Offprint

Inhalt

Aufsätze

A Book on Arabic Inflexion According to the System of the Greeks: a Lost Work by Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ B. Isʜᴀ̄ǫ

Nadia Vidro[1]

The Cairo Genizah, a collection of manuscript fragments from the Ben Ezra Synagogue in Old Cairo, preserved a number of otherwise unknown grammars of Classical Arabic.[2] These grammars survive in Judaeo-Arabic and were copied by Jews interested in attaining a solid knowledge of Classical Arabic. Among the newly identified works is a fragmentarily preserved treatise on Arabic inflexion that does not belong to the Arabic grammatical tradition. It uses concepts and terminology characteristic of philosophers, logicians and scholars familiar with Greek grammar. Bibliographical information on a similar kind of treatise is preserved in the *Fihrist* of Iʙɴ ᴀʟ-Nᴀᴅɪ̄ᴍ, who writes that a grammar entitled *Kitāb Aḥkām al-iʿrāb ʿalā maḏhab al-yūnāniyyīn* was composed by a famous physician, philosopher, and translator of Gᴀʟᴇɴ and other Greek works Aʙᴜ̄ Zᴀʏᴅ Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ ʙ. Isʜᴀ̄ǫ ᴀʟ-ʿIʙᴀ̄ᴅɪ̄ (809–873 CE).[3] A book on Arabic grammar by Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ ʙ. Isʜᴀ̄ǫ is also mentioned by Eʟɪᴀs ᴏꜰ Nɪsɪʙɪs (975–1046) in *Maǧālis*.[4] Furthermore, a grammar according to the Greek logicians, which may or may not be identical with Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ's treatise, is referred to by Mᴜʜᴀᴍᴍᴀᴅ ʙ. Aʜᴍᴀᴅ ᴀʟ-Kʜᴡᴀ̄ʀɪᴢᴍɪ̄ (10th century) in *Kitāb Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*.[5] However, this work has hitherto not been identified and its existence has been doubted in research literature.[6]

---

1   Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies, University College London; 319, Foster Court, Malet Place, London, WC1E 6BT. Email: n.vidro@ucl.ac.uk.

2   Vidro, Kᴀsʜᴇʀ (2014), Vɪᴅʀᴏ (forthcoming).

3   Iʙɴ ᴀʟ-Nᴀᴅɪ̄ᴍ, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Fʟᴜ̈ɢᴇʟ (1872: I, 294)). On Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ ʙ. Isʜᴀ̄ǫ and his works see Iʙɴ Aʙɪ̄ Usᴀʏʙɪʿᴀ, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ* (Mᴜ̈ʟʟᴇʀ (1884: I, 184–200)), Iʙɴ ᴀʟ-Nᴀᴅɪ̄ᴍ, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Fʟᴜ̈ɢᴇʟ (1872: I, 294–95)), Sᴀʾᴅɪ (1934), Bᴇʀɢsᴛʀᴀ̈ssᴇʀ (1925), Mᴇʏᴇʀʜᴏꜰ (1926), Sᴛʀᴏʜᴍᴀɪᴇʀ (EI³, voc. *Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq*). On Ḥᴜɴᴀʏɴ ʙ. Isʜᴀ̄ǫ's grammar of Arabic see Mᴇʀx (1889: 105–106), Sᴀʾᴅɪ (1934: 436, no. 171), Sᴇᴢɢɪɴ (1984: IX, 232–33).

4   Eʟɪᴀs ᴏꜰ Nɪsɪʙɪs, *Maǧālis* (Cʜᴇɪᴋʜᴏ (1923: 59)).

5   ᴀʟ-Kʜᴡᴀ̄ʀɪᴢᴍɪ̄, *Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm* (ᴠᴀɴ Vʟᴏᴛᴇɴ (1895: 46)).

6   Cᴀʀᴛᴇʀ (1972: 71–72). Sᴇʀɪᴋᴏꜰꜰ (2018) proposed an alternative theory suggesting that this work was a grammar of the Greek language.

In this article I present an edition and English translation of the newly identified grammar, accompanied by an initial assessment of its contents and language. I discuss the text's authorship and suggest that the grammar may, indeed, be associated with Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq.

The treatise and its author

Hitherto, only five folios of the grammar discussed in this article have been identified.[7] It is clear that the text is incomplete. Fortunately, an introduction to the second discourse has survived among the identified fragments and it allows us a glimpse into the structure of the work.[8] The introduction shows that the work is divided into discourses (*maqālāt*) devoted to different categories of grammar (*funūn al-naḥw*). The first discourse is not preserved but references to it in the beginning of the second discourse testify that it dealt with parts of speech and gave "a definition of each part (of speech), a categorisation of accidents that it requires and what is derived from it".[9] The second discourse is dedicated to the correct pronunciation of utterances (*qirāʾat al-kalām ʿalā l-ṣawāb*) by using the appropriate vowels, *hamza* and *tanwīn,* and eliding such letters as *alif, nūn, waw* and *yāʾ* where necessary. In the introduction it is explained that the discourse presents the inflexion of different parts of speech using rules (*ǧumal*) "known to the Greeks as *kanons* (*qawānīn*)".[10] Due to the state of the manuscripts, it is not clear whether the work originally comprised more than two discourses. Inflexion rules are the main subject matter in all fragments and it is not unlikely that all preserved text belongs to the second discourse.

    While describing the rules of inflexion, the author considers each part of speech separately and presents a number of rules that apply to it. In contrast with the traditional tri-partite division into nouns (*ism*), verbs (*fiʿl*) and particles (*ḥarf*) accepted among Arab grammarians, the author states that "in Arabic there are seven types of parts of speech".[11] He mentions the following word types: *ism, kalima, rābiṭ, ḥālifa, wāsiṭa, wāṣila, ḥāšiya.* Although the discourse dedicated to parts of speech has not survived, one can learn the meaning of these terms from a treatise on logic *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ al-mustaʿmala fī l-manṭiq* by a renowned Arabic philosopher and logician Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (d.

---

7 For details of the manuscripts see below, *Manuscripts.*

8 New York, JTS ENA 3173.1

9 New York, JTS ENA 3173.1r.

10 New York, JTS ENA 3173.1r.

11 Manchester, Rylands B 3653v.

950 CE), where the same seven categories are discussed.[12] AL-FĀRĀBĪ distinguishes between nouns (*ism*), verbs (*kalima*) and five types of particles. He contrasts the logicians' term *kalima* with the grammarians' term *fiʿl* and explains that Arab grammarians have no vocabulary for different kinds of particles (*ḥurūf*) making it necessary for him to use Greek grammatical terms instead.[13] The five types of particles are:

> 1. *ḫawālif* (substitutes): pronouns, which include independent personal pronouns, possessive suffixes, object suffixes, suffixes of the suffix conjugation and demonstratives;

> 2. *wāṣilāt* (articles, lit. articulations, joints[14]): particles of definiteness *al-* and *allaḏī* (sic!), vocative particles, as well as particles expressing the ideas of the whole and the part, e.g. *kull* and *baʿḍ*;

> 3. *wāsiṭāt* (intermediaries): prepositions, such as *min*, *ʿan*, etc.;

> 4. *ḥawāšin* (commentative particles,[15] lit. margins, glosses): particles confirming existence, e.g. *inna*, particles of negation, e.g. *laysa*, *lā*, particles of conjecture, e.g. *laʿalla*, various interrogatives, such as *hal*, *mā*, *kayfa*, *kam*, etc.;

> 5. *rawābiṭ* (binding elements): various conjunctions, such as *immā*, *ammā*, *in kāna*, *illā anna*, *min qibali*, *fa-iḏan*.

The listed categories and their names derive from a description of Greek in *Tekhnē Grammatikē* attributed to DIONYSIUS THRAX (ca. 170–90 BCE).[16] This division of speech serves the purposes of the discipline of logic, and words are categorised differently than in the Arabic grammatical tradition. Thus, *laysa* and *kull*, which in AL-FĀRĀBĪ's classification are particles, are viewed by the grammarians as a verb and a noun respectively.[17]

In the Genizah fragments edited here the usage is similar. A verb is referred to as *kalima* (T-S Ar 31.30v, *passim*). The independent pronoun *anta*, the pronominal suffixes *-ka*, *-hu*, etc. and demonstratives, such as *hātāni* and *tānika*, belong to a class of words termed *ḫālifa* (Manchester, Rylands B 3652). A particle, most probably *kāf*, is said to be a *ḫālifa* (pronoun) if it stands in

---

12 AL-FĀRĀBĪ, *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ* (MUḤSIN (1968: 41–56)). See also ESKENASY (1988), GAETJE (1971), HADDAD (1969: 205–207).

13 AL-FĀRĀBĪ, *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ* (MUḤSIN (1968: 41–42)).

14 Corresponding to the Greek *arthra* (GAETJE (1971: 12, 15)).

15 Corresponding to the Greek *epirrhēma* "adverb", which is defined as something that explains or expands the meaning of the verb (see GAETJE (1971: 15)).

16 DIONYSIUS THRAX, *Tekhnē Grammatikē* (UHLIG (1883: 22–101 (para 11–20)), translated in KEMP (1987: 176–85). On the Greek origins of AL-FĀRĀBĪ's terminology see VERSTEEGH (1977: 51–54, 121–22), GAETJE (1971).

17 AL-FĀRĀBĪ remarks so himself (MUḤSIN (1968: 45-46)).

place of a noun and a *rābiṭ* (conjunction) if it stands for *min qibali* (Manchester, Rylands B 3652v).[18] The definite article *al-* is designated as a *wāṣila* (article, Manchester, Rylands B 3653v). Despite the lacuna at the end of Manchester, Rylands B 3653v, it seems certain that the relative pronouns *allatī* and *allaḏayni*, as well as the vocative particles *yā* and *ayyuhā* are articles, too (Manchester, Rylands B 3653r). Among the commentative particles (*ḥawāšin*) are mentioned *an, anna, ḥattā, lām* of negation, *lā*, etc. (Paris, AIU IX.A.6v), as well as *wāw, bāʾ* and other particles that introduce an oath (Paris, AIU IX.A.6r).

The fragments' connection with Greek grammar and the philosophical-logical tradition of language description is futhermore evident in the terminology used for grammatical persons, number and inflexion. In Arabic linguistics grammatical persons are referred to by the terms *al-mutakallim* (the speaker), *al-muḫāṭab* or *al-muḫāṭab al-muwāǧah* (the addressee) and *al-ġāʾib* (the absentee). In contrast, the author of the fragments uses the terms first, second and third persons (lit. faces, *waǧh, awǧuh*):[19]

> A verb has three persons (*awǧuh*): the first, the second and the third. The first is from whom the utterance is. The second is who is addressed with the utterance. The third is who is pursued by the utterance.[20] (Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30v).

The term *waǧh* for a grammatical person is a translation of the Greek *prosopon* (lit. face, mask). It was used by AL-FĀRĀBĪ in a section on the discipline of grammar in the classification of the sciences *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm*.[21] The above given definition itself strongly resembles the Greek definition in *Tekhnē Grammatikē*, which in a literal translation reads:

> There are three persons, first, second and third. The first is from whom the utterance is. The second is to whom the utterance is. And the third is about whom the utterance is.[22]

As to the terminology for the grammatical number, the Arab grammarians do not use a hypernym for the concept of "number" and always refer to the singular, dual or plural. However, such hypernym seems to be employed in the fragments edited here. When discussing the vocalisation of the final *kāf*

---

18 See footnote 52.

19 In the annotated Hebrew translation of T-S Ar 31.30 on the website of the Friedberg Jewish Manuscript Society (https://fjms.genizah.org), the three faces are understood as referring to the three cases. As the following quotation demonstrates, this interpretation is untenable.

20 The Judaeo-Arabic expression used to define the third person is not entirely unclear, see footnote 54.

21 AL-FĀRĀBĪ, *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm* (MULAḤḤAM (1996: 21)). See also VERSTEEGH (1977: 62n53).

22 DIONYSIUS THRAX, *Tekhnē Grammatikē* (UHLIG (1883: 51 (para 13))).

of demonstratives, such as *tilka*, *tānika*, and *ulāʾika*, the author uses the phrase "the three numbers" (*al-aʿdād al-talāta*) in parallel to "the singular, the dual and the plural":

> It belongs to the inflexion of pronouns that *kāf* of the masculine in the singular, the dual and the plural is always vocalised with *fatḥa*. And in the feminine in the three numbers it is vocalised with *fatḥa* (Manchester, Rylands B 3652r).

The hypernym "numbers" (*arithmoi*) is used in *Tekhnē Grammatikē*: "There are three numbers – singular, dual and plural."[23]

Finally, the term *taṣrīf*, which in the Arabic grammatical tradition stands for "alterations of words, excluding the declensional endings (*iʿrāb*)"[24], is used in the fragments to denote case and inflexion:

> The case markers (*atar al-taṣrīf*) [on relative pronouns] are clear only in the dual, both masculine and feminine. Thus, in the masculine you say *alladāni* in the nominative case and in the accusative and the genitive *alladayni* (Manchester, Rylands B 3653r).
> In Arabic these verbs do not require the same cases (*taṣrīf*) as are required by the nouns which are described by them. ... But their basic form according to them is the indicative (Manchester, Rylands B 3653v).

This usage tallies well with the use of the term in the translations of Greek philosophical and logical writings, where *taṣrīf* stands for all morphological changes, including inflexion.[25]

Formulating rules of inflexion is not the sole objective announced in the introduction to the text's second discourse. The author also intended to provide an exhaustive explanation of an issue that

> all grammarians of Arabic neglected, namely the division of speech into units (*maqāṭiʿ al-kalām*) and the coming out of sound (*maḫraǧ al-ṣawt*) in each of them according to what speakers of Arabic instinctively know and attest to its correctness by their natural dispositions, even though no prescription had been made for this purpose in the grammar books written for them. This is a general issue found in all languages that I am acquainted with and have heard people speak, including Greek and Syriac, which I speak proficiently, as well as Persian, Byzantine Greek and Coptic, which I know a little and have heard people speak them. I reckon that it is found in the rest of the languages because it is an instinctive thing in the natural constitution and

---

23 DIONYSIUS THRAX, *Tekhnē Grammatikē* (UHLIG (1883: 30 (para 12) and 51 (para 13)).

24 VERSTEEGH (EI[2], voc. *Taṣrīf*).

25 VERSTEEGH (EI[2], voc. *Taṣrīf*), TROUPEAU (1981).

> disposition that speech should occur in this way (New York, JTS ENA 3173.1v).

Although the terms *maqāṭiʿ* and *maḫraǧ* make one think of articulation, the author does not appear to refer to phonetics, which is covered in Arabic grammatical works, for example, in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.[26] It is more likely that the subject matter here is intonation groups, pauses and punctuation. Indeed, the author continues:

> The benefit to this chapter of establishing the punctuation (lit. pointing)[27] is very significant. Nay even Galen says that when signs were set for these units, i.e. the three dots, the Greeks acquainted themselves with them and ... them in obscure books that are difficult to understand and comprehend. This is because they show one the right way, guide one and indicate to him the meanings of speech while deterring, protecting and preventing him from moving away from what was intended by the author of a text over to something different (New York, JTS ENA 3173.1v).

Unfortunately, the relevant sections of the text have not survived. However, the "three dots" in the indirect quotation from Galen are reminiscent of Dionysius Thrax's discussion of punctuation, where three types of *stigmí* "dots" are described:

> There are three punctuation marks (lit. dots) – the full, the intermediate, and the subordinate. The full marks the completion of the sense, the intermediate is used to show where the reader can take a breath, and the subordinate is used if the sense is not yet complete but still lacks something.[28]

Some information on the text's author can be extracted from the fragments, in addition to his knowledge of the Greek grammatical tradition and Galen. Firstly, the author mentions his mastery of Classical Greek and Syriac together with some familiarity with Persian, Byzantine Greek, and Coptic. Secondly, in examples illustrating various points of grammar the author sometimes uses the name Abū Zayd and once the name Ḥunayn. Whereas the use of Abū Zayd in examples is common, that of Ḥunayn is extremely rare. In the Greek tradition, grammarians are known to have used their own names or those of their teachers in giving examples,[29] and it is not impossible that the same may be the case in our grammar. The names Abū Zayd and Ḥunayn, together with

---

26 Al-Nassir (1993).

27 This translation follows my emendation of the text. See footnote 39.

28 Dionysius Thrax, *Tekhnē Grammatikē* (Uhlig (1883: 7 (para 4)), translated in Kemp (1987: 173).

29 Versteegh (1977: 39–40 and footnote 11 there).

the author's knowledge of Greek, Syriac, Persian, Greek terminology and Galen, suggest that the discussed fragments are associated with Abū Zayd Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq al-ʿIbādī. A Nestorian Christian, who lived and worked in Iraq, Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq was proficient in Arabic, Syriac and Classical Greek.[30] He acquired Persian during his medical studies in Gandeshapur.[31] Having studied in Byzantium and later visited it in search of Greek manuscripts, he would have been familiar with Byzantine Greek.[32] He could have heard and also learned some Coptic while looking for manuscripts in Egypt.[33] If this is so, the fragments discussed here may stem from the first hitherto identified copy of Ḥunayn's book on Arabic inflexion according to the method of the Greeks in two discourses (*maqālatān*) entitled *Kitāb Aḥkām al-iʿrāb ʿalā maḏhab al-yūnāniyyīn*.[34] Additional support for this identification can, perhaps, be derived from a report of Elias of Nisibis according to whom Ḥunayn explained in his book on Arabic grammar that the Arabs "have no way of knowing obscure meanings, as the Syrians have it" (*laysa lahum naḥw yaʿrifūna minhu al-maʿānī al-ġāmiḍa kamā lil-siryāniyyīn*).[35] This is reminiscent of the passage in the present text that the Greeks used punctuation to facilitate the understanding of obscure books (*al-kutub al-ġāmiḍa*), whereas Arab grammarians neglected this issue.[36]

---

30 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Flügel (1872: I, 294).

31 Saʾdī (1934: 410, 416).

32 Strohmaier (EI³, voc. *Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq*), Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Flügel (1872: I, 243)), Gutas (1998: 136–38).

33 Bergsträsser (1925: 39, no. 115).

34 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Flügel (1872: I, 294)). See also Merx (1889: 105–106), Saʾdī (1934: 436, no. 171), Sezgin (1984: IX, 232–33).

35 Elias of Nisibis, *Maǧālis* (Cheikho (1923: 59).

36 It must be noted that Elias of Nisibis places this passage in the third discourse (*al-maqāla al-ṯāliṯa*) of Ḥunayn's book, whereas in the text edited here it belongs to the second discourse. Ibn al-Nadīm speaks of a treatise by Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq in two discourses (*maqālatān*). Unless Ibn al-Nadīm and Elias of Nisibis speak of two different works, an error must be assumed in one of the accounts, either factual or scribal/editorial. Indeed, الثالثة is not an implausible misreading for الثانية.

Manuscripts

Hitherto I have identified five folios of the grammar: New York, JTS ENA 3173.1 (1 folio); Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30 (1 folio); Manchester, Rylands B 3652 (1 folio); Manchester, Rylands B 3653 (1 folio); Paris, AIU IX.A.6 (1 folio).[37] The fragments are on paper, with a full page measuring roughly 19 × 12 cm and containing ca. 23 lines.

   The preserved text clearly starts on New York, JTS ENA 3173.1r. Apart from the two Manchester fragments, the folios are not consecutive and the size of the lacunae is uncertain (judging by the number of lines on a complete page of the manuscript, nine lines of text are missing of each page in Manchester, Rylands B 3652 and Manchester, Rylands B 3653). My tentative reconstruction of the order of the pages is based on the order in which parts of speech are discussed by AL-FĀRĀBĪ in *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ* and by inner-textual considerations.

   The fragments are copied in an end of the 11th–12th-century handwriting. They exhibit a consistent marking of diacritics on those Hebrew letters that can represent more than one Arabic character. A number of signs are used: oblique strokes above the letters גדכת indicate ث خ ذ غ respectively. A dot above the letter is used on טצ for ظ and ض. A dot below is added to ג to indicate ح. Somewhat unexpectedly, every letter פ in the fragment is marked with an oblique stroke above, presumably to imitate the dot on the Arabic ف.[38] Additional marking of whole words and phrases by pairs of supralinear dots or dots shaped into triangles is used to signpost headings, examples and some words in the text that are deemed significant.

   The fragments are in Hebrew script with no admixture of words in Arabic characters. Few transliteration mistakes are found in the text. These are generally caused by an incorrect interpretation of Arabic graphemes written without diacritical dots. Examples include אלת[פ?]ט for النقط (New York, JTS ENA 3173.1v) and אלואפיה for النافية (Paris, AIU IX.A.6v). There are isolated cases of Hebrew and Arabic vocalisation, including a *tanwīn ḍamma* written as two *ḍammas* next to each other (Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30v).

Notes on the edition

The text of the grammar is edited here in two versions: in Arabic and in Judaeo-Arabic. The Judaeo-Arabic version is a near faithful representation of the manuscripts and reproduces all significant scribal mistakes and the

---

37 ENA 3173.1 is described with excerpts in MAMAN (2006: 522–23). T-S Ar 31.30 is transcribed and translated into Hebrew on the website of the Friedberg Jewish Manuscript Society https://fjms.genizah.org.

38 Cf. CONNOLLY (2018: 14–15 and footnote 4).

marking of diacritical dots and vowels, although supralinear dots are used instead of oblique strokes on גדכפת. Supralinear dots used in the manuscripts to highlight headings and examples are not represented in the edition so as not to clutter the text. Common copying mistakes, such as dittography, are corrected in the Judaeo-Arabic version and mention is made of them in footnotes. The Arabic edition is an attempt to reconstruct the original work underlying the Judaeo-Arabic version. It is intended to make the grammar more easily accessible, firstly, by using Arabic script current in scholarly discourse on the Arabic grammatical tradition, and secondly, by suggesting emendations for the transliterator's mistakes. The reconstruction does not aim to recover the exact *Vorlage* that served the Jewish copyist, and does not classicize Middle Arabic features found in the surviving fragments, which may or may not have existed in their *Vorlage*.

In the edition square brackets [*abc*] are used to mark up characters that were originally present in the manuscripts but are no longer legible or are absent due to holes. In the Arabic reconstruction angled brackets < *abc* > are used to mark up editorial additions. Transliteration mistakes are set in **bold** in the Judaeo-Arabic version, and correction suggestions are incorporated into the Arabic reconstruction without markup.

Text

New York, JTS ENA 3173.1r

מן הדֿא [אל]פן אלאול ואנא אכֿדֿ פֿי אלפֿן אלדֿי ...

من هذا الفن الأول وأنا آخذ في الفن الذي ....

בע[ד] אן אקטע הדֿה אל[מקא]לֹה ....

بعد أن أقطع هذه المقالة ....

ו...הז? ללפֿן אלתֿ[א]נֹ[י] מקאלה תֿאני[ה] ....

و...هز؟ للفن الثاني مقالة ثانية ....

אלמקאלה אלתֿאניה

المقالة الثانية

אני קד פֿרגֿת פי אלמקאל[ה] [א]לתי קבל הדֿה מן אלפֿן אלדֿי

إني قد فرغت في المقالة التي قبل هذه من الفن الذي

קצדת אליה מן נחו אלערביה **פֿדאת** בה לאנה אול

قصدت إليه من نحو العربية فبدأت به لأنه أول

פנ[ו]ן [אלנחו] ו[ה]ו תקסים אלכלאם אלי אקסאמה

فنون النحو وهو تقسيم الكلام إلى أقسامه

אלאול אלמפֿרדה ותחדיד כל קסם מנהא ותצניף

الأول المفردة وتحديد كل قسم منها وتصنيف

אללואחק אלתי תלזמה ומא יתפֿרע מנהא אדֿ

اللواحق التي تلزمه وما يتفرع منها إذ

אתית על[י] דֿלך ען אכֿרה פֿאני אכֿדֿ פֿי אלפֿן

أتيت على ذلك عن آخره فإني آخذ في الفن

אלתֿאני מן אלנחו והו קראה אלכלאם עלי אלצואב

الثاني من النحو وهو قراءة الكلام على الصواب

בתחריך מא ינבגֿי אן יחרך באלצֿמה ואלפתחה

بتحريك ما ينبغي أن يحرك بالضمة والفتحة

ואלכסרה ותסכין מא ינבגֿי אן יסכֹן והמז מא

والكسرة وتسكين ما ينبغي أن يسكَن وهمز ما

ינבגֿי אן יהמז ותנוין מא ינבגֿ[י] אן ינון ואסקאט

ينبغي أن يهمز وتنوين ما ينبغي أن ينون وإسقاط

אלנון או אלאלףֿ או אלואו או אליא מא ינבגֿי אן יסקט

النون أو الألف أو الواو أو الياء ما ينبغي أن يسقط

מנה   ואקצד אלי מא ילזם קסמא קסמא מן

منه   وأقصد إلى ما يلزم قسما قسما من

אקסאם אלכלאם ואפֿרדה עלי [חֹ?]דה ואצף גֿמל

أقسام الكلام وأفرده على حدة؟ وأصف جُمل

אעראבה בֿ... כלאם אקדר עליה ואבלגֿה פֿי

إعرابه بِـ... كلام أقدر عليه وأبلغه في

אסתיפֿא .... חתי נחתוי מ[גֿ]רי?

استيفاء .... حتى نحتوي مجرى؟

אלטרק ואלמדֿאהב [מ]ן [אל]גֿמל אלתי תערפה

الطرق والمذاهب من الجمل التي تعرفه

אליונאניין באלקואנין ואבתדי באלקסם אלאול פֿאצף
اليونانيين بالقوانين وأبتدئ بالقسم الأول فأصف

מא ילזמה מן אלאעראב על[י] טריק אלקואנין פֿיה
ما يلزمه من الإعراب على طريق القوانين فيه

תם אתבעה אלדֿי יתלוה עלי אלולי אלדֿי תקדם
ثم أتبعه الذي يتلوه على الولاء الذي تقدم

New York, JTS ENA 3173.1v

... ונטֿאמי להא עליה ואסלך פֿי [גֿ]מיעהא
... ونظامي لها عليه وأسلك في جميعها

.... [אל]י אן אפֿרגֿ מנהא ...
.... إلى أن أفرغ منها ...

.... תם .... [א]מרא מן אל...
.... ثم .... أمرا من الـ...

אגֿפֿלה גֿמיע אצחאב נחו אלערביה מן מקאט[ע]
أغفله جميع أصحاب نحو العربية من مقاطع

אלכלאם ומכֿרגֿ אלצות פֿי כל ואחד מנהא עלי
الكلام ومخرج الصوت في كل واحد منها على

מא יתעארפֿה אהל אלערביה בפֿטרהם וישה[ד]ון
ما يتعارفه أهل العربية بفطرهم ويشهدون

עלי צחתה בקראיחהם ואן כאן לם ירס[ם] להם
على صحته بقرائحهم وإن كان لم يرسم لهم

פֿיה אלי הדֿה אלגֿאיה רסם פֿימא וצֿע להם מן
فيه إلى هذه الغاية رسم فيما وضع لهم من

כתב אלנחו והו אמר עאם מוגֿוד פֿי גֿמיע מא
كتب النحو وهو أمر عام موجود في جميع ما

אשרפֿת עליה מן אלאלסן וסמעת אהלה יתכלמון
أشرفت عليه من الألسن وسمعت أهله يتكلمون

בה מן אליונאני ואלסריאני ואנא אתכלם בהמא

به من اليوناني والسرياني وأنا أتكلم بهما

ואחכמהמא ומן אלפֿארסי ואלרומי ואלקבטי

وأحكمهما ومن الفارسي والرومي والقبطي

וקד שדות מנהא שיא וסמעת אהלהא יתֿכֿ

وقد شدوت منها شيئا وسمعت أهلها

יתכלמון בהא ואחסבה מוגֿודא פי סאיר אלאלסן

يتكلمون بها وأحسبه موجودا في سائر الألسن

לאנה כאנה אמר גֿריזי פֿי אלפֿטרה ואלטבע אן

لأنه كأنه أمر غريزي في الفطرة والطبع أن

יגֿרי אלכלאם עליה ומנפֿעה **אלתֿ[פֿ?]ט** להדא אלבאב

يجري الكلام عليه ومنفعة النقط؟[39] لهذا الباب

ואקאמתה ע[ט֯]ימה גֿדא חתי אן גֿאלינוס יקול

وإقامته عظيمة جدا حتى إن جالينوس يقول

אנה מתי וצֿעת אעלאם תלך אלמ[קאט]ע והי נקט

إنه متى وضعت أعلام تلك المقاطع وهي نقط

תֿל[ת] תערפהא אליונ[אניון] .... בהא פֿי

ثلث تعرفها اليونانيون .... بها في

אלכתב אלגֿאמצֿה אלמסת[גֿל]קה ען אלפֿהם ואלמוקﭫ

الكتب الغامضة المستغلقة عن الفهم والموقف

לאנהא תסדדה ותרשדה ותדלה עלי מעאני אל

لأنها تسدده وترشده وتدله على معاني

כלאם ותחצרה ותחוטה ותמנעה מן אן יזול עמא

الكلام وتحصره وتحوطه وتمنعه من أن يزول عما

קצד אליה מנהא צאחב אלכלאם אלי גֿירה ואבלג מן שרח

قصد إليه منها صاحب الكلام إلى غيره وأبلغ من شرح

---

39 This emendation is based on the similarity of the Arabic graphemes التفط and النقط when
written without diacritical dots. An alternative suggestion is to reconstruct التفطن "to
know, understand".

ذلك ما أرجوا אן יעטֹם מנפَעתה למן נטֹר פֿיה אן שא אללה:

ذلك ما أرجوا أن يعظم منفعته لمن نظر فيه إن شاء الله:

Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30r

מאלה ו[א]ן פתחת אלדֹאל פֿקלת לא תצֹרב זידא

ماله وإن فتحت الذال فقلت لا تضرب زيدا

או תאכֹד מאלה כאן אלמעני פֿי דֹלך לא תצֹרב

وتأخذ ماله كان المعنى في ذلك لا تضرب

זידא ואנת תאכֹד או קד אכֹדת מאלה

زيدا وأنت تأخذ أو قد أخذت ماله

וכדֹלך תקול לא תאמר באלמערוףֹ ותכפֿר באללה

وكذلك تقول لا تأمر بالمعروف وتكفر بالله

פֿאדֹא סכנת אלרא מן תכפֿר כאן אלמעני לֹא תאמר

فإذا سكنت الراء من تكفر كان المعنى لا تأمر

באלמערוףֹ ולא תכפֿר באללה ואן פֿתחת אלרא

بالمعروف ولا تكفر بالله وإن فتحت الراء

כאן אלמעני לֹא תאמר באלמערוףֹ ואנת כאפֿר

كان المعنى لا تأمر بالمعروف وأنت كافر

באללה וקד יגֹרי הדֹא פֿי גֹיר אלנהי הדֹא אלמגֹרי

بالله وقد يجري هذا في غير النهي هذا المجرى

בעינה מא כאן מן אלזמאן גֹיר מוצוףֹ תאבעא

بعينه ما كان من الزمان غير موصوف تابعا

ללפֿעל או אלאנפֿעאל פֿהו נצב מן דֹלך אנך

للفعل أو الانفعال فهو نصب من ذلك أنك

תקול סיר בפֿלאן נהארא או לילא או דהרא

تقول سير بفلان نهارا أو ليلا أو دهرا

ואן וצפֿת אלזמאן ארתפֿע תקול סיר בפֿלאן דהר

وإن وصفت الزمان ارتفع تقول سير بفلان دهر

אלטויל וכדֹלך אן כאן אלזמאן **מחדודא** תקול

طويل وكذلك إن كان الزمان محدودا تقول

סיר בפלאן שהר או אלסנה פֿאן כאן אלזמאן

سير بفلان شهر أو السنة فإن كان الزمان

אנמא הו וקת נצבתה תקול צֿרב פֿלאן סָחַרַא

إنما هو وقت نصبته تقول ضرب فلان سحرا

כאן אדֿא אצֿיפֿת אלי מא אלתעגֿב או אלאנכאר

كان إذا أضيفت إلى ما التعجب أو الإنكار

פֿאנהא אן כאנת מתקדמה מע מא כאן אלנצב

فإنها إن كانت متقدمة مع ما كان النصب

קאימא פֿי אלאסם ואן תאכֿרת קלבת[40] אלאסם

قائما في الاسم وإن تأخرت قَلبت الاسم

אלי אלרפֿע מן דֿלך אנך תקול מא כאן אטרףֿ

إلى الرفع من ذلك أنك تقول ما كان أظرف

זידא פֿאדֿא אכֿרת כאן רפֿעת תקול מא

زيدا فإذا أخرت كان رفعت تقول ما

אטרףֿ מא כאן אבו זיד למכאן אנך תקול

أظرف ما كان أبو زيد لمكان أنك تقول

מא אטרף מא כנת באלתא וקד יגֿוז אן ידכֿל

ما أظرف ما كنت بالتاء وقد يجوز أن يدخل

הדֿא פֿי אחכ[א]ם אלאסם אלכלמה **אלמתֿנאה**

هذا في أحكام الاسم الكلمة المثناة ‹أو›

Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30v

אלמגֿמועה באלנון או אלמונתֿה באלקול פֿי חאל

المجموعة بالنون أو المؤنثة بالقول في حال

אלרפֿע אדֿא אצֿפֿתהא אלי נפֿסך [ת]כתב בנונין

الرفع إذا أضفتها إلى نفسك تكتب بنونين

מתֿאל דֿלך אנך תקול תלומאנני [ו]תלומונני

مثال ذلك أنك تقول تلومانني وتلومونني

---

40 Initially written קבלת and corrected in the margins to קלבת.

ותלומנני ותכתב פّי חאל אלנצב בנון ואחדה

وتلومينني وتكتب في حال النصب بنون واحدة

תקול **תّلوמאני** וחתי תלומוני וחתי תלומ[יני]

تقول <حتى> تلوماني وحتى تلوموني وحتى تلوميني

כל כלמה תקדם אלאסמא פّהي מוחדה

كل كلمة تقدم الأسماء فهي موحدة

כאנת אלאסמא מתֶّנאה או כאנת מגֶّמועה

كانت الأسماء مثناة أو كانت مجموعة

ואדֶّא אכֶّרתהא ואתבעתהא בעד אלאסמא

وإذا أخرتها وأتبعتها بعد الأسماء

פّאן כאן אסמאן או אסם **במֻתَّني** תֶّنית

فان كان اسمان أو اسم مثنى ثنيت

ואן כאן אכَתֶّר מן אסמאן או אסם מגֶّמוע

وإن كان أكثر من اسمان أو اسم مجموع

גֶّמעת מתֶّאל דֶّלך אנך תקול קאל זיד ועמר

جمعت مثال ذلك أنك تقول قال زيد وعمرو

פאן אכרת קאל וקדّمت זידא ועמרא קלת

فإن أخرت قال وقدمت زيدا وعمرا قلت

זידֶّ ועמرֶّ קאלא וכَדֶّלך תקול קאל אלרגֶّלאן

زيدٌ وعمروٌ قالا وكذلك تقول قال الرجلان

פّאן אכֶّرت קלת אלرגֶّלאן קאלא וכَדֶّלך פّי

فإن أخرت قلت الرجلان قالا وكذلك في

אלגֶّמע תקול קאל חניν וזידֶّ ועמרֶّ פّאן

الجمع تقول قال حنين وزيدٌ وعمروٌ فإن

אכֶّרت קלת קאלו וכَדֶّלך תקול קאל אלرגֶّאל

أخرت قلت قالوا وكذلك تقول قال الرجال

פّאن אכֶّرت קלת קאלו **קּד** קלנא אן אלכלמה

فإن أخرت قلت قالوا   قد قلنا إن الكلمة

תׄלתה אוגׄה אלאול ואלתׄאני ואלתׄאלת ואן
ثلثة أوجه الأول والثاني والثالث وإن

אלאול הו אלדׄי מנה אלקול ואלתׄאני הו אלדׄי
الأول هو الذي منه القول والثاني هو الذي

יואגׄד באלקול ואלתׄאלת הו אלדׄי יסתקפי
يواجه بالقول والثالث هو الذي يستقفى

באלקול ואן פי כל ואחדٍ מן הדׄה אפׄראד
بالقول وإن في كل واحدٍ من هذه إفراد

וגׄמע **פׄי** בעצׄהא תתׄניה פאלאפׄראד
وجمع ‹و›في بعضها تثنية فالإفراد

ואלגׄמע פי אלוגׄה אלאול רפׄע אבדא אלא אן יקע
والجمع في الوجه الأول رفع أبدا إلا أن يقع

Manchester, Rylands B 3652v

כׄאלפׄה ותכון ראבטא פׄאדׄא כאן כׄאלפׄה
خالفة وتكون رابطا فإذا كان خالفة

קאם מקאם אסם כנחו קולך ערפׄתך
قام مقام اسم كنحو قولك عرفتك

תוׄפׄ... ודל[ך] דעאני אלי אלתׄקה בך או יקאל
توف... وذلك دعاني إلى الثقة بك أو يقال

ד......... אלי אלתׄקה בך ואדׄא [כאן] ראבטא
د...... إلى الثقة بك واذا كان رابطا

[קאם מקא]ם מן קבל כנחו קולך מא ותׄקת
قام مقام من قبل كنحو قولك ما وثقت

.... מני בעדׄרך אני מן
.... مني بعذرك إني من

.... בעדׄרך וקד יגׄוז אן ידכׄל פׄי
.... بعذرك وقد يجوز أن يدخل في

.....................א ויגׄוז א[ן] ידכׄל פׄי ע[?]ד אלאסמא
............ا ويجوز أن يدخل في عدد؟ الأسماء

.... [מן] קבל   [ומ]ן [א]לרפّע פֿי אל[כֿאלפֿ]ה
.... [من] قبل   ومن الرفع في الخالفة

ואנ[ת] [ודא]ל אלמערפֿה **והו נטֿאירהא** מן אל
<أنا> وأنت ودال[41] المعرفة ونظائرها من

מונת ומתֿני הדֿה וגֿמעהא ומן אלנצב
المؤنث ومثنى هذه وجمعها ومن النصب

פֿיהא [א]יّאי ואיאךֿ ואיאה ודֿאל אלנכרה
فيها إياي وإياك وإياه ودال[42] النكرة

ונטֿאי[ר]הא מ[ן] אל[מ]ّונתֿ ותתֿניה הדֿה
ونظائرها من المؤنث وتثنية هذه

[וגֿ]מעהא ומן אל[כֿפֿ]ץֿ פֿ[י]ה[א] כלמא א...فֿ
وجمعها ومن الخفض فيها كلما أ...ف

....עהא וא.....
.............................عها وا.........

....
....

Manchester, Rylands B 3652r

רפֿע והאתֿין נצב וכפֿֿץֿ ותאנך רפֿע ותינך נצב
رفع وهاتين نصب وخفض وتانك رفع وتينك نصب

[ו]כֿפֿֿץֿ   ומן אעראב אלכֿאלפֿה א[ן] כאף אל[מד]כר מן
وخفض ومن إعراب الخالفة أن كاف المذكر من

אלמפֿר[ד] ואלמתֿני ואלמגֿמוע מפֿתו[חה] אב[דא]
المفرد والمثنى والمجموع مفتوحة أبدا

ומן אלמונתֿ פֿי? אלאעדאד אלתלתֿה מפֿ[תוחה] ...
ومن المؤنث في؟ الأعداد الثلثة مفتوحة ...

תוגֿבה אלכֿאלפֿה מן [אל]אעראב פֿי...........................
توجبه الخالفة من الإعراب فيِ ....

---

41 Or وذال. See footnote 53.

42 Or وذال. See footnote 53.

אלכ̇אלפה אלמולפ̇ה מע אלכלמה ....
الخالفة المؤلفة مع الكلمة ....

... מע אלואסטה פ̇י אלאעדאד ....
... مع الواسطة في الأعداد ....

...אל...ל...... אמרא פ̇א[נ]הא תרפ̇ע ....
...الـ..لـ... أمرا فإنها ترفع ....

[מ]ן [דל]ך [אנ]ך תקול אב[ו זיד] קד פ̇המ[תה] ....
من ذلك أنك تقول أبو زيد قد فهمته ....

יע?...... חקה. ומתי כאנת פ̇...................
يعَ؟...... حقه. ومتى كانت فـ................

[מפ]עול בה נצב מן ד̇לך אנך תקול אבא זי[ד]
مفعول به نصب من ذلك أنك تقول أبا زيد

[א]כרמת וקד יג̇וז אן ידכ̇ל הד̇א אלבא[ב] פי ק
أكرمت وقد يجوز أن يدخل هذا الباب في

קואנין אעראב [א]לאסם   קוא[נין] אעראב
قوانين إعراب الاسم   قوانين إعراب

פי [אל]ואסטה   ..דמ.......... [א]לואצלה תסע בין?
في الواسطة   ..دمـ........ الواصلة تسع بين؟

א.....................................ולאכ̇.................
ا.....................................ولاخـ.................

.......................אכ̇א.....................
.......................اف.....................

....
....

Manchester, Rylands B 3653v

ולד̇לך קלת אן אצנאף̇ אקסאם אלכלאם פ̇י
ولذلك قلت إن أصناف أقسام الكلام في

אלערביה סבעה וליס ילזם פ̇י אלערביה
العربية سبعة وليس يلزم في العربية

הדֹה אלכלם מן אלתצריף *מא

هذه الكلم من التصريف ما

ילזם אלאסמא אלתי תנעת בהא*[43]

يلزم الأسماء التي تنعت بها

.... לכן אצלהא ענדהם באלרפֹע

.... لكن أصلها عندهم بالرفع

.....................א חרףֹ מן חרוף אלנצב פֹ

..................ا حرف من حروف النصب ﻒ

.... [ק]ד עדדנא תלך אלאחרף פֹי

.... قد عددنا تلك الأحرف في

[אלקאנון אלס]אדס מן קואנין אעראב אלכלמה וליס

القانون السادس من قوانين إعراب الكلمة وليس

....................רהם אלכפֹץ ולא שי מן אלכל[ם] [אל]א

.....................رهم الخفض ولا شيء من الكلم إلا

[א]דֹא וקע עליהא אלגֹזם תם תבעהא אסם

إذا وقع عليها الجزم ثم تبعها اسم

מצֹאף אליה ואצלה אלף לאם כמא קלנא פי אל

مضاف إليه واصلة ألف لام كما قلنا في

קאנון אלסאבע מן קואנין אע[ראב] אלכלמה

القانون السابع من قوانين إعراب الكلمة

קואנין אעראב [אל]כלמה אלואצלה

قوانين إعراب الكلمة الواصلة

[קד ק]לנא פימא וצֹפֹנ[א] ... אלואצלה פי אלמ[ק]אלה

قد قلنا فيما وصفنا ... الواصلة في المقالة

.............................הדֹה אן מן אל...............ת...........

.... هذه أن من الـ .... ت ....

---

43 The manuscript reads מא ילזם אלאסמ אלדֹי ינעת בה כמא ילזם אלאסמא אלתי תנעת בהא, which appears to be a reduplication or two different attempts at deciphering the Arabic Vorlage.

.... לَאם ול.................ה...........
.... لام ولـ.....................ـه.............

....
....

Manchester, Rylands B 3653r

ואמא פّי אלמונתֹ פّפّי מתֹל קולך **אלת** ואללתאן
وأما في المؤنث ففي مثل قولك التي واللتان

ואללאתי ואמא אתֹר אלתצריף פֿאנמא יבין
واللاتي وأما أثر التصريف فإنما يبين

פّי אלמתֹני פّקט מן אלמדֹכר ואלמונתֹ ודֹלך אנך
في المثنى فقط من المذكر والمؤنث وذلك أنك

תקול פّי אלמדֹכר פّי אלרפّע אללדֹאן ופّי אלנצב
تقول في المذكر في الرفع اللذان وفي النصب

ואלכّפֿץֹ אללדֹין ופّי אלמונתֹ פّי אלר[פّע אללתאן]
والخفض اللذين وفي المؤنث في الرفع اللتان

ופّי אלכّפֿץֹ ואלנצב אללתין ....
وفي الخفض والنصب اللتين ....

אלנדא יא ואיהא ויא תרפّע ....
النداء يا وأيها ويا ترفع ....

מצֹאפّא אלי שّי כמא קיל פّי בא[ב] ....
مضافا إلى شيء كما قيل في باب ....

נע[ת אלד]ֹי יצֹאפֿ אלי אלאסם יגֻוז ....
نعت الذي يضاف إلى الاسم يجوز ....

אן ינצב ואדֹא נאדית בנכרה נצבת
أن ينصب وإذا ناديت بنكرة نصبت

תקול יארגֻלא ויארגֻלאן ואן כאן איצֹא מעה
تقول يا رجلا ويا رجلان[44] وإن كان ايضا معه

---

44 The expected form is يا رجلين.

נעת נצבתה בגﹾיר תנוין ואדֹא נאדית

نعت نصبته بغير تنوين وإذا ناديت

במערפֹה רפֹעת וקד יגﹾוז אן יכון אלנדﹶא פֹﹻי

بمعرفة رفعت وقد يجوز أن يكون النداء في

אלמערפֹה בﹻיא ו[בא]ﹻיהא ובהמﹶא גﹶמ[ﹻיע]א דﹶ[לﹻך]

المعرفة بيا وبأيها وبهما جميعا ذلك

[אנך] תק[ול יﹶא איהا אﹾ]לרגﹸל ויﹶארגﹸלﹶא[ﹺן] ....

أنك تقول يا ايها الرجل ويارجلان. ....

........א................רא מצאﹺ[ﹾף] ....

........اﹻ..........رﹻا مضاف ....

................................תﹻ...............................

...............................ت....................

....

....

Paris, AIU IX.A.6v

....

....

................................הﹶדֹא אלכﹶפֹ....

................................هذا الكف....

...............................יﹻוגﹸב אלכﹶפֹﹾﹺﬞ .....

....يوجب الخفض ...

................................ﹺﬞת כלﹶאהﹸמﹶא ....

....ت كلاهما .....

.......................פﹻﹺי בﹶאב קﹶואﹺנﹻין אל

....في باب قوانين ال

...............................לﹾﹶא אﹶלﹾﹶא מפﹾרדﹶה

.............................لا إلّا مفردة

.... אסתﹺתﹾﹶנﹶא [אלﹾ]קﹻלﹻיל מן אלכﹶתﹻﹾﹻיר

.... استثناء القليل من الكثير

.... [?י] קע עליה מן דלך אנך תקול דֹהב
.... يقع عليه من ذلك أنك تقول ذهب

.... זידא ויכון גֹואבבא⁴⁵ למא **אלנאפֹיה**
.... زيدا ويكون جوابا لما النافية

..כון .... יקע עליה רפֹעא מן דֹלך אנך
..كون .... يقع عليه رفعا من ذلك أنك

תקול מא דֹהב אלא אבו זיד   ומא דל מן אל
تقول ما ذهب الا ابو زيد   وما دل من

חואשי עלי אלאיגֹאב בשריטה ו[ע]ל[י] אלאנכאר
الحواشي على الإيجاب بشريطة وعلى الإنكار

פֹמתֹל אן כֹפיפה **ולן** וחתי [וכי] וכילא וכימא
فمثل أن خفيفة ولن وحتى وكي وكيلا وكيما

ולאן ולאן לא ואללאם עלי כ[י] ולאם אלגֹחוד
ولأن ولأن لا واللام على كي ولام الجحود

פֹכלהא תנצב אלכלמה אלתי מכֹרגֹהא מכֹרג זמאן
فكلها تنصب الكلمة التي مخرجها مخرج زمان

מסתקבל וחתי כא............... אפֹרדת מע
مستقبل وحتى كا............. أفردت مع

אסם קט ולם יכן מעהא כלמה להֹא **כֹّאצّת**
اسم قط ولم يكن معها كلمة لها خاصة

כֹפֹצֹת דֹלך אלאסם אלדֹי תפֹרד מעה פֹّאעלא
خفضت ذلك الاسم الذي تفرد معه فاعلا

כאן או מפֹעולא מן דֹלך אנך תקול תכלם אל
كان أو مفعولا من ذلك أنك تقول تكلم

.[נ]אס כלהם חתי אבי עמרֶّו   פֹّאן אצֹّפֹת אלי אל
الناس كلهم حتى أبي عمرُو   فإن أضفت إلى

[א]סם כלמה קבלה כאנת או בעדה רפֹّעת אל
الاسم كلمة قبله كانت أو بعده رفعت ال

---

45 The manuscript reads גֹואבבֹנא, where the dot inside the nun probably marks it for deletion.

Paris, AIU IX.A.6r

....

....

.... הדה? ....

.... هذه؟ ....

תהא ולא ....

.......تها ولا ....

ל פٰיהא ....

.........ل فيها ....

[אל]ראבע מן קואני[ן] ....

الرابع من قوانين ....

ויקום מקאם ליס ....

ويقوم مقام ليس ....

ויכון נהיא פٰיכון חכם....................

ويكون نهيا فيكون حكم....................

[א]לראבע מן קואנין אלכלמה ותכון לא ....

الرابع من قوانين الكلمه وتكون لا ......

ולא הי מן טריק אלכٰבר איצٰא ומא ....

ولا هي من طريق الخبر أيضا وما ....

אَעני בין קולך לא ובין קולך ולא ....

أعني بين قولك لا وبين قولك ولا ....

תרפٰע **תנוין** ויגٰוז אן תנצב בלא תנוין [ומן] דלך

ترفع بتنوين ويجوز أن تنصب بلا تنوين ومن ذلك

אנך תקול לא כٰוفْ עליהם ולא הם יחזנון

أنك تقول لا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون

ותקול לא ח[ול ו]לٰא קו֕רה אלא באללה. ומא דל **עלי**

وتقول لا حول ولا قوّة إلا بالله. وما دل من

אלחואשי עלי אל[קס]ם מתֿל אלואו **ואליא** ואלמים
الحواشي على القسم مثل الواو والباء[46] والميم

ואליא מע אלמים [פ]כלהא תכֿפֿץ אלאסם אלדֿי יקסם
والياء مع الميم فكلها تخفض الاسم الذي يقسم

בה מן דֿלך אנך תקול ואלל[ה] מא כאן פֿיכֿפֿץ אלהא
به من ذلك أنك تقول والله ما كان فيخفض الهاء

מן אללה ובאללה מא כאן [מ]תֿלה **ותא אללה** מא
من الله وبالله ما كان مثله وتالله ما

כאן מתֿלה **ולים** אללה מא כאן מתֿלה
كان مثله وليم الله ما كان مثله

פֿאן אסקטת אלחואשי וגֿרדת אלאסם אלדֿי
فإن أسقطت الحواشي وجردت الاسم الذي

יקסם בה פֿאנך מתי חלפֿת נצבת אלל[ה]
يقسم به فإنك متى حلفت نصبت الله

מא כאן כדֿי פֿתפֿתח אלהא מן [א]ללה. ומתי
ما كان كذى فتفتح الهاء من الله. ومتى

חלפֿת כֿפֿצֿת תקול אללה מא פֿעלת ....
حلفت خفضت تقول الله ما فعلت ....

<hr>

Translation

New York, JTS ENA 3173.1r

... of this first category. And I will start with the category which ......
after I end this discourse ....
..... the second discourse to the second category ....

The second discourse
In the preceding discourse I finished (discussing) the category of the Arabic grammar
that I intended (to discuss). I began with it because it is the first
category of grammar, namely, the division of speech into parts.
Firstly, simple expressions: a definition of each part (of speech), a categorisation
of accidents that it requires and what is derived from it. Then
I exhausted this subject to the end. Now I begin with the second category
of grammar, namely, the correct pronunciation of utterances:
using a vowel where *ḍamma*, *fatḥa* or
kasra are required; pronouncing without a vowel what should be made vowelless; hamzating
what should be hamzated; nunating what should be nunated; dropping
the *nūn*, *alif*, *wāw* and *yā'* where they should be dropped.
I intend (to address) what is necessary for each part of speech one by one.
I will treat (each part of speech) separately and will describe the rules
of its inflexion in ...... speech that I am able to and I will attain it
fully .... so that we fully cover the course of
paths and ways of the rules that are known
to the Greeks as *kanons*.[47] I will begin with the first part (of speech) and will describe
the inflexion that it requires by way of rules that apply to it.
Then I will follow it up with the next one in the sequence (of parts of speech) which was (mentioned) before

New York, JTS ENA 3173.1v

and in my ordering of them according to it. I will proceed with all of them
.... until I finish them ....
..........Then.................. a matter pertaining to the ....
all grammarians of Arabic neglected, namely the division
of speech into units and the coming out of sound in each of them according

---

47 Arab. *qawānīn*, for rules or paradigms.

to what speakers of Arabic instinctively know and attest to

its correctness by their natural dispositions, even though no prescription had been made

for this purpose in the grammar books written for them. This is a general issue found in all

languages that I am acquainted with and have heard people speak,

including Greek and Syriac, which I speak

proficiently, as well as Persian, Byzantine Greek and Coptic,

which I know a little and have heard people

speak them. I reckon that it is found in the rest of the languages

because it is an instinctive thing in the natural constitution and disposition that

speech should occur in this way. The benefit to this chapter of establishing the punctuation[48] is very significant. Nay even Galen says

that when signs were set for these units, i.e. the three

dots, the Greeks acquainted themselves with them and ...... them in

obscure books that are difficult to understand and comprehend. This is

because they show one the right way, guide one and indicate to him the meanings

of speech while deterring, protecting and preventing him from moving away from

what was intended by the author of a statement over to something different. I will provide an exhaustive explanation

of this which, I hope, will be of great benefit to him who studies it, so God will.

Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30r

his money. But if you vocalise the *ḏāl* with *fatḥa* and say *lā taḍrib Zaydan wa-taʾḫuḏa mālahu*, it means "Do not beat

Zayd while you are taking or had already taken his money".

Similarly, you can say *lā taʾmur bi-l-maʿrūfi wa-takfur bi-llāhi*.

If you vocalise the *rāʾ* of *takfur* with a *sukūn*, it means "Do not enjoin

what is right and do not be infidel". But if you vocalise the *rāʾ* with *fatḥa*,

the meaning is "Do not enjoin what is right while you are infidel".

It goes in the exact same way (with other constructions) that are not prohibitions.

If a time (expression) without an attribute follows

an active or a passive verb, it takes the accusative. For example, you can say *sīra bi-fulānin nahāran aw laylan aw dahran*.

---

48 This translation follows my emendation of the text. See footnote 39.

But if you describe the time, you put it in the nominative. Say *sīra bi-fulānin dahrun ṭawīlun.*
Similarly, if the time is limited, you say
sīra bi-fulānin šahrun aw al-sanatu. But if the time is
a (specific) moment, you use the accusative and say *ḍuriba fulānun saḥaran.*
If *kāna* is added to *mā* of wonder or of denial
and is fronted together with *mā*, the noun stays
in the accusative.[49] But if it is postponed, then it turns the noun
into nominative. For example, you say *mā kāna aẓrafa
Zaydan.* But if you postpone *kāna*, you use the nominative and say *mā
aẓrafa mā kāna Abū Zaydin* like you say
mā aẓrafa mā kunta with *tāʾ*.[50] It is possible to subsume
this under the rules of nouns. When a verb in the dual or

Cambridge, T-S Ar 31.30v

plural form with *nūn*, or in feminine sigular is used in a statement in the
indicative, if you connect it to yourself, you write two *nūns*.
For example, you say *talūmāninī, talūmūnanī*
and *talūmīnanī*. But in the subjunctive you write only one *nūn*.
You say *ḥattā talūmānī, ḥattā talūmūnī,* and *ḥattā talūmīnī.*
Every verb that comes before the (subject) nouns is singular,
be the nouns dual or plural.
But if you postpone it and make it follow the nouns,
then if (the subject) is two nouns or a dual noun, you use the dual form (of
the verb).
If there are more than two nouns or a plural noun,
you use the plural (verb form). For example, you say *qāla Zaydun wa-ʿAmrun.*
But if you postpone *qāla* and put *Zayd* and *ʿAmr* before it, you say
Zaydun wa-ʿAmrun qālā. And you also say *qāla al-raǧulāni.*
But if you postpone, you say *al-raǧulāni qālā.* Similarly, in
plural you say *qāla Ḥunaynun wa-Zaydun wa-ʿAmrun.* But if
you postpone, you say *qālū.* Similarly, you say *qāla al-riǧālu.*
But if you postpone, you say *qālū.* We said earlier that a verb
has three persons (lit. faces): the first, the second and the third.
The first is from whom the utterance is. The second is who is
addressed with the utterance. The third is who
is pursued by the utterance.[51] Each of them has a singular form

---

49 As in the present tense of the construction.

50 I.e. the 2ms suffix.

51 The Judaeo-Arabic expression *yustaqfā bi-l-qawl* used to define the 3rd person is not
entirely clear. Form X of the root *q.f.w* usually means "to strike someone on the neck"
and can also mean "to make someone to follow someone or something" and "to avail

and a plural form, and some of them have a dual form. The singular
and the plural in the first person are always in the indicative except when
they are affected by ...

Manchester, Rylands B 3652v

a pronoun or it can be a conjunction. If it is a pronoun,
it takes the place of a noun, as when you say *ˁaraftuka*
... *wa-ḏalika daˁānī ilā al-ṯiqa bika* or it is said
.... *ilā al-ṯiqa bika.* If it is a conjunction
it takes the place of *min qibali* as when you say *mā waṯiqtu*
.... *minnī bi-ˁuḍrika. innī min*
.... *bi-ˁuḍrika.*[52] It is possible to count it among
.... and it is possible to count it among nouns .....
.... *min qibali.*   To the nominative among the pronouns belong
anā and *anta,* the *dāl* (or *ḏāl*?) of the definite[53] and similar forms
in the feminine, dual and plural. To the accusative
among them belong *iyyāya* and *iyyāka* and *iyyāhu,* the *dāl* (or *ḏāl*?) of the
indefinite
and similar forms in the feminine, dual
and plural. To the genitive among them belongs everything that .....
....
....

Manchester, Rylands B 3652r

the nominative and *hātayni* is the accusative and the genitive. *tānika* is the
nominative and *taynika* is the accusative
and the genitive. It belongs to the inflexion of pronouns that *kāf* of the
masculine in
the singular, the dual and the plural is always vocalised with *fatḥa.*
And in the feminine in the three numbers it is vocalised with *fatḥa* ...

---

oneself of somebody's absence (in order to do something behind his back)". The
meaning "to pursue, to examine, to study" is suggested by BLAU in one case (2006: 559).
An alternative translation may be "somebody who is construed as absent by the
utterance". I thank Professor Geoffrey KHAN for this suggestion.

52 The name of the intended particle has not survived. The preserved parts of the examples
suggest that the particle is *kāf*, used as a 2ms pronominal suffix *-ka* and as the
inseparable *ka-*. Equating *ka-* with *min qibali* demands an explanation. AL-FĀRĀBĪ lists
min qibali among causative conjunctions (*rawābiṭ*; *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ* (MUḤSIN (1968: 56)).
Since the particle *ka-* discussed here is also a conjunction (*rābiṭ*) rather than a
preposition (*wāsiṭa*), the reference may be to the use of *min qibali/min qibali an/min
qibali mā* and *ka-an/ka-anna* in the sense of "because" (BLAU (2006: 526, 582)).

53 The expressions *dāl* (or *ḏāl*) of the definite and *dāl* (or *ḏāl*) of the indefinite (see below)
are not clear. The reference may, perhaps, be to the demonstrative *ḏā* and related forms.

the inflexion that the pronoun necessarily requires ...
The pronoun that is joined to the verb ......
... to the preposition in the (three) numbers
.... imperative, it makes it nominative ....
For example, you say *Abū Zaydin qad fahimtuhu*
.... *ḥaqqahu.* When it is ....
a direct object, it is the accusative. For example, you say *Abā Zaydin*
akramtu. It is possible to subsume this chapter under
the rules of the inflexion of the noun.   Rules of the inflexion
that apply to the preposition   ...... the article extends between(?)
....
....
Manchester, Rylands B 3653v

and for this reason I said that in Arabic there are seven types of parts
of speech. In Arabic these verbs do not require
the same cases as are required by the nouns which
are described by them.
.... But their basic form according to them is the indicative
.... one of the particles of the subjunctive
.... we had enumerated these particles in
the sixth rule of inflexion of the verb. There is no
.... /i/ in any verbs unless
they are in the jussive mood and are followed by a noun
to which the article *alif lām* is annexed,[54] as we said in the
seventh rule of inflexion of the verb.

Rules of inflexion of articles

We have already said when describing ... the article in the (first) discourse
.... this that of the ....
.................*lām* ....
....
....

Manchester, Rylands B 3653r

As for the feminine, it is, for example, *allatī* and *allatāni*
and *allātī.* The case markers are clear
only in the dual, both masculine and feminine. Thus,
in the masculine you say in the nominative case *allaḏāni* and in the accusative

---

54 The reference is probably to sentences like *lam yaktub-i l-waladu.* I thank Dr. Almog
   Kᴀꜱʜᴇʀ for suggesting this interpretation of the passage.

and the genitive *allaḏayni*. And in the feminine, in the nominative it is *allatāni* and in the genitive and the accusative *allatayni*.

The vocative (particles) are *yā* and *ayyuhā*. *yā* puts (the noun) in the nominative .....

annexed to something, as was said in the chapter ....

attribute that is annexed to the noun, it may be ....

put in the accusative. If you call out to an indefinite, you use the accusative. You say *yā raǧulan* and *yā raǧulayni*. And if it also has

an attribute, you put it in the accusative without *tanwīn*. If you call out to a definite, you use the nominative. The vocative for

the definite can be with *yā*, with *ayyuhā* and with the two of them together. Thus,

You say *yā ayyuhā al-raǧulu* and *yā raǧulāni* ....

.... annexed ....

....

....

Paris, AIU IX.A.6v

....

....

.... this ....

.... requires the genitive .....

.... *kilāhimā* ......

.... in the chapter on the rules of ......

.... *illā* a word

.... excepting the few from the many

.... that it affects. For example, you say *ḏahaba*

...... *Zaydan*. It can also follow[55] the *mā* of negation (clause)

.... that it affects is in the nominative. For example,

you say *mā ḏahaba illā Abū Zaydin*. Commentative particles

that indicate an affirmation under a certain condition or a negation are,

for example, *an* without gemination and *lan* and *ḥattā* and *kay* and *kaylā* and *kaymā*

and *liʾan* and *liʾan lā* and the *lām* on *kay* and the *lām* of negation.

All of them put in the subjunctive those verbs that have the form of the future tense. And *ḥattā* .... if you set (something) apart using

only a noun and there is no verb which specifically belongs to it,

you put the noun that you use for setting apart in the genitive, whether it is an agent

or a patient. For example, you say *takallama*

---

55 For the translation of *ǧawāb* as "an utterance following another utterance", see SADAN (2010: 131–34).

al-nāsu kulluhum ḥattā Abī ʿAmrin. But if you annex a verb to the
noun, be it before or after it, you put the (noun) in the nominative ....

Paris, AIU IX.A.6r

....
....
.... this ....
.... *wa-lā* ....
.... in it ....
the fourth rule ....
in place of *laysa* ....
and it can be a prohibition and the judgment is ....
the fourth rule of verbs and *lā* can be ....
wa-lā also behaves like an assertion and what ....
I mean between *lā* and *wa-lā,*
you put it in the nominative with *tanwīn,* and it is also possible to put it in
the accusative without *tanwīn.* For example,
you say *lā xawfun ʿalayhim wa-lā hum yaḥzanūna.*[56]
And you can also say *lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata illā bi-llāhi.*
Commentative particles that indicate an oath are *wāw* and *bāʾ* and *mīm*
and *yāʾ* together with *mīm.* All of them put the noun sworn by in the genitive.
For example, you say *wa-llāhi mā kāna,* and the *hāʾ*
of *Allāhi* gets the genitive. *Bi-llāhi mā kāna* is the same and *ta-llāhi mā
kāna* is the same and *laymu llāhi mā kāna* is the same.
But if you remove the commentative particle and strip bare the noun
sworn by, you use the accusative when you swear: *Allāha
mā kāna kaḏā* and you use *fatḥa* on the *hāʾ* of *Allāha.* And when
you swear, you use the genitive and say *Allāhi mā faʿaltu ...*

Conclusions

In this article I presented an edition, an English translation and an initial
assessment of a newly identified grammar of Classical Arabic that does not
belong to the Arabic grammatical tradition. By focusing on the author's
division of speech into seven parts and on the grammatical terminology
attested in the treatise, I established the text's connection with the
philosophical-logical tradition of language description and the Greek
grammatical tradition reflected in DIONYSIUS THRAX's *Tekhnē Grammatikē.*
Evidence suggests that the treatise is associated with the famous translator
ABŪ ZAYD ḤUNAYN B. ISḤĀQ AL-ʿIBĀDĪ and may represent the first hitherto

---

56 Q. 10:62

identified copy of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq's book on Arabic inflexion according to the Greek system *Kitāb Aḥkām al-iʿrāb ʿalā maḏhab al-yūnāniyyīn.*

Bibliography

Primary sources:

Dionysius Thrax. *Tekhnē Grammatikē.* Ed. Uhlig G. (1883): *Dionysii Thracis Ars grammatica.* Leipzig: B.G. Teubneri.

al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr. *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm.* Ed. Mulaḥḥam ʿA. Bū (1996). Beirut: Dār wa-Maktabat al-Hilāl.

al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr. *Kitāb al-Alfāẓ al-mustaʿmala fī l-manṭiq.* Ed. Muḥsin M. (1968). Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq.

Elias of Nisibis. *Maǧālis.* Ed. Cheikho L. (1923). *Trois traités anciens de polémique et de théologie chrétiennes.* Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 26–72.

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Isḥāq. *Kitāb al-Fihrist.* Ed. Flügel G. (1872). Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel.

Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, Aḥmad b. Qāsim. *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbāʾ.* Ed. Müller A. (1884). Cairo.

Al-Khwārizmī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Kitāb Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm.* Ed. van Vloten G. (1895). Leiden: Brill.

Secondary literature:

Al-Nassir A. (1993): *Sibawayh the phonologist: A critical study of the phonetic and phonological theory of Sibawayh as presented in his treatise, Al-Kitab.* London: Kegan Paul.

Bergsträsser G. (1925): *Hunain ibn Ishaq, über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen.* In: *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 17/2. Leipzig.

Blau J. (2006): *Dictionary of medieval Judaeo-Arabic texts.* Jerusalem: Academy of Hebrew Language, Israel Academy of Science and Humanities.

Carter M. (1972): Les origines de la grammaire arabe. In: *Revue des Études Islamiques* 40, 69–97.

Connolly M.M. (2018): *Linguistic Variation in Egyptian Judaeo-Arabic Folk Tales and Letters from the Ottoman Period.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Cambridge.

Dunlop D.M. (1955): Al-Fārābī's introductory sections on logic. In: *Islamic Quarterly* 2/4, 264-282.

Eskenasy P.E. (1988): Al-Fārābī's classification of the parts of speech. In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 11, 55-82.

Gaetje H. (1971): Die Gliederung der sprachlichen Zeichen nach al-Fārābī. In: *Der Islam* 47, 1–24.

Gutas D. (1998): *Greek thought, Arabic culture: The Graeco-Arabic translation movement in Baghdad and early ʿAbbāsid society (2nd-4th/8th-10th centuries).* London: Routledge.

Gutas D. (2014): *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical works.* 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.

Haddad F. (1969): Alfārābī's views on logic and its relation to grammar. In: *Islamic Quarterly* 13, 192-207.

Kemp A. (1987): The *Tekhnē Grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax translated into English. In: Taylor D. J. (ed.): *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*. Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 169-189.

Maman A. (2006): *Otzrot Lashon: The Hebrew Philology Manuscripts and Genizah Fragments in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*. New York: JTSA.

Merx A. (1889): *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*. In: *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 9/2. Leipzig.

Meyerhof M. (1926): New light on Hunain Ibn Ishaq and his period. In: *Isis* 8/4, 685–724.

Sadan A. (2010): The meaning of the technical term *jawāb* in Arabic grammar. In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 37, 129–137.

Saʾdi L.M. (1934): A bio-bibliographical study of Hunayn Ibn Ishaq Al-Ibadi. In: *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine* 2, 409–46.

Sezgin F. (1984): *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: Brill.

Serikoff N. (2018): The Greek verbal lemmas from the Lexicon by Bar Bahlul, their origin and the lost work by Hunayn ibn Ishaq "Principles of *iʿrāb* according to the Greek scholars". In: Orientalistica 1/1, 45–65 (in Russian).

Strohmaier G.: "Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq". In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, THREE. Consulted online on 28 November 2018 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_30560>

Sypiański J. (2012): Arabo-Byzantine Traffic of Manuscripts and the Connections between the Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement and the First Byzantine 'Renaissance' (9th-10th Centuries). In: Janocha M. (ed.): *Byzantium and Renaissances. Dialogue of Cultures, Heritage of Antiquity. Tradition and Modernity*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Campidoglio, 177–194.

Troupeau G. (1981): La logique D'Ibn Al-Muqaffaʿ et les origines de la grammaire arabe. In: *Arabica* 28/2/3, 242–50.

Versteegh C. H. M. (1977): *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*, Leiden: Brill.

Versteegh C.H.M.: Taṣrīf. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition. Consulted online on 21 October 2018 <http://dx.doi.org.ezp.lib.cam.ac.uk/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_7440>

Vidro N., Kasher A. (2014): How medieval Jews studied Classical Arabic grammar: a Kūfan primer from the Cairo Genizah. In: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 41, 173–244.

Vidro N. (forthcoming): Grammars of Classical Arabic in Judaeo-Arabic: an overview. In: *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 8/1–2.