



## Redundant in Arabic: A Comparative Study with Other Semitic Languages

**Tarek S. M. S. Alna'na'i**

Department of Arabic Language and Literature, College of Arts and Social Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University, P.O. Box 42, Al-Khoud P.C. 123, Muscat, Oman.

Orcid No: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9600-0447>

Email: [tareks@squ.edu.om](mailto:tareks@squ.edu.om)

### Abstract

**This study** attempts to investigate the linguistic thought in Semitic languages about the redundant letters; in terms of their concept and quantum. The **redundant** in the language set by Arab linguists are two types: the first one have to repeat a radical in the verb; in the second, which this study intends to investigate, the redundant must be among added letters or extra letters collected by *'alyawma tansāhu*, or *sa'altumūnīhā*. In this research, several methodological questions about the concept of redundant in Semitic languages and its quantum were raised. Major findings are as follows: Subject of the study is still in need of reconsideration of the methodology in Semitic languages, particularly Arabic, in need to put one approach and clear, which absorbs all the studied patterns underneath it, and excludes all we could enter into another level of linguistic analysis. This research has classified the views of linguists on the subject of study in Semitic languages.

The concept of the redundant by the linguists of Akkadian, Ugaritic, Mandaic, Hebrew (except Ibn Ganah), Ge'ez and Amharic (specially Leslau) is mostly closest to the Arabic non-absolute concept of the redundant, with their two types, on the morphological level. The Amharic has what is different from most of the Semitic languages.

This study determined the redundant letters and their quantum in the Semitic languages; it put the letters in exchange for Arabic word "*sa'altumūnīhā*"; and specified what redundant or decreased of them in Semitic languages; and selected the short or long vowels of redundant - at the end of words - which was characterized by Ge'ez language, which does not represent a sign of declination in them.

**Keywords:** linguistic, redundant, quantum, Arabic, Semitic.

### 0. Introduction

This study attempts to investigate the linguistic thought that emanates in Semitic from the redundant letters in terms of their concept and quantum. It covers both the Arab thought and



the whole of the Semitic thought. The **redundant** in the language set by the Arabic linguists are of two types. The first one where the root of the verb repeats in words such as *ǧalbaba* put on one's clothes (*ǧelbāb*) and *šamlala* (he) hurried. In the second type, the redundant must be among added letters or extra letters collected by *'alyawma tansāhu*, or *sa'altumūnīhā*.<sup>1</sup> The study intends to investigate the second type of redundant in letters. Because the second type is a more common problem in the scientific method than the first type. **The term "redundant letters" is an Arabic term with multiple meanings, the best known is based on the morphological level, which is the subject of our study.** At the next level, grammar composition was studied. And last but not least, the study was not on morphological level of the title. Because in linguistics studies, Arabs and other Semites, added letters trace numerous examples from the area of Morphology to the field of Phonetics and sometimes to the field of grammar and composition. Therefore, it was necessary for us not to limit the study to the field of Morphology alone. This study, however, is a morphological study in the first place.

The intended **Semitic languages** in this study are Akkadian language, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Old Syriac, Mandaic, Ge'ez and Amharic. As for the approach of the study, a comparative analysis of the Semitic languages which has been adopted on the basis of the description of each language.

It identifies the **motives** of the study and focuses on **several methodological questions** and attempts to answer them. These questions are as follows: Is the concept of the "added letters or extra letters" the term specified in linguistic and Semitic studies? Or has not it lived up to the point of the term? Is there a difference between the concepts of "redundant", and "added letters or extra letters"? Is "redundant" the same concept in Semitic languages or not? Have linguists identified the number of these letters? Do the letters in Semitic languages correspond to those in Arabic letters? All of the above questions must be answered by use of **the comparative approach in all Semitic languages** in this study.

The **challenges faced by the research** are as follows: the object of study is not dealt equally in all Semitic studies such as Arabic. We did not find the term "redundant" as a subject, a unit, or a chapter in a language book except in the three languages: Arabic, Old Syriac and Hebrew by Marwan bin Ganah, who also wrote in Jewish Arabic. Linguists do not regard the theme of "redundant letters," especially in their study. Therefore, it has become a difficult task for researchers in these languages. And then we cannot find languages' lettering increase in those languages or even a direct reference to them or to their number or other things is the scope of this study. Therefore, the **task of a researcher in those languages is to devise opinions (or extract views) and read between the lines** through scholars' words of those languages about

<sup>1</sup> See: *'ebnu ya'īša: šarhu l-mufaṣṣali*, 7/154.



nominal and verbal templates. The idea of morphological template was the survival collar of the researcher. The template has facilitated many of the previous difficulties because it accurately reflects the linguist opinion in determining the extra letter and the root of the word in the language of study. But the same template does not solve all the problems encountered by the researcher because it does not distinguish in a number of examples - much of the Lieutenant from non-Lieutenant (i.e. Lieutenant him not to leave him.) of these letters. Is it likely that morphological Libra - in terms of Semitic languages but not others – is an innovation of Arabic linguists?<sup>2</sup> This morphological Libra originates from the old Syriac and Hebrew linguists through Arabic directly or through one of the two languages: Hebrew or old Syriac, or through translations into other languages, or the impact of other Semitic language scholars, especially in the modern era. Building on the above, this research has devised its article and extracted it from reading between the lines in Semitic languages, (except the three above-mentioned languages) which may represent a new chapter in the studies of those languages. This effort was only to collect the material in those languages, let alone studying, analyzing and comparing, analyzed and compared with other Semitic languages.

We do not have any **previous studies** in Semitic languages on the subject. There are many ancient and modern studies in Arabic only that are covered in the list of sources and references. Some examples are what ibn Ganah studied in Hebrew on the subject (written by Jewish Arabic) or old Syriac scholars who have written chapters on the subject in their books in Arabic. Arab impact is clearly evident in it. And concerns from previous two studies are raised in Mohammed Hammad's yearbook of the International Islamic University in Islamabad, Pakistan, the second issue, 1992, entitled "non-traditional lettering increase ". This research deals with all the letters of the Arabic alphabet – except traditional increase of letters. In a hypothetical case, all Arabic letters may be increase as well. The research has adopted more than a thousand four-root, but returned to the original triple according to the shape and meaning. The research found - based on sixteen proof - on the validity of assumption that the remaining eighteen letters of the Arabic alphabet - with the traditional redundant of ten letters - letters of increase also. Although the Sibawayh and the ancient linguists<sup>3</sup> rejected Hammad's<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> We do not know exactly who is the first, who invented the morphological Libra in the Arabic, but there are signs that the first man, who separate a morphology from syntax or grammar is Moaz bin Muslim Alharraa, See: *'abdu l-ḥamīdī: durūsu t-taṣrīfī*, P. 8-9. He is the first layer of kufa grammarians. See: *'az-zubaydiyyu: ṭabaqātu n-naḥwiyyīna wa-lluḡawīyyīna*, P.125. This does not mean that Alharraa is the first, who invented the Arabic morphological Libra; because the thoughts on morphology already existed even before him.

<sup>3</sup> See: *sibawayhi: 'al-kitābu*, 4/328-329.

<sup>4</sup> David opinion in Syriac close to the opinion of Hammad in non-traditional redundant in Arabic, See: *dāwūd: 'al-lum'atu š-šahiyyatu fī nāḥwi l-luḡati s-suryāniyyati*, P. 145. As well as



view, his opinion is meritorious, which can be a pre-grammar system, or pre-linguistic rules and dates to the oldest Arabic (sources?), before setting redundant of the traditional ten letters to the redundant in the late stages of the history of Arabic. What concerns us is that Hammad examined all the Arabic letters, except ten of them in Arabic language only, and this study considers those ten letters in Semitic languages, so, this study is completely different.

The second study is by Yousria Zakaria entitled "The impact of the Arab grammarians in the thought of Ibn Ganah and his interpretation of the letters increase" Faculty of Languages and Translation Journal, Issue Thirty, in 1999. The difference in both studies is that Yousria confined the subject studied in the thought of Ibn Ganah only with regard to the Hebrew language and the Arabic impact in that of thought. Sometimes she used examples of old Syriac language discussed in Hebrew Ibn Ganah and studied the subject in the major Semitic languages already known. So, this study is different from the previous two studies in form and content with our deep appreciation for all serious and sober previous studies.

Based on the preceding discussion, **the study is divided** into an introduction and two chapters, a conclusion and summary. The Introduction contains the subject of the study and its importance and its motives and the difficulties encountered. The **first chapter** outlines the concept and is divided into two sections. The first section covers the absolute or unrestricted concept of redundant, and the second one discusses the restricted concept of the redundant. The **second chapter** discusses the quantum of redundant. The **conclusion** outlines the most important results.

## 1.0 The concept of Redundant

### 1.1. In Arabic:

The concept of redundant in the Arab heritage has number of glosses which may have distinctly emerged overlapped by some linguists and some features by other linguists. This means the absolute may be included as non-absolute depending upon the point of view of the linguists. Those levels of the language are divided into phonological, morphological, compositional grammar and semantics. We must differentiate between these meanings and linguistic levels in order to conclude true and accurate results on the subject of the study. Below, we will throw light on these multiple meanings of the concept of the redundant beginning with the Arab scholars, which shows the richness of the subject in Arabic studies. What is the absolute concept of redundant? And what is meant by the non-absolute concept of redundant? The absolute concept of increasing (or the general concept) is the term of this research in order to classify the views of linguists who have studied the redundant and cited examples where there is an overlap of different linguistic levels. The non-absolute concept of redundant is the original term of this research in order to classify the views of linguists who

---

consistent with the opinion of Joseph Darian, See: *kitābu l-ʾitqāni fī ʿarfī luġati s-suryāni*, P.47, footnote 3.



have studied the redundant according to a certain level and cited examples where there is no overlap of different linguistic levels (i.e. examples are very limited to show redundant on the morphological level only, without other linguistic levels) where we can say that they are often morphological, although it may not meet all the criteria. The concept of redundant according to many scholars is absolute. It is also restricted by some of them. However, we sometimes find the two concepts - the absolute and non-absolute - in one book by the same linguist. This puzzles the researcher at first glance in judgment on the methodology of the linguist. The following is a summary of the sayings of linguists in the Arab heritage on this topic.

### 1.1.1. The absolute concept of Redundant

**Sibawayh** is the concept for redundant is an absolute one, according to what can be read between the lines because he considered all following characters extra letters: The glottal hard catch (in: *'ibn* a son)<sup>5</sup>, (in: *'idrib* hit!)<sup>6</sup>, the Hamza of Aorist (in: *'af'alu* I do.)<sup>7</sup>, the Nun of Aorist (in: *naf'alu* we do.)<sup>8</sup>, the Ya of Aorist (in: *yadribu* he hits.)<sup>9</sup> the Ya of dual <sup>10</sup> (without example), the Ta of Aorist (in: *taf'alu* you do/ she does.)<sup>11</sup>, the Ta of feminization (in: *rahmatin / rahmah* mercy)<sup>12</sup>, the Ha of lamentation (in: *wā-gulāmāh* Hey heartbreak on the boy!)<sup>13</sup>, the Ya of vocation (in: *yā gulāmāh* Oh my boy!), the Nun of dual (without example), the Nun of plural (without example), the Nun of the five verbs (in: *taf'alīna* you (f.) do.), the Nun of feminization (in: *fa'alna* they (f.) have done.)<sup>14</sup> And the Lam (in: *dālika* (demonstrative) that)<sup>15</sup> are all redundant letters. According to **Kufa linguists** any word that has more than three radicals is a plus.<sup>16</sup> **Almazeneyy** and **Ibn Ginny** said that the letter of redundant is not one of the three radicals of the word.<sup>17</sup> **Ibn Ginny** considered the Alif of the pronoun " *'anā* " "I" redundant. In pronunciation, it falls in (Alwaṣl) the continuous speech and must be pronounced in the case of (Alwaqf) the pause only.<sup>18</sup> The letters of Aorist (present-prefixes) are considered by most Arabic linguists as redundant. Declension vowels (or Nunation) are a part of construction in Ibn Ginny's book<sup>19</sup>,

<sup>5</sup> See: *'al-kitābu*, 4/235.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. P. 287.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. P.235-236.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. P.287.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. P.236.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. P.235.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. P. 237.

<sup>16</sup> See: *'ebnu l-'anbāriyyi: 'al-'inṣāfu fī masā'ili l-ḥilāfi ...*, 2/793-794, and *yusef: 'al-'af'ālu r-rubā'iyatu nuṣū'uhā wa-sti'māluhā*, P.1004.

<sup>17</sup> See: *'ebnu ḡinnī: 'al-munṣifu*, 1/11.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. 1/9.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. 1/15.



which is contrary to the opinion of some Arabic linguists.<sup>20</sup> Almazeneyy and Ibn Ginny have used the word “yalḥaqu to be added” at times, and the word “zīda to be redundant” at other times in another context as if they were synonymous.<sup>21</sup> And the word “*’ilḥāq* attachment / annexation / appended” comes as an explanation or a definition of the word “*ziyādah* redundant”. So the redundant is “appended what is not from the word to the word...”<sup>22</sup> So it is clear from the foregoing discussion that the concept of redundant is absolute, because the evidence of redundant (mentioned above) overlaps with different linguistic levels, not only on the morphological side, but more so at linguistic levels, to the point of entry for each of more than three assets in the concept of the redundant when Kufa linguists, and considering the redundant of the Alif in the pronoun “*’anā*” I in case of the pause. Although that is a phonetic redundant. The redundant of Nunation or redundant of declension vowel is a sign of declining, which is a grammatical redundant. The redundant in letters of Aorist is a morphological redundant.

### 1.1.2. The non-absolute concept of Redundant

As we found indications that some Arabic linguists have an absolute concept about the redundant, there are other indications that some of the definitions on the subject of the study indicate the concept of redundant is non-absolute as shown below: The redundant letters when some Arabic linguists (as well as old Syriac<sup>23</sup>) use are “that is not from the original formation of the word.”<sup>24</sup> The redundant letters do not mean anything in many places except the ten letters formed by *’alyawma tansāhu* or *sa’altumūnīhā*.<sup>25</sup> Declension vowels are not part of construction in Ibn Alhagib book.<sup>26</sup> This is contrary to the former opinion of Ibn Ginny.<sup>27</sup> Some Arabic linguists distinguish between the two types of redundant letters. The first is the irremovable redundant where a part cannot be removed from the word. The second type is the removable redundant where it is not inherent to the word, so the part can be removed from the word. In modern Linguistics, the first is often known as phonemic redundant and cannot be removed. The second is often known as morphemic which redundant can be removed. But not all intend all morphemes, and meant only some of the morphemes such as Deuteronomy and morphemes of plural, determinate article (no person<sup>28</sup> has considered these previous morphemes, especially in Arabic, from the increasing letters).

<sup>20</sup> See: *’al-’istrābādīyyu: šarḥu šāfiyati bni lḥāḡibi*, 1/2. and about Ibn Alhagib's opinion... see section 2.

<sup>21</sup> See: *’ebnu ḡinnī: ’al-munšifu*, 1/15.

<sup>22</sup> See: *’ebnu ya’iša: šarḥu l-mufaššali*, 7/154.

<sup>23</sup> See: *’al-ḥōriyyu: ḡerāmatik ’al-luḡati l-’ārāmiyyati ...*, P.23.

<sup>24</sup> See: *’ebnu ’uṣfūrīn: ’al-mumti’u fī t-tašrīfi*, 1/201.

<sup>25</sup> See: *’al-’istrābādīyyu: šarḥu šāfiyati bni lḥāḡibi*, 1/19.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. 1/2.

<sup>27</sup> See: *’ebnu ḡinnī: ’al-munšifu*, 1/15. And about Ibn Ginny's opinion ... see section 1.

<sup>28</sup> Except Ibn Ganah in Hebrew.



Some linguists differentiate whether it is a phoneme or a morpheme. For example, “Ta” of feminization in words " 'abāya (tun)/(h) cloak / overcoat, 'alāwa(tun)/(h) premium / bonus and "Ta" of feminization in words " qā'ima(tun)/(h) standing (adj. f.) And 'imra'a(tun)/(h) woman. The "Ta" of " 'abāya(tun)/(h) cloak / overcoat and 'alāwa(tun)/(h) premium / bonus is an irremovable redundant i.e. the "Ta" is a phoneme, but the "Ta" of " qā'imah standing (adj. f.) And 'imra'a(tun)/(h) woman is a removable redundant i.e. The "Ta" is a morpheme. This precise distinction (between two types of redundant letters) has been expressed by Alzamakshary and Ibn Yaiesh in terms of their time, as *munfaṣilah* separate or *ka-l-munfaṣilah* as separate and *lāzimah* irremovable or *ḡayr lāzimah* removable ... and semi-it.<sup>29</sup> Therefore Ibn Yaiesh didn't consider Deuteronomy-morphemes and plural-morphemes irremovable redundant letters, but removable<sup>30</sup> (morphemes). This was a distinction between the phonemic redundant and the morphemic redundant in the letter "Ta" only. It can be understood that the redundant must be phonemic redundant only. But this is not true because they had considered other morphemes such as morphemes of the present and others a redundant. So, there is no phonemic redundant exclusively without morphemic redundant, or a clear morphemic redundant without phonemic redundant, but there are redundant phonemes with some redundant morphemes. This is the concept of redundant in Arabic studies according to the non-absolute concept of redundant. This subject has to be studied only with non-absolute concept because it belongs to the morphological level, while the absolute concept belongs to general level.

## 1.2. In other Semitic Languages:

The concept of redundant in other Semitic languages is often closer to the non-absolute concept in Arab morphology. This provision applies to the following Semitic languages: Akkadian language, Ugaritic, Hebrew (except the study of Ibn Ganah), Mandaic, Ge'ez and Amharic (the study of Leslau only)<sup>31</sup>. But there is evidence of some examples with the absolute concept of the redundant<sup>32</sup>, especially in Hebrew and old Syriac. As we understand their point of view to redundant through elicitation, from Which came in their studies from nominal and verbal derivation patterns and through their following to morphological pattern approach. But the modern Akkadian linguists replaced the Arabic "f" by three other consonants "prs"<sup>33</sup>. Hence, “the non-redundant letter is distinguished from the redundant

<sup>29</sup> See: 'ebnu ya'isha: *ṣarhu l-mufaṣṣali*, 5/99.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. 5/40.

<sup>31</sup> Leslau with his two books: *Introductory Grammar of Amharic*, and: *Reference Grammar of Amharic*, see sources and references.

<sup>32</sup> See: Ibn Janah: “*Kitābu l-luma'*“, P. 59-76; 'ar-ruziyyu. *'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-'āramiyyati ...*, P.351; 'al-qirdāḥiyyu. *'al-'iḥkāmu fī ṣarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.70. and: 'iḥkāmu l-'iḥkāmi fī 'ilmi t-taṣrīfī 'inda s-suryāni, P.12.

<sup>33</sup> See: Von Soden: *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*, S. 75.



letter. The concept of redundant was non-absolute by them. The redundant letter is "What has mostly redundant the basic characteristic trilateral or quadrilateral?" They often considered that any word that has more than three or four radicals, has extra letters. Modern Ugaritic<sup>34</sup> and Mandaic<sup>35</sup> linguists replaced the three Arabic consonants "fʿl" with three other consonants "qʿl" similar to some<sup>36</sup> Hebrew linguists<sup>37</sup>. Morphological inflections were all added to the original root<sup>38</sup>, and what increase it. The majority of the three radical root and the minority<sup>39</sup> of two radical roots in Semitic Languages justify the use of three morphological pattern. Ibn Ganah differed his study about the redundant in letters in Hebrew. He considered the redundant letters different from the Arabs, the Syrians and other Hebrew scholars. Ibn Ganah considered the Hebrew prepositions, relative pronoun and other redundant letters.<sup>40</sup> The concept of redundant by Ibn Ganah went beyond the concept of the absolute redundant in letters to a systematic error called double-error. Here firstly, these letters are not part (or like a part) of the word. Secondly, they are not originally redundant because it is one of the original structural elements in the sentence, not a morphological element. Some Hebrew linguists used the same Arabic three consonants "fʿl" as morphological pattern and others replaced it by "qʿl".<sup>41</sup> The types of Redundant by David<sup>42</sup> in old Syriac are different from the types of Arabic redundant and some types of redundant letters by some Syrians themselves like Ibn Alebry and others<sup>43</sup>. According to David's opinion the types of redundant in old Syriac are as following: The first is the redundant of reduplication, the redundant of vowel impletion, is the redundant which forms between the reduplication and impletion redundant. The second is the redundant of known Redundant Letters<sup>44</sup>. Although the redundant of vowel impletion by Ibn Alebry (for example) falls under the second type (not the first<sup>45</sup>). In the old Syriac concept, the redundant is mostly non-absolute except some places that are beyond as follows: David, Alrozzy and Alqerdahy considered the following letters,

<sup>34</sup> See for ex. Tropper: Ugaritische Grammatik, S.108.

<sup>35</sup> See for ex. Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 55

<sup>36</sup> See: *sāsōn: tōrat hap-po'al*, P.34.

<sup>37</sup> (Some linguists differentiate between *mišqāl* weight, and *binyān* construction or template).

See: Glinert: The Grammar of Modern Hebrew, P.428.)

<sup>38</sup> See: Kutscher: A History of the Hebrew language, P.6; and Muraoka: A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, P. 109; and *birq'li: diqdūq 'ibrī mudrāg*, P.130.

<sup>39</sup> See: Blau: A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, P. 41.

<sup>40</sup> See: Ibn Janah: "Kitābu l-luma", P. 62-70.

<sup>41</sup> See: Glinert: The Grammar of Modern Hebrew, P.428; Kutscher: A History of the Hebrew language, P.6; and Muraoka: A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, P. 109; *birq'li: diqdūq 'ibrī mudrāg*, P.130. and *sāsōn: tōrat hap-po'al*, P.34.

<sup>42</sup> See: *dāwūd: 'al-lum'atu š-šahiyyatu* ..., P. 146.

<sup>43</sup> See: *'al-qirdāhiyyu: 'ihkāmu l-'ihkāmi* ..., P.12; *'ar-ruziyyu: 'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-'āramiyyati* ..., P.351. And *'al-qirdāhiyyu: 'al-'ihkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati* ..., P.70.

<sup>44</sup> See: *dāwūd: 'al-lum'atu š-šahiyyatu* ..., P. 140-146.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. P. 146.



the Ta of Aorist, the Ta of feminization, the Ta of plural and others redundant letters ...<sup>46</sup> Amharic is different from most Semitic languages, because it has some suffix morphemes which could be one of the redundant letters as in Indo-European languages where they change the meanings in general. For example, Nominalization i.e. changing the verb form to noun form (demonstrative verb), etc.<sup>47</sup>

## 2. Quantum of redundant in letters

This chapter answers the question, is added in Semitic Languages what is added in Arabic language from redundant letters? The following table summarizes the results of the research in this matter, according to the non-absolute concept of redundant, according to common and according to the agreed; because this subject must be studied only with non-absolute concept; which belongs to the morphological level, while the absolute concept is a general level:

language	The redundant letters in Semitic languages																
	according to the concept of non-absolute increase																
Akkadian	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ŋ	ī	-	ā	ē	-	-	-	-	-
Ugaritic	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ŋ	ī-y	-	ā	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hebrew	ש	-	א	-	ת	מ	ו	נ	י	ה	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Old Syriac	ܫ	-	'	-	ܬ	ܡ	ܘܘ	ܢܝ	-	-	ܐܐ	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mandaic	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ŋ	ī-y	h <sup>48</sup>	ā	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arabic	-	س	أ	ل	ت	م	و	ن	ي	هـ	ا	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ge'ez	-	s	'	-	t	m	-	ŋ	-	-	ā	-	o	-	-	e	i
Amharic <sup>49</sup>	š	s	'	-	t	m	-	ŋ	y	-	-	-	-	a	ä	e	i

<sup>46</sup> See: 'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'ihkāmu l-'ihkāmī ..., P.12; 'ar-ruzziyyu: 'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-'āramiyyati ..., P.351 ; 'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'al-'ihkāmu fī ṣarfī s-suryāniyyati ..., P.70. and dāwūd: 'al-lum'atu š-šahiyyatu ..., P. 140-141.

<sup>47</sup> See: Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49. And: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.230-239.

<sup>48</sup> Only in one-word *hēklā* temple (from the root ykl) according to Nöldeke's opinion. See: (Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.).

<sup>49</sup>The Amharic letters (l, y, w, ŋ, and ch) and the short-mutated vowels are all redundant as morphemic suffixes, not phonemic. They are therefore - supposedly - not considered from letters of redundant according the non-absolute concept of redundant. however, they are special redundant letters of Amharic. See: Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.225-244; and: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49.



The Arabic linguists preceded the other linguists of Semitic languages in the study of the redundant by letters and synthesized for them. Suyouty cited the words of Ibn Duraid: " The redundant letters, for some grammarians, are ten characters although some of them said nine, if compounded two words, as in *'alyawma tansāhu* (today you forget it). This is done by Abu Usman Almazenny. "It is said that when Abu Othman asked for redundant letters, Abu Abbas replied with poetically:

*ḥawītu –ssimāna fā-šayyabnanī wa-mā kuntu qidman ḥawītu-ssimānā*

I have loved the fat women (as a result of that) they made my hair gray and had not loved them like before." <sup>50</sup>

Whoever counts only nine characters, counts two characters (Hamza and Alif) as one character. Sibawah counted them as ten letters<sup>51</sup> but Ibn Malik collected them in one verse four times: *hanā'un wa-taslīmum* (bliss and surrender), *talā yawma 'unsihi* (It has followed his day of affability), *nihāyatu mas'ūlin* (The end of the official) and *'amānun wa-tashīlun* (Safety and facilitate). Others collected them in another words and sentences such as *hum yatasā'alūna* (they wonder/ they are asking), or *'atāhu sulaymānu* (Solomon went to him), <sup>52</sup>I could collect them as a sentence: *lā ta'man sahwī* Beware of my omissions! For example: *'asqafah* inability to cry <sup>53</sup>, *'istā'a* (he) could <sup>54</sup>, *'iṣba'* finger <sup>55</sup>, *zaydel* with the meaning of *zayd* (name) <sup>56</sup>, *tanḍub* kind of trees <sup>57</sup>, *zurqum* with the meaning of *'azraq* blue <sup>58</sup>, *'aḡūz* old (man / woman) <sup>59</sup>, *faršana* (*'aššay'a*) he cut it<sup>60</sup>, *qindīl* old kind of lamps <sup>61</sup> and *hibla'* with the meaning of *bala'a* (he) swallow<sup>62</sup>. As I could collect all the redundant letters in Semitic languages. The following table indicates corresponding Semitic languages on analogy with the word "sa'altumūnīhā (*s'ltmūwnīyhā*)" taking into account the real appendages or already realized:

<sup>50</sup> See: *'as-suyūṭīyyu: 'al-'ašbāhu wa-n-naẓā'iru*, 1/252.

<sup>51</sup> See: *sibawayhi: 'al-kitābu*, 4/235-237. And *'ebnu 'aqīlin: šarḥu bni 'aqīlin*, 4/206.

<sup>52</sup> See: *'ebnu ya'iša: šarḥu l-mufaṣṣali*, 9/141.

<sup>53</sup> See: *'ebnu manẓūrīn: lisānu l-'arabi*, word *'asqafā*.

<sup>54</sup> See: *'abdu l-ḥamīdī: durūsu t-taṣrīfī*, P. 50.

<sup>55</sup> See: *'al-ḥamalāwiyyu: šadā l-'arfī fī fanni ṣ-ṣarfī*, P.183.

<sup>56</sup> See: *sibawayhi: 'al-kitābu*, 4/237.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. 4/236.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid. 4/325.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. 4/237.

<sup>60</sup> See: *'al-'istrābādīyyu: šarḥu šāfiyati bni alḥāḡībi*, 1/69.

<sup>61</sup> See: *'al-kitābu*, 4/292-294.

<sup>62</sup> See: *'ebnu ḡinnī: 'al-munṣifū*, 1/25-26.



## The redundant letters in the Semitic languages

language	quantum
Arabic	<i>s'ltmūwnīyhā</i>
Akkadian	<i>š'tmūnīāē</i>
Ugaritic	<i>š'tmūnīyā</i>
Hebrew	<i>š'tmūnīyhā</i>
Old Syriac	<i>šs'ltmūnīyhā</i>
Mandaic	<i>š'tmūnīyhā</i>
Ge'ez	<i>s'tmnāoei</i>
Amharic	<i>šs'tmnyaāei</i>

The redundant letters in **Akkadian** can be collected in (*š'tmūnīāē*). For example, in Akkadian: *šalubum* very wild<sup>63</sup>, or *šalubu* wild, *šaḥluqtum* perversion (f.)<sup>64</sup>, *erbettum* four (f.)<sup>65</sup>, *tābalu* continent (root: 'b)<sup>66</sup>, *mēlū* hill (root: 'lī)<sup>67</sup>, *tulūlu* rain<sup>68</sup>, *neperdū* (Ass.) bright / shiny / glittery<sup>69</sup>, *šagīmu* roar<sup>70</sup>, *kāšidum* invader/ conqueror<sup>71</sup>, and *pitēqu*<sup>72</sup> child. There are also examples of the increasing of vowel [i] in Akkadian which was originally as semi vowel [y] or [ai], (i.e. *purais* > *purīs*) for example: *tuḫimum* spleen<sup>73</sup>. In **Ugaritic** the redundant letters can be collected in (*š'tmūnīyā*), for example: *yušahmamu* is heated<sup>74</sup>, 'arway > 'arwū Lion<sup>75</sup>, *tarbaš* courtyard / stable<sup>76</sup>, *maḍra'* > *midra'* > *midar'* state / state land<sup>77</sup>, *šabū'* seven<sup>78</sup>, 'admān red<sup>79</sup>,

<sup>63</sup> Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S.81.

<sup>64</sup> Ungnad: Gramatik des Akkadischen, S. 44.

<sup>65</sup> Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S. 78; und Ungnad: Gramatik des Akkadischen, S. 43.

<sup>66</sup> Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S.82.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid. P.78, 79.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid. P.75.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid. P.89.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid. P.74.

<sup>71</sup> Ungnad: Gramatik des Akkadischen, S. 42.

<sup>72</sup> Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S. 74.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. P.75

<sup>74</sup> Tropper: Ugaritische Grammatik, S.604, 605.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid. P. 265.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid. S. 269.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. P. 261.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid. P. 271.



*huzār* porker / pig<sup>80</sup>, *yaḥmūr* Roe<sup>81</sup> and *sāpir* writer<sup>82</sup>. The redundant letters in Akkadian and Ugaritic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract three characters (s, l, h) from Arabic, and as they redundant by one character (š instead of s), although they didn't consider the Ta of feminization, the Alif of dual, the waw of plural. In AKK, there is an Extra-long vowel *ē*. In Ugaritic there is ya, which has two kinds (in Arabic). The first ya in a prolongation (as a long vowel), and the second is a quasi-vowel / or semi consonant as in *yaḥmūr* roe, in Ugaritic<sup>83</sup>. Excluding contentious letters can be collected the redundant letters in the **Hebrew** language in (*š'tmūnīyhā*), where I have added the long vowel (**A**) in some nominal patterns such as *māṭār* rain to the characters of redundant in Hebrew. This probably was overlooked by linguists because it isn't written on the form of character, but in the form of (T) under the character. The following are some examples: *šalhæbæt* flame / fire<sup>84</sup>, *æqdāḥ* pistol / red agate<sup>85</sup>, *tiqvā* hope<sup>86</sup>, *mæḥqār* search / study<sup>87</sup>, *gibbōr* champion / hero<sup>88</sup>, *nā'ōr* cultured, *šenī*<sup>89</sup> second<sup>90</sup>, *yitshār* pure oil<sup>91</sup>, *hāḥīn* understanding<sup>92</sup> and *māṭār* rain<sup>93</sup>.

The redundant letters in Hebrew are dissimilar to Arabic, as they decrease three characters (two consonants: s and l, and a semi vowel w) from Arabic, and as they redundant by one character (š instead of s). In the opinion of some linguists, some characters (s, l and r) are very rare. Some examples are such as: *s'nīr* a block of ice<sup>94</sup>, *zal'āfā* shiver / trembling from *zā'af* anger / irritation<sup>95</sup> and *'irgel* refine (iron) from *'iggel* role / draw a circle<sup>96</sup>. If we take the controversial letters (s, l, and r) into account, there will be word that combines the redundant in the Hebrew (*šs'ltmūnīyhā*). But Ibn Ganah has another art of Hebrew redundant letters (which I don't agree) collected in *šəlōmī 'ak tibnæh* (i.e. eleven letters:

<sup>80</sup> Ibid. P.262.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid. P.266.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid. P. 266.

<sup>84</sup> See: *yælin: tōldōt hi-tpathūt had-diqdūq hā-'ibrī*, P.187.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. P.171.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. P.178.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. P.171.

<sup>88</sup> See: Ibn Janah: "Kitab al -luma ", P.49-56.

<sup>89</sup> See: *yælin: tōldōt hi-tpathūt had-diqdūq hā-'ibrī*, P.171.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid. P.188.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid. P.172.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. P.171.

<sup>93</sup> See: *šidqā: had-diqdūq ham-ma'asī*, P.128, 136, 137.

<sup>94</sup> König: " Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache " B.II, S.404.

<sup>95</sup> Kautzsch. " Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik " S. 108.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.



š, l, ō, m, ī, ’, k, t, b, n, h). Or in saying *šəmla(’)ktō bīnā*. There is a difference<sup>97</sup> of opinion by Modern Hebrew linguists in the redundant letters as prefixes or suffixes, whether nouns or verbs. Gesenius, for example, determined the Hebrew prefixes as six: (t, n, m, y, h, ’)<sup>98</sup>. Beer says, "the names which have many types of redundant formations, return to the verbal formulae, have the same prefixes as in the verb: (t, š, n, m, y, h, ’)<sup>99</sup>. According to Steuernagel the noun prefix [š] is rare: therefore, the noun prefixes are six only (t, n, m, y, h, ’) in words such as: *’ətsba* [finger], *yitshār* [pure oil], *midbār* [desert / words], *nə<sup>’</sup>mān* [speaker / secretary], *tōrā* [law]<sup>100</sup>. But Nägelsbach, Olshausen and Ungnad cited only four Hebrew noun prefixes: (t, m, y, ’)<sup>101</sup>. Although Steuernagel cited five Hebrew noun suffixes: (ū, ī, n, m, l) in words such as: *karməl* [Grove / Mount Carmel], *’ērōm* [nudity / shame], *šulhān* [table], *raglī* [footmen / infantry soldier], *yaldūt* [childhood] (as the feminization of Alta mark).<sup>102</sup> But Gesenius differentiated between the single suffixes and the syllable suffixes which were added to the Hebrew nouns. He cited three single suffixes: (l, m, n) and four syllable suffixes: (ī, ay, ūt, īt)<sup>103</sup>.

The redundant letters in **old Syriac** can be collected in (*šs’ltnūnīyhā*). Some examples are *šawda* ‘told from *yīda* ‘know<sup>104</sup>, *sarhəb* hurrt / quicken from *r<sup>’</sup>hab* rushed<sup>105</sup>, *’əstaqbal* arrived / happened / attended<sup>106</sup>, *’arn<sup>’</sup>bā* rabbit<sup>107</sup>, *P’al* up<sup>108</sup>, *ta’dirā* subsidy / Help<sup>109</sup>, *mappəq* way out (adj.)<sup>110</sup>, *nātūrā* guard / keeper<sup>111</sup>,

<sup>97</sup> There are unconfirmed assumptions about redundant of some uncommon letters in the Hebrew words, such as prefix: ע [’] in עקרב *’aqrāb* Scorpion, עכביש *’akkābīš* spider, and עגור *’agūr* crane. And such as suffixes: ר [r] in עכבר *’akbār* mouse; ש [š] in חרמש *hərmeš* machete; ב [b] in עכשוב *’akšūb* Ankpoth of lupine; ה [h] in עטלף *’ətalf* Bat; ק [k] in גזנקו *ganzakkāw* his vaults, with Persian suffix –ak, and ד [d] in סרפד *sirpād* (a dander spiky plant). Therefore, there are those who reject this assumption. See: Ungnad: "Hebräische Grammatik " S. 46; Steuernagel: " Hebräische Grammatik ... " S. 93.); König: " Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache " B.II, S.402, 406; and Olshausen: " Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache " S. 409, 411.

<sup>98</sup> See: Kautzsch: "Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik " S. 245-248.

<sup>99</sup> Beer: " Hebräische Grammatik " B.I. S. 105-108.

<sup>100</sup> See: Steuernagel: "Hebräische Grammatik " S. 92.

<sup>101</sup> See: Nägelsbach: "Hebräische Grammatik" S. 87-88; Olshausen: "Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache" S. 370-402; und Ungnad: "Hebräische Grammatik "S. 43-44.

<sup>102</sup> Steuernagel: " Hebräische Grammatik " S. 92.

<sup>103</sup> Kautzsch: " Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik " S. 248-249.

<sup>104</sup> See: *’al-ḥōriyyu. ḡerāmatik ’al-luḡati l-’ārāmiyyati ...*, P.148.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

<sup>106</sup> See: *’al-qirdāḥiyyu. ’al-’ihkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.70.

<sup>107</sup> See: *’al-qirdāḥiyyu. ’ihkāmu l-’ihkāmi ...*, P.11.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid. P.11, 12.

<sup>109</sup> See: *’ar-ruzziyyu. ’al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-’ārāmiyyati ...*, P.351

<sup>110</sup> See: *’al-qirdāḥiyyu. ’al-’ihkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.70.

<sup>111</sup> See: *’ar-ruzziyyu. ’al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-’ārāmiyyati ...*, P.351. and *’al-qirdāḥiyyu.*



*ræ'yānā* thought / opinion<sup>112</sup>, *'alīmā* boy / laddie<sup>113</sup>, *'aḥrāyā* other / another / else<sup>114</sup>, *'æmhātā* mothers<sup>115</sup> and *kātōḇā* writer<sup>116</sup>. The old Syriac and Arabic have the same redundant letters. As they redundant by one character (š an addition to s); where the ['] is considered a character and the long vowel [A] is another character. But Polus Khoury and others counted ten letters (', h, w, y, l, m, n, s, š, t)<sup>117</sup>; where he considered two letters as only one letter<sup>118</sup>, i.e. (', ā) as (') and (y, ī) as (y); and despite the fact that Khoury didn't consider here the letter [r] from the redundant letters, he reminded the redundant letters, elsewhere in the same book, as non-standard redundant<sup>119</sup>. So Khoury and David divide the redundant into two types: Standard redundant (the subject of this study) and non-standard redundant<sup>120</sup>. While Gerges Alruzzy combines the letters in the word: (*'štny swmā*)<sup>121</sup> [i.e. nine letters, without: l, i and h]. According to David, although there are nine letters, they are all different, where he didn't count the letter [l] as one of the redundant letters, and considered two letters (', ā) as only one letter<sup>122</sup> [i.e. the letters are: ', h, w, y, l, m, n, s, š, t]. While Qerdahy cited eight letters only, where he considered four letters [h, l, i, š] outside the scope of the increasing, redundant letters. They could be collected in: (*'ænas māyōtā*), or (*'asnī mawtā*)<sup>123</sup>.

The redundant letters in **Mandaic** can be collected in (*'š'tmūnīyhā*). Following are some examples: *šarhazta* horror / panic<sup>124</sup>, *'afrāštā* education<sup>125</sup>, *tušlima* completion<sup>126</sup>, *mixla* food<sup>127</sup>, *ṭarūš(a)* deaf<sup>128</sup>, *bīnyānā* building<sup>129</sup>, rare in template *qutail* and

---

*'al- 'iḥkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.70.

<sup>112</sup> See: *'ar-ruzziyyu: 'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-'ārāmiyyati ...*, P.350.

<sup>113</sup> See: *'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'iḥkāmu l-'iḥkāmi ...*, P.11; and: *'al-'iḥkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.70.

<sup>114</sup> See: *'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'iḥkāmu l-'iḥkāmi ...*, P.11.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid. and *dāwūd: 'al-lum 'atu š-šahiyyatu ...*, P. 296-297.

<sup>116</sup> See: *'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'iḥkāmu l-'iḥkāmi ...*, P.11.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> See: *'al-ḥōriyyu: gerāmatik l-luḡati l-'ārāmiyyati ...*, P.23, 24.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid. P.149.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid. and *dāwūd: 'al-lum 'atu š-šahiyyatu ...*, P. 296-297.

<sup>121</sup> See: *'ar-ruzziyyu: 'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luḡati l-'ārāmiyyati ...*, P.349.

<sup>122</sup> See *dāwūd: 'al-lum 'atu š-šahiyyatu ...*, P. 144-145.

<sup>123</sup> See: *'al-qirdāḥiyyu: 'al-'iḥkāmu fī šarfī s-suryāniyyati ...*, P.69-70.

<sup>124</sup> Macuch: Handbook of classical and modern Mandaic, P. 187.

<sup>125</sup> Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.

<sup>126</sup> Macuch: Handbook of classical and modern Mandaic, P. 191.

<sup>127</sup> Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 56.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid. P.55.

<sup>129</sup> Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135-136.



usually from Arabic words<sup>130</sup>, 'ewīr(a) blind<sup>131</sup>, hēklā temple (from ykl)<sup>132</sup> and xaṭāha guilt / sin<sup>133</sup>. Therefore, the redundant letters in Mandaic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract two characters (s, l) from Arabic, and as redundant by one character (š instead of s).

In **Ge'ez**, the letters can be collected in (*s'tmnāoei*). Following are some examples, 'astašādala (he) showed<sup>134</sup>, 'əgzi mister<sup>135</sup>, ta'aqaba (he) watch out for<sup>136</sup>, manfas soul<sup>137</sup>, bərhān light<sup>138</sup> and bā'əl/ rich<sup>139</sup>. Then these Letters in Ge'ez are unlike the Arabic, as they detract four characters (l, w, y, h) from Arabic, and as they redundant by short vowels, such as: karabo basket<sup>140</sup>, kufāle Separation / division<sup>141</sup>, ḥalāyi singer<sup>142</sup>.

In **Amharic**, the letters can be collected in (*šs'tmnyaäei*). Some examples are given below. ašqādaddāmā (causative from qāddāmā to forward / to be at the forefront)<sup>143</sup>, 'aswässädä (he) gave (wässädä he took)<sup>144</sup>, astawwäqä (he) tells (from awwäqä he knows)<sup>145</sup>, adärräsä (he) drove / connected<sup>146</sup>, tädar marriage live (root: darä)<sup>147</sup>, mä-qabər tomb / shrine<sup>148</sup>, näšäbraq flash / spark (from tänsäbarräqä shine / sparkle)<sup>149</sup>, näbälbal flame / fire<sup>150</sup> and qədmiya precedence / priority<sup>151</sup>. These letters in Amharic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract three characters (l, w, h) from Arabic, and redundant by one character (š instead of s) and the vowels (ä, e, a and i) found in words such as säbbärä he broke<sup>152</sup>, wəffar-e obesity<sup>153</sup>, lämmada educator<sup>154</sup>, sənəttari fragment<sup>155</sup>.

---

<sup>130</sup> Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 55.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

<sup>132</sup> Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.

<sup>133</sup> Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie, S. 55.

<sup>134</sup> Tropper: Altäthiopische Grammatik, S.108.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid. P.265.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid. P.107.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid. P.63.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid. P.272.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid. P.56.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid. S.60.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid. S.59.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid. S.58.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. P.486.

<sup>144</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.99.

<sup>145</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.490.

<sup>146</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.97-98. And: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.473-480.

<sup>147</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.228-229.

<sup>148</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.47.

<sup>149</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.229.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid. P.229.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid. P.225-226.

<sup>152</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.86.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid. P.46.

<sup>154</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.220; Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.47.



In Amharic suffix morphemes (Nominalizer) turn the words to names in the following examples, such as follows: *-am* (*märz-am* very poisonous, from *märz* poison)<sup>156</sup>, *-ännä*, or *-täñña* (*särra-täñña* worker, from *särra* work)<sup>157</sup>, *-lla*, *-llo*, or *-lle* (gärodalle / gäradolle active young)<sup>158</sup>, *-äčča*, *-äčča*, *-öčča*, or *-učča* (*daräččan* edge from *dar* limit /edge)<sup>159</sup> and other morphemes<sup>160</sup>. In Amharic, there is prefix morpheme with the meaning of English "of" or other meanings: *yä* (*yä-kätäma*, literally: attributable to the city)<sup>161</sup>. If we add these morphemes to the redundant letters, they form the word that can be collected in (*šš'tmnyaäei lhhñ*).

### 3. Results and Conclusion

#### 3.1. Concept of the Redundant:

The subject of redundant is still methodologically turbulent in Semitic languages, especially in Arab Studies. From the discussion above, it is clear that some writings are absolute in the understanding of the redundant, while other writings are non-absolute in understanding of the subject itself, and without referring to the writers whether they followed absolute or non-absolute approach. Indeed, there are attempts to restrict the non-absolute itself by removing some of the suffixes or prefixes from the redundant in field by a team of researchers, who are unnamed by Abdel Rahman Shahin. This research demonstrates the approach adopted in steering of the definitions and the evidences. It seems that the Arab linguistic terms on the subject of the study were not crystallized in the era of Sibawayh (a sixth layer of visual grammarians, died in 180 AH)<sup>162</sup> or the subsequent (as cited by Ibn Ginny and his teacher Mazny); Therefore, we have launched the " absolute concept of redundant" which does not differentiate between the types of redundant letters according to the modern linguistic levels. It does not differentiate between phonetic and morphological redundant, and syntactic and semantic redundant. Yet it is an approach any way by itself. But we have neither been able to generalize this because there are evidences from the statements of Arabic linguists themselves nor confirm at the same time their non-absolute concept of redundant in letters. But we found the two concepts in one book (Almunsef) by the same author (like Ibn Ginny and his teacher Mazny), that do not separate between the absolute concept and the non- absolute concept

<sup>155</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.219-224.

<sup>156</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.48; Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.230.

<sup>157</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.47; Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.236.

<sup>158</sup> Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.239.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid. P.230-239 and: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49.

<sup>161</sup> Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.48-49.

<sup>162</sup> See: 'az-zubaydiyyu: *ṭabaqātu n-naḥwīyyīna wa-lluḡawīyyīna*, P. 66, 72.



except two or three pages<sup>163</sup>. So, we found the absolute concept by Sibawayh, linguists of Kofa, Ibn Ginny and his teacher Almazny, in spite of the fact that none of them has considered the determinate article, a character of redundant. This means that the absolute concept itself was not inclusive or specific or accurate. Perhaps Ibn Usfour may step towards the definition of the redundant in letters with non- absolute concept through the condition that every redundant letter must be a part (but not an original) of the word. That is the redundant must be phonetic. In spite of that, Ibn Usfour himself didn't apply these conditions on his examples in his book itself. He added some redundant morphemes (such as feminization prefix and present suffixes) to his examples with the redundant phonemes. We also found that he distinguished between grammatical Affixes (signs of decline) and redundant morphemes like Ibn Al Hagib and the explainer of his book<sup>164</sup>. He also distinguished between general and some redundant morphemes (suffixes of dual and plural) like Al Zamakhshari and the explainer of his book Ibn Yaish<sup>165</sup>. This means that the non-absolute concept itself was not inclusive or specific or accurate like the absolute concept. The bottom line is that there are two concepts for redundant the absolute and non-absolute, but both are not accurate in the Arab linguistic books. The last is divided into two sections where the first does not distinguish between redundant phonemes and morphemes (for example: definition's article, which is not a character from the redundant in Arabic). The second distinguishes between redundant phonemes and some redundant morphemes (but not all) and without frequency. The subject of redundant is still methodologically turbulent in Arab Studies in the past and the present. The most recent studies on the subject of the study didn't come out of the Sibawayh's mantle but who follow the linguists. They depend mostly on the mother's writing heritage, without a serious attempt to contribute to the renewal and without Vitriol or praising. The concept of the redundant by the linguists of Akkadian, Ugaritic, Mandaic, Hebrew (except Ibn Ganah), Ge'ez and Amharic (especially Leslau) is mostly the closest to the Arabic non-absolute concept of the redundant. It seems that the problem is not solved yet where we find some of the examples do not distinguish between the redundant phonemes and the morphemes, but mostly the redundant letter is what increase on the origin of the word triple or quadruple, in the context of modern awareness of the difference between phoneme and morpheme. The concept of the redundant in the old Syriac came mostly non-absolute except some differences between linguists. From these differences, different concepts such as the absolute concept of redundant sometimes; or the non-absolute concept of the redundant has been introduced. But it doesn't distinguish between redundant phonemes and morphemes. Finally, we can say that the subject of the study needs to have a clear method in determining redundant letters whether on the absolute level of language or non-absolute but not both together. The linguist should profess

---

<sup>163</sup> See: *'ebnu ġinnī: 'al-munšifu*, 1/11,13,15.

<sup>164</sup> See: *'al-'istrābādiyyu: šarḥu šāfiyati bni lḥāġibi*, 1/2.

<sup>165</sup> See: *'ebnu ya'īša: šarḥu l-mufaššali*, 5/40.



explicitly that he follows this linguistic approach or that, and should be committed to do so in his representation. The Amharic is subject to what is different from most of the Semitic languages where the morphemic suffixes could be one of the redundant letters (as in Indo-European languages); because they change meanings in general, such as changing the verbal meanings to nominal meaning (denominative) and so on ... Otherwise the non-absolute concept of the redundant in Amharic is the prevailing or the predominant (by Leslau), as previously explained.

### 3.2. Quantum of the redundant in letters:

In Arabic the redundant letters are according to the non-absolute concept of redundant. They are most likely ten letters. Linguists have collected them in many different words, the most famous is *sa'altumūnīhā*. These words didn't distinguish between vowels and semi vowels: [w, ū] and [y, ī], Therefore I have collected them in (*s'ltmūwnīyhā*) and I have put these collections or assemblies against in the other Semitic languages. I found the semi vowel [w] clearly in Arabic only, but didn't find it as a letter of redundant in other Semitic languages. The redundant in letters in Akkadian could be collected in (*š'tmūnīāē*), unlike in Arabic, as they detract three characters (s, l, h) from Arabic. But it cannot be decided that Akkadian doesn't have the semi vowels [y] or [w] as redundant letters, because original template has *purais* which changes to *purīs*. The Akkadian collection increased from Arabic collection by two characters (š instead of s and ē).<sup>166</sup>The Akkadian collection increased Arabic collection by two characters (š instead of s and ē). There are not special letters for umlauts in Arabic, but this doesn't mean that there are no real umlauts in Arabic. In Ugaritic the redundant letters could be collected in (*š'tmūnīyā*), unlike in Arabic, as they (in Akkadian) detract three characters (s, l, h) from Arabic, although I didn't find ex. For the semi vowel [w], it cannot be decided that Ugaritic don't have it (the semi vowel [w]) as a redundant letter. In Hebrew they could be collected in (*š'tmūnīyhā*), unlike in Arabic, as they are decreased three characters (two consonants: s and l, and semi vowel w) from Arabic, and redundant one character (š instead of s). In old Syriac they could be collected in (*šs'ltmūnīyhā*), unlike in Arabic, as they detract the semi vowel [w] from Arabic, and as they are redundant by one character (š an addition to s). In Mandaic they could be collected in (*š'tmūnīyhā*), dissimilar to Arabic, as they detract three characters (two consonants: s and l, and a semi vowel w) from Arabic, and as they are redundant by one character (š instead of s). In Ge'ez there are five consonants and four vowels (three short vowels: *o, e, i* and one long vowel *ā*) could be collected in (*s'tmnāoei*), in contrast to Arabic, as they detract four characters (l, w, y, h) from Arabic, and as they redundant by short vowels. There are six consonants, four vowels and a semi vowel

<sup>166</sup> Ibid. P.75



[y] in Amharic and could be collected in (*šs'tmnyaäei*), unlike in Arabic, as they detract three characters (l, h, w) from Arabic, and as they are redundant by one character (š instead of s) and the vowels. The redundant in letters is either contentious or anomalous depending upon different views. In some Semitic languages such as Hebrew, old Syriac and Amharic. In Hebrew and old Syriac, they could be collected in (*šs'ltmūnīyhār*). In Amharic they could be collected in (*šs'tmnyaäei Iḥhñ*), i.e. by adding morphemic suffixes. Finally, we must mention that Ge'ez and Amharic are characterized by the redundant of vowels at the end of words, which are not signs of decline in them.

#### 4. Summary: Strengths & Limitations

This research has faced many difficulties not only due to the lack of study of the subject before in Semitic languages (except Arabic, Hebrew and old Syriac), but also because of the absence of the term "redundant letters" itself. So, the researchers' work in these languages is to elicit opinions (or extract views) and read between the lines through the scholars' work of these languages about nominal and verbal templates. This research asked several methodological questions about the concept of redundant in Semitic languages and its quantum in detail. It can be noted that only the most important findings have been stated. As follows: subject of the study is still in need of reconsideration of the methodology in Semitic languages, particularly Arabic. And the need to put one approach clearly and absorb all the studied patterns underneath it, and exclude all we could to enter into another level of linguistic analysis. This research has classified the views of linguists on the subject of study in Semitic languages, and attributed them to two concepts absolute, and non-absolute in Arabic. The last one is divided into two types: The first one distinguishes between phonemic and some morphemic redundant at morphological level; the second doesn't distinguish between them. The case in old Syriac is closer to Arabic because the linguists who wrote in Arabic are clearly influenced by Arab heritage.

The concept of the redundant by the linguists of Akkadian, Ugaritic, Mandaic, Hebrew (except Ibn Ganah), Ge'ez and Amharic (especially Leslau) are mostly close to the Arabic non-absolute concept of the redundant, with their two types, on the morphological level. The Amharic is subject to what is different from most of the Semitic languages; where the morphemic suffixes could be one of the redundant letters such as Indo-European languages.

This study determined the redundant letters and their quantum in Semitic languages. It organized the letters in exchange for Arabic word "*sa'altumūnīhā*"; and specified what redundant or decreased from Semitic languages; and selected the motor redundant letters short -at the end of words - which was characterized by Ge'ez and Amharic, which does not represent a sign of decline in them.



## 5. Sources and references

### 5.1. Arabic Sources and References

- *'al-'istrābādiyyu, raḍiyyu d-dīni: šarḥu šāfiyati bni l-ḥāǧibi, taḥqīqu muḥammad nūr il-ḥasan wa-āḥarīn, dāru l-fikri l-'arabiyyi, mišr, 1975.*
- *'ebnu l-'anbāriyyi, 'abū l-barkāti 'abdu r-raḥmāni bni muḥammadin: 'al-'inšāfu fī masā'ili l-ḥilāfi bayna l-bašriyyīna wa-lkūfiyyīna, taḥqīqu muḥammad muḥyī d-dīni 'abdi l-ḥāmīdi, 'al-maktabatu l-'ašriyyatu, šaydā – bayrūt, 1987.*
- *'ebnu ġinnī, 'abū l-faṭḥi 'uṭmān: 'al-munšifu, šarḥun li-kitābi t-tašrīfi li-'abī 'uṭmāna l-māziniyyi, taḥqīqu 'ibrāhīm mušafā wa-'abdi llāhi 'amīn, mišr, 1954.*
- *ḥammād, muḥammad: ḥurūfu z-ziyādati ġayru t-taqlideyyati, ḥawleyyatu l-ġāme'ati l-'islāmiyyati l-'ālamīyyati bi-'islām 'abād, bakistān, 'al-'adadu t-tānī, 1992.*
- *'al-ḥamalāwiyyu, 'aš-šayḥu 'aḥmad: šadā l-'arfi fī fanni š-šarfi, šaraḥahu wa-šahḥaḥahu ḥusnī 'abdu l-ġalīl yusef, maktabatu l-'al'ādāb, mišr, 1992.*
- *'al-ḥōriyyu, 'al-qassu bōlos: ġerāmatik 'al-luġati l-'ārāmiyyati, šarfun wa-naḥwun, bayrūt, 1962.*
- *dāwūd, 'iqlīmes yūsef: 'al-lum'atu š-šahiyyatu fī naḥwi l-luġati s-suryāniyyati, 'al-mawšil, 1896.*
- *daryān, 'al-maṭrān yūsef: kitābu l-'itqāni fī šarfi luġati s-suryāni, bayrūt, 1913.*
- *'ar-ruzziyyu, gerges: 'al-kitābu fī naḥwi l-luġati l-'ārāmiyyati s-suryāniyyati l-kildāniyyati wa-šarfihā wa-šī'rihā, bayrūt, 1897.*
- *'az-zubaydiyyu, 'abū bakrin mohammadun ebnu l-ḥasani: ṭabaqātu n-naḥwiyyīna wa-l-luġawīyyīna, taḥqīqu moḥammad 'abū l-faḍl 'ibrāhīm, dāru l-ma'ārifī, mišr, 1984.*
- *sibawayhi, 'abū bišrin ebnu 'uṭmāna ebnu qanbarin: 'al-kitābu, taḥqīqu wa-šarḥu 'abdi s-salām moḥammad hārūn, maktabatu l-ḥanġiyyi, 'al-qāhirah, mišr, 1988.*
- *'as-suyūṭiyyu, ġalālu d-dīni 'abdu r-raḥmāni: 'al-'ašbāhu wa-n-naẓā'iru fī n-naḥwi, murāġa'atu wa-taqdīmu fāyiz tarḥīnī, dāru l-kitābi l-'arabiyyi, 'al-qāhirah, mišr, 1993.*



- *šāhīn, 'abdu r-raḥmān moḥammad: fī tašrīfi l-'af'ālī, maktabatu š-šabābi, 'al-qāhirah, miṣr, 1984.*
- *'abdu l-ḥamīd, muḥammad muḥyī ed-dīn: durūsu t-tašrīfi, 'al-qīsmu l-'awwālu: fī l-muqaddimāti wa-tašrīfi l-'af'ālī, 'al-maktabatu l-'ašriyyatu, ṣaydā – bayrūt, 1995.*
- *'ebnu 'uṣfūrīn, 'aliyyun ebnu mu'minin: 'al-mumti'u fī t-tašrīfi, taḥqīqu faḥri d-dīn qabāwah, ḥalab, 1970.*
- *'ebnu 'aqīlin: šarḥu bni 'aqīlin, maktabatu dāri t-turāti, 'al-qāhirah, miṣr, 1980.*
- *'al-qirdāḥiyyu, 'al-qassu ḡibrā'il: 'al-'iḥkāmu fī šarfi s-suryāniyyati wa-naḥwihā wa-ši'rihā, without date.*
- *-'iḥkāmu l-'iḥkāmi fī 'ilmi t-tašrīfi 'inda s-suryāni, roma, 1924.*
- *'ebnu manzūrīn, moḥammadun ebnu makramin: lisānu l-'arabi, maṭba'atu bülāq, 'al-qāhirah, miṣr, 1889.*
- *'ebnu ya'īša, muwaffāqu d-dīni bnu ya'īša bnu 'aliyyin: šarḥu l-mufaššali, maktabatu l-mutanabbī, 'al-qāhirah, miṣr, 1990.*
- *yusef, zāfir: 'al-'af'ālu r-rubā'iyyatu nuṣū'uhā wa-sti'māluhā, 'al-muḡalladu 85, ṣ 1004 min miḡallati maḡma 'i l-luḡati l-'arabiyyati bi-dimašq, tašrīnu t-tānī, dimašq, 2010.*
- *yusef, yusriyyah zakariyyā: 'aṭaru n-nuḥāti l-'arabi fī fikri bni ganāḥ wa-tafsīrihi li-ḥurūfi z-ziyādati, miḡallatu kulliyyati l-luḡati wat-tarḡamati, ḡāmi'atu l-'azhari, 'al-'adadu t-talāṭūna, 'al-qāhirah, miṣr, 1999.*

## 5.2. Hebrew Sources and References:

- *'aḥīnerī, yiṣḥāq: hēkal ham-mišqālīm, hōšā'at yizr' æ'el, tel 'ābīb, 1976.*
- *birq' lī, šā'ul: diqdūq 'ibrī mudrāg, hōšā'at r' ūben, mas, y'rūšālayim, 1971.*
- *yaelīn, dā'id: tōldōt hi-tpathūt had-diqdūq hā-'ibrī, 'im mišq' lēy haš-šemōt bal-lāšōn hā-'ibrīt, ḥæbrat qohælat b''m (b' 'erāḥōn mugbāl), y'rūšālayim, 1945.*
- *šidqā, yiṣḥāq: had-diqdūq ham-ma' a'sī, hōšā'at qiryat sefær, y'rūšālayim, 1981.*
- *sāsōn, bārūk: tōrat hap-po'al, hap-po'al hōrā'ōtā 'untīyyātō, y'hōšuwwa' rōbær' šṭayin, hōšā'at yabnæ b''m (b' 'erāḥōn mugbāl), tel 'ābīb, 1973.*



### 5.3. Western Sources and References

- [1] Beer, Georg: "Hebräische Grammatik" B.I. 2.Auflage von D. Rudolf Meyer... Berlin, 1952.
- [2] Blau, Joshua: "A grammar of biblical Hebrew" Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1976.
- [3] Ibn Janah, Abul Walid Marwan: "kitābu l-luma' " Ed. J. Derenbourg and William Bucher, Paris, 1886.
- [4] Glinert, Lewis: "The Grammar of Modern Hebrew" Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [5] Kautzsch, E.: " Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik" Leipzig, 1909.
- [6] -: "Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar" second Edition. Oxford, 1976.
- [7] König, F.E.: "Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache" B.II, zweite Hälfte 1. Teil, Hildesheim-New York, 1979.
- [8] Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel: "A History of the Hebrew Language" edited by Raphael Kutscher, the Magnes press, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1964.
- [9] Leslau, Wolf: "Reference Grammar of Amharic" Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1995.
- [10] -: "Introductory Grammar of Amharic" Harrassowitz Verlag , Wiesbaden, 2000.
- [11] Macuch, Ruodolf: "Handbook of classical and Modern Mandaic" Walter De Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1965.
- [12] -: "Neumandäische Chrestomathie mit grammatischer Skizze, kommentierter Übersetzung und Glossar" Ottoharrassowitz. Wiesbaden, 1989.
- [13] Nägelsbach, Carl Wilhelm Eduard: " Hebräische Grammatik" 2. Auflage, Leibzig, 1862.
- [14] Nöldeke, Theodor: "Mandäische Grammatik" bearbeitet von Anton Schall, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1964.
- [15] Olshausen, Justus: "Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache" Braunschweig, 1861.
- [16] Paul Joüon, S.J- T. Muraoaka: "A Grammar of biblical Hebrew" Roma, 1996.
- [17] Segert, Stanislav: "A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language" University of California press, Berkeley, Los Angelos, London, 1984.



*Accepted: 05-01-2025*

*Revised: 15-12-2024*

*Received: 06-11-2024*

- [18] Steuernagel, Carl.: "Hebräische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literature, Übungstücken und Wörterverzeichnis" 13. Auflage, Leipzig, 1961.
- [19] Tropper, Josef: "Ugaritische Grammatik" Ugarit – Verlag, Münster, 2000.
- [20] -: "Altäthiopische Grammatik des Geöez mit Übungstexten und Glossar" Ugarit – Verlag, Münster, 2002.
- [21] Ungnad, Arthur: "Hebräische Grammatik" Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1912.
- [22] -: "Gramatik des Akkadischen" 5., Auflage, München, 1969.
- [23] Von Soden, Wolfram: "Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik" 3., Auflage, Roma, 1995.