



BRILL

ARABICA 66 (2019) 98-136

Arabica



brill.com/arab

# “Though This Be Madness, Yet There Is Method In’t”: The *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* (Diptotes) in Arabic Grammatical Tradition

Jean N. Druel and Almog Kasher

IDEO and Bar-Ilan University

*jean@druel.com and almog.kasher@biu.ac.il*

## Abstract

This article discusses theories designed by medieval Arabic grammarians to explain one of the most puzzling topics in Arabic grammar, *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* (diptotes). The mainstream theory of *mamnū‘ 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.

## Keywords

Arabic grammatical tradition, diptotes

## 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 *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* (diptotes). La théorie classique du *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* a probablement été finalisée au début du IV<sup>e</sup>/X<sup>e</sup> siècle; elle diffère de la théorie de Sībawayhi (m. v. 180/796), dont elle généralise cependant les principales caractéristiques. Une modification ultérieure a été apportée à cette théorie classique, probablement durant le VII<sup>e</sup>/

XIII<sup>e</sup> 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.

## Mots clefs

tradition grammaticale arabe, diptotes

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

One of the most puzzling aspects of Arabic is, no doubt, the class of *al-mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* (the so-called “diptotes”).<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to see any order in the highly heterogeneous group of classes of nouns<sup>3</sup> 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 *aʿal*, 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 *amnū‘ min al-ṣarf* nouns.

Since the theory of *amnū‘ min al-ṣarf* accepted by the vast majority of Arab grammarians has been long known in modern scholarship,<sup>4</sup> 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.

4 See e.g. William Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896-1898<sup>3</sup>, I, p. 245-246; Michael G. Carter (ed.), *Arab Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins (“Amsterdam Studies in

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 Ya‘īsh’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-Nāzim’s (d. 686/1287) commentary on his father’s celebrated *Alfiyya*.

Since the earliest extant grammar that contains the mainstream theory is Ibn al-Sarrāġ’s (d. 316/928) famous *al-Uṣūl fī l-naḥw*,<sup>5</sup> our next task, in section 3, is to study the transformations the theory regarding *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* underwent, starting with Sibawayhi (d. ca 180/796), through al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898)—a teacher of Ibn al-Sarrāġ—until it took its final shape. Here we also discuss *Mā yanšarifu wa-mā lā yanšarifu* by al-Zaġġāġ (d. 311/923), a contemporary of Ibn al-Sarrāġ as well as a student of al-Mubarrad; as we shall see, al-Zaġġāġ’s theory regarding *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* is indeed very similar to Ibn al-Sarrāġ’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 *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*. In section 4 we analyse an alternative, dissenting, theory of *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*, put forward by a grammarian

---

the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 3, Studies in the History of Linguistics”, 24), 1981, p. 74-79; Djamel Kouloughli, *Le résumé de la grammaire arabe par Zamaḡšarī: Texte, traduction et commentaires*, Lyon, ENS Éditions (“Langages”), 2007, p. 34-38.

5 On Ibn al-Sarrāġ’s role in the systematisation of Arabic grammatical theory, see esp. Jonathan Owens, *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins (“Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 3, Studies in the History of Linguistics”, 45), 1988, p. 4, 28-30; Michael G. Carter, “Arabic Grammar,” in *Religion, Learning and Science in the ‘Abbasid Period*, eds M.J.L. Young, John Derek Latham and Robert Bertram Serjeant, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (“The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature”, 3), 1990, p. 128; Georges Bohas, Jean-Patrick Guillaume and Djamel Eddin Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, London-New York, Routledge (“Arabic Thought and Culture”), 1990, p. 10-11; Ramzi Baalbaki, “Introduction: The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition,” in *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, ed. *id.*, Aldershot-Burlington, Ashgate-Variorum (“The Formation of the Classical Islamic World”, 36), 2007, p. xxxvii.

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

## 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.<sup>7</sup> Thus nouns, by default, carry the three case markers and the *tanwīn*;<sup>8</sup> for those which do not meet this expectation an explanation must be furnished.

As for case markers, *īrāb* is explained as aimed at differentiating between syntactic functions,<sup>9</sup> and is therefore a nominal feature: on the one hand, there are non-nouns that are *muʿrab*, namely imperfect verbs, whose *īrāb* 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

6 On this grammarian, see esp. Ramzi Baalbaki, “Expanding the *maʿnawī ʿawāmil*: Suhaylī’s Innovative Approach to the Theory of Regimen,” *Al-Abhath*, 47 (1999), p. 23-58. Issues pertaining to al-Suhaylī’s theory of *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* are discussed in Ṭariq ʿAbd ʿAwn al-Ġanābī, “Manhaġ al-Suhaylī l-naḥwī fī Amāliyyihī [sic],” *Maġallat ādāb al-mustanṣirīyya*, 8 (1984), p. 103-138; Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā, *Abū l-Qāsim al-Suhaylī wa-maḍhabuhu l-naḥwī*, Jidda, Dār al-bayān al-ʿarabī, 1985, *passim*; Juan Pablo Arias, “De los nombres propios, según al-Suhaylī (m. 518 [sic]/1185-6),” *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos*, 45 (1996), p. 25-34.

7 See Bohas, Guillaume and Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, p. 51-53; Kees Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes: Az-Zaġġāġī’s Theory of Grammar*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, J. Benjamins (“Amsterdam Studies in Theory and History of Linguistic Science”, 75), 1995, p. 64, 126; Yasir Suleiman, *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Study in taʿlīl*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1999, p. 33-36 and *passim*.

8 Note the multifaceted nature of *tanwīn* in Arabic grammatical tradition, the *tanwīn* taken by *munṣarif* nouns, named *tanwīn al-tamakkun* (on this term, see in what follows), *al-tamkīn*, *al-amkaniyya*, *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-Baqāʿ Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal li-l-Zamaḥṣarī*, ed. Imil Badī 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*.

9 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 124, 165, 198; II, p. 286; III, p. 189; IV, p. 20. See also Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 104 ff., 126 ff.

are inherently indeclinable, or to fill the position of a *mabnī* verb.<sup>10</sup> Other nouns are *mutamakkin* (firmly established [in noun-ness]);<sup>11</sup> these are entitled to *īrāb* by dint of their noun-ness.<sup>12</sup>

*Tanwīn*, according to Ibn Yaʿīš, is a marker of “lightness” (*ḥiffa*),<sup>13</sup> which is why it is suffixed to indefinite nouns, being “basic” (*aṣl*), “lighter” (*aḥaff*)

10 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, II, p. 286 ff.; IV, p. 210 ff. See also Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 101; Bohas, Guillaume and Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, p. 52-53; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 126 ff.

11 For surveys of previous studies on *tamakkun*, see Rafael Talmon, *Eighth-Century Iraqi Grammar: A Critical Exploration of Pre-Ḥalilian Arabic Linguistics*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns (“Harvard Semitic Studies”, 53), 2003, p. 287-288; Janusz Danecki, “The Notion of *tamakkun* in Sibawayhi’s Grammar,” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 48 (1993), p. 121-130. See also Ramzi Baalbaki, *The Legacy of the Kitāb: Sibawayhi’s Analytical Methods within the Context of the Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics”, 51), 2008, p. 118-119; Ayoub, “Tanwīn,” *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*; Amal E. Marogy, “The Notion of *tanwīn* in the *Kitāb*: Cognitive Evaluation of Function and Meaning,” in *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics II: Kitāb Sibawayhi: Interpretation and Transmission*, eds Amal Elesha Marogy and Kees Versteegh, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics”, 83), 2015, p. 160-170; Georgine Ayoub, “Case and Reference: The Theory of *mā yaṣarīf wa-mā lā yaṣarīf* in Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb*,” in *Foundations of Arabic Linguistics III: The Development of a Tradition: Continuity and Change*, eds Georgine Ayoub and Kees Versteegh, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics”, 94), 2018, p. 11-49. Note also that the literal translation given here for the term *tamakkun* is based on the text of Ibn Yaʿīš; some scholars have suggested that “being able to” was this technical term’s original meaning. See Janusz Danecki, “The Notion of *tamakkun* in Sibawayhi’s Grammar,” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 48 (1993), p. 121-130; Mohamed Chairret, “*Ḥiffa*, *ṭīqal* et *tamakkun*: régime d’incidence et classes de mots,” *Langues et littératures du Monde arabe*, 1 (2000), p. 217.

12 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 164, 167.

13 Elsewhere, however, Ibn Yaʿīš (*Šarḥ*, I, p. 88) states that the function of *tanwīn* is to differentiate between *mā yaṣarīfu* and *mā lā yaṣarīfu*. See also *ibid.*, III, 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 arabische Linguistik*, 2 (1979), p. 15; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 179 ff.; Chairret, “*Ḥiffa*, *ṭīqal* et *tamakkun*”; Arik Sadan, “The Technical Terms *ḥiffa* and *ṭīqal* 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 (*alāma*) to denote *tanwīn*, 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 *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* under this framework, Owens (*ibid.*, p. 209) regards the *tanwīn* as “indefinite -n,” claiming that *mamnū’ 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.”

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<sup>14</sup> and require nouns), do not carry *tanwīn*.<sup>15</sup> 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*).<sup>16</sup> 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 (-i)<sup>17</sup> only follows it in this respect, since both are properties, unique attributes (*ḥāṣṣa*),<sup>18</sup> of nouns.<sup>19</sup> According to another view these nouns are deprived of both *tanwīn* and a specific marker of the genitive in the first place, since verbs lack both.<sup>20</sup> 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

14 This view is generally ascribed to the Baṣran grammarians; see Abū l-Qāsim al-Zaġġāġī, *al-Īdāḥ fi ʿilal al-naḥw*, ed. Māzin al-Mubārak, Beirut, Dār al-nafāʿis, 1986<sup>5</sup>, p. 83 ff.; Kamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Saʿīd al-Anbarī, *al-Inṣāf fi masāʾil al-ḥilāf bayn al-naḥwīyyīn al-baṣrīyyīn wa-l-kūfīyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī l-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Egypt, al-Maktaba l-tiġārīyya l-kubrā, 1961<sup>4</sup>, 1, p. 235 ff.; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 72 ff.; Nadia Vidro and Almog Kasher, “How Medieval Jews Studied Classical Arabic Grammar: A Kūfan Primer from the Cairo Genizah,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 41 (2014), p. 231.

15 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, 1, p. 165-168, 179. See also Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 137-138, 179.

16 Another recurring explanation justifies the lack of *tanwīn* here by the principle that “if a word is characterised by *tiqal* (heaviness), the Arabs avoid the addition to it of another element that aggravates its *tiqal*, or introduce into it an element of *ḥiffa* (lightness) to counterbalance its *tiqal*.” Ramzi Baalbaki, “*Ilḥāq* as a Morphological Tool in Arabic Grammar,” *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 4 (2001-2002), p. 21-22; see also *id.*, “Coalescence as a Grammatical Tool in Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb*,” in *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics*, ed. Yasir Suleiman, Richmond, Curzon, 1999, p. 99. See also Ibn al-Nāẓim, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mālik, *Šarḥ Ibn al-Nāẓim ʿalā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Muḥammad Bāsil ʿUyūn al-Sud, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 2000, p. 450.

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

18 On this term in al-Astarābādī’s (d. 688/1289?) *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya*, see Beata Sheyhatovitch, “The theory of definition in *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya* by Raḍī l-Dīn al-ʿAstarābādī” (in preparation).

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

20 *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*.<sup>21</sup> 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]).<sup>22</sup> 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)<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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).<sup>25</sup>

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 lower-case letters assigned to the members of the latter will be used for further reference in this article.

The nine traits of “subsidiarity”:

---

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

- 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 *Approaches to the History and Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher*, eds Manuel Sartori, Manuela Elisa Bibiana Giolfo 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 *ḡayr munṣarif*, to wit, the *tanwīn*. A straightforward identification between the two is found, for example, in *Alfyyat Ibn Mālik: al-ṣarf tanwīn* (Ibn al-Nāzim, *Ṣarḥ*, p. 449), and in al-Širbīnī’s following statement: *fa-yumnaʿu l-ṣarf allaḍi huwa l-tanwīn* (Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 18; see also *ibid.*, p. 74). See also Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1885-1888, I, p. 306-309; Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 73; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 173. For discussions on the etymology of the technical term *ṣarf*, see Silvestre de Sacy, *Grammaire arabe*, Tunis, Société anonyme de l’imprimerie rapide (“Bibliothèque de l’Institut de Carthage”, 4/5), 1904-1905<sup>3</sup>, I, p. 397-398; Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, I, p. 306-309; Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, p. 173-174; *id.*, “Ṣarf,” *EL*<sup>2</sup>; Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”

- 22 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Ṣarḥ*, I, p. 164-165, 167.

- 23 Following Abū Ishāq (sc. al-Zaḡḡāḡ), against al-Mubarrad and Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912 or 320/932), Ibn Yaʿīš (*ibid.*, III, p. 51) maintains that a combination of three or more traits does not render nouns invariable (*mabnī*).

- 24 *Ibid.*, I, p. 166-168; V, p. 453.

- 25 *Ibid.*, I, 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 *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* is that of proper names.<sup>26</sup>
- (2) Femininity: (grammatical) femininity is “subsidiary” to masculinity; the type of femininity pertinent to *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* is the “inherent” (*lāzim*) rather than the “accidental” (*‘āriḍ*) kind, thus excluding cases in which the feminine suffix marks the distinction between a masculine and a feminine, e.g. *qā’im* vs *qā’ima* (standing up [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]) and *imru’* (man) vs *imra’a* (woman), or between a collective noun and a *nomen unitatis*, e.g. *ša’ir* (barley) vs *ša’ira* ([a single] barleycorn).<sup>27</sup>
- (3) Taking a verbal pattern: such patterns are restricted, or at least characteristic, to verbs, hence their “subsidiarity.”<sup>28</sup>
- (4) Adjectivity: adjectives (*waṣf*, *ṣifa*) are “subsidiary” to the noun (in the narrow sense)<sup>29</sup> they modify (*mawṣūf*), since the former require the latter,<sup>30</sup> just as a verb requires its subject;<sup>31</sup> adjectival attributes are preceded by their head;<sup>32</sup> adjectives are derived, just like verbs, and are therefore “subsidiary,” just like verbs.<sup>33</sup>

26 *Ibid.*, I, p. 168; III, p. 352. Note that grammatical patterns expressed with the root F.‘L are also considered as proper names (*ibid.*, I, p. 124-125). There are also nouns denoting abstract concepts that are nevertheless regarded as their proper names (*ibid.*, I, 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 III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences”), 1997, p. 250.

27 *Ibid.*, I, p. 168; III, p. 352.

28 *Ibid.*, I, 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 *fīl* and *fā’il* 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 Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 173.



- (5) Being “transformed, turned from” another pattern (*ʿadl*): derived words are “subsidiary” to the words from which they are derived.<sup>34</sup>
- (6) Plurality: plurality is “heavier” than singularity.<sup>35</sup>
- (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*),<sup>36</sup> *mamnūʿ min al-šarf* compounds are those in which the two nouns are considered as one: the second has the status of *tāʾ marbūṭa* (the first terminating, accordingly, with *-a*), and consequently, the compound behaves analogously to nouns terminating with *tāʾ marbūṭa*.<sup>37</sup>
- (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.* *Ishāq*), to the exclusion of borrowed common nouns, which behave just like Arabic common nouns (*e.g.* *dībāğ* [silk brocade]).<sup>38</sup>
- (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 *ḥarfs*; <sup>39</sup> in both, the first *ḥarf* is *alif*; in both, the corresponding masculine and feminine patterns are different (*e.g.*

34 *Ibid.*, I, p. 174. According to this grammarian, *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.

35 *Ibid.*, I, p. 179.

36 The reason why these compounds are invariable is that they “include” the meaning of the particle *wa-* (see above).

37 *Ibid.*, I, p. 95, 98, 183-184.

38 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 185-186. See Kees Versteegh, “What’s It Like to be a Persian? Sibawayhi’s Treatment of Loanwords,” in *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics II: Kitāb Sibawayhi: Interpretation and Transmission*, eds Amal Elesha Marogy and Kees Versteegh, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics”, 83), 2015, p. 209-210.

39 The term *ḥarf* (in the phonetic/phonological sense) basically corresponds to “consonant.” However, long vowels are regarded in Arabic grammatical tradition as sequences of a short vowel and a glide, the latter being a *ḥarf*: *i* is analysed as a short *i* (*kasra*) followed by a quiescent (*sākin*) *yāʾ*, regarded as a *ḥarf*, thus *iy*; *ū* is analysed as a short *u* (*damma*) followed by a quiescent *wāw*, another *ḥarf*, thus *uw*; and *ā* as a short vowel *a* (*fatha*) followed by an *alif*, which is also regarded as a quiescent *ḥarf*, this sequence being often symbolised in Western writings as *alif*. See Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 43; Bohas, Guillaume and Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, p. 98-99, fn. 3; Gideon Goldenberg, “Principles of Semitic Word-Structure,” in *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*, eds Gideon Goldenberg and Shlomo Raz, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1994, p. 29-64; Kees Versteegh, “Phonological Constraints in Arabic Grammatical Theory: The *iltiqāʾ as-sākinayn*,” *Romano-Arabica*, 3 (2003), p. 221-236.

*aḥmar* vs *ḥamrāʾ* (red [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]), *sakrān* vs *sakrā* (inebriated [m.sg. and f.sg., respectively]); and to neither can *tāʾ marbūṭa* be suffixed (e.g. \**ḥamrāʾa*, \**sakrāna*). That is, the pattern at stake is *faʿlān* whose feminine is *faʿlā*, but not *faʿlān* whose feminine is *faʿlāna* (e.g. *nadmān-nadmāna* (boon companion [m.sg. and f.sg. respectively]), which is *munṣarīf*. In proper names, where this trait is not restricted to the pattern *faʿlān*, e.g. *ʿUtmān*, the augment *-ān* is analogised to the abovementioned *-ān* in *faʿlān*: both consist of an augmented *-ān*, and *tāʾ marbūṭa* cannot be suffixed to both.<sup>40</sup>

Below the various classes of *mamnūʿ 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 marbūṭa*, e.g. *Ṭalḥa*,<sup>41</sup> are *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* due to the combination of traits (1) and (2).<sup>42</sup> We noted above that *qāʾima*, for instance, is *munṣarīf*, despite being an adjective (trait (4)), since the *tāʾ marbūṭa* is suffixed to it in order to differentiate between masculinity and femininity, whereas the femininity trait relevant to *mamnūʿ 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.<sup>43</sup>

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

40 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 186-187; IV, p. 218.

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-manīyya* (f.), but not when used as a proper name of *al-mawt* (m.) (*ibid.*, I, p. 121).

45 *Ibid.*, I, p. 193-194.

origin (trait (8)), e.g. *Ġūr*,<sup>46</sup> if used as feminine proper names, since they possess three traits.<sup>47</sup>

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.<sup>48</sup>

- (b) Proper names in verbal patterns, e.g. *Yazīd*, are *mamnūʿ min al-šarf* due to the combination of traits (1) and (3).<sup>49</sup> *Aġmaʿ* (entire, all [m.sg.]) also belongs here.<sup>50</sup>
- (c) Proper names whose patterns are “transformed” from different patterns are *mamnūʿ min al-šarf* due to the combination of traits (1) and (5), e.g. *ʿUmar*, which is “transformed” from *ʿĀmir*.<sup>51</sup> *Ġumaʿ* (f.pl. of *aġmaʿ*) also belongs here,<sup>52</sup> 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).<sup>53</sup>

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).<sup>54</sup>

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

46 Analysed as *Ġuwr*, see fn. 39. *Ġūr* is a toponym of a town also known as *Firūzābād*, see Šihāb al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Yāqūt b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī l-Rūmī l-Baġdādī, *Muġam al-buldān*, Beirut, Dār Šādir, 1977, II, p. 181; L. Lockhart, “Firūzābād,” *EP*.

47 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 194-195.

48 *Ibid.*, I, p. 123-124. See also *ibid.*, III, 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-aġmaʿ* (*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 *aġmaʿ* (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.*, III, p. 70-72) also indicates that in the dialect of the Ḥiġāz, these proper names take an invariable *-i* (thus e.g. *Qaṭāmi*), whereas the Tamīm treat them as *mamnūʿ min al-šarf*, except when the final consonant is *r*, in which case most of them use these names in the Ḥiġāzi fashion (e.g. *Ḥaḍāri*).

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. *Iṣḥāq*, are *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* due to the combination of traits (1) and (8).<sup>56</sup> But if they consist of only three *ḥarḥs*, the middle of which is quiescent (i.e. *CvCC*), e.g. *Lūt*,<sup>57</sup> they are *muṣṣarif*.<sup>58</sup>
- (f) Proper names terminating with an augmented *-ān*, e.g. *Marwān*, are *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* due to the combination of traits (1) and (9).<sup>59</sup>

Before we move on to classes of *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* other than proper names, a note is necessary regarding the use of proper names indefinitely, e.g. *hādā Ibrāhīmu wa-Ibrāhīmun āḥaru* (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 *muṣṣarif* when used indefinitely (in which case they lose trait (1), and are left with only one trait, at the most).<sup>60</sup> Moreover, Ibn Ya‘īš maintains that there are traits dependent on trait (1); for instance, the toponym *Adrabūjān*<sup>61</sup> possesses traits (1), (7),<sup>62</sup> (8) and (9),<sup>63</sup> but the latter three are in effect only when combined with trait (1).<sup>64</sup> Ibn Ya‘īš neither elaborates on this point nor justifies the dependence of some traits on others.

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

- (g) Adjectives of verbal patterns, e.g. *aḥmar* (red), are *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* due to the combination of traits (3) and (4).<sup>65</sup>

56 *Ibid.*, I, p. 186, 191.

57 Analysed as *Luwṭ*, see fn. 39.

58 *Ibid.*, I, p. 193.

59 *Ibid.*, I, p. 187, 191. This also applies to *subḥān*, which, according to Ibn Ya‘īš, is a proper name of the verbal noun *al-tasbiḥ* (*ibid.*, I, p. 119-121, 294-295; III, p. 21) and *kaysān*, a proper name of *al-ḡadr* (perfidy) (*ibid.*, I, p. 122).

60 *Ibid.*, I, p. 124-125, 168, 170, 184, 187, 191-192; V, p. 154. See *ibid.*, I, p. 192-193 for Ibn Ya‘īš’s discussion on *Aḥmar* used as a proper name, indefinitely (see also *ibid.*, IV, p. 132). This issue is studied in detail in Jean N. Druel, “The Proper Name *Aḥmar*: A Morphological Discussion in the 2nd-4th Centuries AH (Sibawayh, al-Akhfash, al-Māzinī, al-Mubarrad, Ibn Wallād and Ibn al-Sarrāj),” *Mélanges de l’Institut Dominicain d’Études Orientales*, 29 (2012), p. 51-60.

61 Other vocalisations are possible, see Yāqūt, *Muḡam*, I, p. 128.

62 I.e. *Adra-biḡjān* (*ibid.*).

63 In fact, it also possesses trait (2), as stated elsewhere (Ibn Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ*, III, p. 51; see also Yāqūt, *Muḡam*, I, 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 *ḥarḥs*, viz. *-ān*, can be considered as “augmented” in this foreign name.

64 Ibn Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 192. See also *ibid.*, I, p. 170.

65 *Ibid.*, I, p. 173-174. See also *ibid.*, IV, p. 131 ff.

- (h) Adjectives of patterns considered as “transformed” are *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* due to the combination of traits (4) and (5), e.g. *tulāt* (“transformed” from *talāta talāta* [three by three]),<sup>66</sup>
- (i) Adjectives of the pattern *fa‘lān*, e.g. *sakrān*, are *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* due to the combination of traits (4) and (9).<sup>67</sup>

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

- (j) Nouns terminating with augmented *-ā*<sup>68</sup> or *-ā’* (*alif al-ta’nūt*), e.g. *ḥublā* (pregnant), *bušrā* (glad tidings), *sakrā*, *ḥamrā’* and *šahrā’* (desert),<sup>69</sup> are *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*. These feminine markers, by themselves, render them *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*: in addition to femininity (trait (2)), which these markers share with the *tā’ marbūṭa*, they are also “superior” to it, since they form part and parcel of the nominal pattern, in contrast to the elidable *tā’ marbūṭa*; this “superiority” counts as a second trait.<sup>70</sup> For adjectives terminating with these augments, trait (4) is merely added to this double-trait;<sup>71</sup> this is also the case, *mutatis mutandis*, for proper names (trait (1)).<sup>72</sup>

Ibn Ya’īš also states that whereas common nouns terminating with an augmented *alif* that is not *alif al-ta’nūt*, such as *alif* of *ilḥāq* (appending [one pattern to another]),<sup>73</sup> are *munšarif*, e.g. *arṭan* (أرطى; *Calligonum*),<sup>74</sup> those which are proper names are *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*, e.g. *Arṭā*, due to the combination of trait (1) and the similarity of this *alif* to *alif al-ta’nūt*:

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 *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* needs some clarification. The so-called *maqšūr* nouns are analysed as taking case endings underlyingly, since for phonetic reasons the final *alif* cannot take a vowel. This applies not only to *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* nouns such as *ḥublā*, but also to *munšarif* nouns, such as *‘ašan* (عَصًا), whose final *alif* is elided when taking *tanwīn* (\*‘aša”n → ‘ašan). In both cases the nouns are classified as *mu‘rab*, since nothing prevents them from possessing *tamakkun* (see above on factors causing nouns to be *mabnū*). See *ibid.*, I, p. 151, 153, 162-163; IV, p. 33-36.

69 Ibn Ya’īš does not mention any plural terminating with *-ā* or *-ā’*; Ibn al-Nāẓim (Šarḥ, p. 451), however, also adduces *marḏā* (sick [pl.]) and *ašdiqā’* (friends), as well as *ašyā’* (things). The lack of *šarf* in the latter word is said to have occasioned a debate among grammarians, on which see Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inšāf*, II, p. 812-820.

70 Ibn Ya’īš, *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 *ǧa’far* and *salḥab*. Ibn Ya’īš, *Šarḥ*, III, p. 199-200, 383; IV, p. 34; V, p. 323.

both consist of an augmented *alif*, and in both *tā’ marbūta* cannot be suffixed (in the case of *Arṭā* etc., this stems from the fact that the noun in question is a proper name).<sup>75</sup>

- (k) “Broken” plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns<sup>76</sup> *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCiC*,<sup>77</sup> e.g. *masāğid* (mosques) and *danānīr* (dinars), are *mamnū’ min al-şarf*. Since these patterns do not occur in singular nouns, it is as if these nouns are pluralised (trait (6)) twice.<sup>78</sup> 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]).<sup>79</sup>

Two final remarks on Ibn Ya’iṣ’s account of *mamnū’ min al-şarf* are in order here, regarding *şarf vs mamnū’ min al-şarf* in poetry. First, *mamnū’ min al-şarf* nouns may be *munşarif* as poetic licence, thereby reverting to their basic state.<sup>80</sup> Secondly, Ibn Ya’iṣ also permits the use of *munşarif* nouns possessing only one

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

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*, *mağā’il*, *fa’ā’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 Taşrif 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 Ya’iṣ’s formulation: plurals whose third [*harf*] is *alif* followed by two *harfs*, or three, the middle of which is quiescent.

78 Here Ibn Ya’iṣ gives as examples cases of the so-called *ğam’ al-ğam’* (on which see Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, I, 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 Ya’iṣ, *Şarh*, I, p. 178-179. See also *ibid.*, I, p. 195. Plurals terminating with *tā’ marbūta*, e.g. *şayārifa* (money changers) are *munşarif* (*ibid.*, III, p. 443), a fact for which no explanation is furnished by Ibn Ya’iṣ. Ibn al-Nāzim (*Şarh*, p. 458), however, shows that they have counterparts in the singular, e.g. *karāhiya* (dislike).

80 Ibn Ya’iṣ, *Şarh*, I, p. 187-188. Ibn al-Nāzim (*Şarh*, p. 472) adds another factor rendering this practice permissible (outside poetry), to wit, *tanāsub* (uniformity), e.g. [*innā ‘tağnā li-l-kāfirīna*] *salāsilan* [*wa-ağlālan wa-sā’iran*] (Kor 76, 4, according to a *qirā’a*, see Aḥmad Muḥtār ‘Umar and ‘Abd al-‘Alī Sālim Makram, *Mu’ğam al-qirā’āt al-Qur’āniyya*, Kuwait, Maṭbū’at ġāmi’at al-Kuwayt, 1988, VIII, p. 19) “We have prepared chains, iron collars, and blazing Fire for the disbelievers” (*The Qur’an*, transl. M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 401) and [*wa-qālū lā tađarunna ālihatakum wa-lā tađarunna*] *Waddan wa-lā Suwā’an wa-lā Yağūṭan wa-Ya’ūqan wa-Nasran* (Kor 71, 23, according to a *qirā’a*, see ‘Umar and Makram, *Mu’ğam*, VII, p. 232-233) “Saying, ‘Do not renounce your gods! Do not renounce Wadd, Suwa’, Yaghuth, Ya’uq, or Nasr!’” (*The Qur’an*, p. 391).

trait of “subsidiarity” as *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* in poetry, a practice most common in definite proper names.<sup>81</sup>

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 *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*. However, the eleven classes of *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* ((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, ‘*adl*, being a compound, foreignness, and terminating with the augmented *-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, ‘*adl*, and terminating with the augmented *-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 *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* 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)), *i.e.* 28. Obviously, there are some combinations that simply do not (or even cannot) exist, *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: *Adrabīḡān*, as an indefinite masculine proper name possesses three traits, being a compound of a foreign origin and terminating with the augmented *-ān* (traits (7), (8) and (9), respectively), but the noun possessing these three traits of “subsidiarity” is not *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*, as these are said to depend on the trait of being a definite proper name (trait (1)) in order to devoid *šarf*; 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 *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* is identical to Ibn Yaʿīš’s in its basic principles: nouns become *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* 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,

81 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, I, p. 191. Other explanations, by various grammarians, are mentioned for the poetic verses in which *munšarif* nouns behave (at least *prima facie*) as *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* (*ibid.*, I, p. 188-191).

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.<sup>82</sup> So for a noun to resemble a verb enough to be granted the property of lack of *tanwīn*, it must possess the verb’s “subsidiarity” both in form and in meaning.<sup>83</sup>

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.<sup>84</sup> Nor do nouns become *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* due to several traits of “subsidiarity” in form, e.g. *uḡaymāl*,<sup>85</sup> or in meaning, e.g. *ḥā’id* (menstruating),<sup>86</sup> for the similarity between these and the verb is not complete. On the other hand, *Aḥmad* (class (b)), for instance, is *mamnū‘ 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)).<sup>87</sup>

Ibn al-Nāẓim recognises twelve classes of *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf*, the eleven classes discussed above and a twelfth class of proper names that end in an *alif* of *ilḥāq*, e.g. *Artā*, which are subsumed above under class (j).<sup>88</sup> 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 *mamnū‘ 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 *ḡamal* (camel). *Ibid.*, p. 548, 561; see also Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 1, 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*, 1, p. 187.

87 Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Ṣarḥ*, p. 450.

88 Ibn al-Nāẓim (*ibid.*, p. 465) states explicitly that it is only *-ā*, not *-ā'*, which deprives a word of *ṣarf* in this case, but no explanation is furnished.



1) One consists of five classes of nouns that are *mamnū' min al-šarf* although they are indefinite. These are nouns terminating with *alif al-ta'nūt* (class (j)), plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCīC* (class (k)), as well as those in which adjectivity (trait (4)) is combined with taking the pattern *fa'lān*,<sup>89</sup> i.e. class (i), with taking the pattern *af'al*, i.e. class (g),<sup>90</sup> or with 'adl (trait (5)), i.e. class (h).

2) The second group consists of seven classes that are *mamnū' min al-šarf* when definite; these are the six classes of proper names (a)-(f) and proper names terminating with the *alif* of *ilhāq* (see above).<sup>91</sup>

Thus, the reason why *alif al-ta'nūt*, namely *-ā* and *-ā'* (class (j)), is sufficient to deprive nouns of *šarf* 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)).<sup>92</sup> Just like Ibn Ya'īš, Ibn al-Nāẓim explains the difference between these augments and *tā' marbūta* as due to the *lāzim* (“inherent”) nature of the former and the *'ariq* (“accidental”) nature of the latter.<sup>93</sup>

“Broken” plurals of the syllabo-vocalic patterns *CaCāCiC* and *CaCāCīC* (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)).<sup>94</sup>

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

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

91 Ibn al-Nāẓim, *Šarḥ*, p. 450-451.

92 *Ibid.*, p. 451.

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

94 *Ibid.*, p. 457.

Apart from these cases, the traits considered as pertaining to meaning are adjectivity<sup>95</sup> and definiteness (mostly as proper names)<sup>96</sup> (traits (4) and (1), respectively), whereas those considered as pertaining to form are terminating with an augmented *-ān*,<sup>97</sup> taking a verbal pattern,<sup>98</sup> ‘*adl*,<sup>99</sup> being a compound,<sup>100</sup> femininity by *tā’ marbūta*, either overt or covert<sup>101</sup> and foreignness<sup>102</sup> (traits (9), (3), (5), (7), (2) and (8), respectively).<sup>103</sup>

Note that the somewhat different presentations of the traits by Ibn Ya‘īš 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 Ya‘īš, 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. *rağūlum ‘adlun* (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 *-ā’* 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 *tā’ marbūta* 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-Ṣan‘ā’—ṣan‘ānī*. 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 *fa‘lān* (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 *af‘al* (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-ta’nīt*.

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

103 It is evident that Ibn Ğinnī (d. 392/1002) has in mind a different conception of *lafẓ* and *ma’nā* when he states that out of the nine traits preventing *ṣarf*, only one is *lafẓī* (taking a verbal pattern, trait (3)), while all other eight are *ma’nawīyya*. See Abū l-Faṭḥ ‘Uṭmān Ibn Ğinnī, *al-Ḥaṣā’iṣ*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Alī l-Nağğār, Beirut, Dār al-hudā, n.d.<sup>2</sup>, 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, *afʿal*.

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 *ṣarf* is addressed by the grammarians;<sup>104</sup> the type of compounds relevant to lack of *ṣarf* is exclusive to proper names;<sup>105</sup> and adjectives of foreign origin have most probably the status of common nouns, an issue also addressed by the grammarians.<sup>106</sup>

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 *mamnūʿ 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: Sibawayhi (d. ca 180/796), al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) and al-Zaḡḡāḡ (d. 311/923)

Sibawayhi’s theory of *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* is outlined towards the end of chapter 2 of his *al-Kitāb*,<sup>107</sup> with a detailed elaboration in a series of chapters

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

105 See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Ṣarḥ*, III, p. 144-145.

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

107 Sibawayhi, *al-Kitāb (Le livre de Sibawaihi)*, ed. Hartwig Derenbourg, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1881-1889, I, p. 5-6.

in the book’s second part.<sup>108</sup> In chapter 2, on the variegated types of endings words take (both *mu‘rab* and *mabnī*), Sībawayhi establishes that verbs are “heavier” than nouns, since the latter are “primary” and of greater *tamakkun*<sup>109</sup> 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*.<sup>110</sup> As for *mamnū‘ 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 *tamakkun* of other nouns, just as verbs lack the *tamakkun* of nouns.<sup>111</sup> 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 *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* is indeed characterised by a certain trait, or traits, of “subsidiarity,”<sup>112</sup> 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 *mamnū‘ 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 *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf*, *aḥmar*, etc. (class (g)), characterised as *mā ḍāra‘a l-fi‘l al-muḍāri‘ min al-asmā‘ fi l-kalām wa-wāfaḡahu fi 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 *a‘lam[u]* (I [will] know).<sup>113</sup> As for the first, opaquer, part of the phrase under discussion (*mā ḍāra‘a l-fi‘l al-muḍāri‘ min al-asmā‘ fi l-kalām*), it seems

108 *Ibid.*, II, p. 1 ff. Reuschel’s analyses of several paragraphs therein, in his section on “Triptota und Diptota,” should be taken with much caution; for one thing, he identifies *tanwīn* with “Indetermination.” See Wolfgang Reuschel, *Al-Ḥalīl ibn-Aḥmad, der Lehrer Sībawayhi, als Grammatiker*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1959, p. 41-47. See also Ulrike Mosel, *Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sībawayhi*, PhD dissertation, University of Munich, 1975, p. 75-80; Michael G. Carter, “The Use of Proper Names as a Testing Device in Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb*,” in *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*, eds Cornelis Henricus Maria Versteegh, Konard Koerner and Hans-Josef Niederehe, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins (“Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series 3, Studies in the History of Linguistics”, 28), 1983, p. 109-120; Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”

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.

112 Sībawayhi does not use the term *far‘* in the context of *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf*. This term occurs only twice in *al-Kitāb*. See Gérard Troupeau, *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*, Paris, Klincksieck (“Études Arabes et Islamiques. Série 3, Études et Documents”, 7), 1976, p. 159.

113 *Ibid.*, I, p. 5.

that it corresponds to Sībawayhi's explanation of *muḍāra'atuhu fi l-ṣifa*:<sup>114</sup> like verbs, adjectives need nouns (in the narrow sense, *i.e.* excluding adjectives),<sup>115</sup> since nouns are "prior" to adjectives, just as they are "prior" to verbs. Moreover, adjectives carry the meaning of the imperfect<sup>116</sup> and assign the accusative, just like the verb. Sībawayhi 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 *fatha* 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*.<sup>117</sup> 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.<sup>118</sup>

Back to common nouns taking verbal patterns, such as *afkal*, their *ṣarf* is, in fact, conditioned upon their being indefinite (*fi l-nakira*).<sup>119</sup> Now Sībawayhi 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.<sup>120</sup> Consequently, most indefinite nouns are *munṣarif*.<sup>121</sup> This trait is omnipresent throughout Sībawayhi's discussions of *mamnū' min al-ṣarf*, in the form of a distinction between *fi l-nakira* and *fi l-ma'rifa*; save for several specific words,<sup>122</sup> 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

114 See also Abū Sa'īd al-Sīrāfi, al-Ḥasan b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Marzubān, *Ṣarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, eds Aḥmad Ḥasan Mahdalī and 'Alī Sayyid 'Alī, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2008, I, p. 164.

115 See fn. 3 and fn. 32.

116 In Hārūn's edition, this assertion is illustrated as follows: *hādā raḡulun 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 Sībawayhi, Abū Biṣr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar, *al-Kitāb*, ed. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, [Beirut], 'Ālam al-kutub, 1983<sup>3</sup>, I, p. 20.

117 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, I, p. 5.

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

119 *Ibid.*, I, p. 5.

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

121 *Ibid.*, I, p. 5.

122 See below. On *subḥān*, whose lack of *ṣarf* is explained on grounds of its definiteness, see *ibid.*, I, p. 135.

indefinitely.<sup>123</sup> Thus, when *afkal*, for instance, is used *fī l-maʿrifa*, that is, as a definite proper name (class (b), thus *Afkal*), it is *mamnūʿ 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.<sup>124</sup> This is yet another case where two traits, taking a verbal form and definiteness, combine, in Sībawayhi’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, Sībawayhi 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” (*istatqalū fīhi mā statqalū fī-mā huwa awlā bi-hādā l-bināʾ*). Sībawayhi 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.<sup>125</sup> 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 mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf*.<sup>126</sup>

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. *Dibāǧ*, which possesses only trait (1), but not (8)): whereas common nouns of foreign origin are said to possess *tamakkun* in speech (*fī l-kalām*, by which Sībawayhi 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,<sup>127</sup> in accordance with their usage in the foreign language, and are said not to possess *tamakkun* in speech.<sup>128</sup> This class does not seem to be considered by Sībawayhi 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 Sībawayhi in this context.

123 See Ayoub, “Case and Reference.”

124 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, p. 1.

125 *Ibid.*, II, p. 2-3.

126 *Ibid.*, II, p. 3. On *Aḥmad*, which is analysed as an elative used as a proper name, see *ibid.*, II, p. 4. On *aǧmaʿ* and *aktaʿ*, see *ibid.*, II, p. 5. On other verbal forms used for proper names, see *ibid.*, II, 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.*, II, p. 47, and the discussion below on compounds.

128 *Ibid.*, II, p. 18-19. *Nūḥ* etc. are *munṣarif*, due to their “lightness” (*ibid.*, II, p. 19, and see below).

Another trait of “subsidiarity” mentioned in chapter 2 is femininity (trait (2)). Sībawayhi maintains that masculine is “lighter” than feminine, as it is “primary” and possesses greater *tamakkun*.<sup>129</sup> It follows that, save for some exceptions, nouns of three *ḥarfs*—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]).<sup>130</sup> Sībawayhi’s aim here is to explore the extent to which masculine is “light.”

In light of Sībawayhi’s recognition of femininity as a trait of “subsidiarity,” it is striking that it does not constitute a cause for the lack of *ṣarf* 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 *ṣarf*, in Sībawayhi’s view, but rather the nature of the augment. In the beginning of the chapter Sībawayhi explains the lack of *ṣarf* here as designed to differentiate between the *alif* that joins as a marker of femininity, on the one hand, and the *alif* of *ilḥāq*<sup>131</sup> and the *alif* originating in a third radical semi-vowel, on the other.<sup>132</sup> This point is repeated at the end of the chapter, where Sībawayhi contrasts *ḥarfs* of *ilḥāq* to the former *alif*, which joins the noun “for a meaning,” ascribing the lack of *ṣarf* here to the “distance” of this *alif* from *ḥurūf al-aṣl*. He also draws an analogy with *masāğid*, 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.<sup>133</sup> In this context Sībawayhi 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’ marbūṭa*.<sup>134</sup> It is worthy of note that elsewhere the *alif* of *ḥublā* is characterised, with relation to *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf*, as joining “for a meaning,” with no mention of femininity.<sup>135</sup>

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

129 *Ibid.*, I, p. 5-6.

130 *Ibid.*, II, p. 13.

131 On the lack of *ṣarf* in definite proper names terminating with this *alif* see below.

132 *Ibid.*, II, p. 8.

133 *Ibid.*, II, p. 9 and Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. Hārūn, III, p. 213.

134 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, p. 9 and Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. Hārūn, III, p. 212-213.

135 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, p. 47.

in *alif al-ta'nūt* that follows another *alif*.<sup>136</sup> To *ḥamrā'* are analogised *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* nouns of the pattern *fa'lān* (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 *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* both definitely and indefinitely; neither adjectivity nor being a definite proper name are evoked as a trait preventing *ṣarf* in this case.<sup>137</sup> Other nouns terminating with *-ān*, that is, those whose feminine does not take the pattern *fa'lā* but *fa'lāna*, e.g. *'uryān* (naked), are *mamnū' 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 is analogised to adjectives of the pattern *af'al*, which are *mamnū' 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 *fa'lān* whose feminine is *fa'lā*, 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.”<sup>138</sup> Sībawayhi further states that nouns terminating with *alif* of *ilḥāq* used as masculine proper names are *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* when definite, analogously to *'uryān*,<sup>139</sup> that is, they are analogised, in the fashion explained here, to nouns terminating with *alif al-ta'nūt*, and are therefore *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* when definite.

Turning now to another feminine marker, nouns terminating with *tā'* *marbūṭa* are analogised by Sībawayhi to compounds<sup>140</sup> such as *Ḥaḍra-mawt* (see below), in which the *tā' marbūṭa* is analogised to *-mawt*. These nouns are therefore *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* when definite, i.e. when used as definite proper names (class (a)),<sup>141</sup> just as the compounds are *mamnū' min al-ṣarf*. Interestingly, this explanation comes (most probably on the authority of al-Ḥalīl) in response to Sībawayhi's question as to why these nouns are not *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* when indefinite, as are nouns terminating with *alif al-ta'nūt*, in view of the fact that *tā' marbūṭa* also designates femininity.<sup>142</sup> This by no means contradicts the abovementioned explanation of the *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* nouns terminating with *alif al-ta'nūt*, 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. 12.

140 In Sībawayhi's words: *bi-manzilat ism ḍumma ilā ism fa-ḡu'ilā isman wāḥidan*.

141 On *ḡudwa* and *bukra*, see *ibid.*, II, p. 44-45.

142 *Ibid.*, II, p. 12-13.



that the *alif* joins “for a meaning,” hence the question as to why the *tā’ marbūṭa*, which joins for the same meaning, displays a different behaviour. The difference between nouns terminating with *tā’ marbūṭa* and those terminating with *alif al-ta’nīt*, 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 *dağāğā* (a chicken) forms *duğayyigā* and *Ḥaḍra-mawt* forms *Ḥuḍayra-mawt*, i.e. they retain the *tā’ marbūṭa* and the second base, respectively. Moreover, *tā’ marbūṭa* is never used for *ilhāq*, and does not form part of the pattern.<sup>143</sup> What is manifest in Sībawayhi’s discussion of *tā’ marbūṭa* is the fact that the lack of *ṣarf* in the nouns in question is not explained by their femininity.

This also holds for yet another class displaying femininity: Sībawayhi states that when feminine nouns of at least four *ḥarfs* are used as masculine proper names,<sup>144</sup> e.g. *ʿAnāq*, they are *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf*, since males are basically named by masculine nouns (*wa-dālīka anna aṣl al-mudakkār ʿindahum an yusammā bi-l-mudakkār*), which are more appropriate for them (*wa-llaḍī yulāʾimuhu*).<sup>145</sup> What prevents *ṣarf* 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 *ṣarf*. We have already encountered the rule that masculine proper names of three *ḥarfs* are, with some exceptions, *munṣarif* (regardless of whether or not the middle *ḥarf* is quiescent). Here Sībawayhi avers that feminine proper names of the pattern *CvCvC*<sup>146</sup> are *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf*, whereas one is at liberty to choose between *ṣarf* and lack thereof (albeit the latter is said to be “better”) for those of the pattern *CvCC*, e.g. *Hind*. At this point, Sībawayhi draws a comparison between the feminine and the masculine, explaining the behaviour of the former as stemming from the basicness of the latter, which is the “primary” and of a greater *tamakkun*, just like the indefinite.<sup>147</sup>

At the end of this chapter Sībawayhi accounts for the lack of *ṣarf* in *Zayd* and *ʿAmr* (two names of the pattern *CvCC*) when used as feminine proper names<sup>148</sup>:

143 *Ibid.*, II, p. 12. See also *ibid.*, II, p. 47.

144 See above his explanation of *ṣarf* in those consisting of three *ḥarfs*.

145 *Ibid.*, II, 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 Sībawayhi’s formulation: *kull muʿannaṭ sammaytahu bi-talāṭat aḥrūf mutawālin minhā ḥarfāni bi-l-taḥarruk*.

147 *Ibid.*, II, p. 21-22.

148 This is the opinion of Ibn Abī Ishāq (see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. Hārūn, III, p. 242; the word *ibn* is missing from Derenbourg’s edition) and Abū ʿAmr, on the authority of Yūnus, and is also, in Sībawayhi’s own view, the *qiyās*. For ʿĪsā (b. ʿUmar), however, they are *munṣarif*, due to their “lightness.”

feminine nouns are more appropriate for females (*li-anna l-mu’annaṭ ašadd mulā’amatan li-l-mu’annaṭ*), and the latter are basically named by the former, just as males are basically named by masculine nouns.<sup>149</sup> 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). Sībawayhi here intends to contrast feminine nouns used as masculine proper names, which are *mamnū’ min al-šarf* only when consisting of at least four *ħarfs*, to masculine nouns used as feminine proper names, which are *mamnū’ min al-šarf* even when taking the “lightest” pattern, owing to their femininity, as explained here. It should be stressed that the lack of *šarf* in *Zayd* and *Amr* 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 *šarf*.<sup>150</sup>

Another trait of “subsidiarity” discussed in chapter 2 of *al-Kitāb* is plurality (trait (6)). Sībawayhi 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. *masāğid* and *mafātīħ* (keys) (class (k)), are *mamnū’ min al-šarf*.<sup>151</sup> In contrast, *šayāqila*, etc. are not so, since *tā’ marbūṭa*, as mentioned above, is not regarded as an augment, in contrast to the *yā’* and *alif* of this word, but is rather compounded to the form *šayāqil-*, analogically to the compounding of *-mawt* to *Ḥaḍr-* in *Ḥaḍra-mawt*; in this respect, *šayāqila* belongs to the class of *ṭalħa*. Sībawayhi here also analogises the *tā’ marbūṭa* to the gentilic *-ī*: when the latter is added to *Madā’in*, for instance, the resulting word, *madā’inī*, belongs to the class of *tamīmī* (and

---

According to Ibn al-Nāẓim (*Šarħ*, p. 462), these names are *mamnū’ min al-šarf* 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 *šarf* as well). See also Abū l-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad, *Kitāb al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ḥālīq ‘Uḍayma, Cairo, Lağnat ihyā’ al-turāṭ al-islāmī, 1994<sup>3</sup>, III, p. 351.

149 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, p. 22.

150 See also the discussion on toponyms of foreign origin in *ibid.*, II, p. 22.

151 *Ibid.*, I, p. 5; II, p. 15. The *šarf* in plurals of the pattern *af’āl* (also: *fu’ūl*) 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 *qawl* [saying, speech, opinion]—*aqāwīl*, i.e. the so called *ğam’ al-ğam’*); this is not the case for the patterns under discussion, which are the “utmost” patterns. Moreover, there are singulars taking the pattern *af’āl*. See *ibid.*, II, p. 16-17.

is therefore *munṣarīf*). This pattern, moreover, is also used for singulars, e.g. *‘abāqīya* (crafty, cunning, mischievous).<sup>152</sup>

As for *‘Umar*, etc. (class (c)), these proper names are deemed “diverted” (*maḥdūd*, also: *ma’dūl*, trait (5)) from the pattern most deserving of them (*‘Āmir* in the case of *‘Umar*). They are *mamnū’ 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. *‘Āmir*): they are “shifted” from the state of the latter by dint of their indefiniteness, and are thus no longer deemed “diverted” from them.<sup>153</sup> 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.”

Sībawayhi also raises the question as to the lack of *ṣarf* in *ǧuma‘* and *kuta‘*, to which he answers (most probably on the authority of al-Ḥalīl) that these are definite and “diverted” from the plurals of *ǧam‘ā’* and *kat‘ā’* (their respective f.sg. forms, whose expected plural forms are \**ǧum‘* and \**kut‘*<sup>154</sup>), and are *munṣarīf* when used as indefinite proper names.<sup>155</sup> 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 *‘Umar*. As for *uḥar* (another, other [f.pl.]),<sup>156</sup> it is said to differ from its basic form and behave differently from other words of the same class (this word’s *aḥawāt*, in Sībawayhi’s parlance), which must take the definite article and modify definite nouns when used as adjectival attributes, hence the impermissibility of \**niswatun ṣuǧarun* (lit. smallest/youngest women, without the definite article). The word *uḥar*, on the other hand, can be used as an adjectival attribute without the definite article.<sup>157</sup> Here again, only one trait is relevant to the discussion. The same notion also explains the lack of *ṣarf* in *tulāt*, etc. (class (h)),<sup>158</sup> 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.

153 *Ibid.*, II, p. 14, 15.

154 See *ibid.*, II, p. 220; see also al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ*, III, p. 490.

155 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, II, p. 14.

156 For Ibn al-Nāzīm (*Šarḥ*, p. 456-457), *uḥar* is *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* due to a combination of adjectivity and *‘adl* (traits (4) and (5), respectively).

157 *Ibid.*, II, p. 14-15. See also *ibid.*, II, p. 40, where the lack of *ṣarf* in *saḥar* is also given the same explanation (on which see also *ibid.*, II, p. 45).

158 *Ibid.*, II, p. 15.

such as *Qaṭām*, analysed as *ma’dūl* from proper names, e.g. *Qāṭima*, just as *‘Amr* is *ma’dūl* from *‘Āmir*.<sup>159</sup>

Finally, Sibawayhi relates that he asked Yūnus why the compound *Ma’dī-karib* (class (d)) lacks *ṣarf* although it is one single noun (i.e. not an annexation, of *Ma’dī* 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 *mamnū’ 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 *tā’ marbūṭa*, e.g. *ṭalḥa/Ṭalḥa*, to *aḥmar*, “broken” plurals such as *masājid* and *mafātih*, and nouns terminating with *-ā* such as *ḥublā*, which are *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* when indefinite, that is, they are *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* adjectives or common nouns. Compounds are said to belong to the first group: they are *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* when definite, but not so when indefinite, since the definite is “heavier” than the indefinite. The analogy with names terminating with *tā’ marbūṭa* is also formal.<sup>160</sup> *Ma’dī-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 *ṣarf* when indefinite. A hierarchy thus exists among the causes preventing *ṣarf*: some of these prevent *ṣarf* by themselves, others only when combined with definiteness. That is, the lack of *ṣarf* in this class, among others, is explained by a combination of two traits.<sup>161</sup>

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 *ṣarf*, and some classes of *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* are indeed not analysed as such. Several other classes of *mamnū’ min al-ṣarf* are, however, explained by a combination of two traits, mostly in the form of the distinction between *fī l-ma’rifa* and *fī l-nakira*. Of special importance is the case of *aḥmar*, etc. (class (g)), whose lack of *ṣarf* 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 *tā’ marbūṭa* above. In our discussion Sibawayhi says: *kamā tarakū ṣarf al-hā’ fī l-ma’rifa wa-ṣarfūhā fī l-nakira li-mā ḍakartu laka* (!). The argument based on analogy between the two classes turns to be circular. See also *ibid.*, II, p. 84. See also Baalbaki, “Coalescence,” p. 88; Jean N. Druel, “How to Deal with Contradictory Chapters in Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*? Compound Numerals from ‘Eleven’ to ‘Nineteen’ (Chapters 314, 336 and 412 of the *Kitāb*),” in *Perspectives on Islamic Culture: Essays in Honour of Emilio G. Platti*, eds Bert Broeckeaert, 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 *mamnū' min al-šarf*. Later theory can readily be seen as a generalisation of these classes.

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

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

Yet, the notion of a combination of two traits as an explanation for the lack of *šarf* in *aḥmar*, 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 ġiha wāḡida*), and hence its *šarf*.<sup>162</sup>

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 *mamnū' min al-šarf* while others do not; the reason furnished by the latter is these names' "lightness" (as their pattern is deemed "minimal"), which "counterbalances" their femininity.<sup>163</sup> In contrast, feminine proper names of foreign origin are said to be *mamnū' min al-šarf* by all speakers, since they combine foreignness together with femininity (traits (8) and (2), respectively), and thus two "preventing elements" (*māni'āni*) are combined in them.<sup>164</sup> 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 *šarf* according to the mainstream theory, to wit, foreignness and definiteness

<sup>162</sup> Al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, III, p. 311.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, III, p. 350.

<sup>164</sup> *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.<sup>165</sup> While he does analogise nouns terminating with *tā' marbūṭa* with compounds (see above),<sup>166</sup> 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' marbūṭa* in order to explain the lack of *ṣarf* in compounds.<sup>167</sup>

Al-Mubarrad's student, Ibn al-Sarrāġ, already presents the fully-fledged mainstream theory of *mamnū' min al-ṣarf*;<sup>168</sup> another student of al-Mubarrad's, al-Zaġġāġ, 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-Zaġġāġ'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'nūt* and “broken” plurals such as *masāġid* and *mafātiḥ* (classes (j) and (k), respectively). As for the former, al-Zaġġāġ incorporates in his list, beside femininity (trait (2)), a trait which he formulates as follows: augmenting a feminine marker in a way differing from *tā' marbūṭa*, this difference being considered an additional trait.<sup>169</sup> By this trait al-Zaġġāġ refers to the *alif al-ta'nūt*; here the difference between al-Zaġġāġ and other grammarians seems to be more a matter of formulation rather than of essence.<sup>170</sup> 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-Zaġġāġ does not elaborate on this explanation.<sup>171</sup>

165 *Ibid.*, III, p. 319, 327-328.

166 See for example *ibid.*, IV, p. 19.

167 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 20.

168 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sahl Ibn al-Sarrāġ, *al-Uṣūl fi l-naḥw*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatḥī, Beirut, Mu'assasat al-risāla, 1996<sup>3</sup>, II, p. 79 ff.

169 Abū Ishāq al-Zaġġāġ, *Mā yanṣarifū wa-mā lā yanṣarifū*, ed. Hudā Maḥmūd Qurā'a, Cairo, Laġnat ihyā' al-turāṭ al-islāmī, 1971, p. 3-5.

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-Zaġġāġ's list. Following Sībawayhi, al-Zaġġāġ (*ibid.*, p. 35) analogises words such as *sakrān* to e.g. *ḥamrā'*, and definite proper names terminating with *-ān* to e.g. *sakrān*. Al-Zaġġāġ'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-Zaġġāġ analogises compounds to proper names such as *Ṭalḥa*, which is *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* due to the “compounding” of *tā' marbūṭa* to *ṭalḥi* (*ibid.*, p. 102; see also *ibid.*, p. 124).

171 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

Secondly, although al-Zağğāğ, unlike Sibawayhi, does not analogise words terminating with *tā' marbūṭa* to compounds,<sup>172</sup> the *ṣarf* in e.g. *ṣayāqila* (which is indefinite) is nevertheless explained *inter alia* by dint of analogy to compounds.<sup>173</sup>

Moreover, al-Zağğāğ 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 *binā'*,<sup>174</sup> and secondly, he categorically disallows *ṣarf* in feminine proper names of the pattern *CvCC* (class (a)), explaining the fact that they do appear with *ṣarf* in poetry as due to poetic license.<sup>175</sup>

From the following case we may infer that al-Zağğāğ reads the theory of two traits into Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb*: after paraphrasing the text of *al-Kitāb* regarding *uḥar* (see above), he explains that it is *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* due to the combination of being "transformed" and adjectivity (traits (5) and (4), respectively), on which he immediately remarks that Sibawayhi 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 *uḥar* without the definite article and the fact that it conveys the sense of adjectivity; this, he says, is *ka-annahu ṣarḥ li-madḥab Sibawayhi*.<sup>176</sup>

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

Al-Suhaylī's attack is aimed at the heart of the mainstream theory of *mamnū' 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.<sup>177</sup> First, he

172 *Ibid.*, p. 38.

173 *Ibid.*, p. 47.

174 *Ibid.*, p. 2.

175 *Ibid.*, p. 49-51.

176 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

177 *Tanwīn* as a marker of separateness (*'alāmat al-faṣl*) is also mentioned in e.g. Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, II, p. 493. Cf. also Sibawayhi's *tanwīn-naṣb* principle, also known as the Separation and Non-Identity Principle (SNIP), on which see Michael G. Carter, "Twenty Dirhams' in the *Kitāb* of Sibawaihi," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 35 (1972), p. 485-496; Jonathan Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins ("Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series 3, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences", 53), 1990, p. 107 ff.; Georgine Ayoub, "La forme du sens: Le cas du nom et le mode du verbe," in *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar, Budapest, 1-7 September 1991 (The Arabist 3-4)*, eds Kinga Dévényi and Tamás Iványi, Budapest, Eötvös Loránd

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 *aḥmar* do not, *tanwīn* cannot be considered as a marker of *tamakkun* in speech.<sup>178</sup> Thirdly, al-Suhaylī evokes the behaviour of *id*: in *ḥīna’idin* (at that time), for instance, this word has *tanwīn*, since it is not annexed, while it does not when annexed: *id zaydun qā’imun* (when Zayd was standing up). This word, he says, has the least *tamakkun*, being very similar to particles.<sup>179</sup> 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 šāḥi mā ḥāḡa l-dumū’a l-ḡurrafan* (Oh my friend, what stirred up the flowing tears?).<sup>180</sup> 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),

---

University Chair for Arabic Studies-Csoma de Kőrös Society Section of Islamic Studies, 1991, p. 55 ff.; Talmon, *Eighth-Century Iraqi Grammar, passim*; Almog Kasher, “Sibawayhi’s *tanwīn-naṣb* Principle Revisited,” *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, 51 (2009), p. 42-50; *id.*, “Anachronistic interpretation of Sibawayhi’s *al-Kitāb*: Al-Sirāfi and the *tanwīn-naṣb* principle,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 101 (2011), p. 273-284; Michael G. Carter, *Sibawayhi’s Principles: Arabic Grammar and Law in Early Islamic Thought*, Atlanta, Lockwood (“Resources in Arabic and Islamic Studies”, 5), 2016, p. 191-219. A distinction should nevertheless be drawn between this and the *main* function(s) ascribed to *tanwīn* by mainstream grammarians. Incidentally, Lipiński holds that nunation in Classical Arabic and mimation in ancient South Arabian “denote the undefined state of the noun,” yet that these two endings “initially characterized the non-construct state of the noun without denoting determination or indetermination.” See Edward Lipiński, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, Leuven, Peeters (“Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta”, 80), 2001<sup>2</sup>, p. 279. This view is criticised in Joshua Blau, “Problems of Noun Inflection in Arabic: Reflections on the Diptote Declension,” in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting*, eds Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz, Winona Lake-Jerusalem, Eisenbrauns-Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2006, p. 30, fn. 11 (= *id.*, *Arabic Linguistics*, Jerusalem, The Bialik Institute, 2017, p. 95, fn. 11 [Hebrew]).

178 Note that here al-Suhaylī refers to *tamakkun* in speech (*fi l-kalām*), a Sibawayhian 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-’iwaḡ* (*tanwīn* of compensation); in our case it “compensates” for a deleted clause. See Ibn Ya’īš, *Šarḥ*, IV, 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 Ya’īš, *Šarḥ*, IV, 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.<sup>181</sup>

As for the lack of *-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 *-i*, e.g. *naḍīri* (my warning; Kor 67, 17). This lack of a specific marker of the genitive is the reason for the term *ǧayr munṣarif*: it only turns (*yanṣarifu*) from the *rafʿ* (i.e. *-u*) to the *naṣb* (i.e. *-a*).<sup>182</sup> This is why, when there is no risk for confusion, namely with a definite article or in *status constructus*, *-i* is used as the genitive marker.<sup>183</sup>

Al-Suhaylī also denounces the notion of “heaviness” with respect to *mamnūʿ 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 *šamardal* (youth, strong and hardy; which is *munṣarif*) are nevertheless “heavier” than words such as *Zaynab* (*mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf*); if the latter, words such as *hamm* (distress; *munṣarif*) are nevertheless “heavier” than words such as (*rawḍa*) *ǧannāʿ* ([garden] abounding with herbs; *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf*).<sup>184</sup>

The harshest criticism is levelled at the principle of similarity to the verb. Al-Suhaylī wonders why nouns such as *ḍārib* are *munṣarif* although they resemble the verb formally, semantically and syntactically.<sup>185</sup> It is madness and delusion, according to al-Suhaylī, to claim that *Ibrāhīm* is *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* due to an alleged similarity to *yafʿalu* ([he] acts/will act) and *yanṭaliqu* ([he] goes/will go

181 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī l-Suhaylī Abī l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Andalusī fī l-naḥw wa-l-luġa wa-l-ḥadīṯ wa-l-fiqh*, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā, [Cairo], Maṭbaʿat al-saʿāda, [1970], p. 24-26. See also Abū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Suhaylī, *Natāʾiġ al-fikr fī l-naḥw*, eds ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawġūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwad, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1992, p. 69-70, 104, 151-152 (note that in *ibid.*, p. 70, *tanwīn* is regarded as the marker of both *tamakkun* and separateness).

182 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 29.

183 *Ibid.*, p. 39.

184 *Ibid.*, p. 22-23.

185 *Ibid.*, p. 20, 22. Here al-Suhaylī emphasises the requirement that the *ʿilla* (grammatical cause) be both *muṭṭarid* (coextensive) and *munʿakis* (coexclusive), that is, it must constitute both a necessary and a sufficient condition. According to al-Suhaylī the fact that *ḍārib* is not *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* demonstrates that the *ʿilla* lacks *ittirād*. On *ittirād* and *inʿikās* see Suleiman, *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition*, p. 128-132; Sheyhatovitch “The theory of definition.”

away).<sup>186</sup> Against the “subsidiarity” of verbs vis-à-vis nouns, al-Suhaylī argues that verbs operate on nouns, and therefore precede them.<sup>187</sup>

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 *mamnū‘ 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?<sup>188</sup>

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?<sup>189</sup> Furthermore, why should the feminine suffixes *-ā* and *-ā‘* and plurality each count as two traits (in classes (j) and (k), respectively)?<sup>190</sup>

He adds that the list of traits of “subsidiarity” is arbitrary as well, since it excludes diminutiveness, containing a weak radical (*mu‘tall*) and taking an augment (apart from *-ān*).<sup>191</sup>

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<sup>192</sup>—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.<sup>193</sup>

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

186 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 24.

187 *Ibid.*, p. 24. This argument is ascribed by Ibn al-Anbārī to the Kūfans, see *al-Inṣāf*, 1, p. 236. See also al-Zağğāğī, *al-Īdāh*, p. 83. Cf. the opposite argument in section 1 and the references in fn. 14.

188 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 23-24.

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, *Natā‘iğ*, p. 169-170.

193 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 21-22. The latter point is not illustrated by al-Suhaylī; other grammarians (e.g. Ibn Ya‘īš, *Ṣarḥ*, 11, p. 180 ff.) discuss annexation of nouns designating time (not only adverbials) to verbs (or verbal clauses), e.g. *hādā yawmu yanfa‘u l-ṣādiqīna ṣidquhum* (Kor 5, 119) “This is a Day when the truthful will benefit from their truthfulness” (*The Qur’an*, p. 79).

as an adjective (traits (2) and (4), respectively),<sup>194</sup> and so should “broken” plurals (trait (6)) of adjectives, e.g. *kirām* (noble [pl.]).<sup>195</sup> On the other hand, *Abū Qābūs* (a *kunya*) is *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*, notwithstanding the fact that it has only one trait, definiteness.<sup>196</sup>

We shall now see how al-Suhaylī applies his view, that *tanwīn* functions as a marker of separateness, to *mamnū‘ min al-šarf* vs *munšarif*. The first class he addresses is proper names.<sup>197</sup> What is striking is that whereas for most grammarians, as we have seen, in the default case nouns can receive *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 *status constructus* and are thus in no need of *tanwīn*; in accordance, it is the existence of proper names with *tanwīn* that demands explanation! One should also note that poets frequently use such names as *mamnū‘ min al-šarf*.<sup>198</sup> Al-Suhaylī’s explanation of proper names with *tanwīn* runs as follows: *tanwīn* is only found in proper

194 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 20. This is also a case of lack of *ittirād* (see fn. 185).

195 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

196 *Ibid.*, p. 21; it is inferred that this is a case of lack of *in’ikās* (see fn. 185). According to al-Suhaylī, *qābūs* is an Arabic word, meaning *ḥasan al-waǧh* (having a beautiful face). See also Abū l-Faḍl Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-‘arab*, Beirut, Dār Šādir, 1968, VI, p. 168. Ibn Ya‘īš (*Šarḥ*, IV, p. 511) explains the lack of *šarf* in *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, *Qābūs* is of foreign origin. See e.g. Abū Maṣū‘ al-Ġawālīqī, Mawḥūb b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥaḍīr, *al-Mu‘arrab min al-kalām al-aǧami‘ alā hurūf al-mu‘ǧam*, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Šakīr, [Cairo], Maṭba‘at dār al-kutub, 1969<sup>2</sup>, p. 307-308; Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān*, VI, p. 168. As a curiosity, the pattern *fā‘ūl* is mentioned in an anonymous “Kūfan” grammar as preventing *šarf* when combined with definiteness. Vidro and Kasher, “How Medieval Jews Studied Classical Arabic Grammar,” p. 194.

197 This issue is discussed by Arias (“De los nombres propios,” p. 26-29), who claims that al-Suhaylī disregards secondary and tertiary causes (*‘ilal*). As we shall see, al-Suhaylī never rejects these concepts; rather, he only takes issue with the mainstream grammarians on this specific topic, due to the shortcomings he finds in their arguments. On the extensive use of higher-order explanations by al-Suhaylī, see e.g. al-Bannā, *Abū l-Qāsim al-Suhaylī*, p. 285 ff.; Almog Kasher, “Iconicity in Arabic Grammatical Tradition: Al-Suhaylī on the Correspondence between Form and Meaning,” *Romano-Arabica*, 16 (2016), p. 201-224. Note, incidentally, that Ibn Maḍā‘ (d. 592/1196) endorses the mainstream theory’s list of traits while rejecting its higher-order explanations. See Ibn Maḍā‘, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā l-nuḥāt*, ed. Šawqī Ḍayf, Cairo, Dār al-ma‘ārif, [1982]<sup>2</sup>, p. 135-137. On this Ḍāhirī scholar, see esp. Kees Versteegh, “Ibn Maḍā‘ as a Ḍāhirī Grammarian,” in *Ibn Ḥazm of Cordoba: The Life and Works of a Controversial Thinker*, eds Camilla Adang, Maribel Fierro and Sabine Schmidtke, Leiden-Boston, Brill (“Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1, The Near and Middle East”, 103), 2013, p. 207-231 (and the references therein).

198 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 26-27.

names that originate in common nouns taking *tanwīn*, since the speakers take the original meanings of proper names into consideration.<sup>199</sup> Excluded are therefore proper names that do not originate in non-proper (Arabic) nouns (*ġayr manqūl* [not transferred]<sup>200</sup>): *Umar* (class (c)) did not designate anything before being used as a proper name, rather, it is the outcome of a “transformation” *ʿĀmir*—which does take *tanwīn*—has undergone (*ʿudila ʿanhu*) (al-Suhaylī regards names such as *Salmān* and *ʿImrān* [class (f)] as *maʿdūl* as well, but does not explicitly state whether this applies to all proper names terminating with *-ān*);<sup>201</sup> *Ibrāhīm* (class (e)), being a foreign name, does not originate in anything taking *tanwīn*; and *Zaynab* (class (a)), it is inferred, is *murtaġal* (improvised), *i.e.* coined specifically as a proper name.<sup>202</sup> Also excluded are proper names that originate in words not taking *tanwīn*, such as *Yazīd* (class (b)).<sup>203</sup> Another case of *ġayr manqūl* is mentioned, namely proper names that are compounds, *e.g.* *Baʿla-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*.<sup>204</sup>

But not all classes of *mamnūʿ 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 *mamnūʿ 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 marbūṭa*, 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” (*ʿadl*) that *ʿUmar* undergoes. The same holds for *ʿAnāq* (class (a)), a feminine noun used as a masculine proper name, although it does not terminate with a feminine marker.<sup>205</sup> Al-Suhaylī extends this principle to feminine proper names such as *Fāṭima*, since the *tāʾ marbūṭa* loses its

199 Cf. *e.g.* Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī l-labīb ʿan kutub al-aʿarīb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭīb, Kuwait, al-Maġlis al-waṭānī li-l-ṭaqāfa wa-l-funūn wa-l-ādāb, al-turāt al-ʿarabī, 2000-2002, 1, p. 326 ff., where the use of proper names with the definite article, *e.g.* *al-Ḥārīt*, is explained on the ground of *lamḥ al-aṣl*. See also Arias, “De los nombres propios,” p. 26-28.

200 See Carter, “The Use of Proper Names,” p. 110.

201 See al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 35, 37.

202 For this sense of *murtaġal*, see Carter, “The Use of Proper Names,” p. 110; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, 1, p. 106.

203 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 28, 34 ff.

204 *Ibid.*, p. 39.

205 *Ibid.*, p. 29-31.

original meaning,<sup>206</sup> and states that all feminine proper names are *mamnū' min al-ṣarf*.<sup>207</sup>

The pattern *fa'āl* (class (c)) of feminine proper names is deemed by al-Suhaylī to be (basically) hypocoristic; the (name of the) loved one is annexed<sup>208</sup> to the (pronoun of the) self (*i.e.* “my [...]”), a notion signalled by the lack of *tanwīn*.<sup>209</sup> Other classes lacking *tanwīn* due to an “aroma” (*rā'iḥa*) of annexation are, for instance, *ağma'* (class (b))<sup>210</sup> and *ğuma'* (class (c)). In a similar vein, *saḥar* (class (c)) is *mamnū' min al-ṣarf* since it is definite in meaning.<sup>211</sup>

For *tulāt* (class (h)) there is no risk that it can be mistakenly perceived as being in *status constructus*, hence its lack of *tanwīn*.<sup>212</sup>

As for *sakrān* (class (i)), its lack of *tanwīn* 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.<sup>213</sup> Its lack of *tanwīn* is analogous to the lack of *tanwīn* in the dual suffix; this is also why it does not take *tā' marbūṭa*.<sup>214</sup> On the other hand, nouns of the patterns *fi'lān* and *fu'lān* are likened to singulars of the syllabo-vocalic patterns *CiCCāC* and *CuCCāC*, respectively; for instance, *tu'bān* (long serpent) is “appended”<sup>215</sup> to *fustāt* (a type of tent) and *sirḥān* (wolf) to *qirtās* (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

206 *Ibid.*, p. 31-32. In al-Suhaylī, *Natā'iğ*, p. 291, *ğudwa* and *bukra* (class (a)) lack *tanwīn* due to definiteness and femininity, in line with both the mainstream view and his own.

207 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 32. No explanation is given for feminine proper names not terminating with *tā' marbūṭa*; 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.

208 *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.

209 Al-Suhaylī, *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 *-i*, but not identical, as this is nevertheless not a case of a “pure” annexation.

210 In al-Suhaylī, *Natā'iğ*, p. 287-288 it is asserted that *ağma'* is annexed to a personal pronoun.

211 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 33. In al-Suhaylī, *Natā'iğ*, p. 287-289, it is stated that *saḥar* is either underlyingly annexed, *i.e.* *saḥar ḍālika l-yawm*, just like *ağma'*, or, better, it takes the definite article, *i.e.* *al-saḥar alladī min ḍālika l-yawm*.

212 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 37.

213 See also al-Suhaylī, *Natā'iğ*, p. 42.

214 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 37-38. See also al-Suhaylī, *Natā'iğ*, p. 43.

215 On *ilḥāq* see section 1.

intensiveness. But this explanation is not available for *fa‘lān*, because there exists no singular of the syllabo-vocalic pattern *CaCCāC*.<sup>216</sup> However, when nouns of the patterns *fi‘lān* and *fu‘lān* become proper names (class (f)), they are *mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf*, since they no longer belong to the class of common nouns, which can be likened to one another.<sup>217</sup>

Another case of lack of *tanwīn* due to analogy is the “broken” plurals of the type *masāğid* (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 *munṣarif*, and both forms appear in the Qur‘ān.<sup>218</sup> When suffixed by *tā‘ marbūṭa*, however, they are likened to the singular, since *tā‘ marbūṭa* is not suffixed to the *nūn* of the sound masculine plural (just like the dual).<sup>219</sup>

To sum up, al-Suhaylī’s view on the function of the *tanwīn* exempts *mamnū‘ 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 *mamnū‘ 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*. *Mamnū‘ min al-ṣarf* feminine proper names (class (a)), on the other hand, originate in common nouns taking *tanwīn*, but since the *tā‘ 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 *fa‘āl* is provided with distinct explanation of its own, based on the notion of annexation.

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

216 See Baalbaki, “*Ilḥāq*,” p. 18-19.

217 Al-Suhaylī, *Amālī*, p. 38.

218 See the first Qur‘ānic verse adduced in fn. 80.

219 *Ibid.*, p. 38-39.

of *ṣarf* in words terminating in *-ā* or *-ā'* (class (j)) and in adjectives of verbal patterns (class (g)) is not explained. This shortcoming (in the extant text?<sup>220</sup>) 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 *fa'lān* (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 *mamnū' min al-ṣarf*. Needless to say, Arab grammarians did not use diachronic explanations.<sup>221</sup> 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.

<sup>220</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>221</sup> On the general question of diachronic studies in Arabic grammatical tradition, see Haim Blanc, "Diachronic and Synchronic Ordering in Medieval Arab Grammatical Theory," in *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D.H. Baneth Dedicata*, ed. J. Blau, Jerusalem, Magnes, 1979, p. 155-180; Jean-Patrick Guillaume, "Le statut des représentations sous-jacentes en morphophonologie d'après Ibn Ğinnī," *Arabica*, 28 (1981), p. 222-241; Yaakov Gruntfest, "The Comparative and Diachronic Approach to Language in Mediaeval Semitic Linguistics," in *Speculum historiographiae linguisticae*, ed. Klaus D. Dutz, Münster, Nodus, 1989, p. 37-51; *id.*, "The Diachronic Approach to Language in Medieval Arabic Philology," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 15 (1992), p. 149-170; Ramzi Baalbaki, "Reclassification in Arab Grammatical Theory," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 54 (1995), p. 1-13; Kees Versteegh, "Linguistic Attitudes and the Origin of Speech in the Arab World," in *Understanding Arabic: Essays in Contemporary Arabic Linguistics in Honor of El-Said Badawi*, ed. Alaa Elgibali, Cairo, American University in Cairo Press, 1996, p. 15-31.