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

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

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

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

1.3. In morphology the most conspicuous example of the effects of “resemblance” is the feature of partial inflection (nos. 14, 15, 16) which extends to cover also the complete absence of inflection (nos. 17, 18, 19). But note also that “resemblance” explains the distribution of one and two-letter words (no. 20), the selection and behaviour of certain plural patterns (nos. 21, 22), and the incomplete paradigm of *layṣa* (no. 24). Exactly what is in Si`bawayhi’s mind in no. 23 is not entirely obvious: the form *unayyi* (orthographically *umayyyyy*, with four *yāʾs*) is reluctantly and perhaps only theoretically conceded as acceptable alongside the more familiar *umawī*, which is said to be the *qiyās* “regular form” (II. 70, 121/74, 20), so it may be that Si`bawayhi is here implicitly rejecting the hypothetical *siqāyi* where the *alif* counts as one weak consonant in a cluster of four weak consonants (scil. *saqאqyiy*), hence it is to be dismissed on the same grounds as *umayyyī*.

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

---

2 In a very perceptive comment from the floor Dr. Ahmed ‘Omar Muḥtar pointed out that this topic should have been placed among the morphological items. Indeed it would have been just as appropriate (and that is in fact where I had originally put it), but I preferred in the end to emphasize the phonological aspects: a “weak” verb such as *muṣṭal/yaṣīlš* also has a weak *masdar*, namely *ṣila*. It is a true borderline case.
which accounts for the masculine gender of the verb in the metalanguage on the grounds that it resembles the agent noun pattern (no. 30).^3

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

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

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

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

---
^3 There is an implicit distinction here between the masculine gender of words referred to as a class in the metalanguage and the gender of words referred to as individual items, which is usually feminine because they are thought of as a "kalima". This subtlety is well worth exploring further.
the case of the imperfect verb we have to understand the active participle mudārī as implying that the verb inherently resembles the agent while with the quasi-participial adjective the passive mušabbah makes it equally clear that the similarity has been imposed on the word by speakers. This is in keeping with what has already been said about mudārā being a descriptive term and šabbaha, like qāṣa, a process term.

2.5. The nexus of terms for similarity includes, of course, mitla and ka, expressing the fundamental assumption of the Kitāb that language operates on the basis of similarities. However, the picture is not as simple as it seems, for Sibawayhi surprises us by telling us that ka, normally translated innocently enough as “like, as” does not mean the same as mudārī! The Arabs treat negative particles the same as interrogatives, imperatives and prohibitives (uğriyat muğrābhā, šabbabūhā), he says, because they are all non-assertive. However, “they are not the same as interrogative and conditional particles, they merely resemble them, laysat ka-hurufi l-istibhāmi wa-l-ğazā‘i, innamā hiya mudārā‘atun laha” (l. 61, 11ff/72, 16ff: the difference is that negative particles deny the occurrence of the event while the others simply fail to assert it). This makes it clear that, in the Kitāb, at least, ka should perhaps always be understood as meaning “identical, the same as”. Whether this holds true for mitla remains to be established: one would certainly look for inspiration in the Qur‘ān commentaries on laysa ka-mitiḥbi šay‘un (Sūra 42:11, though Sibawayhi himself has nothing to say on the matter).

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

3.1. By far the most fascinating aspect of resemblance, however, is that it sometimes operates in two directions: the linguistic behaviour of element A is determined by its resemblance to element B and that of B by its resemblance to A. Thus the imperfect verb resembles the agent noun (no. 13) and the agent noun resembles the imperfect verb (no. 1); conditionals resemble interrogatives and interrogatives resemble conditionals (no. 10); hamzat al-wasf resembles hamzat al-qat‘ and vice versa (no. 28). Occasionally the reciprocity is implicit, though none the less circular for that: indeclinable nouns that end in sukūn resemble verbs, but verbs end in sukūn precisely because they do not resemble nouns! (cf. nos. 17, 18)
3.2. In addition to these unmistakably circular relationships, there are a number of chains of resemblance which, to maintain the metaphor, we should perhaps call spiral resemblances. The behaviour of the semi-declinable nouns is determined by their resemblance to verbs which in turn resemble fully declinable nouns (nos. 14, 13); conditional particles resemble the agent nouns in their syntactic flexibility but the flexibility of agent nouns comes from their resemblance to verbs (nos. 12, 1); phrases such as 'alayka resemble maṣdars but the ability of a maṣdar to take a free object pronoun derives from its similarity to the imperfect verb (no. 8); note that the similarity of the maṣdar to the verb is this time expressed through ḡarā mağrā not ḍārā, I. 79, 15ff/97, 1ff).

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

3.4. The obvious image for this situation is the Möbius strip, a continuous surface on which one moves from one face to the other without leaving the circle. It should come as no surprise to us to find that Sībawayhi is well aware of the apparent circularity of muḍārda. As he puts it when discussing the resemblance between the imperfect verb and the agent noun: “each one goes inside the other”, kullu wāhidin minhumā dāhilun ‘alā sāhibih (73, 9/87, 5), perhaps more technically to be translated as “each one belongs to the other one’s set”. Ibn Ġinnī also noticed this paradox when discussing the way Sībawayhi explained al-ḥasanu wağhan by its resemblance to dāribun rağulan and conversely ad-dāribu l-rağuli by its resemblance to ḥasanu l-wağhi (cf. Table nos. 1, 2). He justifies Sībawayhi’s reasoning by saying, “when the Arabs make a similarity between two things (šabbahat šay’an bi-šay’in), they fix that similarity firmly in their minds and build up the relation between the two: do you not see how, having made the imperfect verb (al-fīl al-muḍār) similar to the noun and given it inflections, they complete that concept (of similarity) between the two by making the agent noun similar to the verb and giving it (verbal) operation?” (Ibn Ġinnī, Ḥasa’īs I, 304)4

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

---

4 The translation is deliberately literal: more precise renderings such as “assimilate” for šabbahat carry too many distracting associations.
of inflections was finally resolved by the axiom that nominal inflection was primary, \( a\ell \), and verbal inflection merely secondary, \( s\ar\), in an irreversible order.\(^5\)

4.1. In the subsequent history of Arabic grammar the term \( d\ar\a\ 'a \) has tended to drop out of the vocabulary, and seems (at least impressionistically) to have been largely replaced by \( s\aba\b\ ) and its cognates. Sometimes the survival of the term can be explained as merely the reflection of the author’s close dependence on Sibawayhi (e.g. al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāġ), other times perhaps it is not even thought of as a technical term at all, e.g. when Ibn Ya’iš says that the elision of the \( t\arn\w\in \) under certain conditions is possible because “it resembles the semi-vowels \( w/y \) because of its nasality” (Ibn Ya’iš, \( s\arb \) IX. 37 [= \( m\ufass\a \ ) § 609, end]). As one might expect, with al-Farrā’ we may have an interesting exception: the seven times he explicitly uses the concept of \( m\uda\r\a \a \) in the \( m\a\'\a\ni \ l-Q\u\r\a\n \) (which we know thanks to Kinberg’s superb Lexicon)\(^6\), reveal a general similarity to Sibawayhi in usage, but only a very slight overlap in the actual cases dealt with by both authors, which suggests that there is still much work to be done on this early phase.

4.2. There are only three prominent survivals of the Sibawayhian terminology, the outstanding one being the imperfect verb, exhibiting what al-Zağgāğī calls \( a\l-m\uda\r\a\a\ l-m\ar\b\h\r\ ) “the well-known resemblance”, as Versteegh translates it.\(^7\) It is not important to follow the history of this term much further, except to point out that for Ibn as-Sarrāġ it was obviously so familiar as a technical term that he saw no incongruity in using it twice in the same sentence in different meanings, in combinations such as “resembling the imperfect verb” \( m\uda\r\ ) li-l-\( m\uda\r\ )\(^8\), an uncomfortable juxtaposition which Sibawayhi seems consciously to avoid by saying in the same context \( d\ar\a\a \ l-f\il\a \ l-m\uda\r\ )\ , e.g. I. 5, 11/6, 12.

4.3. Secondly we note that an expanded vocative of the type \( y\a t\u \l\a\n \ ) \( g\u\b\l\a\n \ ) has attracted the name \( a\l-m\uda\r\ l-l-m\uda\r\ ) because the two elements are in an operating relationship with each other which resembles \( i\d\a\a \ ) . What is most interesting about this is that Sibawayhi does not use the term himself when discussing this very issue, which he treats, with al-Halīl’s manifest help, as case of a long compound word (\( m\a\'\ni\u\ ) in which the second element structurally completes the first (I. 282f/324f);

---

\(^5\) See Versteegh 1995: esp. chs. IV and X on the logical priority of parts of speech generally and of nouns over verbs in particular.

\(^6\) al-Farrā’, \( m\a\'\a\ni \ , now exhaustively indexed by Kinberg 1996. The verb \( d\ar\a\a \) is found in I. 175, 8; 409, 7-8; 414, 15; II. 48, 9; III. 6, 5, with a further reference to I. 265, 12 (although not involving \( d\ar\a\a \)) , and \( m\uda\r\ ) is used in II. 105, 5 and III. 191, 13.

\(^7\) Cf. Versteegh 1977: 78, 1995: 129, 143. both from al-Zağgāğī \( i\d\a\a \) : 86.

\(^8\) Ibn as-Sarrāġ, \( u\u\b\ ) : II. 145. It is also true that Ibn al-Sarrāġ uses the expression \( d\ar\a\a \ l-f\il\a \ l-m\uda\r\ ) here too, but that is beside the point.
nor is it found in al-Mubarrad (Muqtadab IV, 224-6). The earliest occurrence may be as early as Ibn as-Sarrāġ (d. 316/929), who uses it both for the vocative and for the categorical negative in similar circumstances (Usūl I, 328, 344, 390). It looks as if Ibn as-Sarrāġ may have made a creative innovation of his own and, by using it in his elementary pedagogical grammar, wanted it to gain acceptance as a technical term (Muğaz, 45, 47). It is well established in the later grammars, e.g. al-Zamahšārī, Mufassal § 48 (Mufassal 18-9), whence it finds its way into Howell and Reckendorf, though, surprisingly, not Wright.

4.4. The other survival is rather more problematical, since it seems to have a specific and self-contained phonological application and, moreover, refers to a process applied to the language by the speakers in contrast with the commonest (though not exclusive) meaning of a perceived empirical similarity between elements. It is used transitively with bi- and denotes what might be called partial assimilation, e.g. of [s] to [z] in the context of voiced consonants, thus mazdar for masdar etc. To be sure, the concept of a speaker “making something (phonologically) resemble something else” is well within the general principle that languages operate on the basis of internal similarities as implied by mudāra'ā elsewhere in the Kitāb, but it is very tempting to look at the purely phonological application as a survival from the vocabulary of an earlier stage of phonetics, rather in the way that other phonetic terminology existed outside the Kitāb (Fischer 1985: 194-203). In support of that is the lexical fact that dāra'ā bi- is simply not the same word as dāra'ā and should not be treated as such. It certainly gave problems to later grammarians⁹, but it does survive in Ibn Ğinnī, for example, though Bakalla omits to identify it as a technical term (Bakalla 1982: 83). In any case Ibn Ğinnī seems to have preferred the more more transparent synonym qarraba which Sībawayhi also uses in the same context.

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

⁹ Cf. Ibn Ya'iš, quoted in Jahn’s notes to Kitāb § 569, referring to his own edition of Ibn Ya'iš 1392 (= X. 52f in Cairo n.d.): note that Jahn correctly translates it here angeabhängt, to express the fact that it is done by the speaker.
the distinction needs to be made at all, but these are exactly the questions which
could not be asked until the legal and theological systems had evolved far enough to
be able to frame them: I need only mention Ibn Jinnī’s fascinating explorations in
this area.

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

TABLE

1. Syntactical

(1) When the agent noun resembles the imperfect verb it keeps its tanwīn and
is followed by the nasb, e.g. hādā dāribun zaydan (I. 73, 9/87, 6)

(2) Adjectives resemble agent nouns, and so may agree with their antecedent
although they refer to the following noun, e.g marartu bi-rağūlin ḥasanin
abūhu (I. 200, 10/233, 15)

(3) The concord of marartu bi-rağūlin abī ʿasratin abūhu is based on its
resemblance to marartu bi-rağūlin ḥasanin abūhu (I. 200, 20/234, 7)

(4) Adjectives resemble nouns in that they can be qualified, thus sīra ʿalayhi
tawilun min al-dahr, like sīra ʿalayhi sayrun ḥasanun (I. 96, 19/117, 4)

(5) In phrases of the type mālun aşābū the relative clause resembles an adjectival
complement (which already contains a pronoun), so the referential pronoun
may be omitted (I. 34, 11/45, 4)

(6) Ḥayrun minka, miṭluka etc. resemble proper names and so are definite
enough to be separated from their subjects by the damīr al-fasāl, (e.g. zaydun
baru ḥayrun minka) (I. 348, 2, 3, 5/395, 14, 16 bis)

(7) Nafs can corroborate oblique pronouns because they resemble the dependent
pronoun suffix, i.e. marartu bika nafsika, like raʾaytuka nafsaka (I. 344, 1/391, 13)

(8) A free pronoun may occur with expressions such as ʿalayka iyyāhu because
these resemble (verbal) nouns (I. 334, 14/382, 16)

(9) The particle an is elided after negative kāna to make it resemble other cases
where only one particle (scil. sa-) is used before the verb (I. 362, 25/408, 18)
(10) (a) Non-assertive sentences resemble conditionals, so interrogatives may be followed by inversion, e.g. kayfa zaydan ra’ayta (I. 40, 16/51, 14)
(b) Conditionals resemble interrogatives, and so may have an apodosis with wa- or fa- and dependent verb (a poetic licence, I. 398, 24/448, 22)

(11) When the conditionals man etc. meaning “whoever, whatever” resemble the assertives inna and kāna, their verbs remain independent, e.g. a-tadkuru man ya’tīna na’ti bi (I. 391, 14/440, 16)

(12) Because conditional particles resemble the agent noun in their syntactic flexibility (tasarruf), they may be separated from their verbs in poetry, e.g. wa-in ma’mūruṣa hariba just as in daribun ‘abdallāhi the agent noun is separated from its object by tanwîn (I. 406, 18/457, 15)

2. Morphological

(13) The imperfect verb resembles the agent noun, and so it has nominal inflection (I. 2, 4ff/3, 7ff and passim)

(14) (a) Semideclinable nouns do not have complete inflection because they resemble the imperfect verb (I. 5, 11f/6, 12f)
(b) Some resemble the fully declinable noun, e.g. min ‘alul’alin, and so may inflect fully (I. 3, 3f/4, 7f)

(15) Adjectives of the af’al pattern resemble the imperfect verb (II. 268, 16/251, 5)

(16) Adjectives of the pattern of ‘aṣšan resemble hamrā’, hence they are also semideclinable (II. 10, 17, 18/10, 24 bis)

(17) (a) The invariable nouns ‘an, qat and ladun resemble the verb more than the noun, so they are unwovelled (I. 340, 9/387, 20)
(b) al-āna resembles ayna in being a zarf and hīna‘idin resembles ayna in being annexed to an uninflected element (II. 48, 1, 2, 3/51, 12 bis)
(c) Hāzibāzi is invariable because it resembles hamsata-‘aṣara (II. 48, 3/51, 13)

(18) Some invariable nouns and verbs also resemble the particle, e.g. sawfa, qad and the fa’ala (mād’i) verb form (I. 2, 18, 20/2, 20, 21)

(19) Imperative verbs have no functional resemblance at all to the verb, any more than kam etc. have to the fully inflected noun, so they have no inflection (I. 3, 7/4, 10)

(20) (a) There are no one-letter verb forms (except for weak radicals) because the verbal derivatives include elements which resemble nouns, which therefore must preserve the range of nominal inflections (II. 332, 1/305, 1)
Indeclinable two-letter nouns are more common than declinable ones because they resemble particles (II. 336, 1, 21-22/309, 1, 18-19)

Two-letter words which function as verbs are more common than two-letter verb forms because they resemble particles (II. 336, 3/309, 3)

Aymu reduces to mu- because it resembles a harf, which is also common when two-letter nouns resemble particles (II. 336, 21-2/309, 18-19)

Plurals which themselves take a plural are fully inflected because they then resemble regular singualrs, e.g. aqwālun/aqwāwilu (II. 16, 23/16, 23)

‘Adwaw is an adjective by its pattern but takes a broken plural because it resembles a noun (II. 201, 23/195, 10)

The plural pattern šāl is fully inflected as a man’s name because it is originally a feminine (i.e. broken plural), but since it refers to men it resembles the masc. words without -at which always refer to women (II. 21, 13/21, 15)

Plural patterns such as šāl for some adjectives are selected because the singular resembles a noun and is treated as if in the šal pattern, e.g. niyām, jiyyi (II. 214, 21/206, 16)

Nīsha suffix: if the hamza were not substituted for a weak radical in words like siqā’s (< s-q-y) it would come to resemble umayyī without the regular ibdāl to umawī (II. 71, 23/76, 1)

Laysa resembles layta so it has no full paradigm (II. 399, 6/361, 15)

3. Phonological and Miscellaneous

The masdār functionally resembles the verb (e.g. when you say saqyan laka) so it has congruent forms, showing the same weakness as the verb, e.g. yaṣilu/silatun (II. 395, 2/358, 7)

Imāla in cases such as yaṣrībuhā gāsim is prevented by the resemblance of -hā to the alif in šā’il which retains the nasb (here: back vowel quality) if an appropriate consonant is nearby (II. 288, 12/266, 15)

The initial hamza of aymun can be elided because the alif resembles a harf (II. 296, 19/273, 10)

Wasṭ and qat’ may resemble each other, e.g. when you say yā ‘allāhu etc. with the alif of the article resembling the alif which is elided in al-aḥmar < al-aḥmar (II. 459, 18/410, 20)

Fā’ assimilates to bā’ because of its resemblance to ūā’ (II. 461, 15, 17/412, 8)
Final unvowelled \( \text{lám} \) assimilates, e.g. \( 
abla \text{r-ra'ayta} \), where the two letters resemble two from the same \( \text{maḥrāq} \) (II. 467, 6/416, 23)

Final unvowelled \( 
\text{mīm} \) should not assimilate to \( 
\text{bā'} \) because by its nasality \( 
\text{mīm} \) resembles \( 
\text{nūn} \) (II. 468, 21/418, 17)

The \( 
\text{t-} \) agent suffix in \( 
\text{haṣītu} < \text{haṣītu} \) etc. assimilates because it resembles the \( 
\text{t-} \infix \) of Stem VIII (II. 473, 18/423, 4)

Some letters are made to resemble each other because of a resemblance in their point of articulation, thus \( 
\text{maṣdar} > \text{maṣdar} \) (II. 476, 18ff/426, 13ff)

Assimilation (\( 
\text{idgām} \)) in \( 
\text{iqṭatalū} < \text{qīṭalū} \) is correct, like \( 
\text{jā'āl-laka} \) because of the resemblance to doubled roots of the type \( 
\text{iḥmararti} \) (II. 459, 22/410, 24)

Verbs named in the metalanguage are masculine because they resemble the word \( 
\text{sā'il} \) (II. 32, 17/34, 22)
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