

ARTÍCULOS

The Origin and Vicissitudes of the Term *šibh al-ġumla* (“Quasi-Clause”) in Arabic Grammatical Tradition

Origen y vicisitudes del término *šibh al-ġumla* («cuasi-cláusula») en la tradición gramatical árabe

Almog Kasher

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2127-011X>

Abstract

This article delves into the origin of the now widely used term *šibh al-ġumla* (lit. “quasi-clause”) in Medieval Arabic grammatical tradition, tracing its transformation until it acquired its present form, as a hyperonym of both the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase. It focuses on the writings of Ibn Mālik, likely the first to employ this phrase; next, it explores Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī’s alternative characterisation of the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase as “resembling the clause”; and finally, it takes a glimpse at the term’s use by modern writers. The appendices address two peripheral issues: the first refutes a previous claim attributing the coinage of the term *šibh al-ġumla* to Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī, while the second discusses the term *šibh al-muštaqq*, which is infrequently employed as a synonym of *šibh al-ġumla*.

Keywords: *šibh al-ġumla*, “quasi-clause”; *šibh al-muštaqq*; Medieval Arabic grammar; Ibn Mālik; Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī; Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī.

Resumen

Este artículo profundiza en el origen del término *šibh al-ġumla* (lit. «cuasi-cláusula»), ampliamente utilizado en la tradición gramatical árabe medieval, rastreando su transformación hasta adquirir su forma actual como hiperónimo tanto del *ẓarf* como de la frase preposicional. Se centra en los escritos de Ibn Mālik, probablemente el primero en emplear esta frase; a continuación, explora la caracterización alternativa que Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī hace del *ẓarf* y de la frase preposicional como «similar a la cláusula»; y, finalmente, analiza el uso del término por parte de los escritores modernos. Los apéndices abordan dos cuestiones periféricas: el primero refuta una afirmación anterior que atribuye la acuñación del término *šibh al-ġumla* a Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī, mientras que el segundo analiza el término *šibh al-muštaqq*, que rara vez se emplea como sinónimo de *šibh al-ġumla*.

Palabras clave: *šibh al-ġumla*, «cuasi-cláusula»; *šibh al-muštaqq*; gramática árabe medieval; Ibn Mālik; Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī; Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī.

Citation / Cómo citar: Kasher, Almog, “The Origin and Vicissitudes of the Term *šibh al-ġumla* (“Quasi-Clause”) in Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Al-Qantara*, 46, 1 (2025), 819. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3989/alqantara.2025.819>

Received: 16/05/2024; *Accepted:* 09/07/2024; *Published:* 17/10/2025

1. Introduction

The technical term *šibh al-ġumla* (lit. “quasi-clause”)¹ is commonly utilised in contemporary Arab scholarship, as well as in school grammars, serving as a hyperonym of both the *ẓarf* (i.e. the locative/temporal adverbial) and the prepositional phrase. In sharp contrast, it has not won currency in Western scholarship on Arabic grammar and is seldom referenced in Western studies on Arabic grammatical tradition (though, as we shall see, its theoretical underpinnings have been discussed in modern scholarship). Notably, it is absent from Western standard grammars of Arabic, with only a single mention in the entire *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, not in any entry concerning Arabic grammatical tradition, but rather in Dickins’ “Topic and Comment”, where he observes that Khartoum Arabic expresses definiteness in all cases by *al-*, including “semiclausal” (*šibh jumla*) adverbs/adverbial phrases”.²

The present article delves into the origins of this term in Medieval Arabic grammatical tradition and traces the transformations it underwent until it acquired its current usage.³ Since Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274) is the earliest grammarian in whose writings I was able to detect this term, the main section of this article will explore his utilization of the term, against its theoretical background as presented by two of his predecessors, with occasional digressions into later writings. Subsequently, I discuss a chapter in Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī’s (d. 761/1360) *Muġnī al-labīb ‘an kutub al-a‘ārīb*, where he introduces an alternative conception of the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase, which he characterises as “resembling the clause”. Lastly, we shall take a glimpse at some modern uses of the term by Arab writers, illustrated with pedagogical grammars, a linguistic dictionary and a book-length study of clauses and “quasi-clauses”. The objective here is not only to explore the semantic shift this term underwent, but also to analyse how modern writers reinterpret the concept of “resemblance to the clause” in light of the term’s later meaning. In the concluding section, it will be suggested that although the later usage of the term has been detached from its original theoretical basis, its utility lies in filling a gap in traditional terminology.

Appendix 1 will refute a previous claim attributing the coinage of this technical term to Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987). Appendix 2 will be dedicated to our term’s synonym, *šibh al-muštaqq*, which has not gained much currency.

2. Ibn Mālik on *šibh al-ġumla*

2.1. *Šibh al-ġumla* in Ibn Mālik’s Writings: Preliminary Discussion

The phrase (not yet a fully-fledged technical term) *šibh al-ġumla* likely makes its initial appearance in the writings of Ibn Mālik, specifically in his commentary on his own lengthy versified grammar *al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, in his discussion of the *mawṣūl*. The latter is a technical term that denotes nouns and particles that necessitate a *šila*, typically a clause: to the nouns of this class belong words that are customarily termed “relative pronouns”, such as *alladī*; an example of a *mawṣūl* particle is *an*, called *an al-maṣdariyya*, since the combination of *an* with the clause that follows it is equivalent to a verbal noun.⁴ A popular illustration is the Qur’ānic *wa-an taṣūmū ḥayrun lakum* (Q. 2: 184) “For you to fast is better for you”,⁵ in which the combination of *an* and *taṣūmū* is explained as equivalent to the verbal noun *al-ṣawm* or *al-ṣiyām*.

The verse at stake in *al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya* asserts that a resumptive pronoun and a clause or “what resembles it” (*mā ašbahahā*) are obligatory for *mawṣūl* nouns:

¹ Carter (*Arab Linguistics*, p. 199) translates this term as “quasi-sentence”.

² Dickins, “Topic and Comment”.

³ For a different use of the phrase *šibh al-ġumla*, encompassing participles and other constituents conveying verbal meaning, see al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 2, pp. 55 and 64. Another noteworthy usage of the term that differs from its traditional meanings is found in Baalbaki, *Dictionary*, pp. 378-379 (see also pp. 591-592), where the term “phrase” is translated as *šibh ġumla* or *šibḡumla*; this likely represents an innovation by either Baalbaki himself or another modern scholar.

⁴ See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, Ch. 1. It should be noted, however, that Sibawayhi classified *an* as a noun (see Kasher, “*anna* and *an*”).

⁵ Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 46.

malzūmu ‘ā’idin wa-ğumlatin wa-mā / ašbahahā mawṣūlu l-asmā⁶ fa-‘lamā⁷

The *mawṣūl* among nouns is what a resumptive pronoun and a clause or (lit. and – see below) what resembles it are necessary for, so know!

In the *Šarḥ*, this verse is paraphrased as follows: *al-mawṣūlu min-a l-asmā’i mā lazimahu ‘ā’idun wa-ğumlatun aw šibhuhā*, where instead of *mā ašbahahā* Ibn Mālik employs *šibhuhā*, in which the anaphoric personal pronoun refers to *ğumla*.⁸ Subsequently, in his detailed elucidation of each element in this verse, Ibn Mālik clarifies that *šibh al-ğumla* is mentioned here to indicate that the *šila* must not be *ğumla šarīḥa*, that is, a “plain, explicit” clause.⁹ Ibn Mālik’s subsequent convoluted illustration encompasses the three types of *šibh al-ğumla* that he will discuss: *allaḍī ‘indaka ḡayru llaḍī fī nafsi l-munṭaliqi abūhu*, which can be translated as “what¹⁰ is in your mind¹¹ is not what¹² is in the mind of the one whose father is departing”.¹³ The third type of constituents, exemplified here with the participle *munṭaliq* along with the following nominative noun (commonly parsed as its “subject”, *fā’il*), as a *šila* of the relative pronoun *al-*, will not be discussed here, as it requires a separate study. The first two cases are ‘*indaka* and *fī nafsi l-munṭaliqi abūhu*, exemplifying *ẓarf*¹⁴ and prepositional phrase, respectively, functioning as *šilas* of the relative pronoun *allaḍī*. In what sense do these resemble clauses? To answer this question, I shall provide an overview of the mainstream grammarians’ theory as extensively discussed by two of Ibn Mālik’s predecessors, Ibn al-Anbārī (577/1181) and Ibn Ya’īs (d. 643/1245), the latter being one of Ibn Mālik’s teachers.

2.2. Ibn Mālik’s Predecessors on the *istaqarra* / *mustaqirr* Hypothesis

Mainstream grammarians maintain that when a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase is not overtly “linked” to an element possessing a verbal meaning, a verb or a participle should be reconstructed. For instance, regarding the sentences *Zaydun amāmaka* “Zayd is in front of you” and *Zaydun fī l-dāri* “Zayd is in the abode”, where no explicit verbal element is present, grammarians reconstruct either a verb, the most popular being *istaqarra* (lit. “to stay, to be situated”), or a participle, e.g. *mustaqirr*.¹⁵

⁶ For *asmā’*. Both the initial and final *hamzas* are elided for the sake of meter. See Wright, *Grammar*, vol. 2, pp. 380–381. I would like to thank Dr Avigail Noy for discussing this phenomenon with me.

⁷ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, p. 105.

⁸ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, p. 105.

⁹ Of relevance here is Lane’s (*Lexicon*, vol. 4, p. 1676) definition of *qawl šarīḥ*: “A saying [that is explicit, plain, or clear;] not requiring anything to be conceived in the mind, nor any interpretation”. The word “interpretation” in this definition renders *ta’wīl* in Lane’s source here: al-Fayyūmī (d. ca. 770/1368), *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munīr*, p. 337 (on this dictionary, see Baalbaki, *The Arabic Lexicographical Tradition*, pp. 83–84). As we shall see below, *šarīḥa* is indeed contrasted to *mu’awwala* with respect to clauses.

¹⁰ Or: “the one who”.

¹¹ For this meaning of ‘*ind*, see Lane, *Lexicon*, vol. 5, p. 2171. An alternative translation is: “with you”.

¹² Or: “the one who”.

¹³ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, p. 105.

¹⁴ As is well known, words like ‘*ind*, *ḥalf* “behind”, *amām* “in front of”, *fawq* “above”, *qabl* “before” etc., are not classified in Arabic grammatical tradition as prepositions, but as nouns typically functioning as locative / temporal adverbials. See Kasher, “Is *ḥalfa* a Preposition?”. These usually (but definitely not exclusively) form part of an annexation (*iḍāfa*), e.g. *amāma Zaydun* “in front of Zayd”. This prompted one of the reviewers of the present article to raise an interesting question regarding the status of the *nomen rectum* here. In the traditional “atomistic” parsing, only the *nomen regens* would be parsed as a *ẓarf*. A case in point is Ibn Ḥālawayhi’s (d. 370/980 or 981) (*I’rāb*, p. 149) parsing of the phrase ‘*inda rabbiḥim* in the Qur’ānic verse *ḡazā’uhum ‘inda rabbiḥim ḡannātu ‘adnin* ... (Q. 98: 8) “Their reward with their Lord is everlasting Gardens ...” (Abdel Haleem, *The Qur’an*, p. 430; Jones’ translation, which is otherwise used in the present article, is based, in this case, on a syntactic analysis that differs from Ibn Ḥālawayhi’s: “Their recompense is with their Lord: gardens of Eden ...” [Jones, *The Qur’an*, p. 582]). Ibn Ḥālawayhi states that ‘*inda* takes the accusative ‘*alā l-ẓarfī*, while *rabbiḥim* takes the genitive due to the *iḍāfa*. The annexation here is not different from any other annexation; for instance, regarding the verse *širāṭa llaḍīna an’amta ‘alayhim* ... (Q. 1: 7) “The path of those You have blessed ...” (Jones, *The Qur’an*, p. 23), Ibn Ḥālawayhi (*I’rāb*, p. 30) parses *širāṭa* alone as *badal* of *al-širāṭa* in the previous verse, while *allaḍīna* is said to take the genitive (though without any case marker) *bi-iḍāfatī l-badali ilayhi*. The question of the extent to which the grammarians possessed a concept of “noun phrase” (discussed in Owens, *Foundations*, *passim*) is as relevant to the *ẓarf* as it is to any other syntactic function. It should also be noted that *ẓurūf* are not necessarily *nomina regentia* (e.g. *al-yawma* “today”, and even *amāman*).

¹⁵ On the “*istaqarra* / *mustaqirr* hypothesis”, see Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 152–155. See also Levin, “*al-taqdīr*”, p. 143; Bohas, “Le rasoir d’Occam”, pp. 14–15.

In his book on *Streitfragen* between Baṣran and Kūfan grammarians, Ibn al-Anbārī dedicates a chapter to the dispute over the question of the identity of the operator that assigns the accusative to the *ẓarf* functioning as the predicate in nominal sentences (*ḥabar al-mubtadaʿ*). For our purposes, it is immaterial whether or not these opinions and their accompanying arguments were genuinely upheld by early grammarians;¹⁶ moreover, the view ascribed to the Kūfans holds no relevance to the present discussion. Of significance is Ibn al-Anbārī's claim that while the Baṣrans (in general) believed this operator to be an underlying verb (*fi l-muqaddar*)¹⁷ and reconstructed the sentence *Zaydun amāmaka* as *Zaydun-i staqarra amāmaka*, some Baṣrans contended that the operator is an (underlying) active participle, proposing the reconstruction *Zaydun mustaqirrun amāmaka* for the aforementioned sentence.¹⁸ According to Ibn al-Anbārī, the explanation of the Baṣrans runs as follows: *ẓarf* is defined as a locative or temporal noun with which the preposition *fi* is intended, thus, *amāmaka* is underlyingly *fi amāmika*;¹⁹ since prepositions are employed in order to connect (*daḥalat rābiṭatan tarbuṭu*) nouns with verbs, they must necessarily be "linked" (*tata ʿallāqu*) to something (that is, a verbal constituent);²⁰ hence, the *taqdīr* of the abovementioned sentence is *Zaydun-i staqarra fi amāmika* (displaying both the underlying *fi* and the underlying verb), from which the preposition is elided, and the reconstructed verb becomes the operator of the *ẓarf*, assigning it the accusative case.²¹

The Baṣrans who advocate for the reconstruction of the active participle *mustaqirrun* base their choice, according to Ibn al-Anbārī, on the priority of nouns (the part of speech to which participles belong) over verbs, employing to this end the terms *aṣl* "primary" and *farʿ* "secondary";²² they argue that reconstruction of an *aṣl* is preferable to reconstruction of a *farʿ*.²³

Ibn al-Anbārī sides with the former opinion and presents two arguments in its favour. First, while nouns are *aṣl* vis-à-vis verbs in general, they are their *farʿ* with respect to syntactic operation (*ʿamal*);²⁴ since the issue at hand involves the reconstruction of an operator, it is preferable to re-

¹⁶ An up-to-date overview of the different views of modern scholars on the historicity of the Baṣran-Kūfan opposition as two rival grammatical "schools" is Baalbaki, "Introduction", esp. pp. xxxix-xlii.

¹⁷ Levin ("*al-taqdīr*", p. 151) defines the technical term *taqdīr* as "the imaginary utterance which the speaker intends as if [s/he] were saying it, when expressing his/[her] literal utterance". In this article, ample evidence (from post-Sībawayhian grammarians) is adduced for the correspondence between terms of the root *q-d-r* and words of the roots *n-w-y* (such as *niyya*, *manwī*) and *r-w-d* (such as *murād*) (Levin "*al-taqdīr*", pp. 159-160). However, as shown by Versteegh ("*Underlying Levels*", p. 280), *taqdīr* signifies not only the underlying structure (which is often designated by the terms *aṣl* and *maʿnā*), but also the activity of the grammarians, that is to say, the reconstruction of an underlying structure. For the terms *tamīl* and *taqdīr* in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*, see Ayoub, "*tamīl*"; Versteegh, "*Underlying Levels*", pp. 280-282 and 285. See also Bohas, "Le rasoir d'Occam"; Bohas, Guillaume & Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, pp. 62-63; Versteegh, "*Taqdīr*"; Kasher, "Two Types of *taqdīr*?" Issues pertaining to *taqdīr* are discussed in numerous other studies, some of which are referred to by the ones mentioned here.

¹⁸ Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, vol. 1, p. 245. See also Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*, p. 73. Al-Azharī (d. 905/1499) (*Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 206), on the other hand, maintains that *ḡumhūr al-Baṣriyyīna* upheld the opposite view. It might be the case that by his time this view became popular, possibly under the influence of Ibn Mālik (see below), so that each grammarian projected the most popular view in his time back to the majority of the Baṣrans.

¹⁹ The phrase *amāmaka* refers to the area in front of the addressee, and therefore *fi amāmika* and *amāmaka* (as a *ẓarf*) literally mean "in the area in front of you". It is immaterial for the present discussion whether the prepositional phrase *fi amāmika*, which underlies *amāmaka*, is permissible. See Kasher, "Is *ḥalfa* a Preposition?", pp. 121-124 (esp. fn. 31).

²⁰ On this principle, see Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, p. 135; Levin, "Prepositions", pp. 357-361; Levin "*al-taqdīr*", p. 143; Bohas, "Le rasoir d'Occam", pp. 12 and 14-15.

²¹ Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, vol. 1, p. 246.

²² On these terms, see Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, pp. 237-238. See also Owens' (*Foundations*, pp. 218-220) suggestion to translate *aṣl* and *farʿ* as "unmarked" and "marked", respectively. On the priority of nouns over verbs (without utilising the terms *aṣl-farʿ*), see al-Zaḡḡāḡī, *al-Idāh*, pp. 83-84, and its annotated translation in Versteegh, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes*, pp. 135-138. As noted by Versteegh here, "[t]he most important syntactic argument is the fact that two nouns suffice to make a complete sentence, which is impossible for two verbs". See also Versteegh, *Greek Elements*, pp. 142-145; Goldenberg, "Subject and Predicate", pp. 51-53.

²³ Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, vol. 1, p. 246.

²⁴ This notion is explained by Bohas, Guillaume & Kouloughli (*The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, p. 59) as follows: "The noun, by definition, is always submitted to another element's government [= *ʿamal*]; on the other hand, according to the majority opinion, it has not the capacity to govern anything. ... As for the government exercised by verbo-nominals such as the *maṣḍar*, participles, and participial adjectives, it is attributed to the verbal notion (*maʿnā l-fi l*) which is implicit in them." On the other hand, "[t]he verb is the governing element *par excellence* ...".

construct the *aṣl* with respect to syntactic operation. Second, Ibn al-Anbārī observes that the *ẓarf* can serve as a *šila* of *allaḍī*, e.g. *allaḍī amāmaka*; the *šila* is necessarily a clause (*ğumla*), whereas the active participle, despite incorporating (according to the grammarians) a personal pronoun,²⁵ does not constitute a clause.²⁶ In his *Asrār al-‘arabiyya*, where he summarises this discussion, Ibn al-Anbārī asserts that this proves that *zurūf* and prepositional phrases belong to *ğumal*.²⁷ This argumentation seems to be underpinned by an implicit principle of generality, that stipulates that the same analysis should apply to all constructions under consideration: since the reconstruction of a verb, but not of a participle, is the only possible solution in a specific construction, while both verbs and participles are possible in all other constructions, a verb should be reconstructed universally.

Ibn Ya‘īš maintains that in sentences such as *Ḥālidun fī l-dāri* “Ḥālid is in the abode”, the *ḥabar* is *istaqarra*, constituting a verbal clause (*fī l-wa-fā’il*), rather than the *ẓarf* itself.²⁸ He also recounts the aforementioned dispute amongst grammarians, stating that the majority opinion favours the reconstruction of a verb, for which he adduces Ibn al-Anbārī’s two arguments. However, Ibn Ya‘īš raises the following question concerning Ibn al-Anbārī’s second argument (which, in his text, is the first): why is it not possible to reconstruct the active participle *mustaqirrun* alongside another reconstruction, namely of the *mubtada’* (i.e. subject of a nominal clause) *huwa*, resulting in the complete underlying structure *allaḍī huwa mustaqirrun fī l-dāri*? Ibn Ya‘īš resolves this issue by highlighting the irregularity and “ugliness” of sentences with the structure *mā anā bi-llaḍī qā’ilun laka šay’an* “I am not the one who is saying (or: says, or: will say) anything to you”, where *allaḍī huwa qā’ilun* is intended (*al-murād*),²⁹ in contrast with the regularity and the “beauty” of the construction under discussion.³⁰ The subtle line of argumentation is significant here: Ibn Ya‘īš’s (imaginary?) opponent does not propose reconstructing the entire clause *huwa mustaqirrun* at once. Instead, it is argued that *allaḍī fī l-dāri* has the underlying structure *allaḍī mustaqirrun fī l-dāri*, for which a yet “deeper” underlying structure is provided, in which the *mubtada’* is restored, to wit *allaḍī huwa mustaqirrun fī l-dāri*; the problem lies in the immediate underlying structure, namely *allaḍī mustaqirrun fī l-dāri*. In other words, the proposal is not to reconstruct *allaḍī huwa mustaqirrun fī l-dāri* as an underlying structure of *allaḍī fī l-dāri* in a single step. The reason for this approach, I believe, lies once again in the grammarians’ quest for general solutions, since positing a reconstruction such as *Zaydun huwa mustaqirrun fī l-dāri*³¹ for the simple nominal sentence *Zaydun fī l-dāri* appears highly artificial.³²

Among the proponents of reconstructing an active participle, Ibn Ya‘īš names Ibn al-Sarrāğ (d. 316/928).³³ Ibn Ya‘īš’s arguments here are more elaborate than Ibn al-Anbārī’s abovementioned argument in favour of this view. The first is based on the premise that the *aṣl* of the *ḥabar* is to be a single phrase (*mufraḍ*),³⁴ so

²⁵ See fn. 34 below.

²⁶ Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, vol. 1, p. 247. See also Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*, pp. 73-74, where only the second argument is mentioned.

²⁷ Ibn al-Anbārī, *Asrār*, p. 74.

²⁸ Ibn Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 88. Al-Zamaḥṣārī, on whose text Ibn Ya‘īš comments, divides clauses (functioning as predicates) into four types: *fī liyya*, *ismiyya*, *ẓarfiyya* and *šartīyya*. Here Ibn Ya‘īš reduces the third to the first. The controversy over whether the *ẓarf* or the prepositional phrase should be parsed as the “true” predicate, leading to a third sentence type in addition to verbal and nominal sentences, will not be addressed here, as it has no bearing on the present discussion.

²⁹ In his main discussion of this construction, Ibn Ya‘īš (*Šarḥ*, vol. 3, pp. 152-153) deems it “weak”.

³⁰ That is, either with or without a *mubtada’*, the former being illustrated with *allaḍī huwa fī l-dāri* (Ibn Ya‘īš, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 90).

³¹ Note that *huwa* here is not a *ḍamīr al-faṣl* (commonly, though misleadingly, translated as “copula”; see Carter, “Copula”; Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 126-134; Kasher, “*ḍamīr al-faṣl*”; Carter, “The Seven Deadly Sins”, p. 527), but rather a subject whose predicate is *mustaqirrun*.

³² One should also keep in mind that the aim of the reconstruction is to provide an operator assigning the accusative, which can be either a verb or a participle. While the reconstruction of the *fā’il* along with the verb appears intuitive, given that every verb inherently involves a *fā’il* (or a *nā’ib al-fā’il*), reconstructing a *mubtada’* with the participle would be an *ad hoc* solution.

³³ Cf. Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 83-84 and 154-155. Indeed, in his discussion of predicate types, Ibn al-Sarrāğ (*al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, pp. 62-64) reconstructs an active participle, and subsumes such sentences under those in which the subject and the predicate are identical in reference (e.g. *Zaydun* and the underlying *mustaqirrun* in *Zaydun ḥalfaka* “Zayd is behind you”), in contrast with sentences in which the predicate is a clause. Elsewhere, however, he reconstructs a verb (e.g. Ibn al-Sarrāğ, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 194).

³⁴ When contrasted with *ğumla*, this term denotes a single phrase; as shown by Peled (*Sentence Types*, p. 92, fn. 14),

that the *ḡumla* takes its position (*wāqiʿatun mawqīʿahu*),³⁵ from which it follows that it is preferable to reconstruct the *aṣl*. The second is grounded in the principle stipulating that the shorter the *taqdīr*, the more favourable it is;³⁶ reconstruction of a verb is tantamount to reconstruction of a clause, in contrast to reconstruction of a noun, which is a single phrase (*mufrad*).³⁷ The *ẓarf*, says Ibn Yaʿīṣ, takes the accusative due to the operation exerted either by the verb or the noun.³⁸ This statement, incidentally, demonstrates the fact that although Ibn Yaʿīṣ advocates for reconstructing a verb, he occasionally presents both possibilities. In one instance, he even limits himself to mentioning only a participle as the restored constituent.³⁹

2.3. Ibn Mālik's Reassessment

In the chapter on *al-mafʿūl fīhi* in his *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, Ibn Mālik states that when the *ẓarf* functions as a *šila*, its covert operator can only be a verb, whereas when it functions as a *ḥabar* or as a *šifa* (an attribute, namely, an asyndetic relative clause), it may be either a verb or an active participle.⁴⁰ He explains that the *šila* can be a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase, which substitute for, and assume the role of (*qāʿiman maqāma*),⁴¹ a verbal clause, for which he offers reconstructions such as *istaqarra*.⁴² He maintains that when the predicate in a nominal sentence (*ḥabar al-mubtadaʿ*) is a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase, either a verb, e.g. *istaqarra*, or an active participle, e.g. *mustaqirr*, can be reconstructed (*muqaddar*); however, Ibn Mālik favours the latter, for the following two reasons:

First, in case of *taqdīr* of a verb, the verb (that is, the verbal clause) fills the syntactic position (*maḥall*) of the nominative. In Arabic grammatical tradition, clauses that fill syntactic positions (termed *maḥall* or *mawḍiʿ*) where they can be substituted for single words (predominantly nouns) that carry *iʿrāb* markers – more accurately, where they are considered substitutes for single words – are said to have a *maḥall* (or *mawḍiʿ*) *min al-iʿrāb*.⁴³ Thus, a clause functioning as the predicate in a nominal clause is said to have the *maḥall* of the nominative; this nominative case can only be overt on a noun; hence, another *taqdīr* is necessary, this time of an active participle. In other words, the case of the clause, determined by its position, can only be realised by reconstruction of a structure in which a noun carrying a case marker fills this position. Therefore, two reconstructions are required here, instead of only one if an active participle is chosen in the first place.

Second, Ibn Mālik identifies two constructions in which reconstruction of a verb is impossible. These are sentences introduced by *ammā*, e.g. *ammā ʿindaka fa-Zaydun* “(lit. as to)⁴⁴ with you –

this term is not restricted to a single word. It should be noted that nouns derived from verbs that function as *ḥabar* incorporate a resumptive pronoun (as their *fāʿil*), which refers to their *mubtadaʿ* (see Peled, *Sentence Types*, p. 85); it follows that in these instances the *ḥabar* consists of two words. However, the active participle and the pronoun incorporated in it do not form a clause (see Peled, *Sentence Types*, p. 142, fn. 8). On constructions where the *fāʿil* of the participle is an explicit noun, see Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 138–147.

³⁵ This issue is discussed in detail earlier (Ibn Yaʿīṣ, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 88).

³⁶ This principle is discussed in Bohas, “Le rasoir d’Occam”.

³⁷ Ibn Yaʿīṣ, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 90. This argument is challenged by Ibn Hišām (*Muḡnī*, vol. 5, p. 336), who contends that the elided constituent is merely the verb itself, while its pronominal subject is “relocated” to the *ẓarf*, in which case the elision is of a *mufrad* (namely, merely the verb), much like the elided adjective (i.e. participle).

³⁸ Ibn Yaʿīṣ, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 90–91. The prepositional phrase fills the position (*mawḍiʿ*) of the accusative, for the same reason.

³⁹ Ibn Yaʿīṣ, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 89–90.

⁴⁰ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, p. 307.

⁴¹ See Versteegh, “Syntactic Position”, pp. 275–277.

⁴² Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, pp. 121–122.

⁴³ On the classification of clauses into those with and without a *maḥall*, see Baalbaki, “Grammars for Beginners”, p. 69. Peled (“*ʿAmal* and *ibtidāʿ*”, p. 155, fn. 12) clarifies that the absence of a *mawḍiʿ min al-iʿrāb* in a clause means that “it is not convertible into a nominal that can be assigned case”. On *mawḍiʿ* in *Kitāb Sibawayhi*, see Carter, “An Arab Grammarian”, p. 148; Baalbaki, *The Legacy of the Kitāb*, *passim*. On *mawḍiʿ* and *maḥall* in Arabic grammatical tradition, see Versteegh, “Syntactic Position”, pp. 271–274 and 277–278; Owens, *Foundations*, pp. 34–36 and 71–72; Kasher, “The Terminology of Vowels and *iʿrāb*”, esp. pp. 144–145 and 154–155. Bohas, Guillaume & Kouloughli (*The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, pp. 61–62) address this matter under the term *iʿrāb maḥalli*, translated as “statutory *iʿrāb*”. See also Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, pp. 131 and 133.

⁴⁴ Since *ammā* often introduces contrastive topics, another possible translation, depending on the context, might be:

there is Zayd”, and *idā al-mufāḡa’a* (also known as *idā al-fuḡā’iyya*), e.g. *ḥaraḡtu fa-idā fī l-bābi Zaydun* “I went out, and lo, at the door was Zayd”, since these two words cannot precede a verb, either overt or covert.⁴⁵ Conversely, constructions where the *taqdīr* of an active participle (for a predicative *zarf* / prepositional phrase) is impossible do not exist.⁴⁶ For the sake of generality, an active participle should be chosen universally.⁴⁷

Ibn Mālik attributes his opinion to Sībawayhi (d. ca. 180/796), and the opposite view to al-Aḥfaš (d. 215?/830?).⁴⁸

In his *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, Ibn Mālik presents two additional arguments in favour of the active participle:

First, he adduces a poetic verse where *kā’in* is overt with a predicative *zarf*, claiming that nowhere does a verb appear on the surface in such a construction.

Second, he argues that the reconstructed verb is tantamount to a clause, in contrast with the active participle, which is a single phrase (*mufrad*), and thus “primary” (*aṣl*) in relation to the clause.

Here Ibn Mālik dismisses the abovementioned counterargument of those who advocate for reconstructing a verb (namely, that this reconstruction is necessary when the *zarf* is a *šila*), on the ground that the two positions differ with respect to the nature of the constituents filling them, at least primarily. In the case of *šila*, the *zarf* fills a position where a single phrase does not suffice, thus requiring the reconstruction (*ta’awwala bi-*) of a single phrase filling this position as a clause.⁴⁹ Conversely, as the predicate, the *zarf* fills a position primarily (*bi-l-aṣāla*) filled by a single phrase, necessitating the reconstruction (*ta’awwala bi-*) of a clause filling this position as a single phrase.⁵⁰

We now turn to the chapter on relative pronouns in the *Tashīl* and its commentary by Ibn Mālik. Although Ibn Mālik does not explicitly employ the term *šibh al-ğumla* here, his insights concerning the structure where the *zarf* and the prepositional phrase fill this position can shed light on the concept of “resemblance to a clause” encapsulated in this term. In the *Tashīl*, Ibn Mālik asserts that

“but” or “whereas”.

⁴⁵ For indefinite participles following *ammā*, see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 2, p. 181; Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, pp. 301–302. Elsewhere, Ibn Mālik (*Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 2, pp. 139–140) distinguishes between *ammā* and *idā*, in his discussion of constructions such as *Zaydan ḡarabtuḥu* “Zayd [acc.], I hit him”, where an operator (here, the verb) is already “occupied” by the direct object (hence the term *ištiḡāl*, commonly used for such constructions) and therefore cannot operate on the accusative noun; to resolve this problem, grammarians typically reconstruct another operator, for which the overt operator is an exponent, thus, **ḡarabtu Zaydan ḡarabtuḥu* (for a comprehensive study of this construction, see Noy, *The Concept of* ‘ištiḡāl’; see also Baalbaki, “Harmony and Hierarchy”, pp. 8 ff.; Owens, *Foundations*, p. 188; Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 219–221). Here Ibn Mālik subsumes *idā al-mufāḡa’a* under elements that prevent this construction, as this particle is followed either by *mubtada’* + *ḡabar* or by *ḡabar* + *mubtada’* (in the sequel: by overt *mubtada’* and *ḡabar* or by *mubtada’* + elided *ḡabar*). He opposes the analogy drawn by Sībawayhi between *idā* and *ammā*, since although *ammā* cannot precede a verb, it often precedes a constituent operated on by a verb, e.g. *fa-ammā l-yatima fa-lā taḡhar. wa-ammā l-sā’ila fa-lā tanhar* (Q. 93: 9–10) “As for the orphan, do not oppress him; as for the beggar, do not drive him away” (Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 575), and may also precede a constituent operated on by a covert operator, whose “occupied” (*mašḡūl*) exponent follows, e.g. the reading *fa-ammā Tamūda fa-hadaynāhum* (Q. 41: 17) “As for Thamūd [acc.], We guided them” (Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 438) (on this reading, see ‘Umar & Makram, *Mu’ḡam*, vol. 6, p. 68; al-Ḥaṭīb, *Mu’ḡam*, vol. 8, pp. 272–273); *idā*, on the other hand, cannot be followed by a verb or even a constituent operated on by a verb.

⁴⁶ See, however, Abū Ḥayyān (745/1344), *al-Taḍyīl*, vol. 4, p. 50.

⁴⁷ Ibn Hišām (*Muḡnī*, vol. 5, pp. 352–353) rejects Ibn Mālik’s argument by asserting that the verb should be reconstructed *after* the subject. The proper position of the verb in the underlying structure is dealt with in Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī*, vol. 5, pp. 350–351, where he argues that those advocating the reconstruction of a verb (rather than a participle) must position it after the subject, since a verbal predicate cannot precede the *mubtada’* (in other words, such a reconstruction would alter the sentence type). Al-Ašmūnī (15th century) (*Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 94–95) maintains that participles are mandatorily reconstructed in these cases only due to (the peculiarity of) these specific positions, much as verbs are mandatorily reconstructed as *šilas* (and as *šifas* of indefinite *mudtada’*s whose *ḡabars* are introduced by *fa-*, on which see below). In addition, al-Ašmūnī holds that it is permissible to reconstruct an obligatorily elided verb in these positions, as it is only overt verbs that are impermissible there. Finally, he reiterates Ibn Hišām’s rebuttal, based on the premise that even covert verbs cannot follow these particles.

⁴⁸ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, pp. 149–150.

⁴⁹ Elsewhere, Ibn Mālik (*Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, pp. 203–204 and 207–208) allows for the elision of a nominative resumptive pronoun in the *šila* under certain conditions: when it functions as a *mubtada’* and its *ḡabar* is neither a clause nor a *zarf*, and provided that the *šila* is lengthy (if this latter condition is not met, the construction is “disliked” by the Baṣrans; the Kūfāns, on the other hand, do not impose this requirement). A case in point is Q. 43: 84 to be discussed below.

⁵⁰ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, pp. 317–318.

these necessitate, inter alia, a clause, either “plain, explicit” (*ṣarīḥa*) or *mu’awwala*.⁵¹ In the *Šarḥ* he explains that by the latter he means the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase, which are obligatorily “linked” to a(n underlying) verb, and the adjective following *al-* as a relative pronoun.⁵² Further into this chapter, Ibn Mālik maintains that the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase, with which *istaqarra* (or a similar verb) is intended, can suffice in lieu of a clause as a *ṣila*. He clarifies that *ẓarf* as *ṣila* is underlyingly a clause, since it is obligatorily “linked” to a verb (with its subject); reconstruction of a verb here is agreed upon unanimously, in contrast with the disagreement over the nature of the reconstructed constituent where it fills positions other than the *ṣila*.⁵³

Finally, the phrase *šibhuhā*, where the pronoun refers to *ḡumla*, also surfaces in Ibn Mālik’s celebrated *Alfiyya*, in the following verse:

*wa-ḡumlatan aw šibhuhā llaḏī wuṣil / bihī ka-man ‘indī llaḏī bnuhū kuṣil*⁵⁴

The *ṣila* is either a clause or a quasi-clause, e.g. *man ‘indī llaḏī bnuhū kuṣil[a]* (“the one who is with me is the one whose son was taken care of”).

The phrase *allaḏī wuṣil[a] bihī* designates the *ṣila*, which is said here to consist of either a clause or what resembles it; the latter is exemplified with the *ẓarf* *‘indī*. In several commentaries (and super-commentaries) on the *Alfiyya* this appellation is related, explicitly or implicitly, to the underlying verbal clause. For instance, after explaining that *šibh al-ḡumla* means *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase, al-Murādī (d. 749/1348) clarifies that this designation stems from the fact that these constituents are “linked” to an underlying verb, e.g. *allaḏī staqarra ‘indaka / fī l-dāri*.⁵⁵ Abū Ḥayyān goes as far as to state that there is no necessity to mention this class at all, since the *ṣila* constitutes a *ḡumla* (albeit underlying).⁵⁶

To recapitulate, *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase, when functioning as *ṣila*, are said to “resemble a clause” by virtue of the reconstruction of a verbal clause to which they are “linked”. Consequently, *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase cannot be deemed to “resemble a clause” when the verb(al element) to which they are “linked” is overt: in the latter case, they cannot be said to be underlyingly a clause, nor to substitute for a clause or to assume its role. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge, the phrase *šibh al-ḡumla* in Ibn Mālik’s writings never occurs with reference to a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase with an overt verb(al element). Furthermore, since of all the cases in which *istaqarra / mustaqirr* is reconstructed, it is only in the *ṣila* that a verb is reconstructed according to Ibn Mālik, the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase cannot be considered as *šibh ḡumla* elsewhere, e.g. when functioning as a *ḥabar*.

3. Broader Meanings of *šibh al-ḡumla*

It should come as no surprise, however, that Ibn Mālik is not entirely consistent in such cases, for there are two instances in which the phrase *šibhahā*, where the pronoun refers to *ḡumla*, designates the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase in constructions other than *ṣila*, but where *istaqarra / mustaqirr* is also to be reconstructed according to Arab grammarians. In the first, Ibn Mālik employs (in the *Tashīl*) the phrase *ḡumlatan aw šibhahā* for clauses as well as the *ẓarf* and the *ḡārr wa-maḡrūr* (as clarified in the *Šarḥ*), functioning as a the second *maf’ūl* of cognitive verbs (commonly considered by Arab grammarians as underlyingly *ḥabars*, due to the predicative relations in which the two *maf’ūls* of these verbs engage);⁵⁷ these, Ibn Mālik maintains, cannot become the *nā’ib ‘an al-fā’il*, but he does not provide any illustration;⁵⁸ in his commentary on this text, Abū Ḥayyān provides the

⁵¹ See fn. 9 above.

⁵² Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, p. 186.

⁵³ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, p. 211.

⁵⁴ Goguyer, *Manuel*, p. 23. It is only in the next verse that Ibn Mālik addresses *al-* as a relative pronoun; its first hemistich reads: *wa-ṣifātun ṣarīḥatun ṣilatu al-*, with no intimation that this construction also falls under the class of *šibh al-ḡumla*.

⁵⁵ al-Murādī, *Tawḏīḥ*, pp. 443-444. See also Ibn al-Nāẓim (Ibn Mālik’s son, d. 686/1287), *Šarḥ*, p. 63; Ibn Hišām, *Hāṣiyatāni*, pp. 274-275; al-Ašmūnī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 75; al-Azharī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 169.

⁵⁶ Abū Ḥayyān, *Manḥağ*, pp. 29-30. This difficulty is addressed and responded to in al-Šāṭibī (d. 790/1388), *Maqāṣid*, vol. 1, pp. 475-476.

⁵⁷ See Kasher, “*xabar*”.

⁵⁸ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 2, p. 129.

example **ẓunna fī l-dāri Zaydan* “it was thought that Zayd was in the abode”.⁵⁹ It is thus inferred that the prepositional phrase *fī l-dāri* in the corresponding active sentence, e.g. *ẓanantu Zaydan fī l-dāri* “I thought that Zayd was in the abode” is considered *šibh al-ğumla*. In the second case, *ğumlatan aw šibhahā* (in *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*) parallels *ẓarf* and *ğumla* (in the *Tashīl*), within a discussion of attributes assuming the role of (*yuqāmu ... maqāma*) their heads (*al-man‘ūt*).⁶⁰ Ibn Mālik does not exemplify this construction, but his commentators take it upon themselves to provide some illustrations; Ḥālid al-Azharī, for instance, adduces several examples, including the Qur’ānic verse ... *wa-minnā dūna dālīka* ... (Q. 72: 11) “and among us there are some who fall below that”,⁶¹ which he reconstructs as *wa-minnā farīqun dūna dālīka*.⁶² This situation is reminiscent of Ibn Ya‘īṣ’s aforementioned inconsistency with regard to the reconstructed constituent.⁶³ In fact, Ibn Mālik himself demonstrates tolerance towards the reconstruction of a verb for the predicative *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase, as he confines himself to presenting the two possibilities in his *Alfiyya*:

*wa-aḥbarū bi-ẓarfīn aw bi-ḥarfī ḡarʿ / nāwīna ma‘nā kā‘inin aw-i staqarʿ*⁶⁴

They (i.e. the speakers) predicated by means of a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase (i.e., used these constituents as *ḥabar*), intending the meaning of *kā‘in* or *istaqarra* (i.e., at the underlying structure).

Commenting on this verse, Abū Ḥayyān and Ibn ‘Aqīl (d. 769/1367) explain that according to its manifest meaning (*ẓāhir*), Ibn Mālik permits the reconstruction of both a verb and a participle.⁶⁶

In his *al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, on the other hand, Ibn Mālik mentions the verb and the participle conjoined by *bal*, which, as he explains in the commentary, designates “retraction” (*iḍrāb*) from the former:

wa-bi-staqarra bal bi-mustaqirri / yu‘allaqu l-ẓarfu wa-ḥarfu l-ḡarrī

The *ẓarf* and the preposition are “linked” to *istaqarra*, nay rather to *mustaqirr*.⁶⁷

Moreover, it seems that Ibn Mālik’s inconsistency here might be related to his originality: once he explicates and defends his own unique theory, he does not insist on adhering to it throughout the book. Therefore, he occasionally aligns with the more common theory, which reconstructs a verb in all the positions at stake.

A similar use of the term *šibh al-ğumla*, coupled with a preference for a participle as the reconstructed constituent in the predicate position, is also found in later grammars. Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) asserts that the predicate (in nominal sentences) is of three types: *mufradun wa-ğumlatun wa-šibhuhā*, the latter meaning *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases.⁶⁸ Later, however, in his main discussion of this construction, he supports Ibn Mālik’s reconstruction of an active participle.⁶⁹ In a similar vein, al-Ḥaṭṭāb (d. 954/1547) uses the term *šibh al-ğumla* for the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase as *šila*,⁷⁰ “linked” to the elided verb *istaqarra*,⁷¹ yet, this grammarian also employs this term for the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase functioning as predicates, for which he reconstructs a participle, such as *mustaqirr*.⁷²

⁵⁹ Abū Ḥayyān, *al-Taḍyīl*, vol. 6, p. 248.

⁶⁰ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 3, pp. 322-323.

⁶¹ Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 540.

⁶² Ḥālid, *Šarḥ*, vol. 2, p. 128. Note that Jones’ translation fits this reconstruction.

⁶³ See also fn. 33 above, regarding Ibn al-Sarrāḡ’s inconsistency.

⁶⁴ For *ḡarr*.

⁶⁵ For *istaqarra*. Goguyer, *Manuel*, p. 31.

⁶⁶ Abū Ḥayyān, *Manḥaḡ*, p. 42 (read *taqdīr* instead of *taqdīm*); Ibn ‘Aqīl, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 209-211. Al-Murāḍī’s (*Tawḍīḥ*, p. 479), al-Makkūḍī (d. 807/1404-1405) (*Šarḥ*, p. 47), and al-Ašmūnī (*Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 93-94) note that Ibn Mālik favours reconstructing a participle. A different view is presented in al-Šāṭibī, *al-Maqāṣid*, vol. 2, pp. 12-14. Al-Azharī (*Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 206-207) ascribes to Ibn Mālik the position advocated by Ibn Hišām, according to which the reconstruction should align with the intended meaning (see below).

⁶⁷ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, pp. 149-150. On this sense of *bal*, see Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 1, p. 553.

⁶⁸ al-Suyūṭī, *Ham‘*, vol. 1, p. 312.

⁶⁹ al-Suyūṭī, *Ham‘*, vol. 1, pp. 320-321.

⁷⁰ The term also applies to participles functioning as the *šila* of *al-*.

⁷¹ al-Fākihī, *al-Fawākih*, pp. 187-188.

⁷² al-Fākihī, *al-Fawākih*, pp. 224-225.

In al-Širbīnī's (d. 977/1570) commentary on the *Āğurrūmiyya* the term *šibh al-ğumla* is used in his discussion of predicate types, where the resemblance to *ğumla* is said to inhere in the preposition and the *zarf* being "linked" to a mandatorily elided constituent, either a participle, in which case they are phrases, or a verb, in which case they are clauses.⁷³

Although this usage of the term *šibh al-ğumla* is at variance with its theoretical underpinning, since the *zarf* and the prepositional phrase "linked" to a participle are not "underlyingly" clauses, the term is nevertheless not totally detached from the theory; these grammarians do not use the term outside cases where *istaqarra / mustaqirr* is reconstructed.

There is one locus in Ibn Mālik's *Tashīl* where the exact meaning of the phrase in question is uncertain: in his discussion on pluralization and dualization of proper names, Ibn Mālik notes that proper names of the form of *al-ğumlati wa-šibhihā* cannot be pluralised (instead, determinative pronouns such as *dawū* are annexed to them in order to indicate duality or plurality). Unfortunately, no illustration is furnished, nor was this text commented on by Ibn Mālik (at least in the extant manuscripts of his *Šarḥ*). In his commentary on this text, Ibn 'Aqīl exemplifies these two classes with *Ta'abbata Šarran*, *Baraqa Naḥruhu* (two commonly adduced nicknames in the form of verbal clauses), *Anta* and *Anā / Innamā* (according to different manuscripts).⁷⁴ This discussion is likely based on a previous chapter, where Ibn 'Aqīl employs the phrase *al-ğumlatu aw šibhuḥā* for various classes of proper names taking the form of clauses, e.g. *Ta'abbata Šarran*, and other combinations of words, although none of these combinations is illustrated with a *zarf* or a prepositional phrase: *Qā'imun 'Abawāhu* (where the first word operates on the second),⁷⁵ *Zaydun Wa-'Amrun*, *Rağulun 'Aqilun* (both are cases of *itbā'*, more specifically, a conjunction between two names and a head followed by an adjectival attribute, respectively), *Ka-Annamā* (a compound of two particles), *Yā Zaydu* (a particle and a noun), *Anta* (the pronoun *an-* followed by the particle *-ta* designating the second person) and *Halumma* (a particle and a verb, i.e. *ha-lumma*).⁷⁶ The term *šibh ġumla* is also used by al-Suyūṭī in the same context.⁷⁷ It would therefore be imprudent to interpret Ibn Mālik's text as referring to *zurūf* and prepositional phrases, outside any syntactic structure, which would leave the question of "linking" unresolved. This case incidentally shows that for a very long period after it was first employed, the phrase *šibh al-ğumla* did not evolve into a fully-fledged technical term.

4. Ibn Hišām on *mā yušbiḥu l-ğumlata*

The generalization of the class of "what resembles the clause" is already initiated by Ibn Hišām, in his *Muğnī al-labīb*,⁷⁸ whose third chapter is dedicated to *mā yušbiḥu l-ğumlata* "what resembles clauses", namely *zurūf* and prepositional phrases, yet, the content of this chapter is not limited to cases where *istaqarra / mustaqirr* is reconstructed. Ibn Hišām begins this chapter with the statement that these must be "linked" to a verb, to "what resembles it", to "what is interpreted (*uwwila*) as what resembles it" or to "what designates its meaning"; otherwise, an underlying constituent is reconstructed. The first two cases are illustrated, e.g., with the Qur'ānic verse [*širāṭa llaḍīna*] *an'amta 'alayhim ġayri l-mağḍūbi 'alayhim [wa-lā l-ḍāllīna]* (Q. 1: 7) "the path of those You have blessed, not of those against whom there is anger nor of those who go astray",⁷⁹ where the first token of *alā* is "linked" to the verb *an'amta* and the second to the passive participle *mağḍūb*. The third case is illustrated, e.g., with the verse *wa-huwa llaḍī fī l-samā' i ilāhun wa-fī l-arḍi ilāhun ...* (Q. 43:

⁷³ Carter, *Arab Linguistics*, pp. 198-201. Indifference to whether the elided constituent is a verb is also evident in Goguyer's definition of *šibh al-ğumla*: "... qui est le complément d'un verbe ou d'un équivalent verbal ..." (Goguyer, *Manuel*, pp. 268-269).

⁷⁴ Ibn 'Aqīl, *al-Musā'id*, vol. 3, p. 482. In *al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya* and its commentary, Ibn Mālik (*Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, vol. 2, pp. 285 and 286) discusses proper names of the form of a *ğumla*, but does not mention any class "resembling" the *ğumla*.

⁷⁵ On this construction, see Peled, *Sentence Types*, pp. 138-147.

⁷⁶ Ibn 'Aqīl, *al-Musā'id*, vol. 3, pp. 45-46.

⁷⁷ al-Suyūṭī, *Ham*, vol. 3, pp. 231-232.

⁷⁸ On his view in *Ḥāšiyatānī*, see above. In other treatises, Ibn Hišām lists, in the chapters on the nominal *mawṣūl*, the three types of *šibh al-ğumla* mentioned by Ibn Mālik (in his *al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*) and addresses the underlying verb to which the *zarf* and the prepositional phrases are "linked", but does not relate the term *šibh ġumla* to the reconstructed verbal clause (Ibn Hišām, *Awḍaḥ*, vol. 1, p. 165; Ibn Hišām, *Šarḥ Qaṭr al-nadā*, pp. 111-112).

⁷⁹ Jones, *The Qur'ān*, p. 23.

84) “It is He who is God in heaven and God on earth”,⁸⁰ where *fī* is said to be “linked” to the noun *ilāh*, parsed as a predicate of an elided *huwa* (thus, *wa-huwa llaḏī huwa ilāhun fī al-samā’i*),⁸¹ since *ilāh* is interpreted as *ma’būd* “worshipped”. The fourth case, which is also referred to as “what contains a ‘scent’ (*rā’iḥa*) of it (i.e. of a verb)”, is exemplified, e.g., by the sentence *fulānun Ḥātimun fī qawmihi* (lit. “so-and-so is Ḥātim in his tribe”), where Ḥātim (al-Ṭā’ī, a pre-Islamic poet known for his generosity) conveys the meaning of generosity (rather than interpreted as a participle). Under the category of elided verbs, Ibn Hišām discusses constructions such as *wa-ilā Tamūda aḥāhum Ṣāliḥan* ... (Q. 7: 73 and 11: 61) “And to Thamūd [We sent]⁸² their brother Ṣāliḥ”,⁸³ where the preposition *ilā* is “linked” to the elided verb *arsalnā*, although no mention is made of *irsāl* in the verses’ contexts, but it is indicated by the mention of the prophet sent to them (*al-mursal ilayhim*).⁸⁴ Only later in this chapter does Ibn Hišām address constructions in which *istaqarra* / *mustaqirr* is reconstructed.⁸⁵ One of the topics discussed here is the controversy over whether the reconstructed constituent should be a verb or an adjective, i.e. a participle. Ibn Hišām states that a verb is necessarily reconstructed in the *šila*, as well as in constructions of the type *rağulun fī al-dāri fa-lahu dirhamun* “(any) man in the abode is entitled to a dirham”, since this *fa*- introducing the predicate is permitted only when the head of the subject is modified by an asyndetic relative clause, but not when it is modified by an adjectival attribute (thus: *rağulun ya’tīnī fa-lahu dirhamun* “(any) man who comes to me is entitled to a dirham”, but not: **rağulun ṣāliḥun fa-lahu dirhamun* “(any) good man is entitled to a dirham”).⁸⁶ As to the predicate, the attribute and the circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*), Ibn Hišām presents the different opinions, and the main arguments in favour and against each position, but does not decide between them.⁸⁷ In the next section, on reconstruction in accordance with meaning, he suggests reconstructing either a participle or an imperfect verb when the present or the future is intended, and either a perfect verb or an adjective (i.e. a participle) when the past is intended.⁸⁸ To recapitulate, the chapter on *zurūf* and prepositional phrases, characterised as “what resembles the clause”, addresses both cases where the verbal (or semi-verbal) constituent is overt or covert, and both cases where the constituent in question is a verb and a participle, including those where it is *istaqarra* / *mustaqirr*. Moreover, in his introduction to this work, Ibn Hišām presents the subject matter of this chapter as “what oscillates between clauses and single phrases” (*mā yataraddadu bayna l-mufradāti wa-l-ğumali*), namely, the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase.⁸⁹ The commentator al-Damāmīnī (d. 827/1424) explains this expression as referring to these constituents being “linked” sometimes to a *mufrad*, at others to a *ğumla*.⁹⁰

5. Modern Arab Writers on *šibh al-ğumla*

In his comprehensive study *al-Muṣṭalahāt al-musta’ mala fī kutub tadrīs qawā’id al-luğa al-‘arabiyya, wa-wāḏi’ ūḥā*, ‘Aṭṭālāh delves into grammatical terms used in modern school grammars, seeking to detect for each term the grammarian who coined it. He asserts that in modern school grammars the term *šibh al-ğumla* is utilised mostly in the context of the types of the *ḥabar* and of the circumstantial qualifier (*ḥāl*), where it conveys the sense of the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase.⁹¹ His explanation of this appellation runs as follows: this term originates in the “linking”

⁸⁰ Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 454.

⁸¹ In line with fn. 49 above, Ibn Hišām states elsewhere that elision of the resumptive pronoun functioning as a *muḥtada* is allowed when the predicate is a *mufrad*, as in our verse; however, it is uncommon when the *šila* is not lengthy (Ibn Hišām, *Awḍaḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 166-168). See also al-Šumunnī (d. 872/1468), *al-Munṣif*, vol. 2, p. 110.

⁸² Square brackets in the original.

⁸³ Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 154 (see also p. 213).

⁸⁴ Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī*, vol. 5, pp. 271-287.

⁸⁵ Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī*, vol. 5, pp. 313, 315 ff., and esp. 326 ff.

⁸⁶ See also the discussion in Sartori, “*fā*”, pp. 24 ff.

⁸⁷ Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī*, vol. 5, pp. 334-336.

⁸⁸ Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī*, vol. 5, pp. 340-341.

⁸⁹ Ibn Hišām, *Muğnī*, vol. 1, p. 56.

⁹⁰ al-Damāmīnī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 26.

⁹¹ ‘Aṭṭālāh, *al-Muṣṭalahāt*, p. 342.

of the *ẓarf* or the preposition to an elided clause or a single phrase (*mufrad*), which are generally reconstructed as *istaqarra* and *mustaqirr*, respectively; since both possibilities are admissible, what substitutes for both of them (*ḥalla maḥallahumā*) is regarded as resembling a clause (*šibhan li-l-ḡumla*).⁹² An example of a school grammar referred to by ‘Aṭṭālāh is *Mabādi’ al-‘arabiyya* by al-Šartūnī. The latter states that the *ḥabar* can either be a single phrase (*mufrad*), a clause (*ḡumla*) or a *šibh ḡumla*, the latter being either a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase.⁹³ Later, he asserts that *šibh al-ḡumla* functioning as a *ḥabar* must have an elided adjective, e.g. *kā’in*, or verb, e.g. *yakūnu*, to which the *ẓarf* or prepositional phrase is “linked”, this elided constituent being the real *ḥabar*.⁹⁴

In *al-Taṭbīq al-naḥwī*, designed for university students, al-Rāḡiḥī explains the term *šibh al-ḡumla*, applied by the grammarians to both *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases, as stemming from two reasons. First, neither *ẓurūf* nor prepositional phrases convey an “independent meaning”, only a “subsidiary meaning” (*ma ‘nan far ‘iyyan*), whether they are *tāmmayni* (lit. “complete”, that is, functioning as a predicate, thus forming a clause with a subject) or not; it is therefore as if they constitute an “incomplete clause” (*ḡumla nāqiṣa*) or *šibh ḡumla*. Note that according to this explanation, the term applies to every *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase, regardless of its syntactic position. The second explanation, which al-Rāḡiḥī states is the most important for the grammarians, is the fact that *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases substitute for a clause: *istaqarra*, consisting of a *fi l* and a *fā’il*, is reconstructed in sentences such as *Zaydun fi l-bayti / ‘indaka*. This indeed conforms to the theory that underlies the original usage of this term and is restricted to cases where the *ẓarf* or the prepositional phrase is not “linked” to an overt constituent. However, in his analysis of the illustration that follows, al-Rāḡiḥī applies the term *šibh ḡumla* to all of its four⁹⁵ prepositional phrases, all of which are “linked” to the explicit verb: *sāfara Zaydun mina l-Qāhirati ilā Dimašqa bi-l-ṭā’irati li-yaḥḍura l-mu’tamara* “Zayd travelled from Cairo to Damascus by airplane in order to attend the conference”. This also applies to his other illustrations, as well as throughout his elucidation of the term *ta’alluq*. Moreover, in this section al-Rāḡiḥī reconstructs not only verbs, but also active participles, for sentences whose (surface) predicates are *ẓurūf* or prepositional phrases.⁹⁶ Elsewhere throughout the book, *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases parsed *šibh ḡumla* are not necessarily “linked” to any elided constituent.⁹⁷

In their dictionary of linguistic and literary terms,⁹⁸ Ya’qūb & ‘Āṣī state that *šibh al-ḡumla*, which they identify with the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase, must be “linked” to a constituent, which may be either overt or elided, optionally or mandatorily. Within their discussion of the latter case, they assert that the *taqdīr* of the elided constituent may be either a verb (e.g. *istaqarra*) or an adjective similar to a verb (e.g. *mustaqirr*), however, when the elided constituent functions as a *šila*, its *taqdīr* is obligatorily a verb.⁹⁹

In his book-length study *I’rāb al-ḡumal wa-ašbāh al-ḡumal*, Qabāwa defines *šibh al-ḡumla* as a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase, contrasting it with a single phrase and a clause.¹⁰⁰

Several explanations are provided for the term *šibh al-ḡumla*. According to the first, it is termed thusly because it is “composed” (*murakkaba*) of two or more words (overtly or covertly),¹⁰¹ much like a clause.¹⁰² Additionally, in cases where it is “linked” to an elided constituent, it also indi-

⁹² ‘Aṭṭālāh, *al-Muṣṭalahāt*, pp. 342-343.

⁹³ al-Šartūnī, *Mabādi’*, p. 197.

⁹⁴ al-Šartūnī, *Mabādi’*, p. 199.

⁹⁵ *li-yaḥḍura* is commonly reconstructed as *li-[an] yaḥḍura*, where *an* and the following constituent are paraphrased as a *maṣḍar* in the genitive. See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, Ch. 9.

⁹⁶ al-Rāḡiḥī, *al-Taṭbīq*, pp. 355-361. See also pp. 100-102 and 229-230.

⁹⁷ See e.g. al-Rāḡiḥī, *al-Taṭbīq*, pp. 228-240. Larcher (*Syntaxe*, p. 179; see also p. 24, fn. 5) states that Arabic grammars (with reference to al-Ḡalāyīnī’s *Ġāmi’ al-durūs al-‘arabiyya*) explain the fact that *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases, and not just clauses, can function as a *šila*, by referring to the concept of *šibh al-ḡumla*, with *taqdīr* of a conjugated or nominal form of a verb such as *istaqarra*, to which the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase are “linked”, thus explaining the accusative of the *ẓarf*.

⁹⁸ For other linguistic dictionaries’ entries on *šibh al-ḡumla*, see Baalbaki, “Grammars for Beginners”, p. 81, fn. 93.

⁹⁹ Ya’qūb & ‘Āṣī, *al-Mu’ḡam*, pp. 440-442 (see also p. 729).

¹⁰⁰ Qabāwa, *I’rāb*, p. 15.

¹⁰¹ By “covertly”, Qabāwa most likely refers to the preposition *fi* reconstructed for the *ẓarf* (see above).

¹⁰² Qabāwa also notes that *šibh al-ḡumla* predominantly indicates a time or place, but this does not typify clauses, but rather verbs, to a certain extent.

cates the existence of a covert pronoun, which renders it similar to clauses in its “composition”. Qabāwa further relates this appellation to the reconstruction of a clause, e.g. *istaqarra*, for which the *šibh al-ġumla* may substitute: due to their indication of the elided clause and their substitution for it, the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase “resemble” the clause, hence the term *šibh al-ġumla*. An alternative explanation is that such a *šibh al-ġumla* “oscillates” (*mutaraddida*) between single phrases (*al-mufradāt*) and clauses,¹⁰³ namely, they belong neither to the former nor to the latter: at times they are “linked” to verbs, at others to single phrases. Since they are predominantly “linked” to verbs, they are more similar to clauses than to single phrases; but since their constituents do not engage in predicative relations (or conditional relations), they do not constitute a clause, which is why the grammarians study them together with single phrases.¹⁰⁴ Under the title *ta'alluq šibh al-ġumla*, Qabāwa discusses various cases in which a *ẓarf* or a prepositional phrase is “linked” to an overt constituent.¹⁰⁵ Only in the following chapter does he discuss constructions belonging to the *istaqarra / mustaqirr* theory.¹⁰⁶

The complete detachment of Qabāwa's usage of the term *šibh al-ġumla* from the theory that originally underlies it is manifest in his application of this term to prepositional phrases¹⁰⁷ that are not required to be “linked”. A case in point is the so-called “redundant” (*zā'ida*) prepositional phrases, which serve solely for emphasis, such as the preposition *bi-* often preceding the *ḥabar* in sentences introduced by *laysa* and *mā*, e.g. *a-laysa llāhu bi-aḥkami l-ḥākimīna* (Q. 95: 8) “Is not God the most discerning of judges?”¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹

6. Concluding Remarks

In this article, we discuss three extensions of the term *šibh al-ġumla*: originally, the phrase designated *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases “linked” to an underlying verb such as *istaqarra*, as in such positions they assume the role of a clause. For Ibn Mālik, this is the case only when they function as a *šila*. The inclusion of all *ẓurūf* and prepositional phrases belonging to the *istaqarra / mustaqirr* theory under the category of *šibh al-ġumla* is a natural shift, which can be traced back to Ibn Mālik, and is widespread amongst later grammarians, who are sometimes indifferent, in this respect, as to whether the reconstructed constituent should be a verb or a participle. The familiar modern use of the term as a hyperonym of *ẓarf* and prepositional phrase, irrespective of their position, can be traced, as we have seen, to Ibn Hišām's class of *mā yuṣbiḥu l-ġumlata*. This second, and more drastic, broadening of the term's meaning can be explained in two ways:

Consider the following statement by al-Murādī: *wa-ammā šibhu l-ġumlati fa-huwa l-ẓarf* *naḥwu llaḍī 'indaka wa-l-ġārru wa-l-maġrūru naḥwu llaḍī fī l-dāri* “as for *šibh al-ġumla*, it is the *ẓarf*, e.g. *allaḍī 'indaka* ‘(that) which/(the one) who is with you’, and the prepositional phrase, e.g. *allaḍī fī l-dāri* ‘(that) which/(the one) who is in the abode’”.¹¹⁰ This sentence appears in his commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Alfiyya*, just before his aforementioned explanation of the term *šibh al-ġumla*. Here he explicates Ibn Mālik's words *wa-ġumlatun wa-šibhuhā* by dividing both *ġumla* and *šibhuhā* into their subclasses, mentioning for the former the well-known division of clauses into nominal and

¹⁰³ Qabāwa here references Ibn Hišām's *Muġnī al-labīb* and Ibn 'Aqīl's *Šarḥ* on Ibn Mālik's *Alfiyya*. Qabāwa's wording echoes the former's introduction mentioned above, where the third chapter is said to discuss *mā yataraddadu bayna l-mufradāti wa-l-ġumali*, namely the *ẓarf* and the prepositional phrase. However, Ibn Hišām does not claim this *taraddud* to be an explanation of the term *šibh al-ġumla*, which is not mentioned there. Ibn 'Aqīl's (*Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 211) text, in which the term at stake is also not indicated, merely addresses the controversy over the two possible reconstructions, as a single phrase and as a clause.

¹⁰⁴ Qabāwa, *I'rāb*, pp. 271-272.

¹⁰⁵ Qabāwa, *I'rāb*, pp. 273-293. See also pp. 69 and 234-235.

¹⁰⁶ Qabāwa, *I'rāb*, pp. 295-303.

¹⁰⁷ Here Qabāwa (*I'rāb*, pp. 322-324) includes also *ẓurūf* that cease to function as such, e.g. *al-ḥaġġu ašhurun ma'lūmātun* ... (Q. 2: 197) “The *Ḥajj* is in specific months” (Jones, *The Qur'ān*, p. 48), where the noun *ašhur* functions as a regular *ḥabar*, taking the nominative.

¹⁰⁸ Jones, *The Qur'ān*, p. 578.

¹⁰⁹ Qabāwa, *I'rāb*, pp. 322-345. On this class of prepositions, see Levin, “*al-taqdīr*”, pp. 146-147; Baalbaki, *The Legacy of the Kitāb*, pp. 96-97.

¹¹⁰ al-Murādī, *Tawḍīḥ*, p. 443.

verbal. Although the context here is crucial, this sentence, if taken at face value, can easily be misinterpreted as presenting a general statement, in line with the previous subdivision of *ḡumla*, which is not restricted to the context of *ṣila*.

But I believe that the more important impetus for the broadening of the meaning of the term *ṣibh al-ḡumla* lies in the fact that this term fulfils a terminological need in Arabic grammatical thought, as a technical term embracing both *zarf* and prepositional phrase. The close distributional resemblance between these two types of constituents often leads grammarians to apply the term *zarf* to prepositional phrases, even when they do not convey a locative or temporal meaning.¹¹¹ Al-Astarābādī (d. ca. 688/1289), for instance, comments on Ibn al-Ḥāḡib's (d. 646/1249) mention of the *ḥabar* as a *zarf* by clarifying that this term encompasses both *zurūf* and prepositional phrases, with the latter not explicitly mentioned, due to its similar behaviour to *zarf*, so much so that some grammarians name it *zarf*, as a technical usage.¹¹² In a similar vein, within the chapter on *ḥabar* in his commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Tashīl*, Nāẓir al-Ġayṣ (d. 778/1377) states that the grammarians apply the term *zarf* to prepositional phrases, due to their similar behaviour in this position.¹¹³ Some grammarians refer to the two categories collectively as *al-zarf wa-ṣibhuhu*. For instance, in *Tashīl*, Ibn Mālik employs the phrase *zarfin wa-ṣibhihi* when discussing their permissibility to directly follow *kāna* and its "sisters",¹¹⁴ while in the *Šarḥ* they are referred to as *zarfan aw ḡarran wa-maḡrūran*.¹¹⁵ The term *ṣibh al-ḡumla* thus addresses the grammarians' need for a term that encompasses these two types of constituents, rather than confusingly employing the term *zarf* for both.¹¹⁶

The detachment of the contemporary usage of the term *ṣibh al-ḡumla* from its theoretical underpinnings has significant methodological repercussions. Specifically, it underscores the need for caution to avoid falling into anachronistic biases when studying Arabic grammatical tradition. This caution is necessary to prevent the misreading of Ibn Mālik's writings through the lens of later grammars.

Appendix 1: Did al-Fārisī Coin the Term *ṣibh al-ḡumla*?

In his abovementioned study, 'Aṭṭālāh speculates that the term *ṣibh al-ḡumla* might have been coined by Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī.¹¹⁷ He notes that the term was "uncommon" amongst grammarians of the second through the fifth centuries AH, and states that he only encountered this term in the writings of al-Suyūfī and al-Ḥaṭṭāb.¹¹⁸

However, a closer examination of al-Fārisī's text referred to by 'Aṭṭālāh reveals that this grammarian does not employ the term *ṣibh al-ḡumla*. The issue addressed here by al-Fārisī concerns the sentence *Zaydun ḍarabtuhu wa- 'Amran kallamtuhu* "Zayd [nom.], I hit him, and 'Amr [acc.], I talked to him".¹¹⁹ In this sentence, the second clause, conjoined to the clause *ḍarabtuhu* functioning as a predicate of *Zaydun*, displays the so-called *iṣṭigāl* construction, mentioned in fn. 45 above. According to al-Aḥfaṣ, as noted by al-Māzinī (d. 248/862), this sentence is disallowed because the first clause has a *mawḍi'*, as it fills the position of a nominative *ḥabar*, while the second does not have a

¹¹¹ See Kasher, "al-fi'l al-muta'addī bi-ḥarf", pp. 137-138.

¹¹² al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, p. 243.

¹¹³ Nāẓir al-Ġayṣ, *Šarḥ*, vol. 2, p. 995.

¹¹⁴ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, p. 367.

¹¹⁵ Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, vol. 1, p. 368.

¹¹⁶ One of the reviewers of this article argues that "[w]ere this unequivocally the reason for the development of the term, one would expect post Ibn Malik grammarians to categorically have avoided using *zarf* for two different functional categories". Apart from the fact that I do not claim this to be unequivocally the reason for the development of the term, there are two more important issues to consider. First, Ibn Mālik did not coin the term *ṣibh al-ḡumla* as a hyperonym for *zurūf* and prepositional phrases (in fact, he did not use this phrase as a fully-fledged technical term). Rather, *ṣibh al-ḡumla* gradually acquired this meaning at the expense of its original theoretical underpinning. Second, commonly used terms do not easily give way to newly coined terms, even when the former are inaccurate and the latter are well-grounded in grammatical theory. A case in point is the term *maṣḍar*, which continued to be employed for the so-called "inner/cognate object" well after the term *al-maf'ūl al-muṭlaq* had been coined, although the former was repeatedly criticised by Arab grammarians.

¹¹⁷ 'Aṭṭālāh, *al-Muṣṭalahāt*, p. 343.

¹¹⁸ 'Aṭṭālāh, *al-Muṣṭalahāt*, p. 343, fn. 58.

¹¹⁹ The subject matter of this *mas'ala* is discussed in Bernards, *Changing Traditions*, pp. 57-65.

mawḍiʿ due to its *ištiḡāl* structure. Al-Fārisī disagrees with this argument, contending that although the first clause has a *mawḍiʿ*, the clause has the status of what lacks *iʿrāb*, and is treated as such, since the *iʿrāb* is not explicit; therefore, a clause lacking *mawḍiʿ* can be conjoined to it.¹²⁰ At the end of this *masʿala*, al-Fārisī concludes that the two clauses may be conjoined, due to *al-mušābaha bay-nahumā* “the similarity between them”. This, says al-Fārisī, is “not more far-fetched” than treating *aydaʿ* (“saffron”, among other meanings) when definite analogically to *aḍḥab(u)*, since they take the same form; by this he refers to the former being *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf* (“diptote”) when used as a definite proper name, by dint of its pattern, which is characteristic of verbs such as *aḍḥab(u)*.¹²¹ At this point, al-Fārisī says: *wa-laysa šabahu l-ḡumlati llatī yutaʿawwalu lahā mawḍiʿun bi-ḡumlatin*¹²² *ʿalā lafẓihā wa-ṣūratihā bi-aḡmaḍa min šabahi aydaʿ bi-aḍḥab* “the similarity of a clause for which a *mawḍiʿ* is reconstructed to another clause of the same form (which has no *mawḍiʿ*) is not more obscure than the similarity of *aydaʿ* to *aḍḥab(u)*”.¹²³ It is evident that the term *šibh al-ḡumla* does not fit the context; to be sure, neither *zurūf* nor prepositional phrases are discussed in this *masʿala*. The phrase *šabah al-ḡumla ... bi-ḡumla* clearly corresponds to the aforementioned phrase *al-mušābaha bay-nahumā*. The misinterpretation of the phrase as the term *šibh al-ḡumla* can be traced back to the editor of this work.¹²⁴

Interestingly, another instance of the word *šabah* preceding the word *ḡumla*, in a different work by al-Fārisī, namely *Šarḥ al-abyāt al-muškilat al-iʿrāb* (also known as *Īdāḥ al-šiʿr*), led one of its editors to interpret it as the term *šibh al-ḡumla*. Here, al-Fārisī discusses the words *lahū šabahun* “(are) similar to him” in a poetic verse, stating: *fa-qawluhu lahū šabahun ḡumlatun ...*, meaning that the words *lahū šabahun* form a clause. Yet, in Hindāwī’s edition only the prepositional phrase *lahū* is enclosed by double quotation marks, suggesting that it is parsed as *šibh ḡumla*.¹²⁵ In al-Ṭanāḥī’s edition, on the other hand, the entire clause *lahū šabahun* is correctly enclosed by double quotation marks.¹²⁶

Appendix 2: *šibh al-muštaqq*

In an article on *šibh al-ḡumla*, Fahmī introduces the term *šibh al-muštaqq* as a synonym, referencing the chapter on *ḥāl* in *Ḍiyāʿ al-sālik ilā Awḍaḥ al-masālik*,¹²⁷ a modern commentary on Ibn Hišām’s commentary on the *Alfiyya*, by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Naḡḡār. The passage in question focuses on the so-called *ḥāl muwaṭṭiʿa*, a circumstantial qualifier whose head noun merely “paves the way” for the true *ḥāl*, which is its attribute,¹²⁸ as in *innā anzalnāhu Qurʾānan ʿarabiyyan ...* (Q. 12: 2) “We have sent it down as a Recitation in Arabic”.¹²⁹ Here Ibn Hišām enlists this type of *ḥāl* as one of the cases where it is an underived noun (*ḡāmida*) (although *ḥāl* is basically a derived noun [*muštaqqa*]), noting that in this case it is modified by an attribute.¹³⁰ Al-Naḡḡār comments that this attribute can be either a derived noun (*muštaqq*) or *šibhihi*.¹³¹ The latter expression refers to

¹²⁰ al-Fārisī, *al-Masāʿil al-Baṣriyyāt*, pp. 211-213.

¹²¹ On this theory in Arabic grammatical tradition, see Druel & Kasher, “The *mamnūʿ min al-ṣarf*”.

¹²² The text in the printed edition reads: *taḥmiluhu*, which does not fit the context and should be emended to *bi-ḡumla*, these two words being homographs if denuded of their diacritical dots.

¹²³ al-Fārisī, *al-Masāʿil al-Baṣriyyāt*, p. 216.

¹²⁴ al-Fārisī, *al-Masāʿil al-Baṣriyyāt*, p. 216, fn. 1. ʿAṭṭālāh’s (*al-Muṣṭalahāt*, p. 343, fn. 58) claim that al-Fārisī attributes the use of this term to Ibn al-Sarrāḡ stems from a misinterpretation of this editor’s footnote.

¹²⁵ al-Fārisī, *Šarḥ al-abyāt*, p. 308.

¹²⁶ al-Fārisī, *al-Šiʿr*, p. 277.

¹²⁷ Fahmī, “*Šibh al-ḡumla*”, p. 44.

¹²⁸ On *ḥāl muwaṭṭiʿa*, see Sheyhatovitch, “*tawṭiʿa*”, pp. 276-277.

¹²⁹ Jones, *The Qurʾān*, p. 221.

¹³⁰ Ibn Hišām, *Awḍaḥ*, vol. 2, p. 299.

¹³¹ Note that in the illustration provided, the attribute is not a derived noun; however, Ibn Hišām (*Awḍaḥ*, vol. 3, pp. 304-306) categorises adjectives ending with *yāʿ al-nisba* under the class of underived nouns that semantically resemble derived nouns (*al-ḡāmīd al-mušbih li-l-muštaqq fi al-maʿnā*), as the meaning of *Dimašqī* “Damascene”, for instance, is *mansūb ilā Dimašq* “related to Damascus”. Ibn Hišām does not include *zurūf* or prepositional phrases in this class. Moreover, al-Naḡḡār (*Ḍiyāʿ*, vol. 3, p. 120), when discussing *hunā* “here” and *amma* “there” as attributes (e.g. *marartu bi-raḡulin hunā* “I passed by a man

zurūf and prepositional phrases, which are “linked” to an elided *muštaqq*, as in *fihā yufraq kullu amrin ḥakīmīn. amran min ‘indinā ...* (Q. 44: 4-5) “in which every wise command is made clear, as a command from Us”¹³².¹³³ This text can be traced back to Ḥālid al-Azharī’s commentary on the same book by Ibn Hišām, although al-Azharī does not elaborate on how the attribute he terms *šibhihi* resembles the *muštaqq*.¹³⁴ The term *šibh al-muštaqq*, as a synonym of *šibh al-ḡumla*, also appears in some modern linguistic dictionaries. For instance, in their dictionary *al-Ḥalīl*, ‘Abd al-Masīḥ and Tābirī explain this term as stemming from its potential to be linked to an elided derived noun, such as *kā’in* or *mawḡūd*.¹³⁵ Another synonymous term is *šibh al-waṣf*.¹³⁶

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank both anonymous referees for their insights and helpful suggestions.

Declaration of competing interest

The author of this article declares that he has no financial, professional or personal conflicts of interest that could have inappropriately influenced this work.

Authorship contribution statement

Almog Kasher: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing—original draft and Writing—review & editing.

Bibliography

- ‘Abd al-Masīḥ, Ḡurḡ Mitirī and Tābirī, Ḥānī Ḡurḡ, *al-Ḥalīl: Mu ḡam muṣṭalaḥāt al-naḥw al-‘arabī*, Beirut, Maktabat Lubnān, 1990.
- Abdel Haleem, Muhammad A.S. (trans.), *The Qur’ān*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Abū Ḥayyān, *Manḥaḡ al-sālik fī al-kalām ‘alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Sidney Glazer, New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1947.
- Abū Ḥayyān, *al-Taḍyīl wa-l-takmīl fī šarḥ Kitāb al-Tashīl*, ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī, vols. 1-5: Damascus, Dār al-Qalam, 1997-2002; vols. 6-: Riyadh, Dār Kunūz Ishbīliya, 2005-.
- Altūngī, Muḥammad & al-Asmar, Rāḡī, *al-Mu ḡam al-mufaṣṣal fī ‘ulūm al-luḡa (al-alsuniyyāt)*, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1993.
- al-Ašmūnī, *Šarḥ al-Ašmūnī ‘alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik al-musammā Manḥaḡ al-Sālik ilā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut, Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1955.
- [al-Astarābādī], *Šarḥ al-Raḍī ‘alā al-Kāfiya*, ed. Yūsuf Ḥasan ‘Umar, n.p. n.d. (*ṭab’a ḡadīda muṣaḥḥaha*).
- ‘Aṭāllāh, Ilyās, *al-Muṣṭalaḥāt al-musta‘mala fī kutub tadrīs qawā‘id al-luḡa al-‘arabiyya, wa-wāḍi ‘uhā: Dirāsa wa-mu ḡam ‘arabī – Inklīzī*, Beirut, Maktabat Lubnān Nāširūn, 2007.

[who was] here”), states that these do not function as attributes by themselves, but are instead “linked” to an elided element, such as *kā’in* or *mawḡūd*, which serves as the attribute. However, he notes that the statement “the *zarf* is an attribute” is used as a concise expression. During this discussion, al-Naḡḡār refers to the two classes as *al-muštaqq wa-šibhihi*. Thus, although *zurūf* and prepositional phrases are considered similar to the derived noun, it may be concluded that they are less similar to it than adjectives ending with *yā’ al-nisba*.

¹³² Jones, *The Qur’ān*, p. 455

¹³³ al-Naḡḡār, *Ḍiyā’*, vol. 2, p. 195.

¹³⁴ Ḥālid, *Šarḥ*, vol. 1, pp. 575-576.

¹³⁵ ‘Abd al-Masīḥ & Tābirī, *al-Ḥalīl*, p. 241. See also Altūngī & al-Asmar, *al-Mu ḡam*, vol. 1, p. 349.

¹³⁶ ‘Abd al-Masīḥ & Tābirī, *al-Ḥalīl*, p. 242; Altūngī & al-Asmar, *al-Mu ḡam*, vol. 1, p. 349. Oddly enough, in both dictionaries this term is defined as *šibh al-ḡumla* and prepositions, probably in the sense of prepositional phrases, although the latter is encompassed within the former.

- Ayoub, Georgine, “De ce qui ‘ne se dit pas’ dans le Livre de Sībawayhi: La notion de *tamīl*”, in Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter (eds.), *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April-1 May 1987*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins, 1990, pp. 1-15.
- al-Azharī, Ḥalid b. ‘Abdallāh, *Šarḥ al-Taṣrīḥ ‘alā al-Tawḍīḥ, aw al-Taṣrīḥ bi-maḍmūn al-Tawḍīḥ fī al-naḥw*, ed. Muḥammad Bāsil ‘Uyūn al-Sūd, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2006 (2nd ed.).
- Baalbaki, Ramzi, “Some Aspects of Harmony and Hierarchy in Sībawayhi’s Grammatical Analysis”, *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik*, 2 (1979), pp. 7-22.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi Munir, *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms: English – Arabic, with Sixteen Arabic Glossaries*, Beirut, Dār al-‘Ilm li-l-Malāyīn, 1990.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi, “Introduction: The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition”, in Ramzi Baalbaki (ed.), *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2007, pp. xiii-l.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi, *The Legacy of the Kitāb: Sībawayhi’s Analytical Methods within the Context of the Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Leiden, Brill, 2008.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi, *The Arabic Lexicographical Tradition: From the 2nd/8th to the 12th/18th Century*, Leiden, Brill, 2014.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi, “Grammars for Beginners and Ibn Hišām’s Approach to Issues of ‘i rāb’”, in Manuela E.B. Giolfo & Kees Versteegh (eds.), *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics IV: The Evolution of Theory*, Leiden, Brill, 2019, pp. 61-88.
- Bernards, Monique, *Changing Traditions: Al-Mubarrad’s Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb*, Leiden, Brill, 1997.
- Bohas, Georges, “Le rasoir d’Occam et la tradition grammaticale arabe”, *Arabica*, 48 (2001), pp. 1-19.
- Bohas, Georges, Guillaume, Jean-Patrick, & Kouloughli, Djamel, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*, foreword by Michael G. Carter, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press, 2006.
- Carter, Michael G., “An Arab Grammarian of the Eighth Century A.D.: A Contribution to the History of Linguistics”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 93 (1973), pp. 146-157.
- Carter, Michael G., *Arab Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins, 1981.
- Carter, Michael G., “Copula in Arabic Grammar”, in Wilfred Madelung et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Congress of the UEA*, St. Petersburg, Thesa, 1997, pp. 37-45.
- Carter, Michael G., “The Seven Deadly Sins of Arabic Studies”, in Manuel Sartori, Manuela E.B. Giolfo & Philippe Cassuto (eds.), *Approaches to the History and Dialectology of Arabic in Honor of Pierre Larcher*, Leiden, Brill, 2017, pp. 516-533.
- al-Damāmīnī, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, *Šarḥ al-Damāmīnī ‘alā Muḡnī al-labīb*, ed. Aḥmad ‘Izzū ‘Ināya, Beirut, Mu’assasat al-Ta’rīḥ al-‘Arabī, 2007.
- Dickins, James, “Topic and Comment”, *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Online*, Leiden, Brill.
- Druel, Jean N., & Kasher, Almog, ““Though This Be Madness, Yet There Is Method In’t”: The *mamnū’ min al-šarf* (Diptotes) in Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Arabica*, 66 (2019), pp. 98-136.
- Fahmī, Sūzān Muḥammad Fu’ād, “*Šibh al-ğumla: Dirāsa tarkībiyya taḥlīliyya ma’a al-taṭbīq ‘alā al-Qur’ān al-Karīm*”, *Mağallat Kullīyyat al-Ādāb – Ġāmi‘at al-Qāhira*, 61, 1 (2001), pp. 43-89.
- al-Fākihī, ‘Abdallāh b. Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *al-Fawākih al-ğaniyya ‘alā mutammimat al-Ğurrūmiyya*, ed. ‘Imad ‘Ulwan Ḥusayn, Amman, Dār al-Fikr, 2009.
- al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī, *al-Masā’il al-Baṣriyyāt*, ed. Muḥammad al-Šāṭir Aḥmad Muḥammad Aḥmad, Cairo, Maṭba‘at al-Madanī, 1985.
- al-Fārisī, Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Ğaffār, *Kitāb al-Ši‘r, aw Šarḥ al-abyāt al-muškilat al-i rāb*, ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Taṇāḥī, Cairo, Maktabat al-Ḥāngī, 1988.

- al-Fārisī, Abū 'Alī, *Šarḥ al-abyāt al-muškilat al-i'rāb, al-musammā Īdāḥ al-ši'r*, ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī, Damascus, Dār al-Qalam, 1987.
- al-Fayyūmī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī, *al-Miṣbāḥ al-munīr fī ḡarīb al-Šarḥ al-kabīr li-l-Rāfi'ī*, ed. 'Abd al-'Aẓīm al-Šinnāwī, Cairo, Dār al-Ma'ārif, n.d. (2nd ed.).
- Goguyer, Antonin, *Manuel pour l'étude des grammairiens arabes. La 'Alfiyyah d'Ibn-Malik suivie de la Lâmiyyah du même auteur avec traduction et notes en français et un lexique des termes techniques*, Beirut, Imprimerie des Belles-Lettres, 1888.
- Goldenberg, Gideon, "Subject and Predicate in Arab Grammatical Tradition", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 138 (1988), pp. 39-73.
- al-Ḥaṭīb, 'Abd al-Laṭīf, *Mu'ḡam al-qirā'āt*, Cairo, Dār Sa'd al-Dīn, 2002.
- [Ibn] al-Anbārī, Abū al-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Sa'īd, *Kitāb Asrār al-'arabiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Bahḡat al-Bayṭār, Damascus, al-Maḡma' al-'ilmī al-'Arabī, 1957.
- [Ibn] al-Anbārī, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Sa'īd, *al-Inṣāf fī mas'āl al-ḥilāf bayna al-naḥwiyyīna al-Baṣriyyīna wa-l-Kūfiyyīna*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, al-Maktaba al-Tiḡāriyya al-Kubrā, 1961 (4th ed.).
- Ibn 'Aqīl, Bahā' al-Dīn, *al-Musā'id alā Tashīl al-fawā'id*, ed. Muḥammad Kāmil Barakāt, Mecca, Ḡāmi'at Umm al-Qurā, 1982.
- Ibn 'Aqīl, Bahā' al-Dīn 'Abdallāh, *Šarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl ... alā Alfiyyat ... Abī 'Abdallāh Muḥammad Ḡamāl al-Dīn Ibn Mālik ...*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, Dār al-Turāt, 1980 (20th ed.).
- Ibn Ḥālawayhi, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, *Kitāb I'rāb talātīna sūratān min al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*, Cairo, Maktabat al-Zahrā', n.d.
- Ibn Hišām, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh Ḡamāl al-Dīn b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. Abdallāh, *Awḍaḥ al-masālik ilā Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Sidon, al-Maktaba al-'Aṣriyya, n.d.
- Ibn Hišām, *Ḥāšiyatāni min ḥawāshī Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī 'alā Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik: Dirāsatan wa-taḥqīqan*, ed. Ḡābir b. 'Abdallāh b. Surayyi' al-Surayyi'. PhD Diss., al-Ḡāmi'a al-Islāmiyya bi-l-Madīna al-Munawwara, 1439-1440 AH.
- Ibn Hišām, *Muḡnī al-labīb 'an kutub al-a'ārīb*, ed. 'Abd al-Laṭīf Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭīb, Kuwait, al-Maḡlis al-Waṭanī li-l-Ṭaqāfa wa-l-Funūn wa-l-Ādāb, al-Turāt al-'Arabī, 2000-2002.
- Ibn Hišām, Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh Ḡamāl al-Dīn, *Šarḥ Qaṭr al-nadā wa-ball al-ṣadā*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, al-Maktaba al-Tiḡāriyya al-Kubrā, 1963 (11th ed.).
- Ibn Mālik, Abū 'Abdallāh Ḡamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwad and 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawḡūd, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2000.
- Ibn Mālik, Ḡamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Abdallāh, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sayyid and Muḥammad Badawī al-Maḥtūn, Giza, Haḡar, 1990.
- Ibn al-Nāẓim, Abū 'Abdallāh Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḡamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ Ibn al-Nāẓim 'alā Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. Muḥammad Bāsil 'Uyūn al-Sūd, Beirut, Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2000.
- Ibn al-Sarrāḡ, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sahl, *al-Uṣūl fī al-naḥw*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatī, Beirut, Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1996 (3rd ed.).
- Jones, Alan (trans.), *The Qur'ān*, Cambridge, Gibb Memorial Trust, 2007.
- Kasher, Almog, "Two Types of *taqdīr*? A Study in Ibn Hišām's Concept of 'Speaker's Intention'", *Arabica*, 56 (2009), pp. 360-380.
- Kasher, Almog, "The Terminology of Vowels and *i'rāb* in Mediaeval Arabic Grammatical Tradition", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 37 (2010), pp. 139-161.
- Kasher, Almog, "Early Transformations of Theories about *anna* and *an* and the Standardization of Arabic Grammatical Tradition", *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften*, 19 (2010-2011), pp. 243-256.

- Kasher, Almog, “A Note on the Literal Meaning(s) of the Term *ḍamīr al-faṣl*”, *Journal for Semitics*, 21 (2012), pp. 157-166.
- Kasher, Almog, “The Term *al-fi’l al-muta’addī bi-ḥarf jarr* (lit. “The Verb Which ‘Passes Over’ through a Preposition”) in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 13 (2013), pp. 115-145.
- Kasher, Almog, “Is *ḥalfa* a Preposition? On a Subclass of the *ẓarf* in Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Folia Orientalia*, 53 (2016), pp. 113-130.
- Kasher, Almog, “‘Unorthodox’ Usages of the Term *xabar* in the Early Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 69 (2024), pp. 269-304.
- Lane, Edward W., *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, Williams & Norgate, 1863-1893.
- Larcher, Pierre, *Syntaxe de l’arabe classique*, Aix-en-Provence, Presses Universitaires de Provence, 2017.
- Levin, Aryeh, “The Views of the Arab Grammarians on the Classification and Syntactic Function of Prepositions”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 10 (1987), pp. 342-367.
- Levin, Aryeh, “The Theory of *al-taqdīr* and Its Terminology”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 21 (1997), pp. 142-166.
- al-Makkūdī, Abū Zayd ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Alī b. Šāliḥ, *Šarḥ al-Makkūdī ... ‘alā al-Alfiyya fī ‘ilmay al-ṣarf wa-l-naḥw li-l-imām Ġamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh Ibn Mālīk ...*, ed. Ibrāhīm Šams al-Dīn, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1996.
- al-Murādī, Ibn Umm Qāsim, *Tawḍīḥ al-maqāṣid wa-l-masālik bi-šarḥ Alfiyyat Ibn Mālīk*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Alī Sulaymān, Cairo, Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 2001.
- al-Nağğār, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, *Ḍiyā’ al-sālik ilā Awḍaḥ al-masālik, wa-huwa Ṣafwat al-kalām ‘alā Tawḍīḥ Ibn Hišām*, Cairo, Maṭba‘at al-Fağğāla, 1969-1970.
- Nāẓir al-Ġayš, Muḥibb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl al-musammā Tamhīd al-Qawā’id bi-šarḥ Tashīl al-fawā’id*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad Fāḥir et al., Cairo, Dār al-Salām, 2007.
- Noy, Avigail S., *The Concept of ‘išṭigāl in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition*, MA Thesis, Tel-Aviv University, 2006 [in Hebrew].
- Owens, Jonathan, *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins, 1988.
- Peled, Yishai, “‘Amal and ‘ibtidā’ in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Abr-Nahrain*, 30 (1992), pp. 146-171.
- Peled, Yishai, *Sentence Types and Word-Order Patterns in Written Arabic: Medieval and Modern Perspectives*, Leiden, Brill, 2009.
- Qabāwa, Faḥr al-Dīn, *I’rāb al-ğumal wa-ašbāḥ al-ğumal*, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2014 (6th ed.).
- al-Rāğğihī, ‘Abdū, *al-Taṭbīq al-naḥwī*, Alexandria, Dār al-Ma’rifa al-Ġāmi‘iyya, 1998 (2nd ed.).
- Sadan, Arik, *The Subjunctive Mood in Arabic Grammatical Thought*, Leiden, Brill, 2012.
- Sartori, Manuel, “Les rapports logico-sémantique marqués par *fā’* en arabe”, *Quaderni di Studi Arabi*, 15 (2020), pp. 5-46.
- al-Šartūnī, Rašīd, *Mabādi’ al-‘arabiyya: Fī al-ṣarf wa-l-naḥw*, vol. 4, Beirut, Dār al-Mašriq, 1989 (17th ed.).
- al-Šāṭibī, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā, *al-Maqāṣid al-šāfiya fī šarḥ al-Ḥulāša al-kāfiya*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān al-‘Uṭaymīn et al., Mecca, Ġāmi‘at Umm al-Qurā, 2007.
- Sheyhatovitch, Beata, “The Concept of *tawṭī’a* in the Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, in Manuela E.B. Giolfo & Kees Versteegh (eds.), *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics IV: The Evolution of Theory*, Leiden, Brill, 2019, pp. 274-294.
- al-Šumunnī, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, *al-Munṣif min al-kalām ‘alā Muğnī Ibn Hišām*, ed. Muḥammad al-Sayyid ‘Uṭmān, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2012.
- al-Suyufī, Ġalāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, *Ham‘ al-hawāmi’ fī šarḥ Ġam‘ al-ğawāmi’*, ed. Aḥmad Šams al-Dīn, Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1998.

- ‘Umar, Aḥmad Muḥtār, & Makram, ‘Abd al-‘Āl Sālim, *Mu‘ğam al-qirā’āt al-Qur’āniyya*, Kuwait, Maṭbū‘āt Ġāmi‘at al-Kuwayt, 1988 (2nd ed.).
- Versteegh, Kees, *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*, Leiden, Brill, 1977.
- Versteegh, Kees, “The Arabic Terminology of Syntactic Position”, *Arabica*, 25 (1978), pp. 261-281.
- Versteegh, Kees, “The Notion of ‘Underlying Levels’ in the Arabic Grammatical Tradition”, *Historiographia Linguistica*, 21 (1994), pp. 271-296.
- Versteegh, Kees, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes: al-Zağğāğī’s Theory of Grammar*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins, 1995.
- Versteegh, Kees, “Taqdīr”, *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Online*, Leiden, Brill.
- Wright, William, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896-1898 (3rd ed.).
- Ya‘qūb, Imīl Badī‘, & ‘Āṣī, Mīšāl, *al-Mu‘ğam al-mufaṣṣal fī al-luġa wa-l-adab: Naḥw – šarf – balāġa – ‘arūd – imlā’ – fiqh al-luġa – adab – naqd – fikr adabī*, Beirut, Dār al-‘Ilm li-l-Malāyīn, 1987.
- al-Zağğāğī, Abū al-Qāsim, *al-Īdāḥ fī ‘ilal al-naḥw*, ed. Māzin al-Mubārak, Beirut, Dār al-Nafā’is, 1986 (5th ed.).