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intends the substitution of every word by a synonym is to be rejected. At present, however, the originality of Dūrājdīn’s marks is given a more limited value, since his thoughts are to be placed within the context of his time (see Lidia Bettini, Linguæ e retorica nel V secolo, in Quaderni di Studi Arabi, vi [1988] (Atti del XIII Congresso dell’U.E.A.F.)).

E. Wagoner, Al-Nayfisaburu (Wiesbaden 1965, 246 and 333) gives examples of mu’ṣara by the ʿAbbābid poet Abū Nuwās [g.e.] and of those taken from him.

The concept of mu’ṣara is also frequently found in Andalusian poetry, e.g. in the work of Ibn Khāḍifā [g.e.]; apart from quotations of older Middle诗词 (muḍammāni), especially from the Eastern poets, he also uses real mu’ṣara in which he imitates Andalusian poets such as Ibn Sārā (Dīdār, ed. Ghāzi, 366, no. 306). The Hebreb Andalusian poets also imitated Eastern Arabic poetry, at least in their use of the “fever poem” of Moses ben Ezra, which is composed in the same rhyme and metre as the “fever poem” by al-Mutanabbi (see D. Samah, in Tarbiḥ, xxvii [1939], 397 ff).

In his book Dar Mu’ṣalifūl (Weimar 1897, 227-8), M. Hartmann showed that in the 7th/13th century especially, the mu’ṣara was a popular form of art among the Arabic muṣallab poets.

The concept of mu’ṣara is sometimes used as a deliberate act of homage. The poet composes his work in the same rhyme and metre, and in doing so, often tries to surpass the original. The imitating of someone’s work was also used sometimes as a deliberate act of homage. The concept of na‘dālī (‘polemic or contest or rebartee poems’) by, among others, Dūrājīr and al-Farazdaq [g.e.], however, is not regarded as an emulation or imitation, although poems which are based on this principle, or which imitated the Kūran, are sometimes included in collections of muṣaratā. This author realised that he could not delineate the various, related concepts of muṣaratā, naṣā‘ī (q.v.) and muṣarafa. A synonymyical term is perhaps muṣakāfī (see al-Hātīmī, Ḥujjat al-muṣarakah, Baghhdād 1979, ii, 28 ff). The concept of muṣaratā was in use as early as the period of the Dīhiyyān, when the two poets Imrū’l-Kays and Tarāfa b. ʿAbd [g.e.], competed with each other in their description of a hero’s death (two poems in the rhyme bi′). One ʿUmar Dūrī made acclaim as his arbiter (Aqānī, vii, 128 and vii, 194).

A separate place is occupied by the muṣaratā of the Kūran. It is likely that the imitating of the Kūran in this manner was regarded by most Arabs as a blasphemy. One such imitation of the Kūran, by al-Mutanabbi [g.e.], relates to his supposed pretentions to being a prophet. The seventeen-year old poet composed, in the year 232/943, a large number of the “(admonitions)”, which imitated Kūranic verses from the Meccan period. One verse appears to have been preserved (F. Gabrieli, Studi su al-Mutanabbi, Rome 1972, 5-6; R. Blachère, Un poète arabe du IVe siècle, Aboe t-Tayyib al-Muṣaraf, Paris 1935, 67, al-Badi‘ī, al-Sahī al-muṣarrab [an ḥaṣabjūl al-Mutanabbi, Cairo 1963, 55 ff.). Another poet, al-Muṣarr ab [g.e.], is reckoned for imitating the Kūran. HisKillāl al-Fusul, see L. Īlīyāt, which relates cryptic verses and allusions, provoked his contemporaries to accuse the poet of attempting to criticise the Kūran. (Moustapha Saleh, in BEJ, xliii [1969], 142, 146; P. Smoor, Kings and Bedouins in the palace of Aleppo, Manchester 1985, 215-16). On the other hand, many poets are said to have imitated another work by al-Muṣarr ab, called the Muḏīr al-sahīl, and written in rhymed prose. In this context, we may point to the Ḥabhām yinat al-kalām by Ibn al-Qāfūr al-Kalābī (see Saleh, op. cit., 150-1; Idrīs Ṣabīn, Taḥāfiq al-Nābi al-adabī [ed. W. Abu ‘Arab, Beirut 1978], 500 ff.). This poet authorised that he could not surpass his example.

In the field of literary theory, ʿAbd al-Kūhār al-Dūrājdīnī [g. e. in Suppl.] in his Dīdāl al-sīgās is generally regarded as the first to have developed original ideas about the muṣaratā. Von Grünbaum (Kritik und Dichkwst, 112, see also 120) says that Dūrājdīnī interprets the concept of muṣaratā as a stylistic imitation of a certain passage with the purpose of surpassing the predecessor. According to Dūrājdīnī, the explanation which says that muṣaratā

MU'ANNATH [see MUDihuKAR]

MU'ARBAH (a.) “imitation”. This term indicates in Arabic literature imitation or emulation; the poet composes his work in the same rhyme and metre, and in doing so, often tries to surpass the original. The imitating of someone’s work was also used sometimes as a deliberate act of homage. The concept of na‘dālī (‘polemic or contest or rebartee poems’) by, among others, Dūrājdīnī and al-Farazdaq [g.e.], however, is not regarded as an emulation or imitation, although poems which are based on this principle, or which imitated the Kūran, are sometimes included in collections of muṣaratā. This author realised that he could not delineate the various, related concepts of muṣaratā, naṣā‘ī (q.v.) and muṣarafa. A synonymyical term is perhaps muṣakāfī (see al-Hātīmī, Ḥujjat al-muṣarakah, Baghhdād 1979, ii, 28 ff). The concept of muṣaratā was in use as early as the period of the Dīhiyyān, when the two poets Imrū’l-Kays and Tarāfa b. ʿAbd [g.e.], competed with each other in their description of a hero’s death (two poems in the rhyme bi′). One ʿUmar Dūrī made acclaim as his arbiter (Aqānī, vii, 128 and vii, 194).

A separate place is occupied by the muṣaratā of the Kūran. It is likely that the imitating of the Kūran in this manner was regarded by most Arabs as a blasphemy. One such imitation of the Kūran, by al-Mutanabbi [g.e.], relates to his supposed pretentions to being a prophet. The seventeen-year old poet composed, in the year 232/943, a large number of the “(admonitions)”, which imitated Kūranic verses from the Meccan period. One verse appears to have been preserved (F. Gabrieli, Studi su al-Mutanabbi, Rome 1972, 5-6; R. Blachère, Un poète arabe du IVe siècle, Aboe t-Tayyib al-Muṣaraf, Paris 1935, 67, al-Badi‘ī, al-Sahī al-muṣarrab [an ḥaṣabjūl al-Mutanabbi, Cairo 1963, 55 ff.). Another poet, al-Muṣarr ab [g.e.], is reckoned for imitating the Kūran. His Killāl al-Fusul, see L. Īlīyāt, which relates cryptic verses and allusions, provoked his contemporaries to accuse the poet of attempting to criticise the Kūran. (Moustapha Saleh, in BEJ, xliii [1969], 142, 146; P. Smoor, Kings and Bedouins in the palace of Aleppo, Manchester 1985, 215-16). On the other hand, many poets are said to have imitated another work by al-Muṣarr ab, called the Muḏīr al-sahīl, and written in rhymed prose. In this context, we may point to the Ḥabhām yinat al-kalām by Ibn al-Qāfūr al-Kalābī (see Saleh, op. cit., 150-1; Idrīs Ṣabīn, Taḥāfiq al-Nābi al-adabī [ed. W. Abu ‘Arab, Beirut 1978], 500 ff.). This poet authorised that he could not surpass his example.

In the field of literary theory, ʿAbd al-Kūhār al-Dūrājdīnī [g. e. in Suppl.] in his Dīdāl al-sīgās is generally regarded as the first to have developed original ideas about the muṣaratā. Von Grünbaum (Kritik und Dichkwst, 112, see also 120) says that Dūrājdīnī interprets the concept of muṣaratā as a stylistic imitation of a certain passage with the purpose of surpassing the predecessor. According to Dūrājdīnī, the explanation which says that muṣaratā

MU'ARBAH (a.) “imitation” [see MUHARAKAR]

MU'ARAB (a.) denotes an arabicised loan or foreign word. During their intensive study of the Arabic language, the Arab philologists did not fail to notice that foreign words were being introduced into the Arabic language. They were called muṣaratā (from Smara ‘in arabicase’, w. in the same manner, occurs also) and often also ṣa‘ān (adjectival, penetrat). A difference between these two terms cannot be determined. The modern language completely loses the loan words which were integrated into the Arabic of pre and early Islamic times (from Smara ‘in arabicase’), while those of the post-classical period are called muṣaratā. However, the term is occasionally used with only rare exceptions of loan words, but to all kinds of linguistic neologisms which came up in post-classical Arabic. The difference between muṣaratā and muṣarafa is not taken into consideration by all philologists, and in muṣaratā often in the general term for ‘foreign word’.

MU'ARRAH in his Muzhir, consistently