

Durham E-Theses

*Arabic grammatical studies in the late 9th and early
10th centuries, with particular reference to the Usūl
al-Nahw of Ibn al-Sarrāj*

David Andrew Cassels

How to cite:

Cassels, David Andrew (1979) Arabic grammatical studies in the late 9th and early 10th centuries, with particular reference to the Usūl al-Nahw of Ibn al-Sarrāj. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7911/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ARABIC GRAMMATICAL STUDIES
IN THE LATE 9TH AND EARLY 10TH CENTURIES,
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
THE USŪL AL-NAHW OF IBN AL-SARRĀJ

BY

DAVID ANDRIEU CASSELS

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Arts
in the University of Durham
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

School of Oriental Studies,
Elvet Hill,
Durham

May, 1979

Abstract

This thesis gives particular attention to the Uḡūl of the noted grammarian, Ibn al-Sarrāj, but some attention is also given to the Muqtadab of al-Mubarrad, his teacher, although this latter work is less significant. This dissertation also provides a more general discussion of grammatical thought as relevant material from the works of earlier and later scholars has also been introduced.

Chapter I consists of an account of the history of Arabic grammatical thought up until the early 10th. century and special attention is given to al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj and their writings on grammar.

Chapter II deals with the methodical and systematic approach of Ibn al-Sarrāj to his subject matter and assesses the significance of this.

Chapter III deals with Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of the regent (ʿamīl) and considers related questions.

Chapter IV is a discussion of aspects of qiyās and taqdir, two important concepts in the methodology of the Arab grammarians.

Chapter V looks specifically at how qiyās determines the relationship of aṣl and farʿ.

Chapter VI examines how al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj approach two specified topics, the tamyīz and the verb of wonder (fiʿl al-taʿajjub).

Chapter VII deals with Ibn al-Sarrāj's treatment of Kufan grammatical thought, and his use of the expression "the Baghdadis" is considered. In addition, the question of Kufan influence on Ibn al-Sarrāj is discussed.

Chapter VIII consists of an examination of material taken from the Uḡūl by Ibn Yaʿīsh and incorporated into his commentary on the Mufaṣṣal of al-Zamakhsharī.

CONTENTS

Titlepage 1
 Abstract 11
 Table of contents 111
 List of tables iv
 Acknowledgments v
 Transliteration vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1
 II. CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS, AND DEFINITION 27
 III. REGENTS, THEIR CLASSIFICATION, AND RELATED THEORY 55
 IV. THE USE OF QIYĀS AND TAQDĪR 79
 V. QIYĀS AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF ASL AND FAR^c 102
 VI. THE TAMYĪZ AND THE VERB OF WONDER 117
 VII. THE UṢŪL AND THE KUFAN SCHOOL OF GRAMMAR 139
 VIII. IBN YA^cĪSH AND THE UṢŪL OF IBN AL-SARRĀJ 166

 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 182

List of tables

1. The division of the parts of speech into regents
 according to Ibn al-Sarrāj 56
2. The "hundred regents" according to al-Jurjānī 57

Acknowledgments

In connection with this thesis I would like to acknowledge the help and encouragement of my supervisor, J. A. Haywood, Esq., Reader in Arabic in the University of Durham. I would also like to make mention of the assistance given by Mrs. J. Butterworth of the library staff at Elvet Hill who made every effort to obtain necessary works.

TransliterationConsonants

ا	أ	ز	z	ف	f
ب	b	ص	s	ق	q
ت	t	ش	sh	ك	k
ث	th	س	s	ل	l
ج	j	ض	ḍ	م	m
ح	h	ط	t	ن	n
خ	kh	ظ	ẓ	ه	h
د	d	ع	ʿ	و	w
ذ	dh	غ	gh	ي	y
ر	r				

Vowels and diphthongs

ا	a	إ	i	و	u
آ	ā	إي	ī	وو	ū
		أى	ay	أو	aw

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Comparatively little attention has been given by scholars in the West to the detailed study of the development of Arabic grammatical thought. While they have been interested in the grammatical tradition of the Arabs, they have largely directed their efforts to preparing editions of the classics of Arabic grammar. The first detailed European study of the Arabic grammatical tradition is Gustav Flügel's work of 1862, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber, but this is essentially an account of the lives and works of the grammarians based on the then available biographical sources and no attention is given in it to the study of grammatical thought. The first proper study of grammatical thought by a Western scholar is the essay by Gotthold Weil which appears in the Introduction to his edition of the Kitāb al-īnqāf of Ibn al-Anbārī which was published in 1913.¹ This essay remains important and other later European scholars who have given attention to Arabic grammatical thought can be seen to have based themselves firmly on the work of Weil.² In the Middle East useful studies have been made of the lives and works of individual grammarians,³ but more general works on grammatical thought have tended to be biographical in nature and little emphasis has been put on critically examining the development of the ideas and techniques of the grammarians.⁴

Although there is considerable scope for undertaking research on the development of Arabic grammatical thought there are certain limits on what can be done. This is because there are some quite considerable gaps in the works readily available of grammarians from the period

between the time of Sībawayh in the late 8th century and that of al-Zanakhaharī in the late 11th and early 12th centuries. Many works of this period appear to be irrevocably lost although manuscripts of works thought to be lost are still being discovered and catalogued. Although research into Arabic grammatical thought is hindered by the loss of much valuable material it has been greatly assisted in recent times by the publication of further grammatical texts based both on long-known and newly discovered manuscripts.

The publication of editions of the Muqtadab of al-Mubarrad and the Uṣūl of his pupil, Ibn al-Sarrāj, is an important contribution to making easily available the works of the early grammarians.⁵ Together these two works provide much information about grammatical studies in the later 9th and early 10th centuries which is a period to which up until recently little attention could really be given. Because of the availability of these two works it is possible to show how the grammatical scholarship of this particular period relates to that of the later period of the famous classics of Arabic grammar and to show how grammatical studies had progressed since the time of Sībawayh. However, in this present thesis attention is restricted to the grammarians' work on syntax and their work on morphology and phonology has not been taken into consideration. This step has been taken to put necessary limitations on the scope of the thesis and can be justified because syntax, morphology, and phonology are rather different branches of linguistic study.

In the history of Arabic grammatical studies the later 9th and early 10th centuries constitute the period of al-Mubarrad and his immediate followers amongst whom was Ibn al-Sarrāj. While there are positive reasons for taking the later 9th century as a point of departure there is an important, but negative reason for so doing. Because of the action of time the works of scholars who flourished in the period

between Sībawayh and al-Mubarrad seem largely to have been lost and their contribution to grammatical thought can only be imperfectly known through later secondary sources. There are extant works such as the Taqrīf of al-Māzinī which was the subject of a commentary by Ibn Jinnī and has survived through the commentary,⁶ but major works of grammar from this period do not appear to have survived.

Probably the most important work of grammar from the period between the Kitāb of Sībawayh and the Muqtaḍab of al-Mubarrad was the Muzā'īl of al-Akhfaḥ al-Aṣṣaṭ (d. 830) who was a scholar whose views are frequently quoted by later grammarians.⁷ No manuscripts of this work are yet known and, indeed, there is no evidence that late scholars like al-Suyūṭī (1445-1505) and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Buḥārī (1621-82) had at their disposal copies of this work. This would tend to confirm that this work amongst others of al-Akhfaḥ's was lost at a comparatively early date, although one of the pupils of Ibn al-Sarrāj, al-Rumānī, wrote a commentary on it.⁸ It is possible by consulting secondary sources to discover the views of a scholar like al-Akhfaḥ on many points and even to find quotations from his works, but this cannot be any substitute for being able to consult his works at first hand which is vital for obtaining a truly accurate view of the development of grammatical thought. Because of this loss of works of scholars like al-Akhfaḥ, it is necessary in attempting to take up in detail from primary sources the history of grammatical thought after Sībawayh to make a start with the work of al-Mubarrad.

Although the point just made constitutes a somewhat negative argument for taking the later part of the 9th century as a point of departure for the present study, there are also positive considerations for so doing. The Basran school of grammar, which became the school of Arabic grammar, reached an important stage in its development with al-Mubarrad for, when he moved from Basrah to take up residence in Baghdad, the Basran school itself was virtually removed from its town

of origin to Baghdad. Up until the arrival of al-Mubarrad in Baghdad the grammatical school which had flourished there was that of Kufah and it had long been established in the metropolis. Indeed, the earliest Kufan grammarians of note, al-Kisā'ī (d.804) and al-Farrā' (d.822), both left Kufah to take up residence in Baghdad.

By the later 9th century the Kufan school appears to have become somewhat ossified and was no longer producing grammarians of the first order. Tha'lab, the great Kufan contemporary of al-Mubarrad, was without doubt a distinguished scholar but he cannot be considered a grammarian of the same stature as his famous predecessors, al-Kisā'ī and al-Farrā'. When al-Mubarrad settled in Baghdad an alternative tradition of grammar and philology became readily accessible. Students were attracted to the circle of al-Mubarrad and the Basran school took firm root in Baghdad and eventually completely ousted the Kufan school.

Another reason for taking the later 9th century as a point of departure is that the leading grammarian of the period, al-Mubarrad, is chronologically the most distinguished Basran scholar after Sībawayh who gave particular attention to grammar. Sībawayh's pupil, al-Akhfash, was a noted and often quoted grammarian but he cannot be said even to approach the rank of al-Mubarrad as a philologist. Even if al-Mubarrad was a noted grammarian his reputation was established by his great work of adab, the Kāmil, and by his general standing as a philologist the position of the Basran school of grammar in particular must have been immeasurably strengthened.

While there are particularly clear reasons for beginning a study of grammatical thought with the later 9th century, the period of al-Mubarrad, terminating it with the early 10th century, the period of his students, is somewhat more arbitrary but is justified simply by the need to limit the scope of the study. However, there are other considerations for setting such a limit. From among the pupils of

al-Mubarrad this study gives attention to the work of Ibn al-Sarrāj and, if al-Mubarrad can be said to have inaugurated a particular phase in the development of the Basran school, then his pupil, Ibn al-Sarrāj, brought it to a particular highpoint with his renowned work, the Uṣūl. Al-Mubarrad's most outstanding pupils were al-Zajjāj, whose work has largely been lost, and Ibn al-Sarrāj, whose major work on grammar is extant. The grammatical works of lesser grammarian pupils of al-Mubarrad are also largely lost like those of al-Zajjāj and in any case did not attract much attention. In short, this means that the work of al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj form together a convenient subject for a study which covers the work on grammar of two generations of scholars.

Having explained the period which this present study intends to cover, it is necessary to give some account of the prior history of the study of grammar. In undertaking such a review of the history of Arabic grammatical thought the work of Sībawayh, which is contained in the Kitāb, forms a convenient and suitable starting point. Firstly, the Kitāb, which was acclaimed as the "Qur'an of grammar",⁹ is the earliest monument of the Basran grammatical tradition and was a work which was universally praised for its excellence and had a decisive influence on the subsequent study of grammar. Secondly, knowledge of the grammarians of the Basran school who preceded Sībawayh is to be derived from what is recorded of their work in the Kitāb because this book seems to have superceded at an early date the works of preceding Basran scholars.

In considering the further development of the Basran school in the period between Sībawayh and al-Mubarrad an important point which emerges is that the Basran study of grammar was continued and developed by comparatively few specialists. Sībawayh was succeeded by his older contemporary and pupil, al-Akhfash al-Awsaṭ (d. 830), and he was succeeded by his pupils, al-Jarmī (d. 840) and al-Mazīnī (d. 862), of

whom the latter was also a pupil of the former.¹⁰ These two scholars were succeeded in turn by their pupil, al-Mubarrad. Al-Akhfash was undoubtedly a more distinguished scholar than his two pupils, al-Jarīmī and al-Māzinī, and his views are very frequently quoted by later authors. His most famous work, which is often mentioned by name, is the Masā'il. It is apparent that he wrote two works of that name, the Kitāb al-masā'il al-kabīr and the Kitāb al-masā'il al-ṣaḡīr, but often the two titles are not clearly distinguished and reference is made simply to the Masā'il.¹¹ It is recorded that Ibn al-Sarrāj made particular use of the Masā'il which is an indication of the esteem in which the work was held.¹² However, the Masā'il does not seem to have been given the attention in later times which a work like the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj was given and after a period of popularity it fell into disuse. Al-Akhfash's pupils, al-Jarīmī and al-Māzinī, were scholars of note and their views are referred to by later scholars but they had the stature neither of their teacher, al-Akhfash, nor far less of their pupil, al-Mubarrad, and no further mention of their work is necessary here.

Abū l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad (826-98) was born in Basrah and as was natural his training in the linguistic sciences was in the Basran tradition.¹³ He began his grammatical training by studying the Kitāb of Sībawayh under al-Jarīmī and on this scholar's death he continued his study of the Kitāb with al-Māzinī. An eye-witness account indicates that al-Mubarrad distinguished himself even as a pupil studying under al-Māzinī:¹⁴

رأينا محمد بن يزيد وهو حديث السن متصمدا
 في حلقة أبي عثمان المازني يقرأ عليه كتاب سيويه،
 وأبو عثمان في تلك الحلقة كأحد من فيها.

Al-Mubarrad did not remain in Basrah but at some time moved to Samarra which was then the seat of the caliphal government. It is said that the reason for his coming was that he was summoned to settle a dispute between the caliph, al-Mutawakkil (847-61), and his well-known intimate, al-Fath b. Khāqān, over a point of Qur'an vowelings. Be that as it may, al-Mubarrad did definitely move in court circles in Samarra but on the murder of the caliph, al-Mubarrad moved to Baghdad and appears to have resided there until his death in 898.

As a result of his arrival in Baghdad al-Mubarrad's depth of knowledge became widely known there and he began to attract students somewhat to the detriment of the Kufan scholar, Tha'lab, ¹⁵ who was at that time the leading philologist in Baghdad. On this matter there are, in particular, accounts of how al-Zajjāj, who became an important Basran scholar and who had up until then studied under Tha'lab, was attracted to al-Mubarrad and abandoned his studies with his old teacher: ¹⁶

وقال الزجاج: لما قدم المبرد بغداد جئت لأناظره
 وكنت أقرأ على أبي العباس ثعلب. فخرمت على
 إيمانه فلما باهنته أجمنى بالحجة وطلبني بالعلمة
 والزمنى الزمامات لم أهدئ إليها. فأستيقنت
 فضله واسترجمت عقله وأخذت في ملازمته.

This account makes clear the immediate impression which al-Mubarrad made on many who heard him in discussion right from his earliest days in Baghdad and it was from such auspicious beginnings that his career in Baghdad developed.

Al-Mubarrad's most important work on grammar is the Muqtadab which is discussed below. Apart from this work it is also worth mentioning his Radd 'alā Sibawayh in which he criticised certain views taken by Sibawayh. This work has not survived but its contents are known from the Intiṣār of Ibn Wallād (d. 943) which is a refutation

of al-Mubarrad and a vindication of Sībawayh. This work has survived and 'Adīmah, the editor of the Muqtaḍab, makes use of it in his marginal notes.¹⁷ Al-Mubarrad also wrote quite a number of works on grammar apart from the two mentioned here and many of them were directly concerned with the study and elucidation of the Kitāb of Sībawayh. However, these works have not survived and do not seem to have attracted much attention on the part of later scholars. They are only known as titles and these can be ascertained from the biographical sources.¹⁸

After the Kāmil al-Mubarrad's most important work was his major treatise on grammar, the Muqtaḍab, which is in fact an earlier work than the Kāmil as it is alluded to on several occasions in it.¹⁹ It is clear that the Muqtaḍab did not have the same high reputation of a work like the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj and it was not a grammar which later scholars often had recourse to. However, it did have some popularity for a period, which is indicated by the fact that commentaries were written on it.²⁰ Ibn al-Sarrāj's pupil, Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī, wrote a commentary and al-Mubarrad's own pupil, Ibn Durustawayh, wrote a commentary which he did not complete.²¹ A commentary was also done by Ibn Bādhiḥ (1055-1133) who was a Spanish scholar of Granada but a comparatively minor scholar, although an assiduous commentator on the classics of grammar.²² It is clear that the Muqtaḍab continued to be used in Spain after the time of Ibn Bādhiḥ because the Spanish scholar, Ibn Khayr (1108-79), lists it in his Fahrasah as a work which had been transmitted down to his time.²³

A specialised commentary on the Muqtaḍab has survived and that is the Tafsīr al-masā'il al-mushkilah fī awal al-muqtaḍab by Sa'īd b. Sa'īd al-Fāriqī (d. 1004).²⁴ In the Muqtaḍab there are a number of very complicated, but artificially constructed sentences which were used to train students and in his commentary al-Fāriqī undertakes to analyse and explain such sentences. 'Adīmah has incorporated into his

marginal notes those parts of this commentary which are strictly relevant to the text of the Muqtaḍab. It is clear from what al-Fāriqī writes in the introduction to his commentary that the Muqtaḍab enjoyed considerable popularity in the later 10th century amongst beginners and those who had gone a little deeper into grammar. ²⁵

However, the sort of commendatory remark about the Uḡūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj which can be found in the biographical sources cannot be found in the case of the Muqtaḍab; indeed, references to it tend to be unfavourable. There is a story that on one occasion, in the presence of Ibn al-Sarrāj, one of his pupils compared al-Mubarrad's Muqtaḍab unfavourably with the Uḡūl and Ibn al-Sarrāj felt obliged to defend his old teacher's reputation: ²⁶

جرى بحضرة ابن السراج ذكر كتاب الأصول الذي
صنعه فقال قائل: هو أحسن من المقتضب. فقال
أبو بكر (ابن السراج): لا تقل هكذا، وأنشد:

وَلَكِنْ بَكَتْ قَبْلِي فَهَيِّجْ لِي الْبُكَاءَ
بُكَاءًا فَقُلْتُ الْفَضْلُ لِلْمُتَقَدِّمِ.

There is also a rather derogatory remark about the Muqtaḍab which Yāqūt records Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī as having made: ²⁷

قال أبو علي: نظرت في المقتضب فما انتفعت منه
بشيء، إلا بمسألة واحدة وهي وقوع إذا جوابا
للشروط في قوله تعالى: وَإِنْ نُصِبْتُمْ سَيِّئَةً، كما قدمت
أيديهم إذا هم يقنطون.

This remark is nothing more than an attempt to belittle the value of the Muqtaḍab and is really a rather fatuous comment because, as 'Adimah notes, with respect to the point on which Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī did reputedly

benefit from the Muqtaḍab, there is in fact no more information given there than in the Kitāb.²⁸

After recounting this remark Yāqūt goes on to mention a general reason why the Muqtaḍab was not a work from which profit was derived:²⁹

ويزعمون أن سبب عدم الانتفاع به أن هذا الكتاب
أخذته ابن الراوندى الزنديق عن المبرد وتناوله
الناس من يد ابن الراوندى. فكانه عاد عليه شومه
فلا يكاد ينتفع به.

This is again simply a rather abusive remark at al-Mubarrad's expense because he had the evident misfortune of being a teacher of the notorious heretic Ibn al-Rāwandī.³⁰ In actual fact, although Ibn al-Rāwandī may have studied the Muqtaḍab under al-Mubarrad there is no reason to suppose that he had any great part in continuing the study of this work which would rather have been done by those scholars who were known as grammarians.

Although al-Mubarrad was recognised as a grammarian this did not result in a strong continuing interest in his works which was to last for many centuries. He did continue to be remembered as a grammarian but later scholars contented themselves with merely citing his views which they seem to have been aware of largely through secondary sources. It is comparatively rare for the later scholars to cite al-Mubarrad's major work on grammar, the Muqtaḍab, although specific references to it can be found.

As a grammar, the Muqtaḍab is quite a large-scale work and in the printed edition occupies four volumes. One of the very obvious characteristics of this work is the lack of any systematic arrangement of its chapters. In the Kitāb the chapters on accident and syntax are to a large extent kept separate even if beyond this there is no clear

scheme for arranging the material. However, in the Muqtaḍab there is not even any separation of the chapters on accidence and syntax. On this point it is worth noting that Ibn al-Sarrāj is specifically described as giving the material in the Uṣūl an excellent arrangement and this may well indicate that previous works like the Muqtaḍab and the Kitāb were felt to be somewhat deficient in this respect.³² This would tend to suggest that there is no reason for supposing that the rather haphazard order of the chapters in the Muqtaḍab does not represent very much the original order in which al-Mubarrad composed the work.

Although 'Adīmāh takes the view that the manuscript on which he bases his printed edition is complete, or very nearly so, it is worth noting that al-Mubarrad seems to neglect certain topics. There are, for example, no chapters on the maf'ūl lahu or the maf'ūl ma'ahu, but apart from this, and disregarding the haphazard arrangement of material, the Muqtaḍab does cover at some point most major topics usually discussed in a grammar.³³

The most important continuator of the work of al-Mubarrad was his pupil, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarrī, generally known as Ibn al-Sarrāj.³⁴ Although the date of the death of Ibn al-Sarrāj is given as 316 A.H. (929 A.D.), there is no information on when he was born. The editors of his brief work on grammar, the Mūjaz fī l-naḥw, El-Chouémi and Damerdjī, place his birth between the years 260-5 A.H. and this is based on facts known about him.³⁵ Firstly, according to an anecdote, Ibn al-Sarrāj was present at the entry of the caliph, al-Muktafī, into Baghdad in 289 A.H. At that time Ibn al-Sarrāj was in love with a slave girl and in some verses drew a comparison between her and the pomp of the caliphal procession. Secondly, and this seems a stronger argument, he was a pupil of al-Mubarrad who died in 285 A.H. and before the death of his teacher he had made a reputation for himself as a pupil of

distinction. As to the places where he resided, it appears that Ibn al-Sarrāj, unlike al-Mubarrad, spent all his life in Baghdad and the editors of the Mūjaz point out in this connection that Yāqūt styles him the "Baghdadi" and that anecdotes about him are set in Baghdad. ³⁶

Ibn al-Sarrāj received his philological training under al-Mubarrad and he became an outstanding pupil, particularly favoured by his teacher: ³⁷

كان ابن السراج من أهدت غلمان المبرد سنا مع ذكائه
وموطنه. وكان المبرد يميل إليه ويقرب ويشرح له
ويجتمع معه في الخلوات والدرجات ويأنس به.

There is no record that Ibn al-Sarrāj had any teacher other than al-Mubarrad but the latter was such a distinguished philologist that a pupil would no doubt have received all the training he needed from him alone. Ibn al-Sarrāj does not seem to have studied under Tha'lab, the great Kufan contemporary of al-Mubarrad, although he probably could have if he had so wanted.

If al-Mubarrad was his only attested teacher, Ibn al-Sarrāj was, at least, an associate of al-Zajjāj, a somewhat older pupil of al-Mubarrad. ³⁸ There is a story recorded of an occasion when Ibn al-Sarrāj and al-Zajjāj were together which throws light on the career of the former as a grammarian: ³⁹

ورأيت ابن السراج يوماً وقد حضر عند الزهاج
صليها عليه بعد موت المبرد، فسأل رجل الزهاج
عن مسألة فقال لابن السراج: أجهب يا أبا بكر.
فأجاب فأخطأ فانتهزه الزهاج وقال: لو كنت في
منزلي ضربتلك ولكن المجلس لا يحمل هذا. وقد
كنا نشبهك في الزكاء والفظنة لابي حسن بن
رهباء وأنت تخطئ في مثل هذا. فقال: قد فربتني

يأبى إسحاق وأدبتي. وأنا تارك ما درست منذ قرأت
 هذا الكتاب — يعني كتاب سيبويه — لأنني
 تشاغلت منه بالمنطق والموسيقى والآن أنا
 أباود.

According to the tailpiece to this story Ibn al-Sarrāj was as good as his word and went on to become the leading grammarian after the death of al-Zajjāj.

Ibn al-Sarrāj's reputation as a scholar is firmly based on his major work of grammar, the Uṣūl. Although this work did not become one of the great classics of grammar that were in wide use in the later Middle Ages, nevertheless, it was apparently quite widely used in the centuries after its composition and remained a work well-known to specialists in grammar. The biographical sources make clear that the Uṣūl was a work that was well thought of although, because such sources tend to take over much material directly from earlier works, it is not easy to date from them the period when such commendatory remarks were first made. With perhaps a shade of hyperbole, Yāqūt records the remark in praise of Ibn al-Sarrāj's scholarship in the Uṣūl: ويقال ما زال
 40 . النحو كجنونا حتى نقله بأصوله
 Another commendation of the Uṣūl
 is recorded by Yāqūt in listing Ibn al-Sarrāj's works: 41

وله من المصنفات كتاب الأصول وهو أحسنها
 وأكبرها وإليه المرجع عند اضطراب النقل واختلافه.
 وجمع فيه أصول علم العربية وأخذ مسائل سيبويه
 ورتبها أحسن ترتيب.

Apart from such commendations of Ibn al-Sarrāj and his scholarship, the continued use of the Uṣūl itself testifies to the high esteem in which its author was held. However, it is not possible, due to the lack of the necessary evidence, to give a complete account of the later

history of the use of the Uṣūl but certain details can be given. First of all, a number of commentaries on it were written.⁴² The earliest commentary was composed by Ibn al-Sarrāj's own pupil, al-Rumānī (909-94).⁴³ The next was done by Ibn Bābshādh (d. 1077), an Egyptian scholar of distinction, whose works had some popularity.⁴⁴ The next two commentators are scholars of the Islamic West. The first is Ibn Bādhish (1055-1133) who has already been mentioned as having written a commentary on the Muqtadab. The second, who is the last attested commentator, was the notable North African grammarian, al-Jazūlī (d. ca. 1209-19).⁴⁵ His teacher was another eminent North African scholar, Ibn Barrī (1106-87), and it is recorded that in an hour of need al-Jazūlī pawned his copy of the Uṣūl which he had made himself while studying the work with Ibn Barrī.⁴⁶

Further information on the use of the Uṣūl in the Islamic West comes from the Fahrasah of Ibn Khayr (1108-79) in which the work is listed as handed down from generation to generation.⁴⁷ Ibn Khayr gives two chains of transmission back to Ibn al-Sarrāj, one through Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī and the other through al-Sīrāfī, the author of the famous commentary on the Kitāb.⁴⁸ He also mentions al-Rumānī's commentary on the Uṣūl but does not provide a chain of transmission.

From the evidence of the commentaries written on the Uṣūl and of the Fahrasah of Ibn Khayr it is clear that the Uṣūl was in general use down to the 12th century and in particular in the Islamic West. This last point is supported by the fact that two of the four texts used by al-Fatī in preparing his printed edition of the Uṣūl were found in North Africa.⁴⁹ After the time of Ibn al-Sarrāj's pupil, al-Rumānī, it is difficult to trace the history of the use of the Uṣūl in the Eastern Islamic world because the Kashf al-zunūn of Ḥajjī Khalīfah does not mention any further commentaries from that region, and there are no sources of information for the East comparable with the Fahrasah

of Ibn Khayr for Spain.

The Uṣūl, however, did remain an important work and was one consulted by scholars undertaking very detailed studies of grammar.

Al-Suyūṭī (1445-1505) frequently cites Ibn al-Sarrāj in the Ashbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir and in it quotes passages from the Uṣūl.⁵⁰ The Uṣūl is also the earliest work which al-Suyūṭī draws on in his treatise on grammatical methodology, the Iqtirāḥ.⁵¹ 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī (1621-82) also found the Uṣūl valuable and in his introduction to the Khizānat al-adab lists the Uṣūl as one of the works which he particularly consulted.⁵² It is of interest that it is the earliest grammar after the Kitāb in al-Baghdādī's list of works consulted. It is also worth noting here that Ibn Ya'īch also found the Uṣūl a valuable work. This is because he takes over material from the Uṣūl as it stands and works it into his commentary on the Mufaṣṣal of al-Zamakhsharī. This is a matter which will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter.⁵³

The Uṣūl has only been partly published in two volumes but, fortunately, the published parts include all the sections of the work dealing with syntax with which this thesis is particularly concerned. The Uṣūl is a work in which the various chapters are presented in a coherent and well thought out manner and the significance of this will be discussed in a later chapter.⁵⁴ A particular point about the method of presentation of the material in the Uṣūl is that Ibn al-Sarrāj tends to treat the various topics by having a section which constitutes a basic discussion and a section constituting an additional discussion of further points which he calls masā'il. Thus, for instance, there is the باب التمييز which is followed by the باب مسائل التمييز. To a certain extent al-Mubarrad also uses the same device in the Muqtaḍab.

Among other works on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj was a commentary on the Kitāb but this has not survived and never had the popularity of

the later commentary on the Kitāb by al-Sirāfī. ⁵⁵ Another work on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj is the Jumal al-uṣūl which was also known as the Kitāb al-uṣūl al-qaḥīr and is clearly an abridgment of the Uṣūl. ⁵⁶ There is also mention in the biographical sources of another work by Ibn al-Sarrāj whose title has the consonantal skeleton الجمل, but what this work is or what the correct vocalisation of this word is cannot be said. ⁵⁷ There is no reason to suppose that this is a work on grammar called the Jumal which is to be differentiated from the above-mentioned Jumal al-uṣūl. References to a work on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj called the Jumal would simply involve an abbreviation of the fuller title Jumal al-uṣūl.

In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions a work called simply the Jumal and relates its contents and format to that of the Uṣūl: ⁵⁸

قد انتهينا إلى الموضوع الذي يتساوى فيه كتاب
الأصول وكتاب الجمل بعد ذكر الذي والألف
واللام. ثم لا فرق بينهما إلا أن بعد التصريف
زيارة المسائل فيه والجمل ليس فيه ذلك.

It is recorded that al-Rumānī wrote a commentary on the Jumal, ⁵⁹ and a rather minor scholar called Ibn Ḥumaydah (1076-1155) wrote a commentary on the verses cited in the Jumal. ⁶⁰ Although little is known about this scholar, the commentary by him is at least evidence that the Jumal was in use up until the middle of the 12th century.

Apart from the Uṣūl, another work on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj has survived and been edited and this is called the Mūjaz. ⁶¹ This is a brief résumé of Arabic grammar and al-Ma'arrī provides some information on the writing of this work: ⁶²

وذكر المعري في رسالة الخفران أن أبا علي
الفارسي كان يذكر أن أبا بكر ابن السراج

عمل من الموجز النصف الأول لرهبيل بزاز ثم
تقدم إلى أبي علي الفارسي بتمامه، قال. وهذا لا يقال
أنه من إنشاء أبي علي لأن الموضوع في الموجز هو
منقول من كلام ابن السراج في الأصول والجمل
فكان أبا علي جاء به على سبيل النسخ، لا أنه
ابتدع شيئاً من عنده.

This work had a certain popularity and is mentioned by Ibn Khayr in his Fahrasah and he gives the same two chains of transmission back to its author which he gives for the Uṣūl.⁶³ The Mūjaz was also the subject of a commentary by al-Rumānī and this work is again mentioned by Ibn Khayr.⁶⁴

The only other Basran pupil of al-Mubarrad who can be ranked with Ibn al-Sarrāj as a grammarian is al-Zajjāj (d. 923) but he did not have the lasting reputation of Ibn al-Sarrāj nor were his writings held in such high regard.⁶⁵ However, his Ma'anī l-Qur'ān did have a certain popularity and was a work which Ibn Khayr studied with his teachers and whose transmission chain he could trace back to al-Zajjāj.⁶⁶ He was the first pupil of al-Mubarrad after the latter arrived in Baghdad, and he seems to have been a particular intimate of his teacher because anyone interested in becoming a pupil of al-Mubarrad first took up the matter with him. He was a much older man than Ibn al-Sarrāj and, according to al-Zubaydī, he was over eighty when he died which would make him probably some twenty years older. After the death of al-Mubarrad it was he who became the senior Basran scholar and he was recognised as the head of the Basran school.⁶⁷

The next most distinguished grammarian from among the pupils of al-Mubarrad was Ibn Durustawayh (872-958) who wrote a number of grammatical works.⁶⁸ He was reckoned to hold very firmly to the Basran

school and wrote a work called the Radd 'alā Tha'lab fi khtilāf al-nahwiyyīn which was a reply to Tha'lab's exposition of the differences between the grammatical schools, the Ukhtilāf al-nahwiyyīn.⁶⁹ Among lesser Basran grammarians of this generation it is worth mentioning the names of Mabarrān (d. 956) who was a pupil of both al-Mubarrad and al-Zajjāj, and 'Ali b. Sulaymān al-Akhfash al-Ṣaghīr (d. 928) who studied both under the Basran, al-Mubarrad, and the Kufan, Tha'lab.⁷⁰ When the generation of Basran scholars who were pupils of al-Mubarrad are taken into consideration, it is clear that they produced no other work of grammar which can compare in reputation with the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj, and this is confirmed by the fact that no such work has survived. For this reason an assessment of Basran grammatical thought in the early 10th century must be firmly based on a study of the Uṣūl.

This thesis is particularly concerned with Basran grammatical thought because in the period under consideration it reached an important stage in its development into the dominant school of Arabic grammar. On the other hand, the rival school of Kufah was in decline and was making no significant advances in the field of grammatical thought. Kufan grammatical study consisted largely of giving attention to the works of past scholars and there was little new work of any vitality. However, for the sake of completeness, it is necessary to give some consideration to the history of the Kufan school of grammar and to take particular account of its state during the period considered in the present study.

Although considerable work has still to be done on the history of Kufan grammatical thought, with particular need for a study of the Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān of al-Farrā', certain general judgments can be made on the development of the school.⁷¹ It is clear that the only Kufan scholars who were grammarians of note were al-Kisā'ī (d. 804) and

al-Farrā' (d. ca. 822).⁷² When individual Kufan grammarians are particularly mentioned it is these two scholars who are singled out on most occasions. Outside the field of grammar, al-Kisā'ī is best remembered as the scholar who established one of the three sets of Kufan canonical Qur'an readings. Al-Farrā' is best remembered as the author of the still extant and partly published Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān. This is a verse-by-verse, surah-by-surah commentary on the Qur'an which is predominantly concerned with grammar. This work was held in high repute and was used by al-Baghdādī in the Khizānat al-adab.⁷³

After al-Farrā' there did not emerge any Kufan grammarian of great note and this had the corresponding result that Kufan grammatical thought did not develop any further. This placed it in an unfavourable position to compete with the Basran school of grammar which continued to be developed by able scholars. The Kufan school also had a great weakness in that there was no Kufan work of grammar which had the undisputed authority of the Kitāb of Sībawayh among the Basrans. This last work was instrumental in firmly establishing the position of the Basran school.

In the history of the Basran school, the later 9th and early 10th centuries constitute the period of al-Mubarrad and his pupils, and correspondingly in the history of the Kufan school, the same time-span constitutes the period of the outstanding scholar, Tha'lab, and his pupils.⁷⁴ While it cannot be denied that Tha'lab was a distinguished philologist, as a grammarian he was much less than an equal of al-Mubarrad. It appears that the main weakness of Tha'lab as a grammarian was that he had learned his grammar by studying the works of his Kufan predecessors and did not have much aptitude for reasoning things out on his own. This is made clear by an account of his teaching style as it appeared to his contemporaries:⁷⁵

وكان يقول: قال الفراء وقال الكسائي. فإذا سئل عن
الجهة والحقيقة لم يأت بشيء.

Part of the reason why Tha'lab did not become a good grammarian was that he had not been trained up to the level of the best Basran grammarians. Although he received a philological training from Kufan teachers, Tha'lab himself draws attention to his own personal study of the works of al-Farra'.⁷⁶ No doubt much of his grammatical knowledge was acquired in precisely this same way and he seemed to lack the advantage of a really thorough grammatical training with a teacher. There is evidence indicating that Tha'lab studied grammar under Salmah b. 'Asim but this scholar cannot be ranked with al-Mubarrad's grammar teachers, al-Jarri and al-Mazini.⁷⁷ Tha'lab's lack of grammatical training with particular regard to the Kitab, which he did study although it was a Basran work, is made clear by an anecdote. Tha'lab's son-in-law, who to his annoyance used to go to al-Mubarrad to study the Kitab, was asked why al-Mubarrad was more knowledgeable on the Kitab than Tha'lab, and he answered that the former had studied it under scholars whereas the latter had studied it under himself.⁷⁸ It also seems to be the case that in the main the Kufans regarded grammar as a subject which was to be studied as an introduction to a general philological training and they did not lay the emphasis on studying grammar for its own sake which the Basrans did.

Although Tha'lab wrote several works on grammar these have not survived.⁷⁹ He does cover grammatical questions in his Majalis which has survived, but this provides no real basis for making meaningful comparisons with the output of the Basran school.⁸⁰ It is clear that neither Tha'lab nor those of his pupils who remained within the Kufan tradition produced works that were the equal of contemporary Basran works, and this is confirmed by the fact that no such works have survived.

For this reason the present study is centred on the Basran school, although in a later chapter attention will be given to the Basran approach to Kufan scholarship at this period. ⁸¹

After dealing with the Basran and Kufan schools during the period under study, it is worth noting that there were a number of scholars who were pupils of both al-Mubarrad and Tha'lab and in their work were reckoned to have drawn both upon the grammatical traditions of the Basrans and of the Kufans. What this "mixing the two schools" meant in practice is difficult to assess because there are no relevant works extant to form the basis for a judgment. Such scholars never constituted a separate school but were seen as inclining more towards one school than the other. The most important of these scholars were Ibn Khayyāt (d. 932) and Ibn Kaysān (d. 911), the latter of whom is reckoned by al-Sirāfi to have been with al-Zajjāj the leading Basran scholars after the death of al-Mubarrad, although al-Sirāfi points out that Ibn Kaysān did "mix the two schools". ⁸² This eclectic approach seems to have been a short-lived phenomenon and did not survive long beyond the generation of the pupils of the pupils of al-Mubarrad and Tha'lab, and there is no evidence that it had any profound effect on the development of the mainstream Basran school.

A study of any Arab grammarian inevitably involves reference to the works of other grammarians and some indication is now given of the principle works referred to in the present study which were composed outside of the period considered in this present study. In a detailed study of grammatical thought it is necessary to refer chiefly to the more compendious works of grammar and for this reason little attention is given to such small-scale works as the well-known treatises of Ibn Hishām. ⁸³ The main earlier work which is consulted in this present study is, of course, the Kitāb of Sibawayh. Of later works particular reference is made to the Sharh al-mufaṣṣal of Ibn Ya'īsh. Although

the profundity and originality of this work is open to question, it is one which has been widely used in the Islamic world. As evidence of this may be cited the very frequent references to it in the Ashbah wa-l-nazā'ir of al-Suyūṭī.⁸⁴ Another work consulted is the commentary by al-Raḍī al-Astarābādī on the Kāfiyah of Ibn Ḥajīb.⁸⁵ A compendious work to which reference has also been made but which is not so well-known is the Manhaj al-salik of the famous Spanish scholar, Abū Ḥayyān Athīr al-Dīn.⁸⁶ This work is a commentary on the Alfiyah of Ibn Mālik and is particularly useful because of the attention given to making clear the views of Sibawayh and to relating the views of the Basran and Kufan scholars as well as those of later scholars of the Islamic West.

Notes to Chapter I

- 1 G. Flügel, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber, Leipzig, 1862; Ibn al-Anbarī, Kitāb al-inṣāf, edited and with an Introduction by G. Weil, Leiden, 1913.
- 2 See H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, 1 vol. published (Beirut, 1961), pp. 1-36; G. Lecomte, Ibn Qutaybah, l'homme, son oeuvre, ses idées (Damascus, 1965), pp. 377-96.
- 3 E.g. A. I. Shalabī, Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī, Cairo, 1958; M. Mubārak, Al-Rummanī al-naḥwī, Damascus, 1963.
- 4 E.g. H. 'Awn, Tatawwur al-dars al-naḥwī, Cairo, 1970; Shawqī Dayf, Madaris al-naḥwīyah, Cairo, 1968; A. al-Sayyid, Madrasat al-Baṣrah al-naḥwīyah, Cairo, 1968.
- 5 Al-Mubarrad, Muqtaḍab, 4 vols., edited and with an Introduction by M. A. 'Aḍimāh (اضيمية), Cairo, 1965-8; Ibn al-Sarrāj, Uṣūl fī l-naḥw, 2 vols. published, edited and with an Introduction by A. al-Fatli, vol. i, Najaf, 1973, and vol. ii, Baghdad, 1973.
- 6 Ibn Jinnī, Munṣif, sharḥ kitāb al-taṣrīf li-l-Māzinī, Cairo, 1954.
- 7 For further mention of al-Akhfash and his work see p. 6 above and n. 10 below.
- 8 Al-Qiftī, Inbāh al-ruwāh, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1950-5), vol. ii, p. 295.
- 9 Abū Tayyib al-Lughawī, Marātib al-naḥwīyīn (Cairo, 1955), p. 65.
- 10 For al-Akhfash al-Awsaṭ see Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s.v. al-Akhfash. (Hereafter this work is abbreviated to E.I²); for al-Jarmī see U. R. Kaḥḥālah, Mu'jam al-mu'allifīn, 15 vols. (Damascus, 1957-61), vol. v, p. 3; for al-Māzinī see Kaḥḥālah, vol. iii, p. 71.
- 11 See for instance the passages cited in n. 12 below.
- 12 Al-Qiftī, vol. iii, p. 145; Yaḥyā, Mu'jam al-udabā', 7 vols. (Leyden and London, 1907-31), vol. vii, p. 10.
- 13 For a comprehensive list of biographical sources on al-Mubarrad see Kaḥḥālah, vol. xii, pp. 114-5. In particular see al-Qiftī, vol. iii, pp. 241-53; Yaḥyā, vol. vii, pp. 137-44; al-Zubaydī, Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwīyīn (Cairo, 1954), pp. 108-20.
- 14 Al-Zubaydī, p. 108. In quoting Arabic passages from unpunctuated texts some punctuation has been added for convenience, based on standard Arabic practice. In punctuated texts, particularly in the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj, some changes in punctuation have been made for the sake of uniformity and convenience.
- 15 For Tha'lab see Kaḥḥālah, vol. ii, pp. 203-4.
- 16 Yaḥyā, vol. vii, p. 14.

- 17 'Adimah, Introduction to the Muqtadab, pp. 89-95. For Ibn Wallād see Kahhālah, vol. ii, p. 167.
- 18 Ibn al-Nadīm, Fihrist (Leipzig, 1872), p. 59; al-Qiftī, vol. iii, pp. 251-2; Yāqūt, vol. vii, pp. 143-4.
- 19 See 'Adimah, pp. 78-80.
- 20 Hājji Khalīfah, Kashf al-zunūn, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1941-3), vol. ii, p. 1793.
- 21 For Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī see E.I.², s.v. Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī; for Ibn Durustawayh see E.I.¹, s.v. Ibn Durustawayh.
- 22 For Ibn Badhish see Kahhālah, vol. vii, p. 15.
- 23 Ibn Khayr, Fahrasah (Saragossa, 1894-5), p. 307.
- 24 See 'Adimah, pp. 83-6. For al-Fāriqī see Kahhālah, vol. iv, p. 224.
- 25 'Adimah, p. 84.
- 26 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 62.
- 27 Yāqūt, vol. vii, p. 143.
- 28 'Adimah, p. 70. See al-Mubarrad, vol. ii, pp. 57-8 and vol. iii, p. 178; Sibawayh, Kitāb, 2 vols. (Bulaq, 1316-7 A.H.), vol. i, p. 435; W. Wright, A grammar of the Arabic language, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (reprinted Beirut, 1974), vol. ii, p. 345C.
- 29 Yāqūt, vol. vii, p. 143.
- 30 See E.I.², s.v. Ibn al-Rāwandī.
- 31 See 'Adimah, pp. 77-8. See also M. A. Maiman, Iqlīd al-khizānah (Lahore, 1927), s.v. Muqtadab.
- 32 See pp. 27-9 below.
- 33 See 'Adimah, pp. 74-81.
- 34 For a comprehensive list of biographical sources on Ibn al-Sarrāj see Kahhālah, vol. x, p. 19. In particular see al-Qiftī, vol. iii, pp. 145-9; Yāqūt, vol. vii, pp. 9-12; al-Zubaydī, pp. 122-5.
- 35 Ibn al-Sarrāj, Mujaz fī l-naḥw, ed. M. El-Chouēmi and B. Damerdjī, (Beirut, 1965), pp. 5-6. This particular work is subsequently referred to by its author's name and title together to distinguish it from the Uṣūl.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- 37 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 32. Also al-Qiftī, vol. iii, p. 148. In l. 4 of this quotation the تانس of the Fihrist has been changed to the يانس of the Inbāh.
- 38 For al-Zajjājī see Kahhālah, vol. i, p. 33.

- 39 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 62. Also al-Qiftī, vol. iii, p. 149. In l. 4 of this quotation the شهر بالزكاة of the Fihrist has been changed to the نشهدك في الزكاة of the Inbāh.
- 40 Yaqūt, vol. vii, p. 10.
- 41 Ibid., pp. 10-1.
- 42 Hājji Khalīfah, vol. ii, p. 111.
- 43 For al-Rummanī see Kahhālah, vol. vii, p. 162.
- 44 For Ibn Bābshādh see Kahhālah, vol. v, p. 32.
- 45 See E.I.², s.v. al-Djazūlī.
- 46 See ibid., s.v. Ibn Barri.
- 47 Ibn Khayr, pp. 307-8.
- 48 For al-Sirāfi see Kahhālah, vol. iii, pp. 242-3.
- 49 Ibn al-Sarraġ, vol. i, pp. 33-4.
- 50 Al-Suyūṭī, Ashbah wa-l-naza'ir, 4 vols. (Hyderabad, 1359-61 A.H.), vol. i, pp. 13, 28, 90, 143-4, 241, 268, 274, 322; vol. ii, pp. 11, 51, 79, 87, 90, 91, 131.
- 51 Idem, Iqtirāh (Hyderabad, 1359 A.H.), pp. 6, 49.
- 52 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, Khizānat al-adab, 4 vols. (Beirut, n.d.), vol. i, p. 8. See Maiman, s.v. Uṣūl.
- 53 See pp. 166-79 below. Ibn Ya'īsh, Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal, 10 vols., Cairo, n.d.
- 54 See pp. 27-9 below.
- 55 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 62.
- 56 Yaqūt, vol. vii, p. 11.
- 57 Ibid.
- 58 Ibn al-Sarraġ, vol. ii, p. 271.
- 59 Al-Qiftī, vol. ii, p. 295.
- 60 Yaqūt, vol. vii, p. 40.
- 61 See n. 35 above.
- 62 Yaqūt, vol. iii, pp. 13-4. See also al-Ma'arri, Risālat al-ghufrān, ed. Bint al-Shāṭi' (Cairo, 1950), pp. 357-8.
- 63 Ibn Khayr, p. 310.
- 64 Ibid., p. 316. See also al-Qiftī, vol. ii, p. 295; Yaqūt, vol. v, p. 281.

- 65 See n. 38 above.
- 66 Ibn Khayr, pp. 64-5.
- 67 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 60; al-Sirāfi, Akhbār al-naḥwīyīn al-Baṣriyīn (Cairo, 1955), pp. 80-1.
- 68 See n. 21 above.
- 69 See Fleisch, p. 19.
- 70 For Mabramān see Kahhālah, vol. x, p. 307; for al-Akhfash al-Ṣaḡhīr see E.I.², s.v. al-Akhfash.
- 71 Al-Farrā', Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān, 2 vols. published, Cairo, 1955- .
- 72 For al-Kisā'ī see Kahhālah, vol. vii, p. 84; for al-Farrā' see E.I.², s.v. al-Farrā'.
- 73 See Maiman, s.v. Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān.
- 74 For Tha'lab see Kahhālah, vol. ii, pp. 203-4.
- 75 Al-Qiftī, vol. i, p. 144; Yāqūt, vol. i, p. 141.
- 76 Yāqūt, vol. i, pp. 135, 140.
- 77 Al-Zubaydī, p. 150. See also Abū Ṭayyib, p. 96. For Salmah b. 'Āṣim see Kahhālah, vol. iv, pp. 240-1.
- 78 Al-Qiftī, vol. i, pp. 144-5; al-Zubaydī, p. 156.
- 79 See Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 74; al-Qiftī, vol. i, pp. 150-1; Yāqūt, vol. ii, pp. 152-3.
- 80 Tha'lab, Majālis Tha'lab, 2 vols., Cairo, 1948-9.
- 81 See pp. 139-62 below.
- 82 Al-Sirāfi, pp. 80-1. For Ibn Khayyāt see E.I.², s.v. Ibn Khayyāt; for Ibn Kaysān see E.I.², s.v. Ibn Kaysān.
- 83 See *ibid.*, s.v. Ibn Hishām.
- 84 See p. 180, n. 2 below.
- 85 Al-Astarabadhī, Sharḥ al-kāfiyah, 2 vols., Turkey (Istanbul?), n.d.
- 86 Abū Ḥayyān, Manhaj al-sālik, New Haven, Connecticut, 1947.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS, AND DEFINITION

In the Kitāb of Sībawayh little attention is given to arranging the various chapters in a logical and systematic manner. There are, of course, many instances of chapters on related but separate topics being grouped in a sequence, but there is nothing truly comparable with the ordered presentation of subject matter to be found in later works. This may well be due to the fact that the chapters of the Kitāb are largely arranged in the order in which Sībawayh happened to deal with them. In addition, the Kitāb is described in the biographical sources as a work unlike any previously written and its author would probably have been working without a convenient model for planning the lay-out of his work.¹ More importantly, it is recorded that Sībawayh never taught the Kitāb to any of his students and this may well indicate that by the time of his death Sībawayh may not have completed revising and arranging the work.²

The next major extant work of a Basran grammarian is the Muqtaḍab of al-Mubarrad and, as has been mentioned in the introduction,³ this grammar also lacks a logical and systematic arrangement of its various chapters. However, the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj, unlike the Kitāb and the Muqtaḍab, is a work which is arranged in a careful and planned manner. It seems safe to assume that it is a characteristic which differentiates the Uṣūl from other preceding major works of grammar and this would apply even in the case of works which are no longer extant. An indication that this assumption is correct is provided by a passage quoted by al-Qifṭī:⁴

قال أبو عبد الله المرزباني: صنف - يعني ابن السراج - كتابا في النحو سماه الأصول انترجه من أبواب كتاب سيبويه، وجعل أصنافه بالتقسيم على لفظ المنطقيين فأعجب بهذا اللفظ الفيلسفيون. وإنما أدخل فيه لفظ التقاسيم؛ فأما المعنى فهو كله من كتاب سيبويه على ما قسمه ورتبه؛ إلا أنه عدل فيه على مسائل الأخفش ومذاهب الكوفيين، وهالف أصول البصريين في أبواب كثيرة لتتركه النظر في النحو وإقباله على الموسيقى.

With regard to the content of this passage it may also be mentioned that Yaḩut writes of Ibn al-Sarrāj in a passage previously quoted:

5. وأخذ مسائل سيبويه ورتبها أحسن ترتيب

Before discussing further the passage quoted by al-Qiftī from al-Marzubānī (d. 994), it is worth noting that the tone of it does not appear to be particularly friendly towards Ibn al-Sarrāj.⁶ The passage seems to belittle his work for it suggests that although he introduced into the Uḩūl certain considerations drawn from logic, the content itself simply consists of material drawn from the Kitāb which has been re-arranged. In addition, there are certain influences from his attention to the Masā'il of al-Akhfash and Kufan grammatical thought, and deviations from Basran norms are attributed, somewhat disparagingly, to the fact that he was distracted from grammar by the study of music.

The passage suggests that Ibn al-Sarrāj introduced into grammar what are called "divisions" (taqāsīm). The meaning of this term is not completely clear but it seems to imply that al-Marzubānī holds that Ibn al-Sarrāj was influenced by classification procedures used in logic.⁷ The term lafz, as it is used in this passage, would seem to

mean "phraseology", implying that Ibn al-Sarrāj introduced into the Uṣūl the terminology used by the logicians in their classification procedures. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj gives considerable attention in the Uṣūl to classifying his material and arranges the work to take this into account, nevertheless, he does not express himself in terms which could be said to belong particularly to the terminology of the classification procedures of logic. The real force of al-Marzubānī's remarks about Ibn al-Sarrāj's approach would appear to be that in logic there are procedures for classification and analysis, and in the Uṣūl too there is attention given to classification and analysis which was accordingly felt to have come about through the influence of logic. In a passage quoted earlier Ibn al-Sarrāj confesses to having been distracted from grammar by the study of music and logic, and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah particularly mentions that Ibn al-Sarrāj studied logic under the philosopher, al-Fārābī.⁸ This study of logic may well have contributed to making Ibn al-Sarrāj methodical and systematic in his approach to his work as a grammarian.

On the evidence from biographical sources it may be inferred that Ibn al-Sarrāj's work on classification and analysis in the Uṣūl was something that had not been undertaken before and essentially represents an innovation on his part. This, however, is represented in the passage quoted from al-Qifṭī as having come about through the influence of logic and is not attributed to a desire simply to arrange the Uṣūl in a systematic and coherent manner which would have been a natural advance for some grammarian to make in writing a grammar. That this was an innovation on the part of Ibn al-Sarrāj is supported by the evident lack of systematic arrangement of material in earlier works like the Kitāb and the Muqtaḍab which has been already mentioned.

At various points in the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj explains the order in which he is dealing with the various topics to show that they are

being treated in a systematic manner.⁹ In particular, at the beginning of the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj states that he will present his material in a convenient and well-ordered fashion and in the clearest possible terms:¹⁰

فقد أعلنت في هذا الكتاب أسرار النحو وجموعته
 جميعاً يحفره وفصلته تفصيلاً يظهره. ورتبت
 أنواعه ومنوفه على مراتبه بأعز ما أمكن من
 البقل وأبينه ليسبق إلى القلوب فهمه ويسهل
 على متعلميه حفظه.

It would be unfair to treat this statement as simply expressing the sort of conventional claim which an author might make in the preface of a work. Rather, it should be taken as a wholly justifiable claim, perhaps implying in itself that previous works are somewhat defective with regard to arrangement and clarity of expression.

In the Uṣūl many examples can be found of Ibn al-Sarrāj's attention to questions of classification and definition and a start will be made here with his treatment of the nominative case. Before he discusses the various uses of the nominative case Ibn al-Sarrāj sets out what he considers them to be:¹¹

الأسماء التي ترتفع خمسة أصناف:
 الأول: مبتدأ له خبر
 الثاني: خبر المبتدأ بنيت عليه
 الثالث: فاعل بُني على فعل، وذلك الفعل حديث منه
 الرابع: مفعول به بُني على فعل فهو حديث منه ولم
 يُذكر من فعل به فقام مقام الفاعل
 الخامس: مشبه بالفاعل في اللفظ.

The main point of interest about the list itself is that Ibn al-Sarrāj

identifies a particular use of the nominative case which he calls the mushabbah bi-l-fā'il fi l-lafz or simply the mushabbah bi-l-fā'il.¹²

This consists of the subject of kāna and analogous verbs and of the subject of particles which behave like kāna and the verb proper and this includes words like the negative particle mā in the Hijazi usage. Although other grammarians took account of the uses of the nominative case which Ibn al-Sarrāj classifies as mushabbah bi-l-fā'il, the expression itself for this class seems to be particular to Ibn al-Sarrāj.

Of the five uses of the nominative which Ibn al-Sarrāj lists, the subtada' and the khobar will be considered in the chapter on the regent and need not be discussed here.¹³ The other three uses of the nominative case broadly cover what would be called in English the subject of the verb. The first of these three classes is the fā'il of which Ibn al-Sarrāj offers the following definition:¹⁴

الاسم الذي يرتفع بأنه فاعل هو الذي بنيته على الفعل
الذي بُني للفاعل، ويجعل الفعل هديثاً عنه مقدماً
قبله، كان فاعلاً في الحقيقة أو لم يكن، كقولك: جاء
زيد، ومات حمود، وما أُشبه ذلك. ومعنى قد لي:
بنيته على الفعل الذي بُني للفاعل أي ذكرت الفعل
قبل الاسم لأنك لو أتيت بالفعل بعد الاسم لارتفع
الاسم بالابتداء. وإنما قلت: على الفعل الذي بُني للفاعل،
لأفرق بينه وبين الفعل الذي بُني للمفعول إذ
كانوا قد فرقوا بينهما.... وإنما قلت: كان فاعلاً في
الحقيقة أو لم يكن، لأن الفعل ينقسم قسمين:
فمنه حقيقي ومنه غير حقيقي.

This passage consists of a definition of what a fā'il is and an explanation of why the definition is worded as it is. The first point

made in the definition is that for a noun to be a fā'il it must follow the verb whose subject it is because, if the noun precedes the verb, it is not a fā'il but a mubtada'; this is a point commonly made clear by the grammarians. The second point made in the definition is that for a noun to be a fā'il it must be the subject of a verb in the active voice (fi'l alladhī buniya li-l-fā'il). By this condition Ibn al-Sarrāj distinguishes between the fā'il (active subject) and the maf'ūl alladhī lam yuṣamma fā'iluhu (passive subject). On this point it may be mentioned that Ibn Ya'īsh expressly criticises definitions of the fā'il which are so worded as to differentiate it from the maf'ūl alladhī lam yuṣamma fā'iluhu:¹⁵

و بعضهم يقول في وصفه: كل اسم تقدمه فعل غير مغير
 عن بنيته وأُسندت ونسبت ذلك الفعل إلى
 ذلك الاسم. ويريد بقوله: غير مغير عن بنيته،
 الانفصال عن فعل ما لم يسم فاعله. ولا حاجة إلى
 الاحتراز من ذلك لأن الفعل إذا أُسند إلى مفعول
 نحو: ضرب زيد، وأُكرم بكر، صار ارتفاعاً من جهة
 ارتفاع الفاعل إذ ليس من شرط الفاعل أن يكون
 محمداً للفعل أو مؤثراً فيه.

The third point which Ibn al-Sarrāj makes in his definition of the fā'il is that in defining whether a noun is a fā'il or not, no distinction is to be made as to whether the noun is a true fā'il or not. This stipulation arises out of Ibn al-Sarrāj's classification of verbs into what are true verbs and what are not. What Ibn al-Sarrāj considers as true verbs will be dealt with later when discussing the question of the division of verbs into transitive and intransitive, but it is necessary to discuss verbs which are not true verbs in dealing with the fā'il. Ibn al-Sarrāj's particular classification of

this sort of verb is not one which seems to be followed in later works but it is of interest for illustrating problems which the term fā'il itself presented to the grammarians. The verbs which are not real verbs are of three types: 16

فالضرب الأول: أفعال مستعمارة للاختصار
وفيهما بيان أن فاعليهما في الحقيقة مفعولون نحو:
مات زيد، وسقط الحائط، ومرض بكر.
والضرب الثاني: أفعال في اللفظ وليست بأفعال
حقيقية وإنما تدل على الزمان فقط وذلك قولك:
كان عبد الله أذاك، وأصبح عبد الله عاقلا. وليست
تجبر بفتح فاعله، وإنما تجبر أن عبد الله أخوك
فيها مضي وأن الصباح أتى عليه وهو عاقل.
والضرب الثالث: أفعال منقولة، تراد بها
غير الفاعل الذي جعلت له نحو قولك: لا
أرئيتنا ما هنا. فالتنهي إنما هو للمتكلم كأنه ينهى
نفسه في اللفظ وهو للمخاطب في المعنى. وتأويله:
لا تكونن ما هنا فإن من حضرني رأيتك. ومثله
قوله تعالى: وَلَا تَهْمُونَنِي إِذْ وَأَنْتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ. لم
ينههم عن الموت في وقت لأن ذلك ليس لهم
تقديمه وتأخيرها ولكن معناه: كونوا على الإسلام،
فإن الموت لا بد منه فمتى صادفكم، صادفكم عليه.
وهذا تفسير أبي العباس (المبرد) رحمه الله.

The first class of unreal verb is illustrated by examples like
مات زيد، وسقط الحائط، and مرض بكر. It would clearly be incor-
rect to describe the subject in any of these examples as a fā'il, if

due regard is given to the literal sense of that word. Indeed, Ibn al-Sarrāj observes that the fā'il in such examples is really a maf'ūl. However, it would be incorrect to call the subject in these examples the maf'ūl alladhī lam yusamma fā'iluhu because this would imply that there is a definable, though unspecified fā'il, when in fact the question of the true fā'il is more one for philosophy or theology than one for the grammarians. Although it would be fair to call the fā'il "unreal" for this reason, there does not seem to be a strong case for classifying the verbs themselves in the above examples as "unreal".¹⁷

The second class of unreal verb consists of kāna and analogous verbs. It was generally accepted by the grammarians that these verbs are not true verbs but resemble verbs in outward form and behaviour and because of this they are called af'al nāqisah or, less commonly, af'al 'ibārah.¹⁸ Although Ibn al-Sarrāj undertakes a classification of verb types to assist in explaining his definition of the fā'il, the subject of a verb like kāna is not strictly referred to by the grammarians as a fā'il but rather as the ism kāna. Ibn al-Sarrāj himself, as has been mentioned, classifies it as a mushabbah bi-l-fā'il not as a true fā'il. Abū Ḥayyān does point out, however, that the grammarians do loosely refer to the subject and predicate of kāna and analogous verbs as the fā'il and the maf'ūl.¹⁹

Ibn al-Sarrāj's third class of unreal verb is rather difficult to define and the discussion of the examples which he gives is centred on points of idiom and rhetoric rather than of grammar proper. The discussion of the example لَا أَرِيْنَدَكَ مَا مَنَا involves the explanation of an idiomatic way of speaking, and the discussion of the Qur'anic وَأَنْتُمْ سَابِقُونَ involves explaining the force of the rhetoric of the Qur'anic diction.

The introduction by Ibn al-Sarrāj of a classification of the various types of verb into his discussion of the fā'il reflects the

more general problem created by the Arabic terminology for the grammatical subject of a sentence. In English this problem does not really arise because the single expression "subject" can be used in analysing any type of sentence. The Arab grammarians called the subject of nominal sentences the mubtada', but the term fā'il was only just one possible term for the subject of verbal sentences. The Arabic term fā'il will translate literally into English as "doer" or "agent" or, if an exact technical expression is wanted, as "active subject". The Arab grammarians and, as the Uṣūl shows, Ibn al-Sarrāj in particular were always to a greater or lesser degree sensitive to the underlying meaning of the term fā'il and did not use it as a comprehensive term for the subject in verbal sentences.

It is clear that the subject of verbal sentences is not always a fā'il in the strict sense of a "doer", as the sentence in the passive voice ضَرِبَ زَيْدٌ illustrates. The grammarians considered that such a sentence implies that someone struck Zayd, say 'Amr: ضَرَبَ عَمْرٌ زَيْدًا. For the grammarians the term "Zayd" in the passive sentence is as much the object of the action of the verb as it is in the active sentence. Accordingly, the subject of the passive sentence is called the maf'ūl alladhī lam yusamma fā'iluhu and this can be translated into English as the "passive subject". Because the Arab grammarians felt that there was a real difference between the active and passive subject, Ibn al-Sarrāj is careful to word his definition of when a noun is an active subject in such a way as to differentiate it from the passive subject.

The use of the term fā'il, as has been mentioned, is also unsuitable with regard to its underlying meaning of "doer" for the subject of kāna and analogous verbs, and so the term ism is used as in ism kāna, for instance. Ibn al-Sarrāj recognises that the use of the term fā'il without qualification for the subject of the verb kāna and analogous verbs is unsuitable. Accordingly, he calls it the mushabbah bi-l-fā'il

which might be rendered into English as the "quasi active subject".

The subject of kāna and analogous verbs is only one type of quasi active subject and a second type is formed by the subject of sentences introduced by the particle mā in the Hijazi use together with other negative particles behaving similarly. ²⁰ In an example like ما زيد منطلق²⁰ where the negative particle follows the Tamimi usage, the sentence consists of a mubtada' and a khabar and the presence of the negative particle, which here has no power of government, does not affect the construction. However, in an example like ما زيد منطلقاً the negative particle in the Hijazi usage functions like the verb of negation laysa, and accordingly the subject of the sentence is, in the terminology of Ibn al-Sarrāj, a quasi active subject just like the subject of the verb laysa.

In the classification of types of verb which Ibn al-Sarrāj undertakes in his section on the fā'il he divides verbs into two great classes: those which are true verbs and those which are not; and his treatment of the latter class has been dealt with above in discussing the fā'il. His treatment of true verbs consists simply of a classification of verbs according to their transitivity and intransitivity and this is a subject which he discusses further in his chapter on the maf'ul bihi. ²¹ The establishment of an exact classification of verbs according to their transitivity and intransitivity is a topic to which Ibn al-Sarrāj gives much more attention than is generally given in later works like the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal of Ibn Ya'īsh. Dealing in his section on the fā'il with the further classification of true verbs Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ²²

والحقيقي ينقسم قسمين: أهدرها أن يكون
الفعل لا يتعدى الفاعل إلى ما سواه ولا يكون فيه
دليل على مفعول نحو: قمت وقعدت، والآخر

أن يكون فعلا واصلا إلى اسم بعد اسم الفاعل.
والفعل الواصل على ضربين : فضرب واصل
مؤثر نحو: ضربت زيدا، وقتلت بكرا، والضرب
الآخر واصل إلى الاسم فقط غير مؤثر فيه نحو:
ذكرت زيدا، ومددت عمرا، وهجوت بكرا. فإن
هذه تنهى إلى المحي والميت والشاهد والغائب،
وإن كنت إنما تمدح الذات وتدمها إلا أنها غير
مؤثرة.

ومنها الأفعال الداخلة على الابتداء والخبر
وإنما تنبئ عن الفاعل بما جرس في نفسه أو تيقنه
غير مؤثرة بالمفعول، ولكن أخبار الفاعل بما وقع
عنده نحو: فلننت زيدا أهلاك، وعلمت زيدا
غير الناس.

The division of verbs into transitive and intransitive is a very basic one but Ibn al-Sarrāj goes further by dividing the former into those which can be said to have a tangible effect on their direct object and those of which this cannot be said. This distinction is also made briefly by al-Mubarrad in the *Muqtaḍab*.²³ In English to distinguish between the *fi'l al-mu'aththir* and the *fi'l ghayr al-mu'aththir* it would be necessary to talk perhaps of "physical" and "mental" verbs. Ibn Ya'ish also distinguishes between the two sorts of transitive verb using the term *'ilāj* rather than *mu'aththir*. Of the transitive verb he writes:²⁴

يكون ملاحا أو غير ملاح. فالعلاج ما يفتقر إلى
إيجاده إلى استعمال جاهدة أو نحوه نحو: ضربت
زيدا، وقتلت بكرا. وغير العلاج ما لم يفتقر إلى

ذلك بل يكون مما يتعلق بالقلب نحو: ذكرت
زيدا وفهمت الحديث.

When Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses the maf'ūl bihi he again returns
to the question of the classification of transitivity and intransitivity
and he goes into further detail: 25

قد تقدم قولنا في المفعول على الحقيقة أنه المصدر.
ولما كانت هذه تكون على ضربين: ضرب منها يلاقى
شيئاً يؤثر فيه، وضرب منها لا يلاقى شيئاً ولا
يؤثر فيه، فسُيُسمى الفعل الملاقى متعدياً وما لا
يلاقى غير متعد. فأما الفعل الذي هو غير متعد
فهو الذي لا يلاقى مصدره مفعولاً نحو: قام، والجمهر،
... والأفعال التي لا تتعدى هي ما كان منها خلقاً
أو حركةً للجسم في ذاتها وهيئةً له أو نفاذ من
أفعال النفس غير متشبثة بشئ، طارح منها.
أما الذي هو خلقاً فنحو: اسود، والجمهر،... وأما حركة
الجسم بغير ملاقاته لشيء، آخر فنحو: قام، وقعد....
ألا ترى أن هذه الأفعال مصونة لحركة الجسم
وهيئة في ذاتها. فإن قال قائل: فلا بد لهذه الأفعال
من أن تلاقى المكان وأن تكون فيه، قيل: هذا لا
يد منه لكل فعل والمتعدى وغير المتعدى في هذا
سواء... لأن الفعل يصنع ليدل على المكان كما يصنع
ليدل على المصدر والزمان. وأما أفعال النفس التي
لا تتعداها فنحو كرم، وظرف.... وأما الفعل الذي
يتعدى فكل حركة للجسم كانت ملاقية لغيرها وما

أشبه ذلك من أفعال النفس. وأفعال الحواس من
 الخمس كلها متعدية ملاقية نحو: نظرت،
 وشميت، وسمعت، وذقت، ولمست، وجميع
 ما في معانيهن فهو متعد. وكذلك حركة
 الجسم إذا لاقت شيئاً كان الفعل من ذلك
 متعدياً. نحو أتيت زيدا، ووطئت بلدك ودارك.

Ibn al-Sarrāj is, of course, inaccurate when he writes at the beginning of the above passage that transitive verbs يلاق شيئاً because, as he mentions in the passage quoted previously, not all transitive verbs can be said to have an effect on their direct object. The way in which Ibn al-Sarrāj deals with the question of transitivity and intransitivity in verbs is of interest because he considers this to depend on whether or not their respective infinitives are transitive. The Basran grammarians held that verbs are derived from their respective infinitives which are more basic than the verbs themselves and, accordingly, Ibn al-Sarrāj attributes a verb's power to govern a direct object to the power of its infinitive so to do. Ibn Ya'ish makes this same point clear when he defines transitivity: ²⁶

ومعنى التعدى أن المصدر الذى هو مدلول الفعل،
 وهو فعل الفاعل، على ضربين: ضرب منهما يلاق
 شيئاً ويؤثر فيه فيسمى متعدياً، وضرب منهما
 لا يلاق شيئاً فيسمى غير متعد. فكل حركة
 للجسم كانت ملاقية لغيره سميت متعدية
 وكل حركة له لم تكن ملاقية لغيره كانت
 لازمة أى هى لازمة للفاعل لا تتجاوزهُ، نحو:
 قام وقعد.

In a later chapter the question of Ibn Ya'ish's incorporation of material from the Uṣūl into his Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal will be dealt with in detail,²⁷ but it is worth noting here that Ibn Ya'ish does seem to be influenced in this passage by his reading of the Uṣūl. Just like Ibn al-Sarrāj he also makes the incorrect statement that all transitive verbs have an effect on their direct object. In addition, Ibn Ya'ish also uses the verb laqa as a non-technical term to explain the technical term ta'addā and similarly he uses the idea of movement (ḥarakah) in explaining transitivity. However, Ibn Ya'ish's analysis of types of verb is not as thorough as that of Ibn al-Sarrāj.

In the preceding part of this chapter Ibn al-Sarrāj's classification of the uses of the nominative case and the varieties of verb has been examined and it is also worth considering his classification of the uses of the accusative case. Ibn al-Sarrāj divides the various uses of the accusative into a class which can be called the maf'ūl and a class which can be called the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl.²⁸ He draws up a classification of the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl in a manner which is very much his own, although other scholars do deal with various of the considerations which underlie his classification. The grammarians as a whole did consider that certain uses of the accusative case could be classified as mafā'il, namely the maf'ūl mutlaq, maf'ūl bihi, maf'ūl fihi, maf'ūl lahu, and the maf'ūl ma'ahu. They also considered that other uses of the accusative resembled the maf'ūl but they did not go as far as formally putting them into a class called the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl. The term maf'ūl translates into English as "object" and the term mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl could be translated as "quasi-object", just as Ibn al-Sarrāj's term mushabbah bi-l-fā'il could be translated as "quasi active subject".

According to Ibn al-Sarrāj the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl divides up into two classes:²⁹

والمتشبه بالمفعول ينقسم على قسمين. فالقسم الأول قد يكون فيه المنصوب في اللفظ هو المرفوع في المعنى. والقسم الثاني ما يكون المنصوب في اللفظ غير المرفوع، والمنصوب بعض المرفوع.

The first of these two classes can be further divided into three varieties: 30

هذا النوع ينقسم على ثلاثة أقرب. فمنه ما العامل فيه فعل حقيقي. ومنه ما العامل فيه شيء على وزن الفعل ويتصرف تصرفه وليس بفعل في الحقيقة. ومنه ما العامل فيه حرف جامد غير متصرف

The first of these three types consists of the hāl and the tamyiz. Ibn al-Sarrāj does not explain very clearly in the case of the hāl why the accusative in outward form may represent what is nominative in meaning, and all he writes in explanation is: 31

فأشبهه: جاء عبد الله راكباً، ضرب عبد الله رجلاً.
وراكب هو عبد الله، ليس هو غيره.

Ibn Ya'ish makes the same point much more clearly when he explains why the accusative of the hāl cannot be said to be a true maf'ūl: 32

ومما يدل أنها ليست مفعولة أنها هي الفاعل في معنى وليس غيره. فالراكب في: جاء زيد راكباً، هو زيد. وليس المفعول كذلك بل لا يكون إلا غير الفاعل أو في حكمه نحو: ضرب زيد عمراً.

However, it has to be said that the hāl does not necessarily qualify the subject of the sentence and that the ṣāhib al-hāl may be some other term. In the case of Ibn al-Sarrāj this objection would appear

to be met by the fact that he states that the class of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul, into which the hāl falls, is one in which the accusative in outward form may be (قد يكون) nominative in meaning. However, the point of classifying the hāl in this manner would seem to be to distinguish the hāl from the mafa'il proper, rather than to give a universally valid description of it.

The second variety of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul where the accusative in outward form is nominative in meaning and the regent governing it is a verb proper, is the accusative of the tamyiz. This description, however, does not apply to the use of the tamyiz in enumeration and measurement and in the present discussion such usages are specifically excluded. ³³ In explanation of his classification Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ³⁴

الأسماء التي تنتمى بالتمييز والعامل فيها
فعل أو معنى فعل، والمفعول هو فاعل في المعنى
وذلك قولك: قد تفقأ زيد شحماً، وتصيب عرقاً،
وطبت بذلك نفساً، وامتلأ الإناء ماءً، ووضعت به
ذراً. فالماء هو الذي ملأ الإناء والنفس هي التي
طابت والعرق هو الذي تصيب. ولفظه لفظ
المفعول وهو في المعنى فاعل. وكذلك ما جاء في
معنى الفعل وقام مقامه نحو قولك: زيد أفرههم
عبداً، وهو أحسنهم وجهاً. فالناره في الحقيقة هو
العبد والحسن هو الوجه، إلا أن قولك أفره
وأحسن في اللفظ لزيد وفيه ضميره، والعبد نير
زيد والوجه إنما هو بعضه إذ أن الحسن في
الحقيقة للوجه والفراحة للعبد.

Although this analysis of tamyiz as it stands supports Ibn al-Sarrāj's way of classifying this particular use of the accusative case, it is an analysis which can appear over-simple when compared with that of later grammarians. Abū Ḥayyān, for instance, writes in the Manhaj al-sālik that the grammarians divide uses of the tamyiz into several categories: ³⁵

... يكون منقولاً و مشبهاً بالمنقول. والمنقول
على ثلاثة أقسام منقول من فاعل وذلك نحو:
تصبب زيد عرقاً، واشتعل الرأس شيباً وطاب
زيد نفساً. أصله تصبب عرق زيد، واشتعل
شيب الرأس، وطابت نفس زيد. فأسندنا الفعل
إلى مجرور وانتصب الفاعل تمييزاً.... ومنقول
من مفعول وذلك نحو قوله تعالى: وَجَبَّرْنَا الْأَرْضَ
يُيُونًا، وعرست الأرض شجراً، وهفرت الدار بئراً.
أصله: فَجَبَّرْنَا يُونِ الْأَرْضِ، وعرست شجراً في الأرض،
وهفرت بئراً في الدار.... ومنقول من مضاف
نحو: زيد أحسن منك وجهاً. أصله: وجه زيد
أحسن من وجهك.... والمشبّه بالمنقول نحو:
قولهم: هَذَا زَيْدٌ رَجُلًا، وكفى بزيد ناصراً، وداری
خلف دارك فرسخاً.

This passage provides a more highly developed analysis of tamyiz constructions than Ibn al-Sarrāj does, although Abū Ḥayyān does mention that there are certain scholars who do not accept the tamyiz manqūl min al-maf'ūl and some treat the tamyiz manqūl min al-mudāf as having the meaning of an original fā'il which would accord with Ibn al-Sarrāj's analysis of tamyiz constructions of this type. ³⁶ Even if tamyiz

constructions are analysed along the lines laid down by later scholars, the same point may be made as was made in the case of the ḥāl, namely, that in the case of the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl the accusative in outward form may be nominative in meaning. However, there is no evidence that Ibn al-Sarrāj would analyse the tamyiz as other than standing in for an implied fa'il.

The two other types of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl of the class where the accusative in outward form may be nominative in meaning are the predicate of kāna and analogous verbs and the subject of inna and analogous particles.³⁷ It is clear why Ibn al-Sarrāj does not consider these to represent true mafa'il and there is no need to discuss them further here but they will be mentioned in a later chapter.³⁸

The second class of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl consists of only one item and this is the accusative used in exception after illā in positive sentences and as an alternative to the badal construction in negative sentences.³⁹ Ibn al-Sarrāj describes this variety of mushabbah

bi-l-maf'ūl as: ما يكون المنصوب فيه في اللفظ غير المرفوع والمنصوب

بعض المرفوع.⁴⁰ The meaning of the first part of this description is clear, ما يكون المنصوب فيه في اللفظ غير المرفوع, because it serves to distinguish this type of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl from all other types. Ibn al-Sarrāj does not suggest that the exceptive accusative admits of being interpreted as nominative in meaning unlike the other types of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl. The second part of the description,

والمنصوب بعض المرفوع, is somewhat less clear but can be explained by using an illustration like قام القوم إلا زيد. Here the term زيد in the accusative is to be thought of as part of what is denoted by the term القوم in the nominative until it is expressly excepted from it.

Ibn Ya'īsh takes much the same consideration into account when he explains why the term in the accusative after illā cannot be treated as a true maf'ūl:⁴¹

إنما قلنا أنه مشبه بالمفعول ولم نقل أنه مفعول
لأن المستثنى أبداً بعن المستثنى منه والمفعول
غير الفاعل.

However, the statement by Ibn al-Sarrāj, *والممنصوب بعن المرفوع*, is only valid if the mustathnā minhu is a term in the nominative, but the point of this remark may be to show that there is some affinity between this mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl and the others where the accusative in outward form may be nominative in meaning.

In what has preceded, the work of Ibn al-Sarrāj in classifying and analysing various grammatical usages has been examined and similar to this in many ways is his attention to defining the parts of speech. However, in defining the parts of speech Ibn al-Sarrāj takes into account considerations that are not purely grammatical, but which stem rather from logic. This is because one of the developments which came to take place in grammatical thought was that philosophy and, in particular, logic came to exert an influence on the grammarians in their outlook and the ways in which they explained various matters.⁴² One particular area in which logic was influential was in the definition of the parts of speech.

Whether or not Arabic grammar owes to logic its tripartite division of the parts of speech into noun, verb, and particle does not matter for the purposes of this present discussion, but what is of relevance is that the grammarians came to take into account what the logicians had done towards defining the parts of speech. The different types of word which occur in speech were not felt to be something based purely on the analysis of the Arabic language. Al-Mubarrad, for instance, writes:⁴³

فالكلام كل: اسم، فعل، وحرف جاء لمعنى. لا يخلو الكلام
— مريباً كان أو أنجبياً — من هذه الثلاثة.

In the light of the idea of the universality of the tripartite division of speech it is not unnatural that the grammarians should have drawn on logic in discussing the parts of speech and their definition because logic is a subject which claims universal validity and in it too the parts of speech and their definition are discussed.

In the Kitāb Sībawayh does not give a formal definition of the noun but merely gives some examples of nouns: فالا اسم: رجل و فرس و هانقا: 44

In the Muqtaḍab al-Mubarrad goes into more detail and offers the following definition of the noun: 45

أما الأسماء فما كان واقعا على معنى نحو: رجل و فرس
 و زيد و عمرو، وما أشبه ذلك. و تعتبر الأسماء بواحدة:
 كل ما دخل عليه هرف من حروف الجر فهو اسم،
 وإن اصنع من ذلك فليس باسم.

In defining a noun as that which can be made subject to a preposition, al-Mubarrad produces a definition which is framed in purely grammatical terms and this is a mode of definition of common occurrence in works of grammar.

Not all definitions of the noun are of this order. Al-Sīrāfī, a pupil of Ibn al-Sarrāj, is quoted by Ibn Ya'īsh as giving the following definition of the noun which may be taken as typical of definitions by later grammarians: كلمة دلت على معنى في نفسها من غير اقتران

كلمة دلت على معنى في نفسها من غير اقتران 46 This would translate as "a word conveying a meaning in itself unconnected with a specific time". Al-Zamakhsharī similarly

writes: الاسم ما دل على معنى في نفسه دلالة مجردة عن الاقتران, and Ibn Ya'īsh notes that most grammarians would add the words زمان

كلمة دلت على معنى في نفسها من غير اقتران 47 From Ibn Ya'īsh's comments on al-Sīrāfī's definition it emerges that the wording of the definition establishes two differentiae (faṣl) by which the noun is distinguished from the particle and the verb respectively: 48

وقوله: يدل على معنى في نفسها، فصل احترز به من الحرف لأن الحرف يدل على معنى في غيره. وقوله: من غير اقتران بزمان محض، فصل ثان جمع به المصادر إلى الأسماء ومنع الأفعال أن تدخل في هـ الأسماء لأن الأهداث تدل على أزمنة مبسوطة إذ لا يكون هدئا إلا في زمان، ودلالة الفعل على زمان معلوم إما ماضٍ وإما غير ماضٍ.

Ibn al-Sarrāj's basic definition of the noun is: 49

الاسم ما دل على معنى مفرد وذلك المعنى يكون شخصا وغير شخصي نحو: دجل وفرس وهجر وبلد وعمر وبكر. وأما ما كان غير شخصي فنحو: الضرب والأكل والظن والعلم واليوم والليلة والساعة.

Neither here nor later in his discussion does Ibn al-Sarrāj introduce the idea that a noun is كلمة تدل على معنى في نفسها with a view to differentiating between the noun and the particle but, rather, he is only concerned with differentiating between the noun and the verb.

His use of the term مفرد is a way of expressing the idea behind the phrase in later definitions من غير اقتران بزمان محض, and this is made clear by his justification of his definition: 50

وإنما قلت: ما دل على معنى مفرد، لأفرك بينه وبين الفعل إذ كان الفعل يدل على معنى وزمان وذلك الزمان إما ماضٍ وإما حاضر وإما مستقبل.

Ibn al-Sarrāj does mention that the noun, unlike the verb, does not indicate a notion in زمان محض, using the standard phrase of the later definition, when he rebuts an objection (often mentioned by the

grammarians) to the generally accepted definition of the noun and he explains the word مَحْضَلٌ as if it would be unknown in this sense to his readers: 51

فإن قلت: إن في الأسماء مثل اليوم والليلة والساعة
وهذه أزمانها فما الفرق بينها وبين الفعل. قلنا:
الفرق أن الفعل ليس هو زمان فقط. فالיום معنى
مفرد للزمان ولم يوضع مع ذلك لمعنى آخر،
ومع ذلك أن الفعل قد قسم بأقسام الزمان الثلاثة:
الماضي والحاضر والمستقبل. فإذا كانت اللفظة تدل
على زمان فقط فهي اسم، وإذا دلت على معنى
وزمان محصل فهي فعل. وأغنى بالحصل الماضي
والحاضر والمستقبل.

The relation of Ibn al-Sarrāj's approach to the definition of the noun to the ideas of the logicians is not difficult to show. In the Kitāb al-alfāz al-musta'malah fī l-mantiq al-Fārābī defines the noun

as: كل لفظ مفرد دال على المعنى من غير أن يدل بذاته على زمان 52, and this sort of definition can be seen as ultimately

stemming from Aristotle who writes: هي لفظة دالة بتواطؤ مجردة

53. Al-Zajjāj, an older contemporary of Ibn al-Sarrāj,

is recorded as having a definition of the noun which has a certain

resemblance to the sort which the logicians put forward: صوت متعلق

54. Although this

definition can be said to owe something to the ideas of logic, it does

not have a really close connection and the presence of the terms متعلق

, and مفهوم, tends to move the definition away from the ideas

of the logicians.

When discussing the definition of the noun in the Idāh fī 'ilal al-nahw, al-Zajjājī (d. ca. 949), who was a pupil of both al-Zajjāj and

Ibn al-Sarrāj, mentions that the grammarians and the logicians define it in a different manner although some of the grammarians incline to the logicians' view. Al-Zajjājī himself frames his own definition to meet the needs of grammar but admits the validity of the logicians' definition: 55

الاسم في كلام العرب ما كان فاعلا أو مفعولا أو
واقعا في ميز الفاعل والمفعول به. هذا الحد داخل
في مقاييس النحو وأوضاعه. وليس يخرج عنه اسم
البتة، ولا يدخل فيه ما ليس باسم. وإنما قلنا
في كلام العرب لأننا له نقصد وعليه نتكلم، ولأن
المنطقيين وبعض النحويين قد هدره هذا
خارجا عن أوضاع النحو. فقالوا: الاسم صوت
موضوع دال باتفاق على معنى غير مقرون بزمان.
وليس هذا من ألفاظ النحويين ولا أوضاعهم،
وإنما هو من كلام المنطقيين، وإن كان قد تعلق
به جماعة من النحويين. وهو صحيح على أوضاع
المنطقيين ومن ذهبهم لأن غرضهم غير غرضنا
ومغزاهم غير مغزانا. وهو عندنا على أوضاع النحو
غير صحيح لأنه يلزم منه أن يكون كثير من
الحروف أسماء لأن من الحروف ما يدل على معنى
دلالة غير مقرونة بزمان، نحو: إن ولكن وما
أشبه ذلك.

This passage confirms that by the time of al-Zajjājī some of the grammarians were taking over the logicians' definitions of the noun although the majority appear to have based their definitions purely on the needs of grammar. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj's ideas on the definition

of the noun are influenced by logic, yet they are not so profoundly influenced as the sort of definition based on logic which al-Zajjājī quotes above. However, it does appear from the evidence available that Ibn al-Sarrāj was the first grammarian who can be definitely attested as defining the noun along lines laid down by the logicians.

The definition of the verb is easier to deal with because the grammarians tend to discuss it in less detail, as is the case with the definition of the particle as well. However, Sibawayh gives more attention to defining the verb than to defining the other two parts of speech: 56

وأما الفعل فأمثلة أهدت من لفظ أهدات الأسماء
وَبُنِيَتْ لَهَا مَعْنَى وَلَمَّا يَكُونُ وَلَمْ يَقْعُ وَمَا هُوَ كَائِنٌ
وَلَمْ يَنْقَطِعْ.

Although Sibawayh's view on the verb was discussed by the scholars and is important for indicating that he held the general view of the Basrans that the verb is derived from the infinitive, nevertheless, it has little direct bearing on the way in which the verb was defined by later scholars.

As typical of later definitions of the verb may be cited that by Ibn Ya'īsh: فَمَا الْفِعْلُ فَكَّرَ كَلِمَةً تَدُلُّ عَلَى مَعْنَى فِي نَفْسِهَا مَقْتَرِنَةٌ
57 Ibn al-Sarrāj's definition of the verb largely corresponds with this except that, as was the case with the noun, he does not include the expression فِي نَفْسِهِ to distinguish the verb from the particle: 58

الفعل ما دل على معنى وزمان وذلك الزمان إما
ماضٍ وإما حاضر وإما مستقبل. وقلنا: وزمان، لنفرق
بينه وبين الاسم الذي يدل على معنى فقط.

This definition by Ibn al-Sarrāj also links up with the ideas of the

logicians; al-Fārābī, for instance, writes in definition of the verb

in the Kitāb al-alfāz: لفظة مفردة تدل على معنى وعلى زمان.⁵⁹

It is significant that Ibn al-Sarrāj considers that a verb conveys both a notion and a time. According to Ibn Fāris, al-Kisā'ī had defined a

verb as: ما دل على زمان,⁶⁰ but the way Ibn al-Sarrāj does so is

completely in accordance with the practice in logic which is based on Aristotle's definition in On interpretation (in the Arabic translation of which the verb is called kalimah, the usual term of the logicians):

As وأما الكلمة فهي ما تدل مع ما تدل عليه على زمان....⁶¹

was the case with the noun, Ibn al-Sarrāj seems to be the first scholar who can be attested as having defined the verb in a work of grammar along the lines laid down by the logicians.

Unlike their definitions of the verb and the noun, the grammarians' definitions of the particle seem to be firmly based on their own ideas and are unrelated to the work of the logicians. Indeed, in logic itself little attention was given to parts of speech other than the verb and

noun. Sibawayh defines the particle, which he calls حرف جاء لمعنى, as: حرف جاء لمعنى ليس باسم ولا فعول.⁶² In the Jumal al-Zajjājī

gives what was to become the standard definition of the particle: والحرف

ما دل على معنى في غيره.⁶³ Although the standard definition of the particle was in use by the time of al-Zajjājī, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not mention it when discussing the particle. In definition of the particle Ibn al-Sarrāj writes:⁶⁴

الحرف ما لا يجوز أن يخبر عنه كما يخبر عن الاسم.
ألا ترى أنك لا تقول: إلى منطلق، كما تقول:
الرجل منطلق، ولا: من ذاهب، كما تقول: زيد ذاهب.
ولا يجوز أن يكون خبراً. لا تقول: عمرو إلى، ولا:
بكر عن. فقد بان أن الحرف من الكم الثلاثة هو الذي
لا يجوز أن يخبر عنه ولا يكون خبراً.

Notes to Chapter II

- 1 Al-Sirāfi, p. 37.
- 2 Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 52; al-Sirāfi, p. 39.
- 3 See pp. 10-11 above.
- 4 Al-Qiftī, vol. iii, p. 149.
- 5 See p. 13 above.
- 6 For al-Marzubānī see Kahhālah, vol. ii, pp. 97-8.
- 7 For the logical term "division" see A. A. Luce, Logic (London, 1958), pp. 31-2.
- 8 Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah, 'Uyūn al-anbā'', 2 vols (Cairo, 1882), vol. ii, p. 136.
- 9 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 61-2, 174-5, 399, 498.
- 10 Ibid., p. 60.
- 11 Ibid., p. 62.
- 12 Ibid., p. 92.
- 13 See pp. 61-3 below.
- 14 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 81.
- 15 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 74.
- 16 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 82-3. In l. 15 of this passage has been substituted for  in the printed text. 
- 17 See also al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, p. 188.
- 18 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 89.
- 19 Abū Hayyān, pp. 125-6.
- 20 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 106-13.
- 21 Ibid., pp. 202-3.
- 22 Ibid., pp. 81-2.
- 23 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, p. 188.
- 24 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 62.
- 25 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 202-3.
- 26 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 124.
- 27 See pp. 166-79 below.

- 28 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 189, 257.
- 29 Ibid., p. 257.
- 30 Ibid., pp. 257-8.
- 31 Ibid., p. 258.
- 32 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, p. 55.
- 33 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 189, 374-5. See also pp. 65-6 below.
- 34 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 268.
- 35 Abu Ḥayyān, pp. 224-5.
- 36 Ibid., pp. 223-5.
- 37 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 276-7.
- 38 See pp. 70-1 below.
- 39 See pp. 67-70 below.
- 40 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 257, 342.
- 41 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, p. 77.
- 42 On the general question of the influence of Greek grammatical thought and logic see C. H. M. Versteegh, Greek elements in Arabic linguistic thinking, Leiden, 1977.
- 43 Al-Mubarrad, vol. i, p. 3.
- 44 Sībawayh, vol. i, p. 2.
- 45 Al-Mubarrad, vol. i, p. 3.
- 46 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 22.
- 47 Ibid., pp. 22-3.
- 48 Ibid., p. 22.
- 49 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 38.
- 50 Ibid. In l. 2 of this passage ۛ! has been substituted for ۛ! in the printed text.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 38-9.
- 52 Al-Fārābī, Kitāb al-alfāz al-musta'malah fi l-manṭiq (Beirut, 1968), p. 41.
- 53 Al-Fārābī, Sharḥ al-'ibārah (Beirut, 1960), p. 29.
- 54 Ibn Fāris, Sāhibī fi fiqh al-lughah (Cairo, 1910), p. 51.

- 55 Al-Zajjājī, Idāh fi 'ilal al-naḥw (Cairo, 1959), p. 48.
- 56 Sībawayh, vol. i, p. 2.
- 57 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 2.
- 58 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 41.
- 59 Al-Fārābī, Alfāz, pp. 41-2.
- 60 Ibn Fāris, p. 52.
- 61 Al-Fārābī, Sharḥ al-'ibārah, p. 33.
- 62 Sībawayh, vol. i, p. 2.
- 63 Al-Zajjājī, Jumal fi l-naḥw (Paris, 1957), p. 17.
- 64 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 43.

CHAPTER III

REGENTS, THEIR CLASSIFICATION, AND RELATED THEORY

One of the most important of the concepts used by the Arab grammarians is that of the 'āmil, a word which can be rendered into English as "regent". In definition of what a regent is Weil writes that it is "to express it in the way of the Arab grammarians a word, which, by the syntactical influence which it exercises on a word that follows, causes a grammatical alteration of the last syllable of the latter, i.e. a change of case or mood."¹ Although the idea of the regent was basic to the thought of the Arab grammarians from the earliest times onward, nevertheless, systematic discussions of this topic are comparatively rare.

Among the various matters which Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses at the beginning of the Uṣūl is the regent and this discussion would appear to constitute one of the earliest systematic treatments of it.² The best known work devoted to the regent is the 'Awāmil al-mi'ah of 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 1078) which was the subject of a number of late commentaries.³ Prior to this Abū 'Alī al-Fārisī had written a work on the regent although it plainly did not have the same success.⁴ In the Ashbah wa-l-naẓā'ir of al-Suyūṭī there is a discussion of various points connected with the regent in which the author draws heavily on quotations culled from earlier works.⁵

In his discussion of the regent in the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj classifies the various regents according to whether they are nouns, verbs, or particles and he further subdivides these three classes in the manner shown in the accompanying table.⁶ Amongst the particles he even includes

TABLE 1

THE DIVISION OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH INTO REGENTS

ACCORDING TO IBN AL-SARRĀJ⁶A Nouns

- 1 The noun in the mubtada' and khavar construction
- 2 Nouns with verbal regimen
 - i The active participle
 - ii The assimilated adjective
 - iii The infinitive
 - iv Nouns with verbal force (e.g. ruwayda)
- 3 Nouns with the regimen of particles (i.e. the mudāf in the construct)

B VerbsC Particles

- 1 Particles governing nouns
 - i Prepositions
 - ii inna and similar particles
- 2 Particles governing verbs (i.e. entailing the use of the subjunctive and jussive moods)
- 3 Particles without regimen (e.g. interrogative particle a)

TABLE 2

THE "HUNDRED REGENTS" ACCORDING TO AL-JURJĀNĪ ⁷

A The 'awāmil al-lafziyah (98)

a The 'awāmil al-samā'iyah (91 regents in 13 classes)

- 1 Prepositions (17)
- 2 inna and similar particles (6)
- 3 mā and lā functioning like laysa (2)
- 4 Particles governing the accusative (7)
(wa, illā, yā, ayā, hayā, ay, a)
- 5 Particles governing the subjunctive (4)
- 6 Particles governing the jussive (5)
- 7 Particles governing the jussive used in conditional sentences (9)
- 8 Expressions entailing tamyiz (4)
(numerals 11-99, kam, kadhā, ka'ayyin)
- 9 Nouns with verbal force (asmā' al-af'āl) (9)
(governing the accusative:- ruwayda, balha, dūnaka, 'alayka, hayyahal, hā; governing the nominative:- hayhāt, shattān, sar'ān)
- 10 kāna and similar verbs (13)
- 11 Verbs of appropinquation (4)
- 12 Verbs of praise and blame (4)
- 13 Verbs of doubt and certainty (7)

b The 'awāmil al-qiyāsiyah (7 regents)

- 1 The verb
- 2 The assimilated adjective
- 3 The active participle
- 4 The passive participle
- 5 The infinitive
- 6 The first element (muḍāf) in the construct
- 7 The first element (munayyiz) in the tamyiz construction

B The 'āmilān al-ma'nawīyān (2 regents)

- 1 Regent of the mubtada' and khābar, i.e. ibtidā'
- 2 Regent of the imperfect tense, i.e. its taking the position of a noun without an express substantive regent

those which do not function as regents at all. For the purposes of comparison a table has also been drawn up listing the "hundred regents" according to al-Jurjānī's reckoning so that this scholar's approach may be compared with that of Ibn al-Sarrāj. ⁷ The approach of al-Suyūṭī to the regent in the Ashbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir is completely different to that of Ibn al-Sarrāj because the latter aims at providing a classification of the regents while the former aims mainly at setting down various rules as to how the regents function. ⁸

The 'Awāmil al-mi'ah of al-Jurjānī is an extremely terse résumé of the grammatical regents in Arabic and is so constructed as to yield a total number of one hundred regents. One of the main points about al-Jurjānī's classification is that there are two broad types of regent, the 'āmil lafẓī and the 'āmil ma'nawī and these two terms may be translated as "verbal regent" and "notional regent". In explanation of these two terms Weil writes: "Two kinds of regentia are distinguished, one which can be recognized externally (lafẓī) and one which is only to be supposed logically, but which is not expressed (ma'nawī)." ⁹ Al-Jurjānī's further classification of the verbal regents into the two classes of samā'ī and qiyāsī does not find its way into the standard grammars of Arabic. If a regent is samā'ī it is a lexically definable term such as the preposition bi, but if it is qiyāsī it represents a class of terms such as the verb whose constituents cannot be exhaustively defined.

One of the main differences between Ibn al-Sarrāj's treatment of the regent and that of al-Jurjānī is that the former makes no reference to notional regents and verbal regents. Later grammarians like al-Zamakhsharī make use of these expressions but they are ones which seem to post-date the time of Ibn al-Sarrāj and are used neither by Sibawayh in the Kitāb nor by al-Mubarrad in the Muqtaḍab. ¹⁰

All regents except two are classified as verbal regents and these two are ibtidā' and the regent governing the imperfect indicative verb.

In the Uṣūl ibtidā' is not specifically called a ma'nā, a form of expression which in itself would prepare the way for the formal division of regents into verbal and notional. However, the idea that ibtidā' is specifically a ma'nā does appear in the Jumal of al-Zajjājī, a pupil of Ibn al-Sarrāj: 11

اعلم أن الاسم المبتدأ مرفوع والخبر إذا كان اسماً
واحداً مثله فهو مرفوع أبداً. وذلك قولك: زيد قائم،
زيد مرفوع لأنه مبتدأ والابتداء معنى رفوعه.
وهو مضارعته للفاعل وذلك أن المبتدأ لا بد له
من خبر ولا بد للخبر من مبتدأ يسند إليه.
وكذلك الفعل والفاعل لا يستغنى أحدهما عن صاحبه.

In the commentary on the Jumal by al-Jurjānī's contemporary, Ibn Bābshādh (d. 1077), ibtidā' is discussed using the sort of terms found in al-Jurjānī's classification: 12

أما الابتداء فمعنى لا لفظ وهو وصف قائم في
المعقول. وذلك الوصف اهتمامك بالمبتدأ
وجعلك إياه أولاً لئان يكون الثاني خبراً عنه.
فهذا تفسير صفة الابتداء. والمبتدأ لفظ وهو كل
اسم بدأت به لتخبر عنه بغيره معرى من العوائل
اللفظية. فهذا معرفة الفرق بين الابتداء والمبتدأ.
والابتداء عامل والمبتدأ معقول. والابتداء تقدير
والمبتدأ لفظ.

Like the Uṣūl, the Sharḥ al-jumal of Ibn Bābshādh is a work intended for beginners and, accordingly, it seems probable that Ibn al-Sarrāj would have referred to notional and verbal regents if this classification had been current in his day for these expressions did become a basic part of grammatical terminology.

If the concept of the notional regent is taken to be one which only developed after the time of al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj, then statements made by Abu Ḥayyān about views which al-Mubarrad is said to have held must have an element of anachronism about them. One view which al-Mubarrad is said to have held about why the mubtada' is in the nominative is: ارتفع بالتجرید من العوامل اللفظية; and similarly for the khabar: ارتفع بالتحری من العوامل اللفظية.¹³ In the Muqtaḍab al-Mubarrad writes on why the mubtada' is in the nominative:¹⁴

فأما رفع المبتدأ فبالابتداء، ومعنى الابتداء:
التنبيه والتعريف من العوامل غيره، وهو أول
الكلام.

If al-Mubarrad had been in the habit of using the expression "verbal regent" as a contrast to "notional regent" one would have expected him to have introduced the expression here.

The other notional regent which the grammarians recognised was the regent governing the imperfect indicative. On this point al-Zamakhsharī writes:¹⁵

هو في الارتفاع بعامل معنوي نظير المبتدأ وخبره.
وذلك المعنى وقوى بحيث يصح وقوع الاسم
كقولك: زيد يضرب، رفعت له لأن ما بعد المبتدأ
من مطلق معنى وقرع الأسماء.

Ibn al-Sarrāj's explanation of the same point is:¹⁶

الفعل يرتفع بموقعه موقع الأسماء... ألا ترى
أنك إذا قلت: يقوم زيد، جاز أن تجعل زيدا
موضع يقوم فتقول: زيد يفعل كذا، وكذلك إذا
قلت: عمرو ينطلق، فإنما ارتفع ينطلق لأنه
وقع موقع أهلك إذا قلت: زيد أهلك.

Here there is no mention of the idea of a notional regent and the term ma'nā itself does not appear and the same applies to al-Mubarrad's treatment of the point in the Muqtaḍab.¹⁷ Apart from this Ibn al-Sarrāj's explanation is very similar to that of the later scholar, al-Zamakhsharī, and for this reason it seems probable that the former would have indicated that the regent is notional if that expression had been current in his day.

In discussing the idea of notional and verbal regents reference has been made to ibtidā' and the nominal sentence, and this requires some further consideration. In defining the noun's power to act as a regent Ibn al-Sarrāj makes a tripartite division into the noun acting in the mubtada' and khavar construction, the noun acting as a verb, and the noun acting as a particle.¹⁸ In the case of the first and the third of these classes the validity of the classification depends on the particular views of Ibn al-Sarrāj to which all grammarians do not subscribe. On the noun in the first of these three classes, that in the mubtada' and khavar construction, Ibn al-Sarrāj writes:¹⁹

الاسم يعمل في الاسم على ثلاثة ضرور. الضرب
الأول أن يبنى عليه اسم مثله أو يبنى على اسم
ويأتلف باجتماعهما الكلام ويتم ويفقدان
العوامل من غيرهما نحو قولك: عبد الله أهوك.
فعبد الله مرتفع بأنه أول المبتدأ فاقد للعوامل،
ابتدأته لتبني عليه ما يكون هديتنا عنه. وأهوك
مرتفع بأنه الحديث المبنى على الاسم الأول
المبتدأ.

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj does not explain exactly how one noun acts as a regent on another in the mubtada' and khavar construction

but, rather, he writes that the mubtada' is put into the nominative by the very act of functioning as a mubtada', which is the concept of ibtidā' although he does not call it such here; the khavar is put into the nominative by the act of functioning as a predicate. This, however, does not involve one noun acting on another. A satisfactory explanation of the contention that one noun acts on another in this construction is given when Ibn al-Sarrāj gives special attention to the mubtada' at a later point in the Uṣūl:²⁰

المبتدأ ما جهرت من عوامل الأسماء ومن الأفعال
والحروف وكان القصد فيه أن تجعله أولاً لثان
صتداً به دون الفعل يكون تانيه خبره ولا يستغنى
واحد منهما عن صاحبه. وهما حرفومان أبدأ فالمبتدأ
رفع بالابتداء والخبر بهما، نحو قولك: الله ربنا،
وهي نينا.

This passage gives an explanation of Ibn al-Sarrāj's view that in the mubtada' and khavar construction one noun acts as a regent on another because he states here that the mubtada', which is a noun, together with ibtidā' act as the regent of the khavar.

If this is taken as the explanation of how one noun acts on another in this construction, this type of noun regent only exists providing that it is accepted that the mubtada' acts as a regent on the khavar. This view was rejected by scholars like Ibn al-Anbarī and Ibn Ya'īsh who held that the khavar was put into the nominative by ibtidā' alone, acting, to be sure, through the medium of the mubtada'.²¹ In criticism of the view which Ibn al-Sarrāj among others takes, and in defence of his own view, Ibn Ya'īsh writes:²²

وذهب آخرون إلى أن الابتداء والمبتدأ جميعاً
يعملان في الخبر. قالوا: لأننا وجدنا الخبر لا يقع

إلا بعد المبتدأ والابتداء فوجب أن يعمل فيه .
وهذا القول عليه كثير من البصريين ولا ينفك
من ضعف . وذلك من قبل أن المبتدأ اسم والأصل
في الأسماء أن لا تعمل وإذا لم يكون لها تأثير في
العمل والابتداء له تأثير ، فإضافة ما لا تأثير له
إلى ما له تأثير ، لا تأثير له . ويمكن أن يقال إن
الشيئين إذا تركبا حدث لهما بالتركيب معنى
لا يكون في كل واحد من أفراد ذلك المركب . والذي
أراه أن العامل في الخبر هو الابتداء وهذه على ما
ذكر كما كان عاملاً في المبتدأ إلا أن عمله في
المبتدأ بلا واسطة وعمله في الخبر بواسطة المبتدأ
يعمل في الخبر عند وجود المبتدأ وإن لم يكن
للمبتدأ أثر في العمل .

This passage from Ibn Ya'īsh provides an excellent example of how grammatical thinking could become more complex. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj simply puts forward his view about the nature of the regent determining the case of the khābar and does not feel compelled to justify it. Later grammarians, however, thought more deeply about the point and were able to offer reasoned critiques of views like that of Ibn al-Sarrāj and put forward in their place more subtly formulated views.

As has been mentioned above the existence of the third type of noun regent which Ibn al-Sarrāj classifies also depends on the way in which a particular construction is explained. This type consists of nouns with the governing power of particles and in fact this refers to the construct. Ibn al-Sarrāj states that the construct either indicates possession and is equivalent to the use of the particle li, or it

indicates of what sort a particular thing is and is equivalent to the use of the particle min.²³ In the course of discussing the latter case Ibn al-Sarrāj specifies exactly what the regent is when he explains the relationship of the expressions ثوب من خبز²⁴ and ثوب خبز

وهذا لا فرق فيه بين إضافته بخير من وبين إضافته بمن. وإنما هذ فوا من هنا استخفافا فلما هذ فوها التقى الا سيمان فنخض أهدهما الآخر إذا لم يكن الثاني خبرا عن الأول ولا صفة له.

However, this type of noun regent does not exist if the view of certain later scholars on the regent governing the genitive in the construct is followed. Ibn Ya'īsh, for instance, when analysing the expressions غلام زيد and غلام فضة²⁵ writes:

فالعامل هنا حرف الجر المقدر والتأثيره وتقديره غلام لزيد وخاتم من فضة. لا ينفلا كل إضافة حقيقية من تقدير أهد هذين الحرفين. ولولا تقدير وجود الحرف المذكور لهما صانع الجر. ألا ترى أن كل واحد من المضاف والمضاف إليه اسم ليس له أن يعمل في الآخر لأنه ليس عمله في أحدهما أولى من العكس. وإنما الخفض في المضاف إليه بالحرف المقدر الذي هو اللام أو من. وهن هذ فة لنيابة المضاف إليه منه وميرودته عوضا عنه في اللفظ وليس بمنزلت في العمل.

Ibn al-Sarrāj follows the view of Sibawayh in holding that the first element in an idāfah construction puts the second into the genitive, and he considers that this construction simply conveys the meaning of either of the particles li or min.²⁶ The view taken by Ibn Ya'īsh is,

however, rather more subtle involving the use of taqdīr so that the idāfah construction is seen not merely as conveying the meaning of either li or min but the term in the genitive itself owes its grammatical case to these notional particles. Again, this is a case of later grammarians putting forward more complex grammatical explanations.

The second major class of regent specified by Ibn al-Sarrāj in the Uṣūl consists of the verb and his treatment of the verb as a regent deserves consideration. In explanation of the verb's power of government Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ²⁷

اعلم أن كل فعل لا يخلو من أن يكون عاملاً
وأول عمله أن يرفع الفاعل أو المفعول الذي هو
هدية عنه نحو: قام زيد وضرب عمرو. وكل اسم
تذكره ليزيد في الفائدة بعد أن يستغنى الفعل
بالاسم المرفوع الذي يكون ذلك الفعل هديته
عنه، فهو منصوب ونصبه لأن الكلام قد تمّ قبل
هيكته وفيه دليل عليه.

What is of note about this explanation of the verb's power of government is that Ibn al-Sarrāj explains the principle which determines the use of the accusative case, which is a grammatical case particularly to be explained by the governing power of the verb. When Ibn al-Sarrāj details the various uses of the accusative at a later point in the Uṣūl he again refers to what determines the use of this case: ²⁸

الأسماء المنصوبات تنقسم تسمة أولى على ضربين:
فالضرب الأول وهو العام الكثير كل اسم تذكره بعد
أن يستغنى الرفع بالمرفوع وما تبعه في رفعه إن
كان له تابع، وفي الكلام دليل عليه، فهو نصب
والضرب الآخر كل اسم تذكره لفائدة بعد اسم

مضاف أو فيه نون ظاهرة أو مضمرة وقد تم
بالإضافة والنون، وهالت النون والإضافة بينهما
ولولاها لصلح أن يضاف إليه، فهو نصب.

The second class of accusative usage listed in this passage is in fact the accusative of the tamyiz used in counting and measuring and it is treated by Ibn al-Sarrāj as different because it is not an accusative usage dependent on the verb.

In these passages Ibn al-Sarrāj sets out the idea that the use of the accusative is generally to be explained by the fact that it is not essential for the formation of semantically complete utterances. In a sentence like ضرب زيد حمرا the essential part according to this principle is ضرب زيد because this is an expression which in itself is semantically complete. Similarly in sentences like تصيب تصب and جاء زيد ركباً and جاء زيد عرفاً the use of the accusative to express the tamyiz and the hāl respectively is to be explained by the fact that تصيب زيد and جاء زيد are in themselves semantically complete utterances, while the terms in the accusative serve only to provide added information. On various occasions Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to this "formal redundancy" of the accusative by calling it a faqlah and this term is also used by later grammarians and is further discussed later in this chapter. 29

Of course, omitting terms in the accusative in this way is purely an analytical device of the grammarians and they can be considered only as "formally" redundant because they are not redundant in any real sense. The principle of the formal redundancy of accusative terms is based on the fact that a verb and its subject are sufficient in themselves to form meaningful utterances, and Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to this by using the expression استغناء الفعل بالفاعل. However, it is to be noted that not all uses of the accusative can possibly be considered as

formally redundant because in certain constructions the accusative is used to express what is the subject or predicate of the sentence. This point will be given further consideration in discussing the approach of later grammarians to formal redundancy.

When dealing with the various uses of the accusative individually Ibn al-Sarrāj specifically refers to the concept of formal redundancy when dealing with the hāl and the use of the accusative in exceptive sentences. The passage relating to the hāl is cited later in the chapter when dealing with another point, but it is worth giving some consideration at this point to Ibn al-Sarrāj's treatment of the use of the accusative in exceptive sentences because certain aspects are of interest when considering the idea of formal redundancy. In introducing his discussion of exceptive sentences Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ³⁰

المستثنى يشب المنعول إذا أتى به بعد استفاء
الفعل بالفاعل و بعد تمام الكلام. تقول: جاءني القوم
إد زيدا، فجاءني القوم كلام تام وهو فعل و فاعل.

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj likens the term in the accusative after illa to the maf'ūl and this implies that it is dependent for its grammatical case on the regimen of the verb. In commenting on the expression جاءني القوم he makes this specific: ³¹

فلو جاز أن تذكر زيدا بعد هذا الكلام بغير حرف
الاستثناء ما كان إد نصبا، ولكن لا معنى لذلك إد
بتوسط شيء آخر. فلما توسطت إلهدت معنى
الاستثناء و وصل الفعل إلى ما بعد إد.

Ibn al-Sarrāj here draws attention to the principle of the formal redundancy of the accusative by making the point, which in terms of this principle is valid but in practice is meaningless, that were it possible

to introduce a term like جاءني القوم زيد after جاءني القوم without also introducing the exceptive particle, then the term would have to go into the accusative. This particular line of argument seems to be peculiar to Ibn al-Sarrāj.

The later grammarians followed Ibn al-Sarrāj in holding that the term in the accusative after illā owed its case to the regimen of the verb acting through the medium of the exceptive particle. However, this view only seems to have developed in the course of time. In the Kitāb Sibawayh deals with the question of the regent by quoting the view of al-Khalīl that the regent governing the accusative is the discourse (kalām) preceding the particle illā and there is no mention that it is the verb itself in the preceding discourse which is the regent.³² This view is in accord with Sibawayh's view that the regent acting on the maf'ūl ma'ahu is the preceding discourse, whereas the later Basrans came to the view that it was the verb itself in the preceding discourse that was the regent.³³

However, there were other views on the question of the regent governing the accusative after illā. Al-Mubarrad is recorded as having held the view, which is associated with the Kufan school, that the particle illā itself is the regent on the grounds that it replaces an expression like أكنى or أستثنى. That he held this view is confirmed by the Muqtaḍab:³⁴

... لما قلت : جاءني القوم وقع عند السامع أن
زيدا فيهم ، فلما قلت : إلا زيدا - كانت (إلا)
بدلا من قولك : أكنى زيدا ، وأستثنى فيمن
جاءني زيدا ، فكانت بدلا من الفعل .

Although he holds this view about the regent al-Mubarrad accepts that the accusative after illā is to be explained by formal redundancy:³⁵

فإنها باب الاستثناء - إذا استثنى الفعل بالفاعل،
أو الابتداء بحجره - النصب، إلا أن يصلح البدل،
فيكون أجود، والنصب على حاله في الجواز.

Ibn al-Sarrāj does refer to the idea that illā can be related to the expression أُتِثْنِي but he simply uses this as an analogy and does not use it as a formal explanation of the use of the accusative: ³⁶

فالمستثنى بمعنى المستثنى منه، ألا ترى أن زيدا
من القوم فهو بعضهم فتقول على ذلك: ضربت القوم
إلا زيدا، وصرت بالقوم إلا زيدا، فكأنك قلت في جميع
ذلك أُتِثْنِي زيدا

One particular variety of exceptive sentence in which the particle illā occurs twice followed by two different terms enables Ibn al-Sarrāj to confirm the general principle of formal redundancy: ³⁷

فإن أوقعت استثناءً بعد استثناء قلت: ما
قام أهد إلا زيد إلا عمرا، فتنصب عمرا لأنه لا
يجوز أن يكون لفعل واحد فاعلان مختلفان
يرتفعان به بخير حرف عطف. فهذا كما يبصر أن
النصب واجب بعد استثناء الرفع بالرفوع.
وللا أن تقول: ما أتاني أهد إلا زيد إلا عمرا، وإلا
زيدا إلا عمرو، فتنصب أيهما شئت وترفع الآخر.

This represents a neat way of proving the principle of formal redundancy and it is perhaps indicative of the attention which Ibn al-Sarrāj gives to this question that other grammarians do not seem to have put this construction to the same use. Al-Mubarrad, for instance, simply takes the view that after the double illā one of the terms is in the nominative due to the regimen of the verb and the other is in the accusative in

accordance with the principle accepted by the grammarians that the term after illā goes into the accusative unless there is a specific reason why this should not happen: ³⁸

تقول: ما جازى أهد إلا زيد إلا عمرا. وإن شئت
قلت: إلا زيدا إلا عمرو. فالمعنى فيهما جميعا
واحد، وإن اختلف الإعراب؛ لأنك إذا شغلت
الفعل بأهدهما انتصب الآخر بالاشتناء ولم
يصلح البديل؛ لأن المرفوع منهما موجب.

Ibn al-Sarrāj gives particular attention to the idea that the accusative is to be seen as formally redundant but, although this idea was accepted by later grammarians, it is not set out with the same degree of prominence. However, later scholars did give further consideration to this question and coined the term 'undah to serve as an antonym to the term faḍlah which, as has been mentioned, is found in the Uḡūl. Al-Astarābādhi using these two terms writes: ³⁹

... والمرفوع عمدة الكلام كالفعل والمبتدأ والخبر
والبدائي محمولة عليها. والمنصوب في الأصل فضلة
لكن يشبه بها بعض العمدة كاسم إن وخبر كان
وخبر ما ولا.

The term 'undah covers those uses of the nominative and the accusative such as the mubtada', khabar, fa'il, subject of inna, and the predicate of kāna, which are the basic elements in creating meaningful sentences. The term faḍlah covers those uses of the accusative which can be seen as formally redundant and is even used by later authors like al-Astarābādhi and Abū Ḥayyān to cover uses of the genitive. ⁴⁰

In explaining the meaning of the term 'undah al-Astarābādhi mentions that it covers the subject of inna and the predicate of kāna because these uses of the accusative have an affinity with uses of the nominative

and cannot be likened to those uses of the accusative which are to be explained by formal redundancy. In defining the term 'umdaḥ' in this way al-Astarābādī introduces a consideration which is not taken into account by Ibn al-Sarrāj because the latter does not make the point clear that not all uses of the accusative can reasonably be explained by formal redundancy.

It has been mentioned that later writers do not seem to give the question of the semantic redundancy of the accusative quite the degree of prominence which it has in the Uṣūl. Al-Astarābādī, in fact, introduces the idea when discussing why in arranging a grammar the uses of the nominative case are treated before those of the other grammatical cases, and the same applies to Ibn Ya'īsh who writes: 41

اعلم أنه قدم الكلام في الإعراب على المرفوعات
لأنها اللوازم للجملة والعمدة فيها التي لا تخلو
منها، وما عداها ففضلة يستقل الكلام دونها.

Ibn Ya'īsh does subsequently go into the question of formal redundancy in more detail but this is in fact connected with his discussion of why the fā'il is in the nominative, and in the course of this he explains why the "strong" vowel dammaḥ is used for the nominative and the "weak" vowel fathāḥ is used for the accusative: 42

الفاعل إنما اختص بالرفع لقوته والمفعول بالنصب
لضعفه. والمعنى بقوة الفاعل تمكنه بلزوم الفعل وعدم
استغناء الفعل عنه. وليس المفعول كذلك، بل يجوز
سقوطه وهذفه. ألا ترى أنك تقول: ضرب زيد، ويكون
الكلام مستقلاً وإن لم تذكر مفعولاً. ولو أخذت
ت حذف الفاعل ولم تقم مقامه شيئاً نحو: ضرب زيد،
من غير فاعل لم يكن كلاماً.... فإسبوا بأن أعطوا

الأقوى الأقرى والأضعف الأضعف.

It is possible to relate the view of later grammarians like Ibn al-Sarrāj regarding the function of the accusative case to an idea suggested in the Kitāb of Sībawayh. In the Kitāb Sībawayh relates many uses of the accusative case to its use with the numerals 11-99 and he refers to this by the stock phrase 'ishrūn dirham'. The ideas underlying Sībawayh's frequent reference to this expression are outside the scope of this present study,⁴³ but one particular use of the accusative which he likens to that with 'ishrūn dirham' is treated in a way which can be related to the ideas of the later grammarians about formal redundancy. However, Sībawayh does not give any definite expression to the idea that the use of the accusative case is in general to be explained by formal redundancy. The particular usage in question is as follows:⁴⁴

وأما قولهم : داري خلف دارك فرسخًا، فانتصب
لأن خلف خبر للدار وهو كلام قد عمل بعضه في بعض
واستغنى. فلما قال : داري خلف دارك، أبهم ولم
يدر ما قدر ذلك فقال : فرسخًا وذراعيًا وميلًا. أراد أن
يبين. فيعمل هذا الكلام في هذه الخبايا كما
عمل له عشرون درهما في الدرهم....

The gist of Sībawayh's argument here is that the example داری داری خلف دارك is a semantically complete utterance consisting of mubtada' and khbar, and because of this the additional element which amplifies the meaning is put into the accusative. Here Sībawayh uses the verb استغنى which Ibn al-Sarrāj also uses in presenting the principle of formal redundancy. Although this particular instance can be used to show how the ideas of later grammarians on the use of the accusative

can be traced back to Sībawayh, nevertheless, there does not appear to be another instance in the Kitāb of a similar correspondence. It would appear that the idea of formal redundancy with regard to the accusative case only properly developed after the time of Sībawayh. Al-Mubarrad does make passing reference in the Muqtaḍab to this idea but unlike Ibn al-Sarrāj he lays no great emphasis on it. ⁴⁵

If the principle of formal redundancy explains uses of the accusative case there is another, but subordinate, consideration. This is, that although the part of a sentence which consists of a verb and its subject is formally complete, nevertheless, it presupposes certain terms which are all put into the accusative. In describing the circumstances in which the accusative is used Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ⁴⁶

وكل اسم تذكره ليزيد في الفائدة بعد أن يستغنى
 الفعل بالاسم المرفوع الذي يكون ذلك الفعل هديتنا
 عنه، فهو منصوب، ونصبه لأن الكلام قد تم قبل
 حكيه ونبه دليل عليه . (underlining mine)

Although Ibn al-Sarrāj particularly uses here the idea of formal redundancy to account for the use of the accusative case, he also makes the point that a formally complete utterance contains a "suggestion" (dalīl) of terms in the accusative.

According to this principle with regard to a sentence like ضرب زيد كسرا, although the expression ضرب زيد is in itself formally complete, nevertheless, it does contain within itself a "suggestion" of a term in the accusative to come which in this instance is specifically كسرا. Clearly, all transitive verbs when used in sentences involve the "suggestion" of a direct object in the accusative whether or not it is expressly mentioned. Indeed, when Ibn al-Sarrāj defines the intransitive verb he specifically mentions the absence of

such a "suggestion". 47

Ibn al-Sarrāj again introduces the notion of a "suggestion" when he discusses the hāl: 48

فأما الذي يسمونه الحال فنحو قولك: جاء محمد
الله راكبا، وقام أهدوك منتصبا، وجلس بكر
متكئا. فعبد الله مرتفع بجاء وراكبا منتصب
لشبهه بالمفعول لأنه جىء به بعد تمام الكلام
واستفناء الفعل بفاعله وإن في الفعل دليلا عليه كما
كان فيه دليل على المفعول. ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت:
قمت، فلا بد من أن تكون قد قمت على حال
من أهوال الفعل.

The argument that a verb involves the "suggestion" of a hāl is logically sound but is clearly more abstract than saying that a transitive verb involves the "suggestion" of a direct object. The idea that the verb involves the "suggestion" of terms in the accusative can be found in other authors, and al-Suyūṭī quotes the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal of al-Sakhāwī (1163-1245) on the resemblance of the hāl to the maf'ūl bihi and there the same point is made as is done in the passage above from the Uṣūl: 49

أما تشبهها بالمفعول به فلأن في الفعل دلالة على
كل واحد منهما، فإذا قلت: ضربت، دل ذلك على
مضروب وعلى حال، ولأن كل واحد من الحال والمفعول
اسم جاء بعد استقلال الفعل بالفاعل.

When dealing with the maf'ūl ma'ahu, after having dealt with the maf'ūl lahu, Ibn al-Sarrāj again draws on the idea of the verb involving a "suggestion" of terms in the accusative: 50

ويُفرق بين هذا الباب والباب الذي قبله أن باب
المفعول له إذا قلت: هُتكت طلب الحير، إن في
هُتكت دليلا على أن ذلك لشيء. وإذا قلت: ما
صنعت وأباك، فليس في صنعت دليل على أن
ذلك مع شيء، لأن لكل فاعل غرضه فعل ذلك
الفعل، وليس لكل فاعل مصاحب لا بد منه.

Ibn Ya'īsh introduces this same consideration when he explains why the
preposition li which is used with the maf'ūl lahu may be omitted but
not the conjunction wa which is used with the maf'ūl ma'ahu:⁵¹

وذلك لأن دلالة الفعل على مفعول له أقوى من
دلالتك على المفعول معه. وذلك لأنه لا بد لكل فعل
من مفعول له سواء ذكرت أو لم تذكره إذ العاقل
لا يفعل فعلا إلا لغرض وعلّة، وليس كل من فعل
شيئا يلزمه أن يكون له شريك أو مصاحب.

In this passage it is worth noting Ibn Ya'īsh's remark:

... لا بد لكل فعل من مفعول له سواء ذكرت أو لم
تذكره إذ العاقل لا يفعل فعلا إلا لغرض وعلّة.....

Although this specifically refers to the maf'ūl lahu it confirms that
in general the capacity of a verb to presuppose certain accusative
usages is not affected by their being expressly mentioned or not.

It is clear that a verb can only involve the "suggestion" of
certain types of accusative expression and the grammarians particularly
note that the verb does not involve the "suggestion" of a maf'ūl ma'ahu.
Only a transitive verb can have a "suggestion" of a direct object.
Two other uses of the accusative which the verb presupposes, and which
the grammars specifically mention, are the hāl and the maf'ūl lahu but

other uses could clearly be added. In works of grammar later than the Uḡūl the idea that the verb presupposes certain uses of the accusative is not given any particular prominence and only appears incidently, whereas in the Uḡūl Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to it in explaining the verb's power of government and in enumerating the uses of the accusative as well as introducing it as appropriate at other points. Something similar to the later more developed idea of the verb involving a "suggestion" of certain accusative usages can be found in the Kitāb of Sībawayh when the point whether a sentence like ذهب الشام is like one with an accusative of place is discussed: ⁵²

وقد قال بعضهم: ذهب الشام، شبهه بالمبهم
 إذ كان مكانا يقع عليه المكان والمذهب. وهذا شاذ
 لأنه ليس في ذهب دليل على الشام وفيه دليل
 على المذهب والمكان.

Notes to Chapter III

- 1 E.I.², s.v. 'āmil (G. Weil).
- 2 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 55-60.
- 3 See Ḥājji Khalīfah, vol. ii, p. 1179. For al-Jurjāni see Kaḥḥālah, vol. v, p. 310. The Arabic text of the 'Awāmil al-mi'ah is contained in an appendix to A. Lockett, Mi'ut Amil and Shurhoo Mi'ut Amil, Calcutta, 1814.
- 4 See Ḥājji Khalīfah, vol. ii, p. 1179.
- 5 Al-Suyūṭī, Ashbāh, vol. i, pp. 241-56.
- 6 This table is based on the material in Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 55-60.
- 7 This table is based on the text of the 'Awāmil al-mi'ah contained in the work by Lockett cited in n. 3 above.
- 8 See n. 5 above.
- 9 E.I.², s.v. 'āmil (G. Weil).
- 10 See Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, pp. 83-4; vol. vii, pp. 12-3.
- 11 Al-Zajjājī, Jumal, p. 48.
- 12 I. M. Rejab, "A critical edition of Sharḥ al-Jumal li al-Zajjājī by Ibn Bābshāḥ" (Ph.D dissertation, University of St. Andrews, Dec. 1975), p. 182. For Ibn Bābshāḥ see Kaḥḥālah, vol. v, p. 32.
- 13 Abū Ḥayyān, p. 38.
- 14 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, p. 126.
- 15 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 12.
- 16 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 151.
- 17 Al-Mubarrad, vol. ii, p. 5.
- 18 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 55-8.
- 19 Ibid., p. 55.
- 20 Ibid., pp. 62-3; see also pp. 65 and 279.
- 21 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, p. 23; Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 85.
- 22 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 85.
- 23 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 56-7.
- 24 Ibid., p. 57. In l. 4 of this passage >| has been substituted for >| in the printed text.

- 25 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, pp. 117.
- 26 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 209; see also E.I.², s.v. iqāfah.
- 27 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 58.
- 28 Ibid., p. 189.
- 29 Ibid., pp. 83 and 102; vol. ii, pp. 124, 251, and 252.
- 30 Ibid., vol. i, p. 342.
- 31 Ibid., pp. 342-3.
- 32 Sibawayh, vol. i, pp. 360 and 369.
- 33 Ibid., p. 150.
- 34 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, p. 390.
- 35 Ibid., p. 396.
- 36 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 343.
- 37 Ibid., p. 345.
- 38 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, p. 424. See also Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, pp. 92-3.
- 39 Al-Astarābādhi, vol. i, p. 70.
- 40 Ibid.; Abū Ḥayyān, p. 130.
- 41 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 75.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 See M. G. Carter, "'Twenty dirhams' in the Kitāb of Sibawayhi", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 35 (1972), pp. 485-97.
- 44 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 207.
- 45 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, p. 116; vol. iv, p. 396.
- 46 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 58; see also p. 189.
- 47 Ibid., pp. 81-2. Passage quoted p. 36 above.
- 48 Ibid., p. 258.
- 49 Al-Suyūṭī, Ashbāh, vol. ii, p. 190.
- 50 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 257.
- 51 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, p. 53.
- 52 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 16.

CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF QIYĀS AND TAQDĪR

One of the most important terms used by the Arab grammarians in their study of grammar is the term qiyās. As a simple definition of qiyās, which would translate literally into English as "analogy", it may be said that a language has established rules of phonology, morphology, and syntax, and it is the principle of qiyās at work which ensures that in general these rules are followed. It is this idea to which Ibn al-Anbarī refers when he writes: ¹

اعلم أن إنكار القياس في النحو لا يتحقق لأن
النحو كله قياس. ولهذا قيل في هذه: النحو علم
بالمقاييس المستنبطة من استقراء كلام العرب
فمن أنكر القياس فقد أنكر النحو.

A very simple example from morphology of the use of the term qiyās is found when Ibn al-Sarrāj defines the varieties of grammatical anomaly which occur: ²

منه ما شذ من باب وقياسه ولم يشذ في استعمال
العرب له نحو استكرو. فإن باب وقياسه أن يعقل
فيقال استماد مثل استقام واستعاذ وجميع ما
كان على هذا المثال. ولكنه جاء على الأصل
واستعملته العرب كذلك.

The grammarians' understanding of qiyās is in fact often best illustrated in their discussions of situations where they consider that

the demands of qiyās are disregarded in actual usage. Ibn al-Sarrāj, for instance, notes that there are certain aspects of the use of conjunctions to which the normal rules of usage do not apply: ³

واعلم أنه قد جاء في العطف أشياء مخالفة للقياس.
فمن ذلك قولك: سرت برجل قائم أبواه لا قاعدين،
فقولك: قاعدين، معطوف على قائم وليس في قولك:
قاعدين، شيء يرجع إلى رجل كما كان في قولك:
قائم أبواه، فمير يرجع إلى رجل. فجاز هذا في المعطوف
على غير قياس. هذا لفظ المازني و قول كل من يرضى
قوله. وكان ينبغي أن تقول: سرت برجل قائم
أبواه ولا قاعد أبواه، وأن لا يجيء الأبوان مضميرين.
ولكنه حكى عن العرب وكثرت في كلامهم حتى صار
قياسا مستقيما. وصح جاء في العطف لا يجوز في
الأول قول العرب: كل شاة وسخلة بدرهم، ولو
جمعت السخلة تلى كل لم يستتم. ومثله: رب
رجل وأهنيه، فلو كان الأخر يلي رب لم يجز. ومن
كلام العرب: هذا الضارب الرجل وزيد، ولو كان
زيد يلي الضارب لم يكن جزا.

In the example سرت برجل قائم أبواه لا قاعدين Ibn al-Sarrāj holds that there is a rule of usage which should have applied and, if it had been followed, the construction would have been سرت and, although qiyās, as the grammarians understand it, may dictate that a usage conform with certain rules, this does not always happen in practice. This particular construction is anomalous in the view of the grammarians just as the verb استحوذ in the passage quoted previously is morphologically

anomalous. However, there is this difference that the form of this verb cannot be applied to other verbs at will, whereas this construction can be used where necessary. Although this construction may oppose what qiyās dictates, it can itself be described as qiyās because it is a construction to be followed or, as the grammarians would say, يقاس عليه.

The grammarians would observe and explain qiyās at work in the Arabic language but, particularly in the field of syntax, they could also actively put qiyās to work to determine what was or was not correct in respect of usages and constructions which, although unattested in use, were felt to be consistent with attested usage. By the operation of qiyās the basic rules of usage derived from the simplest constructions would consistently govern how the language was used in more complex constructions, and this assisted the grammarians in determining what was or was not correct in respect of unattested usages and constructions. This active use of the principle of qiyās is of particular interest and will be discussed in some detail.

Already by the late 3rd century A.H. the work of the grammarians was to a large extent to explain, rework, and develop the material on the Arabic language contained in the writings of the earliest authorities of whom the most important by a very long way was Sibawayh. No further basic research seems to have been done by way of consulting reputable informants, and the only activity that approximated to basic research was the continued study of early written sources such as the Qur'an and the material recorded in collections of poetry and proverbs, which was undertaken with a view to extracting further information on usage. Ibn al-Sarrāj himself makes clear that by his time the study of grammar was essentially derivative: 4

النحو إنما أريد به أن ينحدر المنحدر إذا تعلم
كلام العرب. وهو علم استخراج المتقدمين فيه من

استقرأء كلام العرب حتى وقفوا منه على الغرض
الذى قصدوا المبتدئون بهذه اللغة.

Even if grammatical studies were very solidly based on the work of the early scholars, there was scope for the later grammarians to apply qiyās in dealing with usages and constructions which were not covered in the works of the early scholars and on which no information could be found by studying the diction of the Qur'an and early poetry. On this point Ibn al-Sarrāj makes a remark of general significance when discussing one particular usage: فإذا لم يصح سماع الشيء من العرب: ⁵ . ليجئ فيه إلى القياس This is, of course, similar to the practice in Islamic jurisprudence where qiyās (analogy) is applied in situations for which the Qur'an, sunnah, and consensus of the scholars (ijmā') do not provide.

One of the questions discussed by Ibn al-Sarrāj in which the application of qiyās is important is that of word order with the verb kāna. Ibn al-Sarrāj considers that word order with kāna can be related to that which is permissible with the mubtada' and khabar construction: ⁶

واعلم أن جميع ما جاز في المبتدأ وخبره من التقديم
والتأخير فهو جائز في كان إلا أن تفصل بينها وبين
ما عملت فيه كما لم تعمل فيه. فإن فصلت بظرف
ملغى جاز. فأما ما يجوز فقولا: كان منطلقا بعد
الله، وكان منطلقا اليوم بعد الله، وكان أهلك
صاحبنا، وزيد كان قائما غلامه، والزيد ان كان قائما
غلامها، تريد: كان غلامها قائما. وكذلك أخوات
كان. قال الله تعالى: وَكَانَ هَاقًا عَلَيْنَا نَصْرُ
الْمُؤْمِنِينَ.

The possible permutations of word order with simple sentences

are quite easy to grasp but the question of possible word order with kāna, when it has more complex predicates, is rather more involved and Ibn al-Sarrāj gives it considerable attention. It is worth noting at this point that the Arab grammarians often deal with questions of word order under the heading of التقديم والتأخير which is an expression best translated into English as "inversion".⁷ The Arabic expression itself envisages terms being put either before or after their normal position in a sentence. According to Ibn al-Sarrāj inversion can be carried out when kāna has complex predicates in exactly the same way as it is with simple predicates, as long as the integrity of the predicate is maintained:⁸

والتقديم والتأخير في الأخبار المجرّمة بمنزلة في
الأخبار المنزلة ما لم تفرق. تقول: أبوه منطلق
كان زيد، تريد: كان زيد أبوه منطلق، وقائمة
جارية يحبها كان زيد، تريد: كان زيد قائمة
جارية يحبها، وفي داره ضربه عمرو خالدا كان
زيد. فإن قلت: كان في داره زيد أبوه، وأنت
تريد: كان زيد في داره أبوه، لم يجوز لأن الظرف
للأب فليس من كان في شيء وقد فصلت به
بينها وبين خبره. ولو قلت: كان في داره
أبوه زيد، صلح لأنك قدمت الخبر بهيئته
وعلى جملة فصار مثل قولك: كان منطلقا زيد.

In addition to the sort of change of word order envisaged above, Ibn al-Sarrāj further states that the subject of kāna can be made to precede the verb and at the same time this can also be done to the predicate:⁹

وتقول: زيد كان منطلقا أبوه، فزيد مبتدأ

وما بعده خبر له. وفي كان فسير زيد وهو اسماها
 ومنطلقا أبوه خبره. وإن شئت رفعت أبابكان
 وجعلت منطلقا خبره. وتقول: زيد منطلقا أبوه
 كان، تريد: زيد كان منطلقا أبوه، مثل المسألة
 التي قبله.

Although he does not mention the point Ibn al-Sarrāj is now discussing changes of structure with reference to a model sentence of the type كان زيد منطلقا أبوه whereas previously the model sentence was of the type كان زيد أبوه منطلق. This raises the question of the alternative ways of constructing the predicate of the model sentence كان زيد أبوه منطلق. In the Jumal al-Zajjāji notes that one may say كان زيد منطلق, and كان زيد منطلقا أبوه, كان زيد أبوه منطلق. ¹⁰ Although this is a point worth consideration Ibn al-Sarrāj himself does not discuss it, but if it is permissible to say زيد منطلقا أبوه, there would seem to be no reason for disallowing this construction were the predicate كان زيد منطلقا أبوه to be changed to أبوه منطلق or منطلق أبوه.

The whole exercise of laying down possible word order with kāna where its predicate is complex is clearly based on the application of qiyās because many of the alternatives are tortuous and could hardly be supported from attested usage. Even for some of the most simple changes Ibn al-Sarrāj has to rely on qiyās as is the case with أبوه قائم كان زيد which he treats as analogous to منطلقا كان زيد, a completely acceptable construction. It is while discussing this point that Ibn al-Sarrāj makes the general remark about the scope of qiyās quoted earlier: ¹¹

وقال قوم: أبوه قائم كان زيد، خطأ لأن ما لا
 يعمل فيه كان لا يتقدم قبل كان. والقياس

ما خبرتك به إذ كان قولك: أبوه قائم في موضع
قولك: منطلق، فهو بمنزلة. فإذا لم يصح سماع
الشيء، عن العرب لجمع فيه إلى القياس.

The type of change in normal word order with kāna which is discussed here appears to have been a particular concern of Ibn al-Sarrāj because later grammarians like Ibn Ya'īsh are more interested in examining kāna together with analogous verbs to establish which simple changes of word order are permissible with each verb.¹² However, the only other verb apart from kāna which Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses in this respect is laysa.¹³

Another example of the application of qiyās by Ibn al-Sarrāj is found in his discussion of the use with the verb zanna and analogous verbs of the pronoun which the Basrans generally called the damīr al-sha'n or damīr al-qīṣṣah:¹⁴

وتقول: ظننته زيد قائم، تريد الأمر والخبر. وهذا
الذي يسميه الكوفيون المجهول. وتقول: ظننته
هند قائمة، فتذكر لأنك تريد الأمر والخبر، وظننته
نقوم هند. ويجوز في القياس: ظننتها زيد قائم،
تريد القصة، ولا أعلمه مسموعاً من العرب.

It is of interest that Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to the Kufan technical term majhūl as if there was no corresponding Basran term available to him.¹⁵ The use here of the word qīṣṣah does not seem to have any connection with the technical term damīr al-qīṣṣah but is used simply as a feminine noun in contrast to the masculine nouns amr and khābar.

Ibn al-Sarrāj's sanctioning of the use of the feminine pronoun in the example ظننتها زيد قائم is governed solely by the application of qiyās since he concedes that it is an unattested usage. Of course,

in certain constructions a feminine pronoun is normally found as is the case with inna/anna when there is a term following of feminine gender and this is illustrated by the Qur'anic phrase **فَإِنَّهَا لَا تَعْلَىٰ** **أَلْأَبْصَارُ** 16

In tracing the basis of Ibn al-Sarrāj's reasoning it is possible to treat a sentence like **ظننته زيد قائم** in which the nominative follows the pronoun as similar to one like **ظننته زيدا قائما** in which the accusative follows the pronoun, because in the latter case there is a view that the feminine pronoun is possible although in this particular instance a slightly different line of argument is used: 17

تقول: ظننته أخاك قائما، تريد: ظننت الظن
فتكون الهاء كناية عن الظن كأنك قلت:
ظننت أخاك قائما الظن، ثم كنييت عن الظن.
وأجاز بعضهم: ظننتها أخاك قائما، يريد
الظنة.

However, this passage occurs before Ibn al-Sarrāj turns to the construction **ظننتها زيد قائم** and a usage which the Kufans permit, and which Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions directly after proposing this construction, has a more close connection with the application of qiyās here: 18

فأما الكوفيون فيميزون تأنيث المجهول وتذكيره
إذا وقع بعده المؤنث. يقولون: ظننته هند
قائمة، وظننتها هند قائمة.

It is clear why the Kufans permit the use of both the masculine and the feminine pronoun here because the masculine can be seen as representing the basic usage in the construction while the feminine occurs as a result of a very natural attraction of gender. However, Ibn al-Sarrāj's sanctioning of the construction **ظننتها زيد قائم** is somewhat different from this because he holds that the feminine pronoun

owes its gender to the purely notional term qiṣṣah.

While dealing with the same matter in the Sharḥ al-kāfiyah al-Astarābādī also writes that putting the pronoun into the feminine, even if the following clause does not relate to a term of feminine gender, is supported by qiyās and is based on the gender of the notional term qiṣṣah, although such a usage is unattested.¹⁹ Furthermore, al-Astarābādī expresses the view that if the clause after the pronoun does in fact relate to something of feminine gender, the pronoun itself is feminine out of regard for the notional term qiṣṣah, although in these circumstances an attraction of gender between the pronoun and the feminine term in the following clause is apposite:²⁰

ويختار تأنيث الضمير برجوعه إلى المؤنث أي
القيمة إذا كان في الجملة المفسرة مؤنث لقصد
المطابقة، لا لأن مفسره ذلك المؤنث ...

The grammarians also took the view which corresponds to this that even where the masculine pronoun relates to a masculine term in the following clause, it still takes its gender from a notional term like khābar.²¹

This last paragraph makes clear the view of the later grammarians on the gender of the damīr al-sha'n and, although Ibn al-Sarrāj does not put forward this view in such a precise and explicit manner, it is clear that he held that the gender of the damīr al-sha'n is determined by something notional and not with reference to the following clause. Ibn al-Sarrāj does give considerable information on the earlier stages of the discussion of the question of the gender of the damīr al-sha'n, and it may well be that he was the first to propose that on the basis of qiyās the construction ظننتها زيد قائم is permissible.

An example of the application of qiyās in a very marked way is provided by relative clause predication. In their grammars both al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj give considerable attention to recasting

sentences so that they consist of a relative clause which is introduced by the relative pronoun alladhī or the definite article and which is predicated of an element in the original sentence. ²² By this procedure a simple sentence like ذهب زيد becomes الذي ذهب زيد or الإخبار بالذي والألف واللام , الزاهب زيد , of which a suitable English translation would be "relative clause predication". As a result of the changes in the example given the original verbal sentence becomes a nominal one with a mubtada' and a fā'il sād masadd al-khabar.

Relative clause predication does not stand out as a subject which requires a great deal of attention but it was one to which early grammarians in particular applied themselves. Ibn Ya'īsh gives some attention to this topic but he does not examine it in the depth which Ibn al-Sarrāj does. ²³ The later grammarian, al-Astarābādī, does, however, go into some detail on relative clause predication. ²⁴ It seems to be the case that later grammars give some attention to this subject but, essentially, it had really been of interest to earlier grammarians, although there remained some residual interest in it. It is evident that an important aspect of the original interest in relative clause predication was the training of students of grammar and, although Ibn al-Sarrāj does not expressly say this, he does repeatedly use the phrase فإن قيل لـ: أخبر... which would seem to indicate that it was an exercise which someone might require another to do. ²⁵ Relative clause predication was not a topic with which Sibawayh was concerned but it was rather a subject to which later scholars turned. In the Uḡūl al-Māzinī is frequently cited on this topic as if he were someone very much connected with its study. ²⁶

One of the simplest forms of verbal sentence is one of the type ذهب زيد and by the process of relative clause predication this can be converted to الذي ذهب زيد and الزاهب زيد . As well

as sentences like this in the singular, sentences in the dual and plural were also considered and the necessary changes made which this operation dictates. The grammatical analysis which Ibn al-Sarrāj gives for the changes which are made to the simple sentence ذهب زيد can be taken as similar to that given for equivalent changes made to more complicated sentences: 27

إذا قيل لك: أخبرني زيد بالذي، قلت: الذي
 ذهب زيد. فالذي مبتدأ وذهب صلته وفيه
 ضمير الفاعل وهو يرجع إلى الذي فقد تم الذي
 بصلته وخبيره زيد. فإن قيل لك: أخبرني بالألف
 واللام، قلت: الذاهب أهواك. فرفعت الذاهب
 لأنه اسم ومعناه: الذي ذهب. ولم يكن بد من
 رفعه لأن الألف واللام لا تنفصل من الصلة
 كما انفصل الذي، وهي جزء من الاسم ولكن المعنى
 معنى الذي. فإن ثنيت الذي قلت: اللذان قاما
 أهواك. فإن جعلت موضع الذي الألف واللام
 قلت: القائمَان أهواك، ثنيت القائم إذ لم يكن سبيل
 إلى ثنية الألف واللام، والتأويل: اللذان قاما.
 ويرجع إلى الألف واللام الضمير الذي في القائمين.
 ... فإن جمعت قلت: الذين قاموا أهوتك، وبالألف
 واللام: القائمون أهوتك. وتفسير الجمع كتفسير الثنية.

Although relative clause predication is in essence a theoretical exercise it does have a practical aspect because there is certainly a difference in emphasis between الذي ذهب زيد and ذهب زيد. However, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not consider this point and treats the subject purely as a mechanical exercise. Al-Astarābādī does draw

attention to this point and explains how the sentence ضربت زيدا and ضربته زيد differ in emphasis: ²⁸

... إذا قلت : ضربت زيدا ، فربما تخاطب به من لا يعرف أن لك مضروبا في الدنيا وربما تخاطب من يعرف شخصا بمضروبيتك لكنه لا يعرف أنه زيد . وأما قولك : الذي ضربته زيد ، فلا تخاطب به إلا على الوجه الثاني أي تخاطب من يعرف أن لك مضروبا لأن مضمون الصلة يجب أن يكون معلوما للتخاطب كما ذكرنا ولكن لا يعرف أنه زيد ، إذ لم عرف ذلك لوقع الإخبار عنه بأنه زيد ضائعا . فالجملة الثانية نصت في المحتمل الثاني للجملة الأولى .

Various problems of usage arise in the course of discussion of relative clause predication and these have to be dealt with by the use of grammatical reasoning. One such question which Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses is whether it is admissible to say القائم إهوتك on the analogy of أقائم إهوتك ²⁹

ولا يجوز أن تقول : القائم إهوتك ، على قول من قال أقائم إهوتك ، لأن قديهم : أقائم إهوتك ، مجرى مجرى : أيقوم إهوتك ، وما كان فيه الألف واللام لا يجرى هذا المجرى لأنه قد تكمل اسما معرفةً والمعارف لا تقوم مقام الأفعال لأن الأفعال نكرات ولكن لا يجوز أن تعمل ما في صلة الألف واللام وهو قائم .

Because a subject like relative clause predication involves to a large extent discussion of constructions which are grammatically possible but which are often rather barbarous, there is considerable

scope for the use of grammatical reasoning to prescribe what is permissible since attested usage is of little help. The reasoning employed can be somewhat involved as is the case with Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of the validity of the construction القائم أبواها

30 : أهواك

فتقول: القائم أبوه أهواك، والقائم أبوها أهواك.
ولا يجوز أن تقول: القائم أبواها أهواك، من أجل
أن قائم قد عمل عمل الفعل وما تمت الألف واللام
بعد وصلته، وما لم يتم فلا يجوز أن يثنى. فإذا
أحملت ما في صلة الألف واللام في فاعل امتنعت
التثنية. وإنما جاز أن تقول: القائم أهواك، لأن
الاسم قد تم والضمير الذي في القائم لا يظهر فأشبهه
ما لا ضمير فيه. وإنما اهتمل الضمير الاسم إذا كان
في صلة ما هو له وجاريا عليه استثناءً بعلم السامع.
وليس باب الأسماء أن تفسر فيها إنما ذلك للأفعال،
فإذا لم يكن اسم الفاعل فعلا في الحقيقة للألف
واللام أو لما يوصف به أو يكون خبرا له، لم يحتمل
الضمير البتة.

When relative clause predication is applied to verbs which govern more than one direct object even the most basic changes raise points of usage. If the sentence أعطى عبد الله زيدا درهما is recast so that the word درهم has the rest of the sentence predicated of it, Ibn al-Sarrāj argues that qiyās calls for the introduction of a pronoun prefixed by the particle iya into the resulting sentence rather than framing it in other ways: 31

وإن أخبرت عن درهم بالذي قلت: الذي أعطى

عبد الله زيدا درهم، تريد الذي أعطاه عبد الله
زيدا درهم، فحذفت الهاء. ويجوز إثباته. ولا
أن تقول: الذي أعطى عبد الله زيدا إياه درهم،
وهو القياس لأنك جعلت ضمير الدرهم في موضعه.
ألا ترى أنك لو جعلت في هذه المسألة موضع
الدرهم عمرا، لم يحسن أن تجعل الضمير إلا
في موضع المفعول الثاني لأنه ملبس، وليس
كالدرهم الذي لا يكون إلا مأخوذا ولا يكون
آهنا.... فإن قلت ذلك بالأنف واللام قلت:
المعطية عبد الله زيدا درهم. وإن شئت قلت:
المعطى عبد الله زيدا إياه درهم. وهو القياس
كما خبرتك.

When Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses relative clause predication with the infinitive, the essentially artificial nature of this whole procedure becomes very clear from the way in which one particular point is discussed and this is very revealing of the methodology of the Arab grammarians. Ibn al-Sarrāj permits relative clause predication with the infinitive so that, for instance, ضربت ضربا شديدا can become الذي ضربت ضربا شديدا, and شربت شربا الإبل can become الشارب أنا شربا الإبل.³² However, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not allow relative clause predication with the hāl and for this reason he does not allow it with certain infinitives and other expressions which are grammatically analysed as representing the hāl construction:³³

ومن نصب المصادر إذا كانت نكرة على الحال لم
يجز الإخبار عنها كما لا يجوز الإخبار عن الحال.
وإذا كانت المصادر ونحوها أيضا هالا فيها الألف
واللام لم يجز أن تخبر عنها نحو: أرسلها العراك.

والقوم فيها الجباء الغفير، ورجع عوده على بدئه، وما
أشبه هذا مما جاء، إلا وهو معرفة. وكل ما شذ من
بابه فليس لنا أن نتصرف فيه ولا نتجاوز ما
نكلمر به.

The criterion used to reject relative predication with infinitives in hāl constructions is that such usages are basically anomalous and cannot be subject to changes which can validly be applied to regular constructions. If relative clause predication is possible with infinitives there would seem to be no real reason why it should not be admissible when the infinitive is analysed as a hāl, even if those uses of the hāl where the term is indefinite cannot logically be made subject to this process. This confirms that the grammatical methodology which Ibn al-Sarrāj employs does not take into account whether constructions thrown up by relative clause predication are likely to occur in practice but, rather, whether they are admissible on the basis of considerations dictated by purely formal grammatical analysis.

Although the Arab grammarians would explain qiyās at work in the Arabic language and would also actively make use of qiyās, nevertheless there were constructions and usages which seemed to fall outside the working of qiyās. In dealing with such situations the grammarians would employ what is called tagdīr and it has, as Weil points out, a strong connection with qiyās, although it is used in a variety of ways. ³⁴

In spite of the fact that the idea of tagdīr is very important in the thought of the Arab grammarians, no attempt was made by them to define the term and the various aspects of its use. Thus, although it is convenient and legitimate to talk about tagdīr as a definable aspect of grammatical methodology, it would be incorrect to say that it was a technical term of the same order as for instance the term 'āmil.

The grammarians make use of the actual word taqdir in expressions like ... على تقدير ... , "implying...", and والتقدير ... , "what is implied is...". They do not use the word in the sense of a precisely defined procedure which they would apply in certain situations.

Although it is convenient to talk of "the Arab grammarians' use of taqdir" when discussing their methodology, it must be remembered that while the grammarians certainly had their methodology they contented themselves with simply applying it in practice and they did not feel a need to discuss its techniques in general. For this reason the expression taqdir is not used as a strictly defined methodological term and, indeed, there are many discussions of points in which the word taqdir or its derivatives is not employed but in which the grammatical reasoning could be classified as taqdir.

Many Arabic constructions were treated by the grammarians as being more or less elliptic and by the use of taqdir they could remove this elliptic element through changing the sentence structure and adding explanatory elements, and thereby assisting the process of grammatical analysis. Describing taqdir Weil writes: "Er ändert den Wortlaut der Ueberlieferung, indem er eine Umstellung oder Ergänzung vornimmt, und schnell hat er den neuen Text in Einklang mit irgend einer der erlaubten Analogien gebracht." 35

Where taqdir was of great importance was in the analysing of constructions which occur in poetry and the grammarians used it to seek acceptable explanations for usages which seemed to violate the established rules of grammar. Many such usages could be justified by taqdir although others simply had to be classed as anomalous and defying any grammatical explanation. An example of this use of taqdir occurs when Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses inversion with the verb kāna although he does not employ the word taqdir itself or any of its derivatives: 36

فما أجزته في المبتدأ والخبر من التقديم والتأخير
فأجزه فيها ولكن لا تفصل بينها وبين ما عملت
فيه بما لم تعمل فيه ولا تقل: كانت زيدا الحمى
تأخذ، ولا: كان غلامه زيد يضرب. لا تجز هذا
إذا كان زيد والحمى اسمين لكان.. فإن أضمرت
في كان الأمر أو الحديث أو القصة وما أشبه
ذلك - وهو الذي يقال له المجهول - كان ذلك
المضمر اسم كان وكانت هذه الجملة خبره. فعلى
ذلك يجوز: كان زيدا الحمى تأخذ. وعلى هذا
أنشدوا:

فَأَصْبَحُوا وَالنَّوَى عَلَى مُعَرِّبِهِمْ
وَلَيْسَ كُلُّ النَّوَى يُلْقِي الْمَسَاكِينُ

كان قال: وليس الخبر يلقي المساكين كل النوى،
ولكن هذا المضمر لا يظهر.

كان زيدا الحمى تأخذ According to Ibn al-Sarrāj a construction like
is admissible if a term like amr, hadīth, or qissah is implied after
kāna which is a device that the Arab grammarians considered analogous
to the explicit ḍamir al-sha'n.³⁷ In support of this usage Ibn
al-Sarrāj also cites a verse into which such a notional term must be
introduced to allow a grammatically sound analysis. His approach to
this question is rather different from that of Sibawayh in the Kitāb.³⁸
The latter puts forward the idea of a suppressed term with certain
usages of kāna so as to explain the syntax of a number of verses of
poetry including the one cited above, but he does not consider it

admissible to form sentences like كان زيدا الحسى تأخذ on the analogy of these purely poetical usages.³⁹

The notion of taqdīr can be used in a manner which seems strained even allowing for the methodology of the Arab grammarians. An example of this occurs in Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of the question of inversion of an attribute and the term which it qualifies:⁴⁰

لا يجوز أن تقدم الصفة على الموصوف ولا أن متصل
الصفة فيما قبل الموصوف ولا تقدم شيئا مما
يتصل بالصفة على الموصوف وكذلك البدل إذا
قلت : صرت برجل ضارب زيدا ، لم يجوز أن تقدم
زيدا على رجل . وكذلك إذا قلت : هذا رجل يضرب
زيدا ، لم يجوز أن تقول : هذا زيدا رجل يضرب ،
لأن الصفة مع الاسم بمنزلة الشيء الواحد وكذلك
كل ما اتصل بها . فإذا قلت : عبد الله رجل يأكل
طعاما ، لم يجوز أن تقدم طعاما قبل عبد الله
ولا قبل رجل . والكوفيون يميزون إلفاء رجل
فيحملونه بمنزلة ما ليس في الكلام فيقولون :
طعاما عبد الله رجل يأكل ، لا يهتدون برجل .
وتقديره عندهم : طعاما عبد الله يأكل . وإلفاء
هذا غير معروف ، ولإلفاء ههنا سنذكرها إن
شاء الله . ولكن هذه المسألة تجوز على غير ما
قدروا ، وهو أن تجعل رجلا بدلا من عبد الله ترفعه
بالابتداء وتجعل يأكل خبرا . فحينئذ يصلح تقديم
طعاما .

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj first takes the view that it is

inadmissible to change the construction *عبد الله رجل يأكل طعاما* to *عبد الله رجل يأكل طعاما* because this violates the rule that an attribute predicated of a term cannot govern anything preceding that term. The Kufans, however, permit this construction by taking the view that the term *رجل* is to be disregarded, but Ibn al-Sarrāj considers it incorrect to do this. Nevertheless, he does proceed to permit the construction if the word *رجل* is treated as a badal, although in doing so he in effect withdraws his previous contention that the construction is inadmissible and he goes back on the general rule which he laid down governing the positioning of terms grammatically dependent on an attribute.

The concept of tagdīr is particularly used in the discussion of constructions in which the speaker's intentions are seen as dictating how precisely he expresses himself. This often involves consideration of differences of expression which have little or no effect on meaning. This is illustrated in the discussion, which Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from al-Māzinī, of the sentence *أعطى عبد الله زيدا درهما* which, by the process of relative clause predication, can be changed to *المعطى عبد*

41 : الله زيدا درهم

قال المازني في الإخبار عن الدرهم: المعطى عبد الله زيدا درهم، فجعلت الدرهم معلقا بالمعطى لأنك إذا قدرت على الهاء لم تجي' بإياه. ألا ترى أنك تقول: ضربته، ولا تقول: ضربت إياه، قال: وإن شئت قلت المعطى عبد الله زيد إياه درهم، فجعلت ضمير الدرهم في موضعه إذا كان مظهرا. فهذا مذاهب حسن.

قال أبو بكر [ابن السراج]: وهذا الذي

قال المازني إنه مذاهب هم عندى الأجود.

According to al-Māzinī, if in relative clause predication the inseparable pronoun is used attached to the participle this is done on the "implication" of the use of the pronoun object with the verb proper, but if the inseparable pronoun prefixed by the particle īya is introduced later on in the sentence this is done on the "implication" of the position that the substantive for which it stands would have occupied.

Another example of the use of taqdīr involving a purely notional distinction is found in Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of the expression الحسن وجهها. From the standpoint of grammatical analysis this construction can be looked upon as either representing the use of the tamyiz or as analogous to the use of the active participle governing the direct object. According to Ibn al-Sarrāj the analysis adopted has a certain grammatical consequence: 42

وأما قولك: الحسن وجهها والكريم أبا، فإن أصحابنا يشبهونه بالضارب رجلا وقد قدمت تفسيره في هذا الكتاب. وغير ممتنع عندي أن ينتصب على التمييز أيضا، بل الأصل ينبغي أن يكون هذا وذلك الفرع لذلك قد بينت بالوجه الحسن منه كما بينت في قولك: هو أحسنهم وجهها. وكذلك يجرى عندي قولهم: هو الحقور كلبا، وما أشبه ذلك. فإذا نصبت على تقدير التمييز لم يجز أن تدخل عليه الألف واللام. فإذا نصبت على تقدير المفعول والتشبيه بقولك: الضارب رجلا، جاز أن تدخل عليه الألف واللام.

Here Ibn al-Sarrāj draws the rather notional but not inconsistent conclusion that if the accusative in the expression الحسن وجهها is used on the "implication" of the tamyiz the expression الحسن الوجهة

is inadmissible, but if the accusative is used on the "implication" of a correspondence with the active participle followed by the direct object the expression **الحسن الوجه** is admissible. The approach adopted here seems to be peculiar to Ibn al-Sarrāj. ⁴³

Notes to Chapter IV

- 1 Ibn al-Anbārī, Luma' al-adillah (Stockholm, 1963), p. 44.
- 2 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 61.
- 3 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 322.
- 4 Ibid., vol. i, p. 37.
- 5 Ibid., p. 101.
- 6 Ibid., pp. 97-8.
- 7 For a discussion of inversion see *ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 231-65.
- 8 Ibid., vol. i, pp. 100-1.
- 9 Ibid., p. 101.
- 10 Al-Zajjājī, Jumal, p. 55.
- 11 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 101.
- 12 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, pp. 112-5.
- 13 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 102-3.
- 14 Ibid., p. 219.
- 15 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. iii, pp. 114-8.
- 16 Qur'an 22:16. See also Wright, vol. ii, p. 299B.
- 17 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 218.
- 18 Ibid., p. 219.
- 19 Al-Astarābādhi, vol. ii, p. 28.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 See M. S. Howell, A Grammar of the Classical Arabic Language, Introduction and 4 pts. (Allahabad, 1883-1911), pt. i, pp. 551-2.
- 22 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, pp. 231-65; al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, pp. 89-132.
- 23 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. iii, pp. 156-60.
- 24 Al-Astarābādhi, vol. ii, pp. 44-53.
- 25 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, pp. 288, 289, 291. See also al-Astarābādhi, vol. ii, p. 44.
- 26 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, pp. 295, 298, 301, 310, 312, 313.

- 27 Ibid., pp. 288-9.
- 28 Al-Astarābādī, vol. ii, p. 45.
- 29 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 289.
- 30 Ibid., pp. 289-90.
- 31 Ibid., p. 295.
- 32 Ibid., p. 311.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Weil, Introduction, pp. 25-7.
- 35 Ibid., p. 25.
- 36 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 98-9.
- 37 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. iii, pp. 114-8.
- 38 Sibawayh, vol. i, pp. 36-7, 73-4.
- 39 See Howell, pt. ii, pp. 196-7.
- 40 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 234. In l. 2 of this passage the addition in the printed text after شيئا of بصيغة الجمهور has been omitted.
- 41 Ibid., pp. 295-6. In l. 6 of this passage |ذا| has been substituted for >| in the printed text.
- 42 Ibid., vol. i, p. 272; see also pp. 158-9.
- 43 See Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vi, p. 84.

CHAPTER V

QIYAS AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF ASL AND FAR'

One of the effects of what the grammarians saw as qiyās at work in the grammar of Arabic was that grammatical phenomena which can be considered as similar tend to be governed by similar rules. At its simplest this often states little more than the obvious and, for example, is seen in the view of the grammarians that the passive subject is put into the nominative because it resembles the active subject in its function, or in the view that the active participle resembles the verb in its power of regimen because it is derived from the verb. Although at this level this aspect of qiyās is quite obvious, it can be extended and is seen by the grammarians to operate in a more involved manner. An example of this is the view of the grammarians that there is a relationship between the particle inna and the transitive verb due to the fact that both govern the nominative and the accusative. Although this would appear to be a purely coincidental similarity the grammarians did not treat it as such.

When a resemblance between two grammatical phenomena was observed the grammarians would proceed to identify which of the two it was that the other had come to resemble. They would describe the basic phenomenon as the aṣl and the other which had come to resemble it as a far'. This same relationship of aṣl and far' was also considered to exist in respect of a single phenomenon if it had both a primary and a secondary aspect. For instance, the use of the particle wa as a conjunction proper was seen as its primary use (aṣl), whereas its use with the maf'ūl ma'ahu was seen as a secondary use (far'). Similarly, the use of the particle

fa as a conjunction was seen as its primary use, whereas its use with the verb in the subjunctive on the implication of a suppressed particle an was seen as a secondary use. When an English translation of the terms asl and far' is required, it is necessary to resort to expressions like "ground-form" and "by-form" respectively, although in certain instances the terms can be translated as "primary usage" and "secondary usage".

In the grammatical writings particularly of later scholars the terms asl and far' are frequently employed and for a discussion of the theory behind their use it is necessary to turn to the Luma' al-adillah of Ibn al-Anbārī.¹ In this work he explains that it is qiyās which underlies the relationship between asl and far' and, indeed, his discussion of qiyās deals largely with how it determines the relationship between asl and far' and he gives scant attention to other aspects of qiyās. This is reflected in the way in which he defines qiyās:²

وهو عرف العلماء عبارة عن تقدير الفرع بحكم
الأصل. وقيل: هو حمل فرع على أصل بطلّة تقتضى
إجراء حكم الأصل على الفرع. وقيل: هو ربط الأصل
بالفرع بجامع. وقيل: هو اعتبار الشيء بالشيء
بجامع. وهذه الحدود كلها متقاربة.

In the Luma' al-adillah much of Ibn al-Anbārī's discussion of qiyās in grammar consists of a very literal application to it of the techniques of qiyās in fiqh in all its intricacies. However, this falls outside of the scope of this present study because such an approach is largely irrelevant to actual grammatical practice. The influence of fiqh can of course be seen in the definitions of qiyās quoted above. In spite of the influence of fiqh, Ibn al-Anbārī's discussion, in its more fundamental aspects, of how qiyās governs the relationship of asl and far' is worth quoting to explain this relationship:³

لا بد لكل قياس من أربعة أشياء : أصل وفرع
 وعلّة وحكم. وذلك أن تركيب قياساً في الدلالة
 على رفع ما لم يسم فاعله فتقول : اسم أُسند الفعل
 إليه مقدماً عليه فوجب أن يكون مرفوعاً قياساً
 على الفاعل. فالأصل هو الفاعل ، والفرع ما لم يسم فاعله ،
 والعلّة الجامعة هي الإسناد ، والحكم هو الرفع. والأصل
 في الرفع أن يكون للأصل الذي هو الفاعل وإنما أجرى
 على الفرع الذي هو ما لم يسم فاعله بالعلّة الجامعة
 التي هي الإسناد. وعلى هذا النحو تركيب كل قياس
 من أقيسة النحو.

The particular example given here to illustrate Ibn al-Anbārī's explanation of the mechanics of qiyās is a rather simple and obvious one but the exercise shows how the relationship of aṣl and farʿ could be rationalised, although here the influence of qiyās in fiqh is strong.

The operation of qiyās is very important where the 'illah involved is what the grammarians called tashbih and the relationship of aṣl and farʿ of the verb and the particle inna provides one of the best examples of such a relationship based on tashbih because it is an example to which the grammarians gave particular attention.⁴ Ibn al-Sarrāj observes that inna and analogous particles resemble the verb because they all govern the nominative and the accusative and he considers it significant that these particles end in an indeclinable fathah like the perfect tense of the verb.⁵ Although Sibawayh makes clear the resemblance of these particles to the verb, he does not mention this formal consideration, but this point was picked up by the later grammarians who also considered significant in this respect the use of the nūn al-wiqāyah with inna and similar particles.⁶

Ibn al-Sarrāj deals very briefly with the relationship to the verb of inna and analogous particles: ⁷

فإن تشبه من الأفعال ما قدم مفعوله نحو:
ضرب زيدا رهيل. وأعملت هذه الأعراف في
المبتدأ والخبر كما أعملت كان. وفرق بين
عمليهما بأن قدم المنصوب بالحروف على المرفوع
كأنهم جعلوا ذلك فرقا بين الحرف والفعل.

Ibn Ya'īsh, however, deals with this question much more fully: ⁸

وشبهت من الأفعال بما قدم مفعوله على فاعله
فقولك: إن زيدا قائم، بمنزلة: ضرب زيدا رهيل.
وإنما قدم المنصوب فيها على المرفوع فرقا بينها
وبين الفعل. فالفعل من حيث كان الأصل في العمل
جرى على سنن قياسه في تقديم المرفوع على المنصوب
إذ كانت رتبة الفاعل مقدمة على المفعول. وهذه
الحروف لما كانت في العمل فروعا على الأفعال
وحمولة عليها جعلت دونها بأن قدم المنصوب
فيها على المرفوع مطلقا لها عن درجتها الأفعال إذ
تقديم المفعول على الفاعل فرع وتقديم الفاعل أهل....

In the passage from the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj states that the verb differs from inna because in the case of the latter the term in the accusative must precede the one in the nominative, as if thereby a distinction is drawn between particle and verb. However, in an earlier passage in the Uṣūl he states more definitely that it is the mark of differentiation between them. ⁹ Ibn al-Sarrāj does not introduce the terms asl and far' into the above discussion but Ibn Ya'īsh does establish a relationship of asl and far' between the verb and inna.

The grammarians came to hold the view that the far' in comparison to the aṣl is subject to certain restrictions in its usage and al-Suyūṭī gathers together a number of examples of this in the Ashbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir.¹⁰ In the case of inna Ibn Ya'īsh observes that its inferior status as a far' is manifest in the fact that with it the term in the accusative must precede the term in the nominative, inasmuch as with the verb the precedence of the term in the nominative over the term in the accusative embodies the aṣl whereas the placing of the accusative in front of the nominative embodies a far'. Ibn al-Sarrāj simply treats the word order with inna as a mark of differentiation but Ibn Ya'īsh treats it as the sign of the lower status of the far' with regard to the aṣl.

Although the use of the terms aṣl and far' to describe such a relationship as was felt to exist between the verb and inna is not found in the Kitāb of Sībawayh, the use of these terms represents a development of certain ideas about grammatical relationships to be found in the Kitāb. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj does not make the point in a definite manner that inna is inferior in status to the verb, a fact which Ibn Ya'īsh attributes to the nature of the relationship of aṣl and far', this point is made by al-Khalīl in the Kitāb:¹¹

وزعم الخليل أنها عملت عملين، الرفع والنصب،
 كما عملت كان الرفع والنصب هين قلت: كان
 أهلك زيد، إلا أنه ليس لك أن تقول: كأن أهلك
 عبد الله، تريد: كأن عبد الله أهلك، لأنها لا
 تصرف تصرف الأفعال ولا يضم فيها المرفوع
 كما يضم في كان. ومن ثم فرقوا بينهما كما فرقوا
 بين ليس وما فلم يجروها مجراها.

In considering the relationship between inna and the verb al-Khalīl takes the view that with inna the nominative cannot be made

to precede the accusative because there are certain restrictions on its use in comparison with the verb and these serve as a means of differentiation between them. The idea behind this is that when something resembles something else in the way in which it functions, there is a certain force at play which prevents a complete assimilation with regard to their respective rules of use, and this acts to maintain their separate identity. In this connection al-Khalīl compares the verb laysa with mā al-hijāzīyah. In the Hijazi use of the negative particle mā it becomes assimilated to the verb of negation, laysa, because it takes its predicate in the accusative case. However, there are certain restrictions on this use of mā which do not apply to the verb laysa, among which is the condition that the subject must precede the predicate.¹² In short, it may be said that in the passage from the Kitāb quoted here may be seen the basis of the later idea that the far' is inferior in status to its aṣl.

Although the discussion of inna in the Uṣūl does not give much information on contemporary grammatical theorising about its relationship to the verb, considerable detail on this topic can be found in the slightly later Idāh 'ilal al-naḥw of al-Zajjājī. This is found in the course of a discussion of the varieties of 'illah which occur in Arabic grammar and this is illustrated predominantly through reference to the particle inna.¹³ Al-Zajjājī classifies the varieties of 'illah as being three, of which the latter two have particular relevance to the present discussion. The first variety of 'illah is made up of the 'ilal al-ta'limīyah which relate to the established rules of grammar which a teacher would set forth to his pupils:¹⁴

فَأَمَّا التَّعْلِيمِيَّةُ فَهِيَ الَّتِي يَتَوَصَّلُ بِهَا إِلَى تَعَلُّمِ
كَلَامِ الْعَرَبِ لِأَنَّهَا لَمْ نَسْمَعْ نَحْنُ وَلَا غَيْرُنَا كُلَّ
كَلَامٍ مِنْهَا لَفْظًا. وَإِنَّمَا سَمِعْنَا بَعْضًا فَقَمْنَا عَلَيْهِ

نظيره فمن هذا النوع من الحلل قولنا: إن زيدا قائماً. إن قيل: يم نصبت زيدا، قلنا: بيان، لأنها تنصب الاسم وترفع الخبر لأنها كذلك علمنا ونعلمه فهذا وما أشبهه من نوع التعليل وبه ضبط كلام العرب.

The second variety of 'illah' arises from the grammarians' explanations of points like the relationship of inna to the verb: ¹⁵

فأما العلة القياسية فإن يقال لمن قال: نصبت زيدا بيان، في قوله: إن زيدا قائماً: ولم يجب أن تنصب إن الاسم. فالجواب في ذلك أن يقول: لأنها وأخواتها ضارعت الفعل المتعدي إلى مفعول فحملت عليه فأعملت أعمالاً لها ضارعتة. فالمنصوب بها مشبه بالمفعول لفظاً والمرفوع بها مشبه بالفاعل لفظاً. فهي تشبه من الأفعال ما قدم مفعوله على فاعله نحو: ضرب أهلك محمد، وما أشبه ذلك.

It has been mentioned above that Ibn al-Anbārī particularly defines qiyās in terms of how it underlies the relationship of aṣl and far' and it is of interest that al-Zajjājī should describe as an 'illah qiyāsiyah' the 'illah' which he considers to govern what is in fact a relationship of this type, although he does not expressly mention this here.

The third variety of 'illah' takes up as it were where the second variety leaves off: ¹⁶

وأما العلة الجدلية النظرية فكل ما يعقل به في باب إن بعد هذا مثل أن يقال: فمن أى

جهة شابهت هذه الحروف الأفعال. وبأى الأفعال
شبهتموها، أبا الماضي أم المستقبل أم الحادثة
في الحال، أم المترافية، أم المنقضية بلا مهلة.
(وهين) شبهتموها بالأفعال لأى شىء عدلتم
بها إلى ما قدم مفعوله على فاعله نحو: ضرب
زيدا عمرو. وهلا شبهتموها بما قُدم فاعله على
مفعوله لأنه هو الأهل وذلك فرع ثان. فأى هلة
دعنا إلى إلحاقها بالفروع دون الأصول وأى
قياس اطرد لك في ذلك.

In itself al-Zajjājī's discussion of this 'illah is an indication of the high stage of development which grammatical theory had reached by the first half of the 10th century. In this passage al-Zajjājī uses the terms asl and far' not with reference to the relationship itself of inna to the verb but to the fact that placing the subject before the object in a verbal sentence represents the asl, whereas placing the object before the subject represents a far'. This point was also made by Ibn Ya'īsh in the passage from the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal quoted earlier. Al-Zajjājī indicates that he will answer the questions which the passage quoted above and its continuation raise but unfortunately he does not in fact do so. It would have been of some interest to know his precise answer to his own question:

وهلا شبهتموها بما قدم فاعله على مفعوله لأنه هو
الأصل وذلك فرع ثان. فأى هلة دعنا إلى إلحاقها
بالفروع دون الأصل وأى قياس اطرد في ذلك.

However, it seems clear that the answer would have been very similar to that which could be given by consulting the passage quoted from

Ibn Ya'īsh: that through this is manifest the inferiority of the far' to the aḡl.

Before considering further the sort of relationship which can be described as that of aḡl and far', it is of value to consider what use Ibn al-Sarraj makes of these two terms occurring together. In analysing the construction الحسنُ وجها, which has already been discussed, Ibn al-Sarraj uses the terms aḡl and far':¹⁷

وأما قولك: الحسنُ وجها، والكريمُ أبا، فإن أصحابنا يشبهونه بالضارب رجلا وقد قدمت تفسيره في هذا الكتاب. وغير متنع عندي أن ينتصب على التمييز أيضا، بل الأصل ينبغي أن يكون هذا وذلك فرع لأنك قد بينت بالوجه الحسن منه كما بينت في قولك: هو أحسنهم وجها.

Ibn al-Sarraj considers the analysis of the construction الحسنُ وجها as a tamyiz to represent the aḡl, whereas the analysis based on an affinity to the construction الضارب رجلا, to which the former construction has been assimilated, represents a far'. This use of the terms aḡl and far' does not involve the strict technical meaning discussed in this chapter.

Another instance of the use of the terms aḡl and far' is found when Ibn al-Sarraj discusses possible alternative word order for the sentence هند منطلقة وأبوها قائم:¹⁸

فإن قلت: هند أبوها قائم ومنطلقة، هاز. والأحسن عندي أن تقدم منطلقة لأن الأصل للمورد والجملة فرع. ولا ينبغي أن يقدم الفرع على الأصل إلا في ضرورة شعرهم.

Here a predicate which consists of a single term is seen as more basic

than one which consists of a sentence complete in itself. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj uses the terms agl and far' in this connection, these terms again are not used in a strict technical sense.

Ibn al-Sarrāj also uses the terms uṣūl and furū' in the course of a discussion of the rather rare use in positive statements of the fā' al-sababiyah:¹⁹

ألا ترى أن الشاعر، إذا اضطر فعطف على الفعل
الواجب الذي على غير شرط بالفاء وكان الأول
سببا للثاني، نصب كما قال :

سَأْتَرُكَ مَنزِلِي لِبَنِي تَمِيمٍ، وَالحَقَّ بِالْحِجَازِ فَاسْتَرِيحًا

حمل لحاقه بالحجاز سببا لاستراحته. فتقديره
لما نصب كأنه قال: يكون لحاق فاستراحة. وقد
جاء مثله في الشعر أبيات لقوم فصحاء إلا أنه
قبیح أن تنصب وتططف على الواجب الذي على
غير شعر [لأنه قد جعل لهذا المعنى آلات
وكان حق الكلام أن يقول لو كان في غير شعراً:
والحق بالحجاز، فإذا لحقت استرحمت، وإن
الحق أسترع. ومع ذلك فإن الإيجاب على غير الشرط
أصل الكلام. وإزالة اللفظ عن جهته في الفروع
أهم من منها في الأصول لأنها أدل على
المعاني.

The meaning of the general remark on uṣūl and furū' as it applies in this particular instance is that the use of the particle fa purely as a conjunction represents the agl, whereas its use with the subjunctive represents a far'; and it is better to go beyond the normal use with the

fā' al-sababiyah because the use of the subjunctive clearly marks its function, whereas fa used simply for conjunction does not have an analogous accompanying marker of its purpose. In this context the terms asl and far' are used as strict technical terms unlike their use in the two preceding instances cited.

From an examination of the occasions on which Ibn al-Sarrāj uses the expressions asl and far' it is clear that he makes little use of them in the discussion of relationships which later grammarians would define in terms of an asl and far'. However, in his discussion of certain questions he does refer to a point which the grammarians took to be a principle involved in the relationship of asl and far'. It has been mentioned above that the view was taken that a far' is inferior in status to its asl and this inferiority is manifest in certain restrictions on the use of the far' which do not apply to the asl. In the Uṣūl there are some examples of this line of thought, although it is not expressly put forward in terms of the relationship of asl and far'.

When discussing the position of the maf'ūl ma'ahu in the sentence Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ²⁰

ولا يجوز التقديم للمفعول في هذا الباب. لا تقول:
والخشبة استوى الماء، لأن الواو أصلها أن
تكون للعطف، وحق المعطوف أن يكون بعد
المعطوف عليه، كما أن حق الصفة أن تكون
بعد الموصوف. فقد أخرجوا الواو في هذا الباب
عن هذه الذي كان له. ومن شأنهم إذا أخرجوا الشيء
من هذه الذي كان له ألزموه هالاً واحدة.

In the Ashbah wa-l-naẓā'ir al-Suyūṭī quotes Ibn 'Uṣfūr on the same

question in the course of discussing the point that furū' are inferior in status to uṣūl:²¹

وقال ابن عصفور في (شرح الجمل) لما
كان جعل الواو بمعنى مع في المفعول معه
فرعا عن كونه عاطفة، لم يتصرفوا في الاسم
الذي بعدها ولم يقدموها على العامل، وإن
كان متصرفا، ولا على الفاعل. لا يقولون:
والطيالسة جاء البرد، ولا: جاء والطيالسة
البرد، لأن الفروع لا تحتل من التصريف
ما تحتله الأصول.

Although Ibn al-Sarrāj uses the term aṣl in the passage from the Uṣūl he does not introduce the term far' to describe the special use of the conjunction wa with the maf'ūl ma'ahu. However, the word aṣl is used in a way which would lead on to the use of the word far', as the quotation from Ibn 'Uṣfūr shows. This scholar uses these expressions to refer to the primary and a secondary function of the conjunction wa.

Ibn al-Sarrāj takes the view that the position of the maf'ūl ma'ahu in the sentence is very firmly defined because the particle wa is basically used for conjunction and the element which it is used to add on, naturally, follows what it is added on to. In dealing with the same point Ibn 'Uṣfūr states that there are restrictions put on the position of the maf'ūl ma'ahu because the accompanying particle wa functions as a far' in relation to its use as a conjunction proper which represents the aṣl. Accordingly, there are such restrictions because furū' do not have the range of permitted use which characterises uṣūl.

Although Ibn al-Sarrāj gives a practical explanation of why the maf'ūl ma'ahu should be restricted in the position it may take in the sentence, it is apparent that he does take what is tantamount to the

more theoretical view of Ibn 'Uṣfūr but he expresses it in somewhat different terms:

وقد أخرجوا الواو في هذا الباب عن هذه الذي
كان له . ومن شأن الحرب إذا أخرجوا الشيء عن
هذه الذي كان له ألزموه حالا واهدة.

The general principle stated here that a usage which is to be seen as an extension of a more basic usage is subject to restrictions which do not apply to the basic usage, is again taken up by Ibn al-Sarrāj when he discusses the use of the fā' al-sababiyah and the subjunctive: ²²

ومن شأن الحرب إذا أزالوا الكلام عن أصله
إلى شيء آخر غيروا لفظه وهذفوا منه شيئا
والزموه موضعا واهدا، إذا لم يأتوا بحرف يدل
على هذا المعنى، ولم يصرفوه ويجعلوه كالمثل
ليكون ذلك دليلا لهم على أنهم خالفوا به أصل
الكلام.

It has been mentioned earlier that the use of the particle fa with the subjunctive is considered by Ibn al-Sarrāj to be an extension (far') of its basic use (aṣl) as a conjunction and in this context the general remark about such extended usages indicates that the verb following fa must be in the subjunctive because this alone marks the special function of the particle.

In the above passage from the Uṣūl the phraseology used in describing usages which are extensions of more basic usages is of interest. The use of the expression ألزموه موضعا واهدا may be compared with that of the expression ألزموه حالا واهدة used by Ibn al-Sarrāj in connection with the maf'ūl ma'ahu. The verbs ṣarrafa, taṣarrafa, and their derivatives are commonly used by the grammarians

in discussing the relationship of aṣl and far', and in the above passage Ibn al-Sarrāj uses the verb ṣarrafa in making the point that a usage which is an extension of a more basic usage has certain restrictions placed on it which do not apply to the basic usage (لم يصرّفه). Although questions of aṣl and far' are not discussed as such in the Kitāb of Sībawayh, the verb ṣarrafa is used in the sense referred to here because al-Khalīl states in a passage quoted earlier when he deals with the point that with inna and analogous particles the nominative cannot be made to precede the accusative: لا تُصَرَّفُ تَصَرَّفُ

الأفعال. ²³ In the passage quoted above from the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj also likens extended usages which have certain restrictions placed on them to the set expressions of proverbs and this is a comparison often made by the grammarians. ²⁴

By the 10th century the grammarians were discussing relationships of aṣl and far' but it is unclear in what precise stages the grammarians developed their ideas on this subject. As has been mentioned, the subject is not one which is dealt with in the Kitāb although it did develop out of ideas present in that work. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj does give some attention to what are relationships of aṣl and far' but he rarely uses these terms themselves, and al-Mubarrad in the Muqtaḍab shows no interest at all in this topic. It seems likely that at the time of Ibn al-Sarrāj relationships of aṣl and far' were treated as a rather theoretical subject and discussion of it did not intrude to any great extent into general works of grammar. Indeed, it is from a theoretical work from this period, the Idāh 'ilal al-naḥw of al-Zajjājī, that some idea can be obtained about the stage of development of grammatical theory in this field as it affects the particle inna.

Notes to Chapter V

- 1 Ibn al-Anbārī, Luma', pp. 42-58.
- 2 Ibid., p. 42.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Al-Suyūṭī, Iqtirāḥ, p. 48.
- 5 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 278.
- 6 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 279; Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, p. 82.
- 7 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 278.
- 8 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 102.
- 9 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 113.
- 10 Al-Suyūṭī, Ashbāḥ, vol. i, pp. 260-4.
- 11 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 280.
- 12 See Wright, vol. ii, p. 104A; Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, pp. 108-9.
- 13 Al-Zajjājī, Idāḥ, pp. 64-6. See also E.I.², s.v. 'illah'.
- 14 Al-Zajjājī, Idāḥ, p. 64.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid., p. 65.
- 17 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 272. See also pp. 98-9 above.
- 18 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 63.
- 19 Ibid., pp. 189-90. In ll. 9-10 of this passage the material in brackets has been supplied from the quotation in al-Baghdādī, vol. iii, p. 600. See also Wright, vol. ii, pp. 30-2, esp. p. 32B.
- 20 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 256. In l. 4 of this passage المعطوف عليه has been substituted for المطف عليه in the printed text.
- 21 Al-Suyūṭī, Ashbāḥ, vol. i, p. 262. For Ibn 'Uṣfūr see E.I.², s.v. Ibn 'Uṣfūr.
- 22 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 189.
- 23 See p. 106 above.
- 24 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 116; vol. ii, p. 349.

CHAPTER VI

THE TAMYIZ AND THE VERB OF WONDER

In the preceding chapters attention has been concentrated on the techniques and procedures of the Arab grammarians but in this chapter a different approach will be followed by way of contrast and an examination will be made of the way in which two specific topics of Arabic grammar are treated. As it would be impossible to examine every topic dealt with in the grammars, attention will be given in this chapter to the tamyiz and the verb of wonder. Although in the previous chapters various grammatical topics have been touched on when dealing with the techniques and theory of the grammarians, nevertheless, by a more detailed examination of specific topics a different perspective on the work of the grammarians can be obtained.

Tamyiz

It is curious that although there are a number of uses of the accusative which are clearly analogous and which are generally known as the tamyiz, Sibawayh does not have a term to cover such uses of the accusative, inspite of the fact that he does discuss several of them. Indeed, in the Kitāb there is no unified discussion of usages which could be seen as involving tamyiz.¹ Although there is no term for tamyiz in the Kitāb, the term mufassir is used in the Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān of al-Farrā' who was a pupil of Sibawayh's Kufan contemporary, al-Kisā'i.² In the Muqaddimah fi l-nahw of the Basran scholar, Khalaf al-Ahmar (d. 796), the expression "الواحد الخارج عن الجماعة" is used for the noun functioning as a tamyiz with the numbers 11-99 and this term is clearly

based on the fact that a noun in the singular is here used for what is plural in meaning.³ However, this expression, which is limited to one particular use of the tamyiz, was not generally accepted and by the time of al-Mubarrad the familiar and more comprehensive expression tamyiz was in use together with other less important terms like tabyin and tafsir.⁴

Sibawayh's basic discussion of constructions which would be recognised as being examples of the tamyiz is actually found in his chapter on the assimilated adjective (sifah mushabbah) and this deserves some explanation. Sibawayh considered that the assimilated adjective could be treated as similar to the active participle because both could be connected with another noun through annexation or through governing it in the accusative as in the expressions حسنُ الدهمِ، ضاربُ زيدٍ and الحسنُ وجهًا، الضاربُ زيدًا.⁵ Now, it has already been mentioned in a previous chapter that the grammarians considered that the construction الحسنُ وجهًا could be explained both as a tamyiz construction and as a construction similar to the use of the active participle in expressions like الضاربُ رجلاً.⁶ This, therefore, explains why constructions which later grammarians considered to involve the tamyiz are discussed by Sibawayh in his chapter on the assimilated adjective.

It is worth mentioning that when Ibn al-Sarraj deals with the tamyiz in the Uṣūl he adopts a format different from that found in other grammars because his discussion of the tamyiz is split into two separate parts which do not run consecutively.⁷ One chapter on the tamyiz deals with constructions where the regent is a verb or its equivalent and these are the majority of tamyiz constructions. The other chapter deals with the use of the tamyiz in enumeration and measuring. This division is based on the fact that in the former case the tamyiz is dependent on a formally complete utterance like many other uses of the accusative, as has been explained in an earlier chapter,⁸ whereas in

the latter case the tamyiz is dependent simply on the noun which precedes it.

In dealing with tamyiz the later scholars tried to define exactly what it is and al-Zamakhshari, for instance, begins his discussion of it by giving a comprehensive definition of it:⁹

وهو رفع الإبهام في جملة أو مفرد بالنق على أحد
 محتملاته فمثال في الجملة طاب زيد نفسا، وتصبب
 عرقا ونفقا شحا... ومثاله في المفرد: عندي راقود
 هنلا، ودطل زينا، ومنوان سمن، وتفيزان برا،
 وعشرون درهطا.

Al-Mubarrad, on the other hand, defines the tamyiz in a far more cursory way and only illustrates his definition in terms of its use with the numbers 11-99: فمعناه أن يأتي مبينا عن نوعه وذلك قولك: عندي 11-99
 10 Ibn al-Sarraj for his part does not attempt to provide a real definition of the tamyiz.

One of the points which needs some attention in discussing the tamyiz is the question of the use of singular and plural nouns.

Al-Mubarrad turns to this point after discussing tamyiz constructions of the type أنت أفره الناس عبداً when he moves on to discuss the related expression أنت أفره الناس عبيدا 11:

ويجوز أن تقول — وهو حسن جدا — أنت أفره
 الناس عبيدا، وأجود الناس دورا. ولا يجوز عندي:
 عشرون دراهم يا فتى.
 والفضل بينهما أنك إذا قلت: عشرون،
 فقد أتيت على العدد فلم يحتج إلا إلى ذكر ما يدل
 على الجنس. فإذا قلت: هو أفره الناس عبدا، جاز أن
 تعنى عبدا واحدا فن تم هسن. والختير، إذا

أردت الجماعة، أن تقول: عبيدا. قال الله عز وجل:
 قُلْ هَلْ أُنَبِّئُكُمْ بِالْأَخْسَرِينَ أَعْمَالًا. وقد يجوز أن
 تقول: أفره الناس عبدا، فتعني جماعة العبيد
 نحو التمييز، والجمع أبين إذا كان الأول غير
 مخطور المصدر.

After his own discussion of this point Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from this passage but his own explanation of the occasions on which it is possible to use the plural in the tamyiz is based on using the regent as the criterion: 12

واعلم أن الاسماء التي تنصب على التمييز لا
 تكون إلا نكرات تدل على الأجناس وأن الحوامل
 فيها إذا كنّ أفعال أو في معاني الأفعال كنت
 بالخيار في الاسم المميز إن شئت جمسته وإن
 شئت وهديته تقول: طيتم بذلك نفسا، وإن
 شئت: أنفسا. قال الله تعالى: فَإِنْ طِبَّنَا لَكُمْ عَنْ
 شَيْءٍ مِنْهُ نَفْسًا، وقال تعالى: قُلْ هَلْ نُنَبِّئُكُمْ
 بِالْأَخْسَرِينَ أَعْمَالًا. فتقول على هذا: هو أفره الناس
 عبيدا، وأجود الناس دورا.

Here Ibn al-Sarrāj lays down somewhat more incisively the principle which is to be followed although he adds the quotation from al-Mubarrad to provide further detail.

In his supplementary section on the tamyiz with a verbal regent Ibn al-Sarrāj introduces further discussion of this question when he quotes al-Mubarrad on a point of grammar in the Qur'an: 13

وقال (المبرد) في قوله تعالى: ثُمَّ يُخْرِجُكُمْ طِفْلًا،

وقوله: فَإِنْ طِبَّنَ لَكُمْ عَنْ شَيْءٍ مِنْهُ نَفْسًا، إن التمييز إذا لم يسم عدد معلوم كالعشرين والثلاثين جاز تبيينه بالواحد للدلالة على الجنس وبالجميع إذا وقع الإلباس. وللاإلباس في هذا الموضع لقوله: فَإِنْ طِبَّنَ لَكُمْ، ولقوله: ثُمَّ يُحْزِرْهُكُمْ. وقال: قد قال قوم: طفلًا حال، وهذا أحسن....

Although the question of number with the tamyiz is in essence relatively simple to understand, the grammarians still took a lot of trouble to explain it exactly. ¹⁴

Another point which comes up in discussions of the tamyiz is under what circumstances a term in the accusative functioning as a tamyiz may be replaced by the same term, but in the genitive governed by the preposition min. Sibawayh refers briefly to this usage but does not supply any specific rules: ¹⁵

(هذا باب ما ينتصب انتصاب الاسم بعد المقادير)
وذلك قولك: ويحى رجلاً، ولله دره رجلاً، وهسبلاً به
رجلاً، وما أشبه ذلك. وإن شئت قلت: ويحى من
رجل، وهسبلاً به من رجل، ولله دره من رجل، فتدخل
من هنا كدهولها في كم توكيدا.

Al-Mubarrad, on the other hand, attempts to provide a precise rule for when the preposition min can be used: ¹⁶

ومن التمييز ويحى رجلاً، ولله دره فارسًا، وهسبلاً به
شجاعًا، إلا أنه إذا كان في الأول ذكر منه هسن
أن تدخل من توكيدا لذلك الذكر، فتقول ويحى
من رجل، ولله دره من فارس، وهسبلاً به من شجاع،
ولا يحوز: عشرون من درهم، ولا: هو أفرههم من

عبد، لأنه لم يذكره في الأول.

In his section on the use of the tamyiz in measurements Ibn al-Sarrāj appears to borrow from this passage but adds an explanation of what precisely is meant: 17

... وإذا كان في الأول ذكر منه حسن أن تدخل
من توكيدا لذلك الذكر. تقول: ويجه من رجل، والله
در زید من فارس، وهسبلك به من شجاع. ولا يجوز
عشرون من درهم، ولا: هو أفرههم من عبد، لأنه
لم يذكره في الأول. ومعنى قولهم: ذكر منه، أن
رجلا هو الهاء في ويجه، وفارس هو زيد، ولا الأفره
لأن الأفره هببر زيد.

In the Uḡul Ibn al-Sarrāj also twice quotes a passage by al-Mubarrad on the use of min but it would appear to be derived from a work other than the Muqtabad. This passage does not lay down a rule for the use of min but attempts to explain the reason for its use: 18

وقال ابو العباس (المبرد) - رحمه الله - فأما قولهم:
حسبك بريد رجلا، وأكرم به فارسا، وما أشبه ذلك،
ثم تقول: حسبك به من رجل، وأكرم به من فارس،
والله دره من شاعر، وأنت لا تقول: عشرون من
درهم، ولا: هو أفره منك من عبد، فالفضل بينهما
أن الأول كان يلتبس فيه التمييز بالحال فأدخلت
من لتخلصه للتمييز. ألا ترى أنك لو قلت: أكرم
به فارسا، وهسبك به خطيبا، لحاز أن تعنى في هذه
الحال. وكذلك إذا قلت: كم ضربت رجلا، وكم ضربت
من رجل، حاز ذلك لأن كم قد يتراهن عنه صيغته،

فإن قلت : كم ضربت رجلاً ، لم يدر السامع أردت
 كم مرة ضربت رجلاً واحداً أم كم ضربت من رجل ،
 فدخل من قد أزال المشك .

In the Mufaṣṣal al-Zamakhsharī makes no reference to the use of min instead of the tamyiz and what Ibn Ya'īsh writes is not particularly useful. ¹⁹ The latter does make the point that min can separate the ḥāl from the tamyiz and in doing this he incorporates without attribution into his own work part of the above passage which Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from al-Mubarrad. Later discussion of the use of min, such as is found in the Manhaj al-sālik of Abū Ḥayyān, cannot be directly related to what is found in earlier works because, as has been mentioned in an earlier chapter, the grammarians eventually classified uses of the tamyiz according to how the various constructions could be analysed, and this influenced their discussion of the use of min. ²⁰

Al-Mubarrad was well-known for his readiness to depart from the grammatical views of Sibawayh and one of the points where he does so is in permitting the placing of the tamyiz in front of the verb which acts as its regent: ²¹

وأعلم أن التبيين إذا كان العامل فيه فعلاً جاز
 تقديمه لتصرف العمل فقلت : تفقأت شحاً ، وتصببت
 عرقاً ، فإن شئت قدمت فقلت : شحاً تفقأت ، وعرقاً
 تصببت . وهذا لا يجيزه سيبويه لأنه يراه كقولك :
 عشرون درهماً ، وهذا أفرهم عبداً . وليس هذا
 بمنزلة ذلك لأن عشرين درهماً إنما عمل في الدرهم
 ما لم يؤخذ من فعل . ألا ترى أنه يقول : هذا زيد
 قائماً ، ولا يجيز : قائماً هذا زيد ، لأن العامل غير فعل .
 وتقول : راكباً جاء زيد ، لأن العامل فعل . فلذلك أجزنا

تقديم التمييز إذا كان العامل فعلا. وهذا رأى أبى
عثمان المازنى.

In his Naqd kitāb Sibawayh, which is quoted by Ibn Wallād,
al-Mubarrad criticises Sibawayh's view for being inconsistent and
considers his own view to be supported by qiyas and attested usage: ²²

وقد أجاز (سيبويه) في الحال التقديم إذا كان
العامل فعلا. وإنما الحال عنده وعند غيره بمنزلة
التمييز فيلزمه هذا أن يجيز تقديم التمييز إذا كان
العامل فعلا وإلا ترك قوله في الحال.... وجاء في الشعر
تصديق هذا القياس وهو قوله:

أَهْجُرُ لَيْلِي لِلْفِرَاقِ حُبَيْبَهَا وَمَا كَانَ نَفْسًا بِالْفِرَاقِ تَطِيبُ

In his discussion of tamyiz Ibn al-Sarraj mentions the view of
al-Mubarrad on this question but he does not make his own view clear
at this point. However, he rejects this usage later on in the Uṣūl
in the chapter on inversion where he bases his view on Sibawayh's
analysis of the nature of the tamyiz: ²³

وقياس بابه أن لا يجوز لأن فاعل في الحقيقة وهو
مخالف للمفعولات. ألا ترى أنه إذا قال: تفتأت
شحمًا، فالشحم هو المتفق، كما أنه إذا قال: هو خير عبدا،
فالعبد هو خير.

Ibn Ya'ish takes the same view but expresses himself in a rather
more technical manner: ²⁴

ألا ترى أن التصيب في قولك: تصيب زيد عرقا،
وتفتأ شحمًا، في الحقيقة للعرق والتفقؤ للشحم، والتقدير

تصيب عرق زيد، وتفقاً شمه. فلو قدمناهما لأوقمناهما
 موقعا لا يقع فيه الفاعل لأن الفاعل إذا قدمناه خرج
 عن أن يكون في تقدير فاعل نقل عنه الفاعل، إذ كان
 هذا موقعا لا يقع فيه الفاعل.

When dealing with the question of placing the hāl at the beginning of the sentence Ibn al-Sarrāj writes that the Basrans treat it like the tamyiz, and this would indicate that the general view of the Basrans of this period was that the tamyiz could be placed at the beginning of the sentence when the regent is a verb. ²⁵ Ibn al-Sarrāj, however, does not take this view and later scholars like Ibn al-Anbārī and Ibn Ya'īsh consider the view which he takes to be the true Basran one. ²⁶ In fact, there was always a division of opinion among Basran scholars on this point. ²⁷

Verb of wonder

The particular approach of the grammarians to the verb of wonder (fi'l al-ta'ajjub) led them to examine certain theoretical questions which their approach itself entailed. No single grammarian treats the theoretical questions raised by the verb of wonder in an exhaustive manner and there is a varying emphasis in the works of grammar on the different questions. It is of interest to see how al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj deal with this subject and to compare their approach with that of later grammarians.

In dealing with the theoretical aspects of the grammarians' approach to the verb of wonder it is particularly worth remembering that the approach of the Arab scholars was rather different from that which a scholar today might adopt. The latter might look at the verb of wonder in a manner similar to Wright who, in explanation of the

examples ما أَفْضَلَ زَيْدًا and أَفْضَلَ زَيْدٍ, writes: ²⁸

The first formula literally means: what has made Zeid excellent? can anything make him more excellent than he is? The second: make Z. excellent (if you can,—you cannot make him more excellent than he is); or, more literally: try (your ability at) making excellent upon (ب) Zeid.

The Arab grammarians did not attempt to interpret an expression such as ما أَحْسَنَ زَيْدًا as having the literal sense of "What has made Zayd excellent?", but representing, in fact, a standard formula for expressing wonder or astonishment. Rather, the majority of the Basrans followed and expanded the very briefly expressed view of al-Khalīl which Sibawayh cites in commenting on the expression ما أَحْسَنَ عِبْدَ اللَّهِ : ²⁹

زعم الخليل أنه بمنزلة قولك : شيء أحسن عبيد الله ،
ودخل معنى التعجب . وهذا تمثيل لم يتكلم به .

Although this view was accepted by the majority of the Basrans it is worth noting that there was a minority view held by the Kufan, al-Farrā', and the Basran, Ibn Durustawayh, that the term mā used in expressions like ما أَحْسَنَ زَيْدًا is, in fact, interrogative and this would appear to be a more reasonable explanation as has been mentioned. ³⁰

Al-Mubarrad begins his discussion of the verb of wonder by explaining how the example ما أَحْسَنَ زَيْدًا is to be parsed: ³¹

فما اسم مرتفع بالابتداء، وأحسن خبره وهو فعل
وزيد مفعول به، فمقديره : شيء أحسن زيدا، إلا
أن معنى التعجب دخله مع ما. ولا يكون ذلك في
شيء غير ما.

The explanation that mā replaces the term shay' was not accepted by those who held that mā must have a clause dependent on it (ṣilah) when used in senses other than its interrogative and conditional senses, but

al-Mubarrad argues that this view is mistaken: ³²

فإن قال قائل: هل رأيت ما تكون اسما بغير صلة إلا
في الجزاء والاستفهام؟ قيل له: إنما كانت في الجزاء
والاستفهام بغير صلة إذا قلت مجازيا: ما تصنع أصنع،
أو مستفهما: ما تصنع يا فتى، لأنك إنما تستفهم عما
تنكر، ولو كنت تحرف كنت مخبرا لا مستخبرا، والصلة
تعرفه. وكذلك الجزاء إذا قلت: ما تصنع أصنع،
لأنك أبهمته ولم تقصد إلى شيء واحد بعينه. فالحنى
من الإبهام الذي يكون في الجزاء والاستفهام كذلك
هو التجب لأنك إذا قلت: ما أحسن زيدا، فقد
أبهمت ذلك فيه ولم تخصص.

That the term mā is to be interpreted as having an understood ṣilah

is a view that was held by certain of the Kufans and is, according to

Ibn Ya'ish, the most generally accepted view attributed to al-Akhfash. ³³

Al-Mubarrad does explain this view but he does not specify who held it: ³⁴

وقد قال قوم: إن أحسن صلة لما والمخبر محذوفه.
وليس كما قالوا. وذلك أن الأخبار إنما تحذف إذا كان
في الكلام ما يدل عليها. وإنما هربوا من أن تكون
ما وهد ما اسما. فتقديرهم: الذي حسن زيدا شيء.
والقول فيها ما بدأنا به من أنها تجرى بغير صلة
لمضارعتها الاستفهام والجزاء في الإبهام.

Al-Mubarrad also takes up the question of why an expression of

the form ما أحسن زيدا should convey the idea of wonder and astonish-

ment: ³⁵

فإن قال قائل: فإذا قلت: ما أحسن زيدا، بمنزلة:

شيء حسن زيدا، فكيف دخل معنى التعجب، وليس ذلك في قولك: شيء أحسن زيدا؟ قيل له: قد يدخل المعنى في اللفظ ولا يدخل في نظيره. فمن ذلك قولهم: علم الله لأفطن. لفظه لفظ: رزق الله، ومعناه القسم. ومن ذلك قولهم: غفر الله لزيد. لفظه لفظ الخبر ومعناه الدعاء. ومن ذلك أنك تقول: قال الله لأفطن، فتقسم على معنى التعجب. ولا تدخل التاء على شيء من أسماء الله غير هذا الاسم لأن المعنى الذي يوجب التعجب إنما وقع هاهنا. وكل ما لزمه شيء على معنى لم يتصرف لأنه إن تصرف بطل ذلك المعنى ومار بمنزلة الأفعال التي تجرى على أمولها، ولم يدخلها من المعنى أكثر من ذلك.

In this passage al-Mubarrad makes the point that the verb of wonder is essentially a formulaic expression with a special meaning associated with it. Although Sibawayh does not go into detail on questions of theory connected with the verb of wonder, the line of argument which al-Mubarrad employs in the above passage can be found in the *Kitāb* used in other circumstances.³⁶ When dealing with the same point Ibn al-Sarrāj makes use of an analogy often employed by the grammarians because he likens the verb of wonder to proverbs which, as set expressions, have an affinity with the formulae used for expressing wonder.³⁷

When he deals with theory connected with the verb of wonder Ibn al-Sarrāj is much more concise than al-Mubarrad and, although he holds the same views, there are differences in the arguments which he uses. In explanation of how the verb of wonder is to be interpreted he writes:³⁸

فإذا قلت: ما أحسن زيدا، فما اسم مبتدأ وأحسن خبره وفيه ضمير الفاعل «زيد معحول به». وما هنا اسم تام غير موصول فكأنك قلت: شيء، حسن زيدا، ولم تصف أن الذي حسنه شيء، بعينه، فلذلك لزمها أن تكون مبهمه غير مخصوصة كما قالوا: شيء جاءك، أي: ما جاءك إلا شيء، وكذلك: شيء أهرّ ذا ناب، أي: ما أهرّ إلا شيء. ونظير ذلك: إني مما أن أفعل، يريد: إني من الأمر أن أفعل. فلما كان الأمر مجهولا جعلت ما بغير صلة. ولو وصلت لصار الاسم معلوما، وإنما لزم الفعل الماضي وهذه لأن التعجب إنما يكون مما وقع وثبت، ليس مما يمكن أن يكون ويمكن أن لا يكون.

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj introduces several analogies to support the contention that the term mā is indefinite when used with the verb of wonder. The analogy drawn from the expression إني مما أن أفعل is also discussed by al-Mubarrad who goes into more detail.³⁹ Ibn al-Sarrāj by way of analogy also makes use of the expression شيء جاءك and this analogy is also used by Ibn Ya'īsh in a slightly different form:⁴⁰

فتقول: ما أحسن زيدا... فما اسم مبتدأ في موضع الرفع. وهي هنا اسم غير موصول ولا موصوف بمعنى الشيء، كأنك قلت شيء، أحسن زيدا، ولم ترد شيئا بعينه. إنما هي مبهمه كما قالوا: شيء جاء بك، أي: ما جاء بك إلا شيء.

In a later passage Ibn Ya'īsh also makes use of the proverb which Ibn

al-Sarrāj cites, شر أهرّ ذاناب, " 'Tis an evildoer that makes a dog growl." 41

The view of the Arab grammarians on the nature of the verb of wonder has been compared above with that which scholars today would take and a point which Ibn al-Sarrāj makes throws particular light on the view of the majority of Arab scholars: 42

وانما لزم فعل التعجب لفظا واحدا ولم يُصَرَّف ليدلّ
على التعجب. ولولا ذلك لكان كسائر الأخبار لأنه
هنر ويدلّ على أنه خبر أنه يجوز لك أن تقول
فيه: صدق أو كذب.

Ibn al-Sarrāj takes the view that a sentence which contains a verb of wonder is a proposition admitting of truth or falsity. However, according to the modern interpretation a sentence like ما أحسن زيدا would be seen as having the outward form of a question and could not admit of truth or falsity. Even if the meaning of such a sentence is taken into account, which in English idiom would be "How excellent Zayd is!", the sentence is rather an exclamation or an ejaculation and not a proposition. However, for Ibn al-Sarrāj there is no question that a sentence like ما أحسن زيدا is not a proposition because its underlying meaning is شيء أحسن زيدا which clearly admits of being true or false.

Ibn Ya'ish takes this same consideration into account when discussing how the verb of wonder formed on the pattern أحسن زيد is to be analysed. The view of the majority of grammarians was that the verb of wonder formed on this pattern is not in fact an imperative but simply assumes the outward form of it. 43 Al-Zamakhsharī criticises this view as arbitrary and prefers to follow the view of al-Zajjāj that the verb is a true imperative. Commenting on the sentence

أكرم زيد he writes: 44

وعندي أن أسهل منه مأخذا أن يقال إنه أمر
لكل أحد بأن يجعل زيدا كريما، أي بأن يصفه
بالكرم.

Ibn Ya'ish, however, criticises this view on several counts and this includes the consideration that a sentence containing a verb of wonder forms a proposition: 45

إنه وإن كان بلفظ الأمر فليس بأمر وإنما هو خبر
كقولك للصدق والكذب، فيصح أن يقال في جوابه:
صدق أو كذبت، لأنه في معنى: حسن زيد جدا.

One of the rules which the grammarians lay down in dealing with the verb of wonder is that it can only be formed from verbs with a simple trilateral root and, accordingly, cannot be formed from quadriliterals and from augmented forms of the verb. Although both al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarraġ set down this rule, nevertheless, they have to account for expressions like ما أعطاه للراحم and ما أولاه ، where the verb of wonder is based on the sense of fourth form verbs. Sibawayh does mention briefly that the verb of wonder can be formed from the fourth form of the verb but he does not elaborate on this. 46 Later scholars, however, did not accept that the verb of wonder could be formed at will from the fourth form of the verb. 47

Neither al-Mubarrad nor Ibn al-Sarraġ satisfactorily account for expressions like the two quoted above. Ibn al-Sarraġ, for instance, writes: 48

فإن قال قائل: فقد قالوا: ما أعطاه - وهو أعطى
يعطى - وما أولاه بالخير، قيل: هذا على حذف
الزوائد لأن الأمل عطا يعطو إذا تناول، وأعطى
غيره إذا تناول. وكذلك ولي وأولى غيره.

Al-Mubarrad expands on this approach but his whole argument based on analogy is rather weak and not really to the point: 49

فإن قيل : فقد قلت : ما أعطاه للدرهم ، وأولاه
 بالمعروف ، وإنما هو من أعطى وأولى ، فهذا —
 وإن كان قد خرج إلى الأربعة — فإنما أصله الثلاثة
 والهمزة في أوله زائدة . وعلى هذا جاء : وَأَرْسَلْنَا
 الرِّيحَ لَوَافِحٍ ، ولو كان على لفظه لكان ملاحظ ، لأنه
 يقال : ألقيت فهي ملقحة ، ولكنه على حذف الزوائد
 ومن ذلك قوله :

يُخْرِجُنَّ مِنْ أَجْوَاذِ لَيْلٍ غَاضِي
 وإنما هو مُخْفِي . واستعمل بحذف زيادته . ومثل
 ذلك قوله :

تَكْشِفُ عَنْ جَمَاتِهِ دَلُّ الدَّالِ
 يريد : المولى . ومن ذلك حذفك جميع الزوائد إذا
 اهتجت إلى حذفها في تصغير أو جمع أو اضطر إليه
 الشاعر ، كما قال العجاج :

وَمَهْمَةٌ حَالِكٌ مِّنْ تَعَرَّجَا
 إنما هو مهلاك في بعض الأقاويل .

Here al-Mubarrad bases his argument on unsatisfactory analogies which are drawn from what are really debatable points of lexicography. 50

Both al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarraj attempt to explain anomalous formation of the verb of wonder but they offer no consistent explanation of this. Ibn Ya'ish on the other hand puts forward a rather simple and obvious explanation: 51

وقد قالوا : ما أعطاه الدرهم ، وأولاه للخير . فهذا
 ونحوه مفسود على السماع عند سيبويه ، لا يجوز

منه إلا ما تكلمت به العرب. فالتحجب من فعل
قياس مطرد ومن أفعل مسموع لا يجاوز ما
ورد عن العرب.

Although Ibn Ya'īsh cites Sibawayh in support of his view, it seems clear that the latter does permit the verb of wonder to be formed regularly from the fourth form of the verb and al-Astarabādhī states specifically that this is the view of Sibawayh. ⁵²

Although al-Mubarrad, Ibn al-Sarrāj, and Ibn Ya'īsh admit the possibility of forming the verb of wonder from the fourth form of the verb, a later grammarian like Abū Hayyān also lists examples of the verb of wonder formed anomalously from augmented forms of the verb other than the fourth: ⁵³

وأما إن كان ثلاثياً مزيداً ... إن كان على وزن غير
وزن أفعل فلا يجوز أن يصاغ منه أفعل ولا أفعل.
وتشد من ذلك ما أخناه وما أفقره وما أتقاه وما
أقومه وما أمكنه وما أملاه وما آمله وما أشده وما
أهوله وما أخصره وما أشهاه وما أحياه وما أرفعه
من استغنى وافتقر وأتقى واستقام وتمكن وامتلأ
وتأجل واشتد واهتال واختصر واشتهى واستحيا
وارتفع.

The appearance of such usages in later works may be due to the fact that further study of early poetry had revealed them, or they may represent usages current in the language but which were so anomalous in the eyes of earlier grammarians that they ignored them.

From time to time in works of Arabic grammar there are discussions of points which are in a broad sense theological in nature and in

al-Mubarrad's chapter on the verb of wonder certain such points are discussed in detail. An examination of his treatment of such questions provides excellent examples of his rather discursive style and his tendency to digress. The standard Basran explanation of the verb of wonder is capable of producing some theological argument and al-Mubarrad deals with this point: 54

فإن قال قائل: رأيت قولك: ما أحسن زيدا، ليس في التقدير والإعمال — لا في التعجب — بمنزلة قولك: شئ حسن زيدا. فكيف تقول هذا في قولك: ما أعظم الله يا فتى، وما أكبر الله؟ قيل له: التقدير على ما وصفت لك والمعنى: شئ عظيم الله يا فتى، وذلك الشئ، الناس الذين يصفونه بالعظمة، كقولك: كبرت كبيرا، وعظمت عظيما. فإن قال قائل: فينتصب هذا من حيث انتصب زيد، قيل له: لا شئ من الأفعال ينتصب على معنى الآخر بأكثر من الفاعل والمفعول به. ألا ترى أنك تقول: شتمت زيدا، وأكرمت عمرا، فالفعل الناصب جنس واحد والمعنى مختلف.

وليس شئ يُخبر به عن الله — عز وجل — إلا على خلاف ما تخبر به عن غيره في المعنى. وحينئذ الفعل واحد في الإعمال. فمن ذلك ما أذكره لك ليدل على سائر إن شاء الله. وهو نحو قولك: رحم الله الناس، ورحم زيد عمرا، فالرحمة من زيد رقة وتحنن، والله يجل عنها. وكذلك علم الله، وهو عالم بنفسه. وتقول: علم زيد علما، وإنما ذلك علم جهل

فيه وأدب اكتسبه . وكذلك جميع ما تخبر به .
 وإذا كان زيد مفعولا قلت : لقيت زيدا ،
 ورأيت عمرا . وتقول : ذكرت الله فإنما تعنى أن
 ذكرتك كان لهذا الاسم . وكذلك دعوت الله .
 صحارح الأطفال واهدة في الإعمال والمطاني
 تختلف . فعلى هذا يجري التقدير فيما ذكرت
 لك .

Although al-Mubarrad does not say so the point which gives rise to the above discussion is in fact one of the Kufan objections to the Basran explanation of the verb of wonder. 55

Another point which raises difficulties of a theological nature, and which al-Mubarrad discusses, is the apparent use in the Qur'an of the verb of wonder with reference to the state of mind of God himself. When discussing the verb of wonder of the pattern *أحمن زيد* al-Mubarrad writes: 56

وسى هذا الباب قول الله عز وجل : أَسْمِعْ بِهِمْ وَأَبْصِرْ
 ولا يقال لله - عز وجل - تعجب . ولكنه طرح
 على كلام العباد ، أى هؤلاء ، من يجب أن يقال
 لهم : يا أسمعهم وأبصرهم فى ذلك الوقت .
 ومثل ذلك قوله : فَقُولَا لَهُ قَوْلًا لَيْنًا لَعَلَّهُ
 يَتَذَكَّرُ أَوْ يَخْشَى ، ولعل إنما هى للترهيب . ولا يقال
 ذلك لله . ولكن المعنى - والله أعلم - اذهبنا على
 رجاؤكما وقولا القول الذى ترهوان به . ويرهوبه
 المخلوقون تذكر ما طالبوه .
 وأما قوله : فَمَا أَصْبَرَهُمْ عَلَى النَّارِ ، فليس

من هذا ولكنه - والله أعلم - التقرير والتوبيخ.
 وتقديره: أى شىء أصبرهم على النار، أى دعاهم
 إليها واضطرهم إليها كما تقول: صبرت
 زيدا على القتل. ونهى رسول الله صلى الله عليه
 وسلم أن يصبر الروح. ومثل ذلك قوله:

قُلْتُ لَهُ: أَصْبَرَهَا دَائِمًا أَمَّا لِبِسْطَامِ بْنِ قَيْسٍ قَلِيلٌ

فهذا مجازه، ولا يقال لله عز وجل لأنه إنما
 يعجب من يرد عليه ما لا يعلمه ولا يقدره.
 فيتعجب كيف وقع مثله. وعلام الضيوب يجل عن هذا.

Notes to Chapter VI

- 1 Sibawayh, vol. i, pp. 104-8, 298-300.
- 2 Al-Farrā', vol. i, pp. 79, 225-6.
- 3 Khalaf al-Ahmar, Muqaddimah fi l-nahw (Damascus, 1961), p. 58. For Khalaf al-Ahmar see Kahhālah, vol. iv, p. 104.
- 4 See Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 70.
- 5 See art. cited p. 78, n. 43 above.
- 6 See pp. 98-9 above.
- 7 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 268-76, 375-82; see also pp. 189, 374-5.
- 8 See pp. 65-73 above.
- 9 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 70.
- 10 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, p. 32.
- 11 Ibid., p. 34.
- 12 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 269.
- 13 Ibid., pp. 274-5.
- 14 See al-Astarābādhi, vol. i, pp. 216-22.
- 15 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 299.
- 16 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, p. 35; see also p. 67.
- 17 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 378-9.
- 18 Ibid., pp. 273-4, 376-7.
- 19 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 73. See also p. 181, n. 21 (d) below.
- 20 Abū Ḥayyān, p. 226. See p. 43 above.
- 21 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iii, pp. 36-7.
- 22 Ibid., p. 36, n. 2.
- 23 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 238. See also Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 105.
- 24 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 74.
- 25 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 261.
- 26 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 351-3; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, pp. 73-4.
- 27 See Abū Ḥayyān, pp. 228-30.
- 28 Wright, vol. i, p. 98C.

- 29 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 37.
- 30 Abū Ḥayyān, p. 370; see also Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 149.
- 31 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, p. 173.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Abū Ḥayyān, p. 370; Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 149; Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 116.
- 34 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, p. 177.
- 35 Ibid., p. 175; see also p. 177.
- 36 See Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 419.
- 37 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 116.
- 38 Ibid., p. 115. In l. 10 of this passage لزم has been substituted for لزم in the printed text.
- 39 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, pp. 174-5.
- 40 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 142.
- 41 Ibid., p. 146.
- 42 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 114-5.
- 43 See Abū Ḥayyān, p. 371; Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 148.
- 44 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 147.
- 45 Ibid., p. 148.
- 46 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 37.
- 47 See Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, pp. 146-7.
- 48 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 116.
- 49 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, pp. 178-80.
- 50 See *ibid.*, editor's notes.
- 51 Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 144.
- 52 Sibawayh, vol. i, p. 37; vol. ii, pp. 251-2; al-Astarābādhi, vol. ii, p. 308.
- 53 Abū Ḥayyān, p. 347. See also Wright, vol. i, p. 99B.
- 54 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, pp. 176-7. Ll 8-10 of this passage are somewhat difficult to understand although the general point is quite clear.
- 55 See Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, p. 67.
- 56 Al-Mubarrad, vol. iv, pp. 183-4.

CHAPTER VII

THE UṢŪL AND THE KUFAN SCHOOL OF GRAMMARThe Kufans

The Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj represents the earliest extant Basran source of information on the Kufan school. Although the Kufan school was in existence by the time of Sibawayh there is no reference in the Kitāb to the views of Kufan scholars and the next major Basran grammar, the Muqtaḍab of al-Mubarrad, only mentions the Kufans by name once.¹ However, in the Uṣūl the grammatical views of the Kufans and their leading scholars, al-Kisā'i and al-Farrā', are frequently mentioned and commented upon. Although the Uṣūl is the earliest Basran source of information on the Kufans, Kufan views on many questions of grammar can be obtained from an actual Kufan source, the Ma'ānī l-Qur'an of al-Farrā'.² However, this does not detract from the value of the Uṣūl as an early source for Kufan grammatical thought because it provides much information that cannot be found in the Ma'ānī l-Qur'an.

In his Introduction to the Kitāb al-inṣāf Weil observes that the points at issue between the two schools of Basrah and Kufah are portrayed in this work as they appeared to the grammarians of Ibn al-Anbārī's day.³ For this reason the study of much earlier works provides information about the differences between the Basrans and Kufans when the issues were still being debated. In fact, the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj is a product of the period when the first monographs were composed which dealt with the points at issue between the schools, and to which the later works of al-'Ukbarī and Ibn al-Anbārī are almost certainly

indebted.⁴ These first monographs seem to have been completely lost and for this reason the Uṣūl is the only work from the same period which deals with points at issue between the schools.

However, the Uṣūl is a work primarily intended for students of grammar at an early stage in their studies and for this reason it does not provide the detailed information on disputes between the Basrans and Kufans which specialised treatises would have provided. Nevertheless, it is still of value to compare the information about the views of the Kufans which is found in the Uṣūl with that which is to be found in later sources.

An examination of the material about the Kufans contained in the Uṣūl also permits a check to be made on the accuracy of later sources, although it must be said that the simple facts concerning the main points where the Kufans differed from the Basrans were too well known for that to be inaccurately recorded. The principal sources of information on the Kufan school have been the Kitāb al-insāf of Ibn al-Anbārī and the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal of Ibn Ya'īsh but to a large extent these two works only cover the main questions on which the Kufans had their own view. However, the Uṣūl provides information on the views of the Kufans and their leading scholars, al-Kisā'ī and al-Farra', on many points which the two former works do not deal with. It is also worth mentioning in this connection that the Manhaj al-sālik of Abū Hayyān is another work which records the views of the Kufans on many points which are not usually mentioned in other works, but it is a very much later work than the Uṣūl.

The attitude towards the Kufan school of scholars who lived long after its heyday is well-known from works like the Kitāb al-insāf of Ibn al-Anbārī in which criticisms of the Kufans and their ideas abound. In the Iqtirāḥ al-Suyūṭī gathers a selection of views on the Kufan school which are more or less severely critical but he does begin with

a balanced appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the Basrans and Kufans respectively based on the consensus view of the scholars: ⁵

اتفقوا على أن البصريين أصح قياساً لأنهم لا
يلتفتون إلى كل مسموع ولا يقيسون على الشاذ
والكوفيون أوسع رواية. قال ابن جنى: الكوفيون
علّامون بأشعار العرب مطلقون عليها. وقال أبو
حيان... ولسنا متعبدين باتباع مذهب البصريين
بل نتبع الدليل. وقال الأندلسي في شرح المفصل:
الكوفيون لو سمعوا بيتاً واحداً في هواز شئ
مخالف للأصول جعلوه أصلاً وبووا عليه بخلاف
البصريين. قال. وما اقتضوا البصريون على
الكوفيين أن قالوا: نحن نأخذ اللغة من هرشة
الضباب وأكلة اليرابيع وأنتم تأخذونها من أكلة
الشوايرز وباعة الكواصيح.

As this passage shows the Arab grammarians were often critical of usages which the Kufans allowed and in this Ibn al-Sarrāj was no exception. For Ibn al-Sarrāj and for all the Basran grammarians the twin foundations on which grammatical studies were based were samā⁶ (attested usage) and qiyās (analogy), and with regard to these two principles Ibn al-Sarraḡ criticises usages which the Kufans allow.

In discussing the use of the damīr al-shaḡn in sentences of the type ظننته زيد قائم Ibn al-Sarrāj observes that the Kufans put the participle, which they call the fi'l dā'im, into the accusative if it is placed adjacent to the pronoun: ⁶

والكوفيون يجيرون إذا ولي هذه الهاء فعل دائم
النصب، فيقولون: ظننت قائماً زيد. ولا أعرف

لذلك وجهها في القياس ولا السماع من العرب

Unfortunately, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not give any reason why the Kufans permit this usage and he abruptly rejects it as inconsistent with qiyās and not founded upon samā' and he offers no further explanation of this.

Another Kufan usage which Ibn al-Sarrāj rejects for the same reasons is the use of the definite article with the ḥāl in a construction of the type مررت بزيد واقفا—a construction which the Kufans parse in a different way than the Basrans do: ⁷

وتقول: مررت بزيد واقفا، فنصب واقفا على الحال.
والكوفيون يجيزون نصبه على الخبر ويجعلونه
كنصب خبر كان وخبر ظن. ويجيزون فيه
إدخال الألف واللام.... وهذا الذي أجازوه غير
معروف عندي من كلام العرب ولا موجود في ما
يوجب القياس.

On another occasion Ibn al-Sarrāj attacks the Kufans for not being able to differentiate between the parts of speech and for not having a proper appreciation of what is common in speech and what is unusual. This criticism is made after Ibn al-Sarrāj has given a Kufan list of prepositions and it is worth quoting the list to show how unfair on occasions Basran criticisms of the Kufans could be: ⁸

واعلم أن الأشياء التي يسميها البصريون ظروفًا
يسميها الكسائي صفة والفراء يسميها محالًا ويخلطون
الأسماء بالحروف فيقولون: حروف الخفض أمام وقدم
وخلف وقبل وبعد وتلقاء وتجاه وهذا وإزاء ووراء
محدودات ومع وعن وفي وعلى ومن وإلى... وميتاء
وميتاء ولاهني واحد محدود ومنامقصور بمنزلة هذا

ولدى فيخلطون الحروف والأسماء والشاذ بالشائع
وقد تقدم تبيين الفرق بين الاسم والحرف وبين
الشاذ والمستعمل.

Ibn al-Sarrāj criticises the Kufans here because the list purports to be one of particle-prepositions (*huruf al-khafd*) but contains many noun-prepositions (*zuruf*) and he implies that the Kufans do not know the difference between particle and noun. However, there is every evidence that the term harf was used in a more general sense than just to mean particle and could apply as here to a noun or even to a verb.⁹ The strictest of Basran grammarians may have avoided using the term harf loosely for any part of speech but it is not a sign of incompetence as a grammarian not to do so. The second criticism which Ibn al-Sarrāj levels against the Kufans on the basis of the above list is that they confuse what is rare and unusual in speech with what is normal and current. Although the list may contain some expressions of infrequent occurrence they are lexically sound and would merit inclusion in any account of Arabic prepositions which aims at completeness.

One point at issue between the Kufans and the Basrans was that the former permitted the formation of the relative from the roots b-y-d and s-w-d whereas the latter did not and treated them like all other roots denoting colour.¹⁰ To justify their view the Kufans would cite evidentiary verses but the Basrans considered that such verses constituted no authority for the usage but merely represented a poetic licence which was not to be followed. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions one such verse and he relates al-Mubarrad's view both on the verse and on the sort of scholars who use such verses as grammatical evidence:¹¹

وقد أنشد بعض الناس

يَا لَيْتَنِي مِثْلَكَ فِي الْبَيَاضِ أَيْضًا مِنْ أَهْلِ بَنِي إِبَاضٍ

قال أبو العباس (المبرد) : هذا معمول على فساد .
 وليس البيت الشاذ والكلام المحفوظ بأدنى إسناد
 هجة على الأصل المجمع عليه في كلام ولا نحو ولا فقه .
 وإنما يركن إلى هذا ضعفة أهل النحو ومن لا هجة
 معه . وتأويل هذا وما أشبهه في الإعراب كتأويل
 ضعفة أصحاب الحديث وأتباع القصاص في الفقه .

Although this particular criticism is not directed against the Kufans by name it is very much in the spirit of the criticisms which the Basrans made of the Kufans, and the usage in particular which leads to the general criticism of unsound scholarship is one allowed by the Kufans.

As has been shown, in the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj relates and criticises usages allowed by the Kufans but he does not usually provide detailed information on the issues between the Basrans and Kufans of the type which can be found in the Kitāb al-insāf of Ibn al-Anbarī. However, this is not always the case as is the case with the dispute over whether sentences of the type إِنَّ زَيْدًا وَعَمْرُو قَائِمَانِ are admissible. When dealing with the particle inna Ibn al-Sarrāj writes: ¹²

والفراء يجيز: إِنَّ هَذَا زَيْدٌ قَائِمَانِ، وَإِنَّ الَّذِي عِنْدَكَ
 زَيْدٌ قَائِمَانِ، وَإِنَّكَ زَيْدٌ قَائِمَانِ، إِذَا كَانَ اسْمُ إِنْ
 لَا يَتَّبِعِينَ فِيهِ الْإِعْرَابُ نَحْوُ هَذَا وَمَا ذَكَرْنَا فِي
 هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةِ. وَعَلَى ذَلِكَ يَنْشُدُونَ هَذَا الْبَيْتَ

مَنْ يَلِكُ أُمْسَى بِالسَّيْنَةِ رَهْلُهُ خَانِي وَقِيَارٌ بِهَا لَعْرِيْبُ

فيرفع قيارا وينصب، وكذلك لو قال: العريبان،
 فأفراد الفعل وتثنيته في هذا عندهم سواء .

والكسائي يجيز الرفع في الاسم الثاني مع الظاهر والملكي.
فإن نعت اسم إن أو أكرته أو أبدلته منه فالنصب
عندنا لا يجوز غيره وإنما الرفع جاء عندنا على
الغلط.

From this passage it emerges that al-Kisā'i from among the Kufans
supports a usage of the type إن زيدا وعمرو قائمان.

Ibn al-Sarraj undertakes to refute the types of usage supported
in this passage at a later point in the Usūl in the course of his
chapter on العطف على الموضع . After discussing the alternative
constructions لست بقائم ولا قاعدا and لست بقائم ولا قاعد
he turns to the construction 13 : إن زيدا في الدار وعمرو

ومن ذلك: إن زيدا في الدار وعمرو، ولو أسقطت
إن لكان: زيد في الدار وعمرو، فإن مع ما عملت فيه
في موضع الرفع. وينبغي أن تعلم أنه ليس لك أن
تعطف على الموضع الذي فيه هرف عامل إلا بعد تمام
الكلام من قبل أن العطف نظير التثنية والجمع.
ألا ترى أن معنى قولك: قام الزيدان، إنما هو: قام
زيد وزيد، فلما كان العاملان مشتركين في الاسم
ثنيا، ولو اختلفا لم يصلح فيهما إلا الواو. فكنت
تقول: قام زيد وعمرو، فالدار نظير التثنية وإنما
تدخل إذا لم تكن التثنية. فلما لم يكن يجوز أن
يجتمع في التثنية الرفع والنصب ولا الرفع والحذف،
ولا أن يعمل في المثني عاملان، كذلك لم يجوز في
المعطوف والمعطوف عليه. فإذا تم الكلام عطفت
على العامل الأول وكنت مقدرًا إعادته، وإن لا تفيده

في اللفظ لأنك مستغن عنه . ألا ترى أنه لا يجوز أن
تقول إن زيدا وعمرو منطلقان . لما خبرتك به ولأن
قولك منطلقان يصير خبر لرفوع و منصوب وهذا
مستحيل . فإذا قلت : إن زيدا منطلق وعمرو . صلح
لأن الكلام قدّم ورفضت لأن الموضع للابتداء وإن
زائدة فعطفت على موضع إن وأعملت الابتداء
و أضمرت الخبر وهذفته اجترأ بأن الأول يدل
عليه .

Although Ibn al-Sarrāj gives considerable attention to refuting Kufan usages of the type *إن زيدا وعمرو قائمان* , there are various other aspects to this issue but in his actual refutation Ibn al-Sarrāj is very thorough. ¹⁴

Another of the points at issue between the Basrans and Kufans was whether it is permissible to say *طعامك ما زيد آكلا* . This is a question discussed by Ibn al-Anbari in the *Kitāb al-inṣāf* but in his notes Weil is not able to cite any alternative sources of information on this point. ¹⁵ However, in the *Uṣūl* Ibn al-Sarrāj deals with this question:

وأما الكوفيون فيجيزون : طعامك ما زيد آكلا ،
يشبهونها (ما) بلم ولن . وأباه البصريون .
وهجة البصريين أنهم لا يوقعون المفعول إلا حيث
يصلح لخاصية أن يقع . فلما لم يجز أن يتقدم
الفعل على ما لم يجز أن يتقدم ما عمل فيه الفعل .
والفرق بين ما وبين لم ولن أن لم ولن لا يليهما
إلا الفعل فصارتا مع الفعل بمنزلة هموف الفعل .

Although Ibn al-Anbarī devotes a little more space to this question

he in fact adds little to what Ibn al-Sarrāj writes but rather expands his subject matter to suit his format in presenting the Basran-Kufan controversies.

It seems clear that Ibn al-Sarrāj did take an interest in developing the sort of detailed arguments against Kufan views which can be found recorded in the Kitab al-inṣāf, although the Uṣūl itself does not give any detail on this. One of the most prominent controversies between the two schools was whether the verb is derived from the infinitive or vica-versa. The Basrans took the former view and the Kufans the latter. In the Īdāh 'ilal al-naḥw of al-Zajjājī there is a section devoted to this question and he attributes one of the arguments in favour of the Basran position to Ibn al-Sarrāj: 16

دليل آخر للبصريين كان أبو بكر بن السراج
يستدل به، قال: لو كانت المصادر مأخوذة من
الأفعال جارية عليها لوجب ألا تختلف كما لا
تختلف أسماء الفاعلين والمفعولين الجارية على
الأفعال نحو ضارب مضروب وشاتم ومشتوم
ومكرم ومكرم وما أشبه ذلك مما لا ينكسر ورأينا
المصادر تختلفها أكثر مما جاء منها على الفعل كقولنا
شرب شربا وشربا ومضربا وشرابا، وعدل عن الحق
عدلا وعدولا، وما أشبه ذلك. علمنا أنها غير
جارية على الأفعال وأن الأفعال ليست بأصولها.

It is of interest by way of comparison to cite Ibn al-Anbārī's treatment of the same line of argument in defence of the Basran position: 17

ومنهم من تصمك بأن قال الدليل على أن المصدر
ليس مشتقا من الفعل أنه لو كان مشتقا منه لكان

يجب أن يجرى على سَنَنِ فِي الْقِيَاسِ وَلَمْ يَخْتَلَفْ
 كَمَا لَمْ يَخْتَلَفْ أَسْمَاءُ الْفَاعِلِينَ وَالْمَفْعُولِينَ . فَلَمَّا
 اختلف المصدر اختلف الأجناس كالرجل والثوب
 والتراب والماء والزيت وسائر الأجناس دلّ على
 أنه غير مشتق من الفعل .

In his treatment of the point Ibn al-Anbārī does not mention the name of Ibn al-Sarrāj and this illustrates the tendency of later writers to obscure the individual contribution of earlier scholars to grammatical thought. It is also of interest to note how the later scholar treats the argument. With Ibn al-Sarrāj the line of argument is based purely on linguistic considerations but with Ibn al-Anbārī it assumes a pseudo-philosophical veneer because he draws on logic to liken the various forms of the infinitive to the genera of the logicians.

The Baghdadis

As well as making reference to the famous grammatical schools of the Basrans and the Kufans, the Arab writers on grammar also refer from time to time to a group called the Baghdadis.¹⁸ From the evidence available it is clear that if the expression "the Baghdadis" is not to be understood merely as an alternative name for the Kufans, it must refer to a group of scholars closely connected in outlook with the Kufan school. Evidence can be brought forward for the view that the expression "the Baghdadis" is no more than an alternative name for the Kufans and this evidence may seem conclusive, but on further examination the identification of the Baghdadis does not appear to be such a simple matter.

In the Muqtadab al-Mubarrad does not mention the Baghdadis at all and, indeed, a solitary reference to the Kufans is the only occasion

on which he mentions by name a party of grammarians other than the Basrans. ¹⁹ Ibn Qutaybah, an exact contemporary of al-Mubarrad, mentions the Baghdadis four times in the Adab al-kātib but the Baghdadis are the only group of grammarians mentioned in this work other than the Basrans and, from Ibn Qutaybah's use of the term, it must be understood as a simple alternative name for the Kufans. ²⁰ Since the leading Kufan scholars were by residence intimately associated with Baghdad and its intellectual life, it is not unnatural that they should also take their name from that city.

Two of the occasions on which the Baghdadis are mentioned by Ibn Qutaybah are of particular interest: ²¹

ورثأت فلانا، إذا قلت فيه مرثية. هذا قول
البصريين، الأخص وغيره. وأما الفراء وغيره من
البغداديين فيجعلونه من غلطهم مثل: هلأت
السويق.

and:

قال البصريون تقدير الانسان فعلان... وقال
بعض البغداديين: أصل فيه الانسيان على زنة
إنعلان فحذفت الياء استخفافا لكثرة ما يجري
على المنتمين.

In the first passage one of the leading Kufan scholars, al-Farra', is expressly described as one of the Baghdadis which would mean that those Ibn Qutaybah calls the Baghdadis are in fact the Kufans. In the second passage the derivation of the word insān is discussed and certain of the Baghdadis are said to oppose the Basrans, but in the discussion of this point in the Kitāb al-Insāf it is the Kufans who oppose the Basran view. ²²

If the Adab al-kātib is a work which supports the view that the

Kufans and the Baghdadis are one and the same group of scholars, there is information in other works which would lead to a rejection of this view. In the Uḡul there are a number of references to the Baghdadis apart from the much more frequent references to the Kufans and it does appear from this work that some distinction is drawn between the two groups.²³ A discussion of a number of the occasions on which the Baghdadis are referred to provides a further opportunity to consider the treatment in the Uḡul of the views of grammarians outside of the Basran tradition.

On one occasion when Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions the Baghdadis he does identify them with the Kufan school. The grammarians do not consider sentences in which there is a use of two relative pronouns following each other to be supported by attested usage, although such sentences are constructed as an exercise. Dealing with this point Ibn al-Sarrāj writes:²⁴

وكذا يقول البغداديون الذين على مذهب
الكوفيين يقولون : إنه ليس من كلام العرب .
ويذكرون أنه إن اختلف جاز . وينشدون :
مِنَ النَّفْرِ الَّذِي الَّذِينَ إِذَا هُمْ
يَهَابُ النَّاسَ حَلَقَةَ الْبَابِ فَصَفَعُوا

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions "the Baghdadis who follow the Kufans". How this is to be interpreted is not quite clear for either it could refer to a group of Baghdadis who follow the Kufans or it could mean that the Baghdadis in general follow the Kufans.

On another occasion in the Uḡul the Kufans and the Baghdadis are mentioned side by side:²⁵

ومذهب الكوفيين والبغداديين في إن التي تجاب

باللام يقولون : هي بمنزلة ما وإلا وقد قال
 الفراء : إنها بمنزلة قد وقد دخل أبدا على آخر
 الكلام نحو قولك : إن زيدا قائم ، تريد : ما زيد
 إلا قائم . وقد قيل إنه يريد : قد قام زيد . وكذلك :
 إن ضرب زيد لعصرا ، وإن أكل زيد لطحامك . وكان
 الكسائي يقول : هي مع الأسماء والصفات - يعنى
 بالصفات الظروف - إن المشقة خُففت ومع
 الأفعال بمعنى ما وإلا .

The point dealt with here is the grammatical analysis of sentences containing what the grammarians call in al-mukhaffafah which is followed by lām al-fāriqah.²⁶ At the beginning of the passage the Kufans and the Baghdadis are grouped together as if they were two distinct parties of grammarians with similar views on the point under discussion. The only two scholars mentioned by name are al-Kisā'i and al-Farrā' who are in fact Kufan scholars.

On certain occasions Ibn al-Sarrāj does follow the Baghdadis in their views. When discussing the verb of wonder one of the questions which the grammarians turn to is the use with it of various auxiliary verbs. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses admissible use of certain auxiliary verbs after the verb of wonder:²⁷

ولا يجوز : ما أحسن ما ليس زيد ، ولا : ما أحسن ما
 زال زيد ، كما جاز لك ذلك في كان . ولكن يجوز : ما
 أحسن ما ليس يذكر زيد ، وما أحسن ما لا يزال
 يذكرنا زيد . وهذا مذهب البغداديين .

Unfortunately, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not give any more information on the usage which he and the Baghdadis permit. The use of kāna alone from among verbs of its type after the verb of wonder is a usage which is

generally recognised by the grammarians, and on this Ibn Ya'ish writes: 28

وقد قالوا: ما أحسن ما كان زيد. ترفع زيدا هنا
لا غير وكان تامة هنا وزيد فاعل. وما مع الفعل
مصدر والتقدير: ما أحسن كون زيد.

Another example of a Baghdadi view being accepted is seen in a discussion of the vowelling of أَنَّ where Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes al-Mubarrad who gives the Baghdadi view which he accepts as being based on qiyās: 29

قال ابو الصباني (المبرد) — رحمه الله: والبخاريون
يقولون: والله أن زيدا منطلق، فيفتحون أن. وهو
عندي قياس لأنه قسم فكأنه قال: أهدى بالله
على ذلك، أشهد أنك منطلق.

On this point Abū Hayyān has some interesting information in the Manhaj al-sālik; in commenting on the view of Ibn Mālik that after an oath إِنَّ, when unaccompanied by the particle la, may be vowelled both as inna and anna, he writes: 30

والمذاهب في ذلك أربعة (١) إجازتهما واختيار الفتح
وهو مذهب الكمائي والبخاريين (٢) وإجازتهما واختيار
الكسر (٣) ووجوب الفتح وهو مذهب الفراء (٤) ووجوب
الكسر وهو الذي صححه أصحابنا وهو القياس وبه ورد
السمع وهو مذهب البصريين.

It should be noted that although this passage from the Manhaj al-sālik expressly deals with أَنَّ unaccompanied by the particle la, the same is the case with the passage from the Uḡul as the example shows, even if this is not expressly stated. When أَنَّ was used in

oaths and the particle la followed the vowelling inna was accepted without controversy. Although Abū Hayyān mentions the views of the two leading Kufan scholars, he does not mention the Kufans as a group but he gives the view of the Baghdadis as does the Uṣūl. Ibn al-Sarrāj, quoting al-Mubarrad, merely states that the Baghdadis favour the use of anna, but Abū Hayyān adds that they found the use of inna acceptable. Although al-Mubarrad favours the Baghdadi view, Ibn al-Sarrāj writes earlier in the Uṣūl that the vowelling inna is to be used at all times in oaths, and this would agree with what is the best Basran view. ³¹

Although al-Mubarrad accepts the Baghdadi view on this occasion, Ibn al-Sarrāj does quote al-Mubarrad being highly critical of the Baghdadi view of the nature and power of government of the exceptive particle illa: ³²

قال ابو العباس (المبرد) - رحمه الله : يزعم البغداديون
 أن قولهم إلا في الاستثناء إنما هي إن ولا ولكنهم
 حققوا إن لكثرة الاستعمال ويقولون : إذا قلنا :
 ما جاءني إله إلا زيد ، فإنما رفعنا زيدا بلا وإن نصبنا
 بيان . ونحن في ذلك مخبرون في هذا لأنه قد اجتمع
 عاملا ، إن ولا ، فحس نحمل أيهما شئنا . وكذلك يقولون :
 جاءني القوم إلا زيد وإلا زيدا . ولا يعرفون ما تقول نحن أن
 رفعه على الوصف في معنى غير . فيلزمهم أن يقولوا : ما
 جاءني إلا زيدا ، إذا عملوا إن وهم لا يقولون به .
 فسألناهم : لم ذلك ، فقالوا لأن أهد مضمرة . قلت :
 ذلك أهدر أن يجوز أن نصب كما يجوز إذا أظهرت
 أهدا . ولم يكن في ذلك وما يتولد فيه من مسائل ^{جديدة}
 وهذا فاسد من كل وجه ذكرنا إياه يجعل له حظا فيما

يلتفت إليه. ويجب على قولهم أن تنصب النكرات
في الاستثناء بلا تنوين لأن لا تنصب النكرات بلا
تنوين.

The view quoted here on the nature of illa and its power of government is described in later works like the Kitāb al-inṣāf as a Kufan view held by al-Farrā' in particular.³³ Al-Mubarrad's attack on this position is based on the fact that it is quite obviously inconsistent, whereas in the Kitāb al-inṣāf Ibn al-Anbarī's attack is rather more formal and theoretical:³⁴

... كل حرفين ركب أحدهما مع الآخر فإنه يبطل حكم
كل واحد منهما عما كان عليه في حالة الإفراد. ويحدث
لهما بالتركيب حكم آخر. ومما هذا بمنزلة الأدرية
المركبة من أشياء مختلفة فإنه يبطل حكم كل واحد منهما
في حالة الإفراد ويحدث لهما بالتركيب حكم آخر.
وهو (الفراء) لا يقول في إلا كذلك، بل يرغم أن كل
واحد من الحرفين باق على أصله وعمله بعد التركيب
كما كان قبل التركيب.

Kufan influences on the Uṣūl

In a previous chapter a passage has been cited from Yāqūt in which he quotes al-Marzubānī who considers that Ibn al-Sarrāj derived the contents of the Uṣūl from the Kitāb of Sibawayh, "although he relied in it on the Masā'il of al-Akhfash and on Kufan ideas and opposed Basran principles in many matters...."³⁵ The idea that Ibn al-Sarrāj is indebted in the Uṣūl to Kufan grammatical thought is patently untrue because a study of this work leads to no other conclusion than that Ibn al-Sarrāj was a scholar firmly within the Basran tradition.

However, there are indications that Ibn al-Sarrāj was not uninfluenced by Kufan grammatical thought.

When demonstrative pronouns are used to begin sentences and are followed by a noun a further element may be added and treated as a ḥāl as in هذا أخوك قائماً, although the final element may equally correctly be put into the nominative.³⁶ Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of sentences of this type seems on certain points to be influenced by the Kufans' approach to this topic. After explaining why it is necessary to use an accusative of the ḥāl alone in a sentence of the type هذا الصبي مقبلاً in which a proper noun follows the demonstrative, Ibn al-Sarrāj continues:³⁷

وإن كان الاسم ليس يعلم ولكنه واحد ليس له ثان
 كان الخبر أيضا منصوبا كقولك : هذا القصر منيرا
 وهذه الشمس طالعة. وكذلك إن أردت بالاسم أن
 تجمله يعم الجنس كله ويكون إخبارك عن واحد
 كإخبارك عن جميعه، كان الخبر منصوبا كقولك : هذا
 الأسد مهيبا وهذه العقرب مخوفة، إذا لم ترد
 عقربا تراها ولا أسدا تشير إليه من صائر الأسد.

The particular attention given to the sort of sentences discussed in this passage and the prescribing of the accusative in them seems to stem from the Kufan approach to sentences introduced by the demonstrative pronoun. The use of the accusative in the examples in the above passage was called tagrīb by the Kufans. Tagrīb is the use of the demonstrative pronoun with the same governing force as kāna and, according to Tha^{lab}, the use is so called because the demonstrative pronoun is made to "approximate" to the verb kāna.³⁸ As tagrīb is a purely Kufan concept and was not recognised by the Basrans, it is worth quoting a discussion of it by Abū Ḥayyān although he does not mention the sort of sentence

to be explained by taqrīb which are mentioned in the above passage from the Uṣūl:³⁹

فقال الفراء والكسائي: يقال: هذا زيد قائماً على أن قائماً خبر التقريب الذي يشبه فيه هذا كان. حين يقال: كيف تخاف الظلم وهذا الخليفة قادماً، وكيف تجد البرد «هذه الشمس طالعة» يقرب هذا وهذه قدوم الخليفة وطلوع الشمس. ولم يكن هذا في المعنى إشارة لأن الخليفة لا يُجْهَل ولا يُشَدَّ فيه فتعريفه الإشارة. وكذلك الشمس قد غنيت بشهرتها عن الإشارة التي تحددها وتعينها.

In the passage from the Uṣūl quoted previously the first type of sentence for which Ibn al-Sarrāj prescribes the use of the accusative are ones like هذا القمر منيرا and هذه الشمس طالعة in which the subject is a unique entity. From the standpoint of normal Basran grammatical analysis such sentences would not be mentioned for special consideration because the last element could be put into the nominative or accusative at will depending on whether it is treated as a hāl or not.⁴⁰ The second type of sentence mentioned by Ibn al-Sarrāj for which he prescribes the use of the accusative are those introduced by the demonstrative pronoun in which something is affirmed in one particular instance but is generally applicable to the class into which the thing it is affirmed of falls, as in the examples هذا الأسد مهيباً and هذه العقرب مخوفة. Again, from the standpoint of normal Basran analysis such sentences would not constitute a class needing special consideration.

Ibn al-Sarrāj's special treatment of the above two types of sentence seems to have its basis in the Kufan concept of taqrīb as a

discussion of the demonstrative pronoun by al-Farrā' in the Ma'ānī

l-Qur'ān shows: 41

واعلم أن هذا إذا كان بعده اسم فيه الألف
واللام جرى على ثلاثة معانٍ : أحدها أن ترى الاسم
الذي بعده هذا كما ترى هذا ففعله حينئذ مرفوع
كقولك : هذا الحمار فارح . جعلت الحمار نعتاً لهذا إذ
كانا حاضرين ، ولا يجوزها هنا نصب . والوجه الآخر
أن يكون ما بعده هذا واحداً يؤدي عن جميع
جنسه فالفعل حينئذ منصوب كقولك : ما كان
من السباع فيرخصوف ، فهذا الأسد مخوفاً . ألا
ترى أنك تخبر عن الأسد كلها بالخوف . والمعنى الثالث
أن يكون ما بعده هذا واحداً لا نظيره فالفعل
حينئذ أيضاً منصوب . وإنما نصبت الفعل لأن هذا
ليس بصفة للأسد إنما دخلت تقريباً وأما معنى
التقريب فهذا أول ما أخبركم عنه . فلم يجدوا بداً
من أن يرفعوا هذا بأسد وخبره منتظر . فلما
شغل الأسد بمرافعة هذا نصب فعله الذي
كان يرافعه لخلوته . ومثله : والله غفور رحيم .
فإذا أدخلت عليه كان ارتفع به والخبر منتظر
يتم به الكلام فنصبته لخلوته .
أما نصبهم فعل الواحد الذي لا نظيره
مثل قولك : هذه الشمس ضياءً للعباد ،
وهذا القمر نوراً ، فإن القمر لا نظيره فكان
أيضاً عن قولك هذا مستغنياً . ألا ترى إذا
قلت : طلع القمر ، لا يذهب الوهم إلى
غائب فتحتاج أن تقول ، هذا لحضوره

It is clear from the above passage that Ibn al-Sarrāj makes use of Kufan grammatical discussion although he does not mention the term taqrīb in this connection. However, he does mention the concept of taqrīb when discussing the construction ها هو ذا قائماً where the particle hā is followed first by a personal and then by a demonstrative pronoun, and he also gives an indication of what taqrīb is: ⁴²

وقال قوم: إن كلام العرب أن يجعلوا هذه الأسماء
المكنية بين ها وذا وينصبون أخبارها على
الحال فيقولون: ها هو ذا قائماً، وها أنا ها هنا،
وها أنت ذا ظالماً. وهذا الوجه يسميه الكوفيون
التقريب. وهو إذا كان الاسم ظاهراً جاء بعد
هذا مرفوعاً، ونصبوا الخبر معرفة كان أو نكرة.
فأما البصريون فلا ينصبون إلا الحال.

Another of the concepts to which the Kufan grammarians make reference to explain certain points of grammar is the notion of ṣarf or khilāf. This explanation is used on various occasions by al-Farrā^d in the Ma'ānī l-Qur'ān and when he introduces the notion of ṣarf for the first time he writes: ⁴³

... فإن قلت: وما الصرف، قلت: أن تأتي بالواو
معطوفة على كلام في أوله هادئة لا تسيقيم
إعادتها على ما عطف عليها، فإذا كان كذلك
فهو الصرف، كقول الشاعر:

لَأَنَّهُ عَن خُلُقِي وَتَأْتِي بِثَلَّةٍ

كَأَنَّ عَلِيَّكَ إِذَا فَعَلْتَ، عَظِيمٌ

ألا ترى أنه لا يجوز إعادة لا في تأتي

مثله، ولذلك سمي صفا إذا كان محطوفا ولم يستقم
 أن يعاد فيه الحادث الذي قبله. ومثله من
 الأسماء التي نصبها العرب وهي محطوفة على
 مرفوع قولهم: لو تركت والأسد للأكل، ولو
 خليت ورأيك لظلت لَمَا لم يحسن في الثاني
 أن تقول: لو تركت وترك رأيك لظلت،
 تهيبوا أن يعطفوا حرفا لا يستقيم فيه ما
 حدث في الذي قبله.

For the Kufans a common explanation based on meaning could be found for certain uses of the accusative and subjunctive and they called this factor ṣarf or khilāf.⁴⁴ However, in such cases the Basrans did not resort to the abstract idea that it was the meaning which governed the use of the subjunctive or accusative and they produced rather more concrete explanations of what the regent is. Ibn al-Anbārī, for instance, in the Kitāb al-inṣāf firmly rejects the idea of ṣarf in all its applications.⁴⁵

Ibn al-Sarrāj makes no reference to the term ṣarf when discussing the main types of usage which the Kufans explained by this concept.⁴⁶ For instance, he explains the use of the subjunctive after conjunctions like wa and fa as being due to the action of an understood, but unexpressed particle an and this fully accords with the normal Basran explanation.⁴⁷ However, in discussing conditional sentences Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to a particular use of the subjunctive and states that the Kufans call it ṣarf and he himself goes on to make specific use of the term in explaining further similar uses of the subjunctive:⁴⁸

وتقول: إن تقم وتُحسن آتلك، تريد: إن تجمع
 مع قيامك إحصانا آتلك، وكذلك: إن تقم

تُحَسِّنَ آتِكَ، تريد: إن تقم تحسنا، ولم ترد:
 إن تقم وإن تحسن آتلك. وهذا النصب يسميه
 الكوفيون الصرف لانهم صرفوه على النسق
 إلى معنى غيره. وكذلك في الجواب تقول: إن
 تقم آتلك وأحسن إليك، وإن تقم آتلك فأحسن
 إليك. وإذا قلت: أقوم إن تقم، فنسقت بفعل
 عليها، فإن كان من شكل الأول رفعته، وإن كان
 من شكل الثاني ففيه ثلاثة أوجه: الجزم على
 النسق على إن والنصب على الصرف والرفع على
 الاستئناف. فأما ما شاكل الأول فقولا: تُحَمَّدُ
 إن تأمر بالمعروف وتؤجر، لأنه من شكل محمد.
 فهذا الرفع فيه لا غير. وأما ما يكون للثاني
 فقولا: محمد إن تأمر بالمعروف وتنه عن
 المنكر. فيكون فيه ثلاثة أوجه، فإن نسقت
 بفعل يصلح للأول ففيه أربعة أوجه: الرفع
 من جهتين، نسقا على الأول وعلى الاستئناف،
 والجزم والنصب على الصرف.

In this passage two similar uses of the subjunctive are introduced, one related to a verb forming part of the protasis of a conditional sentence and the other related to a verb linking up with the apodasis. Of the first use Ibn al-Sarrāj gives two examples, *إن تقم وتحسن آتلك* and *إن تقم تحسن آتلك*, where both sentences convey rather the same meaning and the second differs only by lacking the conjunction *wa*. The use of the subjunctive does appear slightly unusual in these sentences and the mood expected instead would be the indicative functioning as a *ḥāl*, if the meaning which Ibn al-Sarrāj intends were

to be conveyed. However, this usage can be related to another which is mentioned in Arabic grammars.

In his discussion of the subjunctive Wright states that it is employed with the conjunction wa "when the governed verb expresses an act subordinate to, but simultaneous with, the act expressed by the previous clause." 49 Among the examples given are some which have a strong resemblance to the present usage:

أَلَمْ أَذْكُرْكُمْ وَيَكُونُ بَيْنِي

وَبَيْنَكُمْ الْمَوَدَّةُ وَالْإِحْتَاءُ

and:

وَلَبَسَ عِبَاءَةً وَتَهَرَّ عَيْنِي

أُحِبُّ إِلَى بِنِ لَبَسِ الشُّفُوفِ

The other use of the subjunctive which Ibn al-Sarraj mentions and describes as sarf occurs in sentences like تُحَدِّثُ إِنْ تَأْمُرُ بِالْحُرُوفِ وَتَنُوعُهُ عَنِ الْمُخَلِّقِ. This is in fact an attested use of the subjunctive because when the verb in the protasis of a conditional sentence is in the jussive and there follows another verb connected to it by fa or wa, this second verb can be put into the subjunctive instead of the jussive. 50 Ibn al-Sarraj's treatment of this particular topic was of sufficient interest to al-Astarābādī for him to quote the passage with certain slight changes when discussing in the Sharḥ al-kāfiyah the possible moods of a verb joined by a conjunction to a conditional sentence. 51

Although Ibn al-Sarraj adopts the term sarf it would appear that he does so only because it is a convenient term and he does not put forward the Kufan view that sarf is a concept which explains uses of the subjunctive. In the passage quoted from the Uṣūl it may well be

that Ibn al-Sarrāj adopts the term sarf because in this instance he is particularly indebted to a Kufan source.

Notes to Chapter VII

- 1 Al-Mubarrad, vol. ii, p. 155.
- 2 See p. 26, n. 71 above.
- 3 Weil, p. 48.
- 4 Al-'Ukbari, Masā'il al-khilaf, Aleppo, n.d. The present writer has been unable to obtain a copy of this work for consultation.
- 5 Al-Suyūṭī, Iqtirāḥ, p. 84. In l. 12 of this passage الشواريز has been substituted for the incomprehensible اليئسوا of the original. For this change see A. M. Salman, Al-Suyūṭī al-naḥwi (Baghdad, 1976), p. 238.
- 6 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 219.
- 7 Ibid., p. 267.
- 8 Ibid., pp. 246-7.
- 9 See Khalaf al-Aḥmar, pp. 41-2, 65, 67-8; al-Zajjājī, Jumal, p. 53.
- 10 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. vi, pp. 93-4; vol. vii, pp. 146-7; Abū Ḥayyān, p. 376.
- 11 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 122-3. Passage quoted by al-Suyūṭī, Iqtirāḥ, p. 29.
- 12 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 312-3.
- 13 Ibid., vol. ii, pp. 64-5.
- 14 See also Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 85-7; al-Astarābādhi, vol. ii, pp. 354-5; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. viii, pp. 66-70; al-Farrā', vol. i, pp. 310-1.
- 15 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 79-80; Weil, pp. 136-7; Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. ii, p. 244.
- 16 Al-Zajjājī, Idāḥ, p. 59.
- 17 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, p. 104.
- 18 See A. I. Shalabi, Abu 'Alī al-Fārisī (Cairo, 1958), pp. 445-7.
- 19 See n. 1 above.
- 20 Ibn Qutaybah, Adab al-kātib (Leiden, 1900), pp. 299, 390, 514, 637.
- 21 Ibid., pp. 390, 637.
- 22 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 341-2.
- 23 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 126, 313, 316, 339, 352, 367, 370, 396; vol. ii, p. 374.

- 24 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 374. Passage quoted by al-Baghdādī, vol. ii, p. 530.
- 25 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 316.
- 26 See Wright, vol. i, p. 283B; vol. ii, p. 81C.
- 27 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 126-7. In l. 1 of this passage زي has been substituted for زي in the printed text.
- 28 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. vii, p. 150.
- 29 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 339.
- 30 Abū Hayyān, p. 75.
- 31 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 318. See also al-Zajjājī, Jumal, pp. 70-1; Wright, vol. ii, p. 175; Howell, pt. iii, pp. 392, 398.
- 32 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 367-8.
- 33 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 118-22; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, pp. 76-7.
- 34 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, p. 121.
- 35 See p. 28 above.
- 36 Sibawayh, vol. i, pp. 256-61; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, pp. 56-9; Wright, vol. ii, p. 278A.
- 37 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 180.
- 38 Tha'lab, Majālis Tha'lab, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1948-9), vol. ii, pp. 227-8.
- 39 Abū Hayyān, pp. 198-9. See also *ibid.*, p. 53; al-Suyūṭī, Ham' al-hawamī', 2 vols. (Beirut, n.d.), vol. ii, p. 113; Mahdī Makhzūmī, Madrasat Kufah (Cairo, 1958), pp. 320-1.
- 40 See Sibawayh, vol. i, pp. 258-60; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 58.
- 41 Al-Farrā', vol. i, p. 12. In this passage the word fi'l appears in the sense of the Kufan expression fi'l da'im which is their term for the participle. In this passage al-Farrā' also refers to the Kufan view that the muḥtada' puts the khābar into the nominative and vice-versa.
- 42 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 181. Al-Farrā' does not mention this use of taqrīb in the passage quoted above but Tha'lab does mention it in his Majālis, vol. i, p. 54.
- 43 Al-Farrā', vol. i, pp. 33-4. See also *ibid.* pp. 276, 292.
- 44 See M. G. Carter, "Ṣarf et ḥilāf, contribution à l'histoire de la grammaire arabe", Arabica 20 (1973), pp. 292-304.
- 45 Ibn al-Anbārī, Inṣāf, pp. 108-12, 229-32.

- 46 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 253-7: vol. ii, pp. 159-61.
- 47 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 159.
- 48 Ibid., pp. 197-8.
- 49 Wright, vol. ii, p. 32.
- 50 Ibid., pp. 40-1.
- 51 Al-Astarābādī, vol. ii, p. 261.

CHAPTER VIII

IBN YA'ĪSH AND THE UṢŪL OF IBN AL-SARRĀJ

The Mufaṣṣal of al-Zamakhsharī like so many of the concise works of the Arab grammarians calls for a commentary to assist those using it so as to clear up any problems which the very terseness of the work may create and also to provide valuable and often necessary additional information on topics which are only briefly mentioned. In the case of the Mufaṣṣal this need was met by many scholars who undertook to write commentaries on it, but the one which has found most favour is that of Abū l-Baqā' Ibn Ya'īsh (1158-1245).¹ Although its publication both in the Middle East and in Europe have led to its wide use in recent times, its long-standing popularity in the mediaeval Islamic world is clear from the constant references to it in the pages of the Ashbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir of al-Suyūṭī and of the Khizānat al-adab of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī.²

Although Ibn Ya'īsh's commentary is such a famous work it is not one whose quality is indisputable and many who use it would agree with J. W. Fück's judgment on its author that "his style is verbose and sometimes slovenly."³ If the quality of this work has been called into question, its claims to originality have also been challenged. When comparing the Sharḥ al-kāfiyah of al-Astarabādī with the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal of Ibn Ya'īsh, H. Fleisch writes: "Il est plus difficile a comprendre qu'Ibn Ya'īsh. Mais quand on connaît les sources de celui-ci, il est probable qu'il apparaîtra comme un diligent copieur, peu original."⁴ As a concrete example of this Fleisch refers the reader to a study by G. Troupeau of al-Sīrāfī's commentary on the

chapter of Sibawayh's Kitāb dealing with phonetics. In giving the results of his study of this material Troupeau writes: "Ces renseignements nous étaient parvenus, en partie, dans le commentaire tardif d'Ibn Ya'īsh qui les avait repris à son compte, sans mentionner sa source:....." ⁵

If the Uṣūl of Ibn al-Sarrāj is studied together with the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal of Ibn Ya'īsh, it becomes clear that the former work is one of the sources used in writing the latter because Ibn Ya'īsh incorporates into his own work a number of passages from the Uṣūl exactly as they stand and does not acknowledge the fact. The discussion in this chapter of some of the parallel passages not only serves the purpose of establishing exactly how Ibn Ya'īsh used the Uṣūl but it also gives an opportunity to examine parts of it which a later grammarian found to be of interest and which are often good examples of Ibn al-Sarrāj's thought.

In this study of Ibn Ya'īsh's use of the Uṣūl the parallel passages have been presented side by side with, on occasions, additional material preceding or following to make their respective contexts clear, but this extra material has been separated from the adjacent column by a double vertical line. The break between any such additional material and the parallel passage which it precedes or follows has been shown by sets of dots. Where the parallel passages diverge slightly they have both been underlined with a broken line but where the divergence is more substantial they have been underlined with a continuous line. If either of the texts omits material contained in the other the omission has been shown by square-bracketing the consequent gap in the other text, and the additional material has been underlined in accordance with the principle just mentioned. Errors or omissions affecting the sense in the printed text of the Uṣūl have been corrected

from the relevant passage in the Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal. Such corrections or additions have been enclosed in arrow-shaped brackets and are explained in the notes.

One topic where Ibn Ya'īsh has made particular use of the Uṣūl is the ḥāl. Ibn al-Sarrāj begins his discussion of the ḥāl by stating that the ḥāl together with the tamyīz constitute the class of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl whose regent is a true verb.⁶ He then explains why the ḥāl is put into the accusative and this consists of showing how the general theory of accusative usages which he has explained earlier relates to the ḥāl. Ibn Ya'īsh works this explanatory passage into his treatment of the question why the ḥāl is not a true maf'ūl but only resembles it:⁷

(أقول) فإما الذي سمونه الحال
فمنه قولك: جاء عبد الله راكباً،
وقام أهوك منتصباً، وجلس
بكر متكئاً. فعبد الله مرتفع
بجاء والمعنى: جاء عبد الله في
هذه الحال، وراكب منتصب
لشبهه بالمفعول...

(Sharḥ
al-Mufaṣṣal)
ولو كانت الحال مفعولة
لجاز أن تكون معرفه ونكرة
كسائر المفعولين. فلما اختلفت
بالنكرة دل على أنها ليست
مفعولة وإذ قد ثبت أنها
ليست مفعولة فهي تشبه
المفعول...

... لأنه جي به بعد
تمام الكلام واستخفاء الفعل
بفاعله وأن في الفعل دليلاً
عليه كما كان فيه دليل
على المفعول. ألا ترى أنك
إذا قلت: قصت، فلا بد
من أن تكون قد قصت

... من حيث أنها تجي بعد
تمام الكلام واستخفاء الفعل
بفاعله وأن في الفعل دليلاً
عليها كما كان فيه دليل
على المفعول. ألا ترى أنك
إذا قلت: قصت، فلا بد
[أن تكون قد قصت

في حال من الأحوال []	على حال من أحوال الفِعلِ.
فأشبهه قولك: جاء عبد الله	فأشبهه [] : جاء عبد الله
راكبا ، قولك: ضرب عبد الله	راكبا [] : ضرب عبد الله
رجلا ...	رجلا

... ولأجل هذا الشبه	... وراكب هو عبد الله ،
استحقت أن تكون منصوبة	ليس هو غيره والحال تعرفها
مثله.	وتحتمل ما بإدخال كيف على
	الفعل والفاعل . تقول : كيف
	جاء عبد الله ، فيمكن الجواب:
	راكبا.

Immediately after this passage from the Usūl Ibn al-Sarrāj explains why the hāl is so called and Ibn Ya‘īsh makes use of this passage at the beginning of his commentary on al-Zamakhsharī's treatment of the hāl. Preceding this Ibn Ya‘īsh gives his own explanation of what the hāl is: ⁸

اعلم أن الحال وصف هيئة الفاعل أو المفعول وذلك نحو:
جاء زيد راكبا ، وأقبل محمد مصرعا ، وضربت عبد الله باكيا ،
ولقيت الأمير عادلا . والمعنى : جاء عبد الله في هذه الحال
ولقيت الأمير في هذه الحال . واعتباره بأن يقع في جواب
كيف . فإذا قلت : أقبل عبد الله ضاحكا ، فكان سائلا سأل:
كيف أقبل ، فقلت : أقبل ضاحكا كما يقع المفعول له
في جواب لم فعلت

To this explanation Ibn Ya‘īsh adds the passage from the Usūl: ⁹

... وإنما هي حالا لأنه لا وإنما سميت الحال لأنه لا

(<u>ابو</u>)	يجوز أن يكون اسم الفاعل	(<u>Sharh</u>)	يجوز أن يكون اسم الفاعل
	فيها إلا لما أنت فيه .	(<u>al-mufassal</u>)	فيها إلا لما أنت فيه .
	تطاول الوقت أو قصر . ولا		تطاول الوقت أو قصر . ولا
	يجوز أن يكون لما مضى		يجوز أن يكون لما مضى
	وانقطع ولا لما لم يأت من		وانقطع ولا لما لم يأت من
	الأفعال [<u>إذ الحال</u>]		الأفعال [<u>إذ الحال</u>]
	إنما هي هيئة الفاعل أو		إنما هي هيئة الفاعل أو
	الفعل أو صفته في وقت		الفعل أو صفته في وقت
	ذلك الفعل <u>الضرب عنه</u> .		ذلك الفعل []

After this explanation of the term hāl Ibn al-Sarrāj goes on to define what sort of description the hāl may provide and he states that it may not be an innate quality but only a transient one. Ibn Ya'ish incorporates this point into his commentary on al-Zamakhsharī's remark that the hāl has an affinity to the zarf and he himself states more precisely that it is particularly related to the zarf of time.¹⁰ In taking over this passage Ibn Ya'ish compresses the examples given in it by making the various hāls apply to one subject whereas Ibn al-Sarrāj has three different subjects:¹¹

(<u>ابو</u>)	ولا يجوز أن تكون تلك	(<u>Sharh</u>)	وخص الشبه بظرف
	الصفة إلا صفة متصفة	(<u>al-mufassal</u>)	الزمان لأن الحال لا تبقى
	غير ملازمة ...		بل تنتقل إلى حال أخرى
			كما أن الزمان منقضي لا
			يبقى ويخلفه غيره ولذلك ...

[]	... ولا يجوز أن تكون []	[]	... ولا يجوز أن تكون الحال
	خلقة. لا يجوز أن تقول:		خلقةً فلا يجوز []:
	جاءني زيد أحمراً، ولا أخويك		جاءني زيد أحمراً، ولا []

أهول، ولا []
 طويلا، فإذا قلت متجاوزا
 أو متجاوزا، هاز لأن ذلك
 شيء يفعله وليس بحلقة...
 (أهول، ولا هازي عسرو
 طويلا، فإن قلت متجاوزا
 أو متجاوزا، هاز لأن ذلك
 شيء يفعله وليس بحلقة...)

... فيجوز انتقاله. ||

Ibn al-Sarrāj next turns to the question of the indefiniteness of the hāl and he explains that the hāl must be indefinite because it simply serves to convey extra information, whereas if the definite article were prefixed to it, it would become an epithet differentiating the noun it qualifies from something else. Ibn al-Sarrāj then goes on to specify in detail the difference between the hāl and the adjective and Ibn Ya'ish incorporates a considerable part of this discussion into his own treatment of this point. This occurs in the broader context of his discussion of the verb as the regent governing the accusative of the hāl:¹²

ولا تكون الحال إلا نكرة (أبى)
 لأنها زيادة في الخبر والفائدة.
 وإنما تفيد المائل والمحدث
 غير ما يعرف. فإن أدخلت
 الألف واللام صارت صفة
 للاسم المعرفة وقرنا بينه
 وبين غيره. والفرق بين
 الحال والصفة ...

(Sharh al-mufaṣṣal)
 فمثال العامل إذا كان فعلا
 قولك: جاء زيد ضاحكا، فزيد
 مرتفع بانه فاعل وضاحكا حال
 منه. العامل فيهما الفعل
 المذكور الذي هو جاء لأن
 الحال صفة من جهة المعنى
 ولذلك اشترط فيها ما
 يشترط في الصفات من
 الاشتقاق نحو ضارب
 ومضروب ونبيهما. فكما
 أن الصفة يعمل فيها

عامل الموصوف فكذلك الحال
يعمل فيه العامل في صاحب
الحال، إلا أن عمله في الحال
على صيبل الفضلة لأنها
جارية بحرى المفصل وعمله
في الصفة على صيبل الحاجة
اليها، إذ كانت صينية
للموصوف بحرت بحرى هرف
التحريف. وهذا أهد الفرق
بين الصفة والحال. وذلك...

... أن الصفة تفرق بين
اسمين مشتركين في اللفظ
والحال زيادة في الفائدة
والخبر وإن لم يكن الاسم
مشاركاً في لفظه. ألا ترى
أذك إذا قلت: مررت
بزيد القائم، فأنت لا تقول
ذلك إلا وفي الناس رجل آخر
اسمه زيد وهو غير قائم.
ففضلت بالقائم بينه وبين
من له هذا الاسم وليس
بقائم. وتقول: مررت بالفرزدق
قائماً، وإن لم يكن أهد اسمه
الفرزدق غيره، [فتقول قائماً]
... أن الصفة < تفرق بين
اسمين مشتركين في اللفظ
والحال زيادة في الفائدة
والخبر وإن لم يكن الاسم
مشاركاً في لفظه. ألا ترى
أذك إذا قلت: مررت
بزيد القائم، فأنت لا تقول
ذلك إلا وفي الناس رجل آخر
اسمه زيد وهو غير قائم.
ففضلت بالقائم بينه وبين
من له هذا الاسم وليس
بقائم. وتقول: مررت بالفرزدق
قائماً، وإن لم يكن أهد اسمه
الفرزدق غيره، [فتقول قائماً]

إنما ضمنت به إلى الإخبار
بالسرور خبرا آخر متصلا به
به مفيدا.

فضمنت [] إلى الإخبار
بالسرور خبرا آخر متصلا به
به مفيدا...

... فهنا فرق ما بين الصفة
والحال وهو أن الصفة لا
تكون إلا للاسم مشترك
فيه مضمين أو لمعان،
والحال قد يكون للاسم
المشترك والاسم المفرد.

... إلا أن الخبر بالسرور على
سبيل اللزوم لأنه به
انضمت الجملة والإخبار
بالقيام زيادة يجوز الاستغناء
عنه.

After completing his discussion of this question Ibn al-Sarrāj turns to the point that the hāl may refer both to the subject and the object of a sentence. Here Ibn Ya'īsh again draws on the wording of the Uṣūl when he criticises what he considers to be a weakness of expression in al-Zamakhsharī's treatment of the point: 13

(Uṣūl) واعلم أن الحال يجوز أن
تكون من المفعول كما تكون
من الفاعل. تقول: ضربت
زيدا قائما، فتجعل قائما لزيد
ويجوز أن تكون الحال من
الثاء في ضربت إلا أنك...

(Sharḥ
al-mufaṣṣal) «والحال تكون بيانا لهيئة
الفاعل أو المفعول» فتقول:
هاء زيد قائما، فتكون بيانا
لهيئة الفاعل الذي هو زيد.
وتقول: ضربت زيدا قائما،
فتكون بيانا لهيئة المفعول.
وقوله «تجمله هالا من
أيهما شئت» يعني أنك
إذا قلت: ضربت زيدا
قائما، إن شئت جعلته

هالاً من المفعول الذي
هو زيد. وهذا فيه تصحیح
وذلك أنك إذا جعلت
الحال من التاء وجب أن
تلاصقه فتقول: ضربت
قائماً زيدا....

... فإذا أزلت الحال عن صاحبه فلم تلاصقه، لم يجز ذلك لما فيه من اللبس إلا أن يكون السامع يطمع كما تعلم [] . فإن كان غير معلوم لم يجز....
... إذا أزلت الحال عن صاحبه فلم تلاصقه لم يجز ذلك [] إلا أن يكون السامع يعلمه كما تعلمه أنت . فإن كان غير معلوم لم يجز
وكان اطلاله فاسداً .

One of the standard questions which the grammarians discuss in dealing with the hāl is the ambiguous sentence رأيت زيدا مصعداً

مخدراً . Ibn Ya'ish's treatment of this point consists of

little more than a repetition of the relevant passage from the Uṣūl: ¹⁴

(<u>اتيسل</u>)	ومن كلام العرب: رأيت زيدا مصعداً مخدراً،	وأما قولهم: رأيت زيدا مصعداً مخدراً،	(<u>Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal</u>)
	ورأيت زيدا ماشياً راكباً - إذا كان أهدمها ماشياً	ورأيت زيدا ماشياً راكباً - إذا كان أهدمها مصعداً	
	والآخر راكباً، وأهدمها مصعداً	والآخر مخدراً، وأهدمها ماشياً	
	والآخر مخدراً، تعنى أنك إذا قلت: رأيت زيدا مصعداً	والآخر راكباً، فالمراد	

[أن تكون أنت مخدرا، أن تكون أنت
المصعد وزيد المخدر، المصعد وزيد المخدر،
فيكون مصعدا حالاً للقاء فيكون مصعدا حالاً للقاء
ومخدرا حالاً لزيد. وكيف ومخدرا حالاً لزيد. وكيف
قدرت بعد أن يعلم مخاطب قدرت بعد أن يعلم الصامع
المصعد من المخدر، فإنه من المصعد ومن المخدر، هاز.
لا بأس عليك بتقدم
أى الحالين شئت.

Although Ibn Ya'ish's debt to the Uṣūl is particularly noticeable in his treatment of the hāl, other borrowings of material can be noted as, for instance, in his discussion of exceptive sentences. Ibn al-Sarraḡ starts his chapter on exceptive sentences by discussing the use of the accusative case in positive exceptive sentences when it follows the particle illā.¹⁵ After this he attempts to define what illā resembles in its function and when Ibn Ya'ish explains the nature of exception he incorporates this material from the Uṣūl. First of all Ibn Ya'ish writes:¹⁶

اعلم أن الاستثناء استفعال من ثناء عن الأمر
يثنيه، إذا صرفه عنه. فالاستثناء صرف اللفظ
عن محموله بإخراج المستثنى من أن يتناوله الأول.
ومعرفته تخصيصه صفة عامة. كل استثناء تخصيص
وليس كل تخصيص استثناء. فإذا قلت: قام القوم
إلا زيدا، تبين بقولك: إلا زيدا، أنه لم يكن داخلا
تحت الصدر. إنما ذكرت الكل وأنت تريد بعض
مدلوله مجازا. وهذا معنى قول النحويين: الاستثناء
إخراج بعض من كل، أى إجماله من أن يتناول

On to this passage Ibn Ya'ish grafts the extract from the Uṣūl: 17

<p>(<u>آبِ</u>) وإلا تخرج الثاني مما دخل في الأول. فهى تشبه حرف النفي إذا قلت: قام القوم إلا زيدا، فالمعنى: قام القوم لا زيد، إلا أن الفرق بين الاستثناء والعطف أن الاستثناء لا يكون إلا بعضا من كل والمعطوف يكون غير الأول. ويجوز أيضا في المعطوف أن تعطف على واحد نحو قولك: قام زيد لا عمرو، ولا يجوز أن تقول في الاستثناء: قام زيد إلا عمرا....</p>	<p>(<u>Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal</u>) ... فإلا تخرج الثاني مما دخل في الأول. فهى شبه حرف النفي. فقولنا: قام القوم إلا زيدا، بمنزلة: قام القوم لا زيد، إلا أن الفرق بين الاستثناء والمعطف أن الاستثناء لا يكون إلا بعضا من كل والمعطوف يكون غير الأول. ويجوز [أن يعطف على واحد نحو قولك: قام زيد لا عمرو، ولا يجوز في الاستثناء أن تقول: قام زيد إلا عمرا....</p>
<p>... ولا يكون المستثنى إلا بعضا من كل وشيئا من أشياء. ولا إنما تأتي لتنفى عن الثاني ما وجب للأول، وإلا تخرج الثاني مما دخل فيه الأول موجبا كان أو منفيا، معناها</p>	<p>... والمستثنى منه والمستثنى جملة واحدة وهما...</p>

الإستثناء: والاسم
المستثنى منه مع ما
تستثنيه منه...

... بمنزلة اسم مضاف.
ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت:
جاءني قومك إلا قليلا
منهم، فهو بمنزلة قولك:
جاءني أكثر قومك، فكأنه
اسم مضاف لا يتم إلا
بالإضافة.

... بمنزلة اسم مضاف.
[فإذا قلت:
جاءني قومك إلا قليلا
منهم، فهو بمنزلة قولك:
جاءني أكثر قومك، فكأنه
اسم مضاف لا يتم إلا
بالإضافة.

Ibn Ya'ish also draws on the Uṣūl for material on the points of issue between the Basrans and Kufans and this is seen in his discussion of the dispute over the regent of the khābar of inna and similar particles: 18

فإن قال قائل: إنَّ إنَّ (أبدا)
إنما عملت في الاسم فقط
فنصبته وتركت الخبر...

... على حال كما كان مع
الابتداء...

... وهو قول الكوفيين،
قيل له: الدليل على أنها

(Sharh al-mufaṣṣal)
وذهب الكوفيون إلى
أن هذه الحروف لم تعمل
في الخبر الرفع وإنما تعمل
في الاسم لا غير. وإنما
الخبر مرفوع...

... على حال كما كان مع
المبتدأ

... وهو فاسد ذلك من
قيل...

هي الرافعة للخبر...

... أن الابتداء قد زال وبه
وبالمبتدأ كان يرتفع الخبر.
فلما زال العامل بطل
أن يكون هذا محمولا
فيه، ومع ذلك فإننا وجدنا
كلما عمل في المبتدأ رفعا
أو نصبا عمل في خبره.
ألا ترى إلى ظننت
وأخواتها. لما عملت
في المبتدأ عملت في خبره،
وكذلك كان وأخواتها...

... فكما جاز لك في المبتدأ
والخبر جاز مع إن، لا
فرق بينهما في ذلك إلا
أن الذي كان مبتدأ
يُنْتَصَبُ بِإِنٍ وَأَخْوَاتِهَا.

... أن الابتداء قد زال وبه
وبالمبتدأ كان يرتفع الخبر.
فلما زال العامل بطل
أن يكون هذا محمولا
فيه، ومع ذلك فإننا وجدنا
كل ما عمل في المبتدأ]
[عمل في خبره،
نحو ظننت
وأخواتها. لما عملت
في المبتدأ عملت في الخبر،
وكذلك كان وأخواتها...

... لما عملت في المبتدأ
عملت في الخبر

In drawing on this passage from the Uṣūl Ibn Ya'īsh is led to contradict himself by reproducing a passage which contains a view held by certain Basrans which he has previously rejected. This comes about because Ibn al-Sarrāj amongst others holds the view that the khavar is put into the nominative by the joint action of ibtidā' and the muḩtada' and the above passage from the Uṣūl confirms this. ¹⁹

However, Ibn Ya'īsh rejects this view as unsound when he deals with the

mubtada' and the khavar and prefers the view that it is ibtidā' alone which is the regent, although acting through the medium of the mubtada'.²⁰

The fact that Ibn Ya'īsh incorporates material from the Uṣūl into his own work is in itself a somewhat oblique testimony to the place given to Ibn al-Sarrāj's grammatical writings, although the use made of it by writers like al-Suyūṭī and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, with all due acknowledgement, provides a more open testimony to the worth of the scholarship of Ibn al-Sarrāj. If Ibn Ya'īsh had drawn on the Uṣūl to a greater extent than he in fact does, it would have been possible to say that he did so simply to save himself work in writing his commentary on the Mufaṣṣal, but the fact that his use of the Uṣūl is more selective leads one to assume that he made use of it because of its intrinsic merits. However, there are clearly passages which have been copied simply to suit the ease of the writer and not because they offer particularly fine grammatical analyses or material not readily obtainable elsewhere.

Although extensive reading of the Mufaṣṣal commentary of Ibn Ya'īsh and the Uṣūl specifically with a view to discovering further parallel passages will undoubtedly yield further results, the preceding survey gives an idea of how Ibn Ya'īsh is indebted to the Uṣūl.²¹

Notes to Chapter VIII

- 1 In addition to the Cairo edition used in preparing this present study (see p. 25, n. 53 above), there is also Ibn Ya'ish, Sharh al-mufaṣṣal, 2 vols., ed. G. Jahn, Leipzig, 1882-6.
- 2 See al-Suyūṭī, Ashbāh, vol. i, pp. 28, 30, 49, 52, 55, 61, 62, 68, 70, 85, 89, 90, 95, 96, 99; vol. ii, pp. 22, 27, 33, 34, 37, 40, 45, 59, 61, 74; Maiman, s.v. Mufaṣṣal, sharh Ibn Ya'ish.
- 3 E.I.², s.v. Ibn Ya'ish (J. W. Fück).
- 4 Fleisch, pp. 41-2, n. 2.
- 5 G. Troupeau, Le commentaire d'al-Sirāfi sur le chapitre 565 du Kitāb de Sibawayhi, Arabica (5) 1958, p. 179.
- 6 See pp. 40-5 above.
- 7 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 258; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 55. In ll. 9-10 of the passage from the Uṣūl استغناء الفعل بفعله has been substituted for استغناء الفاعل بفعله and this agrees with the text of the Mufaṣṣal and with Ibn al-Sarrāj's usual terminology as in the Uṣūl, vol. i, pp. 58, 189, 342, 345. In l. 14 of the passage from the Uṣūl يكون has been changed to the تكون of the Mufaṣṣal.
- 8 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 55.
- 9 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 258; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 55.
- 10 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 55.
- 11 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 258-9; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, pp. 55-6. In l. 7 of the passage from the Uṣūl the term أحمل which is absent from the printed text has been added to make sense of the passage.
- 12 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 259; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 57. In l. 6 of the passage from the Uṣūl the words أن الصنة are absent from the printed text.
- 13 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 259-60; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 56.
- 14 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 264; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 56. In l. 5 of the passage from the Uṣūl أحدها has been substituted for أحدها.
- 15 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 342-3.
- 16 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, pp. 75-6.
- 17 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 343; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. ii, p. 76.
- 18 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 278-9; Ibn Ya'ish, vol. i, p. 102.
- 19 Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 63. See also pp. 61-3 above.
- 20 Ibn Ya'ish, vol. i, p. 85.

21 For further parallel passages observed in the preparation of this present study see:

- a Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 67-8 ... خبر المبتدأ ... لتسند إليه...
Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. i, p. 87 ... خبر المبتدأ ... لتسند إليه...
- b Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 118-9. وإنما لزمت الباء ... وجهه أو عينه.
Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. vii, p. 148 ولزمت الباء ... عينه أو وجهه.
- c Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, p. 136 وقال قوم ... دُعُو الرجل.
Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. viii, pp. 129-30 وقال قوم ... دُعُو الرجل.
- d Ibn al-Sarrāj, vol. i, pp. 273-4 ... كان يلتبس ... في هذه الحال.
Ibn Ya'īsh, vol. ii, p. 73 ... ربما يلتبس ... في هذه الحال.

Although Ibn Ya'īsh draws material from the Uḡul without reference to its source, he does on occasions mention the name of Ibn al-Sarrāj when recounting the latter's views on various matters, e.g. Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal, vol. i, pp. 22, 129; vol. ii, p. 54; vol. vii, p. 99; vol. viii, p. 3; vol. ix, p. 104.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abū Ḥayyān Athīr al-Dīn. Manhaj al-sālik. New Haven, Connecticut, 1947.
- Abū Ṭayyib al-Lughawī. Marātib al-nahwīn. Cairo, 1955.
- ‘Adimah, M. A. Introduction to the Muqaddim, see under al-Mubarrad.
- Al-Astarābādī. Sharḥ al-kāfiyah. Turkey (Istanbul ?), n.d.
- Al-Baḥdādī, ‘Abd al-Qādir. Khizānat al-adab. 4 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam. 2nd ed.
- Al-Farrā’. Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān. 2 vols. published. Cairo, 1955- .
- Fleisch, H. Traité de philologie arabe. 1 vol. published. Beirut, 1961- .
- Ḥajjī Khalīfah. Kashf al-zunūn. 2 vols. Turkey, 1941-3.
- Howell, M. S. A grammar of the Classical Arabic Language. Introduction and 4 pts. Allahabad, 1883-91.
- Ibn al-Anbārī. Kitāb al-inṣāf. Edited and with an Introduction by G. Weil. Leiden, 1913.
- _____. Luma‘ al-adillah. Stockholm, 1963.
- Ibn Khayr. Fahrasah. Saragossa, 1894-5.
- Ibn al-Nadīm. Fihrist. Leipzig, 1872.
- Ibn al-Sarraj. Uṣūl fī l-nahw. Ed. A. H. al-Fatli. 2 vols. published. Vol. i, Najaf, 1973. Vol. ii, Baghdad, 1973.
- Ibn Ya‘īsh. Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal. 10 pts. Cairo, n.d.
- Kaḥḥālāh, U. R. Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifin. 15 pts. Damascus, 1957-61.
- Khalaf al-Ahmar. Muqaddimah fī l-nahw. Damascus, 1961.

Maiman, M. A. Iqlid al-khizānah. Lahore, 1927.

Al-Mubarrad. Muqtaḍab. Ed. and with an Introduction by M. A. 'Adīmah.
4 vols. Cairo, 1965-8.

Al-Qiftī. Inbāh al-ruwāh. 3 pts. Cairo, 1950-5.

Sībawayh. Kitāb. 2 vols. Bulaq, 1316-7 A.H.

Al-Sirafī. Akhbār al-naḥwīyīn al-Basriyīn. Cairo, 1955.

Al-Suyūṭī. Ashbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir. 4 pts. Hyderabad, 1359-61 A.H.

_____. Iqtirāḥ. Hyderabad, 1359 A.H.

Troupeau, G. Lexique-Index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi. Paris, 1976.

Weil, G. Introduction to the Kitāb al-insāf, see under Ibn al-Anbarī.

Wright, W. A grammar of the Arabic language. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Reprinted
Beirut, 1974.

Yaqut. Mu'jam al-udabā'. 7 vols. Leiden and London, 1907-31.

Al-Zajjajī. Idāh fi 'ilal al-naḥw. Cairo, 1959.

_____. Jumal fi l-naḥw. Paris, 1957.

Al-Zamakhsharī. Mufaṣṣal, see under Ibn Ya'īsh.

Al-Zubaydī. Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwīyīn. Cairo, 1954.