

5 ICLEI 2016-127 Tarek S. M. Soliman Alnanaie

Increase in Arabic Letters in terms of Concept and Quantum: A comparative study with other Semitic Languages

Tarek S. M. Soliman Alnanaie
Department of Arabic Language & Literature
College of Arts & Social Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University
& Department of Linguistics, Semitic & Oriental Studies
Faculty of Dar Eluloum, Cairo University

Abstract

This study attempts to investigate the linguistic thought in Semitic languages about the increase's letters (added letters or extra letters); in terms of their concept and quantum, proceeding from the Arab Thought to the whole of the Semitic Thought. The **increase** 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 increase must be among added letters or extra letters collected by *'alJawma tansAhu*, or *sa'altumUnIhA*. In this research, several methodological questions about the concept of increase 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, and attributed them to two concepts in the Arabic, to absolute, and non-absolute. The last one divided into two types: The first distinguishes between the phonemic and some morphemic increases on the 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 increase 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 increase, with their two types, on the morphological level. The Amharic has what is different from most of the Semitic languages; where it has morphemic suffixes could be one of the increase's letters , such as Indo-European languages.

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

1.0 Introduction

This study attempts to investigate the linguistic thought that emanates in Semitic from the increased letters (added letters or extra letters) in terms of their concept and quantum. It covers both the Arab thought and the whole of the Semitic thought. The **increase** 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 *galbaba* put on one's clothes (*ǧelbāb*) and *šamlala* (he) hurried. In the second type, the increase must be among added letters or extra letters collected by *'alyawma tansāhu*, or *sa'altumūnīhā*.¹ The study intends to investigate the second type of increase in letters. Because the second type is a more common problem in the scientific method than the first type. **The term "increase 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 "increase", and "added letters or extra letters"? Is "increase" 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 "lettering increase" 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 "letters increase," 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 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?² 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 increased 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 increase of ten letters - letters of increase also. Although the Sibawayh and the ancient linguists³ rejected Hammad's⁴ 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 increases of the traditional ten letters to the increase 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 three chapters and a conclusion. 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 increase, and the second one discusses the restricted concept of the increase. The **second chapter** discusses the quantum of letters of increase and the **third chapter** is the commentary. The **conclusion** outlines the most important results.

First chapter: The concept of increase

1.1. In Arabic:

The concept of the increase 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 increase beginning with the Arab scholars, which shows the richness of the subject in Arabic studies.

What is the absolute concept of increase? And what is meant by the non-absolute concept of increase? 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 increase and cited examples where there is an overlap of different linguistic levels. The non-absolute concept of increase is the original term of this research in order to classify the views of linguists who have studied the increase 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 increases 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 increase 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. Section I: The absolute concept of increase

Sibawayh is the concept for the increase 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)⁵, (in: *'idrib* hit!)⁶, the Hamza of Aorist (in: *'af'alu* I do.)⁷, the Nun of Aorist (in: *na'f'alu* we do.)⁸, the Ya of Aorist (in: *ya'dribu* he hits.)⁹ the Ya of dual¹⁰ (without example), the Ta of Aorist (in: *ta'f'alu* you do/ she does.)¹¹, the Ta of feminization (in: *raḥmatinīn raḥmahīh* mercy)¹², the Ha of lamentation (in: *wā-gulāmāh* Hey heartbreak on the boy!)¹³, the Ha 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: *ta'f'alīna* you (f.) do.), the Nun of feminization (in: *fa'alna* they (f.) have done.)¹⁴ And the Lam (in: *dālīka* (demonstrative) that)¹⁵ are all redundant letters. According to **Kufa linguists** any word that has more than three radicals is a plus.¹⁶ **Almazaney** and **Ibn Ginny** said that the letter of increase is not one of the three radicals of the word.¹⁷ **Ibn Ginny** considered the Alif of the pronoun

"*'anā*" "I redundant. In pronunciation, it falls in (Alwasl) the continuous speech and must be pronounced in the case of (Alwaqf) the pause only.¹⁸ The letters of Aorist (present-prefixes) are considered by most Arabic linguists letters of increase. Declension vowels (or Nunation) are a part of construction in Ibn Ginny's book¹⁹, which is contrary to the opinion of some Arabic linguists.²⁰ Almazeny and Ibn Ginny have used the word "Jalcaqu to be added" at times, and the word "zIda to be increased" at other times in another context as if they were synonymous.²¹ And the word "*'ilhāq* attachment / annexation / appended" comes as an explanation or a definition of the word "*ziyādah* increase". So the increase is "appended what is not from the word to the word..."²² So it is clear from the foregoing discussion that the concept of increase is absolute, because the evidence of increases (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 increase when Kufa linguists, and considering the increase of the Alif in the pronoun "*'anā*" "I in case of the pause. Although that is a phonetic increase. The increase of Nunation or increase of declension vowel is a sign of declining, which is a grammatical increase. The increase in letters of Aorist is a morphological increase.

1.1.2 SECTION II The non-absolute concept of increase

As we found indications that some Arabic linguists have an absolute concept about the increase, there are other indications that some of the definitions on the subject of the study indicate the concept of increase is non-absolute as shown below: The letters of increase when some Arabic linguists (as well as old Syriac²³) use are "that is not from the original formation of the word."²⁴ The letters of increase do not mean anything in many places except the ten letters formed by '*alyawma tansāhu*, or *sa'altumūnīhā*."²⁵ Declension vowels are not part of construction in Ibn Alhagib book.²⁶ This is contrary to the former opinion of Ibn Ginny.²⁷ Some Arabic linguists distinguish between the two types of increase. The first is the irremovable increase where a part cannot be removed from the word. The second type is the removable increase 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 increase and cannot be removed. The second is often known as morphemic which increase 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 person²⁸ has considered these previous morphemes, especially in Arabic, from the increasing letters). 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 word "*qā'imah (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 increase 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 increase i.e. The "Ta" is a morpheme. This precise distinction (between two types of increases) have been expressed by Alzamakhshary and Ibn Yaiesh in terms of their time, as *munfaṣilah* separate or *ka-l-munfaṣilah* as separate and *lāzimah* irremovable or *gayr lāzimah* removable ... and semi-it.²⁹

Therefore Ibn Yaiesh didn't consider Deuteronomy-morphemes and plural-morphemes

irremovable increases, but removable³⁰ (morphemes). This was a distinction between the phonemic increase and the morphemic increase in the letter "Ta" only. It can be understood that the increase must be phonemic increase only. But this is not true because they had considered other morphemes such as morphemes of the present and others an increase. So there is no phonemic increase exclusively without morphemic increase, or a clear morphemic increase without phonemic increase, but there are phonemic increases with some morphemic increases. This is the concept of increase in Arabic studies according to the non-absolute concept of increase. 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 increase 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)³¹. But there is evidence of some examples with the absolute concept of the increase³², especially in Hebrew and old Syriac. As we understand their point of view to increase 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' l" by three other consonants "prs"³³. Hence, "the non-redundant letter is distinguished from the redundant letter. The concept of increase was non-absolute by them. The letter of increase is "What has mostly increased the basic characteristic trilateral or quadrilateral?" They often considered that any word that has more than three or four radicals, has extra letters. Modern Ugaritic³⁴ and Mandaic³⁵ linguists replaced the three Arabic consonants "f' l" with three other consonant "qyl" similar to some³⁶ Hebrew linguists³⁷. Morphological inflections were all added to the original root³⁸, and what increased it. The majority of the three radical root and the minority³⁹ of two radical roots in Semitic Languages justify the use of three morphological pattern. Ibn Ganah differed his study about the increase in letters in Hebrew. He considered letters of increase different from the Arabs, the Syrians and other Hebrew scholars. Ibn Ganah considered the Hebrew prepositions, relative pronoun and other lettering increase.⁴⁰ The concept of increase by Ibn Ganah went beyond the concept of the absolute increase 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 "f' l" as morphological pattern and others replaced it by "qyl".⁴¹ The types of Increase by David⁴² in old Syriac are different from the types of Arabic increase and some types of increases by some Syrians themselves like Ibn Alebry and others⁴³. According to David's opinion the types of increase in old Syriac are as following: The first is the increase of reduplication, the increase of vowel impletion, is the increase which forms between the reduplication and impletion increase. The second is the increase of known letters of Increase⁴⁴. Although the increase of vowel impletion by Ibn Alebry (for example) falls under the second type (not the first⁴⁵). In the old Syriac concept, the increase is mostly non-absolute except some places that are beyond as follows: David, Alrozzy and Alqerdahy considered the following letters, the Ta of Aorist, the Ta of feminization, the Ta of plural and

others letters of increase ...⁴⁶ Amharic is different from most Semitic languages, because it has some suffix morphemes which could be one of the letters of increase 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.⁴⁷

2. Second chapter: Quantum of increase in letters

This chapter answers the question, is added in Semitic Languages what is added in Arabic language from letters increase? The following table summarizes the results of the research in this matter, according to the non-absolute concept of increase, 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 letters of increase in Semitic languages according to the concept of non-absolute increase															
Akkadian	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ḡ	ī	-	ā	ē	-	-	-	-
Ugaritic	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ḡ	ī-y	-	ā	-	-	-	-	-
Hebrew	ש	-	א	-	ת	מ	ו	י	ה	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Old Syriac	ܫ	-	ܐ	-	ܬ	ܡ	ܘܘ	ܝܝ	-	ܐܐ	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mandaic	š	-	'	-	t	m	ū	ḡ	ī-y	h ⁴⁸	ā	-	-	-	-	-
Arabic	-	س	أ	ل	ت	م	و	ن	ي	ه	ا	-	-	-	-	-
Ge'ez	-	s	'	-	t	m	-	ḡ	-	-	ā	-	o	-	-	e i
Amharic ⁴⁹	š	s	'	-	t	m	-	ḡ	y	-	-	-	-	a	ä	e i

The Arabic linguists preceded the other linguists of Semitic languages in the study of the increase by letters and Synthesized for them. Suyouty cited the words of Ibn Duraid: " The letters of increase are 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 Almazneyy. "It is said that when Abu Othman asked for letters of increase, Abu Abbas replied with poetically:

ḥawītu –ssimāna fa-šayyabnanī wa-mā kuntu qidman hawītu-ssimānā
 I have loved the fat women (as a result of that) they made my hair gray and had not loved them like before."⁵⁰

Whoever counts only nine characters, counts two characters (Hamza and Alif) as one character. Sibawah counted them as ten letters⁵¹ but Ibn Malik collected them in one verse four times: *hanā'un wa-taslīmum* (bliss and surrender), *talā yawmā '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 *hhum yatasā'alūna* (they wonder/ they are asking), or *'atāhu sulaymānu* (Solomon went to him),⁵² I could collect them as a sentence:

lā ta'man sahwī Beware of my omissions! For example: *'asqafah* inability to cry⁵³, *'isṭā'a* (he) could⁵⁴, *'iṣba* 'finger⁵⁵,

zaydel with the meaning of *zayd* (name)⁵⁶, *tanḏub* kind of trees⁵⁷, *zurqum* with the meaning of 'azraq blue⁵⁸, 'aḡūz old (man / woman)⁵⁹, *faršana* ('aššay'a) he cut it⁶⁰, *qindīl* old kind of lamps⁶¹ and *hibla* with the meaning of *bala'a* (he) swallow⁶². As I could collect all the letters of increase in Semitic languages. The following table indicates corresponding Semitic languages on analogy with the word "sa'altumUnlhA (*s'ltmūwnīyhā*)" taking into account the real appendages or already realized:

The letters of increase 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'tmnyāēi</i>

The letters of increase in **Akkadian** can be collected in (*š'tmūnīāē*). For example, in Akkadian: *šalubum* very wild⁶³, or *šalubu* wild, üaHluqtum perversion (f.)⁶⁴, *erbettum* four (f.)⁶⁵, *tābalu* continent (root: 'b)⁶⁶, *mēlū* hill (root: 'lī)⁶⁷, *tulūlu* rain⁶⁸, *neperdū* (Ass.) bright / shiny / glittery⁶⁹, *šagīmu* roar⁷⁰, *kāšidum* invader/ conqueror⁷¹, and *pitēqu*⁷² 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: *tuḷimum* spleen⁷³. In **Ugaritic** the increases's letters can be collected in (*š'tmūnīyā*), for example: *yušahmamu* is heated⁷⁴, 'arway > 'arwū Lion⁷⁵, *tarbaš* courtyard / stable⁷⁶, *maḏra* > *midra* > *midar* state / state land⁷⁷, *šabū* seven⁷⁸, 'admān red⁷⁹, *ḥuzīr* porker / pig⁸⁰, *yaḥmūr* Roe⁸¹ and *sāpir* writer⁸². The Letters of increase in Akkadian and Ugaritic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract three characters (s, l, h) from Arabic, and as they increase 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 **JacmUr** roe, in Ugaritic⁸³. Excluding contentious letters can be collected the letters of increase in the **Hebrew** language in (*š'tmūnīyhā*), where I have added the long vowel (ā) in some nominal patterns such as *māṭār* rain to the characters of increase in Hebrew. This probably was overlooked by linguists because it isn't written on the form of character, but in the form of (Ṭ) under the character. The following are some examples: *šalhəbət* flame / fire⁸⁴, 'æqdāḥ pistol / red agate⁸⁵, *tiqvā* hope⁸⁶, *məḥqār* search / study⁸⁷, *gibbōr*

champion / hero ⁸⁸, *nā'ōr* cultured ⁸⁹, *šenī* second ⁹⁰, *yitshār* pure oil ⁹¹, *hābīn* understanding ⁹² and *māṭār* rain ⁹³.

The letters of increase 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 increase 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'nr* a block of ice ⁹⁴, *zal'afā* shi'er / trembling from *zā'af* anger / irritation ⁹⁵ and *'irgel* refine (iron) from *'iggel* role / draw a circle⁹⁶. If we take the controversial letters (s, l, and r) into account, there will be word that combines the increase in the Hebrew (*šs'ltmūnyhā*). But Ibn Ganah has another art of Hebrew letters of increase (which I don't agree) collected in *šālōmī 'ak tibnāh* (i.e. eleven letters: š, l, ō, m, ī, ', k, t, b, n, h). Or in saying *šmla(')ktō bīnā*. There is a difference⁹⁷ of opinion by Modern Hebrew linguists in the letters of increase as prefixes or suffixes, whether nouns or verbs. Gesenius, for example, determined the Hebrew prefixes as six: (t, n, m, y, h, ')⁹⁸. 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, ')⁹⁹. 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: " *'etsba* [finger], *yitshār* [pure oil], *midbār* [desert / words], *nə'mān* [speaker / secretary], *tōrā* [law]¹⁰⁰. But Nägelsbach, Olshausen and Ungnad cited only four Hebrew noun prefixes: (t, m, y,')¹⁰¹. Although Steuernagel cited five Hebrew noun suffixes: (ū, ī, n, m, l) in words such as: *karael* [Grove / Mount Carmel], *ērōm* [nudity / shame], *šulhān* [table], *raglī* [footmen / infantry soldier], *yaldūt* [childhood] (as the feminization of Alta mark).¹⁰² 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, it)¹⁰³.

The letters of increase in **old Syriac** can be collected in (*šs'ltmūnyhā*). Some examples are *šawda* told from *yida* know ¹⁰⁴, *sarhæb* hurry / quicken from *r'hab* rushed ¹⁰⁵, *'estaqbal* arrived / happened / attended¹⁰⁶, *'arn'bā* rabbit ¹⁰⁷, *P'al* up¹⁰⁸, *ta'dirā* subsidy / Help ¹⁰⁹, *mappæq* way out (adj.)¹¹⁰, *nāṭūrā* guard / keeper ¹¹¹, *ræ'yānā* thought / opinion¹¹², *'alimā* boy / laddie ¹¹³, *'ahrāyā* other / another / else¹¹⁴, *'æmhātā* mothers¹¹⁵ and *kātōbā* writer¹¹⁶. The old Syriac and Arabic have the same letters of increase. As they increase by one character (š an addition to s); where the ['] is considered a character and the long vowel [ā] is another character. But Polus Khoury and others counted ten letters (', h, w, y, l, m, n, s, š, t) ¹¹⁷; where he considered two letters as only one letter¹¹⁸, i.e. (', ā) as (') and (y, ī) as (y); and despite the fact that Khoury didn't consider here the letter [r] from the letters of increase, he reminded the letters increase, elsewhere in the same book, as non-standard increase¹¹⁹. So Khoury and David divide the increase into two types: Standard increase (the subject of this study) and non-standard increase¹²⁰. While Gerges Alruzy combines the letters in the word: (*'štny swmā*) ¹²¹ [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 letters of increase, and considered two letters (‘, ā) as only one letter¹²² [i.e. the letters are: ‘, h, w, y, l, m, n, s, š, t)]. While Qerdahy cited eight letters only, where he considered four letter [h, l, i, š] outside the scope of the increasing letters of increase. They could be collected in: (‘*ənas māyōtā*), or (‘*asnī mawtā*)¹²³.

The letters of increase in **Mandaic** can be collected in (*š’tmūnīyhā*). Following are some examples: *šarhazta* horror / panic¹²⁴, *‘afrāštā* education¹²⁵, *tušlima* completion¹²⁶, *mixla* food¹²⁷, *ṭarūš(a)* deaf¹²⁸, *bInJAnA* building¹²⁹, rare in template *qutail* and usually from Arabic words¹³⁰, *ewīr(a)* blind¹³¹, *hēklā* temple (from *yākal*)¹³² and *xatāha* guilt / sin¹³³. Therefore the letters of increase in Mandaic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract two characters (s, l) from Arabic, and as increase by one character (š instead of s).

In **Ge'ez**, the letters can be collected in (*s’tmnāoei*). Following are some examples, *‘astašādala* (he) showed¹³⁴, *‘əgzi* mister¹³⁵, *ta‘aqaba* (he) watch out for¹³⁶, *manfas* soul¹³⁷, *bərhān* light¹³⁸ and *bā‘əl riḥ*¹³⁹. Then these Letters in Ge'ez are unlike the Arabic, as they detract four characters (l, w, y, h) from Arabic, and as they increase by short vowels, such as: *karabo* basket¹⁴⁰, *kufāle* Separation / division¹⁴¹, *ḥalāyi* singer¹⁴².

In **Amharic**, the letters can be collected in (*šs’tmnyaäei*). Some examples are given below. *ašqādaddämä* (causative from *qāddämä* to forward / to be at the forefront)¹⁴³, *‘aswässādä* (he) gave (*wässādä* he took)¹⁴⁴, *astawwāqä* (he) tells (from *awwāqä* he knows)¹⁴⁵, *adärräsä* (he) drove / connected¹⁴⁶, *tədar* marriage live (root: *darä*)¹⁴⁷, *mā-qabər* tomb / shrine¹⁴⁸, *näsäbraq* flash / spark (from *tänšābarräqä* shine / sparkle)¹⁴⁹, *näbälbal* flame / fire¹⁵⁰ and *qədmīya* precedence / priority¹⁵¹. These letters in Amharic are unlike those in Arabic, as they detract three characters (l, w, h) from Arabic, and increase by one character (š instead of s) and the vowels (ä, e, a and i) found in words such as *säbbärä* he broke¹⁵², *wəffar-e* obesity¹⁵³, *lämmada* educator¹⁵⁴, *sənəṭṭari* fragment¹⁵⁵. 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)¹⁵⁶, **-ännä** (or **-täñña** (*sär-ra-täñña* worker, from *sär-ra* work)¹⁵⁷, **-lla**, **-llo**, or **-lle** (gfrödalle / gfradolle active young)¹⁵⁸, **-äčča**, **-äčča**, **-öčča**, or **-učča** (*daräččan* edge from *dar* limit /edge)¹⁵⁹ and other morphemes¹⁶⁰. In Amharic, there is prefix morpheme with the meaning of English "of" or other meanings: **yä-** (*yä-kätäma*, literally: attributable to the city)¹⁶¹. If we add these morphemes to the letters of increase they form the word that can be collected in (*šs’tmnyaäei lchñ*).

2.0 Results and Conclusion

2.1 Concept of the increase:

The subject of increase 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 increase, 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 increase 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)¹⁶² or the subsequent (as cited by Ibn Ginny and his teacher Mazny); Therefore, we have launched the " absolute concept of increase" which does not differentiate between the types of increases according to the modern linguistic levels. It does not differentiate between phonetic and morphological increase, and syntactic and semantic increase. 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 to increase 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 except two or three pages¹⁶³. 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 increase. This means that the absolute concept itself was not inclusive or specific or accurate. Perhaps Ibn Usfour may step towards the definition of the increase in letters with non-absolute concept through the condition that every letter of increase must be a part (but not an original) of the word. That is the increase 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 morphological increases (such as feminization prefix and present suffixes) to his examples with the phonetic increases. We also found that he distinguished between grammatical increases (signs of decline) and morphological increases like Ibn Al Habib and the explainer of his book¹⁶⁴. He also distinguished between general increases and some morphological increases (suffixes of dual and plural) like Al Zamakhshari and the explainer of his book Ibn Yaish¹⁶⁵. 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 the increase 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 phonemic increases and morphemic increases (for example: definition's article, which is not a character from the increase in Arabic). The second distinguishes between phonemic increases and some morphemic increases (but not all) and without frequency. The subject of increase 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 mothers writing heritage, without a serious attempt to contribute to the renewal and without Vitriol or praising. The concept of the increase 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 increase. It seems that the problem is not solved yet where we find some of the examples do not distinguish between the phonemic increases and the morphemic increases, but mostly the increased letter is what increased 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 increase in the old Syriac came mostly non-absolute except some differences between linguists. From these differences, different concepts such as the absolute concept of increase sometimes; or the non-absolute concept of the increase has been introduced. But it doesn't distinguish between phonemic increases and morphemic increases. Finally we can say that the subject of the study needs to have a clear method in determining increases whether on the absolute level of language or non-absolute but not both together. The linguist should profess 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 increased 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 increase in Amharic is the prevailing or the predominant (by Leslau), as previously explained.

2.2 Quantum of the increase in letters:

In Arabic the increase letters are according to the non-absolute concept of increase. They are most likely ten letters. Linguists have collected them in many different words, the most famous is *sa'altum ūnīhā*. 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 increase in other Semitic languages. The increase 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 letter of increase, because original template has *purais* which changes to *purīs*.¹⁶⁶ The Akkadian collection increased from Arabic collection by two characters (š instead of s and E). 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 increases's letters could be collected in (*š'tmUnlJA*), unlike in Arabic, as they (in Akkadic) 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 letter of increase. In Hebrew they could be collected in (*š'tmUnlJhA*), unlike in Arabic, as they are decreased three characters (two consonants: s and l, and semi vowel w) from Arabic, and increased one character (š instead of s). In old Syriac they could be collected in (*šs'ltmUnlJhA*), unlike in Arabic, as they detract the semi vowel [w] from

Arabic, and as they are increased 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 increased by one character (š instead of s). In Ge'ez there are five consonants and four vowels (three short vowels: *oei* and one long vowel *ā*) could be collected in (*s'tmnāoei*) in contrast to Arabic, as they detract four characters (l, w, J, h) from Arabic, and as they increase by short vowels. There are six consonants, four vowels and a semi vowel [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 increased by one character (š instead of s) and the vowels. The increase 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'tmūnīyhār*). In Amharic they could be collected in (*šs'tmnyaäei lchñ*), i.e. by adding morphemic suffixes. Finally, we must mention that Ge'ez and Amharic are characterized by the increase of vowels at the end of words, which are not signs of decline in them.

3.0 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 "letters of increase" 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 increase 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 increase 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 increase 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 increase, 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 increase letters such as Indo-European languages.

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

4.0 Sources and references

4.1 Arab Sources and References

- السترايادي (رضى الدين): "شرح شافية ابن الحاجب" تحقيق محمد نور الحسن وآخرين, دار الفكر العربي, 1975م.
- ابن الأنباري (أبو البركات عبد الرحمن بن محمد): "الإنصاف في مسائل الخالف بين النحويين البصريين والكوفيين" تحقيق محمد محيي الدين عبد الحميد, المكتبة العصرية, صيدا - بيروت, 1987م.
- ابن جني (أبو الفتح عثمان): "المنصف" شرح لكتاب التصريف ألبي عثمان المازني" تحقيق الأستاذين إبراهيم مصطفى, وعبد اهلل أمين, ط1, 1373هـ - 1954م.
- حماد (د. محمد): "حروف الزيادة غير التقليدية" حولية الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية بإسالم آباد, باكستان, العدد الثاني, سنة 1992م.
- الحمالوي (الشيخ أحمد): "شذا العرف في فن الصرف" شرحه وصححه الدكتور حسنى عبد الجليل يوسف, مكتبة الآداب, 1991م.
- الخوري (القس بولس): "غرامطيق اللغة الآرامية, صرف ونحو" بيروت, ط2, 1962م.
- داود (أقلميس يوسف): "اللمعة الشهية في نحو اللغة السريانية" الموصل, 1896م.
- دريان (المطران يوسف): "كتاب اللتان في حرف لغة السريان" بيروت, 1913م.
- الرزقي (جرجس): "الكتاب في نحو اللغة الآرامية السريانية الكلدانية وصرفها وشعرها" بيروت, 1897م.
- الزبيدي (الندلسي) أبو بكر محمد بن الحسن: "طبقات النحويين واللغويين" تحقيق محمد أبو الفضل إبراهيم, دار المعارف, ط2, 1984م.
- سبويه, أبو بشر عمرو بن عثمان بن قنبر: "الكتاب" تحقيق وشارح عباد السالم محمد هارون, مكتبة الخانجي- القاهرة, 1988.
- السيوطي, جلال الدين عبد الرحمن: "الأشباه والنظائر في النحو" مراجعة وتقديم د فاليز ترحيني, دار الكتاب العربي, القاهرة 1993م.
- شاهين (د. عبد الرحمن محمد): "في تصريف الأفعال" مكتبة الشباب, القاهرة, 1984م.
- عبد الحميد, محمد محيي الدين: "دروس التصريف, القسم الأول: في المقدمات, وتصريف الأفعال" المكتبة العصرية, صيدا-بيروت, 1416هـ-1995م.
- ابن عصفور (علي بن مؤمن): "المتع في التصريف" تحقيق فخر الدين قباوة, حلب, 1970م.
- ابن عقيل: "شرح ابن عقيل" مكتبة دار التراث, ط20, القاهرة, 1980م.
- القرداحي (القس جبرائيل): "الحكام في صرف السريانية ونحوها وشعرها". د.ت.
- "إحكام الحكام في علم التصريف عند السريان" روما, 1924م.
- ابن منظور (محمد بن مكرم 711هـ-1311م): "لسان العرب" مطبعة بولاق, القاهرة, 1300هـ - 1307هـ.
- ابن يعيش (موفق الدين يعيش بن علي): "شرح المفصل" مكتبة المتنبى القاهرة, 1990م.
- يوسف (د. ظافر): "الأفعال الرباعية نشوؤها واستعمالها" (ص 1004 من مجلة مجمع اللغة العربية بدمشق) ج 4, المجلد 85, نو القعدة 1431هـ - تشرين الأول 2010م.
- يوسف (د. يسرية زكريا): "أثر النحاة العرب في فكر ابن جناح وتفسيره لحروف الزيادة" مجلة كلية اللغات والترجمة, العدد الثالثون, سنة 1999م.

4.2 Hebrew Sources and References:

1976. "לשון, ביבא לת", לאערזי "תאצוה" מילקשמה לכיה: "קחצי, יריניבא", 1971. "מילשורי, סמ ובואר תאצוה" גרדומ ירבע קודקד: "לואש, ילקרב", תרבה" תירבעה וושלב תומשה ילקשמ מע, ירבעה קודקדה תוחתפתה תודלות: "דוד, יליה", "שת, מילשורי, מ"עב" תלהק".
1981. "מילשורי, רפס תירק תאצוה" ישעמה קודקדה: "קחצי, הקדצ", הנבי תאצוה, נייטשנרוא עשוה"..." ותיטנו ויתוארה-לעפה, לעפה תרות: "דורב, וושש".

ג.1973 לשנת, ביבא לת, מ"עב

4.3 Western Sources and References

- Beer, Georg: " Hebräische Grammatik" B.I. 2.Auflage von D. Rudolf Meyer... Berlin, 1952.
 - Blau, Joshua: "A grammar of biblical Hebrew" Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1976.
 - Ibn Janah, Abul Walid Marwan : "Kitābu l-luma' " Ed. J . Derenbourg and William Bucher, Paris, 1886.
 - Glinert, Lewis: "The Grammar of Modern Hebrew" Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Kautsch, E.: " Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik" Leipzig, 1909.
- -: "Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar" second Edition. Oxford, 1976. • König, F.E.: "Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache" B.II, zweite Hälfte 1. Teil, Hildesheim-New York, 1979.
 - Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel: "A History of the Hebrew Language" edited by Raphael Kutscher, the Magnes press, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1964.
 - Leslau, Wolf: "Reference Grammar of Amharic" Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1995.
 - -: "Introductory Grammar of Amharic" Harrassowitz Verlag , Wiesbaden, 2000.
- Macuch, Rudolf: "Handbook of classical and Modern Mandaic" Walter De Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1965.
- -: "Neumandäische Chrestomathie mit grammatischer Skizze, kommentierter Übersetzung und Glossar" Ottoharrassowitz. Wiesbaden, 1989.
 - Nägelsbach, Carl Wilhelm Eduard: " Hebräische Grammatik" 2. Auflage, Leipzig, 1862.
 - Nöldeke, Theodor: "Mandäische Grammatik" bearbeitet von Anton Schall, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1964.
 - Olshausen, Justus: "Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache" Braunschweig, 1861.
 - Paul Joüon, S.J - T. Muraoaka: "A Grammar of biblical Hebrew" Roma, 1996.
 - Segert, Stanislav: "A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language" University of California press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1984.
 - Steuernagel, Carl.: "Hebräische Grammatik mit Paradigmen, Literature, Übungstücken und Wörterverzeichnis" 13. Auflage, Leipzig, 1961.
 - Tropper, Josef: "Ugaritische Grammatik" Ugarit – Verlag, Münster, 2000.
 - -: "Altäthiopische Grammatik des Ge'ez mit Übungstexten und Glossar" Ugarit – Verlag , Münster, 2002.
 - Ungnad, Arthur: "Hebräische Grammatik" Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1912.
 - -: "Grammatik des Akkadischen" 5., Auflage, München, 1969.
 - Von Soden, Wolfram: " Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik " 3., Auflage,

Roma, 1995.

- ¹ See:) شرح المفصل 7 154 (.
- ² 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] He is the first (Moaz bin Muslim Alharraa) [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.
- ³ See: (.329- 328 4 David "الكتاب").
opinion in Syriac close to the opinion of Hammad in non-traditional increase in Arabic, See: (داود: "اللمعة الشهية في نحو اللغة السريانية" ص 145). As well as consistent with the opinion of Joseph Derian, See: (.47 حاشية 3 ص 47).
- ⁵ See: (.235 4 "الكتاب").
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Ibid. P. 287.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Ibid. P.235-236.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ Ibid . P.287.
- ¹² Ibid . P.236.
- ¹³ Ibid . P.235.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Ibid. P. 237.
- ¹⁶ See:)794-793 2 "النصاف في مسائل الخالف" (د. ظافر يوسف: "الفعال الرباعية نشوؤها واستعمالها" ص 1004 and (ابن جني: "المنصف" 1 11).
- ¹⁷ See: (.11 1 "المنصف").
- ¹⁸ Ibid. 1/9.
- ¹⁹ Ibid. 1/15.
- ²⁰ See: (شرح شاقية ابن الحاجب 1 2) and about Ibn Alhagib's opinion... see section 2.
- ²¹ See: (ابن جني: "المنصف" 1 15).
- ²² See: (شرح المفصل 7 154).
- ²³ See: (الخوري: "غرامطيق اللغة الرامية" ص 23).
- ²⁴ See: (ابن عصفور: "المتع في التصريف" 1 201).
- ²⁵ See: (شرح شاقية ابن الحاجب 1 19).
- ²⁶ Ibid. 1/2.
- ²⁷ See: (.15 1 "المنصف") And about Ibn Ginny's opinion ... see section 1.
- ²⁸ Except Ibn Ganah in Hebrew.
- ²⁹ See: (شرح المفصل 5 99).
- ³⁰ Ibid. 5/40.³¹
- Leslau with his two books: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, and: Reference Grammar of Amharic, see sources and references.
- ³² See: Ibn Janah: "Kitab al-luma", P. 59-76; (الرزقي: "الكتاب في نحو الرامية" ص 351).
- ³³ See: Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S. 75.
- ³⁴ See for ex. Tropper: Ugaritische Grammatik, S.108. ³⁵ See for ex. Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 55.
- ³⁶ See: (.34 'מע, לעפה תרות: וושש.)
construction or template) לקשמ וייב weight, and (Some linguists differentiate between
- ³⁸ 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; and (.130 'ילקרב.)
- ³⁹ See : Blau: A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, P. 41.
- ⁴⁰ See: Ibn Janah: "Kitab al-luma", P. 62-70. ⁴¹ 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; (.130 מע, גרדומ' 34) and (מע, לעפה תרות: וושש.)
" (داود: "اللمعة الشهية" ص 146) See: (.42 الرزقي: "

- 43 See: (الكتاب في نحو الأرامية " ص 351) : (الفرداحي: "إحكام الأحكام" ص 12).
And (الفرداحي: "الإحكام في صرف السريانية" ص 70).
44 See: (داود: "اللمعة الشهية" ص 140-146).
45 Ibid. P. 146.
46 See: (الرزقي: " الكتاب في نحو الأرامية " ص 351) ; (الفرداحي: " إحكام الأحكام " ص 12) ;
(داود: " اللمعة الشهية " ص 140-141). and (الفرداحي: " الإحكام في صرف السريانية " ص 70).
Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49. And: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P. 230-239.
48 Only in
Amharic, P. 230-239. according to Noeldeke's opinion. See: temple לכי (from the root חלכה word
(Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.).
49 The Amharic letters (l, y, w, ñ, and ch) and the short mutated vowels are all suffixes
morphemic increases, not phonemic increases. They are therefore - supposedly - not
considered from letters of increase according the non-absolute concept of increase. however, they are
special increases of Amharic. See: Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.225-
244;
and: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49.
50 See: (السيوطي: "كتاب الشباه والنظائر في النحو" ص 252 1).
51 See: (" شرح ابن عقيل " 4 206). And (" الكتاب " 4 235-237).
52 See: (" شرح المفصل " 9 141).
53 See: (" لسان العرب " مادة " عسقف ")
54 See: (" الحمالوي: "شذا العرف" ص 50).
55 See: (" شرح شافية ابن الحاجب " 1 69).
56 See: (" الكتاب " 4 237).
57 Ibid . 4/236.
58 Ibid . 4/325.
59 Ibid . 4/237.
60 See: (" شرح شافية ابن الحاجب " 1 69).
61 See: (" الكتاب " 4 294-292).
62 See: (ابن جني: "المنصف" 1 25-26).
63 Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S.81.
64 Ungnad: Gramatik des Akkadischen, S. 44. Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S. 78; und Ungnad : Gramatik des Akkadischen,S. 43.
66 Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S.82.
67 Ibid. P.78, 79.
68 Ibid. P.75.
69 Ibid. P.89.
70 Ibid. P.74.
71 Ungnad: Gramatik des Akkadischen,S. 42.
72 Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, S. 74. Ibid. P.75.
73 Ibid. P.75.
74 Tropper: Ugaritische Grammatik, S.604, 605.
75 Ibid. P. 265.
76 Ibid. S. 269.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid. P. 261.
79 Ibid. P. 271.
80 Ibid . P.262.
81 Ibid . P.266.
82 Ibid.
83 Ibid. P. 266.
84 See: (" 187 ")
85 Ibid. P.171.
86 Ibid. P.178.
87 Ibid. P.171.
88 See: Ibn Janah: "Kitab al -luma", P. 49-56.
89 See: (" 171 ")
90 Ibid. P.188.
91 Ibid. P.172.
92 Ibid. P.171.
93 See: (" 137 , 136 , 128 ")
94 See: (" 171 ")

- ⁹⁴ König: "Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache" B.II, S.404.
- ⁹⁵ Kautzsch. "Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik" S. 108.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ There are unconfirmed assumptions about increase of some uncommon letters in the Hebrew words, such as prefix: *öakkABIš* spider, and *öaqrAB* Scorpion, *ö* [ö] in *öagUr* crane. And such as suffixes: *maçhete* *š* [š] *c+rmeš* in *öaKbAr* mouse; *r* [r] in *öagUr* crane. And such as suffixes: *ganzakkAv* *öYyallef* Bat; *f* [f] in *öaKšUB* Ankpoth of lupine; *B* [B] in *sirpAd* (a dander spiky plant). Therefore, *d* [d] in *rvaults*, with Persian suffix *-ak*, and 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.
- ⁹⁸ See: Kautzsch: "Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik" S. 245-248.
- ⁹⁹ Beer: "Hebräische Grammatik" B.I. S. 105-108.
- ¹⁰⁰ See: Steuernagel: "Hebräische Grammatik" S. 92.
- ¹⁰¹ See: Nägelsbach: "Hebräische Grammatik" S. 87-88; Olshausen: "Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache" S. 370-402; und Ungnad: "Hebräische Grammatik" S. 43-44.
- ¹⁰² Steuernagel: "Hebräische Grammatik" S. 92.
- ¹⁰³ Kautzsch: "Wilhelm Gesenius's Hebräische Grammatik" S. 248-249.
- ¹⁰⁴ See: (الخوري "غرامتيك اللغة الرامية السريانية" ص 148).
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶ See: (القرداحي: "الحكام في صرف السريانية ... " ص 70).
- ¹⁰⁷ See: (القرداحي: "الحكام الحكام" ص 11).
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid. P.11, 12.
- ¹⁰⁹ See: (الرزوي: "الكتاب في نحو الرامية" ص 351).
- ¹¹⁰ See: (القرداحي: "الحكام في صرف السريانية ... " ص 70).
¹¹¹ See: (الكتاب في نحو الرامية" ص 351, وراجع كذلك القرداحي: "الحكام في صرف السريانية" ص 70).
- ¹¹² See: (الرزوي: "الكتاب في نحو الرامية" ص 350).
See: (القرداحي: "الحكام الحكام" ص 11, وراجع: "الحكام في صرف السريانية ... " ص 70).
See: (الحكام الحكام " ص 11).
- ¹¹⁵ Ibid. And (داود: "اللمعة الشبيهة في نحو اللغة السريانية" ص 297-296).
- ¹¹⁶ See: (القرداحي: "الحكام الحكام" ص 11).
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸ See: (الخوري "غرامتيك اللغة الرامية السريانية" ص 23, 24).
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid. P.149.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid. and See: (داود: "اللمعة الشبيهة في نحو اللغة السريانية" ص 297-296).
- ¹²¹ See: (الرزوي: "الكتاب في نحو اللغة الرامية السريانية الكلدانية" ص 349).
- ¹²² See: (داود: "اللمعة الشبيهة في نحو اللغة السريانية" ص 145-144).
- ¹²³ See: (القرداحي: "الحكام في صرف السريانية ... " ص 69-70).
- ¹²⁴ Macuch: Handbook of classical and modern Mandaic, P. 187.
- ¹²⁵ Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.
- ¹²⁶ Macuch: Handbook of classical and modern Mandaic, P. 191.
- ¹²⁷ Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 56.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid. P.55.
- ¹²⁹ Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135-136.
- ¹³⁰ Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie ..., S. 55.
- ¹³¹ Ibid.
- ¹³² Nöldeke: Mandäische Grammatik, S. 135.
- ¹³³ Macuch: Neumandäische Chrestomathie, S. 55.
- ¹³⁴ Tropper: Altäthiopische Grammatik, S.108.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid. P.265.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid. P.107.
- ¹³⁷ Ibid. P.63.

- 138 Ibid. P.272.
 139 Ibid. P.56.
 140 Ibid. S.60.
 141 Ibid. S.59.
 142 Ibid. S.58.
 143 Ibid. P.486.
 144 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.99.
 145 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.490. 146
 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P .97-98. And: Reference Grammar of Amharic,
 P.473-480.
 147 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.228-229.
 148 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.47.
 149 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.229.
 150 Ibid. P.229.
 151 Ibid. P.225-226.
 152 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P. 86.
 153 Ibid. P.46
 154 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.220; Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P. 47.
 155 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.219-224.
 156 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.48; Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.230.
 157 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.47; Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.236.
 158 Leslau: Reference Grammar of Amharic, P.239.
 159 Ibid.
 160 Ibid. P.230-239 and: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.46-49.
 161 Leslau: Introductory Grammar of Amharic, P.48-49.
 162 See: (الرَّبِيدِي: "طبقات النحويين واللغويين" ص 66 , 72).
 163 See: (ابن جني: "المنصف: 11 1 , 13 , 15).
 164 See: (" شرح شافية ابن الحاجب " 2 1).
 165 See: (" شرح المفصل " 40 5).
 166 Ibid. P .75