore “subsidiary,” just like verbs.33

26 Ibid., 1, p. 168; 111, p. 352. Note that grammatical patterns expressed with the root FʿL are also considered as proper names (ibid., 1, p. 124-125). There are also nouns denoting abstract concepts that are nevertheless regarded as their proper names (ibid., 1, p. 118 ff.), some of which are mentioned below. See also Kees Versteegh, “The Arabic Tradition,” in The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions: Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic, eds Wout van Bekkum, Jan Houben, Ineke Sluiter and Kees Versteegh, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins (“Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series 111, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences”), 1997, p. 259.

27 Ibid., 1, p. 168; 111, p. 352.

28 Ibid., 1, p. 169.

29 See fn. 3.

30 The terms ṣifa/waṣf and mawṣūf are used here as what Peled terms “metagrammatical intuitive terms”: their semantic scopes cover their meanings both as technical terms and as the everyday concepts underlying them, namely “quality, attribute” and what is described by them, respectively. See Yishai Peled, “Aspects of the Use of Grammatical Terminology in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition,” in Arabic Grammar and Linguistics, ed. Yasir Suleiman, Richmond, Curzon, 1999, p. 50-85. The philosophical distinction between substance and attribute is also of relevance here.

31 The terms fiʿl and fāʿil are also used here as “metagrammatical intuitive terms” (see the preceding footnote), as they also designate “action” and “doer,” respectively.

32 The term ṣifa (also waṣf) denotes both a word class and a syntactic function; when used in the sense of “adjective,” it also connotes “attribute,” and vice versa (see Kasher, “The Term ism”).

33 Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, 1, p. 173.
(5) Being “transformed, turned from” another pattern (ʿadl): derived words are “subsidiary” to the words from which they are derived.34

(6) Plurality: plurality is “heavier” than singularity.35

(7) Being a compound: compounds are “subsidiary” to non-compounds; in contrast with compounds whose meaning is a composition of the meanings of the two nouns, e.g. ḥamsata ʿašara (fifteen), which are invariable (mabnī).36 mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf compounds are those in which the two nouns are considered as one: the second has the status of tāʾ marbūta (the first terminating, accordingly, with -a), and consequently, the compound behaves analogously to nouns terminating with tāʾ marbūta.37

(8) Being of foreign origin: foreign words are adventitious, and are therefore “subsidiary” to original Arabic words; this class only consists of words Arabicised as proper names (e.g. Isḥāq), to the exclusion of borrowed common nouns, which behave just like Arabic common nouns (e.g. dibāǧ [silk brocade]).38

(9) Terminating with an augmented -ān: in addition to being an augment, which is “subsidiary” to what it is augmented to, -ān resembles the feminine augment -āʾ (on which see below): in both -ān and -āʾ, the augment consists of two inseparable ḥarf;39 in both, the first ḥarf is alif; in both, the corresponding masculine and feminine patterns are different (e.g. ʿadl denotes a special type of derivation, with no semantic change. It is thus merely a formal process. This is not the only view in Arabic grammatical tradition on this issue, which requires a special study.
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aḥmar vs ḥamrāʾ (red [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]), sakrān vs sakrā (inebriated [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]); and to neither can tā’ marbūta be suffixed (e.g. *ḥamrāʾa, *sakrānā). That is, the pattern at stake is faʾlān whose feminine is faʾlā, but not faʾlān whose feminine is faʾlāna (e.g. nadmān-nadmāna (boon companion [m.sg. and f.sg. respectively]), which is munṣarif. In proper names, where this trait is not restricted to the pattern faʾlān, e.g. ‘Uṯmān, the augment -ān is analogised to the abovementioned -ān in faʾlān: both consist of an augmented -ān, and tā’ marbūta cannot be suffixed to both.40

Below the various classes of mammaʿ min al-ṣarf are presented, classified according to the traits enumerated above. We begin with classes of proper names (trait (1)):

(a) Proper names ending with tāʾ marbūta, e.g. Ṭalḥa,41 are mammaʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (1) and (2).42 We noted above that qāʾima, for instance, is munṣarif, despite being an adjective (trait (4)), since the tāʾ marbūta is suffixed to it in order to differentiate between masculinity and femininity, whereas the femininity trait relevant to mammaʿ min al-ṣarf is the “inherent,” not the “accidental” kind. Since in proper names such as Ṭalḥa it cannot be elided, it is “inherent” by dint of these nouns’ use as proper names.43

The same combination also accounts for the lack of ṣarf in feminine proper names that do not terminate with tāʾ marbūta, e.g. Hind, Ğumal, Suʿād, Zaynab and Saqar (a proper name of hell), because they contain a covert tāʾ marbūta. It also explains the lack of ṣarf in e.g. Ānāq, an originally feminine common noun (meaning “she-kid”) used as a masculine proper name.44 However, proper names composed of three ḥarf(s), the middle of which is quiescent, i.e. those of the form CvCC, such as Hind, may also be munṣarif, since their patterns’ “lightness” counterbalances one of the two traits.45 This, however, does not apply to names of foreign

41 A masculine proper name (the common noun ṭalḥa is the nomen unitatis of ṭalḥ [Acacia]). Ibn Yaʿīš (ibid., I, p. 169) states explicitly that the trait of femininity (trait (2)) holds for “formal” femininity as well.
42 Ibid., I, p. 168, 192.
43 Ibid., I, p. 168.
44 Ibid., I, p. 169, 192. This also applies to šaʿūb (death), when used as a proper name of al-maniyya (f.), but not when used as a proper name of al-mawt (m.) (ibid., I, p. 121).
origin (trait (8)), e.g. Ğūr,46 if used as feminine proper names, since they possess three traits.47

To this class also belong ġudwa and bukra (the early part of the morning), when referring to parts of a specific day, as well as numerals (used abstractly, e.g. arbaʿatu niṣfu tamāniyata [four is half of eight]); it is as if these are proper names of abstract concepts.48

(b) Proper names in verbal patterns, e.g. Yazīd, are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (1) and (3).49 Aǧmaʿ (entire, all [m.sg.]) also belongs here.50

(c) Proper names whose patterns are “transformed” from different patterns are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (1) and (5), e.g. ‘Umar, which is “transformed” from ‘Āmir.51 Ğumaʿ (f.pl. of aǧmaʿ) also belongs here,52 as do feminine proper names of the pattern faʿāl, e.g. Qaṭām, “transformed” from Qāṭima; in fact, such names possess three traits (1), (2) and (5).53

To this class also belongs saḥar (the last part of the night), when designating a part of a specific day. It is said to be “transformed” from al-saḥar (with a definite article).54

(d) Proper names that are also compounds, e.g. Ḥaḍra-mawt, are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (1) and (7). As mentioned above, the second base has the status of tāʾ marbūta; consequently, such compounds behave analogously to nouns terminating in tāʾ marbūta, so that the proper names among them are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf (see the discussion on Ţalḥa above).55

48 Ibid., I, p. 123-124. See also ibid., II, p. 130; IV, p. 20.
49 Ibid., I, p. 169-172, 191.
50 Ibid., II, p. 230. There are two further alternative views regarding the source of this noun’s definiteness, one that it is underlyingly in status constructus, the other that it has been “transformed” from al-aǧmaʿ (ibid., II, p. 229-230).
51 Ibid., I, p. 174-176, 191.
52 Ibid., II, p. 230, but see the remark in fn. 50 on aǧmaʿ (according to the second view, it is doubly-“transformed”). See also ibid., I, p. 423-424.
53 Ibid., I, p. 191-192. Ibn Yaʿīš (ibid., II, p. 70-72) also indicates that in the dialect of the Ḥiǧāz, these proper names take an invariable -i (thus e.g. Qaṭāmī), whereas the Tamīm treat them as mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, except when the final consonant is r, in which case most of them use these names in the Ḥiǧāzī fashion (e.g. Ḥadārī).
54 Ibid., I, p. 123, 423-424.
55 Ibid., I, p. 98, 183-185, 191.
(e) Proper names of foreign origin (which were proper names already in the source language), e.g. Ishāq, are **mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf** due to the combination of traits (1) and (8). But if they consist of only three ḥarfs, the middle of which is quiescent (*i.e.* ĆvĆĆ, e.g. Lūṭ), they are **munṣarif**.

(f) Proper names terminating with an augmented -ān, e.g. Marwān, are **mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf** due to the combination of traits (1) and (9).

Before we move on to classes of **mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf** other than proper names, a note is necessary regarding the use of proper names indefinitely, e.g. **hāḍā Ibrāhīmu wa-Ibrāhīmun āḫaru** (These are [or: here are] Ibrāhīm and another Ibrāhīm [*i.e.* another person so named]). As manifested in this example, proper names possessing only one further trait (in addition to trait (1)), are **munṣarif** when used indefinitely (in which case they lose trait (1), and are left with only one trait, at the most). Moreover, Ibn Yaʿīš maintains that there are traits dependent on trait (1); for instance, the toponym **Aḏrabīǧān** possesses traits (1), (7), (8) and (9), but the latter three are in effect only when combined with trait (1). Ibn Yaʿīš neither elaborates on this point nor justifies the dependence of some traits on others.

We now move to **mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf** classes of adjectives (trait (4)):

(g) Adjectives of verbal patterns, e.g. aḥmar (red), are **mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf** due to the combination of traits (3) and (4).

---

57 Analysed as Lūwī, see fn. 39.
59 *Ibid.*, I, p. 187, 191. This also applies to subḥān, which, according to Ibn Yaʿīš, is a proper name of the verbal noun al-tasbīḥ (*ibid.*, I, p. 119-121, 294-295, 111, p. 21) and kaysān, a proper name of al-ġadr (perfidy) (*ibid.*, I, p. 122).
61 Other vocalisations are possible, see Yāqūt, *Muʿjam*, 1, p. 128.
62 *Le. Aдра-biǧān* (*ibid.*).
63 In fact, it also possesses trait (2), as stated elsewhere (Ibn Yaʿīš, *Ṣarḥ*, 111, p. 51; see also Yāqūt, *Muʿjam*, 1, p. 128); this trait is not mentioned in this discussion, probably since it revolves around indefinite masculine proper names. It is unclear, however, in what sense the final two ḥarfs, viz. -ān, can be considered as “augmented” in this foreign name.
64 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Ṣarḥ*, 1, p. 192. See also *ibid.*, I, p. 170.
(h) Adjectives of patterns considered as “transformed” are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (4) and (5), e.g. ṭulāṭ (“transformed” from talāṭa talāṭa [three by three]).

(i) Adjectives of the pattern faʿlān, e.g. sakrān, are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to the combination of traits (4) and (9).

Finally, in the following two classes, one trait is enough to inflict loss of ṣarf (these are the two instances of one “recurring” trait mentioned above):

(j) Nouns terminating with augmented -ā or -āʾ (alif al-taʾnīṯ), e.g. ḥublā (pregnant), bušrā (glad tidings), sakrā, ḥamrāʾ and ṣaḥrāʾ (desert) are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. These feminine markers, by themselves, render them mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf: in addition to femininity (trait (2)), which these markers share with the tāʾ marbūṭa, they are also “superior” to it, since they form part and parcel of the nominal pattern, in contrast to the elidable tāʾ marbūṭa; this “superiority” counts as a second trait. For adjectives terminating with these augment, trait (4) is merely added to this double-trait; this is also the case, mutatis mutandis, for proper names (trait (1)).

Ibn Yaʿīš also states that whereas common nouns terminating with an augmented alif that is not alif al-taʾnīṯ, such as alif of ilḥāq (appending [one pattern to another]), are munṣarif, e.g. arṭān (Calligonum), those which are proper names are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, e.g. Artā, due to the combination of trait (1) and the similarity of this alif to alif al-taʾnīṯ:

66 Ibid., I, p. 176-178.
67 Ibid., I, p. 173-174, 186.
68 The classification of the seemingly invariable nouns terminating with -ā as mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf needs some clarification. The so-called maqsūr nouns are analysed as taking case endings underlyingly, since for phonetic reasons the final alif cannot take a vowel. This applies not only to mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns such as ḥublā, but also to munṣarif nouns, such as ‘aṣan (אָסָּעַ), whose final alif is elided when taking tanwīn (*ʿaṣaʾn → ‘aṣan). In both cases the nouns are classified as muʿrab, since nothing prevents them from possessing tamakkun (see above on factors causing nouns to be mabnī). See ibid., I, p. 151, 153, 162-163; IV, p. 33-36.
69 Ibn Yaʿīš does not mention any plural terminating with -ā or -āʾ; Ibn al-Nāẓim (Šarḥ, p. 451), however, also adduces marḍā (sick [pl.]) and aṣdiqāʾ (friends), as well as aṣyāʾ (things). The lack of ṣarf in the latter word is said to have occasioned a debate among grammarians, on which see Ibn al-Anbārī, al-Inṣāf, II, p. 812-820.
70 Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, I, p. 168-169. See also ibid., I, p. 195.
71 Ibid., I, p. 195.
72 Ibid., I, p. 169. See also ibid., I, p. 163.
73 For a comprehensive study of ilḥāq, see Baalbaki, “Ilḥāq.”
74 This word’s final alif is said to “append” it to the pattern of ġaʿfar and salhab. Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, III, p. 199-200, 383; IV, p. 34; V, p. 323.
both consist of an augmented *alif*, and in both *tā’ marbūṭa* cannot be suffixed (in the case of *Artā* etc., this stems from the fact that the noun in question is a proper name).75

(k) “Broken” plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns76 *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCīC*,77 e.g. *masāǧid* (mosques) and *danānīr* (dinars), are *mammūʿ min al-ṣarf*. Since these patterns do not occur in singular nouns, it is as if these nouns are pluralised (trait (6)) twice.78 On the other hand, plural patterns that do have singular counterparts behave just like the latter, e.g. *kilāb* (dogs; sharing its pattern with e.g. *kitāb* [book]).79

Two final remarks on Ibn Yaʿīš’s account of *mammūʿ min al-ṣarf* are in order here, regarding *ṣarf vs mammūʿ min al-ṣarf* in poetry. First, *mammūʿ min al-ṣarf* nouns may be *munṣarif* as poetic licence, thereby reverting to their basic state.80

Secondly, Ibn Yaʿīš also permits the use of *munsarif* nouns possessing only one

---

75 Ibid., I, p. 169. Note that only -ā is mentioned here, not -āʾ.

76 “Syllabo-vocalic patterns,” in contrast with proper patterns, are indifferent as to whether or not their C-slots are filled with radicals. For instance, the syllabo-vocalic pattern *CaCāCiC* is shared by the proper patterns *fawā’il*, *mafa’il*, *faʿā’il* etc. Differently put, syllabo-vocalic patterns are an intermediate level between proper patterns and the CV skeleton. We are grateful to Nadia Vidro for suggesting this useful term to us. We would also like to thank many scholars, especially Manuela E.B. Giolfo, Avigail S. Noy and Noel Rivera, for their insights on this notion. Cf. the term “schéma syllabo-vocalique” in Pierre Larcher, *Linguistique arabe et pragmatique*, Beirut, Presses de l’Ifpo, 2014, p. 233, and the discussion in Hassan Mokhlis, *Théorie du Taṣrīf et traitement du lexique chez les grammairiens arabes*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang (“Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 21, Linguistik”, 185), 1997, p. 54-60.

77 In Ibn Yaʿīš’s formulation: plurals whose third [ḥarf] is *alif* followed by two ḥarfs, or three, the middle of which is quiescent.

78 Here Ibn Yaʿīš gives as examples cases of the so-called *jamʿ al-ḏamʿ* (on which see Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, 1, p. 231-232) that are constructed on the patterns in question, e.g. *akālib*, a plural of *aklub*, in its turn a plural (of paucity) of *kalb* (dog).

79 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 178-179. See also ibid., I, p. 195. Plurals terminating with *tāʾ marbūta*, e.g. *ṣayārifa* (money changers) are *munṣarif* (ibid., I, p. 443), a fact for which no explanation is furnished by Ibn Yaʿīš. Ibn al-Nāẓim (*Šarḥ*, p. 458), however, shows that they have counterparts in the singular, e.g. *karāhiya* (dislike).

trait of “subsidiarity” as 

\textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} in poetry, a practice most common in definite proper names.\footnote{Ibn Yaʿīš, \textit{Ṣarḥ}, 1, p. 191. Other explanations, by various grammarians, are mentioned for the poetic verses in which \textit{munṣarif} nouns behave (at least \textit{prima facie}) as \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} (ibid., 1, p. 188-191).}

It should be emphasised that all nine traits of “subsidiarity” are put by Ibn Yaʿīš on a par: a combination of at least two of any of them renders a noun \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf}. However, the eleven classes of \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} ((a)-(k)) tell a different story: six ((a)-(f)) consist of proper names (trait (1)) in combination with another trait: femininity, taking a verbal pattern, ‘\textit{ṣarīf}’, being a compound, foreignness, and terminating with the augmented \textit{ān} (traits (2), (3), (5), (7), (8) and (9), respectively); three ((g)-(i)) consist of adjectives (trait (4)) that possess an additional trait: taking a verbal pattern, ‘\textit{ṣarīf}’, and terminating with the augmented \textit{ān} (traits (3), (5) and (9), respectively); and two ((j) and (k)) of one “recurring” trait, femininity and plurality (traits (2) and (6), respectively).

The classes of \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} do not exhaust all the possible combinations. Putting aside the two classes of “recurring” traits ((j) and (k)), we are left with nine classes, little less than one third of the number of combinations of two traits out of eight (if we put aside plurality [trait (6)], which is only at work in class (k)), \textit{i.e.} 28. Obviously, there are some combinations that simply do not (or even cannot) exist, \textit{e.g.} foreign words which are “transformed” (traits (5) and (8)). What is of much more interest is Ibn Yaʿīš’s cursory allusion to the dependence of some traits on each other: Aḏrabīḡān, as an indefinite masculine proper name possesses three traits, being a compound of a foreign origin and terminating with the augmented \textit{ān} (traits (7), (8) and (9), respectively), but the noun possessing these three traits of “subsidiarity” is not \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf}, as these are said to depend on the trait of being a definite proper name (trait (1)) in order to devoid \textit{ṣarf}; no further explanation is furnished.

2 Later Internal Development of the Mainstream Theory: Ibn al-Nāẓim (d. 686/1287)

Ibn al-Nāẓim’s theory of \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} is identical to Ibn Yaʿīš’s in its basic principles: nouns become \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} when they resemble verbs by possessing two traits of “subsidiarity.” Yet, the very concept of resemblance between these nouns and the verb is further developed and, accordingly,
the principle of “two out of nine traits” is modified in a fashion that explains the uneven distribution of pairs of combinations that deprive nouns of ṣarf. According to Ibn al-Nāẓim, for two traits of “subsidiarity” to prevent ṣarf, one must pertain to form, the other to meaning. This stipulation stems from the fact that verbs are “subsidiary” to nouns both in form and in meaning: with respect to form verbs are derived from nouns and with respect to meaning verbs need a noun, as subject, and are predicated of it. So for a noun to resemble a verb enough to be granted the property of lack of tanwin, it must possess the verb’s “subsidiarity” both in form and in meaning.

This does not apply when the two traits—one in form and one in meaning—are of one and the same aspect, which is the case in the diminutive. Nor do nouns become mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf due to several traits of “subsidiarity” in form, e.g. uḡaymāl, or in meaning, e.g. ḥāʾiḍ (menstruating), for the similarity between these and the verb is not complete. On the other hand, Aḥmad (class (b)), for instance, is mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, due to its possession of two distinct traits of “subsidiarity,” one in form, viz. a verbal pattern (trait (3)), and one in meaning, viz. definiteness (trait (1)).

Ibn al-Nāẓim recognises twelve classes of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, the eleven classes discussed above and a twelfth class of proper names that end in an alif of ilḥāq, e.g. Arṭā, which are subsumed above under class (j). He divides the twelve classes into two groups:

---

82 See also the previous section.
83 Ibn al-Nāẓim, Ṣarḥ, p. 450.
84 Ibid., p. 450. This is one of Ibn al-Nāẓim’s (ibid., p. 456) reasons for rejecting al-Zaḡḡāḡ’s view that uḥād etc. (class (h)) are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf since they are “transformed” both in form and in meaning (from their original meaning to the meaning of “multiplicity,” e.g. wāḥid wāḥid). Note that Ibn al-Nāẓim does not explain why diminutiveness cannot be regarded as a trait of “subsidiarity” in combination with another trait. As we shall see in the following statement, he goes so far as to disregard its “subsidiarity” in meaning.
85 The diminutive of aḡmāl, in its turn a plural of ǧamal (camel). Ibid., p. 548, 561; see also Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, I, p. 169. It thus possesses both plurality (trait (6)) and diminutiveness (this is not explicitly stated by Ibn al-Nāẓim); however, as we shall see below, Ibn al-Nāẓim considers plurality as pertinent to meaning.
86 This word possesses both femininity and adjectivity (traits (2) and (4), respectively; this is also not explicitly stated by Ibn al-Nāẓim). Note the lack of any formal marker of femininity. On which see Ibn al-Nāẓim, Ṣarḥ, p. 535; see also Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, I, p. 187.
87 Ibn al-Nāẓim, Ṣarḥ, p. 450.
88 Ibn al-Nāẓim (ibid., p. 465) states explicitly that it is only -ā, not -āʾ, which deprives a word of ṣarf in this case, but no explanation is furnished.
1) One consists of five classes of nouns that are *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* although they are indefinite. These are nouns terminating with *alif al-taʾnīṯ* (class (j)), plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCiC* (class (k)), as well as those in which adjectivity (trait (4)) is combined with taking the pattern *faʿlān*.\(^89\) *i.e.* class (i), with taking the pattern *afʿal*, *i.e.* class (g),\(^90\) or with *ʿadl* (trait (5)), *i.e.* class (h).

2) The second group consists of seven classes that are *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* when definite; these are the six classes of proper names (a)-(f) and proper names terminating with the *alif* of *ilḥāq* (see above).\(^91\)

Thus, the reason why *alif al-taʾnīṯ*, namely -ā and -āʾ (class (j)), is sufficient to deprive nouns of *ṣarf* is the fact that it possesses “subsidiarity” both in form and in meaning: it both forms part and parcel of the word pattern and designates femininity (trait (5)).\(^92\) Just like Ibn Yaʿīš, Ibn al-Nāẓım explains the difference between these augments and *tāʾ marbūta* as due to the *lāzim* (“inherent”) nature of the former and the ‘āriḍ (“accidental”) nature of the latter.\(^93\)

“Broken” plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCiC* (class (k)) possess “subsidiarity” in form, since these transgress the patterns of the singulars, as well as “subsidiarity” in meaning, as they designate plurals (trait (6)).\(^94\)

---

89 As we have seen in our discussion of Ibn Yaʿīš, trait (9) manifests itself differently in adjectives, where it is restricted to the pattern *faʿlān*, and in proper names, where it comprises all those that terminate with -ān. Whereas Ibn Yaʿīš analogises the latter to the former, Ibn al-Nāẓım (*ibid.*, p. 462) analogises it directly to *alif al-taʾnīṯ*.

90 As we have seen, Ibn Yaʿīš characterises this class as combining adjectivity with taking a verbal pattern (trait (4)), yet, *afʿal* is the only pattern he mentions in this context. Ibn al-Nāẓım restricts this class to adjectives of the pattern *afʿal*; or, more specifically, to those which do not take *tāʾ marbūta* as a feminine marker, see *ibid.*, p. 453-454; note, however, that he also explains the lack of *ṣarf* in the diminutive of this pattern, *e.g.* `uḥaymir, as stemming from its taking a verbal pattern, for which he adduces the verb *ubayṭir* (*u* [will] practice veterinary medicine), see *ibid.*, p. 453; see Ibn Yaʿīš, *Ṣarḥ*, 1, p. 174 for a different explanation. See more below.


93 *Ibid.*, p. 451. Ibn al-Nāẓım concedes, however, that this is not the case for some words, *e.g.* ʿṣaqāwa (unprosperousness).

Apart from these cases, the traits considered as pertaining to meaning are adjectivity95 and definiteness (mostly as proper names)96 (traits (4) and (1), respectively), whereas those considered as pertaining to form are terminating with an augmented -ān,97 taking a verbal pattern,98 ʿadl,99 being a compound,100 femininity by tāʾ marbūṭa, either overt or covert101 and foreignness102 (traits (9), (3), (5), (7), (2) and (8), respectively).103

Note that the somewhat different presentations of the traits by Ibn Yaʿīš and Ibn al-Nāẓim dovetail with their different models. This is most conspicuous with regard to the trait of taking a verbal pattern (trait (3)). For Ibn Yaʿīš, all nine traits are, theoretically, on a par, including this one, which can be (again, theoretically) combined with each of the other traits. However, Ibn al-Nāẓim’s

---

95 Ibid., p. 451. 453. Ibn al-Nāẓim (ibid., p. 452) maintains that the trait of adjectivity cannot be considered as pertaining to form, despite the fact that adjectives are derived from verbal nouns. This is so because their “subsidiarity” in form is “weak,” since their meaning is not remote enough from the verbal noun’s meaning: just like the verbal noun, they remain nouns as well as indefinite; their derivation from verbal nouns merely confers the ascription of their meanings to their mawṣūf (on this term see fn. 30); and verbal nouns can assume this syntactic function, e.g. raǧulun ʿadlun (a man who acts justly).

96 Ibid., p. 461-463. See also ibid., p. 465-466, 468.

97 Ibid., p. 452 (see also ibid., p. 462). According to this grammarian (ibid., p. 452), the similarity of -ān to -āʾ lies, first, in the fact that both are specific to one gender—the former to the masculine and the latter to the feminine; secondly, in the fact that tāʾ marbūṭa cannot be suffixed to either of them; and thirdly, in the fact that in both the first element is alif and the second is a consonant functioning as a preformative of the imperfect designating the first person (‘—the singular, n— the plural), in addition to the fact that n can substitute ‘ in the nisba, e.g. al-Ṣanʿāʾ—ṣanʿānī. In contrast, nadmān, for instance, is munṣarif due to the “weakness” of its “subsidiarity” in form, since its augment is not specific to the masculine (that is, it persists also in the feminine, viz. nadmāna), which renders it similar to the radicals. Note that, as we have seen above, Ibn al-Nāẓim differentiates between termination with -ān (a trait pertaining to proper names) and taking the pattern faʿlān (a trait pertaining to adjectives).

98 Ibid., p. 450. See also ibid., p. 463. Note here also Ibn al-Nāẓim’s abovementioned (see fn. 90) differentiation between taking the verbal pattern (a trait pertaining to proper names) and taking the pattern afʿal (a trait pertaining to adjectives).

99 Inferred from ibid., p. 455-456, 466, 468.

100 Ibid., p. 461.

101 Ibid., p. 462. Ibn al-Nāẓim maintains that since this marker cannot be elided from a personal name—in contrast to adjectives—it has the same status as alif al-ṭaʾnīṯ.

102 Ibid., p. 463. In Ibn al-Nāẓim’s view, the “subsidiarity” in form is weakened in names of three harfs, as they take the “basic” (aṣl) form of Arabic singulars. Incidentally, Ibn al-Nāẓim rejects the additional condition that the middle harf should be quiescent.

103 It is evident that Ibn Ǧinnī (d. 392/1002) has in mind a different conception of lāfẓ and maʿnā when he states that out of the nine traits preventing sarf, only one is lāfẓ (taking a verbal pattern, trait (3)), while all other eight are maʿnāyya. See Abū l-Fath ʿUṯmān Ibn Ǧinnī, al-Heṣāʾīs, ed. Muhammad ʿAli l-Naḡār, Beirut, Dār al-hudā, n.d.2, i, p. 109.
model enables him to be more specific: since this trait, being “subsidiary” in form, can only be combined with definiteness (trait (1)) or adjectivity (trait (4)), he restricts the latter combination to its single pattern in Arabic, to wit, *af‘al*.

The stipulation that one trait must be taken from a group of two traits pertaining to meaning, and the other from a group of six traits pertaining to form, has explanatory value. First, it reduces the number of possible combinations: putting aside plurality (trait (6)), which, as we have seen, is only at work in one single class, (k), as well as the two classes of one “recurring” trait (classes (j) and (k)), the number of possible combinations is only twelve now, surpassing the number of classes by three; those left out are the combinations of adjectivity (trait (4)) with femininity, being a compound, and foreignness (traits (2), (7) and (8), respectively). The fact that the first combination does not prevent َṣَارَف is addressed by the grammarians;\(^\text{104}\) the type of compounds relevant to lack of َṣَارَف is exclusive to proper names;\(^\text{105}\) and adjectives of foreign origin have most probably the status of common nouns, an issue also addressed by the grammarians.\(^\text{106}\)

Secondly, and more importantly, this model furnished a principled explanation for the dependence of some traits on others; this dependence was only cursorily mentioned by Ibn Yaʿīš, and cannot be accounted for in his model.

Thirdly, it refines the higher-level explanation of the necessity for two traits of “subsidiarity” for a noun to be *māmnūʿ min al-ṣarf*: the correspondence with the traits of “subsidiarity” of verbs vis-à-vis nouns is not only in their number, but must be complete, by consisting of one trait in form and one in meaning.

### 3 Early Transformations of the Theory: Sībawayhi (d. *ca* 180/796), al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) and al-Zaġāǧ (d. 311/923)

Sībawayhi’s theory of *māmnūʿ min al-ṣarf* is outlined towards the end of chapter 2 of his *al-Kitāb*,\(^\text{107}\) with a detailed elaboration in a series of chapters...

---

104 See Ibn Yaʿīš’s discussion above on femininity (trait (2)), regarding the adjective *qāʿima*. See also Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Ṣarḥ*, p. 451.


106 See the account of Ibn Yaʿīš’s discussion on foreignness (trait (8)) above. See also Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Ṣarḥ*, p. 463.

in the book’s second part. In chapter 2, on the variegated types of endings words take (both muʿrab and mabnī), Sībawayhi establishes that verbs are “heavier” than nouns, since the latter are “primary” and of greater tamakkun than the former, and therefore verbs do not carry tanwīn, stating that they are derived from nouns and syntactically require them, but not vice versa. As for mammū’ min al-ṣarf, these nouns are deemed similar to verbs, since their lack of tanwīn and kasra ensues from the fact that they lack the tamakkum of other nouns, just as verbs lack the tamakkun of nouns. However, in contrast with later grammarians, Sībawayhi does not provide a list of all traits that prevent ṣarf. As we shall see, every class of mammū’ min al-ṣarf is indeed characterised by a certain trait, or traits, of “subsidiarity,” yet, Sībawayhi never stipulates that it is only a combination of two traits (or one “recurring” trait) that deprives a noun of ṣarf; most classes are, in fact, characterised in al-Kitāb by only a single trait.

Sībawayhi begins his discussions of mammū’ min al-ṣarf, both in chapter 2 and at the beginning of the second part of al-Kitāb, with what seems to constitute for him the prototypical class of mammū’ min al-ṣarf, aḥmar, etc. (class (g)), characterised as mā ḍāra‘a l-fiʿl al-muḍāriʿ min al-asmāʾ fī l-kalām wa-wafaqahu fī l-binā‘. This phrase needs some elucidation. Its second part can be readily explained, as Sībawayhi states that these take the pattern of e.g. the verb aʿlam[u] (1 [will] know). As for the first, opaquer, part of the phrase under discussion (mā ḍāra‘a l-fiʿl al-muḍāriʿ min al-asmāʾ fī l-kalām), it seems

---


109 For previous studies on tamakkun in al-Kitāb vs later grammars, see fn. 11.

110 Sībawayhi, al-Kitāb, I, p. 5.

111 Ibid., I, p. 6.


113 Ibid., I, p. 5.
that it corresponds to Sibawayhi’s explanation of *muḍāra’atu hu fi l-ṣifa*:\(^{114}\) like verbs, adjectives need nouns (in the narrow sense, *i.e.* excluding adjectives),\(^{115}\) since nouns are “prior” to adjectives, just as they are “prior” to verbs. Moreover, adjectives carry the meaning of the imperfect\(^ {116}\) and assign the accusative, just like the verb. Sibawayhi maintains that, in consequence, they behave analogously to “that which they [sc. the speakers] find heavy,” *i.e.* the verb, so that they are deprived of what “that which they regard light” takes, *i.e.* *tanwīn*, and take *fatḥa* in the genitive. In contrast, if nouns (in the narrow sense), *e.g.* *afkal* (tremour, among other meanings), take this pattern, they are “lighter” and therefore *munṣarif*:\(^ {117}\) Two traits are thus mentioned here: taking a verbal pattern (trait (3)) and adjectivity (trait (4)). Both are regarded as points of similarity to verbs, a similarity whose consequence is lack of *tanwīn*. But taking the pattern of a verb does not, by itself, suffice.\(^ {118}\) Back to common nouns taking verbal patterns, such as *afkal*, their *ṣarf* is, in fact, conditioned upon their being indefinite (*fī l-nakira*).\(^ {119}\) Now Sibawayhi regards definiteness (trait (1)) as a trait of “subsidiarity”: he maintains that the indefinite is “lighter” than the definite and is of a greater *tamakkun*, since it is “primary,” and only “afterwards” does it take “that by dint of which it becomes definite,” by which he probably refers to taking the definite article, annexation to a definite noun and being used as a proper name.\(^ {120}\) Consequently, most indefinite nouns are *munṣarif*.\(^ {121}\) This trait is omnipresent throughout Sibawayhi’s discussions of *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf*, in the form of a distinction between *fī l-nakira* and *fī l-maʿrifa*; save for several specific words,\(^ {122}\) the latter designates the use of the words in question as definite proper names, whereas the former refers either to indefinite common nouns or to proper names used

---


115  See fn. 3 and fn. 32.

116  In Hārūn’s edition, this assertion is illustrated as follows: *hāḏā raǧulun ḍāribun Zaydan* (this [or: here] is a man who is hitting [or: will hit] Zayd), which may also fit as an illustration for the next assertion (regarding the assignment of the accusative), missing from Hārūn’s MS. See Sibawayhi, Abū Bišr ʿAmr b. ʿUṯmān b. Qanbar, *al-Kitāb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, [Beirut], Ālam al-kutub, 1983\(^3\), I, p. 20.


118  Both traits are also mentioned, with respect to the lack of *ṣarf* in adjectives of the pattern *afʿal*, in *ibid.*, 11, p. 1. See also *ibid.*, 11, p. 4-5.


120  These three are listed in *ibid.*, 11, p. 22.

121  *Ibid.*, 1, p. 5.

122  See below. On *subḥān*, whose lack of *ṣarf* is explained on grounds of its definiteness, see *ibid.*, 1, p. 135.
indefinitely. Thus, when *afkal*, for instance, is used *fi l-maʿrifā*, that is, as a definite proper name (class (b), thus *Afkal*), it is *māmnūʿ min al-ṣarf*, for definite nouns are “heavier,” and therefore this word is similar to the verb due to the “heaviness” of the verb; when indefinite, on the other hand, it is “distanced” from the verb. This is yet another case where two traits, taking a verbal form and definiteness, combine, in Sibawayhi’s theory, in order to deprive a noun of ṣarf. Elsewhere, however, a more complicated argument is presented regarding proper names such as *Afkal*. After stating that this pattern, among others, is basically verbal, Sibawayhi explains that when a noun enters a state for which *tanwīn* is sometimes perceived as too “heavy” (i.e. definiteness), the speakers find “heavy” for such nouns “what they find ‘heavy’ for what is more entitled to take this pattern” (*istaṭqālū fīhi mā staṭqālū fī-mā huwa awlā bi-hāḍā l-binā*). Sibawayhi means either verbs, which were mentioned before, or adjectives of the pattern *afʿal*, on which he immediately states that they take the pattern *afʿal* more frequently (than nouns in the narrow sense) due to the similarity between adjectives and verbs. We shall get back to this line of argumentation below, in the discussion of the augment -ān. As for verbs used as masculine proper names, e.g. *Yazīd*, these are *a fortiori māmnūʿ min al-ṣarf*.126

Proper names of foreign origin (traits (1) and (8), class (e)) are contrasted to common nouns of foreign origin used as proper names (e.g. *Dībāǧ*, which possesses only trait (1), but not (8)): whereas common nouns of foreign origin are said to possess *tamakkun* in speech (*fi l-kalām*, by which Sibawayhi most probably means that they have been integrated into Arabic) and can be used both with the definite article and indefinitely, proper names such as *Ibrāhīm* are only used definitely,127 in accordance with their usage in the foreign language, and are said not to possess *tamakkun* in speech.128 This class does not seem to be considered by Sibawayhi as a case of a combination of two traits, a conclusion which is corroborated by the fact that the use of these names indefinitely is not addressed at all by Sibawayhi in this context.

123 See Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”
126 *Ibid.*, 11, p. 3. On *Aḥmad*, which is analysed as an elative used as a proper name, see *ibid.*., 11, p. 4. On *aḡma*’ and *akta*, see *ibid.*, 11, p. 5. On other verbal forms used for proper names, see *ibid.*, 11, p. 6-8.
127 This statement only aims at contrasting proper names with common nouns of foreign origin; this does not exclude the possibility of using proper names of foreign origin indefinitely. See *ibid.*, 11, p. 47, and the discussion below on compounds.
Another trait of “subsidiarity” mentioned in chapter 2 is femininity (trait (2)). Sibawayhi maintains that masculine is “lighter” than feminine, as it is “primary” and possesses greater tamakkun.\textsuperscript{129} It follows that, save for some exceptions, nouns of three harfs—and thus of a minimal pattern—that do not terminate in one of the feminine markers are munṣarif when used as masculine proper names, even if they are of foreign origin, or were feminine common nouns before being used as masculine proper names, e.g. Qadam used as a masculine proper name (from the feminine noun qadam [foot]).\textsuperscript{130} Sibawayhi’s aim here is to explore the extent to which masculine is “light.”

In light of Sibawayhi’s recognition of femininity as a trait of “subsidiarity,” it is striking that it does not constitute a cause for the lack of šarf in several classes displaying this trait, as we shall see in the following discussions.

The different variations in the text of the chapter on nouns terminating with alif as a feminine marker (class (j)) (as well as with alif of ilḥāq) make it impossible to draw definite conclusions. It is most probable, however, that it is not the femininity of the nouns in question that deprives them of šarf, in Sibawayhi’s view, but rather the nature of the augment. In the beginning of the chapter Sibawayhi explains the lack of šarf here as designed to differentiate between the alif that joins as a marker of femininity, on the one hand, and the alif of ilḥāq\textsuperscript{131} and the alif originating in a third radical semi-vowel, on the other.\textsuperscript{132} This point is repeated at the end of the chapter, where Sibawayhi contrasts harfs of ilḥāq to the former alif, which joins the noun “for a meaning,” ascribing the lack of šarf here to the “distance” of this alif from hurūf al-aṣl. He also draws an analogy with masāǧid, but it is unclear whether his emphasis is on the new meaning for which the “breaking” of the pattern takes place, or on the fact that it is a pattern not shared by any singular noun.\textsuperscript{133} In this context Sibawayhi also mentions the fact that this alif is retained in the plural form (e.g. ḥabālā, pl. of ḥublā), possibly contrasting its being an integral part of the noun’s pattern to the behaviour of the alif of ilḥāq, and perhaps also of the tā’ marbūta.\textsuperscript{134} It is worthy of note that elsewhere the alif of ḥublā is characterised, with relation to mammū’min al-ṣarf, as joining “for a meaning,” with no mention of femininity.\textsuperscript{135}

The same explanation also applies to nouns terminating with -ā’, e.g. ḥamrā’, saḥrā’ and aṣdiqā’, whose hamza originates, according to Sibawayhi,

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., I, p. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., II, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{131} On the lack of šarf in definite proper names terminating with this alif see below.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., II, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., II, p. 9 and Sibawayhi, al-Kitāb, ed. Hārūn, III, p. 213.
\textsuperscript{135} Sibawayhi, al-Kitāb, II, p. 47.
in alif al-taʾnīṯ that follows another alif. To hamrāʾ are analogised mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns of the pattern faʾlān (e.g. sakrān, class (i), trait (g)); these have similar forms and in both cases the feminine is not formed by adding a suffix to the singular. Interestingly, these nouns are simply said to be mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf both definitely and indefinitely; neither adjectivity nor being a definite proper name are evoked as a trait preventing šarf in this case. Other nouns terminating with -ān, that is, those whose feminine does not take the pattern faʾlā but faʾlāna, e.g. ‘uryān (naked), are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when used definitely (thus ‘Uryān), in analogy with the previous class, and, in this respect, these nouns are comparable to Afkal (see above); as shown above, the latter isanalysed to adjectives of the pattern afʿal, which are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf both definitely and indefinitely, as this pattern basically belongs to verbs (considering the affinity between adjectives and verbs); in a similar vein, the augment -ān basically belongs to faʾlān whose feminine is faʾlā, and therefore, when these munṣarif nouns terminating with -ān enter a state in which the tanwīn is “heavy” (i.e. when they are definite), they are analogised to “that to which this augment basically belongs.” Sibawayhi further states that nouns terminating with alif of ilḥāq used as masculine proper names are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when definite, analogously to ‘uryān, that is, they are analgesied, in the fashion explained here, to nouns terminating with alif al-taʾnīṯ, and are therefore mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when definite.

Turning now to another feminine marker, nouns terminating with tāʾ marbūṭa are analogised by Sibawayhi to compounds such as Ḥaḍra-mawt (see below), in which the tāʾ marbūṭa is analgesied to -mawt. These nouns are therefore mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when definite, i.e. when used as definite proper names (class (a)), just as the compounds are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. Interestingly, this explanation comes (most probably on the authority of al-Ḫalīl) in response to Sibawayhi’s question as to why these nouns are not mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when indefinite, as are nouns terminating with alif al-taʾnīṯ, in view of the fact that tāʾ marbūṭa also designates femininity. This by no means contradicts the abovementioned explanation of the mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns terminating with alif al-taʾnīṯ, which is probably not based on femininity as a trait of “subsidiarity”: as we have seen, that explanation is based on the fact

---

136 Ibid., II, p. 9.
137 Ibid., II, p. 10.
138 Ibid., II, p. 10-11.
139 Ibid., II, p. 11.
140 In Sibawayhi’s words: bi-manzilat ism ḍumma ilā ism fa-ḡuʾilā isman wāḥidan.
141 On ġudwa and bukra, see ibid., II, p. 44-45.
that the alif joins “for a meaning,” hence the question as to why the tā’ marbūta, which joins for the same meaning, displays a different behavior. The difference between nouns terminating with tā’ marbūta and those terminating with alif al-ta’nit, on the one hand, and the similarity of the former to compounds, on the other, is demonstrated by their respective diminutive forms: the diminutive form of ḥubārā (bustard) is ḥubayyir, i.e. it loses its alif, whereas daǧāǧa (a chicken) forms duǧayyiǧa and Ḥaḍra-mawt forms Ḥuḍayra-mawt, i.e. they retain the tā’ marbūta and the second base, respectively. Moreover, tā’ marbūta is never used for ilḥāq, and does not form part of the pattern.143 What is manifest in Sibawayhi’s discussion of tā’ marbūta is the fact that the lack of šarf in the nouns in question is not explained by their femininity.

This also holds for yet another class displaying femininity: Sibawayhi states that when feminine nouns of at least four harfs are used as masculine proper names,144 e.g. ‘Anāq, they are mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf, since males are basically named by masculine nouns (wa-ḏālika anna aşl al-muḍakkar ‘inda hum an yusammā bi-l-muḍakkar), which are more appropriate for them (wa-llaḏī yulā’imuḫu).145 What prevents šarf in this case is not femininity per se but the deviation from the basic state, from femininity to masculinity.

However, femininity is considered in the next chapter as relevant to a lack of šarf. We have already encountered the rule that masculine proper names of three harfs are, with some exceptions, munṣarif (regardless of whether or not the middle harf is quiescent). Here Sibawayhi avers that feminine proper names of the pattern CvCvC146 are mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf, whereas one is at liberty to choose between šarf and lack thereof (albeit the latter is said to be “better”) for those of the pattern CvCC, e.g. Hind. At this point, Sibawayhi draws a comparison between the feminine and the masculine, explaining the behavior of the former as stemming from the basicness of the latter, which is the “primary” and of a greater tamakkun, just like the indefinite.147

At the end of this chapter Sibawayhi accounts for the lack of šarf in Zayd and Ḥaḍra-mawt (two names of the pattern CvCC) when used as feminine proper names148:

---

143 Ibid., II, p. 12. See also ibid., II, p. 47.
144 See above his explanation of šarf in those consisting of three harfs.
145 Ibid., I, p. 19. See also ibid., II, p. 22. This also applies to feminine proper names, e.g. Zaynab, used as masculine proper names (ibid., II, p. 21).
146 In Sibawayhi’s formulation: kull muʾannaṯ sammaytahu bi-ṯalāṯat aḥruf mutawālin minhā harfīni bi-l-taḥarruk.
147 Ibid., II, p. 21-22.
148 This is the opinion of Ibn Abī Isḥāq (see Sibawayhi, al-Kitāb, ed. Hārūn, 111, p. 242; the word ibn is missing from Derenbourg’s edition) and Abū Ḥaḍra-mawt, on the authority of Yūnus, and is also, in Sibawayhi’s own view, the qiyās. For Ḥaḍra-mawt, however, they are munṣarif, due to their “lightness.”
feminine nouns are more appropriate for females (li-anna l-muʾannaṭ ʾašadd mulāʾamatan li-l-muʾannaṭ), and the latter are basically named by the former, just as males are basically named by masculine nouns. This is the same line of argumentation, *mutatis mutandis*, that we have encountered in the previous chapter, in the discussion of, *e.g.*, ‘Anāq used as a masculine proper name (see above). Sibawayhi here intends to contrast feminine nouns used as masculine proper names, which are *mammūʾ min al-ṣarf* only when consisting of at least four *ḥarfs*, to masculine nouns used as feminine proper names, which are *mammūʾ min al-ṣarf* even when taking the “lightest” pattern, owing to their femininity, as explained here. It should be stressed that the lack of *ṣarf* in *Zayd* and *ʿAmr* used as feminine proper names is explained only by the principle of diversion from the basic state of naming females with feminine nouns; what femininity explains is why the “lightness” of their pattern, *i.e.* CvCC, does not induce *ṣarf*.

Another trait of “subsidiarity” discussed in chapter 2 of *al-Kitāb* is plurality (trait (6)). Sibawayhi maintains that the singular is of greater *tamakkun* than the plural, as it is “primary.” This is why plurals taking syllabo-vocalic patterns not shared by singulars, *viz.* CaCāCiC and CaCāCiC, *e.g.* masāǧid and mafātīḥ (keys) (class (k)), are *mammūʾ min al-ṣarf*. In contrast, ṣayāqila, etc. are not so, since *tāʾ marbūta*, as mentioned above, is not regarded as an augment, in contrast to the ʾayā and *alif* of this word, but is rather compounded to the form ṣayāqil-, analogically to the compounding of -mawt to Ḥaḍr in Ḥaḍra-mawt; in this respect, ṣayāqila belongs to the class of *talha*. Sibawayhi here also analogises the *tāʾ marbūta* to the gentilic -ī when the latter is added to Madāʾin, for instance, the resulting word, madāʾīnī, belongs to the class of *tamīmī* (and

According to Ibn al-Nāẓīm (*Šarḥ*, p. 462), these names are *mammūʾ min al-ṣarf* due to a combination of being a definite proper name and femininity (traits (1) and (2)). The transference from masculinity to femininity brings about a further “heaviness,” which “counterbalances” the pattern’s “lightness” (yet, he remarks, some grammarians allow *ṣarf* as well). See also Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad, *Kitāb al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḫāliq ʿUḍayma, Cairo, Laǧnat iḥyāʾ al-turāṯ al-islāmī, 1994, III, p. 351.

150 See also the discussion on toponyms of foreign origin in *ibid.*, 11, p. 22.
151 *Ibid.*, 1, p. 5; 11, p. 15. The *ṣarf* in plurals of the pattern *afʿāl* (also: *fuʿāl*) is accounted for by its similarity to the singular, since it can also take plurals of the patterns under discussion, just like singulars (*e.g.* *aqwāl*, pl. of *qawwl* [saying, speech, opinion]—*aqwāwil*, *i.e.* the so called *gamʿ al-ʾam*); this is not the case for the patterns under discussion, which are the “utmost” patterns. Moreover, there are singulars taking the pattern *afʿāl*. See *ibid.*, 11, p. 16-17.
is therefore *munsarif*). This pattern, moreover, is also used for singulars, e.g. *ṭabāqiya* (crafty, cunning, mischievous).\(^\text{152}\)

As for *ʿUmar*, etc. (class (c)), these proper names are deemed “diverted” (*maḥdūd*, also: *maʿdūl*, trait (5)) from the pattern most deserving of them (*ʿĀmir* in the case of *ʿUmar*). They are *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* by virtue of their differing from their basic pattern. Their ṣarf when used indefinitely (here designating indefinite proper names) is explained on the ground of the definiteness of their basic patterns (e.g. *ʿĀmir*): they are “shifted” from the state of the latter by dint of their indefiniteness, and are thus no longer deemed “diverted” from them.\(^\text{153}\) The explanation of the lack of ṣarf in these cases is therefore not based on a combination of two traits, since here definiteness is not considered a trait of “subsidiarity.”

Sibawayhi also raises the question as to the lack of ṣarf in *ḡumaʿ* and *kutā*, to which he answers (most probably on the authority of al-Ḥalil) that these are definite and “diverted” from the plurals of *ḡamʿāʾ* and *katʿāʾ* (their respective f.sg. forms, whose expected plural forms are *ḡumʾ* and *kutʾ*\(^\text{154}\)), and are *munsarif* when used as indefinite proper names.\(^\text{155}\) Although this explanation appears, at first blush, to be based on a combination of two traits, it seems that definiteness is here only evoked in order to explain these words’ ṣarf when they are not definite, in line with the analysis of *ʿUmar*. As for *uḫar* (another, other \([f.pl.])\),\(^\text{156}\) it is said to differ from its basic form and behave differently from other words of the same class (this word’s *ahawāt*, in Sibawayhi’s parlance), which must take the definite article and modify definite nouns when used as adjectival attributes, hence the impermissibility of *niswatun ṣuḡarun* (lit. smallest/youngest women, without the definite article). The word *uḫar*, on the other hand, can be used as an adjectival attribute without the definite article.\(^\text{157}\) Here again, only one trait is relevant to the discussion. The same notion also explains the lack of ṣarf in *ṭulāṭ*, etc. (class (h)),\(^\text{158}\) whose adjectivity, although recognised, does not play any part in the explanation of their lack of ṣarf. *ʿAdl* alone is also regarded as the cause for the lack of ṣarf in feminine proper names.

\(^{152}\) *Ibid.*, II, p. 16.  
\(^{154}\) See *ibid.*, II, p. 220; see also al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ*, III, p. 490.  
\(^{156}\) For Ibn al-Nāẓim (*Šarḥ*, p. 456-457), *uḫar* is *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* due to a combination of adjectivity and *ʿadl* (traits (4) and (5), respectively).  
\(^{157}\) *Ibid.*, II, p. 14-15. See also *ibid.*, II, p. 49, where the lack of ṣarf in *ṣaḥar* is also given the same explanation (on which see also *ibid.*, II, p. 45).  
such as Qaṭām, analysed as maʿdūl from proper names, e.g. Qāṭima, just as ʿAmr is maʿdūl from ʿĀmir.159

Finally, Sibawayhi relates that he asked Yūnus why the compound Maʿdī-karib (class (d)) lacks šarf although it is one single noun (i.e. not an annexation, of Maʿdī to karib, a possibility also discussed in this context) and Arabic (i.e. not of foreign origin). Yūnus’ response was that all such compounds are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf because compounding (trait (7)) is not a basic method of forming nouns, as proven by the rarity of common nouns that are compounds. Since they are not mutamakkin, they are not granted the status of the mutamakkin that behaves according to the basic state. Here Sibawayhi contrasts foreign proper names and nouns taking tāʾ marbūta, e.g. ʿalḥa/Ṭalḥa, to aḥmar, “broken” plurals such as masāǧid and mafātīḥ, and nouns terminating with -ā such as hublā, which are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when indefinite, that is, they are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf adjectives or common nouns. Compounds are said to belong to the first group: they are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf when definite, but not so when indefinite, since the definite is “heavier” than the indefinite. The analogy with names terminating with tāʾ marbūta is also formal.160 Maʿdī-karib is a single name, just like Ṭalḥa, and is formed in order to belong to this group of the mutamakkin (also: the awwal [first]); it is “heavy” when definite, but it does not tolerate lack of šarf when indefinite. A hierarchy thus exists among the causes preventing šarf: some of these prevent šarf by themselves, others only when combined with definiteness. That is, the lack of šarf in this class, among others, is explained by a combination of two traits.161

To sum up, in contrast with later grammarians, Sibawayhi never states that a combination of two traits of “subsidiarity” is always necessary in order to prevent šarf, and some classes of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf are indeed not analysed as such. Several other classes of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf are, however, explained by a combination of two traits, mostly in the form of the distinction between fī l-maʿrifa and fī l-nakira. Of special importance is the case of aḥmar, etc. (class (g)), whose lack of šarf is also explained by a combination of this sort, and

159 Ibid., II, p. 36-37.
160 See Sibawayhi’s analogy of compounds to nouns terminating with tāʾ marbūta above. In our discussion Sibawayhi says: kamā tarakū šarf al-hāʾ fī l-maʿrifa wa-ṣarafūhā fī l-nakira li-mā ḏakartu laka (!). The argument based on analogy between the two classes turns to be circular. See also ibid., I, p. 84. See also Baalbaki, “Coalescence,” p. 88; Jean N. Drue, “How to Deal with Contradictory Chapters in Sibawayh’s Kitāb? Compound Numerals from ‘Eleven’ to ‘Nineteen’ (Chapters 314, 336 and 412 of the Kitab),” in Perspectives on Islamic Culture: Essays in Honour of Emilio G. Platti, eds Bert Broeckaert, Stef Van den Branden and Jean-Jacques Pérennès, Louvain-Paris, Peeters (“Les cahiers du MIDÉO”, 6), 2013, p. 73-91.
161 Sibawayhi, al-Kitāb, II, p. 46-47.
whose straightforward similarity to the verb seems to render it a prototypical case of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. Later theory can readily be seen as a generalisation of these classes.

Another conspicuous difference between Sībawayhi and later grammarians is the role the trait of femininity plays in their respective explanations of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. As we have seen in the previous sections, femininity constitutes, for later grammarians, a trait explaining lack of ṣarf wherever the noun in question displays any feature pertaining to femininity.

A few remarks on al-Mubarrad’s treatment of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf are in order, as this grammarian forms a link between Sībawayhi’s theory of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf and that of the later grammarians, who adhere to the theory found in al-Uṣūl fī l-naḥw by Ibn al-Sarrāǧ, al-Mubarrad’s famous student. Al-Mubarrad generally follows in Sībawayhi’s footsteps in his description of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, adapted to his more pedagogically oriented grammar. Like Sībawayhi, he neither presents a list of traits of “subsidiarity,” nor states that lack of ṣarf always stems from two such traits.

Yet, the notion of a combination of two traits as an explanation for the lack of ṣarf in ḥmar, etc. (class (g)) is expressed somewhat more explicitly in al-Mubarrad’s statement that these words are said to be similar to the verb in two aspects (min waḡhayni), to wit taking a verbal pattern and adjectivity (traits (3) and (4), respectively); afkal, accordingly, is said to be similar to the verb in only one aspect (min ǧiha wāḥida), and hence its ṣarf.162

Another, more obscure, case is al-Mubarrad’s treatment of feminine proper names of foreign origin that take the pattern CvCC. The preceding discussion revolves around Arabic feminine proper names of the pattern CvCC, e.g. Hind, which some consider mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf while others do not; the reason furnished by the latter is these names’ “lightness” (as their pattern is deemed “minimal”), which “counterbalances” their femininity.163 In contrast, feminine proper names of foreign origin are said to be mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf by all speakers, since they combine foreignness together with femininity (traits (8) and (2), respectively), and thus two “preventing elements” (māniʿāni) are combined in them.164 It seems that what is argued here is that, even when femininity is “counterbalanced” by the “lightness” of the pattern, these names are still left with another “preventing” element, namely foreignness. If this is the case, the two “preventing elements” do not refer to the two traits depriving these nouns of ṣarf according to the mainstream theory, to wit, foreignness and definiteness

163 Ibid., III, p. 350.
164 Ibid., III, p. 351.
(trait (1)). A less plausible possibility is that the two “preventing elements” do refer to these two.

The second major point by which al-Mubarrad differs from Sībawayhi is his treatment of femininity (trait (2)), which conforms to later theory. While he does analogise nouns terminating with \( tā’ \) marbūṭa with compounds (see above), as far as we know he does not evoke this analogy in order to explain the lack of ṣarf in these nouns. On the other hand, compounds are analogised to nouns terminating with \( tā’ \) marbūṭā in order to explain the lack of ṣarf in compounds.

Al-Mubarrad’s student, Ibn al-Sarrāǧ, already presents the fully-fledged mainstream theory of \( mamnū’ \) min al-ṣarf; another student of al-Mubarrad’s, al-Zaǧǧāǧ, puts forward an account of \( mamnū’ \) min al-ṣarf that is almost identical to the mainstream theory, but lacks some of its systematisation. The first difference pertains to al-Zaǧǧāǧ’s treatment of the two classes whose lack of ṣarf is explained in the mainstream theory as due to one “recurring” trait, namely nouns terminating with \( alif al-ta’ \)nīṯ and “broken” plurals such as masāǧīd and mafātīḥ (classes (j) and (k), respectively). As for the former, al-Zaǧǧāǧ incorporates in his list, beside femininity (trait (2)), a trait which he formulates as follows: augmenting a feminine marker in a way differing from \( tāʾ \) marbūṭa, this difference being considered an additional trait. By this trait al-Zaǧǧāǧ refers to the \( alif al-ta’ \)nīṯ; here the difference between al-Zaǧǧāǧ and other grammarians seems to be more a matter of formulation rather than of essence. As for the latter, these nouns are said to be \( mamnū’ \) min al-ṣarf due to their being plurals and to the fact that they do not share their form with any singular, but al-Zaǧǧāǧ does not elaborate on this explanation.
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165 Ibid., III, p. 319, 327-328.
166 See for example ibid., IV, p. 19.
167 Ibid., IV, p. 20.
170 See also ibid., p. 27 ff. Another difference that is also probably a matter of formulation is that two traits, being a compound and terminating with -ān (traits (7) and (9), respectively), are missing from al-Zaǧǧāǧ’s list. Following Sībawayhi, al-Zaǧǧāǧ (ibid., p. 35) analogises words such as sakrān to e.g. ḥamrāʾ, and definite proper names terminating with -ān to e.g. sakrān. Al-Zaǧǧāǧ’s explanation for the lack of ṣarf in compounds is found in a chapter dedicated to these proper names, where it is ascribed to the combination of definiteness and the fact that compounding is not a “basic” type of word formation; here al-Zaǧǧāǧ analogises compounds to proper names such as Ṭalḥa, which is \( mamnū’ \) min al-ṣarf due to the “compounding” of \( tā’ \) marbūṭa to ṭalḥ (ibid., p. 102; see also ibid., p. 124).

Ibid., p. 46.
Secondly, although al-Zaǧǧāǧ, unlike Sībawayhi, does not analogise words terminating with tāʾ marbūta to compounds, the šarף in e.g. šayāqila (which is indefinite) is nevertheless explained _inter alia_ by dint of analogy to compounds.

Moreover, al-Zaǧǧāǧ differs from the majority of Arab grammarians in two further respects: first, he voices a unique view that the vowel -a in the genitive is considered _bināʾ_ and secondly, he categorically disallows šarף in feminine proper names of the pattern CvCC (class (a)), explaining the fact that they do appear with šarf in poetry as due to poetic license.

From the following case we may infer that al-Zaǧǧāǧ reads the theory of two traits into Sībawayhi’s _al-Kitāb_: after paraphrasing the text of _al-Kitāb_ regarding _uḫar_ (see above), he explains that it is _mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf_ due to the combination of being “transformed” and adjectivity (traits (5) and (4), respectively), on which he immediately remarks that Sībawayhi does not mention adjectivity here, yet it is inferred from his text. He adds that, in his view, the two traits that are combined here are the use of _uḫar_ without the definite article and the fact that it conveys the sense of adjectivity; this, he says, is _ka-annahu šarḥ li-maḏhab Sībawayhi_.

4 An Alternative Theory: al-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185)

Al-Suhaylī’s attack is aimed at the heart of the mainstream theory of _mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf_, to wit, the very function of _tanwīn_. For al-Suhaylī, _tanwīn_ is not a marker of _tamakkun_, but rather of separateness, that is, it marks the fact that the noun in question is not annexed or linked to what follows it. First, he
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172 Ibid., p. 38.
173 Ibid., p. 47.
174 Ibid., p. 2.
175 Ibid., p. 49-51.
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states that *tamakkun* is not a notion that requires a marker. Secondly, as shown by the fact that rare words such as *hudabid* (very thick milk, among other meanings) receive *tanwīn*, whereas frequently used words such as *ahmar* do not, *tanwīn* cannot be considered as a marker of *tamakkun* in speech.\(^{178}\) Thirdly, al-Suhaylī evokes the behaviour of *id*: in *ḥīnaʾidin* (at that time), for instance, this word has *tanwīn*, since it is not annexed, while it does not when annexed: *id ᾁzaydu n qāʾīmun* (when Zayd was standing up). This word, he says, has the least *tamakkun*, being very similar to particles.\(^{179}\) Fourthly, *tanwīn* is not used when unneeded in order to mark separateness, to wit, in pause and after some nominal classes, such as personal pronouns and nouns with a definite article, for there is no risk of these being mistakenly considered as being in *status constructus*. On the other hand, *tanwīn* does appear at the end of poetic verses in order to mark their separateness from the following verse, e.g. *yā sāḥi mā hā ḍā l-dumūʿ l-ḏurrafan* (Oh my friend, what stirred up the flowing tears?).\(^{180}\) Finally, verbs do not terminate with *tanwīn*, since they are linked to their subjects. Particles, as well as the (*mabnī*) nouns resembling them (see section 1),

---

\(^{178}\) Note that here al-Suhayli refers to *tamakkun* in speech (*fi l-kalām*), a Sībawayhian notion, which was not current in later writings, rather than to *tamakkun* in noun-ness. See sections 1 and 3.

\(^{179}\) According to most grammarians, this *tanwīn* belongs to the category of *tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ* (*tanwīn* of compensation); in our case it “compensates” for a deleted clause. See Ibn Yaʾīṣ, *Šarḥ*, 4, p. 155-156; Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 19-21; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 172; Ayoub, “Tanwīn.”

\(^{180}\) According to most grammarians, this is a rare case of *tanwīn*, termed *tanwīn al-tarannum* (*tanwīn* of poetic trilling). See Ibn Yaʾīṣ, *Šarḥ*, 4, p. 157-159; Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 21; Ayoub, “Tanwīn.”
do not terminate with tanwīn since, on the one hand, the operators among them are linked to the words on which they operate, and, on the other, there is no risk for the non-operators among them to be mistaken for being in an idāfa relationship.\footnote{Al-Suhaylī, \textit{Amālī l-Suhaylī Abī l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Andalusī fī l-naḥw wa-l-luģa wa-l-ḥadīṭ wa-l-fiqh}, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā, [Cairo], Maṭbaʿat al-saʿāda, [1970], p. 24-26. See also Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Suhaylī, \textit{Natāʾiǧ al-fikr fī l-naḥw}, eds ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawḡūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1992, p. 69-70, 104, 151-152 (note that in \textit{ibid.}, p. 70, tanwīn is regarded as the marker of both tamakkun and separateness).}

As for the lack of -\textit{i} as a genitive marker in this class of nouns, al-Suhaylī considers this to be a secondary property, designed to prevent the risk of misinterpreting them as nouns followed by the first person singular possessive pronoun, all the more so in light of the fact that a common allomorph thereof is -\textit{i}, e.g. \textit{naḏīri} (my warning; Kor 67, 17). This lack of a specific marker of the genitive is the reason for the term \textit{ḡayr munṣarif}: it only turns (\textit{yansārīfū}) from the \textit{raf} (i.e. -\textit{u}) to the \textit{nasb} (i.e. -\textit{a}).\footnote{Al-Suhaylī, \textit{Amālī}, p. 29.} This is why, when there is no risk for confusion, namely with a definite article or in status constructus, -\textit{i} is used as the genitive marker.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.}

Al-Suhaylī also denounces the notion of “heaviness” with respect to \textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf}, a notion that, he maintains, pertains either to the senses (the tongue or the sense of hearing) or to the mind: if the former is intended, words such as \textit{šamardal} (youth, strong and hardy; which is \textit{munṣarif}) are nevertheless “heavier” than words such as \textit{Zaynab} (\textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf}); if the latter, words such as \textit{hamm} (distress; \textit{munṣarif}) are nevertheless “heavier” than words such as (\textit{rawḍa}) \textit{ḡannā́} ([garden] abounding with herbs; \textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf}).\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 22-23. Here al-Suhaylī emphasises the requirement that the \textit{ʿilla} (grammatical cause) be both \textit{muṭṭarid} (coextensive) and \textit{munʿakis} (coexclusive), that is, it must constitute both a necessary and a sufficient condition. According to al-Suhaylī the fact that \textit{dārib} is not \textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf} demonstrates that the \textit{ʿilla} lacks \textit{iṭṭirād}. On \textit{iṭṭirād} and \textit{inʿikās} see Suleiman, \textit{The Arabic Grammatical Tradition}, p. 128-132; Sheyhatovitch “The theory of definition.”}

The harshest criticism is levelled at the principle of similarity to the verb. Al-Suhaylī wonders why nouns such as \textit{ḍārib} are \textit{munṣarif} although they resemble the verb formally, semantically and syntactically.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 20, 22. Here al-Suhaylī emphasises the requirement that the \textit{ʿilla} (grammatical cause) be both \textit{muṭṭarid} (coextensive) and \textit{munʿakis} (coexclusive), that is, it must constitute both a necessary and a sufficient condition. According to al-Suhaylī the fact that \textit{dārib} is not \textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf} demonstrates that the \textit{ʿilla} lacks \textit{iṭṭirād}. On \textit{iṭṭirād} and \textit{inʿikās} see Suleiman, \textit{The Arabic Grammatical Tradition}, p. 128-132; Sheyhatovitch “The theory of definition.”} It is madness and delusion, according to al-Suhaylī, to claim that \textit{Ibrāhīm} is \textit{mammūʿ min al-ṣarf} due to an alleged similarity to \textit{yafʿalu} ([he] acts/will act) and \textit{yantāliqu} ([he] goes/will go...
Against the “subsidiarity” of verbs vis-à-vis nouns, al-Suhaylī argues that verbs operate on nouns, and therefore precede them.

Al-Suhaylī rejects as arbitrary the grammarians’ assertion that similarity to the verb entails loss of tanwīn and the specific marker of the genitive: why, he asks, do mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf nouns not lose other properties not possessed by verbs, such as duality, plurality, definiteness and annexation? Alternatively, why do they not lose only the tanwīn or only the specific marker of the genitive?

Arbitrariness also inheres, according to al-Suhaylī, in the view that a combination of two traits (or more) prevents ṣarf. Why not one? Why not three? Furthermore, why should the feminine suffixes -ā and -āʾ and plurality each count as two traits (in classes (j) and (k), respectively)?

He adds that the list of traits of “subsidiarity” is arbitrary as well, since it excludes diminutiveness, containing a weak radical (muʿtall) and taking an augment (apart from -ān).

The mainstream theory is also self-contradictory, according to al-Suhaylī, with respect to the notion of definiteness. On the one hand, definiteness supposedly brings nouns closer to the verb (trait (1)), but on the other hand, the definite article and annexation—two cases of definiteness—entail ṣarf, since the nouns in question, so it is claimed, are no longer similar to verbs. In fact, al-Suhaylī notes, being a proper name is a trait that does more to make nouns dissimilar to verbs than the traits of taking the definite article and annexation, since articles may also precede verbs, as poetic licence, and temporal adverbials may be annexed to verbs.

Specific cases also refute the mainstream theory. For instance, muslima (Muslim [f.sg.]) should have been mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, being feminine as well

187 Ibid., p. 24. This argument is ascribed by Ibn al-Anbārī to the Kūfans, see al-Inṣāf, 1, p. 236. See also al-Zaǧǧāǧī, al-Īḍāḥ, p. 83. Cf. the opposite argument in section 1 and the references in fn. 14.
189 Ibid., p. 23.
190 Ibid., p. 24.
191 Ibid., p. 23.
192 Al-Suhaylī here does not differentiate between annexation to definite and to indefinite nouns. Cf. al-Suhaylī, Natāʾiǧ, p. 169-170.
193 Al-Suhaylī, Amālī, p. 21-22. The latter point is not illustrated by al-Suhaylī; other grammarians (e.g. Ibn Yaʿīš, Šarḥ, 11, p. 180 ff.) discuss annexation of nouns designating time (not only adverbials) to verbs (or verbal clauses), e.g. hāḍā yawmu yanfaʿu l-ṣādiqīna ṣidquhum (Kor 5, 119) “This is a Day when the truthful will benefit from their truthfulness” (The Qurʾān, p. 79).
as an adjective (traits (2) and (4), respectively),\textsuperscript{194} and so should “broken” plurals (trait (6)) of adjectives, \textit{e.g.} \textit{kirām} (noble [pl.]).\textsuperscript{195} On the other hand, \textit{Abū Qābūs} (a kunya) is \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf}, notwithstanding the fact that it has only one trait, definiteness.\textsuperscript{196}

We shall now see how al-Suhaylī applies his view, that \textit{tanwīn} functions as a marker of separateness, to \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf} vs \textit{munṣarif}. The first class he addresses is proper names.\textsuperscript{197} What is striking is that whereas for most grammarians, as we have seen, in the default case nouns can receive \textit{tanwīn} and it is the lack thereof that requires an explanation, for al-Suhaylī the reverse is true: proper names are definite (by default), and therefore, unlike indefinite nouns, they are not at risk to be mistakenly considered as being in \textit{status constructus} and are thus in no need of \textit{tanwīn}; in accordance, it is the existence of proper names with \textit{tanwīn} that demands explanation! One should also note that poets frequently use such names as \textit{mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf}.\textsuperscript{198} Al-Suhaylī’s explanation of proper names with \textit{tanwīn} runs as follows: \textit{tanwīn} is only found in proper

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[194] Al-Suhaylī, \textit{Amālī}, p. 20. This is also a case of lack of \textit{iṭṭirād} (see fn. 185).
\item[195] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 21.
\item[196] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 21; it is inferred that this is a case of lack of \textit{inʿikās} (see fn. 185). According to al-Suhaylī, \textit{qābūs} is an Arabic word, meaning \textit{ḥasan al-waḡ} (having a beautiful face). See also Abū l-Faḍl Ṛāmāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr, \textit{Liṣān al-ʿarab}, Beirut, Dār Šādir, 1968, v1, p. 168. Ibn Yaʿīš (\textit{Ṣarḥ}, iv, p. 51) explains the lack of \textit{ṣarf} in \textit{Qābūs} in a poetic verse as due to poetic license, on the ground of its being a definite proper name (see section 1). According to a different view, \textit{Qābūs} is of foreign origin. See \textit{e.g.} Abū Manẓūr al-Ǧawālīqī, Mawḥūb b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḫaḍir, \textit{al-Muʿarrab min al-kalām al-aʿǧamī ʿalā ḥurūf al-muʿǧam}, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Šākir, [Cairo], Maṭbaʿat dār al-kutub, 19692, p. 307-308; Ibn Manẓūr, \textit{Liṣān}, v1, p. 168. As a curiosity, the pattern \textit{fāʿūl} is mentioned in an anonymous “Kūfan” grammar as preventing \textit{ṣarf} when combined with definiteness. Vidro and Kasher, “How Medieval Jews Studied Classical Arabic Grammar,” p. 194.
\item[198] Al-Suhaylī, \textit{Amālī}, p. 26-27.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
names that originate in common nouns taking tanwīn, since the speakers take the original meanings of proper names into consideration. Excluded are therefore proper names that do not originate in non-proper (Arabic) nouns (ġayr manqūl [not transferred]): ‘Umar (class (c)) did not designate anything before being used as a proper name, rather, it is the outcome of a “transformation” ‘Āmir—which does take tanwīn—has undergone (‘udīla ‘anhu) (al-Suhaylī regards names such as Salmān and ‘Imrān [class (f)] as ma’dūl as well, but does not explicitly state whether this applies to all proper names terminating with -ān); Ibrāhīm (class (e)), being a foreign name, does not originate in anything taking tanwīn; and Zaynab (class (a)), it is inferred, is murtaḡal (improvised), i.e. coined specifically as a proper name. Also excluded are proper names that originate in words not taking tanwīn, such as Yazīd (class (b)). Another case of ġayr manqūl is mentioned, namely proper names that are compounds, e.g. Ba‘la-bakk (class (d)). The main reason given, however, for the lack of tanwīn in these names is that they only rarely appear in annexation constructions, and are therefore in no need of tanwīn.

But not all classes of mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf readily conform to this basic principle, at least not without emendation. Proper names such as Ṭalḥa (class (a)) contradict this principle prima facie, since they are mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf that originate in munṣarif nouns. The lack of ṣarf in Ṭalḥa stems, in al-Suhaylī’s view, from the change in state between the common noun and the proper name: in the former, the meaning of the noun depends on the sense of the tāʾ marbūta, whereas in the latter this sense is lost, and the noun’s form is no longer taken into consideration. Ṭalḥa is regarded now as a composition of two nouns, and its gender changes to the masculine. The process is thus analogous to the “transformation” (‘adl) that ‘Umar undergoes. The same holds for Ḥanāq (class (a)), a feminine noun used as a masculine proper name, although it does not terminate with a feminine marker. Al-Suhaylī extends this principle to feminine proper names such as Fāṭima, since the tāʾ marbūta loses its
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201 See al-Suhaylī, Amālī, p. 35, 37.
202 For this sense of murtaḡal, see Carter, “The Use of Proper Names,” p. 110; Ibn Ya‘īs, Šarb, 1, p. 106.
203 Al-Suhaylī, Amālī, p. 28, 34 ff.
204 Ibid., p. 39.
205 Ibid., p. 29-31.
original meaning,\footnote{Ibid., p. 31-32. In al-Suhayli, Natāʾiǧ, p. 291, ġudwa and bukra (class (a)) lack tanwin due to definiteness and femininity, in line with both the mainstream view and his own.} and states that all feminine proper names are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf.\footnote{Al-Suhayli, Amālī, p. 32. No explanation is given for feminine proper names not terminating with tā’ marbūta; yet it may be inferred from the text that the lack of ṣarf in these names stems from the discrepancy between grammatical and natural gender.} The pattern faʿāl (class (c)) of feminine proper names is deemed by al-Suhayli to be (basically) hypocoristic; the (name of the) loved one is annexed\footnote{Iḍāfa here is a metagrammatical intuitive term (see fn. 30), as its semantic scope covers both its meaning as a technical term and the everyday concept underlying it, here designating the relation between the loved one and the self. Cf. Kasher, "Iconicity," p. 210.} to the (pronoun of the) self (i.e. “my […]”), a notion signalled by the lack of tanwin.\footnote{Al-Suhayli, Amālī, p. 37.} Other classes lacking tanwin due to an “aroma” (rāʾiḥa) of annexation are, for instance, aḡmaʿ (class (b))\footnote{In al-Suhayli, Natāʾiǧ, p. 287-288 it is asserted that aḡmaʿ is annexed to a personal pronoun.} and ǧumaʿ (class (c)). In a similar vein, saḥar (class (c)) is mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf since it is definite in meaning.\footnote{Al-Suhayli, Amālī, p. 33. In al-Suhayli, Natāʾiǧ, p. 287-289, it is stated that saḥar is either underlyingly annexed, i.e. saḥar ḏālika l-yawm, just like aḡmaʿ, or, better, it takes the definite article, i.e. al-saḥar allaḏī min ḏālika l-yawm.}

For tūlāt (class (h)) there is no risk that it can be mistakenly perceived as being in status constructus, hence its lack of tanwin.\footnote{Al-Suhayli, Amālī, p. 32-33. This is also the reason for the final invariable -i these names may take (see fn. 53): this vowel is similar to -ī, but not identical, as this is nevertheless not a case of a “pure” annexation.}

As for sakrān (class (i)), its lack of tanwin is not due to the resemblance between -ān and -ā, as argued by the grammarians, for these two augments are similar neither in form nor in meaning. Rather, it is due to a different similarity, both in form and meaning, namely to the dual suffix. The similarity in form is straightforward; semantically, the intensity which this augment designates is similar to duality.\footnote{See also al-Suhayli, Natāʾiǧ, p. 42.} Its lack of tanwin is analogous to the lack of tanwin in the dual suffix; this is also why it does not take tāʾ marbūta.\footnote{Al-Suhayli, Amālī, p. 37-38. See also al-Suhayli, Natāʾiǧ, p. 43.} On the other hand, nouns of the patterns fīlān and fūlān are likened to singulars of the syllabovocalic patterns CiCāC and CuCāC, respectively; for instance, ṭuʿbān (long serpent) is “appended”\footnote{On ilḥāq see section 1.} to fūṣṭāṭ (a type of tent) and sirḥān (wolf) to qīrṭās (papyrus roll, among other meanings). This “appending” is preferred, for these two patterns, to “appending” to the dual, not only because they are identical in syllabo-vocalic pattern and singularity, but also because they do not convey
intensiveness. But this explanation is not available for faʿlān, because there exists no singular of the syllabo-vocalic pattern CaCCāC.²¹⁶ However, when nouns of the patterns fiʿlān and fuʿlān become proper names (class (f)), they are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf, since they no longer belong to the class of common nouns, which can be likened to one another.²¹⁷

Another case of lack of tanwīn due to analogy is the “broken” plurals of the type masāǧid (class (k)), which belong to patterns restricted to plurals, just like the sound masculine plural, which does not take tanwīn. These nouns have no singular counterparts of the same pattern to be likened to, and, moreover, analogy between two types of plurals is preferred to analogy between plurals and singulars. Nevertheless, many speakers use these “broken” plurals as muṣarīf, and both forms appear in the Qurʾān.²¹⁸ When suffixed by tāʾ marbūṭa, however, they are likened to the singular, since tāʾ marbūṭa is not suffixed to the nūn of the sound masculine plural (just like the dual).²¹⁹

To sum up, al-Suhaylī’s view on the function of the tanwīn exempts mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf proper names from being in need of explanation, because their lack of tanwīn directly follows from the basic principle that there is no risk of them being mistakenly perceived as being in the status constructus. It is proper names that take tanwīn which are in need for explanation; the explanation that he offers is that speakers take into consideration the common nouns, terminating with tanwīn, in which they originate. Most classes of mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf proper names indeed do not originate (at least directly) in common nouns taking tanwīn: those taking verbal patterns (class (b)), “transformed” nouns (class (c), and at least a part of class (f)), compounds (class (d)), and nouns of foreign origin (class (e)). Compounds are also said to be exempt from requiring tanwīn, as they seldom take the status constructus. Mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf feminine proper names (class (a)), on the other hand, originate in common nouns taking tanwīn, but since the tāʾ marbūṭa loses its function, the common noun in which they originate is not taken into consideration. The lack of ṣarf in feminine proper names of the pattern faʿāl is provided with distinct explanation of its own, based on the notion of annexation.

Outside the realm of proper names, adjectives such as tūlāt (class (h)) cannot be mistaken for being in status constructus. The pair aṯmaʿ (class (b)) and ǧumaʿ (class (c)) are mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf because they possess an “aroma” of annexation, and saḥar (class (c)), because it is definite in meaning. The lack

²¹⁷ Al-Suhaylī, Amālī, p. 38.
²¹⁸ See the first Qurʾānic verse adduced in fn. 80.
²¹⁹ Ibid., p. 38-39.
of ṣarf in words terminating in -ā or -āʾ (class (j)) and in adjectives of verbal patterns (class (g)) is not explained. This shortcoming (in the extant text?²²⁰) hinders an overall assessment of al-Suhaylī’s theory.

Finally, in order to account for the lack of ṣarf in two classes, adjectives of the pattern faʿlān (class (i)) and plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns CaCāCiC and CaCāCiC (class (k)), al-Suhaylī has recourse to an explanatory tool, ubiquitously used by Arab grammarians, to wit, analogy: each of these classes is said to be similar to a class of nouns not terminating with tanwīn, namely the dual and the sound masculine plural, respectively.

Conclusion

In this article, we discussed the ways by which Arab grammarians struggled with the challenge posed by mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf. Needless to say, Arab grammarians did not use diachronic explanations.²²¹ Instead, they sought a unified explanation for the reason why these, and only these, classes of nouns do not take tanwīn (and the specific marker of the genitive), and why other nouns do. One cannot but admire the ingeniousness of their theories, the fact that all contain ad hoc elements notwithstanding. At any rate, the last word has not yet been said in this matter, especially in terms of “higher cause” level.

²²⁰ See ibid., p. 33.