The Institute of Asian and African Studies
The Max Schloessinger Memorial Foundation

Offprint from

JERUSALEM STUDIES IN ARABIC AND ISLAM

41 (2014)

Nadia Vidro and Almog Kasher

How medieval Jews studied classical Arabic grammar: a Kūfan primer from the Cairo Genizah

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

CONTENTS

Ch. Robin	Le roi ḥimyarite Thaʾran Yuhanʿim (avant 325–v. 375): stabilisation politique et reforme religieuse	1
Ali A. Hussein	The old *qaṣīda* in al-Yamāma: a literary and historical study of the *qaṣīda*s of the Bāhila tribe	97
Phillip I. Ackerman-Lieberman	The disappearance of the early phonetic Judeo-Arabic spelling (EPJAS) and Saʿadya Gaon's translation of the Bible	137
Nadia Vidro and Almog Kasher	How medieval Jews studied classical Arabic grammar: a Kūfan primer from the Cairo Genizah	173
J.T. Olsson	*Ḥudūd* in al-Kindī and Ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī	245
Godefroid de Callataÿ	Philosophy and Bāṭinism in al-Andalus: Ibn Masarra's *Risālat al-Iʿtibār* and the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-ṣafāʾ*	261

REVIEWS

Ali A. Hussein	Geert Jan van Gelder. *Sound and sense in classical Arabic poetry.*	313
Alfred Ivry	Haggai Ben-Shammai, Shaul Shaked, Sarah Stroumsa, eds. *Exchange and transmission across cultural boundaries: philosophy, mysticism and science in the Mediterranean world.*	335

JSAI 41 (2014)

HOW MEDIEVAL JEWS STUDIED CLASSICAL ARABIC GRAMMAR: A KŪFAN PRIMER FROM THE CAIRO GENIZAH*

Nadia Vidro
University College London

Almog Kasher
Bar Ilan University

1. Introduction

Medieval Jews in Islamic lands spoke and wrote Arabic. Immersed in the Muslim culture, they appropriated knowledge in many areas that was developed by Muslim scholars on the basis of Greek knowledge. But did Jews have an interest in Arabic linguistics, the discipline devoted to the very language that they spoke and wrote? Although Jewish grammarians were clearly familiar with works on Arabic grammar and borrowed concepts, terminology and entire book passages from Muslim linguists,[1] knowledge of Arabic grammatical theory does not seem to have been widespread among Jewish intellectuals. Indeed, in the introduction to his main work *Kitāb al-lumaʿ* (first half of the 11th century), the preeminent Hebrew grammarian, Yona Ibn Janāḥ complained that Jews "conversant and skilled" in Arabic grammar were few.[2] Moreover, book lists discovered in the Cairo Genizah[3] mention Muslim books in many disciplines, such as medicine, philosophy and sciences; as well as belles-lettres, and pietistic Muslim literature, but do not include grammatical works that can be clearly identified as grammars of Arabic. To this day, very few Judaeo-Arabic grammars of Classical Arabic have been identified, and only one has been published.[4]

* We would like to thank the three anonymous referees for insights and helpful suggestions. Nadia Vidro's research for this article was carried out as part of the project "Lengua y literatura judeo-árabe de la Edad Media a la Edad Moderna," (MINECO, FFI 2010-20568).

[1] Basal, "Part one"; Becker, *Arabic sources*.

[2] Ibn Janāḥ, *Kitāb al-lumaʿ*, p. 8.

[3] See Allony, *Jewish library*.

[4] An overview of the identified Judaeo-Arabic grammars of Classical Arabic is in preparation by the authors of the present article.

Copying works by Muslim writers in Hebrew characters was a common practice in the Middle Ages as Jews were more familiar with the Hebrew script.[5] Yet the Judaeo-Arabic grammars were clearly not the only grammars of Classical Arabic accessible to Jewish intellectuals who could read and study grammars of Arabic language in the Arabic script. Rather, the significance of the Judaeo-Arabic grammars of Classical Arabic lies in the fact that like any transliterations they represent a means of appropriating knowledge that originated outside of the Jewish culture.[6] Unlike Jewish grammarians' use of Arabic grammatical texts to create descriptions of Biblical Hebrew, the transliterated grammars demonstrate Jewish interest in Arabic grammar *per se*.

The only grammar of Classical Arabic copied in Hebrew characters published to date was discovered by N. Basal in the Firkovitch Collection, housed in the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg.[7] The grammar (RNL Evr.-Arab. II. 290) is an adaptation of an early pedagogical grammar of Arabic *al-Lumaʿ fī al-ʿarabiyya* (*al-Lumaʿ fī al-naḥw*) by the important 10th century grammarian Abū al-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān Ibn Jinnī. The Judaeo-Arabic adaptation follows the plan of the original work but is not a straight representation of *al-Lumaʿ*: some chapters are transliterated verbatim, from others only selected passages are copied, still others are represented by summaries of the material in Ibn Jinnī. It is uncertain whether the adaptation was produced by a Jew, or by a Muslim and then copied in Hebrew characters by a Jew.

Recently, fragments of another Judaeo-Arabic grammar of Classical Arabic have come to light in the Taylor-Schechter Genizah collection (henceforth, the T-S grammar). This grammar is interesting from two different perspectives: the Judaeo-Arabic and the Arabic. Firstly, it expands the tiny corpus of Classical Arabic grammars transmitted in Jewish manuscripts. Thanks to certain physical and orthographic features of the fragments it is possible to get an idea about the history of this grammar's transmission and about its scribe: was the grammar originally composed in Arabic or in Judaeo-Arabic? Was this a private copy or a manuscript produced on commission? Was the scribe Jewish or a recent convert to Islam? Was he educated in Classical Arabic and in the Arabic grammatical tradition? Answers to these questions can add to our understanding of the functional context of Judaeo-Arabic grammars of Classical Arabic. Secondly, the

[5] On the transcription of Arabic works into Hebrew alphabet, see Steinschneider, "Schriften der Araber"; Langermann, "Arabic writings."

[6] See Langermann, "Arabic writings," pp. 137, 139–140. On the inter-cultural appropriation of knowledge, see Sabra, "Appropriation."

[7] Basal, "Medieval Jewish and Muslim cultures."

T-S grammar is of interest for the history of the Arabic grammatical tradition *per se*. To the best of our knowledge, the fragments contain a Judaeo-Arabic version of an otherwise unknown grammar of Classical Arabic, which does not belong to the mainstream of the Arabic grammatical tradition. Indeed, the text can be identified as a pedagogical grammar that reflects terms and theories ascribed in the sources to the so-called Kūfan grammarians, the only one of its kind that has so far been discovered.[8] Its Kūfan tendency allows us to date the grammar to no later than the early 11th century, when the last known "Kūfan" grammarian is likely to have died.[9] Palaeographic evidence suggests that the grammar was transliterated into Hebrew characters towards the end of the 11th century.

In this article we present an edition of the newly discovered grammar, followed by a discussion of its grammatical and pedagogical traits and an attempt to answer questions related to its transmission in Judaeo-Arabic.

2. Description of fragments

In its present state the T-S grammar of Classical Arabic is represented by three fragments: T-S Ar.31.254, T-S 24.31 and T-S AS 155.132. The fragments belong together and are part of a rotulus, a long narrow strip of paper with writing parallel to its shorter side. T-S Ar.31.254 (32x19 cm) consists of two sheets of paper glued together and is torn at the bottom. T-S 24.31 (57x18–19 cm) consists of three sheets glued together and is torn at the top. At the bottom of T-S 24.31 another sheet must have been stuck on as the recto ends in midtext on a place of glueing, with its last line consisting of upper halves of letters. T-S AS 155.132 (13x18.4) may have belonged to this now missing sheet. All three fragments have holes, and are badly rubbed and stained.

The rotulus bears three texts. Originally it held a petition to a dignitary,[10] penned in large Arabic characters. Such state documents were written on only one side of the paper and laid out with wide spaces between the lines, which made them very attractive for recycling as writing paper for other texts.[11] Our document includes two such secondary texts. Firstly, at the top of both recto and verso of T-S Ar.31.254 two short passages from a grammar of Classical Arabic have been copied in Arabic characters. Secondly, a Judaeo-Arabic grammar of Classical

[8] But see footnote 137.

[9] See Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 150. See also Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 265.

[10] On petitions addressed to dignitaries below the rank of a caliph, see Khan, *Arabic legal and administrative documents*, pp. 379–409.

[11] Rustow, "A petition," pp. 17, 22.

Arabic has been copied on the blank side and between the lines of the original petition.

The original petition is found on what is currently the verso of the three fragments. T-S Ar.31.254v carries the opening formula of the petition and T-S 24.31v the closing formula. T-S AS 155.132v is part of a rescript, penned in smaller Arabic characters, on what was, probably, the lower part of the same rotulus as the petition itself.[12] Hence, the petition can be reconstructed as follows: T-S Ar.31.254v, lacuna(?), T-S 24.31, lacuna, T-S AS 155.132v. It is not impossible that T-S Ar.31.254 and T-S 24.31 join directly. Although the area of contact of the fragments in their present state is very small, the following consideration supports this possibility. The separate pieces of paper that were glued together to form the rotulus measure between 24.5 cm and 26 cm long, and carry between 37 and 41 lines of writing. When T-S Ar.31.254 and T-S 24.31 are put together, the distance between the last sticking place on T-S Ar.31.254 and the first sticking place on T-S 24.31 is 25.7 cm and has 45 lines of writing, which roughly corresponds to the length of a single sheet of paper and the density of writing on the preserved fragments.

The above reconstruction of the petition produces the following order of fragments for the grammatical text: T-S Ar.31.254r, T-S 24.31r, T-S AS 155.132r, T-S AS 155.132v, T-S 24.31v (the Judaeo-Arabic text is not found on the verso of T-S Ar.31.254). The grammar is written upside down compared to the original text of the petition and is copied in an Oriental (Egyptian) handwriting of the late 11th century.[13]

As was mentioned above, another secondary text is found in the fragments, namely, four discontinuous short passages (probably pen trials) on the grammar of Classical Arabic, copied in small Arabic characters at the top of T-S Ar.31.254. These passages appear to have been taken from standard grammar manuals.

---

[12] On the structure and characteristic formulae of Arabic petitions, see Khan, *Arabic legal and administrative documents*, pp. 306–317.

[13] We thank Prof. Judith Olszowy-Schlanger for her help with the assessment of the handwriting.

T-S Ar.31.254r contains:

1) a passage on the division of speech into three parts, viz. nouns, verbs and particles:[14]

اقسَامُ الكلام ثلاثٌ اِسمٌ وفعلٌ وحرف جًا لمعنا فالاسمُ قولكَ رجلٌ وفرَسٌ وغلامٌ

2) a passage on the agent and the patient:

فزيدٌ وما اشبه هذا لانك تقولُ اذا اردت التمييز بين الفاعلِ والـ[ـمفـ]ـعول به ضربَ زيدٌ عمرً ضربَ فعلُ ماض زيدٌ فاعل عمرً مفعولً به لانه هو المضروب

T-S Ar.31.254v. carries:

1) a list of operators of the genitive, which resembles another such list presented in Ch. 16 of the Judaeo-Arabic grammar:

الحروف التي تخفض ما بعدها

من والى وعن وعلى وكم وسِوَا وتحت وخلف وامام وقدام وحاشا

2) a passage on *kāna* and its sisters(?):

كان ابدا(؟) ترفع الاسما وتنصب الاخبار التي تاتي(؟) بعد الا[سم]ـا

3. Edition and reconstruction

The text of the grammar is edited here in two versions: in Arabic and in Judaeo-Arabic. The two versions do not simply repeat one another but are each designed to fulfil a different purpose. The Judaeo-Arabic version found in the right column is a near faithful representation of the manuscripts and reproduces all significant scribal mistakes, in particular mistakes in the transliteration and interpretation of the original text in Arabic characters.[15] This version reflects the level of the Jewish copyist's knowledge of the Arabic script and of his familiarity with Classical Arabic sources, such as the Qurʾān. The Arabic edition in the left column is an attempt to reconstruct the original work underlying the Judaeo-Arabic version. The purpose of this reconstruction is not to recover the exact *Vorlage* that served the Jewish copyist, or to classicize Middle Arabic features

[14] On the lack of discrimination between nunated and non-nunated vowels see below, Sec. 4 (7).

[15] The marking of diacritical dots and vowels also follows that of the manuscripts. Common copying mistakes, such as dittography, are corrected in the Judaeo-Arabic version, and mention is made of them in footnotes.

found in the surviving fragments and potentially also in their *Vorlage*. Instead, the reconstruction 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 ridding the text of the numerous transliteration mistakes that obscure its meaning. In the reconstruction we use standard orthography, without arguing that this was also the orthography followed in the actual Arabic *Vorlage*. The vocalization of examples in the reconstruction is ours and does not follow the (often erroneous) vocalization of the Judaeo-Arabic fragments.

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. Inasmuch as the manuscripts are badly rubbed, characters that are even barely legible were not enclosed in square brackets, so as not to clutter the transcription. Since the state of preservation of the surviving fragments is of tangential importance for the reconstruction of the original Arabic work, square brackets are used in the Arabic version only when longer chunks of text are missing. In the Arabic reconstruction angled brackets <*abc*> are used to mark up editorial additions or emendations. Scribal mistakes are set in **bold** in the Judaeo-Arabic version, and our correction suggestions are incorporated into the Arabic reconstruction without markup. Inasmuch as the two versions are synchronized, finding the relevant corrections should be straightforward.

באב[16] אלמפעול בה ואלפאעל

(1) باب المفعول به والفاعل

אעלם א[ן] אלפאעל רפע אבדא תקדם או

اعلم أن الفاعل رفع أبدا تقدم أو

תאכר ואלמפעול בה נצב אבדא [תקדם או

تأخر والمفعول به نصب أبدا تقدم أو

תא]כר תקול מן דלך דכל עבד אללה דארך

تأخر تقول من ذلك دَخَلَ عَبْدُ اللهِ دَارَكَ

רפעת עבד אללה לאנה פאעל ונצבת אלדאר

رفعت عبد الله لأنه فاعل ونصبت الدار

באיקאע אלפעל עליהא ותקול אעגבת עבד

بإيقاع الفعل عليها وتقول أَعْجَبَتْ عَبْدَ

אללה דארך נצבת עבד אללה לאן אלפעל ואקע

اللهِ دَارُكَ نصبت عبد الله لأن الفعل واقع

עליה ורפעת אלדאר לאנהא פאעלה ותקול רכב

عليه ورفعت الدار لأنها فاعلة وتقول رَكِبَ

אכוך פרסך [ר]פעת אלאך לאנה פ[א]על

أَخُوكَ فَرَسَكَ رفعت الأخ لأنه فاعل

ונצב[ת אלפ]רס לאן אלפעל ואקע עליה ותקול

ونصبت الفرس لأن الفعل واقع عليه وتقول

ארצ֗א אבאך כלאמך ורצי אבוך [כ]לאמך:

أَرْضَى أَبَاكَ كَلَامُكَ ورَضِيَ أَبُوكَ كَلَامَكَ

ותקול פי נחו אכר מנה

(2) وتقول في نحو آخر منه

[אע]לם אן אלנעת תאבע[17] ללאסם ואן כ[א]ן

اعلم أن النعت تابع للاسم وإن كان

אלאסם רפעא פנעתה רפע ואן כאן [נצבא

الاسم رفعا فنعته رفع وإن كان نصبا

פ]נעתה נצבֻ ואן כאן כפצ֗א פנעתה כפץ תקול

فنعته نصب وإن كان خفضا فنعته خفض تقول

מן דלך דכל עבד אללה אלעאקל דארך רפעת

من ذلك دَخَلَ عَبْدُ اللهِ ٱلْعَاقِلُ دَارَكَ رفعت

עבד אללה לאנה פאעל ורפעת אלעאקל לאנה

عبد الله لأنه فاعل ورفعت العاقل لأنه

נעת לעבד אללה ונ[צבת אלד]אר לאן אלפעל

نعت لعبد الله ونصبت الدار لأن الفعل

ואקע עליהא תקול אעגב עבד אללה אלעאקל

واقع عليها تقول أَعْجَبَ عَبْدَ اللهِ ٱلْعَاقِلَ

תובך אלגדיד נצבת [ע]בד [אללה לא]ן אלפעל

ثَوْبُكَ ٱلْجَدِيدُ نصبت عبد الله لأن الفعل

[16] T-S Ar.31.254r.

[17] T-S Ar.31.254r: תאבע תאבע.

ואקע עליה ונצבת[18] אלעאקל לאנה נעת לעבד
אללה ורפעת אלתוב לאנה פ[אעל] ורפעת
אלגד[יד] לאנה נעת אלתוב ותקול אשתרי
אכוך פרסא גואדא

واقع عليه ونصبت العاقل لأنه نعت لعبد
الله ورفعت الثوب لأنه فاعل ورفعت
الجديد لأنه نعت الثوب وتقول اشْتَرَى
أَخُوكَ فَرَسًا جَوَادًا

ותקול פי באב אכר מנה והו באב אלאצאפה
תקול דכל עבד אללה דאר אכיך רפעת עבד
אללה לאנה פאעל ונצ[בת אלדאר] לאן אלפעל
וא[קע] על[יהא] וכפצת אלאך לאנך אצפת
אלדאר אליה ותקול אעגבת עבד אללה דאר
אכיך נצ[בת] עבד אללה לאן אלפעל ואקע
עליה ורפעת אלדאר לאנהא פאעלה וכפצת
אלאך לאנך אצפת אלדאר אליה ותקול א[רצא]
אבאך כלאם אכיך:

(3) وتقول في باب آخر منه وهو باب الإضافة
تقول دَخَلَ عَبْدُ اللهِ دَارَ أَخِيكَ رفعت عبد
الله لأنه فاعل ونصبت الدار لأن الفعل
واقع عليها وخفضت الأخ لأنك أضفت
الدار إليه وتقول أَعْجَبَتْ عَبْدَ اللهِ دَارُ
أَخِيكَ نصبت عبد الله لأن الفعل واقع
عليه ورفعت الدار لأنها فاعلة وخفضت
الأخ لأنك أضفت الدار إليه وتقول أَرْضَى
أَبَاكَ كَلَامُ أَخِيكَ

באב[19] תקדים אלפעל ותאכירה
אעלם אן אלפעל אדא תקדם קבל אלאסמא פהו
מוחדׄ ואדא תאכר בע[ד] אלאסמא תׄני וגמע
תקול מן דלך פי תקדים אלפעל קאם זידׄ רפעת
זידא לאנה פאעל ונצ[בת ק]אם ל[אנה פ]על
מא[ץ] פאדא תנית קלת קאמ אלזידאן ואדא

(4) باب تقديم الفعل وتأخيره
اعلم أن الفعل إذا تقدم قبل الأسماء فهو
موحد وإذا تأخر بعد الأسماء ثني وجمع
تقول من ذلك في تقديم الفعل قَامَ زَيْدٌ رفعت
زيدا لأنه فاعل ونصبت قام لأنه فعل
ماض فإذا ثنيت قلت قَامَ ٱلزَّيْدَانِ وإذا

[18] נצבת is written interlinearily as a correction for רפעת, which was probably erroneously copied from a different line.

[19] באב is also written in the previous line.

גמעת קלת קא[ם] אלזידון וחדת קאם [לא]נה	جمعت قلت قَامَ ٱلزَّيْدُونَ وحدت قام لأنه
פ[על מת]קדם ו[כ]דלך כרג אצחאבד וקאם	فعل متقدم وكذلك خَرَجَ أَصْحَابُكَ وقَامَ
אכותך וקיל פי אלק[ר]אן רבנא אכרגנא מן	إِخْوَتُكَ وقيل في القرآن[20] ﴿رَبَّنَا أَخْرِجْنَا مِنْ
הדה אלקריה אלטאל[ם א]הלהא פוחד **קאל**	هَٰذِهِ ٱلْقَرْيَةِ ٱلظَّالِمِ أَهْلُهَا﴾[21] فوحد ظالم
לתקדמה ותקול איצא פי תאכיר אלפעל זידٌ	لتقدمه وتقول أيضا في تأخير الفعل زَيْدٌ
קאם פאדא **אתנית** קלת אלזידאן קאמא ואדא	قَامَ فإذا ثنيت قلت الزَّيْدَانِ قَامَا وإذا
גמעת קל[ת אלזידו]ן קאמוא תנ[י]ת קאם	جمعت قلت الزَّيْدُونَ قَامُوا ثنيت قام
וגמעתה לאנה פעל מתאכר וכדלך תקול	وجمعته لأنه فعل متأخر وكذلك تقول
[אבו]ך סאר ואדא גמעת קלת [אב]אוך סארוא	أَبُوكَ سَارَ وإذا جمعت قلت آبَاؤُكَ سَارُوا
ואדא [ת]נית קלת אבואך סארא תנית וגמעת	وإذا ثنيت قلت أَبَوَاكَ سَارَا ثنيت وجمعت
לאנה פעל **מאˀ** ותקול פי תקדים אלמ[ונ]ת	لأنه فعل متأخر وتقول في تقديم المؤنث
אעלם אן פעל גמע אלמונת אדא תקדם דכר	اعلم أن فعل جمع المؤنث إذا تقدم ذكر
תקול מן דלך קאמת אכתך פאדא תנית קלת	تقول من ذلك قَامَتْ أُخْتُكَ فإذا ثنيت قلت
קאמת אכתאך אלגמיע קאם **אכואך** דכרת	قَامَتْ أُخْتَاكَ الجميع قَامَ أَخَوَاتُكَ ذكرت
אלפעל לאן פעל גמיע אלמונת אדא תקדם דכר	الفعل لأن فعل جميع المؤنث إذا تقدم ذكر
וכדלך תקול כרג עמאתך ודהב כאלאתך וקיל	وكذلك تقول خَرَجَ عَمَّاتُكَ وذَهَبَ خَالَاتُكَ وقيل
פי אלקראן וקאל נסוה פי אלמדינה וקאל אבו	في القرآن[22] ﴿وَقَالَ نِسْوَةٌ فِي ٱلْمَدِينَةِ﴾[23] وقال[24] أبو
עמר[ו בן אלע]לא לא יחל לך אלנסא	عمر[و بن العـ]ـلاء ﴿لَا يَحِلُّ لَكَ ٱلنِّسَاءُ﴾[25]

[20] In the original text a traditional Islamic formula was probably used.

[21] Qurʾān 4:75.

[22] See footnote 20.

[23] Qurʾān 12:30.

[24] Probably a misreading for: وقرأ.

[25] Qurʾān 33:52. However, according to most sources Abū ʿAmr reads تحل here (see ʿUmar and Makram, *Muʿjam*, vol. 5, p. 132). It may well be that تحل did appear in the original text, adducing Abū ʿAmr's reading as a counterexample, but was misinterpreted by the copyist as another illustration of the rule,

באב חרוף אלנסק והי כמסה

וחרוף אלנסק אלואו ואלפא ותם ואו **אולא**

פאדא נסקת בהא עלי אלמנצוב פאנצב ועלי

אלמרפוע פארפע ו[ע]לי אלמכפוץ פאכפץ

[ת]קול מן דלך ל[ק]ית עבדً אללهِ **וזידً אנצבת**

עבד אללה באיקאע אלפעל עליה ונצבת זידא

נסק עלי עבד אללה ותקול לק[יני] עבدُ

אלל[ה] תם זידُ רפעת עבدً אללה לאנה פאעל

ורפעת זיד לאנה נסק עלי עבד אללה ותקול

א[יצא לקי]ת אכאך ثم אבאך [נצב]ת אלאך

ל[אן אלפעל ואק]ע ע[ל]יה ונצבת אלאב לאנה

נסק עלי אלאך ותקול ...מני אכוך ואב[וך] ...

לא [א]בוך.

(5) باب حروف النسق وهي خمسة

وحروف النسق الواو والفاء وثم وأو ولا

فإذا نسقت بها على المنصوب فانصب وعلى

المرفوع فارفع وعلى المخفوض فاخفض

تقول من ذلك لَقِيتُ عَبْدَ اللهِ وَزَيْدًا نصبت

عبد الله بإيقاع الفعل عليه ونصبت زيدا

نسقا على عبد الله وتقول لَقِيَنِي عَبْدُ

اللهِ ثُمَّ زَيْدٌ رفعت عبد الله لأنه فاعل

ورفعت زيدا لأنه نسق على عبد الله وتقول

أيضا لَقِيتُ أَخَاكَ ثُمَّ أَبَاكَ نصبت الأخ

ل[أن الفعل واقع] عليه ونصبت الأب لأنه

نسق على الأخ وتقول ...مني أَخُوكَ وَأَبُوكَ ...

لاَ أَبُوكَ

באך סר וואפק:

תפכר א... ואליא תם צירת מכאן אלנון ואליא

א[סמא פא]נצב [ד]לך ... אלתא

מא פאוקע דלך אלאסם תקול ... אלא תרי

(6) باب سر ووافق

تفكر ا... والياء ثم صيرت مكان النون والياء

اسما(؟) فانصب(؟) ذلك(؟) [الاسم] ... التاء

<اس>ما(؟) فارفع ذلك الاسم تقول ... ألا ترى

---

thus including يحل. It is also possible that the text is corrupted, and the original text referred to the majority reading while Abū ʿAmr was mentioned merely as the exception (as in al-Fārisī, *al-Ḥujja*, vol. 5, p. 479). Nor can this version be ruled out as a reflection of a different tradition (see al-Fārisī, *al-Ḥujja*, vol. 5, p. 479, although this does not explain why Abū ʿAmr is the one singled out), or simply as a mistake by the author.

[א]נך תקול סרני ... תקול **פקלת** מא כרהת ...

ותקול אשתה[י] ... **פאכרה** אבוך ...

أنك تقول سَرَّنِي ... تقول فَعَلْتُ مَا كَرِهْتَ[26] ...

وتقول اشْتَهَى[27] ... مَا كَرِهَ أَبُوكَ ...

...

...[28] [בא]ב אלקטע

אדא לקית מן נעת אלאסמא ... [אלק]טע ואהל

אלבצרה יסמונה אלחאל **יקול** מן דלך כרג עבד

אללה **בניל[א]** רפעת [עבד אללה ... ל]אנה

פאעל ונ[צ]בת **[בני]לא** עלי אלקטע ואנמא

צאר קטעא לאן אלכלאם יתם דונה והו נכרה

אלא תרי אנך תקול [כר]ג עבד אללה פיכון

כלאמא תאמא וכדלך תקול כרג עבד אללה

בנילא ואקבל עבד אללה מסרעא

(7) باب(؟) القطع

إذا لقيت من نعت الأسماء ... القطع وأهل

البصرة يسمونه الحال تقول من ذلك خَرَجَ عَبْدُ

اللهِ نَبِيلًا(؟) رفعت [عبد الله] ... لأنه

فاعل ونصبت نبيلا(؟) على القطع وإنما

صار قطعا لأن الكلام يتم دونه وهو نكرة

ألا ترى أنك تقول خَرَجَ عَبْدُ اللهِ فيكون

كلاما تاما وكذلك تقول خَرَجَ عَبْدُ اللهِ

نَبِيلًا(؟) وأَقْبَلَ عَبْدُ اللهِ مُسْرِعًا

באב אלמצדר

אלמצדר מא אשתק אכרה מן [א]ולה **יקול** מן

דלך כ[ר]ג עבד אללה כרוגא חסנא רפעת עבדَ

אללה *לאנה פאעל ונצבת כרוגא לאנה

מצדרُ*[29] פאן קאל לך קא[י]ל וכיף ערפת אנה

מצ[דר] **תקול** לאנה משתק מן כרג ונצבת

חסנא לאנה נעת ללמצדר וכדלך תקול אקבל

(8) باب المصدر

المصدر ما اشتق اخره من أوله تقول من

ذلك خَرَجَ عَبْدُ اللهِ خُرُوجًا حَسَنًا رفعت عبد

الله لأنه فاعل ونصبت خروجا لأنه

مصدر فإن قال لك قائل وكيف عرفت أنه

مصدر فتقول لأنه مشتق من خرج ونصبت

حسنا لأنه نعت للمصدر وكذلك تقول أَقْبَلَ

---

[26] The vocalization is uncertain. It may also be, e.g., فعلتَ ما كرهتُ.

[27] Or: أشتهي.

[28] T-S 24.31r.

[29] ** is a marginal addition in the same hand. לאנה מצדר is also written within the text.

עבד אללה **אקבאל** חסנא וסאר עבד אללה

סירא עניפא.

عَبْدُ اللهِ إِقْبَالًا حَسَنًا وسَارَ عَبْدُ اللهِ

سَيْرًا عَنِيفًا

באב אלתא אלאצליה וגיר אלאצליה

אנטֿר אלי כל גמע כאנת [פי]ה אלתא תצגר

אלואחד מנה **פאן תנית אלתא פי תצגִ׳ירה**

ואן לם תתנית ... ארא... פי תצג׳ירה

ללואחד פהי אצליה פאנצב פי אלנצב ואכפֹ

פי אלכפֹ פהי ליסת [באצלי]ה ו[נצבה]

ככפצֹה [ת]קול מן דלך פי אלתא אלאצליה

דכלת אביאתך נצבת אלתא לאן אלתא אצליה

אלא תרי אנך תקול ביית פי תצגִיר בית פתבתת

אלתא פיה ותקול דכלת חואניתך וסמעת

אצואתך נצבת הדא כלה לאן אלתא אצליה

אלא תרי אנך תקול חויניתך פתבתת אלתא פי

אלתצגיר ותקול פי אלתא אלתי ליסת באצליה

אלא תרי אנך תקול ב[ני]ה [פאכפ]ט אלתא

וכדלך תקול ראית אכואתך ועמאתך **חפטֹת**

אלתא לאנהא ליסת באצליה וקיל פי אלקראן

[ב]אלתא אלתי ליסת באצליה ולקד **ראינאה**

אבאיתא כלהא פ[כפֹ] אלתא אלואחד איהֺ[31]

(9) باب التاء الأصلية وغير الأصلية

انظر إلى كل جمع كانت فيه التاء تصغر

الواحد منه فإن ثبتت التاء في تصغيره

فهي أصلية فانصب في النصب واخفض في

الخفض وإن لم تثبت ...ارا(؟)... في تصغيره

للواحد فهي ليست بأصلية ونصبه

كخفضه تقول من ذلك في التاء الأصلية

دَخَلْتُ أَبْيَاتَكَ نصبت التاء لأن التاء أصلية

ألا ترى أنك تقول بُيَيْت في تصغير بَيْت فثبتت

التاء فيه وتقول دَخَلْتُ حَوَانِيتَكَ وسَمِعْتُ

أَصْوَاتَكَ نصبت هذا كله لأن التاء أصلية

ألا ترى أنك تقول حُوَيْنِيتُكَ فثبتت التاء في

التصغير وتقول في التاء التي ليست بأصلية

ألا ترى أنك تقول بُنَيَّة(؟) فاخفض التاء

وكذلك تقول رَأَيْتُ أَخَوَاتِكَ وَعَمَّاتِكَ خفضت

التاء لأنها ليست بأصلية وقيل في القرآن[30]

بالتاء التي ليست بأصلية ﴿وَلَقَدْ أَرَيْنَاهُ

آيَاتِنَا كُلَّهَا﴾[32] **فخفض** التاء الواحد آية(؟)

[30] See footnote 20.

[31] איה is the singular of איאתנא in the cited verse, which was erroneously transcribed into Hebrew characters as אבאיתא.

בלא תא וקאל פי אלתא אלאצליה לא תרפעוא אצואתכם פוק צות אלנבי פנצב לאנהא אצליה:

بلا تاء[33] وقال[34] في التاء الأصلية ﴿لَا تَرْفَعُوا أَصْوَاتَكُمْ فَوْقَ صَوْتِ ٱلنَّبِيِّ﴾[35] فنصب لأنها أصلية

באב אלנון אלאצליה וגיר אלאצליה

اعلم أن كل جمع كانت فيه نون الجمع وليست

(10) باب النون الأصلية وغير الأصلية

אעלם אן כל גמע כאנת פיה נון אלגמע וליסת פי ואחדةٍ נון פאלנון מנצובה אבדא פי אלרפע ואלנצב ואלכפ̣ ואדא כאנת אלנון פי ואחד מנה פהי אצליה והי תגרי במא יתצ̣מנהא מן אל[א]עראב תקול מן דלך פי אלנון אלאצליה ראית אלמ[סאכין] [יא ה]דא ומררת באלמסאכין יא הדא אגרית אלנון באלאעראב לאנהא אצליה אלא תרי אנך תקו[ל] [מס]כין

في واحده نون فالنون منصوبة أبدا في الرفع والنصب والخفض وإذا كانت النون في واحد منه فهي أصلية وهي تجري بما يتضمنها(؟)[36] من الإعراب تقول من ذلك في النون الأصلية رَأَيْتُ ٱلْمَسَاكِينَ يَا هٰذَا ومَرَرْتُ بِٱلْمَسَاكِينِ يَا هٰذَا أجريت النون بالإعراب لأنها أصلية ألا ترى أنك تقول مِسْكِين

פתבתת אלנון פי אלואחד וכדלך אלדהאקין ואלבסאתין ותקול פי אלנון אלתי ליסת באצליה ראית אלצאלחין וגאני אלצאלחון **מררת** באל[צא]לחין נצבת אלנון פי אלרפע ואלנצב ואלכפ̣ לאנהא ליסת באצליה וכדלך אלצאדקון ואעלם אן אלנון אלאצליה תתבת פי

فثبتت النون في الواحد وكذلك الدَّهَاقِين والبَسَاتِين وتقول في النون التي ليست بأصلية رَأَيْتُ ٱلصَّالِحِينَ وجَاءَنِي ٱلصَّالِحُونَ ومَرَرْتُ بِٱلصَّالِحِينَ نصبت النون في الرفع والنصب والخفض لأنها ليست بأصلية وكذلك الصَّادِقُونَ واعلم أن النون الأصلية تثبت في

---

[32] Qurʾān 20:56.

[33] Perhaps the word *li-anna* is missing here: لأن الواحد آية بلا تاء.

[34] See footnote 20.

[35] Qurʾān 49:2.

[36] Cf. جرى بما يصيبه من الإعراب (al-Azharī, *Tahḏīb*, vol. 5, p. 236; see also ibid., vol. 10, p. 358), and يجري على ما يصيبه الإعراب (al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 327), but in a different edition of the same book: يجري على ما يقتضيه الإعراب (Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 293).

אלאצאפה תקול מן דלך פי אלאצליה אעגבני בסאתין עבד אללה וגאני דהאקין אלבלאד פתבתת אלנון פי אלאצאפה לאנהא אצליה ותקול פי אלנון אלתי ליסת באצליה גאני **מסלמוא** אלבלאד וגאני **צאלחוא** עבאד אללה חדפת אלנון לאנהא ליסת באצליה:

الإضافة تقول من ذلك في الأصلية أَعْجَبَنِي بَسَاتِينُ عَبْدِ اللهِ وجَاءَنِي دَهَاقِينُ ٱلْبِلَادِ فثبتت النون في الإضافة لأنها أصلية وتقول في النون التي ليست بأصلية جَاءَنِي مُسْلِمُو[37] ٱلْبِلَادِ وجَاءَنِي صَالِحُو[38] عِبَادِ اللهِ حذفت النون لأنها ليست بأصلية

באב רגוע אלהא עלי אלאסם

אדא **ארדת** אלהא עלי אלאסם אלמפעול בה פארפעה תקול מן דלך עבד אללה לקיתה רפעת עבד אללה באלהא אלראגעה עליה וכדלך תקול תובד לבסתֻה פתרפע הדא כלה באלהא אלראגעה

(11) باب رجوع الهاء على الاسم

اذا ردت الهاء على الاسم المفعول به فارفعه تقول من ذلك عَبْدُ اللهِ لَقِيتُهُ رفعت عبد الله بالهاء الراجعة عليه وكذلك تقول ثَوْبُكَ لَبِسْتُهُ فترفع هذا كله بالهاء الراجعة

באב אלתוכיד

אעלם אן חרוף אלתוכיד אגמעון ואכתעון ואנפסהם וכלהם ואלנסוה גמע וכֻתע תוכד בהא אלאסמא אלמכניה ואלטאהרה ואלתאכיד מנזלה אלנעת תקול מן דלך גאני אכותך אגמעון וראית אכותך [אג]מעין וגאני אצחאבך כֻלהֶם וראית אצחאבך כלהם

(12) باب التوكيد

اعلم أن حروف التوكيد أجمعون وأكتعون وانفسهم وكلهم والنسوة جمع وكتع تؤكد بها الأسماء المكنية والظاهرة والتاكيد منزلة[39] النعت تقول من ذلك جَاءَنِي إِخْوَتُكَ أَجْمَعُونَ ورَأَيْتُ إِخْوَتَكَ أَجْمَعِينَ وجَاءَنِي أَصْحَابُكَ كُلُّهُمْ ورَأَيْتُ أَصْحَابَكَ كُلَّهُمْ

[37] See Sec. 4 (6), esp. footnote 103.

[38] See Sec. 4 (6), esp. footnote 103.

[39] Perhaps: بمنزلة or ينزل منزلة.

באב אלפעל

(13) باب الفعل

אעלם אן כל פעל פי אולה יא או תא או נון או

اعلم أن كل فعل في أوله ياء أو تاء أو نون أو

אלף פהו רפע אבדא תקול מן דלך אנת[40]

ألف فهو رفع أبدا تقول من ذلك أَنْتَ

תכרמני רפעת תכרמני באלתא אלזאידה

تُكْرِمُنِي رفعت تكرمني بالتاء الزائدة

מא תני פי אולה ואלאתנין אנתמא **תכרמאן**

التي في أوله والاثنين[41] أَنْتُمَا تُكْرِمَانِّي[42]

אלנון אלאולי עלאמה אלרפע פי אלפעל

النون الأولى علامة الرفع في الفعل

ואלת[א]ניה ללמתכלם ותקול הו [י]חדתני

والثانية للمتكلم وتقول هُوَ يُحَدِّثُنِي

רפעת יחדתני באליא **אלזאיד** ואלאתנין המא

رفعت يحدثني بالياء الزائدة والاثنين[43] هُمَا

יחדתאני וללגמיע הם [יחדתו]ני ותקול נחן

يُحَدِّثَانِّي[44] وللجميع هم يُحَدِّثُونِّي[45] وتقول نَحْنُ

נחדתכם רפעת נחדת באלנון אלזאידה ותקול

نُحَدِّثُكُمْ رفعت نحدث بالنون الزائدة وتقول

אנא אכרמך רפעת אכרמך באלאלף אלזאידה

أَنَا أُكْرِمُكَ رفعت أكرمك بالألف الزائدة

אלתי [א]ולה

التي <في> أوله

באב כַי ואכואתהא

(14) باب كي وأخواتها

אדא גית בכי ואכואתהא והי כי וכילא וכימא

إذا جئت بكي وأخواتها وهي كي وكيلا وكيما

ולילא וכמא אדא **כנת** פי מעני כימא ולאן לא

ولئلا وكما إذا كانت في معنى كيما ولأن لا

וחתי לא ולאם אלגחוד ואללאם אלתי פי מעני

وحتى لا ولام الجحود واللام التي في معنى

כי **פאדא** ואן ואלא **ואן** פאנצב בהן כל פעל

كي فإذا[46] وأن وألا وأن[47] فانصب بهن كل فعل

---

[40] T-S 24.31r: אנת אנת.

[41] Perhaps: וللاثنين.

[42] Perhaps: تكرمانني. Note also that the masculine plural form (تكرمونّي or تكرمونني) is not mentioned.

[43] Perhaps: وللاثنين.

[44] Perhaps: يحدثانني.

[45] Perhaps: يحدثونني.

[46] Possibly: وإذا.

פי אולה יא או תא או נון או אלף תקול מן דלך	في أوله ياء أو تاء أو نون أو ألف تقول من ذلك
זרתך כי תזורני נצבת תזורני בכי ותקול	زُرْتُكَ كَيْ تَزُورَنِي نصبت تزورني بكي وتقول
للاثنين زَرتكما כי תזוראני וללגמיע זרתכם	للاثنين زُرْتُكُمَا كَيْ تَزُورَانِي وللجميع زُرْتُكُمْ
כי תזורוני חדפת [א]לנון מן אלפעל עלאמה	كَيْ تَزُورُونِي حذفت النون من الفعل علامة
ללנצב ותקול אתיתך לילא תג׳ד עלי וללאתנין	للنصب وتقول أَتَيْتُكَ لِئَلَّا تُغِدَّ عَلَيَّ والاثنين[48]
אתיתכמא לילא [תג]דא עלי וללגמיע אתיתכם	أَتَيْتُكُمَا لِئَلَّا تُغِدَّا عَلَيَّ وللجميع أَتَيْتُكُمْ
לילא תג׳צבוא עלי ותקול ללמראה אתיתך כי	لِئَلَّا تَغْضَبُوا[49] عَلَيَّ وتقول للمرأة أَتَيْتُكِ كَيْ
תחסני אלי חדפת אלנון עלאמה ללנצב ולו	تُحْسِنِي إِلَيَّ حذفت النون علامة للنصب ولو
כאן רפעא לכאן **מחסנין** אלי וללמראתין אתיתכמא	كان رفعا لكان تُحْسِنِينَ إِلَيَّ وللمرأتين أَتَيْتُكُمَا
כי **יחסנאן** אלי חדפת אלנון עלאמה **אלנצב**	كَيْ تُحْسِنَا إِلَيَّ حذفت النون علامة للنصب
וללנסוה אתיתכן כי תחסן **אלי תחדף** אלנון	وللنسوة أَتَيْتُكُنَّ كَيْ تُحْسِنَّ إِلَيَّ <لا> تحذف النون
לאנהא עלאמה ללתאנית ואלעלאמה לא **יחדף**	لأنها علامة للتأنيث والعلامة لا تحذف
מא כאן עבד אללה ליצ׳רבך ותקול נצבת	وتقول مَا كَانَ عَبْدُ اللهِ لِيَضْرِبَكَ نصبت
[י]צ׳רבך בלאם אלגחוד וקאל פי **אלקלון**[50] **מא**	يضربك بلام الجحود وقال في القرآن[51] ﴿وَمَا
כאן אללה ליעדבהם ואנת פיהם **פנעת** יעדבהם	كَانَ اللهُ لِيُعَذِّبَهُمْ وَأَنْتَ فِيهِمْ﴾[52] فنصب يعذبهم
בלאם אלגחוד ותקול אתיתך לתכרמני נצבת	بلام الجحود وتقول أَتَيْتُكَ لِتُكْرِمَنِي نصبت
תכרמני בלאם כי וקיל פי **אלקלון** ולירצוה	تكرمني بلام كي وقيل في القرآن[53] ﴿وَلِيَرْضَوْهُ

---

[47] Perhaps: أو, although it is unlikely that *aw* would appear in such a list without *fa-* and *wa-*. It should be noted, however, that the list contains some oddities: *ḥattā* and *li-an* are not mentioned, only *ḥattā lā*, and *li-an lā* (and *li-allā*), and *an* is mentioned only towards the end, after *li-allā* and *li-an lā*.

[48] Perhaps: وللاثنين.

[49] It is unclear why the third example contains a verb that differs from the one in the first two, albeit with the same meaning. It might be a copyist's error.

[50] The derogatory Hebrew designation קלון 'disgrace' stands for what must have originally read القرآن.

[51] See footnote 20.

[52] Qurʾān 8:33.

[53] See footnote 20.

וליפתרקו מא הם פנצב בלאם.

﴿وَلِيَقْتَرِفُوا مَا هُمْ﴾[54] فنصب بلام

באב אלגזם

(15) باب الجزم

וחרוף **אלחזם כם** ול[מ]א ואפלם ואפלמא

وحروف الجزم لم ولما وأفلم وأفلما

ואולמא ואלם ואולם ה[א]ולי אלאחרף תגזם

وأولما وألم وأولم هؤلاء الأحرف تجزم

בהן כל פעל פי אולה יא[55] או תא או נון או

بهن كل فعل في أوله ياء أو تاء أو نون أو

אלף תקול מן דלך לם ידהב בכם אלאתנין לם

ألف تقول من ذلك لَمْ يَذْهَبْ بكم[56] الاثنين[57] لَمْ

ידהבא וללגמיע לם ידהבוא חדפת אלנון מן

يَذْهَبَا وللجميع لَمْ يَذْهَبُوا حذفت النون من

אלתתניה ואלגמע עלאמה ללגזם וכדלך ת[קו]ל

التثنية والجمع علامة للجزم وكذلك تقول

לם **ידהבוא** ולם **יכרגוא** ותקול ללמראה אלם

لَمْ تَذْهَبُوا[58] وَلَمْ تَخْرُجُوا[59] وتقول للمرأة أَلَمْ

תדהבי חדפת אלנון עלאמה ללגזם **ואלמראתין**

تَذْهَبِي حذفت النون علامة للجزم وللمرأتين

אלם תדהבא אלם תקומא ו[ל]לנסוה אלם

أَلَمْ تَذْهَبَا أَلَمْ تَقُومَا وللنسوة أَلَمْ

תדהבין אלם תקמן **פיתבת** פיה אלנון לאנהא

تَذْهَبْنَ أَلَمْ تَقُمْنَ فتثبت فيه النون لأنها

עלאמה ללתאנית **פי אלעלאמה יחדף**

علامة للتأنيث فالعلامة لا تحذف

---

[54] Qurʾān 6:113.

[55] The word שדה is written here between the lines, possibly a misinterpretation of a *madd* sign above the word يآء.

[56] بكم fits here, but another possibility is to emend the text in the following fashion: جزمت يذهب بلم; cf. Chs. 14, 16 and 17, where the operators assigning the case/mood in question are pointed out in some of the illustrations.

[57] Possibly: للاثنين.

[58] T-S 24.31r.: يذهبوا (**ידהבוא**). It is highly improbable that the exact same form was repeated in the original. The repetition in the transcription is possibly due to the copyist's misinterpretation of the preformative, since *tāʾ* and *yāʾ* differ only in their diacritical dots.

[59] T-S 24.31r.: يخرجوا (**יכרגוא**). See the previous footnote.

באב **אלחפט**

וחרוף אלכפט מן ואלי ומע **וגפל** ופי

ותחת ואספל ואעלא ועלי וקדאם ואמאם וכלף

וורא ופוק וחדא **ואדא ומגאמל** ומקאבל

ווגאה ותלקא ועו וג׳יר וסוא וקבל ובעד

ווסר ווסט ולדא ולדן וויל וויח

וויש ומא באל ומא שאן ומאל ומנד וחאשא

וכלא ואלבא ואלכאף ואללאם וכם פי אלכבר

הדה אלחרוף תכפץ אלאסמא ונעותהא ותקול

מן דלך כתבת אלי זיד כפצת זידא באלי ותקול

[ג]יתך בעד [עב]ד אללה וגיתך קבל זיד כפצת

זידא **בבעד** ותקול הדא סוי זיד וחאשא זי[ד]

ותקול אחתמא עבד **אלה** עו זיד כפצת **זיד** בעו

(16) باب الخفض

وحروف الخفض من وإلى ومع وعند(؟) وفي

وتحت وأسفل وأعلى وعلى وقدام وأمام وخلف

ووراء وفوق وحذاء وإزاء ومجامل(؟)[60] ومقابل

ووجاه وتلقاء وعن وغير وسوى وقبل وبعد

ووسط(؟) ووسط[61] ولدى ولدن وويل ووي

وويس وما بال وما شان ومال ومنذ وحاشا

وخلا والباء والكاف واللام وكم في الخبر

هذه الحروف تخفض الأسماء ونعوتها وتقول

من ذلك كَتَبْتُ إِلَى زَيْدٍ خفضت زيدا بإلى وتقول

جِئْتُكَ بَعْدَ عَبْدِ اللهِ وجِئْتُكَ قَبْلَ زَيْدٍ خفضت

زيدا بقبل وتقول هٰذَا سِوَى زَيْدٍ وحَاشَا زَيْدٍ

وتقول احْتَمَى عَبْدُ اللهِ عَنْ زَيْدٍ خفضت زيدا بعن

---

[60] Or, albeit less plausibly, مغامل. At any rate, this word is corrupt. Cf. the unrecognized word بحقال(؟) in Sadan, *Edition*, p. 133, footnote 46, also following ازاء. Sadan suggests there that the copyist mixed the two following words, تجاه and قبال. Several possible solutions can be offered for the puzzle of the copyist's error in the T-S grammar. First, in light of the similarity between the two corrupt words, مجامل and بحقال, it is possible that they represent two words of the same root, but of different patterns (cf. قبال in Sadan's edition vs. مقابل in the T-S grammar). Alternatively, it may be suggested that both forms represent the same word, but the T-S copyist, influenced by the adjacent word مقابل, molded it into the pattern *mufāʿil*, thus misplacing the *alif*; this original word may have been بحيال (note, however, that حيال, rather than بحيال, is expected in a list of genitive operators, and indeed appears in such lists in other treatises). Yet another possibility is that מגאמל (in this case, probably مغامل) reflects مقابل, transliterated in this text twice, the first being a mistransliteration.

We would like to thank Dr. Arik Sadan for discussing this issue with us and for kindly providing us with a copy of the manuscript used in his edition.

[61] Possibly: ووسْط ووسَط (or the other way around) (see Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 111; Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 225; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 204); alternatively, one of them may be أوسط (see Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*, p. 46).

פאדא גית בעד **אלמחפוץ** בשי פארפעה תקול

ענד עבד אללה מאל כתיר כפצת עבד אללה

בעבד ורפעת מאל באלצפה ורפעת כתיר

ל[אנ]ה נעת ללמאל וכדלך תקול עלי אכ[י]ך

תובُ גדידٌ ופי **אכיך חסנה** וענד

א[כי]ך מאל כביר פאדא גית בפעל **ראפע**

נצמת אלדי **יגי אלמכפוץ** תקול מן

דלך וגדת ענד עבד אללה מאלא כבירא כפצת

עבד אללה בענד ונצבת מאלא לאנה מפעול בה

ונצבת כתירא לאנה נעת ללמאל ותקול וגדת פי

עבד אללה כצלה חסנה כפצת עבד אללה בפי

ונצבת אלכצלה לאנהא מפעול בהא ונצבת

חס[נ]ה לאנהא **נ[עת]א** ללכצלה וכדלך אבצרת

עלי עבدَ אללה תובא גדידא:

فإذا جئت بعد المخفوض بشيء فارفعه تقول

عِنْدَ عَبْدِ اللهِ مَالٌ كَثِيرٌ[62] خفضت عبد الله

بعند ورفعت مال بالصفة ورفعت كثير

لأنه نعت للمال وكذلك تقول عَلَى أَخِيكَ

ثَوْبٌ جَدِيدٌ وفِي أَخِيكَ <خَصْلَةٌ> حَسَنَةٌ وعِنْدَ

أَخِيكَ[63] مَالٌ كَبِيرٌ فإذا جئت بفعل واقع

نصبت الذي يجيء <بعد> المخفوض تقول من

ذلك وَجَدْتُ عِنْدَ عَبْدِ اللهِ مَالًا كَبِيرًا خفضت

عبد اللهِ بعند ونصبت مالا لأنه مفعول به

ونصبت كثيرا لأنه نعت للمال وتقول وَجَدْتُ فِي

عَبْدِ اللهِ خَصْلَةً حَسَنَةً خفضت عبد الله بفي

ونصبت الخصلة لأنها مفعول بها ونصبت

حسنة لأنها نعت للخصلة وكذلك أَبْصَرْتُ

عَلَى عَبْدِ اللهِ ثَوْبًا جَدِيدًا

באב אלר[פ]ע

וחרופה אנמא וכאנמא ובינא ובינמא **ובך** ולכן

אלכפיפה והל ואין וכיף ומתי פהדה חרוף

אלרפע לאן אכתר מ[א] יגי בע[דה]א מרפוע

תקול מן דלך אנמא עבدُ אללה מُחסן רפעת

(17) باب الرفع

وحروفه إنما وكأنما وبينا وبينما وبل ولكن

الخفيفة وهل وأين وكيف ومتى فهذه حروف

الرفع لأن أكثر ما يجيء بعدها مرفوع

تقول من ذلك إِنَّمَا عَبْدُ اللهِ مُحْسِنٌ رفعت

---

[62] T-S 24.31r alternates in this chapter between مال كثير (מאל כתיר) and مال كبير (מאל כביר). The occurences of the latter probably read in the original text مال كثير, a much more common phrase in the literature, yet it is also possible that the original text constantly read مال كبير.

[63] Or: أبيك.

עבדֿ אללה במחסן ורפעת מחסן בעבדֿ אללה

ואנמא כבר תקול כאנמא عبد الله אכוך רפעת

עבד אללה באלאך ואלאך בעבד אללה וכאנמא

שביה ותקול בל עבד אללה מחסן והל אכוך

שאכֿ פאלרפע מע הל לא ג׳יר דלך ולך פי **אן**

וכיף פי אלפעל פאלרפע ואלנצב תק[ו]ל מן

דלך אין אכוך גאלסֿ וגאלסא וכיף אכוך צאנעֿ

[וצא]נעא ואנמא גאז ההנא אל[רפע] ואלנצב

לאן אלכלאם יתם דונה **וחדא** ולול[א] ...

[וכ]ם **תרפען** אלאסמא ... תקול מן [דלך]

חדא אכוך רפעת אלאך **[בח]דא** ותקול לולא

עבד אללה אכוך רפעת עבד אללה בלולא

ותקול כם מאלך רפעת אלמאל בכם [ותקו]ל

[הדא אכוך פת]רפע אלאך בהדא ׃

عبد الله بمحسن ورفعت محسن بعبد الله

وإنما خبر تقول كَأَنَّمَا عَبْدُ اللهِ أَخُوكَ رفعت

عبد الله بالأخ والأخ بعبد الله وكأنما

تشبيه وتقول بَلْ عَبْدُ اللهِ مُحْسِنٌ وهَلْ أَخُوكَ

شَاخِصٌ فالرفع مع هل لا غير ذلك ولك في أين

وكيف في الفعل فالرفع[64] والنصب تقول من

ذلك أَيْنَ أَخُوكَ جَالِسٌ وجَالِسًا وكَيْفَ أَخُوكَ صَانِعٌ

وصَانِعًا وإنما جاز ههنا الرفع والنصب

لأن الكلام يتم دونه وحبذا(؟) ولولا ...

وكم(؟) يرفعن الأسماء ... تقول من ذلك

حَبَّذَا(؟)[65] أَخُوكَ رفعت الأخ بحبذا(؟) وتقول لَوْلَا

عَبْدُ اللهِ أخوك(؟)[66] رفعت عبد الله بلولا

وتقول كَمْ مَالُكَ رفعت المال بكم و[تقو]ل

[هذا أخوك] فترفع الأخ بهذا

---

[64] Probably: الرفع.

[65] This reconstruction is supported by the fact that the form חדא in the manuscript is a correction for גידא, which is written with the same Arabic grapheme as حبذا in a text without diacritical dots.

[66] There are three options here for reconstructing the original text: (1) *lawlā ʿabdu llāhi* alone; a deletion sign possibly appears above the word *aḫūka* (or at least above the letters خو [כו]), thus this word may have been copied from the next line. (2) *lawlā ʿabdu llāhi* followed by a verb (the apodosis), of which *aḫūka* is a corruption, e.g., *lawlā ʿabdu llāhi ataytuka*. (3) *lawlā ʿabdu llāhi aḫūka* (with no mention of the apodosis). According to most grammarians, the predicate does not appear in the protasis after *lawlā*. Admittedly, some grammarians, most of them relatively late, are said to have held the view that a predicate may appear in this position, e.g., *lawlā zaydun sālamanā mā salima* (see al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ*, vol. 1, pp. 336-338). However, in addition to the fact that this view is not ascribed to any Kūfan (or other early) grammarian, there is also a theoretical consideration in favor of the rejection of this reconstruction: the four words *lawlā*, *kam*, *ḥabbaḍā* and *hāḍā* are grouped here together as operators of the following noun (on *lawlā* see Sec. 6 (3)); this could be explained by the very fact that no further predicative constituent is needed for a construction consisting of one of them + a nominative noun.

... ואטן ...

... واظن ...

...[67]

...

אעלם אן כל ב[א]ב לם יס[ם] ... זידאً לאנה

(18) اعلم أن كل باب(؟) لم يسم ... زيدًا لأنه

לם יסם פאעלה וכדלך ... בשי פאנצב אלדי

لم يسم فاعله وكذلك ... بشيء فانصب الذي

יגי בעד אלאסם אלמפ[עול?] ... ר[פע]ת עבד

يجيء بعد الاسم المفعول(؟) ... رفعت(؟) عبد

אללה לאנך לם תסם פאעלה וכד[לך] ...

الله لأنك لم تسم فاعله وكذلك ...

וכס[י] אכוך תובא גדידא פאדא גית בשי מן

وكُسِيَ أَخُوكَ ثَوْبًا جَدِيدًا فإذا جئت بشيء من

חרוף א[ל]כפץ ... תקול מן דלך **רהב** לעבד

حروف الخفض ... تقول من ذلك وُهِبَ لِعَبْدِ

אללה אלפאן [רפ]עת אלאלפין לא[נה]מא

اللهِ أَلْفَانِ رفعت الألفين لأنهما

א[ס]ם? ... וכדלך וגה אלי עבד אללה רגלאן

اسم(؟) ... وكذلك وُجِّهَ إِلَى عَبْدِ اللهِ رَجُلَانِ

ואכד מן אכיך תובאן פא... [מ?]א בעדהא

وأُخِذَ مِنْ أَخِيكَ ثَوْبَانِ فا... ما(؟) بعدها

תקול מן דלך כסית תובא ואעטית מאלא

تقول من ذلك كُسِيتُ ثَوْبًا وأُعْطِيتُ مَالًا

קלילא ... פאעלה נצבת מאלא לאנה פעל מא

قَلِيلًا ... فاعله نصبت مالا لأنه فعل ما

לם יסם פאעלה ...

لم يسم فاعله

ותקול פי נחו מנה מ[א] לם יסם פאעלה ...

وتقول في نحو منه ما لم يسم فاعله ...

אלרפע ואלנצב תקול מן דלך אע[ט?]י

الرفع والنصب تقول من ذلك أُعْطِيَ

א[לפ]אן ואל[פי]ן פ[מן נצ?]ב ... מא ...

أَلْفَانِ وأَلْفَيْنِ فمن نصب(؟) ... ما ...

[אע]ט[י]? [עב]ד אללה אלפין ומן רפע לם

أُعْطِيَ(؟) عَبْدُ(؟) اللهِ أَلْفَيْنِ ومن رفع لم

יצמר?] וכדלך ... גית בפרק וקסם פל...

يضمر(؟) ... وكذلك... جئت بفرق وقسم فل...

אלא אלרפע תקול מן ... תקול מן דל[ך] ...

إلا[68] الرفع تقول من ... تقول من ذلك ...

---

[67] T-S AS 155.132r.

[68] Or: إلى.

אל[פין] ירידז ... וגה [א]לכלאם ואן רפעת	ألفين(؟) يريد(؟) ... وجه الكلام وإن رفعت
פ... ... [מ]נה איצא ... תקול מן דלך סמי	ف... منه(؟) أيضا ... تقول من ذلك سُمِّيَ
מחמדא נצבת ... אסם כזיד תסמי אל[ר]גל ...	مُحَمَّدًا نصبت ... اسم كزيد تسمى[69] الرجل ...
מן דלך יכנ[י] ... עבד אלל[ה] נ[צבת?] ...	من ذلك يكنى(؟) ... عبد الله نصبت(؟) ...
[עב]ד אללה יס[מי] פ[אע]ל[ה] ...	عبد الله يسمى(؟) فاعله(؟)

...[70]

... מן ש... ... פעל ... פי אלנכרה אעל[ם] ...	(19) ... من ش... ...فعل ... في النكرة اعلم ...
לא י[נצ[ר]ף ... [א]עלם אן כפצ[ה] ...	لا ينصرف(؟) ... اعلم أن خفضه(؟) ...
באלאצל? ... והדא כפצה נצ[ב]? [ב]גיר	بالأصل(؟) ... وهذا(؟) خفضه نصب(؟) بـ(؟)غير
נון ותק[ול] ... גא כמא ... י[נ]צרף	نون[71] وتقول(؟) ... ...جا[72] كما ... ينصرف(؟)
פא... ... [וא]חד מן גמע מערוף ...ר מן	فا... واحد(؟) من جمع معروف ...ر من
אל...אן ו... וגדר מן אלגדראן והדה אלא[סמ]א	الـ...ان و... وجدر من الجدران وهذه الأسماء(؟)
תנצר[ף] ... פאעול פאנה לא ינצרף פי	تنصرف ... فاعول فإنه لا ينصرف في
אלמערפה וינצרף [פי] אלנכרה נחו ... וכל מא	المعرفة وينصرف في النكرة نحو ... وكل ما
כאן עלי מתל אפעאל מן אלאסמא פהו לא	كان على مثل أفعال[73] من الأسماء فهو لا

---

[69] Or: تسمي.

[70] T-S AS 155.132v.

[71] This word may possibly be emended to تنوين.

[72] Or: جاء.

[73] These words may possibly be emended to مثال أفعل. If the original text read *af'āl*, this paragraph revolves around nouns of patterns characteristic to verbs, under which category not only nouns of the pattern *af'al* are subsumed, but also, e.g., *yazīd* (a personal name of the pattern *yaf'il*). In both cases, *ibrāhīm*, occuring in the sequel two lines down, does not fit as an illustration. If the text read *af'āl*, *ibrāhīm* may be a corruption of any personal name of a pattern characteristic to verbs; and if *af'al*, it may stand for a personal name of that pattern. It is only possible to read *ibrāhīm* here if part of the text is missing.

ינצרף [פי] אלמער[פה] [וינצר]ף [פי

א]לנכר[ה] [נ]חו **חמדٍ** ואברהיمٍ ומא א[שבה]

דלך ומא؟ פ[י] ... או פעלאן פהו לא ינצרף פי

אלמערפה וינצרף פי [אלנ]כרה [נ]חו ...

מתאל ...

ينصرف في المعرفة وينصرف(؟) في

النكرة نحو(؟) <أ>حمد وإبراهيم[74] وما أشبه

ذلك وما(؟) في ... أو فعلان فهو لا ينصرف في

المعرفة وينصرف في النكرة نحو ...

مثال ...

...[75]

[ועבק]סי ואלי ע[ב]ד אלדאר דארי **وعندري**

ואדא נסבוא אלי גמע[76] נסבוא [א]לי ואחד מנה

פקאלוא אדא נסבוא אלי עאנאת **עאי** ואלי

[אד]רעאת קאלוא **אדראעי** ואלי **אלדרהם**

דר[המי וא]לי אלמדאין קאל[וא]

[מ]ד[אי]ני ... כראהה אן **נסבה** אלנסבה אלי

אלמדינה **פמן קא[לוא؟] מדאיני** פאדא

נס[ב]וא אלי אלבחרין קאלוא בחראני קואו?

אלי **שביה אנסבה** אלי אלבח[ר] ונסבוא אלי

אלבחר ונסבוא אלי **אלחמה באלחמאני**

(20) وعَبْقَسِيّ(؟) وإلى عَبْد ٱلدَّار دَارِيّ وعَبْدَرِيّ

وإذا نسبوا إلى جمع نسبوا إلى واحد منه

فقالوا إذا نسبوا إلى عَانَات عَانِيّ وإلى

أَذْرِعَات قالوا أَذْرَعِيّ وإلى الدَّرَاهِم

دِرْهَمِيّ وإلى المَدَائِن قالوا

مدائني(؟) ... كراهة ان يشبه النسبة إلى

المَدِينَة فمن <المَدِينَة> قالوا(؟) مَدِينِيّ[77] فإذا

نسبوا إلى البحرين قالوا بَحْرَانِيّ ...واو(؟)

الا يشبه النسبة إلى البَحْر ونسبوا إلى

البَحْر <بالبَحْرِيّ> ونسبوا إلى الجُمَّة بالجُمَّانِيّ

[74] As for the *tanwīn-kasra* marks under both *aḥmad* and *ibrāhīm* in the manuscript, if they are not errors (see Sec. 4 (7)), they render these nouns illustrations of the rule, mentioned in this paragraph, that if such nouns are indefinite, they are triptotes. However, this rule is generally illustrated in the grammatical literature with such formulae as *marartu bi-aḥmada wa-aḥmadin āḫara* (e.g., al-Zudaydī, *al-Wāḍiḥ*, p. 173), whereas here they simply illustrate the category (or categories) of nouns in question, thus the *tanwīn-kasra* is highly unexpected.

[75] T-S 24.31v.

[76] T-S 24.31v: נסבוא אלי גמע נסבוא א[לי] גמע.

[77] Or: مَدَنِيّ.

ואלי רקבה ומאנ[78] ואדא **נסבוא מפעל** وإلى رَقَبَة برَقَبَانِيّ وإذا نسبوا <إلى(؟)> مَفْعَل

מן[79] דואת **[אל]בא** [ואל]זאו נסבוה **באלואו** من ذوات الياء والواو نسبوه بالواو <فقالوا(؟)>

פי אלנסבה אלי **אלתקצא** מקצוי ואלי מרמי في النسبة إلى المَقْصَى مَقْصَوِيّ وإلى مَرْمى

מרמוי ואלי **מעזי מעזוי** ונסבוא אלי עלי مَرْمَوِيّ وإلى مَغْزى مَغْزَوِيّ ونسبوا إلى عَلِيّ

פקאלוא עלוי וקאלוא הדה **אבך אברזתה** אדא فقالوا عَلَوِيّ وقالوا هٰذِهِ إِبِلٌ نَوَوِيَّةٌ إذا

כאנת תאכל النوى كانت تأكل النوى

باב אלנסבה אלי אלקבאיל (21) باب النسبة إلى القبائل

אדא נסבת אלי [ת]מים קל [ת]מימי ואלי מצר إذا نسبت إلى تَمِيم قل تَمِيمِيّ وإلى مُضَر

[ק]ל מצרי ואלי כנדה כנדי פי אלקבאיל قل مُضَرِيّ وإلى كِنْدَة كِنْدِيّ في القبائل

פכלאם אלערב **יחלי** ואלנסבה אכתרהא עלי فكلام العرب يحكى والنسبة أكثرها على

ג׳יר קיאס ואדא נסבוא אלי הדיל קאלו[א] غير قياس وإذا نسبوا إلى هُذَيْل قالوا

הדלי הדא כלאם אלערב ואלקיאס הדילי ואלי هُذَلِيّ هذا كلام العرب والقياس هُذَيْلِيّ وإلى

חניפה חנפי ואלקיאס [ח]ניפי حَنِيفَة حَنَفِيّ والقياس حَنِيفِيّ

باב אלנסבה אלי אלבלדאן (22) باب النسبة إلى البلدان

אדא נסבת אלי אלכופה קלת כופי ואלי إذا نسبت إلى الكُوفَة قلت كُوفِيّ وإلى

אלבצרה קלת בצרי ואלי מכה קלת מכי ואלי البَصْرَة قلت بَصْرِيّ وإلى مَكَّة قلت مَكِّيّ وإلى

אלימן קאלוא רגל **ימאני ורגל** ימאניאן כמא اليَمَن قالوا رَجُلٌ يَمَانٍ ورَجُلَانِ يَمَانِيَانِ كما

תקול קאצ׳יאן ורגאל ימאנון כמא תקול קאצ׳ון تقول قَاضِيَانِ ورِجَالٌ يَمَانُونَ كما تقول قَاضُونَ

ותקול אמראה ימאניה ואמר[את]אן ימאניתאן وتقول امْرَأَةٌ يَمَانِيَةٌ وامْرَأَتَانِ يَمَانِيَتَانِ

---

[78] The reading of the Arabic grapheme is uncertain; it is conceivable that here the scribe tried to copy a grapheme in his *Vorlage* which he was unable to decipher. Read يرقباني.

[79] T-S 24.31v: מן מן.

ונסוה ימאניאת כמא תקול קאצ֯יאת ותקול רגל **מתאמי** אדא נסבוא אלי אלשאם ורגל תהאם **אלי** נסבוא אלי תהאמהٍ וקד קאל בעצ֯הם ימאני ושאמי ותהאמי פשדדוא ואדא נסבוא אלי אחמר קאלוא אחמרי ואלי אצפרٍ קאלוא אצפרי ואלי **אחמר** קאלוא **אחמרא[ו]י** ואלי **אצפר** קאלוא **אצפראוי**

ونِسْوَةٌ يَمَانِيَاتٌ كما تقول قَاضِيَاتٌ وتقول رَجُلٌ شَآمٍ إذا نسبوا إلى الشَّأْم ورَجُلٌ تَهَامٍ إذا نسبوا إلى تِهَامَة وقد قال بعضهم يَمَانِيّ وشَآمِيّ وتَهَامِيّ فشددوا وإذا نسبوا إلى أَحْمَر[80] قالوا أَحْمَرِيّ وإلى أَصْفَر قالوا أَصْفَرِيّ وإلى الحَمْرَاء(؟) قالوا حَمْرَاوِيّ(؟) وإلى الصَّفْرَاء(؟) قالوا صَفْرَاوِيّ(؟)

باب אלגמע

כל אסמٍ כאן בנאוה עלי פעלה תם גמע גמע בالتا נחו חמזה וחמזאת וטלחה וטלחאת וצ֯רבה **וצ֯רבאת תכפף כל** אסם כאן בנאוה עלי פעלה **ובנאוה בא ואו** ואו תם **גמעה באליא** פאלכלאם באלתכפיף נחו ביצ֯ה וביצ֯את וגוזה וגוזאת ועורה ועוראת וכל אסם כאן בנאוה עלי פעלה וכאן **אלכלאם** [מנה] **ואו ותא** תם גמעתה **באלבא קלת** נחו דעוהٍ ודעואת ורמיה ורמיאת **ועזרה ועזראת** וכלמא כאן בנאוה עלי פעלהِ **תרפע**

(23) باب الجمع

كل اسم كان بناؤه على فَعْلَة ثم جمع جمع بالتاء نحو حَمْزَة وحَمَزَات[81] وطَلْحَة وطَلَحَات وضَرْبَة وضَرَبَات <لا(؟)> تخفف وكل اسم كان بناؤه على فَعْلَة وعينه ياء أو واو ثم جمعته بالتاء فالكلام بالتخفيف نحو بَيْضَة وبَيْضَات وجَوْزَة وجَوْزَات وعَوْرَة وعَوْرَات وكل اسم كان بناؤه على فَعْلَة وكان اللام(؟) منه واوا أو ياء ثم جمعته بالتاء ثقلت نحو دَعْوَة ودَعَوَات ورَمْيَة ورَمَيَات وغَزْوَة وغَزَوَات[82] وكل ما كان بناؤه على فُعْلَة برفع

[80] It is likely that the forms *aḥmar* and *aṣfar* are only mentioned here for the sake of their feminine counterparts used as toponyms, viz. *Ḥamrāʾ* and *Ṣafrāʾ*, respectively. The text, however, seems to be corrupt, so that the reconstruction presented here is conjectural.

[81] As it is, the text means that the plural of every noun of the form *faʿla* is sound, which is incorrect (unless the plural of paucity is meant). What is expected here (taking into consideration the formulations of the following sentences) is *jamaʿtahu*, instead of *JMʿ JMʿ*. Moreover, *ṯaqqalta* is expected before the illustrations (see in what follows). Thus, كل اسم كان بناؤه على فَعْلَة ثم جمعته بالتاء ثقلت نحو حَمْزَة وحَمَزَات…

אלפא תם גמעתה **פקלת קרבה** וקרבאת

וטלמה וטלמאת ואן שית **כפצת** ואלוגה

אלתתקיל ואן כאן אכרה **ואו** ואנקלב מא קבל

אלהא **בא** פאלתכפיף לא ג׳יר תקול מן דלך

זינה וזינאת וכלבה וכלבאת וכלמא כאן עלי

מתאל פעלה בכסרٍ אלפא ובכסר אלעין פמן

גמע **באלבא** פהו מכפף נחו **מנדר ומנדראת**

וכלמא כאן עלי מתאל פעלה נעתא **באלתכפיף**

לא ג׳יר נחו **צחפה וצחפאת וגלה**

וגלאת פאן קלת תלת הבאת לאנהא

נזול אסמא פתקול תלת צכמאת **וארפע**

צכמאת מתל **אלכמריאת** ואלטלחאת ואן שית

כפצת פי לג׳ה אלערב

الفاء ثم جمعته ثقلت < نحو(؟) > قُرْبَة وقُرُبَات[83]

وظُلْمَة وظُلُمَات[84] وإن شئت خففت والوجه

التثقيل وإن كان آخره واوا وانقلب ما قبل

الهاء ياء فالتخفيف لا غير تقول من ذلك

زُبْيَة وزُبًى[85] وكُلْيَة وكُلًى وكل ما كان على

مثال فِعِلَة بكسر الفاء وبكسر العين فمن

جمع بالتاء فهو مخفف نحو سِدِرَة(؟) وسِدْرَات(؟)

وكل ما كان على مثال فَعْلَة نعتا فالتخفيف

لا غير نحو ضَخْمَة وضَخْمَات وعَبْلَة(؟)

وعَبْلَات(؟)[86] فإن قلت ثَلث[87] هبات(؟)[88] لأنها

نزول(؟)[89] اسماء[90] فتقول ثَلث ضَخَمَات وأَرْبَع

ضَخَمَات مثل الحَمَزَات والطَّلَحَات وإن شئت

خففت في لغة العرب

---

[82] Or: وغَدْوَة وغَدَوَات.

[83] Or: قُرَبَات.

[84] Or: ظُلَمَات.

[85] Or: رُبْيَة ورُبًى. Our author refers here to a process of substitution of /y/ for /w/, i.e. *kulwa* > *kulya* and *zubwa* (*rubwa*) > *zubya* (*rubya*). *kulwa* is indeed documented as a variant of *kulya* (see *WKAS*, vol. 1, p. 337) and *rubwa* is considered as the underlying form of *rubya* (see Lane, *Lexicon*, vol. 3, p. 1024). It is also plausible that this statement is a distortion of a view that recurs in the literature, to the effect that /u/ is not added in III-y forms, in order to prevent the substitution of /y/ with /w/ (see, e.g., al-Fārisī, *al-Ḥujja*, vol. 2, p. 269, where the terms *inqilāb* and *qalb* are used, as well as the illustrations *kulya* and *zubya*).

[86] Or: وغَيْلَة وغَيْلَات.

[87] On the defective spelling of this word, see Wright, *Grammar*, vol. 1, p. 10.

[88] It is unclear whether this word stands for *ṯaqqalta*, or for a certain sound feminine plural, in which case *ṯaqqalta* should be restored after it.

[89] What is expected here is a verb conveying the meaning "become," "transform," etc., or, possibly, *tanzilu manzila*.

[90] Or: اسما.

باب אלהגא

אעלם אן כל מא כאן בניתה באלואו **ויכתב**

פקל מנה באלאלף וכל מא כאן[91] בניתה

באלבא כתב **פקל** מנה **באלבא** פממא כתב

באלאלף נחו דעא **וגרא** וצחא ומחא

ונגא יכתב באלאלף[94] אלא תרי אנך תקול

דעוא ונחוא **וג׳רוא** ומחוא ותקול פימא

יכתב **באלבא** קצי ורמי **וסקי** פהו ומא אשבהה

יכתב **באלבא** אלא תרי אנך אדא קלת **דאל**

סמה[98] תכתבה **באלבא** פקלת קצ׳יא ורמיא

ושג׳בא ואן **רדת** פימא יכתב באלואו חרפא פי

אולה **בא** או תא כתבתה **באלבא** מן דלך

[תס]עי יכתב **[באל]בא** לאן ...

(24) باب الهجاء

اعلم أن كل ما كان بنيته بالواو فيكتب

فَعَلَ منه بالألف وكل ما كان بنيته

بالياء كتب فَعَلَ منه بالياء فمما كتب

بالالف نحو دَعَا وغَزَا(؟)[92] وصَحَا[93] ومَحَا

ونَجَا[95] يكتب بالألف ألا ترى أنك تقول

دَعَوَا ونَحَوَا[96] وغَزَوَا(؟)[97] ومَحَوَا وتقول فيما

يكتب بالياء قَضَى ورَمَى وسَعَى فهو وما أشبهه

يكتب بالياء ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت ذاك

فثنيته(؟) تكتبه بالياء فقلت قَضَيَا ورَمَيَا

وسَعَيَا وإن زدت فيما يكتب بالواو حرفا في

أوله ياء أو تاء كتبته بالياء من ذلك

تَسْعَى(؟) يكتب بالياء لأن ...

---

[91] T-S 24.31v: וכל מא כאן וכל מא כאן.

[92] T-S 24.31v: غرا (גרא; see also ג׳רוא below). Although this verb fits here, *ġazā* is used in other writings in this context, whereas *ġarā* was not found at all. See, e.g., Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Ḫaṭṭ*, p. 123; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, p. 270; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 361.

[93] Or: ضحا.

[94] T-S 24.31v: יכתב באלאלף יכתב באלאלף יכתב.

[95] Or: نحا (see below).

[96] Or: نجوا (see above).

[97] See footnote 92.

[98] The first letter may alternatively be ف (or ق) without the diacritic.

4. Spelling and vocalization mistakes

Over one hundred spelling mistakes are found in this text of ca. 2000 words.[99] These mistakes are indicative of the history of transmission of the T-S grammar and can tell us something about its scribe. Indeed, different mistakes can be expected in texts produced in different ways. Certainly not an autograph, our text may have been written down to dictation, copied from a text in Hebrew characters or copied from a text in Arabic characters. Mistakes found in the T-S fragments were clearly caused by the nature of the Arabic script. They tally with mistakes described by Arabic grammarians in their treatises on the *taṣḥīf* as well as with mistakes in Latin transliterations of Arabic,[100] and demonstrate that this work was copied into Hebrew characters from an Arabic script *Vorlage*. The following types of spelling mistakes can be identified in the fragments:[101]

1) Mistakes in letter shapes distinguished in Arabic graphics by diacritical dots

a) tooth-shaped letters *t/ṯ/b/n/y* (the latter two in the initial and medial positions)

In some cases only one tooth-shaped letter is misinterpreted, e.g., בעבד for بعند (Ch. 16) and the opposite وعندري for وعبدري (Ch. 20; this word is written in the T-S grammar in Arabic script); פיתבת for فتثبت (Ch. 15); באלבא for بالتاء (Ch. 23). In other cases two or even three tooth-shaped letters within one word are misunderstood: תנית for ثبتت (Ch. 9); אבאיתא for اياتنا in Qurʾān 20:56 (Ch. 9); זינה for either زبية or ربية (Ch. 23).

b) *j/ḥ/ẖ*

Examples include אלחזם for الجزم (Ch. 15); אלחפט for الخفض (Ch. 16; on *ḍ/ẓ* see 6 below); נחוא for نجوا or perhaps the opposite נגא for نحا (Ch. 24).

---

[99] For comparison, in the only other published grammar of Classical Arabic in Judaeo-Arabic there is one transliteration mistake (see Basal, "Medieval Jewish and Muslim cultures," p. 254, fol. 4a, l. 1).

[100] See Latham, "Arabic into medieval Latin," p. 34; Van Koningsveld, *The Latin-Arabic glossary*, p. 35; Rosenthal, *The technique and approach of Muslim scholarship*, pp. 24–26; Kopf, *Studies*, pp. 65–78.

[101] Arabic originals given in the examples below are based on our reconstruction of the text and include some uncertain readings (e.g., in 2m).

c) *s/š* and the tooth-shaped letters *t/ṯ/n/b/y*

The *s* and the *š* can be confused with each other, e.g., ויש for ويس (Ch. 16) and נסבה for يشبه (Ch. 20; note also *n/y* (1a)). In the initial and medial position the teeth of the *s/š* can be understood as the tooth-shaped letters *t/ṯ/n/b/y*, e.g., שביה for يشبه (Ch. 20), where the initial *y* and the first two teeth of *š* were taken to represent a *š*, the last tooth of *š* was mistaken for *b* and the original *b* was understood as a *y*. In the initial position the first tooth of *s/š* can also be taken for an *m* (see 3b).

d) *r/z*

For instance, רדת for زدت (Ch. 24). Another example is אלכמריאת for الحمزات (Ch. 23) where the *alif* of the plural form may have begun with a small tooth, accounting for the redundant *y* in the transliteration (note also *ḥ/ẖ* (1b)).

e) *f/q*

An example of confounding medial *f* and *q* is found in the transliteration of Qurʾān 6:113, where وليقترفوا is transcribed with וליפתרקו (Ch. 14; on the missing *alif otiosum* see 6).

f) *ʿ/ġ*

Examples include מעזוי for مغزوي (Ch. 20) and שג׳בא for سعيا (Ch. 24; note also *s/š* (1c) and *b/y* (1a)).

g) *ṣ/ḍ*

For instance, נצמת for نصبت (Ch. 16; on confounding *m* with a tooth-shaped letter see 2e); צחפה for ضخمة (Ch. 23; note also *ḥ/ẖ* (1b) and *m/f* (2g)).

2) Mistakes in letter shapes that are similar but not identical in Arabic graphics[102]

a) *w/r* or *z*

For example, ראפע for واقع (Ch. 16; note also *f/q* (1e)) and the opposite אוקע for ارفع

[102] A small number of mistakes discussed in this section may be attributed to similarities between Hebrew characters as well as between Arabic characters (e.g., *waw* vs. final *nun* and *d* vs. *r*). However, the compelling majority of the mistakes are clearly due to misinterpreting Arabic graphemes, and there is not a single mistake that cannot be explained as stemming from similarity of Arabic characters.

(Ch. 6); עזרה for غزوة (Ch. 23; note also *ʿ/ġ* (1f)); אברזתה for نووية (Ch. 20; note also *b/n*, *t/y* (1a) and a redundant initial *aleph* (5)).

b) initial *w/f*

For instance, פאדא for واذا (Ch. 14); ויכתב for فيكتب (Ch. 24).

c) initial *l/alif*

The preposition *li-* attached to a noun with a definite article is sometimes re-analyzed as the *alif* of the definite article, showing that in the Arabic original the initial *alif* must have been connected to the following *l*, e.g., אלנצב for للنصب (Ch. 14); ואלמראתין for وللمرأتين (Ch. 15). The *l* of the definite article can also be lost altogether, e.g., אנסבה for النسبة (Ch. 20); אחמר for الحمراء (Ch. 22; on the missing final *alif*, see 6).

d) medial *q/ʾ*

For example, פקל for فعل (Ch. 24); סקי for سعى (Ch. 24; the same verb in the masculine dual form is transliterated שג׳בא in Ch. 24, see 1f).

e) initial and medial *m*/tooth-shaped letter

For example, מחסנין for تحسنين (Ch. 14); נצמת for نصبت (Ch. 16; note also *ṣ/ḍ* (1g)); אלתקצא for المقصى (Ch. 20).

f) initial and medial *f*/tooth-shaped letter

Examples include פקלת for ثقلت (Ch. 23); ארפע for اربع (Ch. 23).

g) initial and medial *f/m*

f and *m* can be confounded in transliteration, probably, because in the ductus of the original both were similar to a tooth-shape (compare 2e and 2f above). Examples include פאכרה for ما كره (Ch. 6) and צחפה for ضخمة (Ch. 23; note also *ṣ/ḍ* (1g) and *ḥ/ẖ* (1b)).

h) medial *ʿ/ṣ*

An example is נעת for نصب (Ch. 14; note also *b/t* (1a)).

i) *k/l*

k and *l* can be confounded in the initial, medial and final positions, e.g., כם for لم (Ch. 15); יחלי for يحكى (Ch. 21); בך for بل (Ch. 17).

j) *d* or *ḏ/r* or *z*

An example is אדא for ازاء (Ch. 16).

k) medial and final *f/ḍ*

Examples are כפצת for خففت (Ch. 23) and תכפאְ for تخفف (Ch. 23).

l) final *w/n*

For instance, אן for او (Ch. 14).

m) *d* or *ḏ/l*

Examples include גיפל for عند (Ch. 16; note also *ʿ/ġ* (1f) and *f*/tooth-shaped letter (2f)); אלי for اذا (Ch. 22).

3) Mistakes due to transliterating a combination of letters as a single letter and vice versa

a) *ḫ+r/ḍ*

An example is מאאְ for متأخر (Ch. 4; on missing tooth-shaped letters see 4).

b) *š* or *s/m*+a tooth-shaped letter

This mistake is related to the fact that *m* was occasionally confounded with a tooth-shaped letter (see 2e). Examples are מנדראת for سدرات (Ch. 23); מתאמי for شآمٍ (Ch. 22; on the final *yod* of מתאמי see 6).

4) Losing tooth-shaped letters in the initial and medial position

In the beginning and middle of words tooth-shaped letters are occasionally not transliterated: מאח for متأخر (Ch. 4; on *ḫ+r/ḍ*, see 3a); אכואך for أخواتك (Ch. 4); שביה for تشبيه (Ch. 17); אן for أين (Ch. 17); חדא for حبذا (Ch. 17); עאי for عاني (Ch. 20). An opposite case where an additional tooth-shaped letter is introduced is תתנית for تثبت (Ch. 9; on misinterpreting tooth-shaped letters, see 1a).

5) Mistakes in the transliteration of *alif*

The Arabic *alif* seems to have been mistransliterated especially often. In some cases, an extra *aleph* is added, where it is not expected in the Arabic original, e.g., אולא for ولا (Ch. 5); אדראעי for اذرعي (Ch. 20). Some of the redundant initial *aleph*s may be attributed to dittography, whereby the final *alif* of the preceding word was transliterated twice, e.g., פאדא אתנית for فاذا ثنيت (Ch. 4); קאלוא אחמראוי for قالوا حمراوي (Ch. 22). On other occasions, the original *alif* was not transliterated, e.g., כנת where كانت is expected (Ch. 14); אלדרהם where the plural form الدراهم is discussed (Ch. 20); אחמר for الحمراء (Ch. 22; note also the missing *l* of the definite article (2c)). The Hebrew *aleph* can be in a wrong position, e.g., ראינאה for أَريناه in Qurʾān 20:56 (Ch. 9) or וזידׄ אנצבת for وزيدًا نصبت (Ch. 5). In addition, some transliterations that differ from the expected Arabic orthography may reflect the Middle Arabic substrate spelling (see 6).

6) Spellings that may have to do with Judaeo-Arabic/Middle Arabic substrate spelling

Some spellings in the manuscript can be explained by the influence of the Judaeo-Arabic (or Middle Arabic in general) spelling conventions and grammar. It is not always clear if these spellings originated with the Judaeo-Arabic scribe or with the scribe of the Arabic *Vorlage*. Thus, the missing *aleph* in וליפתרקו for وليقترفوا in Qurʾān 6:113 (Ch. 14) and the additional *aleph* in מסלמוא אלבלאד and צאלחוא עבאד אללה (Ch. 10) can be attributed to the common Middle Arabic fluidity in the marking of *alif otiosum*.[103] The loss of cases may account for the

[103] For *alif otiosum* on verbal forms see Blau, *Judaeo-Arabic*, pp. 53-54 (§42-44) and the references there.

untransliterated *alif* of the accusative in אקבל עבד אללה אקבאל חסנא (Ch. 8); כפצת זיד (Ch. 16), as well as by hypercorrection for the additional *aleph* in לאנהא נעתא ללכצלה (Ch. 16).[104] It may be for the same reason that we find forms like ימאני for يمانٍ and מתאמי for شآمٍ where the Classical ending *-in* has been replaced by the long *ī* (Ch. 22; on *m*+tooth-shaped letter/*š* or *s* see 3b).[105]

The spellings יחדתאני and יחדתוני for the dual and plural imperfect form with a 1sg pronominal suffix respectively, instead of the expected يحدثانني and يحدثونني, demonstrate the contraction of two syllables with an identical consonant into a geminated consonant, sometimes attested in Middle Arabic.[106] The spelling אלחפט or אלכפט for الخفض (Ch. 16) reflects the merging of the sounds *ẓ* and *ḍ*, characteristic for most Judaeo-Arabic dialects. Although *ḍ* marking the etymological *ẓ* is more common in Judaeo-Arabic texts, the opposite is also attested.[107] This spelling is attested in medieval texts in Arabic script,[108] and it is not impossible that it was found in the Arabic *Vorlage* of the T-S grammar.

Yet this is a grey area, since many of these mistakes have parallels in other cases that cannot be attributed to the Middle Arabic influence. As has been pointed out above, the Hebrew *aleph* can sometimes be missing or redundant without any apparent reason and tooth-shaped letters can be missing. The final *yod* of מתאמי may also be related to the ductus of the Arabic original where the final *m* may have ended in an upward curve, which was mistaken for a *y*. These phenomena would account for the majority of potentially Middle Arabic spellings.

7) The vocalization of the Judaeo-Arabic text

In the treatise sporadic Arabic vocalization is found, both in the examples illustrating the grammatical rules and within the explanations themselves. The majority of the vowels indicate case endings, yet non-inflectional vowels are also

---

For *alif otiosum* marked on non-verbal forms ending in a *waw*, see Blau, *Christian Arabic*, pp. 127-128 (§28). The latter phenomenon is attested in Muslim manuscripts and thus cannot be attributed to the Judaeo-Arabic scribe with certainty (Blau, *Christian Arabic*, p. 127, n. 28).

[104] Blau, *Christian Arabic*, p. 323 (§221); Blau, *Judaeo-Arabic*, pp. 150–154 (§218–219).

[105] Blau, *Christian Arabic*, pp. 197 (§100.1), 317 (§215).

[106] Blau, *Christian Arabic*, p. 148 (§41.4). However, see Wright, *Grammar*, vol. 1, p. 102 for examples of 2pl and 3pl imperfect forms rejecting the termination *-na* before the 1sg and 1pl suffix.

[107] See Blau, *Judaeo-Arabic*, p. 39 (§23); Blau and Hopkins, "Early orthography," p. 19n18.

[108] See, for example, Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 113; al-Azharī, *Tahḏīb*, vol. 10, p. 358. See Blau, *Christian Arabic*, pp. 113-114 (§20.2-21).

found (examples of the latter case are תֻני (Ch. 4), כֻתע (Ch. 12), כֻלהֻם (Ch. 12), מֻחסן (Ch. 17), כנדַה (Ch. 21), زَرتكما (Ch. 14)). It appears that at least in some cases the non-inflectional vowels are provided in order to differentiate between the intended form and other graphically identical forms. The same may apply to the only case of Hebrew vocalization: באב כַי ואכואתהא (Ch. 14), where the role of the *pataḥ* may have been to distinguish between the Arabic particle كَي, spelled in Judaeo-Arabic כי, and its Hebrew homograph כִּי.

The vocalization is not in full accord with the standard Arabic vocalization. Firstly, the vocalizer did not make a clear distinction between regular and nunated vowels. Thus, *tanwīn ḍamma* is not found in the manuscript, and the same sign is used for *ḍamma* and *tanwīn ḍamma*: קאם זידֻ (Ch. 4) vs. תֻני (Ch. 4). Both *tanwīn fatḥa* and *tanwīn kasra* are found in the manuscript alongside their non-nunated counterparts, but the signs are used indiscriminately: רפעת עבדً אללה (Ch. 5) vs. רפעת עבדַ אללה (Ch. 8); לקית עבדً אללהِ (Ch. 5) vs. לקיני עבדُ אללهٍ (Ch. 5); בכסرٍ אלפא (Ch. 23). Secondly, in two cases an incorrect inflectional vowel is used, both times on the name ʿAbd Allāh: אבצרת עלי עבדَ אללה תובא גדידא (Ch. 16); רפעת עבדً אללה במחסן ורפעת מחסן בעבدً אללה (Ch. 17). These mistakes may be grounded in the vocalizer's dialectal pronunciation of the name as ʿAbdallāh, without case endings.

Interestingly, a similar confusion between the nunated and non-nunated vowels can be detected in the short passages on Arabic grammar copied in the Arabic script in T-S Ar.31.254: *tanwīn ḍamma* is not used, whereas *tanwīn fatḥa* and *tanwīn kasra* are invariably used at the end of words irrespective of their syntactic position, as well as for final non-inflectional vowels:

اقسَامُ الكلام ثلاثُ اِسمُ وفعلُ وحرف: فالاسمُ قولكً رجلُ وفرَسُ وغلامُ: ضربً زيدُ عمرً: بين الفاعلِ.

An analysis of the spelling mistakes demonstrates that most mistransliterations occur in the examples provided to illustrate grammatical rules or in lists of words (such as a list of operators of the genitive). Qurʾānic quotations are, likewise, replete with transliteration mistakes. Although the mistransliterated words do not fit the context, the absolute majority of them are existing Arabic words. Some non-standard spellings may be grounded in the Middle Arabic grammar and orthography, yet the cases are few and uncertain. A number of Arabic graphemes are found in the Judaeo-Arabic text. The majority of these are very common words (e.g., ثم in Ch. 5, مسكين in Ch. 10, عبد الله in Ch. 17, etc.) and must have been left untransliterated by a slip of the pen. Only in one case it seems likely that the

scribe left a word untransliterated because he was not certain how to read the grapheme: ومابى[109] for برقباني in Ch. 20.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the spelling and vocalization mistakes found in the T-S fragments. The Judaeo-Arabic text of the grammar was copied from another manuscript in Arabic script.[110] This *Vorlage* was only sparingly provided with diacritical dots and was written in a cursive hand, in which many letters, including those that have distinct shapes in carefully written manuscripts, must have looked very similar. The Judaeo-Arabic scribe could read cursive Arabic script but was not an expert. He knew Arabic well, since very few mistakes resulted in non-words, and the misreadings are often motivated by the context. Thus, in Ch. 4 the Judaeo-Arabic version פעל מאֲ instead of the intended فعل متأخر is clearly conditioned by the fact that sentences containing past verbs are discussed. The mistaking of the original form يشبه for its near homograph נסבה نسبة in Ch. 20 is equally understandable in the context of a chapter on the *nisba*. The scribe was not familiar with the text of the Qurʾān, and clearly was not a convert to Islam for not only did he misquote Qurʾānic verses, but also referred to it with a common Jewish derogative term *qalon* ("disgrace"; Ch. 14). The T-S scribe was not educated in Classical Arabic grammar, for he violated Classical Arabic vocalization conventions and clearly did not understand the grammatical analysis. One of the most conspicuous demonstrations of the latter is the interpretation of the tooth element as *b*, where final *y* roots are discussed. This is found in two chapters at the end of the treatise: the chapter on the plural of different فعلة patterns (Ch. 23), where final *w* and *y* nouns are discussed, interpreted by the T-S scribe as final *b*; and in the chapter on the past form of final weak verbs (Ch. 24), where the scribe again read *b* for *y*, which resulted in the chapter discussing final *w* and final *b* verbs. The preserved manuscript is a private copy (on scrap paper), presumably prepared by somebody who intended to use this text to learn the basics of Classical Arabic grammar.

---

[109] The reading of the Arabic grapheme is uncertain.

[110] As was mentioned above (Sec. 4 (2), footnote 102), a small number of mistakes may be attributed to similarities between Hebrew characters, implying that our text was copied not from an Arabic *Vorlage*, but from an intermediate text in Hebrew script. Although these mistakes are few, the possibility of such an intermediary copy, which already had the transliteration mistakes, cannot be excluded. However, this would not significantly alter our conclusions below but would extend them to the scribe who prepared the original Judaeo-Arabic copy.

5. Contents of the grammar

(1) Verbal subject and object[111]

The verbal subject takes the nominative and the object takes the accusative, irrespective of their relative order. Thus, *raḍiya abūka kalāmaka*, but also: *arḍā abāka kalāmuka*.

On *fāʿil*, and verbal sentences in general, see Sec. 6 (2). On *WQʿ* see Sec. 6 (4).

(2) Adjectival attribute

The adjectival attribute takes the same case as the noun it modifies, e.g., *daḫala ʿabdu llāhi l-ʿāqilu*.

On *naʿt*, see Sec. 6 (9). On *ḫafḍ*, see Sec. 6 (1).

(3) Annexion

The *nomen rectum* takes the genitive, e.g., *arḍā abāka kalāmu aḫīka*.

(4) Verb preposing and postposing

When the verb precedes its subject, it takes the singular form, e.g., *qāma zaydun / l-zaydāni / l-zaydūna / aḫawātuka* (!) and *qāmat uḫtuka / uḫtāka*, whereas when the verb follows the subject, it agrees with it in number, e.g., *al-zaydāni qāmā* and *al-zaydūna qāmū*.

See Sec. 6 (2) for the use of the terms *taqdīm* and *taʾḫīr*. See Sec. 6 (14) for a discussion of the assertion that when the verb precedes a subject in the feminine plural it takes the masculine singular form. On the term *naṣb* referring to the final vowel of *qāma*, see Sec. 6 (1) and footnote 183. On the application of the term *fiʿl* to a participle, in the so-called *naʿt sababī* construction, see Sec. 6 (13).

(5) Conjunction

The noun following one of the five listed conjunctive particles agrees in case with the noun preceding it, e.g., *laqītu ʿabda llāhi wa-zaydan*.

On *nasaq*, see Sec. 6 (8). Note that the term *ḥarf* as used in the T-S grammar is not restricted to the part of speech 'particle' (this issue will be discussed in a study in preparation).

---

[111] The headings of the chapters in this section are not meant as translations of the respective headings in the text.

(6) The verbs *sarra* and *wāfaqa*

What characterizes the two verbs constituting the subject of this chapter (among others, especially *aʿjaba*), is the fact that the noun phrase with the semantic role of experiencer functions as the object, whereas with verbs such as *ištahā* and *kariha* it functions as the subject.[112]

This distinction appears in several writings.[113] In *Muqaddima* two consecutive chapters are dedicated to verbs "requiring the *fāʿil*" and those "requiring the *mafʿūl.*"[114] Whereas in the former verbs are discussed whose subject is the experiencer, e.g., *ištahā* and *kariha*, the latter revolves around verbs whose object is the experiencer: *sarra, aʿjaba* and probably also *wāfaqa.*[115] Some grammarians also present a test designed to decide whether the noun phrase with the semantic role of experiencer is the *fāʿil* in the nominative, or the *mafʿūl* in the accusative, by substituting a pronoun for it: it is the former if the pronoun is *-tu/a/i*, and the latter if it is *-nī* or *-ka/i*,[116] e.g., *wāfaqa ʿabda llāhi mā aġḍaba zaydan* and *wāfaqanī/wāfaqaka/i.*[117] In similar vein, it is stated in this chapter that nouns substituting *-nī* take the accusative, whereas those that substitute *-tu/a/i* take the nominative.[118] In the second part of the chapter illustrations are given of sentences with independent relative clauses introduced by *mā*, but the argument could not be reconstructed from the surviving fragments.

(7) *qaṭʿ*

The chapter revolves around *qaṭʿ*, a term which is said here to be equivalent to the Baṣran term *ḥāl* (circumstantial qualifier), e.g., *aqbala ʿabdu llāhi musriʿan*.

See the discussion in Sec. 6 (7).

---

[112] See Palmer, *Grammatical roles and relations*, pp. 9–10, 27, 40–44; Goldenberg, *Semitic languages*, pp. 194–197.

[113] See also Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 185, 192.

[114] The verbs in question are referred to as *ḥurūf* in the two titles (see Talmon, "*Muqaddima*," p. 143).

[115] Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*, pp. 67–68. The manuscript reads, according to the editor's vocalization, *wāqifun*, which he reconstructs as *awqafa*; yet *wāfaqa* is much more plausible here.

[116] Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 161 (note that in the illustration of *sarra* one should read *zaydan*); al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, pp. 11-12.

[117] Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 161.

[118] See also al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 1, pp. 151 ff., vol. 3, pp. 191 ff; Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 224; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, pp. 174–176. See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 185, 192.

(8) The verbal noun functioning as a cognate accusative

The verbal noun functioning as the so-called *mafʿūl muṭlaq* takes the accusative case. The chapter opens with the following definition: "The *maṣdar* is that whose last part is derived from its first part," by which is meant that in sentences such as *ḫaraja ʿabdu llāhi ḫurūjan ḥasanan*, the verbal noun functioning as the cognate accusative, here *ḫurūjan*, is derived from the preceding verb, here *ḫaraja*. Two remarks are in order regarding this definition. First, it is not surprising that the term *maṣdar* is used not only at the morphological level, in the sense of verbal noun, but at the syntactic level as well, in the sense of cognate accusative, for this is a very common practice in grammatical writings.[119] Second, in this definition the author of the T-S grammar mixes syntactic function and syntactic construction, that is, whereas the definiendum is the *maṣdar* (as a syntactic function), the definiens refers to the entire construction in which this function occurs.

On the theory that the *maṣdar* is derived from the verb, see Sec. 6 (12).

(9) Sound feminine plural

A test is designed to reveal whether or not a final /*t*/ in a plural form belongs to a plural suffix (*-āt*): if the /*t*/ appears also in the diminutive form of the singular, it is not a part of this suffix; otherwise it is, in which case its accusative marker is /*i*/. It is inferred that the diminutive test is only needed when the singular also ends with /*t*/; otherwise the /*t*/ of the plural belongs to a plural suffix. Thus, one says *daḫaltu abyātaka* with an /*a*/, since the singular is *bayt*, and its diminutive is *buyayt*; in *raʾaytu banātika* or *aḫawātika* the /*t*/ belongs to a plural suffix, as the diminutive of *bint*, for example, is *bunayya*; in *āraynāhu āyātina* the /*t*/ belongs to a plural suffix, as the singular, *āya*, does not end with /*t*/ in the first place.

On the use of the term *ḫafḍ* in reference to /*i*/ as an accusative marker, see the discussion in Sec. 6 (1).

(10) Sound masculine plural

If a plural noun ends with /*n*/ but its singular does not, this /*n*/ takes the unchanging vowel /*a*/ and is elided when the noun is annexed, e.g., *ṣāliḥūna* (nom.), *ṣāliḥīna* (acc. and gen.) and *ṣāliḥū* (nom. annexed). Otherwise, the /*n*/ carries the vowels marking the various cases and remains in annexion, e.g., *masākīn* (sg. *miskīn*).

---

[119] See Carter, *Arab linguistics*, p. 344, where this practice is also criticized by a late grammarian.

On the use of *naṣb* with reference to the final unchanging /*a*/ of the sound masculine plural, see Sec. 6 (1).

(11) Topicalized construction

In the so-called topicalized construction, where a resumptive pronoun functions as the object of the verb, the antecedent takes the nominative, e.g., *ʿabdu llāhi laqītuhu*. This noun is referred to as *al-mafʿūl bihi*, yet it is uncertain whether this term applies to the noun in such constructions, to an underlying structure from which this construction may be said to 'transform' (< *ʿabda llāhi laqītu*) or to its semantic role (patient).

On the theory that the resumptive pronoun assigns the nominative to the antecedent, see Sec. 6 (2).

(12) Emphasizers

Emphasizers are analogized to adjectival attributes, probably with respect to the agreement in case with the modified noun, e.g., *raʾaytu iḫwataka ajmaʿīna*.

On *al-asmāʾ al-makniyya*, see Sec. 6 (11).

(13) The indicative mood

The imperfect verb takes the indicative. This statement probably applies to the default case only, that is, wherever no subjunctive or jussive operator is introduced (see below). Illustrations follow, where it is stated that the final *nūn* (of either the dual or the sound masculine plural form) is the indicative marker.

On the theory that the preformatives assign the indicative, see Sec. 6 (5).

(14)–(15) The subjunctive and the jussive

These chapters present operators of the subjunctive and jussive, followed by illustrative sentences, where it is stated that the elision of the final *nūn* (that is, *-ni* and *-na*) in several forms constitutes the subjunctive or jussive marker. The *nūn* of the 2f.pl. is said to constitute the feminine marker, and therefore it is not elided.

On *li-* and *ḥattā* (and possibly also *aw*) as operators of the subjunctive (rather than a concealed *an*), and on *kamā* as an operator of the subjunctive in the sense of *kaymā*, see Sec. 6 (6).

(16) Genitive

The chapter presents operators of the genitive, e.g., *katabtu ilā zaydin*. It is also stated that if a noun occurs after the genitive, it takes the nominative, e.g., *ʿinda ʿabdi llāhi mālun kaṯīrun*, and that when a transitive verb is introduced, the

following noun takes the accusative as its object, e.g., *wajadtu ʿinda ʿabdi llāhi mālan kaṯīran*.

One may infer that *mā šaʾn*, *mā bāl* and *mā li* (or: *māli*) featuring on the list of operators of the genitive have the status of a constituent assigning the genitive, rather than just *šaʾn*, *bāl* and *li-*, although their mention in this fashion can also be ascribed to their idiomatic quality.[120] These three are discussed together in *al-Muḥallā*: the accusative in constructions introduced by them is explained by the noun being their *ḫabar*,[121] e.g., *mā bālu zaydin qāʾiman*, *mā šaʾnuka wāqifan* and *mā laka sākitan*.[122] They are thus regarded, at least with respect to their relationship with the noun in the accusative, as one constituent. For example, with respect to the verses *fa-mā li-llaḏīna* (according to the orthography in the edition, but see below) *kafarū qibalaka muhṭiʿīna* (Qurʾān 36:70) and *fa-mā lahum ʿan-i l-taḏkirati muʿriḍīna* (Qurʾān 74:49), it is stated that the accusative is due to the nouns' being *ḫabar mā li*; on the other hand, on another occasion a genitive pronoun is incorporated in such a statement: *li-annahu ḫabar mā lakum*.[123] *mā li-* is indeed the most surprising here, for its second element is a preposition, rather than a noun, and is orthographically inseparable from the following noun. However, in four Qurʾānic verses this is not the case, as *li-* is written after *mā* separately.[124] Al-Farrāʾ remarks on the first (Qurʾān 4:78), that *mā li* (or *māli*) is used frequently, to the point that people comprehend[125] (viz. reanalyze) this *li-* as part of *mā*.[126] However, he says, since it is the preposition *li-*, *waqf* (pause) is impermissible after it.[127] Opinions nevertheless vary regarding the permissibility of *waqf* after *li-*.[128] Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī says that Ḫalaf told him that according to al-Kisāʾī, *mā lakum*

---

[120] The first two feature in a similar list in al-Naḥḥās, *al-Tuffāḥa*, p. 18.

[121] See Sec. 6 (2); see also Talmon, "*al-Masʾala al-zunbūriyya*," pp. 151–152; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 91-92; cf. Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 207.

[122] Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 30 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, pp. 85–86.

[123] Cf. al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, vol. 1, p. 281.

[124] One of them is Qurʾān 36:70 mentioned above; see Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Hāʾāt*, pt. 2, pp. 67–70; Bergsträßer and Pretzl, *Die Geschichte des Korantexts*, p. 30.

[125] *tawahhamū*, see Baalbaki, "*Tawahhum*."

[126] For a discussion and historical reconstruction of interrogative *mā-l* in modern dialects, see Singer, *Neuarabische Fragewörter*, pp. 176 ff. Cf. *mā li* > the noun *māl* (*ibid*., p. 177; Brockelmann, *Grundriß*, vol. 1, p. 291).

[127] Al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, vol. 1, p. 278.

[128] See, e.g., ʿUmar and Makram, *Muʿjam*, vol. 4, p. 274.

(or: *laka*) are *ḥarfāni*, analogizing it with respect to *iʿrāb* to *mā qiṣṣatukum* and *mā šaʾnukum*.[129]

The practice of presenting undifferentiated heterogenic lists of genitive operators under one term, characteristic of early pedagogical grammars, will be discussed in a study in preparation. On *ṣifa* see Sec. 6 (10). On the theory that the *ṣifa* assigns the nominative, see Sec. 6 (2).

(17) Words followed by the nominative

The chapter presents a list of words after which the noun generally takes the nominative, e.g., *innamā*, after which the two constituents (viz. the subject and the predicate) assign the nominative to each other, and *lawlā*, which itself assigns the nominative to the following noun. With *ayna*, for example, both the nominative and the accusative are possible after the noun in nominative, thus *ayna aḫūka jālisun/jālisan*; this is possible since the sentence is complete even without the last constituent.

The term *ḥurūf al-rafʿ* in early pedagogical grammars will be discussed in a study in preparation.[130] On the theory that the subject and the predicate assign the nominative to each other, see Sec. 6 (2). On *lawlā* as the operator of the nominative, see Sec. 6 (3).

(18) The passive

The chapter discusses several passive constructions. The subject of a passive verb takes the nominative, whereas its objects take the accusative, e.g., *kusiya aḫūka ṯawban jadīdan*, except when preceded by a preposition, e.g., *wuhiba li-ʿabdi llāhi alfāni*. Thus, one may say *uʿṭiya alfāni*, in which *alfāni* is the subject, but also *uʿṭiya alfayni*, where a pronominal subject is incorporated in the verb. From the surviving fragments of the later parts of the chapter it can only be glimpsed that the verbs *sammā* and *kanā* are discussed.

The term *lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*, as well as the term *mafʿūl* with reference to the subject of the passive verb, are commonly used in medieval Arabic grammatical tradition.[131] On the term *fiʿl mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*, see Sec. 6 (2).

(19) Diptotes

The genitive in diptotes is marked with /*a*/ without *tanwīn*. The categories of diptotes mentioned in the surviving fragments of the chapter are:

---

[129] Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *Īḍāḥ*, p. 182.

[130] See also Peled, "ʿAmal and ʾibtidāʾ," pp. 159 ff.

[131] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, *passim*.

nouns terminating in *-ān*, *fāʿūl* and nouns with verbal patterns (or: with the pattern *afʿal* — see footnote 73).

On the terms (*lā*) *yanṣarifu*, see Sec. 6 (15).

(20)–(22) *Nisba*

This series of chapters revolves around nouns ending with the so-called *yāʾ al-nisba*. The beginning of (20) is missing, and may have been preceded by other chapters on this issue. Many changes in the stem occasioned by the presence of *yāʾ al-nisba* are mentioned, for example: *ʿabd al-dār* → *ʿabdarī/dārī*; *ʿānāt* → *ʿānī*, since the singular form is used as a rule; yet this does not apply to *al-madāʾin* and *al-baḥrayn*, in order to differentiate between their *nisba* forms and those of *madīna* (or: *al-madīna*, i.e. Medina) and *baḥr*, respectively; *raqaba* → *raqabānī*; *marmā* → *marmawī*; *huḏayl* → *huḏalī*, although it is stated that the form in accordance with the *qiyās* would be **huḏaylī*; *al-yaman* → *yamānin* / *yamānī*.

(23) Sound feminine plurals of the patterns *fVʿla*

This chapter discusses the sound feminine plural forms of nouns, including adjectives, of the patterns *fVʿla*. In some of these, a vowel is added in the plural form between the second and third radicals, in which case the term *taṯqīl* is used, e.g., *ḥamza* → *ḥamazāt*, *daʿwa* → *daʿawāt*. The term *taḫfīf* designates the lack of such a vowel, e.g., *bayḍa* → *bayḍāt*.

On the term *rafʿ* referring to the internal vowel /u/ of the pattern *fuʿla*, e.g., *qurba*, see Sec. 6 (1).

(24) Spelling of III-w and III-y verbs

The spelling of the final letter of III-w verbs of the pattern *faʿala* is ا (“*alif*”), but it is ى (“*yāʾ*”) in III-y verbs. If our interpretation of this passage is correct, the final letter of the forms *yafʿalu* and *tafʿalu* is said to be ى (“*yāʾ*”) in III-w verbs as well. The end of the chapter is missing.

6. 'Kūfan' and pedagogical traits

The historicity of the Baṣran-Kūfan opposition, as two rival grammatical 'schools', is one of the most hotly debated issues in the study of the history of Arabic grammatical thought. We have no intention to tackle this question here;[132] rather, we shall now present several points which seem to be fairly well-established, and which suffice for the present study. Taking Sībawayhi (d. *ca.* 180/796) and al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822) as our points of departure, we can detect in their writings opposing theories, notions and terms, to which some of the *Streitfragen* between 'Baṣrans' and 'Kūfans', portrayed in later treatises, correspond. Generally speaking, a number of scholars, such as Ṯaʿlab (d. 291/904) and Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 327/939 or 328/940),[133] affiliated themselves with the Kūfans/al-Farrāʾ, and others, such as al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) and Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), with the Baṣrans/Sībawayhi; the latter, and most of their successors, form what can safely be regarded as the mainstream of Arabic grammatical tradition. In the following pages we shall frequently use the label 'mainstream grammar(ians)', with illustrations mainly, but not exclusively, extracted from the writings of Sībawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj, and the label 'Kūfans' with reference to al-Farrāʾ, Ṯaʿlab and Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī.[134] One should not infer from these labels that either of these two groups is homogenous, nor should these labels be taken as implying the existence of two rival schools of grammar in al-Baṣra and al-Kūfa during the 8th–early 9th centuries.

As for the T-S grammar, the self-affiliation of its author as 'Kūfan' is inferred not only from the terminology, notions and theories embraced in this grammar, around which the lion's share of this section will revolve, but more directly from his allusion to the Baṣrans in Ch. 7. In that chapter, dedicated

---

[132] An up-to-date overview of the different views of modern scholars is Baalbaki, "Introduction," especially pp. xxxix–xlii.

[133] Not to be confused with the much later Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 577/1181), the author of, *inter alia*, the celebrated *al-Inṣāf*.

[134] We shall also refer to *Kitāb al-maqṣūr wa-ʾl-mamdūd*, whose ascription to Nifṭawayhi (d. 323/935) is uncertain (see the editor's note on pp. 103–104; Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 144), to *al-Ṣāḥibī*, on whose author Carter says: "The last important grammarian to be regarded as a genuine Kūfan, and whose work survives, for example, is Ibn Fāris, d. 395/1005" ("Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 265; see also Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 241), but Weil (*Streitfragen*, p. 67) and Sezgin (*GAS*, p. 194) are less decisive, to al-Muʾaddib's *Daqāʾiq al-taṣrīf* (completed in 338/949), on whose author's Kūfan inclinations see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," albeit with much reservation, as he also characterizes him as a 'Baghdadian' (see below) (see also Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 190), as well as to al-Ṭabarī's (d. 310/923) grammatical views, via Abū Ḫuḍayr's study (Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*).

according to its title, to *qaṭʿ* (on this term, see (7) below), the author states near the beginning that the Baṣrans' term for *qaṭʿ* is *ḥāl*, whereas in the rest of the chapter the term *qaṭʿ* is used exclusively. It is unfortunate that there are several missing words in the manuscript where the author most probably alludes directly to the group that uses the term *qaṭʿ*, viz. his in-group, in contradistinction to the Baṣrans' term *ḥāl*.

Note that, whatever the historical roots of the Baṣran-Kūfan opposition, we are not entitled to speak of a strict dichotomy between 'Baṣrans' and 'Kūfans'; even in medieval sources grammarians are frequently said to have adopted the views of the 'rival school'. As for the earlier period, Talmon's extensive studies are of major importance, at least in their capacity as a scrutiny of the early sources, even if one does not adhere to his controversial conclusion, viz. his theory of an 'Old Iraqi School' of grammar.[135] As for later times, some grammarians are said to have studied under both 'Baṣrans' and 'Kūfans' and to have mixed between the teachings of the two schools; some even speak of a third, 'Baghdadi school' of grammar, though this appellation is not conceived in any uniform fashion by different scholars.[136]

There is a corpus of several early pedagogical writings which is of interest for our endeavour to characterize the T-S grammar, the latter itself being a pedagogical grammar, in fact the only extant pedagogical 'Kūfan' grammar, as far as we know.[137] In a study in preparation it will be shown that a group of early pedagogical books, including the T-S grammar, share a number of distinctive traits. Five of the books which belong to this corpus are unproblematic with respect to their authorship: Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912 or 320/932),[138] *al-Muwaffaqī*;

---

[135] In brief, this theory states that al-Farrāʾ was more faithful than al-Ḫalīl and Sībawayhi to an old Iraqi grammatical school; in other words, al-Ḫalīl and Sībawayhi were innovators vis-à-vis the Iraqi grammatical thinking of their time. Later grammarians projected the differences between al-Ḫalīl and Sībawayhi, on the one hand, and al-Farrāʾ, on the other, onto earlier generations. This theory is developed in many studies, culminating in Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*. Summaries are Talmon, "The first beginnings of Arabic linguistics"; Baalbaki, "Introduction," pp. xviii–xix.

[136] See Weil, *Streitfragen*; al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*; Troupeau, "La grammaire à Baġdād"; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*; Sezgin, *GAS*, pp. 151 ff.; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics"; Baalbaki, "Introduction," p. xli.

[137] But cf. Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," pp. 264–265 regarding Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā* and Sezgin, *GAS*, pp. 126–127, regarding Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*.

[138] This grammarian is said to have mixed the teachings of the two schools. See Troupeau, "La grammaire à Baġdād," p. 399; Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 158 ("jedoch neigte er etwas mehr den Basrensern zu"); Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 265.

Luġda (d. *ca.* 311/923), *al-Naḥw*; al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/950), *al-Tuffāḥa*;[139] al-Zajjājī (d. *ca.* 337/949), *al-Jumal*; and al-Zubaydī (d. 379/989), *al-Wāḍiḥ*. The authorship of three other books is, however, controversial: *Muqaddima* (attributed to Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar [d. *ca.* 180/796]),[140] *Talqīn* (attributed to Ibn Qutayba [d. 276/889])[141] and *al-Muḥallā* (attributed to Ibn Šuqayr [d. 315/927 or 317/929];[142] the latter was also published as *al-Jumal*, with an attribution to al-Ḫalīl Ibn Aḥmad).[143] Another book is included in Sadan, *Edition*, basically a critical edition of a very late grammatical treatise, in one of whose manuscripts an otherwise unknown treatise is incorporated, and therefore published as an appendix to the main edition.[144] Needless to say, it is only from its content that we conclude its earlier provenance, as we shall see presently. Due to some striking points of similarity between these four and the five former works (to be discussed elsewhere), we shall hypothesize that they were all composed during the 10th century or earlier. It should be noted that not all early pedagogical grammars belong to this corpus; this epoch also witnessed pedagogical writings conforming to the mainstream tradition, such as Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Mūjaz* and al-Fārisī (d. 377/987), *al-Īḍāḥ*.

The recognition of the existence of traits characterizing writings which belong to this corpus of early pedagogical treatises is of major methodological importance for our study. One direct consequence is that one should not take every trait found in a pedagogical book but generally lacking in mainstream grammars as a reflection of a 'heterodox' — 'Kūfan' or dissenting — grammatical

---

[139] But see Sezgin, *GAS*, pp. 47, 208.

[140] A comprehensive study of this book and its attribution is Talmon, "*Muqaddima*." See also Sezgin, *GAS*, pp. 118, 126; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 179 ff.; Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," pp. 285–286; *idem*, "*Lamḥa ḥawla iḫtilāf al-kūfiyyīna wa-'l-baṣriyyīna*," pp. 191–193; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 264; Baalbaki, "The book," pp. 127–128.

[141] This treatise was studied by Carter ("16th century grammatical experiment"), who surmises that it was written "no earlier than the 10th/16th century" (p. 267). Talmon ("Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 285, footnote 32), on the other hand, believes "on the basis of several elements of its linguistic teaching" that "its late 9th-century provenance is correct." See also Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 154, footnote 1.

[142] This grammarian is also said to have mixed the teachings of the two schools. See Troupeau, "La grammaire à Baġdād," p. 399; Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 162 ("... galt trotz seiner Neigung für die Kufenser ... als Eklektiker ..."); Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," *passim*; Baalbaki, "Introduction," p. xxix.

[143] See Sezgin, *GAS*, pp. 47, 162; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 179 ff.; Ryding, "Morphosyntactic analysis"; *idem*, "Aspects of the genitive"; Talmon "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," pp. 285–286; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 264; Baalbaki, "Introduction," pp. xxviii–xxix.

[144] For details see Sadan, *Edition*, p. 4.

theory adhered to by its author. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that later grammarians, upon encountering such non-mainstream traits, attributed them to the Kūfans (as a 'back-projection'). On the other hand, one should not, of course, automatically ascribe any non-mainstream phenomenon appearing in such a book to its pedagogical character.

In addition to the pedagogical nature of the T-S grammar, the fact that it is a very short volume, as well as the unfortunate fact that parts of it are missing, should also be taken into consideration as two factors which have obvious ramifications for our study.

In the remainder of this section we shall present fifteen points in the T-S grammar which bear on its classification as 'Kūfan'. These points will be examined vis-à-vis early grammatical writings, both pedagogical and more theoretically oriented works, alongside traditional accounts by later grammarians.

It should be noted that we do not aim at completeness, that is, not every trait in the T-S grammar potentially bearing on the Baṣran-Kūfan opposition was found worthy of note. For example, we do not find worthy of discussion the fact that the rare possibility of using *kay* as an operator of the genitive is not mentioned, although Kūfans and Baṣrans are said to have disagreed on this issue.[145]

(1) Vowel and *iʿrāb* terms

a. The author of the T-S grammar makes use of the term *ḫafḍ* (Chapters 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 18 and 19), and never *jarr*. The former is regarded as a Kūfan and the latter as a Baṣran term;[146] the former term is indeed the one used by Sībawayhi

[145] The view attributed to the Baṣrans is also that of most mainstream grammarians, including Sībawayhi, although there is, as far as we know, no evidence for the Kūfan view in early sources (this *masʾala* does not occur among those for which Baalbaki ["Arab grammatical controversies"] found evidence in the early sources). See Carter, *Arab linguistics*, p. 117; Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 65–67. Another example is the so-called *ištiġāl:* we discuss in (2) below constructions such as *ʿabdu llāhi laqītuhu*, accounted for in Ch. 11, where only the nominative is sanctioned, that is, no mention is made of the construction in which the first noun takes the accusative, e.g., *ʿabda llāhi laqītuhu*. One may conjecture that this silence reflects al-Farrāʾ's view that the latter is permissible only when introduced by, e.g., *wa-* or *fa-*, a condition not shared by Sībawayhi and his successors (see Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies," p. 16).

[146] See Weil, *Streitfragen*, p. 72, footnote 1; al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 258, 311; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 228; al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 20; Carter, *Arab linguistics*, p. 449; *idem*, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266.

and the latter by al-Farrāʾ and Ṯaʿlab.[147] This notwithstanding, the term *ḫafḍ* is ubiquitous in mainstream writings, along with *jarr*.[148]

b. The term *rafʿ* is used in the T-S grammar not only for *iʿrāb* (Chapters 1–8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16–18) but also for an internal vowel (*qUrba* and *ẓUlma*) (Ch. 23). Moreover, although the term *naṣb* is used mostly for *iʿrāb* (Chapters 1–10, 14 and 16–19), it is not restricted to it. First, it refers to the final /*a*/ in the sound masculine plural (Ch. 10), but since it is a final vowel it is not a decisive indication that for this author *naṣb* applies to *every* /*a*/.[149] Second, it is used with reference to the final /*a*/ of the perfect verb (3m.sg.), and is explained by the fact that it is a *māḍī* verb (Ch. 4); it is unclear, however, whether or not it is regarded by the author of the T-S grammar as *iʿrāb* (or quasi-*iʿrāb*).[150] The terms *ḫafḍ* and *jazm* are used only for *iʿrāb* (Chapters 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 18 and 19, and Ch. 15, respectively). The term *kasr* is used in reference to the two tokens of non-*iʿrāb* /*i*/ in nouns of the pattern *fIʿIla* (Ch. 23).[151]

---

[147] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 159, 196. See also Nifṭawayhi, *al-Maqṣūr*, *passim*; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, e.g., pp. 15, 504 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 40), but also *jarr* (al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 42).

[148] See al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 20; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 202 (also *ibid*., p. 195); Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, p. 9; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 267; Baalbaki, "Introduction," p. xl.

[149] Cf. Abū ʿUbayda's use of *jarr* for the final /*i*/ of the dual (Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, p. 240); al-Zubaydī's use of *jarr* for an auxiliary vowel /*i*/ in a verb in *jazm* (*al-Wāḍiḥ*, pp. 87–88; note that for al-Zubaydī the imperative is *majzūm* rather than *mabnī*; cf. the meaning of *jarr* attributed to al-Ḫalīl in al-Ḫʷārizmī, *Mafātīḥ*, p. 45 [see Fischer, "The chapter on grammar," p. 99; Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, p. 18], but this may be merely a coincidence) and of *rafʿ* and *jazm* for the final /*u*/ and zero-vowel in *qaṭṭu* and *qaṭ*, respectively (*al-Wāḍiḥ*, p. 271; see also p. 302); and an anonymous writer's use of *naṣb* for the /*a*/ of *nūn al-jamʿ* (e.g., *muslimūna*) and of *ḫafḍ* for the /*i*/ of *nūn al-taṯniya* (e.g., *rajulāni*) and the /*i*/ of III-y verbs in *jazm* (e.g., *yarmi*) (Sadan, *Edition*, pp. 135–136).

[150] In Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 58 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 111, the *māḍī* is an illustration of the category *al-naṣb ʿalā al-bunya* (an oxymoron for mainstream grammarians; see also Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 124 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, pp. 171–172 for *al-rafʿ bi-l-bunya* [see also Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*, p. 92], Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, pp. 153 ff. = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, pp. 199 ff. for *al-ḫafḍ bi-l-bunya* [see also Sadan, *Edition*, p. 136; Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*, p. 91] and Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 181 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 225 for *al-jazm bi-l-bunya*). See also Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 177 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 221; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 166; Sadan, *Edition*, p. 128, 135; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, pp. 15, 17, 26–27 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," pp. 25, 27–29). Note also the use of the term *iʿrāb* with reference to the perfect in Nifṭawayhi, *al-Maqṣūr*, p. 112.

[151] In fact, the terms *rafʿ* etc. are mostly used here, strictly speaking, not with direct reference to the vowels in question, but rather to the syntactic position of the word, which entails a certain *iʿrāb*

The distribution of the terms *raf*ʿ and *naṣb* (with some reservations about the latter) in the T-S grammar seems to be Farrāʾian, as al-Farrāʾ applies the terms, which Sībawayhi restricts to *iʿrāb*, to non-*iʿrāb* vowels as well.[152] Sībawayhi is followed, in this practice, by mainstream grammarians, as well as by Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī.[153]

(2) The operators of the predicative constituents

The author of the T-S grammar seems to adhere to a Farrāʾian view with respect to his conception of sentence types.

A well-known notion held by the mainstream grammarians is the dichotomy between a verbal sentence (the so-called *jumla fiʿliyya*) and a nominal sentence (*jumla ismiyya*). The predicative constituents of the former consist of a verb (*fiʿl*) followed by, or incorporating, a subject (*fāʿil*), to which the verb assigns

---

marker, mostly a vowel. This is suggested, first, by the fact that it is not the final consonants which are mostly said to take the *raf*ʿ etc., but rather the entire word (but compare Kasher, "Terminology of vowel and *iʿrāb*," pp. 142–143, 148). Moreover, the author of the T-S grammar uses the term *ʿalāma* in the sense of mood marker in cases where it is not a vowel (Chapters 13–15). Note, however, that in Ch. 9 the author uses the terms *naṣb* and *ḫafḍ* in reference to both vowels and positions: a striking example is his use of the term *ḫafḍ* with reference to the /i/ vowel as a case marker of the accusative of the sound feminine plural; here it is also said that the /t/ takes the *ḫafḍ*. On the other hand, when the /t/ is not part of the plural suffix, the author says: ... *fa-nṣib fī al-naṣb wa-ḫfiḍ fī al-ḫafḍ*, where the first token of each term refers to a vowel (as a case marker, needless to say) and the second to a syntactic position. In similar vein, it is said (Ch. 19) that the diptotes in the *ḫafḍ* take the *naṣb* without *tanwīn*, i.e. the genitive marker is/a/ (the text is not certain, however).

[152] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 159–160; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 108 ff., 222 ff., 290 ff., 795 ff.. This use of the terms is occasionally attributed to the Kūfans (See al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 315–316; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266; Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 41; cf. al-Ḫʷārizmī, *Mafātīḥ*, p. 43). Sībawayhi is not entirely consistent here, since he sometimes does use these terms with reference to non-*iʿrāb* vowels (see Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 241–243; Kasher, "Terminology of vowel and *iʿrāb*," p. 143, footnote 11). Deviations are found in other early writings as well (see Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 240–241). Talmon (*Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 239 ff., 286) explains this on the grounds that the Sībawayhian dichotomy is an innovation, and therefore diversions from it are reflections of the older system; this is also commensurate with Versteegh's (*Arabic grammar*, pp. 125–130; "Zayd Ibn ʿAlī," p. 18) findings, and with his theory that the terms which would later come to denote *iʿrāb* were originally associated with the articulation of vowels, and linked to the Syriac system (Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, pp. 29–31; see also Talmon, "The first beginnings of Arabic linguistics," p. 250).

[153] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 198. But see Carter's ("16th century grammatical experiment," p. 270) note on the use of these terms in the *Talqīn*.

the nominative. The predicative constituents of the latter consist of a subject (*mubtadaʾ*) and a predicate (*ḫabar*), which may, in its turn, consist of a clause. Whereas grammarians generally agree that the operator assigning the nominative to this subject is an abstract operator termed *al-ibtidāʾ*, their views are at variance regarding the operator assigning the nominative to the predicate, viz. whether it is the *ibtidāʾ*, the *mubtadaʾ*, or both together. Some grammarians add a third sentence type, *jumla ẓarfiyya*, whose predicative constituents consist of a prepositional phrase or a locative/temporal qualifier (*ẓarf*), followed by a subject, to which the prepositional phrase or the *ẓarf* assigns the nominative. Another type occasionally mentioned is the conditional sentence (*jumla šarṭiyya*), which is of no relevance here.[154]

Al-Farrāʾ's conception was radically different, for he held a "unified conception of the kernel sentence structure in terms of subject and predicate (*ism* and *fiʿl/ḫabar*)."[155] This notion seems to be reflected in "the mutual effect of subject and nominal predicate" (sentence type (i))[156] — this is the view that Ibn al-Anbārī ascribes to the Kūfans in general,[157] and that was adopted by Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī.[158] In the "so-called topicalized structures" (ii), the resumptive

---

[154] Modern studies of Arabic grammatical tradition are replete with discussions of issues pertaining to the notion of sentence types. See Levin, "Distinction between nominal and verbal sentences"; Peled, *Sentence types*. Our concise sketch of this notion is, needless to say, a generalization, especially with respect to the indigenous terms.

[155] Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 278. See also Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 172–174; Talmon, "The philosophizing Farrāʾ," pp. 272 ff.; *idem*, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 165 ff. (where Talmon claims that this system is earlier than Sībawayhi's); Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 201 ff., 350 ff., 595 ff.; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 89 ff. Cf. Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 116 (*fiʿl laysa*).

[156] Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 279. See also al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 279–280; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 168; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 170 ff.; Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 168–169. For this notion, al-Farrāʾ occasionally uses the term *rāfaʿa*, translated by Kinberg (*Lexicon*, p. 310) as "to mutually affect the nominative case upon (with regard to the two members of a nominal clause)." This concept is referred to by some grammarians as *tarāfuʿ*, i.e. mutual assignment of the nominative (see, e.g., Bohas, Guillaume and Kouloughli, *The Arabic linguistic tradition*, p. 69). Ibn Kaysān (*al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 109) mentions this view, but without any ascription.

[157] Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, pp. 21 ff..

[158] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 197. Several much later grammarians adopted this view; see, e.g., Bohas, Guillaume and Kouloughli, *The Arabic linguistic tradition*, pp. 70–72. Al-Muʾaddib is inconsistent with regard to the operator of the *mubtadaʾ* (see *Daqāʾiq*, p. 131 vs. pp. 458–460, 469–473 [see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 41]; see also al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 386).

pronoun is regarded by al-Farrāʾ as assigning the nominative to the subject.[159] In subject-verb constructions (iii), the verb assigns the nominative to the subject, whether it precedes it or follows it,[160] so that against the mainstream conception of SV and VS as two distinct sentence types, for al-Farrāʾ this is merely an issue of relative position of these two constituents.[161] Ibn al-Anbārī, on the other hand, ascribes to the Kūfans the view that the operator is the resumptive pronoun in the verb.[162] When the predicative constituents of the sentence consist of a noun and a prepositional phrase or a locative/temporal qualifier (iv),[163] it is the preposition(al phrase) or the locative/temporal qualifier that assigns the nominative to the noun.[164] This is the notion Ibn al-Anbārī ascribes to the Kūfans, as well as to al-Aḫfaš (according to one of his two opinions) and al-Mubarrad.[165]

There is direct evidence that in three out of the four sentence types the author of the T-S grammar adhered to the views of al-Farrāʾ:
(i) It is stated in Ch. 17 that in the sentence *innamā ʿabdu llāhi muḥsinun*, *ʿabdu llāhi* and *muḥsinun* assign the nominative to each other, and the case is the same with *ka-annamā ʿabdu llāhi aḫūka*. A chapter discussing the basic noun-noun construction is lacking.

In the same chapter, the author of the T-S grammar presents the choice between nominative and accusative in sentences introduced by *kayfa* and *ayna*, viz. *ayna aḫūka jālisU/An* and *kayfa aḫūka ṣāniʿU/An*, by referring to the constituent in question as *fiʿl*. It may be the case that the word *fiʿl* here conveys an extended sense

---

[159] Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 279. See also Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 168–169. But cf. Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 176; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 275, 529 ff.; Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, p. 25.

[160] Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 279.

[161] See Talmon, "The philosophizing Farrāʾ," p. 273.

[162] Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, p. 254.

[163] On the notion of *ṣifa*, see (10) below.

[164] Talmon, "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views," p. 279. See also Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 170–171; Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 170–173.

[165] Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, pp. 27 ff., and see Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies," p. 15. It is inferred from al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 2, pp. 354–355 that he approves of the view that a *ẓarf* can assign the nominative to the following noun (in his interpretation of Qurʾān 23:35); in another discussion (*ibid*., vol. 1, p. 157) he classifies the *ẓarf* + subject construction as an independent sentence type, on a par with nominal and verbal sentences (all of which are able to function as *ṣila*s of relative pronouns). However, from yet another discussion (*ibid*., vol. 3, pp. 130–131) it is inferred that it is an underlying verb which assigns the nominative in these sentences (nevertheless, not the *ibtidāʾ*). See also Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 123. On later grammarians' concept of *jumla ẓarfiyya* see Peled, *Sentence types*, pp. 147 ff.

of 'predicate', that is, a class under which both predicate and 'transformed predicate'[166] are subsumed. However, *fiʿl* here may alternatively mean 'participle' (see (13) below).

Another possible case of such a use of *fiʿl* is the term *fiʿl mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu* (Ch. 18). This term is generally applied to the passive verb; however, in this chapter it seems to refer to the accusative in passive constructions, e.g., *uʿṭītu mālan qalīlan* (unless the text is corrupt or the wording is sloppy). It is thus reminiscent of the (uncommon) term *ḫabar mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu* in the same sense.[167]

(ii) As stated in Ch. 11, it is the resumptive pronoun which assigns the nominative in sentences such as *ʿabdu llāhi laqītuhu* and *ṯawbuka labistuhu*.

(iii) The case of the *fāʿil* is explained only by its being *fāʿil*, a term that is used only for the subject following its verb (see Chapters 1–5 and 7).[168] In Ch. 4 it is stated that "preposed" verbs take the singular form, e.g., *qāma zaydun/l-zaydāni/l-zaydūna*, whereas when "postposed" they take the dual and plural forms (as well), e.g., *al-zaydāni qāmā* and *al-zaydūna qāmū* (besides *zaydun qāma*), where the term *ism* is used in reference to the subject. Although this is what one expects from a grammarian who does not adhere to the notion of *ibtidāʾ*,[169] accounts of this contrast in terms of "preposing" and "postposing" are also presented by grammarians who do adhere to this notion, most of whom also use the term *ism* here; this may be regarded as a trait of the genre of pedagogical grammars.[170]

---

[166] See Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 182–194: "... underlying its *naṣb* position in given structures it serves as predicate (*ḫabar*) whose original nexal relations with a certain subject have been impaired by the creation of another set of syntactic relations. As a result, this nominal is deprived of its first-degree predicate status and transforms to a 'second-rate' predicate position marked grammatically by *naṣb*" (*ibid*., p. 183). See also Levin, "*kāna waʾaxawātuhā*," pp. 193–196; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 173.

[167] See, e.g., al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, p. 78. This term will be discussed elsewhere.

[168] See also the explanation of the nominative of the subject of the passive verb (Ch. 18).

[169] See Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *Īḍāḥ*, p. 149; *idem*, *Marsūm*, p. 24. This formulation is also found in al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 135, but, as mentioned in footnote 158, this grammarian is inconsistent with regard to the operator of the *mubtadaʾ*.

[170] See Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, pp. 108, 109; Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 225; al-Naḥḥās, *al-Tuffāḥa*, p. 17; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, p. 10; al-Zubaydī, *al-Wāḍiḥ*, pp. 196 ff. Needless to say, even if the term *ism* is to be regarded as a remnant of a Kūfan-like system, its use does not betray a Kūfan affiliation. Note that in Ch. 1 it is stated that the *fāʿil* takes the nominative, whether it is preposed or postposed, and that the *mafʿūl bihi* takes the accusative, also whether preposed or postposed. According to the illustrations which follow, what is meant here is the relative order between the *fāʿil* and the *mafʿūl bihi*, not their

(iv) In Ch. 16, in his discussion of the sentence *ʿinda ʿabdi llāhi mālun kaṯīrun*, after stating that *ʿinda* assigns the genitive to *ʿabdi llāhi*, the author of the T-S grammar says that the nominative in *māl* is due to the *ṣifa*. Elsewhere he states that in the sentence *kam māluka*, it is *kam* which assigns the nominative to *māluka* (Ch. 17). He himself does not classify *kam*, but the view that *kam* is a compound of *ka-* and *mā* is not only ascribed to the Kūfans, but also attested in al-Farrāʾ.[171]

(3) *lawlā* as a nominative operator

According to the author of the T-S grammar, *lawlā* assigns the nominative to the following noun (Ch. 17).

This view is attributed to the Kūfans, whereas the Baṣrans are said to have held that the cause of the nominative is the *ibtidāʾ*.[172] Baalbaki has already demonstrated that the former view is in fact al-Farrāʾ's, the latter — Sībawayhi's and al-Mubarrad's.[173]

(4) Transitivity

The terms used by the author of the T-S grammar to designate the relationship between a verb and its object (*mafʿūl bihi*) are *waqaʿa ʿalā* and *awqaʿa ʿalā*, serving as the explanation of the accusative of the object (Chapters 1–3).[174] The root *WQʿ* is used by grammarians in general to refer to the relationship between an operator and the constituent it operates on, and specifically between verbs and nouns taking the accusative.[175] There are, however, two points of interest in the use of this root by the author of the T-S grammar: first, he never

---

relative positions vis-à-vis the verb, e.g., *daḫala ʿabdu llāhi dāraka* vs. *aʿjabat ʿabda llāhi dāruka*. This conclusion is corroborated by the appearance of this formulation in al-Naḥḥās, *al-Tuffāḥa*, p. 17 (but cf. Omar, "Grammatical studies in early Muslim Egypt," p. 243).

[171] See al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 231–233; Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies," pp. 19–20.

[172] See al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 134, 283, 289; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 171, 206.

[173] Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies," pp. 15–16.

[174] There is no testimony in this book (or in other early writings, as far as we know; see Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies") for the views ascribed by Ibn al-Anbārī (*al-Inṣāf*, pp. 40 ff.) to Kūfan grammarians regarding the operator of the *mafʿūl*, viz. that it is the verb and its *fāʿil* jointly, or the *fāʿil* alone.

[175] One should not infer that the 'relationship' mentioned here is the very relationship of operation. The divergence in meaning this term conveys for different grammarians, and its links with other terms such as *ʿamila* and *taʿaddā*, are beyond the scope of this study; see, e.g., Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 115–116, 162–166, 174–177, 183, 191 and Carter's (Review, p. 474) criticism. See also Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 970 ff.

uses the term *taʿaddā*, which is most commonly used in this sense in mainstream writings; second, he uses (Ch. 16) the term *fiʿl wāqiʿ* as a term denoting "transitive verb," i.e. as a property of the verb itself, in which case the term does not take any complement referring to the accusative noun of the verb in question. This term is considered as 'Kūfan',[176] and is indeed the term used by al-Farrāʾ,[177] as well as in al-Muʾaddib's *Daqāʾiq*,[178] *Kitāb al-ʿayn* (attributed to al-Ḫalīl Ibn Aḥmad)[179] and *al-Muḥallā*,[180] but the term *taʿaddā* is also used in these three works.[181] On the other hand, the term has not been detected in mainstream writings.

(5) The preformatives as the operators of the imperfect verb

According to the author of the T-S grammar, the preformatives assign the indicative mood to the imperfect verb (Ch. 13).

This view is ascribed in later sources to the Kūfans, or to some of them, especially al-Kisāʾī,[182] and is adhered to by Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, al-Muʾaddib, the authors of *al-Muḥallā* and *Talqīn* as well as, probably, the anonymous author in Sadan, *Edition*.[183]

---

[176] See Weil, *Streitfragen*, p. 72, footnote 1; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 200; al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 21.

[177] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 610–611, 969. Moreover, one of the chapters of al-Farrāʾ's lost book, *Kitāb al-ḥudūd*, is reported to have been entitled *ḥadd al-fiʿl al-wāqiʿ* (see Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 132).

[178] See al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, e.g., p. 49 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 26).

[179] See Talmon, *Arabic grammar*, p. 421. On this dictionary and its authorship, see Talmon, *Arabic grammar*; Schoeler, "Wer ist der Verfasser"; Baalbaki, *The Arabic lexicographical tradition*, pp. 282–292.

[180] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 191.

[181] E.g., al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 148 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 26); Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 14 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 73; Talmon, *Arabic grammar*, pp. 206, 397. On al-Ṭabarī's use of both terms, see Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, p. 146.

[182] See al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ*, vol. 3, p. 192; Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, p. 226; Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, vol. 4, pp. 219–220; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ*, vol. 1, pp. 526–527; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 169. Two other views ascribed to Kūfan grammarians are discussed elsewhere.

[183] Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Muḏakkar*, vol. 1, p. 208; *idem*, *Īḍāḥ*, pp. 145–146; Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 176 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 219; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, pp. 223, 339–340; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, pp. 15, 27, 29 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 17, 28, 131 [where this grammarian explicitly embraces the 'Baṣran' view]; see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," pp. 27–29, 41). In Sadan, *Edition*, p. 128 the preformatives are referred to as *ḥurūf al-ʿawāmil*. It is not mentioned among the views for which Baalbaki ("Arab grammatical controversies") found evidence in the early sources. It is possible that underlying this theory is "an early theorem that considers the a vs. u contrast in the perf. vs. impf. verbs a significant iʿrabi feature" (Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, p. 242 [regarding an occasion in which Sībawayhi uses the term *naṣb* with reference to perfect verbs]; on the view that the imperfect is derived from the

(6) Subjunctive operators

Ch. 14 is dedicated to "*kay* and its sisters," which are said to assign the subjunctive to the following verb. Of these, some are of interest:

a. *li-* and *ḥattā* are included in this list, without any mention of concealed *an*.

The Kūfans are claimed to maintain that *li-* and *ḥattā* assign the subjunctive directly, whereas for the Baṣrans what is responsible for this mood is said to be a concealed *an*; the latter view is indeed that of most mainstream grammarians, including Sībawayhi.[184] However, in most early pedagogical grammars examined here, *li-* and *ḥattā* are presented as operators of the subjunctive, some of them in a list of such operators.[185] This trait may, therefore, be regarded as characteristic of pedagogical writings,[186] and not necessarily as stemming from any Kūfan inclination.

b. It is unclear whether the second occurrence of *an* in the list should be read *aw*. If it does, the text reflects a view attributed to the Baṣran grammarian al-Jarmī, and sometimes to al-Kisāʾī,[187] which differs both from the view of Sībawayhi and other mainstream grammarians, i.e. that the subjunctive following *aw* is assigned by a concealed *an*, and from the one ascribed to the Kūfans, i.e. that it is due to the principle of *ḫilāf*,[188] an opinion which may be traceable to

---

perfect, see Versteegh, *The Arabic language*, pp. 84–85).

[184] On *li-* see Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 266–268; on *ḥattā*, see *ibid*., pp. 238–242. See also al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 96, 156, 282, 284–285; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 207, 235; Carter, *Arab linguistics*, pp. 108–109, 116–119, 124–125; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 171–174, 223–224.

[185] Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, pp. 108, 121–122; Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 226; al-Naḥḥās, *al-Tuffāḥa*, p. 19; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, pp. 182–184; al-Zubaydī, *al-Wāḍiḥ*, pp. 88–89; Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, pp. 18, 227–228 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, pp. 76–77, 269–270; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, pp. 147–148; Sadan, *Edition*, p. 131. See also al-Ḫʷārizmī, *Mafātīḥ*, pp. 50-51. Less clear is Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima*, pp. 71–72. This trait is found as late as the celebrated *al-Ājurrūmiyya* of Ibn al-Ājurrūm (d. 723/1323) (Carter, *Arab linguistics*, see the previous footnote). It is also adhered to by al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, pp. 40–41. This issue is not found among the *masāʾil* for which Baalbaki ("Arab grammatical controversies") located evidence in the early sources.

[186] Not necessarily early ones; see the previous footnote.

[187] For references see Sadan, *Subjunctive*, p. 123; al-Maḫzūmī (*Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 306–307) ascribes this view to the Kūfans in general, save al-Farrāʾ.

[188] On this notion, see al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 293 ff.; Carter, "*Ṣarf* et *ḫilāf*"; Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 316–317.

al-Farrāʾ.[189] However, such formulations appear also in some other pedagogical grammars.[190]

c. *kamā* is included in this list, and is said to convey the sense of *kaymā*.

It is claimed that the Kūfans (and al-Mubarrad) held the view that *kamā* occurs with the same meaning as *kaymā*, and may assign the subjunctive to the following verb,[191] whereas the Baṣrans argued that it neither occurs in this sense nor can it assign the subjunctive.[192]

As an answer to Sībawayhi's question, al-Ḫalīl is quoted as claiming that *kamā* conveys the meaning of *laʿalla* and is not a subjunctive operator, but is rather followed by a verb in the indicative.[193] The difference of opinions regarding *kamā* is attested already by Ṯaʿlab.[194]

(7) *qaṭʿ*

The author of the T-S grammar uses the term *qaṭʿ* as the counterpart of what, for him, *ahl al-baṣra* term *ḥāl* (the circumstantial qualifier) (Ch. 7). It is characterized as following an already complete sentence and as being indefinite.

The term *qaṭʿ* is occasionally regarded as the Kūfan counterpart of the Baṣran term *ḥāl*.[195] The noun to which the term *qaṭʿ* applies is characterized as being indefinite, albeit qualifying a definite noun, thus taking the accusative.[196] The term *qaṭʿ* itself is interpreted in two ways, each highlighting one side of the same coin, to wit, the "cutting of" is understood either structurally,[197] or as signifying the deletion of the definite article.[198]

---

[189] See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 121–123. This difference of opinions applies also to the so-called *fāʾ al-sababiyya* and *wāw al-maʿiyya* (See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 168–170 and 192–194 respectively; also Carter, "*Ṣarf* et *ḥilāf*"; Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies," pp. 22–23).

[190] See Ibn Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī*, pp. 108, 122; Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 226; al-Naḥḥās, *al-Tuffāḥa*, pp. 19–20. On this trait in *al-Ājurrūmiyya*, see Carter, *Arab linguistics*, pp. 108, 118 ff.

[191] On the different opinions with regard to the mood following *kaymā*, see Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 70–71.

[192] See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, p. 76. See also al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 319–320 (where this opinion is also ascribed to al-Mubarrad); Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 231.

[193] Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1, p. 408. See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 72–73. For opinions of later grammarians see *ibid*., p. 75.

[194] See Sadan, *Subjunctive*, pp. 74–75. See also Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 231; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 40. This issue does not appear among the *masāʾil* to which Baalbaki ("Arab grammatical controversies") found testimony in the early sources.

[195] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 117.

[196] See Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 182 ff.

[197] See Carter, "*Ṣarf* et *ḥilāf*," p. 297; Talmon, "*Muqaddima*," p. 148; *idem*, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp.

The use of the term *ḥāl* is not restricted to Sībawayhi and mainstream grammarians. It is used even by al-Farrāʾ, although, acccording to Kinberg, the latter restricts it to transitional states.[199] It should also be noted that al-Farrāʾ's *qaṭʿ* and Sībawayhi's *ḥāl* are not co-extensive; for instance, the former is also applied to accusative nouns in exceptive constructions.[200] The term *qaṭʿ* (in this sense) is not used by Sībawayhi. In addition to the Kūfans it is used also in some pedagogical grammars and early writings; its use in pedagogical writing can be explained as reflecting either a pedagogical or an eclectic trend (i.e. of grammarians 'mixing' between different frameworks — see above), these two explanations not being mutually exclusive.[201]

(8) *nasaq*

The author of the T-S grammar makes use of the term *nasaq*, never *ʿaṭf*, with reference to conjunction (Ch. 5).

The term *nasaq* is sometimes regarded as the Kūfan counterpart of the Baṣran *ʿaṭf*.[202] Of these two terms, Sībawayhi uses only *ʿaṭf*.[203] Al-Farrāʾ, on the other hand, uses both;[204] the term *nasaq* never ceased to be used, also by mainstream grammarians (especially in the form of the term *ʿaṭf al-nasaq*).[205]

183, 190 ff.; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 116–119, 123–124; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 658 ff.; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 31 ff. See also Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *Īḍāḥ*, e.g., p. 464; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 190.

[198] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 122–123. See also Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, pp. 208–209; Sadan, *Edition*, p. 136.

[199] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 194–196, 808–809. Note that if our reading of the main illustration is correct, it includes a non-transitional adjective, viz. *nabīl*.

[200] See Carter, "*Ṣarf* et *ḥilāf*," p. 297; Talmon, "*Muqaddima*," pp. 148–149; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, p. 194; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 34 ff.

[201] In addition to the references above, see also Talmon, "*Muqaddima*," pp. 147–152; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 194, 196; Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, p. 133.

[202] See al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, p. 315; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 167, 202; al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 20; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266; Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 40; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 158–159.

[203] See Troupeau, *Lexique-index*, p. 143.

[204] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 485 ff., 792 ff.

[205] On the term *nasaq*, see, e.g., al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 4, p. 14; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 167–168; al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 20. Cf. Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, *passim*, although some of his arguments regarding the distribution of this term should be reconsidered. The authors have been unable to locate the single occurrence where Ṯaʿlab is said to use the term *ʿaṭf* (*ibid*., p. 94); it may thus be the case that this grammarian does use *nasaq* exclusively (see also Versteegh,

(9) *naʿt*

The term *naʿt* is used by the author of the T-S grammar to refer to adjectival attributes (Chapters 2, 7, 8 and 16). The term *ṣifa* is not used in this sense.

The term *naʿt* is sometimes regarded as the Kūfan counterpart of the Baṣran term *ṣifa* (also *waṣf*).[206] Sībawayhi and al-Farrāʾ use both terms,[207] and both also continued to co-exist in mainstream writings.[208]

(10) *ṣifa*

In his discussion of the sentence *ʿinda ʿabdi llāhi mālun kaṯīrun*, after stating that *ʿinda* assigns the genitive to *ʿabdi llāhi*, the author of the T-S grammar says that the nominative of *māl* is due to the *ṣifa* (Ch. 16; see (2) above). The term *ẓarf* (locative/temporal qualifier) does not appear in the T-S grammar.

The term *ṣifa* is frequently ascribed to the Kūfans as the counterpart of the Baṣran term *ẓarf*.[209] It is used in this sense by grammarians identified as Kūfans, such as al-Farrāʾ, as well as by some very early writers and in several pedagogical grammars (some using both terms), but it is used neither by Sībawayhi nor by the later grammarians of the mainstream (with only one possible

---

Arabic grammar, p. 153).

[206] See al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, p. 314; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 167, 202, 228; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266. It is immaterial for the present discussion which categories, among the concordants, were subsumed under these terms by different grammarians (see Talmon, "Appositival *ʿaṭf*"; *idem*, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, *passim*; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, *passim*), for our interest lies in the adjectival attribute only, the only category at stake in the T-S grammar.

[207] See Troupeau, *Lexique-index*, pp. 203–204, 215–216; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 840 ff., 908–909, 914 ff. The frequencies of these terms in the two books seem to correspond to the attribution of the terms to the respective schools, but this hypothesis needs a further minute scrutiny of all their occurrences (especially in *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*), something that is beyond the scope of the present study.

[208] See, e.g., al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 4, p. 399, where *ṣifa*, *waṣf* and *naʿt* are used interchangeably. See also al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, p. 314; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 167–168; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 267; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, p. 161.

[209] See Weil, *Streitfragen*, p. 72, footnote 1; al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 309–310; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 166, 200–201, 228; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, p. 141; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266; Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 40. This correspondence is mentioned already in *Kitāb al-ʿayn* (see Talmon, *Arabic grammar*, p. 147) and by al-Farrāʾ (*al-Muḏakkar*, p. 98) and Ibn Kaysān (*al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 111), albeit without any allusion to either the Kūfans or the Baṣrans.

exception, to the best of our knowledge).[210] There is, in fact, an important difference between the two terms, for *ṣifa* applies not only to locative/temporal nouns and prepositional phrases, but also to prepositions.[211] The following important observation made by Versteegh is in order here: "... the later tradition perhaps even underestimated the doctrinal and theoretical differences between the two schools: it is clear that at least in some cases the difference in terminology is a sign of a real theoretical difference between Basrans and Kufans ..."[212]

(11) *al-asmāʾ al-makniyya*

The author of the T-S grammar uses the term *al-asmāʾ al-makniyya* with reference to personal pronouns (Ch. 12). It is possible that he uses also the term *iḍmār* once (Ch. 18), when the pronoun in question is covert, i.e. incorporated in a verb.

The terms (*al-ism*) *al-makniyy* and *kināya*, in this sense, are sometimes mentioned as the Kūfan counterparts of the Baṣran terms (*al-ism*) *al-muḍmar* or *ḍamīr*.[213] Sībawayhi does not use terms of the root *KNY* in this sense.[214] Al-Farrāʾ, on the other hand, uses terms derived from both *KNY* and *ḌMR* for personal pronouns.[215] Note, however, Kinberg's translation of the term *makniyy*: "a

---

[210] The only known occurrence of the term *ṣifa* presumably used in this sense in a mainstream writing is the closing sentence of al-Zajjājī, *Ḥurūf: tamma kitāb ḥurūf al-maʿānī wa-ʾl-ṣifāt* (p. 87) (see also Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 94). See also Ibn Durayd (d. 321/933), *Jamhara*, vol. 3, p. 1317, where the term *ṣifa*, in the 'Kūfan' sense, probably belongs to the parlance of the two earlier Baṣran (!) scholars quoted, or to (an) intermediary source(s) which Ibn Durayd quotes, for this term is never used in this sense in the rest of the dictionary.

[211] See Carter, "16th century grammatical experiment," pp. 269–270; Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 141–151, 194, 197; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 909 ff.; Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 232–236; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 161–163 (some studies ignore, however, the fact that prepositional phrases are subsumed under *ẓarf* by Sībawayhi [as well as by most of his followers], e.g., *fīhā* in Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1, p. 222).

[212] Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, p. 13. See also *ibid*., pp. 193–194; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266.

[213] See al-Sāmarrāʾī, *"A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya?*," p. 15; al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 190, 314; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 166, 200, 227; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 152–155.

[214] See Troupeau, *Lexique-index*, pp. 185–186.

[215] See al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya?*," pp. 15–16; Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 360–361, 434–436, 731 ff. Al-Muʾaddib uses both *KNY* and *ḌMR* (see *Daqāʾiq*, e.g., pp. 20, 41; see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," pp. 40–41). See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 196–197, on the use of *KNY* terms by Ṯaʿlab and Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, and *ibid*., p. 196 for their distribution in other writings (see also Nifṭawayhi, *al-Maqṣūr*, pp. 111, 122); see also Versteegh, *Arabic grammar*, p. 112; Abū

pronoun (generally a concrete morpheme, in contrast to *ism muḍmar* ...),"[216] the latter referring, *inter alia*, to pronouns incorporated in verbs and participles (e.g., *al-ism al-muḍmar fī qāʾim*),[217] which fits the use of *iḍmār* made by the author of the T-S grammar.[218]

Although the *ḌMR* terms prevailed, in this sense, the *KNY* terms did not disappear even from mainstream writings.[219]

(12) The direction of derivation between the *maṣdar* and the finite verb

The author of the T-S grammar characterizes the *maṣdar* as derived from its verb (Ch. 8, where its functioning as the so-called *mafʿūl muṭlaq* is discussed, a term which does not appear in this treatise).

According to a well-known *Streitfrage* between Baṣrans and Kūfans, the former are said to have held that the finite verb is derived from the *maṣdar*, whereas the latter allegedly maintained that it was the other way around.[220] Whereas *al-Kitāb*,[221] as well as other treatises,[222] testify for the Baṣran view, al-Muʾaddib, Ibn Fāris, the author of *Talqīn* and al-Ṭabarī adhere to the view attributed to the Kūfans.[223]

(13) The participle as *fiʿl*

In Ch. 4, after the author of the T-S grammar illustrates the rule according to which verbs preceding their subject take the singular form, the only Qurʾānic verse he adduces contains, in fact, an active participle (Qurʾān 4:75). *Prima facie*, this is in line with al-Farrāʾ's classification of participles as *fiʿl*,[224] as well as with

---

Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, p. 153. On these terms in early writings, see Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 204–207.

[216] Kinberg, *Lexicon*, p. 734.

[217] *Ibid*., p. 358.

[218] The early history of these terms will be studied elsewhere.

[219] See, e.g., Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 149 (see al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 16). Ibn Yaʿīš (d. 643/1245) (*Šarḥ*, vol. 2, p. 292) maintains that the terminological difference between the Baṣrans and the Kūfans with respect to these terms is that the Kūfans consider them synonyms, whereas the Baṣrans regard *muḍmar* as a hyponym of *makniyy*.

[220] See Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf*, pp. 102 ff.; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, p. 196.

[221] Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1, p. 1.

[222] E.g., Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 122. See also Talmon, *Arabic grammar*, p. 153.

[223] Al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 44 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 41); Ibn Fāris, *al-Ṣāḥibī*, p. 106; Ibn Qutayba, *Talqīn*, p. 235; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, p. 161. Cf. Baalbaki, "Arab grammatical controversies"; Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, p. 207.

[224] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 591 ff. The term *al-fiʿl al-dāʾim* is regarded as the Kūfan term for participles:

the fact that Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī also adduces this verse for exactly the same purpose, regarding it as a *fiʿl*.[225] However, the use of the term *fiʿl* here may be symptomatic of the so-called *naʿt sababī* construction, in which the relationships between the participle and the following noun in the nominative are analogous to the verb-subject relationships. Thus one also finds the term *fiʿl* used by al-Mubarrad in this context, not only with reference to participles,[226] but also to adjectives such as *ḥasan*.[227]

Another occurrence where *fiʿl* may convey this meaning was discussed in (2) above.

(14) Masculine singular verb + feminine plural subject

Ch. 4 concludes with the statement that when verbs precede a subject in the feminine plural, they take the masculine (singular) form.[228]

Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) attributes to the Kūfans the view that it is permissible to elide the feminine marker *-t* from the perfect when the subject is a feminine plural, which he illustrates with a sound feminine plural.[229]

Ibn Kaysān (*al-Muwaffaqī*, p. 108) mentions this term, attributing it to the Kūfans, in a paragraph discussing the number category of participles preceding their *asmāʾ*. See also Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Muḏakkar*, vol. 1, p. 135; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 183, vol. 2, p. 244; al-Zajjājī, *Majālis*, p. 349; Ibn Fāris, *al-Ṣāḥibī*, pp. 183, 264; al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, e.g., pp. 20, 90 (see Baalbaki, "Unfamiliar morphological terminology," p. 40). In Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, pp. 4, 89 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, pp. 65, 141 the term *fiʿl dāʾim* (also: *fiʿl*) is used with reference to active participles, with regard to the well known polemic over whether they must take the accusative when they interpose between two prepositional phrases. Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī (*al-Zāhir*, vol. 1, p. 435) puts the term *dāʾim* in the mouth of the Baṣrans in a morphological polemic regarding passive participles. See also al-Maḫzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa*, pp. 237–241, 281–282, 310; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 166, 197, 227; Versteegh, *Linguistic causes*, p. 146; Carter, "Development of Arabic linguistics," p. 266. But cf. Talmon, "The philosophizing Farrāʾ," p. 271 (also Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 256–257; Talmon, *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar*, pp. 208, 211–212; Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, pp. 95–97. Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā*, p. 60 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 114; al-Zajjājī, *al-Jumal*, p. 7; al-Zubaydī, *al-Wāḍiḥ*, pp. 50, 81, 203).

[225] Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *Īḍāḥ*, p. 149.

[226] See al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 4, p. 155.

[227] *Ibid*., p. 158. See also Polotsky, "Indirect attribute," p. 166.

[228] However, according to one of the suggestions we raise in footnote 25, the author of the T-S grammar in fact gives a counter-example to the rule he formulates, namely, a reading of Qurʾān 33:52 in which a verb in the feminine singular precedes the subject *niswa*.

[229] Al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ*, vol. 3, p. 293.

General statements concerning the permissibility of these constructions are put forward both by al-Farrāʾ and by Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī.[230] According to these grammarians the preference for one gender over the other in constructions of this kind depends on whether the noun in question is in the plural of paucity or in the plural of abundance: when the subject is of the first type, which includes sound feminine plurals, it is preferable to use the masculine singular form for the preceding verb.[231]

Al-Muʾaddib's text is also of interest: having stated that a verb preceding a feminine singular or dual subject takes the feminine singular form (thus *qāmat-i l-marʾatu* and *qāmat-i l-marʾatāni*), he mentions first the masculine singular form of a verb preceding feminine plural (thus *qāma l-niswatu*), and only afterwards the feminine singular form (*wa-qāmat ayḍan*). This difference between the dual and the plural is explained by his claim that the singular and the plural may belong to different stems (e.g., *rajul* and *qawm*), which is not the case with the dual.[232]

For Sībawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj, on the other hand, different factors are germane here, to wit, broken vs. sound plural, and animacy vs. inanimacy (which is tantamount to: grammatical feminine reflecting biological feminine vs. purely grammatical feminine). Using the masculine form for feminine inanimate nouns is permissible, including instances where they take the form of a sound feminine plural; as for broken vs. sound plural of feminine animate nouns, it is permissible to use the masculine form of the verb with broken plurals, both of animate and inanimate nouns.[233] It is of importance for the present discussion that al-Mubarrad says explicitly that it is impermissible to use the masculine singular form of the verb before the sound feminine plural of animate nouns (e.g.,

---

[230] Al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, vol. 1, p. 454; *ibid*., vol. 3, p. 105, on participles (in *sababī* construction); Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Muḏakkar*, vol. 2, pp. 214–215 (see also *ibid*., vol. 1, p. 181).

[231] Al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, vol. 1, p. 435, vol. 2, pp. 124–125 (where al-Farrāʾ also explains that imperfect verbs designating paucity originally take the form *yafʿalna*, so that when they precede explicit subjects, the *-na* is elided); Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Muḏakkar*, vol. 1, p. 210 (with attribution to Abū al-ʿAbbās [Ṯaʿlab]), vol. 2, pp. 282–285 (with attribution to al-Kisāʾī). As correctly noted by the editor of Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Muḏakkar* (vol. 1, p. 120, footnote 2), Ibn Yaʿīš (*Šarḥ*, vol. 3, p. 376) ascribes this distinction to the Kūfans, albeit correlating the masculine with the plural of abundance and the feminine with the plural of paucity.

[232] Al-Muʾaddib, *Daqāʾiq*, p. 145. Cf. al-Zubaydī's theory below.

[233] Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1, pp. 202, 204 (regarding the *sababī* construction); al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 3, p. 349, vol. 4, p. 59; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, pp. 173–174. Cf. Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ*, vol. 3, pp. 375–378; al-Suyūṭī, *Hamʿ*, vol. 3, p. 293.

**qāma muslimātuka*),[234] and that Ibn al-Sarrāj formulates the same notion positively.[235]

The evidence from pedagogical grammars is unclear: in Luġda one finds, in a chapter about verbs taking the singular form before their subjects, the sentence *atānī niswatun fa-qulna*[236] *lī kaḍā wa-kaḍā*, but he does not elaborate on this issue;[237] al-Zubaydī claims that the speaker is free to choose between the masculine and the feminine forms of verbs preceding the feminine plural, yet when he explains the difference between this and the rule permitting only the feminine form before the feminine dual, he takes recourse to the fact that the plural is *sometimes* broken.[238]

Thus, although no grammarian among those discussed here mentions the singular form as the only option before feminine plurals (including sound feminine plurals of animate nouns) as the author of the T-S grammar possibly does,[239] it seems that this fact brings him closer to al-Farrāʾ, Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī and al-Muʾaddib (and possibly also to al-Kisāʾī and Ṯaʿlab), than to Sībawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj. However, here also there is some inconclusive evidence that the text of the T-S grammar may reflect a pedagogical trend.

(15) (*lā*) *yanṣarifu*

In Ch. 19, the author of the T-S grammar uses the terms *yanṣarifu* and *lā yanṣarifu* with reference to triptosis and diptosis, respectively.

The Kūfans are said to refer to triptotes and diptotes by terms derived from the root *JRY*, e.g., *mā yajrī*, whereas the Baṣrans are said to use terms from the root *ṢRF*, e.g., *mā yanṣarifu* (both examples for triptotes).[240] The former is indeed used very frequently by al-Farrāʾ;[241] however, the latter is also utilized occasionally,[242] and both are used also by Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī.[243]

---

[234] Al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*, vol. 3, p. 349.

[235] Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1, p. 174.

[236] The editor vocalizes *-nna*.

[237] Luġda, *al-Naḥw*, p. 225

[238] Al-Zubaydī, *al-Wāḍiḥ*, pp. 197–198.

[239] But see footnote 228.

[240] See Weil, *Streitfragen*, p. 72, footnote 1; Ḍayf, *al-Madāris*, pp. 167, 201, 228; al-Sāmarrāʾī, "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?," p. 20.

[241] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 100 ff. See also Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 132.

[242] See Kinberg, *Lexicon*, pp. 403, 406.

[243] See Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 197–198. On al-Ṭabarī's use of terms derived from

Bibliography

Primary sources

Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī. *Juzʾ mustaḫraj min Kitāb al-hāʾāt*. N.M.Ḥ. Āl Yāsīn, ed. Pt. 1: *al-Balāġ* 4 (1976): 68–73. Pt. 2: *al-Balāġ* 5 (1976): 62–72.

Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī. *Al-Muḏakkar wa-'l-muʾannaṯ*. M.ʿA. ʿUḍayma and R. ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, eds. Cairo, 1981–1999.

Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim. *Al-Zāhir fī maʿānī kalimāt al-nās*. Ḥ.Ṣ. al-Ḍāmin, ed. 2nd ed. Baghdad, 1987.

Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim. *Īḍāḥ al-waqf wa-'l-ibtidāʾ fī Kitāb Allāh ʿazza wa-jalla*. A. Mahdalī, ed. Beirut, 2010.

Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī, Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim. *Marsūm al-ḫaṭṭ*. Ḥ.Ṣ. al-Ḍāmin, ed. Al-Šāriqa, 2008.

Al-Azharī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *Tahḏīb al-luġa*. M.ʿA. Hārūn, ed. Cairo, 1964–1967.

Al-Fārisī, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Ġaffār. *Al-Ḥujja li-l-qurrāʾ al-sabʿa aʾimmat al-amṣār bi-l-Ḥijāz wa-'l-ʿIrāq wa-'l-Šām llaḏīna ḏakarahum Abū Bakr b. Mujāhid*. B. Qahwajī, B. Juwayjātī, ʿA. Rabāḥ and A.Y. al-Daqqāq, eds. Damascus, 1984–1999.

[Al-Fārisī], Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Ġaffār. *Kitāb al-Īḍāḥ*. K. Baḥr al-Murjān, ed. 2nd ed. Beirut, 1996.

---

both roots, see Abū Ḫuḍayr, *al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī*, p. 110. Interestingly, two titles, probably of the same work, are attributed to Ṯaʿlab, on triptotes vs. diptotes: *Mā yanṣarifu wa-mā lā yanṣarifu* and *Mā yujrā wa-mā lā yujrā* (Sezgin, *GAS*, p. 141). In Niftawayhi, *al-Maqṣūr* (*passim*) only *ṢRF* terms are used, never *JRY*. Both are used in *Kitāb al-ʿayn* (see Talmon, *Arabic grammar*, pp. 378, 393) and by al-Muʾaddib (*Daqāʾiq*, pp. 96, 327). On the distribution of these terms in some pedagogical grammars, see Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory*, pp. 181 ff. (note, however, that the term *lā yanṣarifu* does appear in Ibn Šuqayr, *al-Muḥallā* — see, e.g., p. 12 = al-Ḫalīl, *al-Jumal*, p. 71). For a rare use by Sībawayhi of *lā tujrī*, in the sense of diptosis, see Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 2, p. 38, l. 21.

Al-Farrāʾ, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Ziyād. *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*. Vol. 1: A.Y. Najātī and M.ʿA. al-Najjār, eds. 2nd ed. [Cairo], 1980. Vol. 2: M.ʿA. al-Najjār, ed. [Cairo], n.d. Vol. 3: ʿA.I. Šalabī. [Cairo], 1972.

Al-Farrāʾ, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Ziyād. *Al-Muḏakkar wa-'l-muʾannaṯ*. R. ʿAbd al-Tawwāb, ed. 2nd ed. Cairo, [1989?].

Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar, Ḫalaf b. Ḥayyān al-Aḥmar. *Muqaddima fī al-naḥw*. ʿI. al-Tanūḫī, ed. Damascus, 1961.

Al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī. *Kitāb al-jumal fī al-naḥw*. F. Qabāwa, ed. 5th ed. N.p., 1995.

Al-Ḫʷārizmī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf. *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*. G. van Vloten, ed. Leiden, 1968.

Ibn al-Anbārī, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Saʿīd. *Kitāb al-inṣāf fī masāʾil al-ḫilāf bayna al-naḥwiyyīna al-baṣriyyīna wa-'l-kūfiyyīna*. G. Weil, ed. Leiden, 1913.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr. *Kitāb al-Ḫaṭṭ*. ʿA. Muḥammad, ed. *Al-Mawrid* 5iii (1976): 103–134.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. *Al-Mūjaz fī al-naḥw*. M. al-Šuwaymī and B. Dāmirjī, eds. Beirut, [1965].

Ibn al-Sarrāj, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sahl. *Al-Uṣūl fī al-naḥw*. ʿA. al-Fatlī, ed. 3rd ed. Beirut, 1996.

Ibn Durayd, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. *Kitāb jamharat al-luġa*. R.M. Baʿlabakkī, ed. Beirut, 1987–1988.

Ibn Fāris, Abū al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fāris b. Zakariyyā. *Al-Ṣāḥibī fī fiqh al-luġa al-ʿarabiyya wa-masāʾilihā wa-sunan al-ʿarab fī kalāmihā*. ʿU.F. al-Ṭabbāʿ, ed. Beirut, 1993.

Ibn Janāḥ. *Kitāb al-lumaʿ*. J. Derenbourg, ed. *Le livre des parterres fleuris. Grammaire*

hébraïque en arabe d'Abou'l-Walid Merwan b. Djanah de Cordoue. Paris, 1886.

Ibn Kaysān. *Kitāb al-muwaffaqī fī al-naḥw*. ʿA. al-Fatlī and H.Ṭ. Šallāš, eds. *al-Mawrid* 4ii (1975): 103–124.

Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawrī. *Kitāb talqīn al-mutaʿallim min al-naḥw*. J.ʿA. Muḫaymar. [Cairo], 1989.

Ibn Šuqayr, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan. *Al-Muḥallā "wujūh al-naṣb"*. F. Fāris, ed. Beirut, 1987.

Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū al-Baqāʾ Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī. *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal li-l-Zamaḫšarī*. I.B. Yaʿqūb, ed. Beirut, 2011.

Luġda, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh. *Kitāb al-naḥw*. ʿA. al-Fatlī, ed. *Al-Mawrid* 3iii (1974): 221–246.

Al-Muʾaddib, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Saʿīd. *Daqāʾiq al-taṣrīf*. A.N. al-Qaysī, Ḥ.Ṣ. al-Ḍāmin and Ḥ. Tūrāl, eds. [Baghdad], 1987.

Al-Mubarrad, Abū al-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd. *Kitāb al-muqtaḍab*. M.ʿA. ʿUḍayma, ed. Cairo, 1994.

Al-Naḥḥās, Abū Jaʿfar. *Kitāb al-tuffāḥa fī al-naḥw*. K. ʿAwwād, ed. Baghdad, 1965.

Nifṭawayhi, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ʿArafa. *Kitāb al-maqṣūr wa-'l-mamdūd*. Ḥ.Š. Farhūd, ed. *Majallat Kulliyyat al-Ādāb* 4 (1975–1976): 93–127.

Sībawayhi. *Al-Kitāb*. H. Derenbourg, ed. *Le livre de Sîbawaihi*. Paris, 1881–1889.

Al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Marzubān. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*. A.Ḥ. Mahdalī and ʿA.S. ʿAlī, eds. Beirut, 2008.

Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr. *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī šarḥ Jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*. A. Šams al-Dīn, ed. Beirut, 1998.

Ṯaʿlab. *Kitāb al-faṣīḥ wa-šarḥuhu al-musammā al-Talwīḥ fī šarḥ al-Faṣīḥ li-Abī Sahl*

Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Harawī. In *Faṣīḥ Ṯaʿlab wa-'l-šurūḥ llatī ʿalayhi*. M.ʿA. Ḫafājī, ed. [Cairo], 1949.

Ṯaʿlab, Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā. *Majālis Ṯaʿlab*. ʿA.M. Hārūn, ed. 2nd ed. Egypt, [1960].

Al-Zajjājī, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Isḥāq. *Kitāb al-jumal fī al-naḥw*. ʿA.T. al-Ḥamad, ed. 5th ed. Beirut, 1996.

Al-Zajjājī, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Isḥāq. *Kitāb ḥurūf al-maʿānī*. ʿA.T. al-Ḥamad, ed. 2nd ed. Beirut, 1986.

Al-Zajjājī, Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Isḥāq. *Majālis al-ʿulamāʾ*. ʿA.M. Hārūn, ed. 2nd ed. Kuwait, 1984.

Al-Zubaydī, Abū Bakr al-Išbīlī. *Kitāb al-wāḍiḥ*. ʿA. Ḫalīfa, ed. 2nd ed. ʿAmmān, 2011.

Secondary sources

Abū Ḥuḍayr, N. *Al-Ruʾya al-naḥwiyya ʿinda al-Ṭabarī: qirāʾa fī Jāmiʿ al-bayān ʿan taʾwīl al-Qurʾān.* Irbid, 2014.

Allony, N. *Jewish library in the Middle Ages: book lists from the Cairo Genizah*. M. Frenkel, Ḥ. Ben-Shammai, eds., with the participation of M. Sokolow. Jerusalem, 2006 [in Hebrew].

Baalbaki, R. "Arab grammatical controversies and the extant sources of the second and third centuries A.H." In W. al-Qāḍī, ed. *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Ihsan ʿAbbas on his sixtieth birthday*. Beirut, 1981, pp. 1–26.

——. "*Tawahhum*: an ambiguous concept in early Arabic grammar." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45 (1982): 233–244.

——. "The book in the grammatical tradition: development in content and method." In G.N. Atiyeh, ed. *The book in the Islamic world: the written word and communication in the Middle East*. Albany, 1995, pp. 123–139.

——. "Unfamiliar morphological terminology from the early fourth century A.H.: Muʾaddib's *Daqāʾiq al-taṣrīf*." In L. Edzard and J. Watson, eds. *Grammar as a window onto Arabic humanism*. Wiesbaden, 2006, pp. 21–50.

——. "Introduction: the early Islamic grammatical tradition." In R. Baalbaki, ed. *The early Islamic grammatical tradition*. Aldershot, 2007, pp. xiii–l.

——. *The Arabic lexicographical tradition: from the 2nd/8th to the 12th/18th century*. Leiden, 2014.

Basal, N. "Part one of *al-Kitāb al-muštamil* by Abū al-Faraj Hārūn and its dependence on Ibn al-Sarrāj's *Kitāb al-uṣūl fī al-naḥw*." *Leshonenu* 61 (1998): 191–209 [in Hebrew].

——. "Mediaeval Jewish and Muslim cultures: an anonymous Judaeo-Arabic adaptation of Ibn Jinnī's *al-Lumaʿ*." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 37 (2010): 223–263.

Becker, D. *Arabic sources of R. Jonah b. Janāḥ's grammar*. Tel-Aviv, 1998 [in Hebrew].

Bergsträßer, G. and O. Pretzl. *Die Geschichte des Korantexts*. In Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorāns*. F. Schwally, ed. 2nd ed. Hildesheim, 1961, vol. 3.

Blau, J. *A grammar of Christian Arabic: based mainly on South-Palestinian texts from the first millennium*. Louvain, 1966–1967.

——. *A grammar of Medieval Judaeo-Arabic*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem, 1980 [in Hebrew].

Blau, J. and S. Hopkins. "On early Judaeo-Arabic orthography." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 12 (1984): 9–27.

Bohas, G., J-P. Guillaume and D.E. Kouloughli. *The Arabic linguistic tradition*. London, 1990.

Brockelmann, C. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. Hildesheim, 1966.

Carter, M.G. "*Ṣarf* et *ḫilāf*, contribution à l'histoire de la grammaire arabe." *Arabica* 20 (1973): 292–304.

——. "A 16th century grammatical experiment that failed." *Arabica* 26 (1979): 267–273.

——. *Arab linguistics: an introductory classical text with translation and notes*. Amsterdam, 1981.

——. Review of Owens, *Early Arabic grammatical theory: heterogeneity and standardization*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994): 472–475.

——. "The development of Arabic linguistics after Sībawayhi: Baṣra, Kūfa and Baghdad." In S. Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner, H.-J. Niederehe and K. Versteegh, eds. *History of the language sciences*. Berlin, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 263–272.

Ḍayf, Š. *Al-Madāris al-naḥwiyya*. 4th ed. Cairo, 1979.

Fischer, W. "The chapter on grammar in the *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm*." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (1985): 94–103.

Goldenberg, G. *Semitic languages: features, structures, relations, processes*. Oxford, 2013.

Kasher, A. "The terminology of vowel and *iʿrāb* in mediaeval Arabic grammatical tradition." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 37 (2010): 139–161.

Khan, G. *Arabic legal and administrative documents in the Cambridge Genizah collections*. Cambridge, 1993.

Kinberg, N. *A lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's terminology in his Qurʾān commentary: with full definitions, English summaries and extensive citations*. Leiden, 1996.

Kopf, L. *Studies in Arabic and Hebrew lexicography*. Jerusalem, 1976 [in Hebrew].

Lane, E.W. *An Arabic-English lexicon*. London, 1863–1893.

Langermann, Y.T. "Arabic writings in Hebrew manuscripts: a preliminary relisting." *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 6 (1996): 137–160.

Latham, J.D. "Arabic into medieval Latin." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 17 (1972): 30–67.

Levin, A. "Sībawayhi's view of the syntactical structure of *kāna waʾaxawātuhā*." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979): 185–213.

——. "The distinction between nominal and verbal sentences according to the Arab grammarians." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (1985): 118–127.

Al-Maḫzūmī, M. *Madrasat al-Kūfa wa-manhajuhā fī dirāsat al-luġa wa-'l-naḥw*. 2nd ed. Egypt, 1958.

Omar, A.M. "Grammatical studies in early Muslim Egypt." In K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, eds. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*. Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 239–251.

Owens, J. *Early Arabic grammatical theory: heterogeneity and standardization*. Amsterdam, 1990.

Palmer, F.R. *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge, 1994.

Peled, Y. "ʿAmal and ʾibtidāʾ in medieval Arabic grammatical tradition." *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992): 146–171.

——. *Sentence types and word-order patterns in written Arabic: medieval and modern perspectives*. Leiden, 2009.

Polotsky, H.J. "A point of Arabic syntax: the indirect attribute." *Israel Oriental Studies* 8 (1978): 159–173.

Rosenthal, F. *The technique and approach of Muslim scholarship*. Roma, 1947.

Rustow, M. "A petition to a woman at the Fatimid court (413–414 A.H./1022–23 C.E.)." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 73 (2010): 1–27.

Ryding, K.C. "Morphosyntactic analysis in *al-Jumal fii l-naḥw*: discourse structure and metalanguage." In E. Broselow, M. Eid and J. McCarthy, eds.

Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics IV: Papers from the fourth annual symposium on Arabic linguistics. Amsterdam, 1992, pp. 263–277.

——. "Aspects of the genitive: taxonomy in *al-Jumal fī al-naḥw*." In K.C. Ryding, ed. *Early medieval Arabic: studies on al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad*. Washington, D.C., 1998, pp. 92–142.

Sabra, A.I. "The appropriation and subsequent naturalization of Greek science in medieval Islam: a preliminary statement." *History of Science* 25 (1987): 223–243.

Sadan, A. *A critical edition of the grammatical treatise* Taḏkirat jawāmiʿ al-ʾadawāt *by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd*. Wiesbaden, 2012.

——. *The subjunctive mood in Arabic grammatical tradition*. Leiden, 2012.

Al-Sāmarrāʾī, I. "*A-lanā madāris naḥwiyya*?" *Majallat majmaʿ al-luġa al-ʿarabiyya al-urdunnī* 21–22 (1983): 7–22.

Schoeler, G. "Wer ist der Verfasser des *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 38 (2000): 15–45.

Sezgin, F. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Vol. 9: Grammatik. Leiden, 1984.

Singer, H.-R. *Neuarabische Fragewörter: Ein Beitrag zur historischen und vergleichenden Grammatik der arabischen Dialekte*. Inaugural diss. Erlangen Uni., 1958.

Steinschneider, M. "Schriften der Araber in hebräischen Handschriften, ein Beitrag zur arabischen Bibliographie." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 47 (1893): 335–384.

Talmon, R. "Appositival *ʿaṭf* — an inquiry into the history of a syntactic category." *Arabica* 28 (1981): 278–292.

——. "*al-Masʾala al-zunbūriyya: dirāsa fī māhiyyat iḫtilāf al-maḏhabayni al-naḥwiyyayni*." *Al-Karmil* 7 (1986): 131–163.

——. "The philosophizing Farrāʾ: an interpretation of an obscure saying attributed to the grammarian Ṯaʿlab." In K. Versteegh and M.G. Carter, eds. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April–1 May 1987*. Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 265–279.

——. "*Kitāb 'Muqaddima fī al-naḥw' al-mansūb ilā Ḫalaf al-Aḥmar — dirāsa wa-fihris muṣṭalaḥāt*." *Al-Karmil* 11 (1990): 129–199.

——. "Two early 'non-Sībawaihian' views of *ʿamal* in kernel-sentences." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 25 (1993): 278–288.

——. *Arabic grammar in its formative age: Kitāb al-ʿAyn and its attribution to Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad*. Leiden, 1997.

——. "*Lamḥa ḥawla iḫtilāf al-kūfiyyīna wa-'l-baṣriyyīna wa-qaḍiyyat nasb Kitāb al-ʿAyn ilā al-Ḫalīl b. Aḥmad*." *Al-Karmil* 20 (1999): 189–200.

——. "The first beginnings of Arabic linguistics: the era of the Old Iraqi School." In S. Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner, H.-J. Niederehe and K. Versteegh, eds. *History of the language sciences*. Berlin, 2000, vol. 1, pp. 245–252.

——. *Eighth-century Iraqi grammar: a critical exploration of pre-Ḫalīlian Arabic linguistics*. Winona Lake, 2003.

Troupeau, G. "La grammaire à Baġdād du IXe au XIIIe siècle." *Arabica* 9 (1962): 397–405.

——. *Lexique-index du* Kitāb *de Sībawayhi*. Paris, 1976.

ʿUmar, A.M. and ʿA.S. Makram. *Muʿjam al-qirāʾāt al-Qurʾāniyya*. 2nd ed. Kuwait, 1988.

Van Koningsveld, P.S. *The Latin-Arabic glossary of the Leiden University Library. A contribution to the study of Mozarabic manuscripts and literature*. Leiden, 1977.

Versteegh, C.H.M. [=K.]. *Arabic grammar and Qurʾānic exegesis in early Islam*. Leiden, 1993.

——. *The explanation of linguistic causes: al-Zaǧǧāǧī's theory of grammar*. Amsterdam, 1995.

——. "Zayd b. ʿAlī's commentary on the Qurʾān." In Y. Suleiman, ed. *Arabic grammar and linguistics*. Surrey, 1999, pp. 9–29.

——. *The Arabic language.* Edinburgh, 2001.

Weil, G. *Die grammatischen Streitfragen der Basrer und Kufer*. Leiden, 1913.

Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache. M. Ullmann, ed. Wiesbaden, 1970–.

Wright, W. *A grammar of the Arabic language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, 1896–1898.