

Copyright
by
Katie M. Martins
2014

**The Thesis Committee for Katie M. Martins
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:**

**Vowel Terminology as a Method for Dating Early Arabic
Grammatical Texts: A Case Study of *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw***

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Kristen E. Brustad

Mohammad A. Mohammad

**Vowel Terminology as a Method for Dating Early Arabic
Grammatical Texts: A Case Study of *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw***

by

Katie M. Martins, B.S.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2014

Dedication

To the memory of the late Richard Lott II, my first Arabic instructor, who encouraged me to pursue graduate study in the field.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Kristen Brustad for her constructive feedback and help with translations. I would also like to thank Alexandre Roberts for introducing me to the secondary literature on the subject, and Ari Gordon for valuable conversation and for bringing to my attention several resources that were helpful to me throughout the research stage of this project.

Abstract

Vowel Terminology as a Method for Dating Early Arabic Grammatical Texts: A Case Study of *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*

Katie M. Martins, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Kristen E. Brustad

Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw (KJN) is a short grammatical treatise dating back to the early centuries of Arabic grammatical development. There is no consensus in modern scholarship surrounding its authorship, or even the century in which it was composed. The text is sometimes attributed to the famous 8th century grammarian al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī, but this hypothesis is often rejected in favor of attribution to lesser-known 10th century grammarian Ibn Shuqayr. Contemporary attempts to date this text and identify its author have given inconclusive results, largely due to issues with the methodology employed up to this point. In this thesis, I propose a new methodology for dating Arabic grammatical texts. This method concerns the use of terminology to refer to vowels. The distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowel terminology that remains in use today was first introduced by Sibawayh in his *Kitāb*, in which he states that the terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm* are reserved for syntactically determined vowel endings, while *ḍamm*,

fath, *kasr*, and *sukūn* are used for vowels that are not related to syntax. In works composed during the period before the *Kitāb*, as I will illustrate, vowel terminology is used in a disorganized and inconsistent fashion. In contrast, grammarians after the *Kitāb* adhere to Sibawayh's distinction with remarkable consistency. Thus, vowel terminology represents a clear dividing line between pre-*Kitāb* (late 8th-early 9th centuries) and post-*Kitāb* works (late 9th century and onwards) and is a valuable method for dating texts. In this thesis, I will summarize the controversy surrounding the provenance of KJN, demonstrate the advantages that the method of vowel terminology has over the other approaches taken in contemporary scholarship in an attempt to date the text, and present material from a wide range of grammatical works in order to validate this approach. Finally, I will apply this method to KJN. The results of this study show that the use of vowel terminology in KJN is much more consistent with an earlier (8th century) dating of the text than with the later (10th century) dating that has often been proposed.

Notes on Transliteration

I will use the following system for transliteration:

ء	’	ظ	ẓ
ب	<i>b</i>	ع	‘
ت	<i>t</i>	ع	<i>gh</i>
ث	<i>th</i>	ف	<i>f</i>
ج	<i>j</i>	ق	<i>q</i>
ح	<i>ḥ</i>	ك	<i>k</i>
خ	<i>kh</i>	ل	<i>l</i>
د	<i>d</i>	م	<i>m</i>
ذ	<i>dh</i>	ن	<i>n</i>
ر	<i>r</i>	ه	<i>h</i>
ز	<i>z</i>	و	<i>w, ū</i>
س	<i>s</i>	ي	<i>y, ī</i>
ش	<i>sh</i>	ا	<i>ā</i>
ص	<i>ṣ</i>		
ض	<i>ḍ</i>		
ط	<i>ṭ</i>		

Following Owens (2003), I will omit the definite article in proper names. For example, al-Khalīl will appear simply as Khalīl. Ibn al-Sarrāj appears as Sarrāj.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Authorship: Khalīl or Ibn Shuqayr?	3
1.2 KJN: Organization and Contents	8
Chapter 2: Methodology	15
2.1 The Direct Approach	16
2.2 The Basran-Kufan Approach	20
2.3 The Early-Late Approach	26
2.4 A New Approach: Vowel Terminology	29
Chapter 3: Vowel Terminology in the Pre-Kitāb Era	31
3.1 The <i>Tafsīr</i> of Ibn al-Kalbī	32
3.2 Kitāb al-‘Ayn	33
3.3 Farrā’'s <i>Ma‘ānī</i>	40
3.4 Muqaddima fī l-naḥw	45
3.5 Abu ‘Ubayda and Akhfash	47
Chapter 4: Vowel Terminology in Sibawayh’s <i>Kitāb</i>	54
Chapter 5: Vowel Terminology in the Post-Kitāb Era	65
5.1 Mubarrad’s <i>Muqtaḍab</i>	67
5.2 Sarrāj’s <i>Uṣūl</i>	70
5.3 Zajjājī’s <i>Jumal</i>	73
5.4 Ibn Kaysān’s <i>Muwaffaqī</i>	76

Chapter 6: Vowel Terminology in KJN	80
Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	95
References	99

Chapter 1: Introduction

Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw (KJN) is a short, relatively unsophisticated grammatical treatise dating back to the first few centuries of the development of Arabic grammar. The exact origin of the text remains shrouded in mystery—the identity of its author and the century during which it was composed have been the subject of debate for centuries. KJN is sometimes attributed to the famous 8th century Basran grammarian Khalīl ibn Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī (d. 791), widely regarded as one of the fathers of the Arabic linguistic sciences, but this hypothesis is more often rejected in favor of attribution to the lesser known Baghdadi scholar Ibn Shuqayr (d. 929), who lived two centuries later.

Because the provenance of KJN is uncertain, and because it is a minor work relative to the *Kitāb* of Sibawayh and the works of later grammarians Mubarrad and Sarrāj, for example, it has not been given sufficient attention by modern scholars. However, since so few primary sources from the earliest days of Arabic grammatical scholarship have survived, each extant text represents an important piece of the puzzle of the history of the discipline, and KJN is no exception. Examining the text from new angles in an attempt to shed light on its origins and to establish its relationship to other works from the early period is an important step in reconstructing the history of the Arabic grammatical tradition.

The results of previous attempts in contemporary scholarship to date the text and to identify its author have been inconclusive, in part because the text has not been widely studied, and in part due to the limitations of the methods that have been used up to this point. This thesis aims to contribute to the debate by proposing a new method for dating early grammatical texts in general, and by applying it to KJN as a case study. The method I propose involves examining the use of vowel terminology in order to estimate the time period during which a text was composed. It has long been recognized that the terminological distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels was first introduced by Sibawayh in the late 8th century—works that predate the *Kitāb* do not make this distinction, whereas later authors follow Sibawayh’s scheme for declensional vowel terminology with remarkable consistency. Though this fact has been noted in contemporary scholarship, no one has yet taken advantage of it as a way to date texts. As I will show, this approach has significant advantages over the other approaches found in modern scholarship, and will give a new perspective on aspects of the early history of Arabic grammar that are not yet well understood.

This thesis consists of seven chapters. In the present chapter, I will give an overview of the controversy surrounding the authorship of KJN, and describe the content, organization, and overall character of the text itself. In Chapter 2, I will summarize and evaluate several of the previous attempts to determine its origin, and discuss the advantages of using vowel terminology as a way to date texts. In

Chapters 3-5, I will present data from a wide range of texts from the 8th-10th centuries to establish the validity of this new method, and to lay the groundwork for the final two chapters, in which I will apply this method to KJN and discuss the implications of this study. The results of this study suggest that the text was likely composed in the early period, somewhere between the late 8th-early 9th century, rather than during the lifetime of Ibn Shuqayr, though they cannot conclusively either confirm or reject its attribution to al-Khalīl.

1.1 AUTHORSHIP: KHALĪL OR IBN SHUQAYR?

There are currently two edited versions of the text: one published by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Qabāwa in 1985, under the title *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*, with al-Khalīl listed as the author on the title page, and the other by Fā'iz Fāris, published in 1987, titled *al-Muḥallā* and attributed to Ibn Shuqayr. In this paper, I will use Qabāwa's edition, as it is more thoroughly researched. This version draws from three manuscripts. The earliest of the three, and the basis of Qabāwa's text, is from the Aya Sofya Library in Istanbul and is dated 1204. This manuscript is entitled *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw* and lists Khalīl as the author. The second of the manuscripts is from Dār al-Kutub in Cairo, dated 1324, and titled *Wujūh al-naṣb*. Khalīl is named as the author, though the frequent attribution to Ibn Shuqayr is noted. The final manuscript, from Bashīr al-Āghā Library in Istanbul, dates back to 1466, is also attributed to Khalīl, but is entitled *Jumlat al-i'rāb*.

The attribution of KJN to Khalīl, if correct, would be significant, as Khalīl is one of the most prominent figures in the early history of Arabic grammar, and also

because this would make KJN one of the earliest extant Arabic grammatical texts. From the biographical literature, we know that Khalīl was among the most innovative thinkers of the latter half of the 8th century, with a wide-ranging intellect and authoritative knowledge in a host of disciplines. He made essential contributions in many aspects of the study of the language, and was a pioneer in the fields of lexicography, metrics, phonology, music, and grammar. Sellheim, in his entry in the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, refers to Khalīl as the “real founder” of Arabic philology, emphasizing his influence in the formation of the linguistic sciences. Khalīl’s status as a leading authority in the early history of Arabic is evidenced by the overwhelming number of times Sibawayh cites him in the *Kitāb*, by the anecdotes in the biographical literature in which he is portrayed as an almost mythical figure, and by the number of titles attributed to him—eight in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 995), and fifteen in the whole of the biographical literature, by Talmon’s count¹.

In contrast, the medieval biographical literature contains little information on Ibn Shuqayr. We know that he was a grammarian living in Baghdad during the era of Sarrāj (d. 929). Sīrāfī (d. 987) reports that he mixed elements from both the Basran and Kufan schools (*Akhbār* 81). According to Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 1181), he had a tendency to agree with Kufans on more issues than not (*Nuzha* 187). Ibn al-Nadīm attributes to him only three works: *Kitāb al-mukhtaṣar fī l-naḥw*, *Kitāb al-maqṣūr*

¹ See Talmon (1997), Carter (1998).

² Talmon (1997) discusses this issue in detail, and lists some 40 modern works on Khalīl and *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*.

wa-l-mamdūd, and *Kitāb al-mudhakkār wa-l-mu’annath*, none of which has survived (*Fihrist* 91). Although Ibn Shuqayr was one of the minor writers of his time, there is some evidence of his status as an independent authority on the subject of grammar in that period: prominent 10th century Baghdadi grammarian Zajjājī (d. 948) lists Ibn Shuqayr among his teachers, along with the likes of Zajjāj, Māzinī and Sarrāj (*Īdāh* 79). Though he is identified as a grammarian in many biographies, emphasis is placed on his role as a transmitter of the works of al-Wāqidī (d. 822), a historian of early Islam, and collector of traditions. In fact, Suyūṭī (*Bughya* 1: 302) makes no mention of Ibn Shuqayr as a grammarian (though he does list the titles of the three grammatical works he composed) and instead focuses entirely on his role as a transmitter of history.

The confusion surrounding the authorship of KJN dates back at least to the first half of the 11th century, roughly a century after the death of Ibn Shuqayr—the earliest existing statement casting doubt on Khalīl’s authorship comes from the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Mas‘ar (d. 1050), who says in his biography of Ibn Shuqayr: “He has a book that he called *al-Jumal*. Sometimes this book is attributed to Khalīl, even though it is one of [Ibn Shuqayr’s] works. He says in it: The *naṣb* has forty aspects...” (48-9). Ibn Mas‘ar’s *Ṭabaqāt* seems to be the sole basis for later biographers’ attribution of KJN to Ibn Shuqayr. Both Yāqūt (d. 1228) and Suyūṭī (d. 1505) cite this passage from Ibn Mas‘ar, though Suyūṭī refers to the book as *al-Muḥallā*, rather than as *al-Jumal*. Interestingly, both biographers also list a *Kitāb al-jumal* among the

works of Khalīl. According to Talmon (1997: 42), when Qiftī (d. 1248) mentions the mistaken attribution of book entitled *Kitāb al-ʿawāmil* to Khalīl, he is referring to KJN (*Inbāh* 1: 381).

The confusion is exacerbated by the fact that “books” in the early period of Arabic grammatical development—from the late 8th century into the early 9th century—were often transmitted orally, by the authors themselves, by their students, or by other transmitters. The works were edited and amended by their transmitters, and as a result, the texts themselves did not always have fixed forms until after the death of their authors (Schoeler 2006: 35). It stands to reason, then, that the titles of books from this period were not always chosen by the authors themselves, but instead were given later by their transmitters. As a result, texts from the early period were often known by multiple names. This is the case with KJN, which Qabāwa says in the introduction to his edition of the text was also known by eight other names: *al-Jumal*, *Jumal al-iʿrāb*, *Wujūh al-naṣb*, *al-Muḥallā*, *Jumlat ālāt al-iʿrāb*, *Jumlat ālāt al-ʿArab*, *Jumlat ālāt al-ṭarab*, and *al-Nuqaṭ wa-l-shakl* (KJN 8). Moreover, Ryding (1998: 103) notes that there are three other works composed between the 8th and 10th centuries that were also titled *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*, including one by Sarrāj (d. 928), one by Zajjājī (d. 948), and a third by Ibn Khālawayh (d. 980). However, Ibn Khālawayh’s is the only one listed in the *Fihrist*, which is the earliest source we have.

Just as there is disagreement among medieval Arabic biographers, there is no real consensus among modern scholars about the true authorship of KJN. Most contemporary scholars, including Versteegh, Baalbaki, Talmon, and Owens, discount the attribution to Khalīl in favor of the 10th century dating. Versteegh (1993: 20) and Baalbaki (2008: 28) support the attribution of the text to Ibn Shuqayr on the basis of the presence of Kufan terminology in KJN. Talmon's (1997: 42) position is not entirely clear, though his statement "the puzzle how *K. al-Jumal* came to be recognized as Khalīl's is not yet solved" seems to imply that he does not support this attribution. Schoeler (2006: 52), although he does not mention KJN specifically, argues that Khalīl could not have written a grammar book, which implies that he would accept the hypothesis that Khalīl could not have been the author of KJN. Schoeler's arguments are based on isolated passages from the biographical literature, and on the absence of terms such as *allafa* "to write/compose" and *'amila* "to produce," which are traditionally associated with written works, in references to Khalīl's teachings. None of these arguments are based on a thorough, comprehensive study of the text itself. Owens (1990: 179 ff) has done a more systematic study of syntactic terminology throughout the text, and "provisionally" accepts Ibn Shuqayr as the author. However, his belief that KJN could not have been composed during the lifetime of Khalīl is not convincingly supported by his data.

On the other hand, Ryding, the only Western scholar to devote an independent study to KJN, is not convinced by the arguments for Ibn Shuqayr's

authorship, and believes there is “sufficient supporting evidence” for the attribution of Khalīl (1992: 263; 1998: 105). However, her assumption that the attribution to Khalīl is valid is largely based on Qabāwa’s introduction to the text, rather than on an analysis of the work itself. I will discuss contemporary arguments on both sides of the debate in more detail in Chapter 2.

1.2 KJN: ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS

The text of KJN as published by Qabāwa begins with a short introduction, which states that the whole of Arabic syntax is composed of *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm*, and that whoever understands these aspects will have “little need for many of the other books on grammar” (KJN 33). The author of this introduction refers to a book entitled the *Mukhtaṣar* which he claims to have composed previously—the *Mukhtaṣar* is one of the titles attributed to Ibn Shuqayr in the *Fihrist* and in later biographical works. However, this is not strong evidence for Ibn Shuqayr’s authorship of KJN. According to Schoeler, written texts had become more stabilized by the 10th century, and were more often transmitted in a fixed form rather than merely orally. This is in contrast with texts composed in the late 8th-early 9th centuries, for which it is often difficult to differentiate the author’s original material from material added by later redactors, in the transmission process (Schoeler 2006: 35-6).

Two other features of the introduction to KJN further indicate that it may have been a later addition: the first is the use of the word *jarr* rather than *khafd* for

“genitive,” and the second is the presence of the term *naḥw* with a technical meaning of “syntax” or “grammar” (*jamī‘ al-naḥw fī l-raḥ wa-l-naṣb wa-l-jarr wa-l-jazm*). Both are surprising, in that the use of these two terms in the introduction differs from their use throughout the rest of the text. In the body of the text, the author prefers *khafḍ* over *jarr* to refer to *i*-endings by a substantial margin, though *jarr* does appear in several instances later in the text. The presence of the word *naḥw* with the meaning of “syntax” or “grammar” is significant because this word did not acquire its technical meaning until later. Carter (1985) provides a thorough examination of the history of the meaning of the word, and concludes that *naḥw* did not come to mean “grammar” in a technical sense until the beginning of the 9th century, and that even Sibawayh used *naḥw* in a more general sense, to refer to “manner of speaking.” Throughout the body of KJN, we do not find *naḥw* in its technical sense.

Following the introduction, the beginning of the content portion of KJN consists of explanations of the various aspects (*wujūh*) of the *naṣb*, *raḥ*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm*. Ryding (1998: 93) translates these terms as “accusative/subjunctive,” “nominative/indicative,” “genitive/epenthetic,” and “apocopate,” respectively, in accordance with their modern meanings. However, as I will show in Chapter 3, those terms did not exclusively refer to cases and moods until the second half of the 9th century. In the earliest period of Arabic grammatical development, before the widespread acceptance of Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*, the terms *naṣb*, *raḥ*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm* were used in a much looser sense, and could also refer to the *a-*, *u-*, *i-*, and zero-

vowels, regardless of their relationship to syntax. Hence, I will leave them in the Arabic when translation would obscure the author's intended meaning.

Following the explanation of the aspects of *naṣb*, *rafʿ*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm* is a discussion of the meanings of various particles and letters (*ḥurūf*). Qabāwa's edition of the text concludes with two short chapters on the difference between the conjunctive particles *aw* and *am*, and the use of *ruwayda*. These final two chapters, like the introduction, were in all likelihood added by later transmitters—they are stylistically inconsistent with the rest of the text, and Qabāwa notes the striking similarity between these chapters and part of the *Maʿānī al-ḥurūf* of al-Rumānī (d. 984), which suggests that these two chapters might not have been included in the original text of KJN but instead added in the transmission process (KJN 17).

The breakdown of the chapters in Qabāwa's edition of the text is as follows:

51 aspects of *naṣb*
22 aspects of *rafʿ*
9 aspects of *khafḍ*
12 aspects of *jazm*
23 meanings of *alif*
31 meanings of *lām*
12 meanings of *hāʾ*
15 meanings of *tāʾ*
13 meanings of *wāw*
12 meanings of *lām alif*
10 meanings of *mā*
7 meanings of *fāʾ*
10 meanings of *nūn*
4 meanings of *bāʾ*
9 meanings of *yāʾ*
(Explanation of *ruwayda*)
(Explanation of the difference between *am* and *aw*)

The chapters are short, averaging only 15-20 printed lines. The style of the text is characterized by its minimal level of theoretical detail and its large number of illustrative examples (*shawāhid*)—it contains 368 verses from the *Qurʾān*, 414 poetic verses, and one *ḥadīth*. Some chapters contain only *shawāhid* with no theoretical explanation at all.

Among the most notable features of the text is the exceptionally large number of categories the author invokes to explain form—51 for *naṣb*, 22 for *rafʿ*, 9 for *khafḍ*, and 12 for *jazm*. Nouns and verbs are discussed together, rather than in separate subsections. In his discussion of the aspects of *naṣb*, for example, the chapters on the accusative case in nouns are intermixed with chapters on the subjunctive mood in verbs—and some chapters concern non-syntactic *a*-endings in nouns, which have no connection to the accusative case, as I will show in Chapter 6.

The author rarely makes an explicit connection between constructions that are closely related, or even syntactically identical, and makes seemingly no attempt to generalize or to present a coherent syntactic theory. The aspects of *naṣb*, *rafʿ*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm* are classified by meaning, rather than by functional position or governor, as was common in later works. For instance, the author presents the accusative forms of *madḥ* “praise,” *dhamm* “blame,” *tarahḥum* “mercy,” and *ikhtiṣāṣ* “distinction” in separate chapters, even though they are all explained by the same syntactic phenomenon—the elision of the accusative governor *aʿnī* “I mean” (KJN 62).

The author's discussion of the accusative specifier is another prominent example of syntactically identical forms being discussed separately. As Owens (1990: 190) has noted, KJN distinguishes between two types of specifiers: *tafsīr* on one hand, which is reserved for accusatives after numbers, as in *khamsūna rajulan* "fifty men" (KJN 45), and *tamyīz* on the other hand, which is used for structures such as *anta aḥsanu l-nāsi wajhan* "you are the most handsome of men, in terms of your face" (KJN 46). The common example *ishta'ala l-ra'su shayban* "my hair turned white" is traditionally analyzed as *tamyīz* by later grammarians and is discussed along with these two constructions, but KJN does not include it in either the *tafsīr* or *tamyīz* category, instead placing it in a section of its own, under the heading "the accusative (*naṣb*) whose [grammatical] agent is its object and whose [grammatical] object is its agent" (KJN 50). In contrast, Sibawayh makes explicit the syntactic similarity between all of these constructions, placing them in the same category, as do nearly all later grammarians.

Also illustrating the general lack of structural coherence and theoretical development, as Owens (1990: 189) points out, is the fact that there are three separate chapters on *badal* "apposition": one in the section on *naṣb* (KJN 100), again in the chapter on *khafḍ* (KJN 186), and finally in the discussion of conditional verbs. Although *badal* can also occur in the nominative case, KJN makes no mention of this, and does not explicitly note the connection between the types of *badal*.

Yet another distinguishing feature of KJN's grammatical theory is the fact that the author distinguishes between two classes of circumstantial accusatives: *qaṭʿ* and *ḥāl*. He refers to accusative constructions of the type *hādhā l-rajulu wāqifan* "this man exists standing" (KJN 38) as *qaṭʿ*, as distinct from *ḥāl*, which he uses for constructions like *anta jālisan aḥsanu minka qāʿiman* "you are better sitting than you are standing" (KJN 40) and *inṭalaqtu māshiyān* "I left, walking" (KJN 41). These two types of constructions are placed in one category, *ḥāl*, in major works from the 10th century.

The abundance of *shawāhid*, the astonishingly large number of categories invoked, and the relative lack of theoretical coherence indicate that the primary purpose of the text was likely pedagogical, and that it was intended as a practical handbook for usage, rather than as a comprehensive treatise on syntax. Owens proposes that the author may have had a different, though complementary, purpose in mind: that his interests "may have been more in the classification of the textual examples themselves than in the grammatical framework used to accomplish this" (1990: 190). The structure of KJN allows for the classification of a large number of citations from the Qurʾān and from poetry within a simple framework. It is plausible that the purpose of the text was multifold and that it was intended both as a pedagogical grammar aimed at an audience of non-gammarians, and as a work that would preserve literary material and incorporate it within the framework of a basic grammatical theory.

In Chapter 2, I will summarize the various attempts that have been made thus far to date KJN and to identify the author, which have given inconclusive results. After discussing the limitations of these methods, I will show how vowel terminology can be used as a method to date early grammatical texts, and discuss the advantages of this approach over the other approaches found in contemporary scholarship.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Many approaches have been taken in an attempt to date texts from the early centuries of the Arabic grammatical tradition. Several of these have been applied in the particular context of KJN, and the collective results of these various approaches are inconclusive. The evidence from some studies suggests that Ibn Shuqayr is more likely to have been the author, while the results of others seems to support Khalil's authorship. It is not entirely clear which of these approaches yields the most reliable results in principle, and thus it is difficult to determine which of the conflicting results bears more weight. In this chapter, I will discuss and evaluate three possible approaches to determining the authorship of grammatical texts from the first few centuries of Arabic grammatical development, with particular application to KJN. I will then introduce vowel terminology as a new method for determining the time period during which texts were composed, and discuss the advantages of this method over the others I present here.

The first of the three approaches I will discuss is the attempt to identify the author directly by drawing upon surviving information about the potential authors and their teachings; the second is to ascertain whether the content of the text is more consistent with either the Basran or the Kufan tradition, and to make inferences about its authorship on that basis; and the third approach is to compare the text with a broad range of earlier and later texts whose provenance is not

disputed, in order to try to determine the time period during which it was written. Though all three of these approaches are essential components of a thorough analysis, some are more reliable than others. I will demonstrate that the third approach, that of comparing a text with earlier and later texts, is the most reliable of the three, and I will argue that an analysis of declensional vowel terminology is a particularly valuable way to carry out a study of this type.

2.1 THE DIRECT APPROACH

The first approach, when applied to KJN, amounts to making a direct comparison of the content of the text with surviving information about the theories of both potential authors: Khalīl and Ibn Shuqayr. Though appealing in its conceptual simplicity, this approach is problematic for several reasons. First, we have no information about the grammatical teachings of Ibn Shuqayr. Ibn al-Nadīm lists three works attributed to Ibn Shuqayr: *al-Mukhtaṣar fī l-naḥw*, *al-Maqṣūr wa-l-mamdūd*, and *al-Mudhakkar wa-l-mu'annath* (*Fihrist* 91). Unfortunately, none of these has survived, and, to my knowledge, none of Ibn Shuqayr's teachings are preserved in the texts of later grammarians. The biographical literature states only that Ibn Shuqayr incorporated both Basran and Kufan ideas, and does not give specifics, either about his terminology or his theories. Given that we have no information at all regarding the grammatical teachings of Ibn Shuqayr, it is impossible to gather direct evidence to support or refute his authorship of KJN.

Gathering evidence to determine whether Khalīl was the author is, in principle, a much more viable task, given that a substantial amount of information about Khalīl's grammatical teachings has been preserved in a variety of sources. Perhaps the most valuable source of information about his grammatical theories is the *Kitāb* of Sibawayh. Sibawayh was a disciple of Khalīl and relied heavily on his teachings in the composition of the *Kitāb*, as is evidenced by the fact that Khalīl is cited by name 608 times in the *Kitāb*, more times than all other grammarians combined. Much of the unattributed material in the *Kitāb* is likely also from Khalīl—Ibn al-Anbārī reports that every time Sibawayh says *sa'altuhu* "I asked him" or *qāla* "he said" without mentioning his source by name, he is referring to Khalīl (*Nuzha* 45).

In addition to the testimony of the *Kitāb*, evidence of Khalīl's theories and terminology can be gathered from the lexicon *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*. Though *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* is not a grammatical text *per se*, it does contain several grammatical points, which Talmon (1997) has collected and analyzed. Additional sources of information about Khalīl's teachings include Khwārizmī's (d. 993) *Mafatīḥ al-ʿUlūm*, which provides a list of twenty-one phonological terms attributed to Khalīl, and several lexicographical works: al-Azhārī's (d. 940) *Tahdhīb al-luġha*, Ibn Sīda's (d. 1066) *Muḥkam*, and Ibn Manẓūr's (d. 1312) *Lisān al-ʿArab*, all of which contain technical vocabulary purportedly used by Khalīl (Versteegh 1993: 16-19).

Based on the abundance of information about Khalīl's teachings that is reported in these sources, it would seem logical, as a starting point, to reconstruct Khalīl's terminological system and theories of syntax and morphology based on these reports, and to compare this with the content of KJN. However, although this would be an essential part of a thorough, systematic study of the origin of KJN, this approach alone is not sufficient. One drawback to this method is the questionable reliability of some of the sources. For instance, there is much uncertainty surrounding the attribution of *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* to Khalīl—many scholars, both medieval and modern, have proposed that the text as we know it today was composed not by Khalīl himself, but instead by his student Layth, well after Khalīl's death.² According to some of these theories, Khalīl was the intellectual creator of the lexicon and provided the outline of its general structure, but it was Layth who completed, compiled, and redacted the work, drawing from several authorities, of which Khalīl was only one.

Even if we assume that *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* generally reflects Khalīl's teachings and can in a sense be truly attributed to him, the high probability that Layth and others contributed to the work in some capacity renders it impossible to determine with certainty whether any given theory was Khalīl's own or whether it was added after Khalīl's death, either by Layth or by later redactors. This places any conclusions

² Talmon (1997) discusses this issue in detail, and lists some 40 modern works on Khalīl and *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*.

about the authorship of KJN on the basis of a comparison with the terminology or theoretical material of *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* on shaky ground.

Another issue with this direct approach is that the sources of information about Khalīl’s terminology are sometimes at variance with one another. For instance, the phonological terms as reported in Khwārizmī’s list, in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, and in *Lisān al-ʿArab* are not found in Sibawayh’s quotations of Khalīl. As for the *Kitāb*, it is possible, even probable, that Sibawayh rephrased arguments of other grammarians in his own terms. Because grammatical teaching in that time period was often transmitted orally rather than in written form, the transmitters had much more liberty in their formulation of the teacher’s opinion, particularly regarding terminology (Versteegh 1993: 36). Thus, Sibawayh’s *Kitāb* should not be taken as a fully reliable source for Khalīl’s terminology.

Perhaps the biggest drawback of the direct approach is not a methodological one, but a practical one: the pre-theoretical character of KJN itself, its terse style, and the scattered nature of its content necessarily place limits on the viability of this approach—many of the ideas attributed to Khalīl in the *Kitāb* of Sibawayh and in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* are simply not discussed in KJN. Even if we assume the testimony of Sibawayh’s *Kitāb* and *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* to be perfectly reliable sources of information about Khalīl’s grammatical teachings, the fact that KJN simply does not contain a substantial amount of theoretical detail means that there is limited material for comparison.

These barriers to a direct examination of whether Khalīl or Ibn Shuqayr is the more likely author of KJN necessitate a less direct approach to solving the mystery. One such approach would be to situate the text within the context of the Basran and Kufan debate.

2.2 THE BASRAN-KUFAN APPROACH

Because Khalīl is considered one of the fathers of the Basran school of grammar, the presence in KJN of a significant fraction of canonical Kufan features, either terminological or theoretical, could be considered evidence against his authorship. A mixture of Basran and Kufan features would on first glance also constitute positive evidence in support of KJN's attribution to Ibn Shuqayr, who is reported to have had Kufan leanings. However, the value in such an approach depends on the historical reality of the two schools and the extent to which the dichotomy as represented in the later Arabic biographical literature and in surviving grammatical sources reflects the true existence of two independent traditions in the early period of grammatical development.

Medieval Arabic biographers make a sharp distinction between the two schools. This is evident, for example, in the *Ṭabaqāt* of Zubaydī (d. 989) and in the *Fihrist*, in which Basran and Kufan scholars are listed in separate sections. However, contemporary scholarship has called into question the early existence of two independent traditions. As this topic has been discussed at length in several places,

I will give only a brief summary of the various positions here.³ The argument against the existence of the two schools is stated most strongly in Weil's (1913) introduction to the *Inṣāf* of Ibn al-Anbārī, in which he argues that the Basran and Kufan schools are a literary fiction invented in the generation after Mubarrad and could not have possibly existed as distinct entities in the 8th century. Most modern scholars more or less accept Weil's conclusion. Carter (1973: 302) supports this position without reservation, suggesting that 9th and 10th century grammarians used the term "Kufan" as a blanket term to refer to all theories that were at variance with their own thinking, or that differed from the teaching of Sibawayh. Baalbaki (2007) takes a more ambiguous position, arguing that issues in the *Inṣāf* do often reflect real differences in thinking between early grammarians, but that later scholars exaggerated these differences and created the idea of schools by generalizing from disputes among individual grammarians. Versteegh, originally a proponent of the historical existence of the two schools (1977), later makes several interesting observations about the early use of terminology that cast doubt upon the early existence of the Basran and Kufan schools. Bernards (1997: 17) also believes that the schools did not exist as such until the late 9th century, proposing that the formation of the ideas of the Basran and Kufan schools coincided with the consolidation of Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, a process mediated by Mubarrad.

³ See, for example, Versteegh (1977), Baalbaki (1981, 2007), Owens (1988, 1990, 1991), Carter (1973, 1999).

Despite the considerable doubt surrounding the historical reality of the Basran and Kufan schools, both medieval Arabic historians and contemporary Western scholars have used this dichotomy as a method to date texts and to confirm or refute hypotheses about their authorship. The fact that the terminological differences between the two schools are by nature more easily identifiable than the theoretical differences has led several scholars to examine syntactic terminology in order to date texts. Versteegh and Baalbaki have used this approach with respect to KJN. Versteegh (1993: 20) considers the presence of the Kufan terminology *jaḥd* “negation” and *khafḍ* “genitive” in KJN not only as an argument against Khalīl’s authorship, but also as positive evidence supporting its attribution to Ibn Shuqayr, as he is reported to have taken elements from both grammatical schools. Baalbaki (2008: 28) makes a similar argument, though he notes the presence of the Kufan term *jaḥd* in *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*.

In addition to differences in terminology between the two schools, later sources also record a number of grammatical points on which the Basrans and Kufans are said to have been at variance with one another. I am not aware of any existing study that applies this approach to KJN, so I will briefly consider the type of results this method would produce. A prominent source of information about these issues of controversy is Ibn al-Anbārī’s *Inṣāf*, in which he presents 121 points of dispute and summarizes the positions of both schools. Thus, a logical approach in trying to situate KJN within the context of the Basran-Kufan debate would be to

examine its position on the issues presented in the *Inṣāf*. However, this approach has several drawbacks. Here, we are again faced with the obstacle that KJN either does not cover many of the relevant grammatical points at all, or covers them in such little detail that it is difficult—in some cases, impossible—to identify the author’s position on the issue. This fact alone rules out a comparison of KJN with a large fraction of the issues presented in the *Inṣāf*, leaving us to draw conclusions based on a very limited set of data.

A related problem for this method is that, in some cases, identification of KJN’s position hinges on an interpretation of the author’s terminology. For instance, in *Mas’ala* 14 (*Inṣāf* 86), Ibn al-Anbari reports that the Kufans consider *ni’ma* “to be good” and *bi’sa* “to be bad” to be nouns, whereas Basrans consider them to be verbs. KJN (70) refers to them as *ḥurūf*. If we interpret *ḥarf* here to mean “particle”—as opposed to noun or verb—then KJN’s position on this issue is unique, and does not agree with either the Basran or Kufan position. However, if we interpret *ḥarf* to mean simply “word,” then it could refer either to nouns or verbs, and we cannot determine whether KJN agrees with the Basrans or the Kufans.⁴ Another commonly cited point of debate between the two schools concerns the imperative form of the verb, discussed in *Mas’ala* 75 (*Inṣāf* 414). Kufans consider the imperative form to be governed; Basrans, in contrast, consider it a fixed form. KJN (190) uses the term *jazm* to refer to the imperative, which, based on later grammarians’ use of this term

⁴ Owens (1990: 202) notes the use of *ḥarf* with the meaning of “word.”

to refer only to declensional endings, might suggest that KJN agrees with the Kufan position. However, as we will see in Chapter 6, KJN often uses the term *jazm* to refer to non-declensional endings, so it is difficult to determine whether the author of KJN considers the imperative to be governed or not, and thus it is impossible to know whether KJN agrees with the Kufan or Basran position.

On top of these practical difficulties, this approach faces the more serious methodological issue that Ibn al-Anbārī's presentation of the positions of the two schools does not always reflect real differences between the grammarians representing those schools. Baalbaki (1981: 22) cautions against using the *Inṣāf* to make inferences about early grammatical development, partly on the basis of the fact that Ibn al-Anbārī often oversimplifies the theories of grammarians, and occasionally even blatantly misreports their views. Thus, it is important to substantiate Ibn al-Anbārī's reports by consulting primary texts.

So, this approach can really only be applied to issues on which KJN has a clearly identifiable position and the controversy as presented in the *Inṣāf* can be substantiated by surviving primary texts. The number of issues for which both of these conditions obtain represents a small fraction of the 121 issues contained in the *Inṣāf*; thus, the evidence resulting from this type of study will be circumstantial at best.

Despite the circumstantial nature of this type of evidence, it should not be ignored entirely. A cursory look reveals that KJN does agree with Farrā' and is at

variance with Sibawayh and Mubarrad on several issues. One such issue concerns the government of the Ḥijāzī *mā* (*Inṣāf* 144): both Sibawayh (*Kitāb* 1: 57) and Mubarrad (*Muqtaḍab* 4: 188) explain the accusative government of this particle by virtue of its resemblance to *laysa*, whereas both Farrā' (*Ma'ānī* 2: 42) and the author of KJN (93) claim that the accusative results from the deletion of a preposition. Another issue on which KJN agrees with Farrā' involves the meaning of *illā* in a verse of poetry from al-A'shā. According to Ibn al-Anbārī (*Inṣāf* 232), the Kufans accept that *illā* can occur with the meaning of *wāw*, and the Basrans reject this meaning. Regarding this verse of poetry, both Sibawayh (*Kitāb* 2: 334) and Mubarrad (*Muqtaḍab* 4: 409) interpret *illā* as meaning *ghayr*. Farrā' (*Ma'ānī* 1: 89) and KJN (300) paraphrase *illā* as *wāw*. While the presence of several Kufan features in KJN, both theoretical and terminological, might cast some doubt on Khalīl's authorship, it does not constitute conclusive evidence either against Khalīl's authorship, or in favor of Ibn Shuqayr's for reasons discussed above.

Since neither the direct approach nor the Basran vs. Kufan approach yields conclusive results, I will turn to the third and final approach I will discuss in this chapter—that of comparing the text with grammatical works from the earlier and later periods, respectively, to attempt to determine the approximate time period of its composition.

2.3 THE EARLY-LATE APPROACH

Several approaches to attempting to distinguish between early and late grammatical texts can be found in contemporary scholarship. These approaches include looking at the authorities cited in these texts, comparing syntactic terminology to the terminology found in earlier and later works, and examining the general structure and organization of the works.

Ryding (1998: 101) argues for an earlier dating of KJN based on the authorities cited in the text. She notes that KJN contains only a small number of citations of other grammarians, including Sibawayh, Farrā', Abu 'Amr ibn al-Alā', Naṣr ibn 'Āṣim, and Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb. Sibawayh and Farrā' are each mentioned only once. She takes the paucity of citations of grammarians as evidence supporting an 8th century dating of KJN, and its authorship by Khalīl. However, Baalbaki (2008: 28) comments on the anachronistic mention of Ibn Durayd (d. 933), which Ryding overlooks. This would be evidence against the hypothesis that KJN was written in the early period. Baalbaki also notes that Khalīl himself is quoted in KJN, which leads him to the conclusion that Ibn Shuqayr was more likely to have been the author. However, it is not uncommon for texts to include citations of their purported authors. If we were to take this as evidence against Khalīl's authorship of KJN, we would have to call into question the provenance of a number of other texts whose authorship is not traditionally disputed. As this shows, the authorities cited in KJN

can be taken to suggest either an earlier or later dating; thus, evidence of this type is inconclusive.

Owens has attempted to use syntactic terminology and concepts to date KJN. He concludes that “there are certain themes and terminology that, so far as we know, emerged only in the last half of the ninth century. KJN contains these traits; therefore it must stem from this era or afterwards” (1990: 201). This conclusion is overly simplistic and seems to be based primarily on only two features of KJN: one is the presence of the term *tamyīz* (accusative specifier), which is commonly supposed to have been introduced by Mubarrad in the second half of the 9th century; the other is the discussion of a criterion for identifying nouns, which Owens claims originates with Ibn Kaysān and Lughda in the 10th century. Owens argues that, though it is theoretically possible that KJN was the innovator, it is highly unlikely that terms and concepts that were influential parts of the later grammatical tradition could have stemmed from a relatively unsophisticated text like KJN. While it is true that such influential terminology is unlikely to have originated from a minor work, it is possible that this terminology was part of an early independent tradition. It is also possible that, even if the term *tamyīz* was not introduced until the 9th century, it was not present in the original text of KJN but was a later addition. In short, Owens’ argument for a 10th century dating of KJN is not based on a systematic study of syntactic terminology, and he gives limited evidence to support his conclusion.

Another approach to dating grammatical works is to examine their general structure and organization, as later works generally have a much more systematic structure than earlier works. Owens (1990: 181) comments on the unsophisticated nature of KJN, its short chapters, and the large number of individual grammatical categories the author employs to account for syntactic constructions, with seemingly no attempt to generalize between categories that are similar. Interestingly, Owens admits that the structure and organization of KJN bears more similarity to the *Muqaddima fi l-naḥw*, which he believes dates back to the first half of the 9th century, than it does to 10th century works (1990: 189). Though Owens supports a later dating of KJN based on the evidence presented above, he recognizes that relatively unorganized, unsophisticated texts are more consistent with the early period than with the later period. Thus, the structure of KJN would suggest an earlier dating. Ryding's argument based on the grammarians cited in KJN, and Owens' arguments based on syntactic terminology and concepts, and on structure and organization, lead to opposing conclusions.

As I have demonstrated so far in this chapter, all of the approaches that have been taken in contemporary scholarship to determine the authorship of KJN face serious obstacles. Thus, I will introduce a new method for dating grammatical texts, demonstrate the advantages this method has over the other approaches I have discussed in this chapter, and apply this method to KJN. As an alternative to the

approaches I have discussed up to this point, I will focus on the use of vowel terminology, which forms a sharp dividing line between earlier and later texts.

2.4 A NEW APPROACH: VOWEL TERMINOLOGY

In the system of vowel terminology that eventually came into general acceptance, and remains in use today, there is a clear distinction between two sets of terminology: the declensional set (*rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ/jarr*, and *jazm*), which is reserved for syntactically determined vowels, and the non-declensional set (*ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf*), which is used for fixed vowels. However, the system as we know it today has not always been in use. In the earliest extant works, as I will show in Chapter 3, we find no evidence of any terminological distinction at all—the two sets of terms are used seemingly interchangeably. Terminological use in works that were roughly contemporary with Sibawayh’s *Kitāb* suggests that there might have been various attempts in the late 8th-early 9th centuries to systematize terminology, which were adhered to with varying levels of consistency, and which bear some similarity to the current system but are not identical with it. In Chapter 4, I will show that Sibawayh’s *Kitāb* marks the first clear statement of a distinction between the two contrasting sets of terminology, and not until the period after the widespread acceptance of the *Kitāb* was this distinction consistently applied. I will demonstrate in Chapter 5 that, beginning in the second half of the 9th century, the terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ/jarr*, and *jazm* are consistently used only to refer to case and mood markers, and *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf* are used for non-syntactic

vowels. To the best of my knowledge, though the evolution of vowel terminology has been fairly well documented, no one has yet taken advantage of this as a tool to date grammatical works.

This method has several important advantages over the other methods discussed in this chapter. First, the interpretation of the evidence resulting from an examination of vowel terminology does not depend on tenuous assumptions about the historical reality of the Basran and Kufan schools of grammatical thought. Second, because the system of vowel terminology forms an integral part of the fabric of a grammatical text, as it is interwoven with syntactic theory, it would have been much more difficult for later authors to amend this aspect of the text. Third, vowel terminology, though intertwined with syntactic theory, can be examined independently of the theory itself, which means that this method can be used to date texts that are relatively theoretically unsophisticated. It also broadens the range of sources that we can use for comparison, as this method does not require texts to have a well-developed grammatical theory at all—it requires only that they contain terminology to refer to vowels. Thus, we can draw evidence from texts such as lexicons and exegetical works that do not have a strong grammatical focus. A fourth advantage of a study based on vowel terminology is that it can be carried out more systematically than studies that are based on a small set of syntactic terminology. Finally, in the case of KJN, this approach is more manageable in scope than a direct comparison of the text with Sibawayh's citations of Khalil.

Chapter 3: Vowel Terminology in the Pre-Kitāb Era

In order to demonstrate the inconsistency in the use of vowel terminology during the early period, I will cite passages from several works of the late 8th-early 9th centuries that illustrate the use of declensional terminology in non-syntactic contexts. I include works from the early 9th century in this chapter because, although Sibawayh worked in the late 8th century, his *Kitāb* was not universally accepted as the primary work of grammar on which all later works were based until sometime around the middle of the 9th century, a process mediated by Mubarrad's retraction of his criticism of Sibawayh (Bernards 1997: 17). Thus, although some of the works I will discuss here may have been composed after the *Kitāb*, their use of vowel terminology reflects the prevailing trends of pre-*Kitāb* era. I will present data from seven texts: the *Tafsīr* of Ibn al-Kalbī (d. 763), the *Majāz* of Abū 'Ubayda (d. 822), the *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān* and the *'Arūd* of Akhfash (d. 830 or 835), the *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān* of Farrā' (d. 822), *Kitāb al-'Ayn*, and *Muqaddima fī l-naḥw*, which is attributed (likely erroneously) to Khalaf al-Aḥmar (d. 796).

As a point of clarification, I will use the term “declensional” in this chapter to refer to the set of terms *raf'*, *naṣb*, *jarr/khafḍ*, and *jazm*, and “non-declensional” to refer to *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf*. As we know, the former set eventually came to refer only to syntactically determined vowel endings, while the latter set came to be used for lexically determined vowels, or otherwise syntactically

irrelevant vowels. As I will illustrate in this chapter, the distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowel terminology did not exist, at least not in any well-defined sense, in the period before the *Kitāb* came into general acceptance. From the 8th century until the mid-9th century, we often find *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr/khafḍ*, and *jazm* used to refer to non-syntactic vowels. For simplicity, I will use the term “declensional” to encompass the changeable endings both of nouns and verbs, following Versteegh (1997), though in English this term is technically reserved for the inflection of nouns.

3.1 THE *TAFSĪR* OF IBN AL-KALBĪ

The *Tafsīr* of Kufan exegete Ibn al-Kalbī is of particular interest to this study, as it was composed in the middle of the 8th century, possibly making it the earliest extant text that contains terminology to refer to vowels. Thus, we can gather from it important information about the use of these terms during the earliest stages of the development of grammar as a science. The use of vowel terminology in Ibn al-Kalbī’s *Tafsīr* has been statistically analyzed by Versteegh (1993: 125 ff), who notes that there seems to be no distinction at all between the two sets of terminology. Versteegh concludes from this, very plausibly, that the terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr/khafḍ*, and *jazm*, which eventually came to refer to the grammatical cases and moods, originated merely as synonyms for vowels irrespective of their position in words or their relationship to syntax.

A notable feature of Ibn al-Kalbī's terminology is his indiscriminate use of declensional and non-declensional terminology to refer to internal vowels. For the sixteen word-internal *i*-vowels surveyed by Versteegh, Ibn al-Kalbī uses *khafḍ* for eight of them, and *kasr* for eight. The *i*-vowel of *mukhliṣīna* "sincere in faith" is referred to as *khafḍ*, but the *i*-vowel of *mufriṭūna* "abused" is called *kasr*. Of eighteen internal *a*-vowels, *naṣb* occurs fifteen times, while *fath* occurs only three times. The term *naṣb* appears in reference to the first *a*-vowel of *ḥaṣād* "harvest," while *fath* is used for the initial vowel of *ammarnā*. The term *ḍamm* is used for all eleven internal *u*-vowels included in Versteegh's study. However, this term also appears in declensional contexts. For example, *ḍamm*, rather than *rafʿ*, refers to the syntactically determined ending of *thamrun* "fruit." Versteegh has not noted any instances of the non-declensional terms *sukūn* or *waqf*, but the term *jazm*, which later came to refer only to syntactically determined zero-endings, refers to the internal unvowelled *sīn* in *a-fa-ḥaṣbu*.

3.2 KITĀB AL-ʿAYN

Kitāb al-ʿAyn, as it is a multi-volume lexicon, contains a large number of references to vowels in a variety of syntactic and non-syntactic contexts, and thus is a particularly good source of data for systematic study. As I have discussed in Chapter 2, there is significant reason to doubt that *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* was composed by Khalīl himself, and it is more likely that Layth was the true author. However, the confusion surrounding the authorship of this text does not invalidate the fact that it

is a valuable source of information about early terminological use—even if *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* was composed by Layth and not by Khalīl, there is no doubt that this work stems from a period prior to the general acceptance of Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*.

Talmon (1997: 194-7) presents an analysis of vowel terminology in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, based on 128 occurrences, and the data from his study suggest that the author of *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* did not have a coherent system for distinguishing between the two sets of terms. As Talmon notes, the text contains non-declensional terminology in reference to syntactic vowels in a wide range of contexts, both word-internal and word-final.

Kitāb al-ʿAyn contains abundant examples of declensional terminology for lexically determined vowels. In discussing contrasting vocalizations of certain words, the author frequently uses declensional terminology to refer to internal vowels. For instance, *rafʿ* is used to refer to the internal *u*-vowel in the passive *lam yudaʿ* “he was not left”:

ومن روى: لم يُدْعُ في معنى: لم يُتْرَكْ فسبيله الرفع بلا علة كقولك: لم يُضْرَبْ إلا زيد.

And whoever recites: *lam yudaʿ* with the meaning of *lam yutrak* “he was not left,” his course is to [pronounce the *yāʾ* with a] *u*-vowel (*rafʿ*) without the weak letter, as when you say *lam yuḍrab illā zayd* “no one was struck but Zayd” (*K. al-ʿAyn* 2: 224).

The declensional term *rafʿ* is also used to describe the internal *u*-vowels in *ḍūbān* (a type of camel), and *ʿuqr* “center”:

والضُوبان: الجمل المسن...ومنهم من يرفع "ضُوبانا"

The *ḍawbān* is an old camel...and there are those who pronounce it *ḍūbān*, with a *u*-vowel (*yarfaʿ*) (*K. al-ʿAyn* 7: 50).

ويقال: وعُقْر الدار وعُقْر الدار بالرفع والنصب.

It is pronounced: *ʿuqr al-dār* “the center of the house” and *ʿaqr al-dār* with a *u*-vowel (*rafʿ*) and an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) (*K. al-ʿAyn* 1: 150).

The declensional root *j-z-m* also appears in word-internal contexts to refer to unvowelled consonants. For example, the author uses *majzūm* to refer to the unvowelled *rāʾ* in *ʿarḍ* “width”:

والعَرْضُ مجزوماً: خلاف الطول.

ʿarḍ without a vowel (*majzūm*): width (*K. al-ʿAyn* 1: 271).

Further illustrating the inconsistent use of terminology in this period, there are several instances in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* in which the same internal vowel is described with both declensional and non-declensional terms within the same passage. In the entry on *jināza* “funeral,” for example, the author states that the *jīm* can be vocalized either with an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) or an *i*-vowel (*jarr*); three lines later, the same *i*-vowel is referred to as *kasr*:

الجنّازة بنصب الجيم وجرّها

al-jināza “funeral” with an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) on the *jīm*, or an *i*-vowel (*jarr*) (*K. al-ʿAyn* 6:70)

الجنّازة بكسر الصدر

al-jināza “funeral” with an *i*-vowel (*kasr*) on the first consonant (*K. al-ʿAyn* 6:70)

In the variant pronunciations *‘ilw* and *‘ulw* “elevation,” *khafḍ* is contrasted with *rafʿ*.

In the same passage, however, the initial consonant in the related noun *‘ilya* is called *maksūr*:

وعلو كل شيء أعلاه ترفع العين وتخفض

The *‘ulw/ilw* of everything is its highest point. You can pronounce the *‘ayn* either with the *u*-vowel (*tarfa*) or the *i*-vowel (*takhfiḍ*) (*K. al-‘Ayn* 2: 246).

وفلان من عليّة الناس، أي: من أهل الشرف. وهؤلاء عليّة قومهم. مكسورة العين،
على فعلة خفيفة.

Somebody from the *‘ilya* of the people means [somebody] from the noble class. Those are [called] the *‘ilya* of their people. The *‘ayn* takes an *i*-vowel (*maksūra*) on the pattern of *fi‘la* (*K. al-‘Ayn* 2: 246).

This supports the Versteegh’s hypothesis that *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, and *jarr/khafḍ* were synonymous with *ḍamm*, *naṣb*, and *kasr* in the early period. Further evidence for this is the fact that declensional and non-declensional terms often occur together in mixed sets in *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*. In contrasting *khinna’b* and *khunna’ba*, for example, the author refers to the vocalization of the *khā’* as *maksūr* in the former, but *rafʿ* in the latter:

ورجل خنّاب، مكسور الخاء، مشدّد النون، مهموز: هو الضخم في عبالة
والخنّابة، الخاء رفع والنون مشدّدة، وبعد النون همزة، وهي طرف الأنف.

A man who is *khinna’b*, with an *i*-vowel (*maksūr*) on the *khā’* and a *shadda* on the *nūn*, and a *hamza*: he is heavysset. *Khunna’ba*, with a *u*-vowel on the *khā’* (*rafʿ*) and a *shadda* on the *nūn*, and a *hamza* after it, it is the end of the nose (*K. al-‘Ayn* 4: 278).

In the entry on the root *n-kh-b*, we find the non-declensional term *maksūra*, along with the declensional terms *majrūra* and *manṣūba* to refer to internal vowels:

ورجل نخب في معنى منخوب من الجبن، الخاء مكسورة. ويقال للمنخوب النخب،
النون مجرورة والحاء منصوبة والباء شديدة

A man who is *nakhīb* is faint-hearted from cowardliness. The *khā'* takes an *i*-vowel (*maksūra*). The cowardly man is called *nikhabb*; the *nūn* takes an *i*-vowel (*majrūra*), the *khā'* takes an *a*-vowel (*manṣūba*), and the *bā'* takes a *shadda* (*K. al-ʿAyn* 4: 278).

In the entry on *siyā'*, the author states that the *sīn* can be vocalized either with *a* (*naṣb*) or *i* (*kasr*):

والسياح: تطيينك بالحصّ أو الطين، أو القير. . . يجوز في السين النصب والكسر

Siyā' means “to coat with plaster, clay, or tar” . . . the *sīn* can take an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) or an *i*-vowel (*kasr*) (*K. al-ʿAyn* 2:203).

The terms *naṣb* and *kasr* appear as a set in the discussion of the word *maṣaḥḥa* and its variant pronunciation *maṣiḥḥā*:

(والصومُ مَصِحَّةٌ) وَمَصِحَّةٌ، ونصب الصاد أعلى من الكسر

Fasting is health-giving (*maṣaḥḥa*, or *maṣiḥḥa*) and the *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) is preferable to the *i*-vowel (*kasr*) (*K. al-ʿAyn* 3:14).

In addition to this mixed use of declensional and non-declensional terminology to refer to internal vowels, *Kitāb al-ʿAyn* also shows inconsistency in terminological use for non-syntactic vowel endings. We often find declensional terminology used to refer to fixed endings, including the *i*-ending of nouns on the pattern *faʿāli*, and the endings of indeclinable nouns such as *qablu* “before,” *baʿdu* “after,” *al-āna* “now,” and *ayna* “where.”

Nouns on the pattern *fa‘āli* do not decline, and their *i*-ending does not change with respect to a governor. In *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*, this *i*-ending is sometimes referred to with the declensional term *jarr*, and other times with the non-declensional *kasr*. For example, the root *j-r-r* is used for the ending of *ḥadhāri* “beware,” but *kasr* is used for the ending of *nazāli* “descend”:

حذار من أرماحنا حذار
جُرّت للجزم اللذي في الأمر

ḥadhāri min armāhinā ḥadhāri “beware of our spears, beware!” [*ḥadhāri*] takes an *i*-ending (*jurrat*) due to the unvowelled ending (*jazm*) of the imperative (*K. al-‘Ayn* 3: 199).

ويقال: نزالِ نزالِ، بالكسر، أي: انزلوا للحرب

It is said: *nazāli nazāli*, with an *i*-ending (*kasr*), meaning “go down to the battle” (*K. al-‘Ayn* 7: 367).

He also uses the declensional terms *raf‘* and *majrūr* to describe the *u*-ending of the indeclinable nouns *qablu* “before” and *ba‘du* “after,” and the *u*- and *i*-endings of *qaṭṭi*:

وأما قَطٌّ فإنه الأبد الماضي، تقول: ما رأيتَه قَطٌّ وهو رفع لأنه غاية مثل قولك: قبل
وبعد

As for *qaṭṭu*, it means “never” in the past tense. You say *mā ra‘aytuhu qaṭṭu* “I have never seen him,” and it takes a *u*-vowel (*raf‘*) because it represents an extreme, like *qablu* “before” and *ba‘du* “after” (*K. al-‘Ayn* 5: 14).

وأما القَطُّ الذي في موضع: ما أعطيتَه إلا عشرين درهما قَطٌّ، فإنه مجرور فرقا بين
الزمان والعدد

As for *qaṭṭi* that is in the context of *mā a‘ṭaytuhu illā ‘ishrīna dirhaman qaṭṭi* “I have not given him save twenty dirhams,” [*qaṭṭi*] takes an *i*-ending (*majrūra*) in order to distinguish between time and number (*K. al-‘Ayn* 5: 14).

Similarly, *al-āna* “now” takes an *a*-ending regardless of syntactic position. The author of *Kitāb al-‘Ayn* notes that the ending of *al-āna* is invariant with respect to government, but refers to this *a*-ending with declensional terminology:

أما الآن فإنه يلزم الساعة التي يكون فيها الكلام والأمور . . . والعرب تنصبه في
الجر والنصب والرفع، لأنه لا يتمكن في التصريف، فلا يثنى ولا يثلاث ولا يصغر،
ولا يصرف ولا يضاف إليه شيء.

As for *al-āna*, it corresponds to the time in which the speech or action occurs . . . The Arabs pronounce it with an *a*-ending (*tanṣubuhu*) in the genitive (*jarr*), accusative (*naṣb*), and nominative (*rafʿ*) cases, because it is not declinable in morphology, it does not have a dual or a plural form, or a diminutive. It does not inflect, and nothing can be annexed to it (*K. al-‘Ayn* 8: 404).

Like *al-āna*, the *a*-ending of *ayna* “where” is fixed and does not change with respect to grammatical case. The root *n-ṣ-b* is used in *Kitāb al-‘Ayn* to refer to this vowel as well:

أين: وقت من الأمكنة، تقول: أين فلان؟ فيكون منتصبا في الحالات كلها.

Ayna: a location in place. You say *ayna fulān*? “where is so and so?” It takes an *a*-ending (*muntaṣiban*) in all grammatical cases (*K. al-‘Ayn* 8: 404).

As these examples demonstrate, *Kitāb al-‘Ayn* does not show evidence of a coherent system of terminology for differentiating between syntactic vowels and other vowels—we often find declensional terminology used in reference to internal vowels and non-syntactic final vowels.

3.3 FARRĀ'S *MA'ĀNĪ*

The *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān* of Farrā' is the major Kufan exegetical work from the early period, and though it is a Qur'ānic commentary, it has a strong grammatical focus and shows evidence of a fairly coherent grammatical system. Thus, the fact that it does not have a well-developed system of vowel terminology is significant, because it shows that inconsistency in terminological use was not restricted to lexicographers and exegetes whose works did not focus on grammar.

Owens (1990: 159), Talmon (2003: 243-4), and Versteegh (1993: 126) have commented on the use of vowel terminology in the *Ma'ānī* of Farrā', though none of these studies constitutes a statistical survey of the data. The lexicon of Kinberg (1996) is the most systematic study of terminological use in the *Ma'ānī*. Kinberg has collected all instances of each vowel term in the *Ma'ānī*, and his study reveals that Farrā', unlike some of his predecessors, did in fact recognize some distinction between the two sets of terms, but that this system differs significantly from Sibawayh's. In this way, Farrā''s *Ma'ānī* represents an intermediate stage in the development of systematic vowel terminology in the Arabic grammatical tradition.

Unlike the *Tafsīr* of Ibn al-Kalbī, in which the two sets of terms are used interchangeably, Farrā' does not use non-declensional terminology to refer to vowel endings that are syntactically determined. For example, the *u*-ending marking nominative case or indicative mood is always referred to as *raf'* rather than *ḍamm*. In this sense, Farrā''s system matches Sibawayh's. However, the two systems differ

in that Farrāʾ uses, e.g., both *rafʿ* and *ḍamm* to refer to *u*-vowels that are not syntactically determined, whereas Sibawayh and later grammarians use only *ḍamm* for non-syntactic *u*-endings. Table 1 summarizes the use of vowel terminology in the *Maʿānī*:

Phonological Value	Declensional	Non-declensional
<i>u</i>	<i>rafʿ</i>	<i>ḍamm</i> or <i>rafʿ</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>naṣb</i>	<i>fath</i> or <i>naṣb</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>khafḍ</i>	<i>kasr</i> or <i>khafḍ</i>
∅	<i>jazm</i>	<i>jazm</i> or <i>sukūn</i>

Table 1: Vowel terminology of Farrāʾ

Like *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, Farrāʾ’s commentary contains many instances of declensional terminology referring to internal vowels. Because Kinberg (1996) has studied this thoroughly and has collected all instances of vowel terminology in the *Maʿānī*, I will give only a few representative examples here. In the following passage, Farrāʾ uses the declensional term *rafʿ* to describe the internal vowel in *wujdikum* “your means/wealth,” in Q 65: 6:

وقد أجمع القراء على رفع الواو من "وجدكم" وعلى رفع القاف من "قدر"

The readers have agreed on the *u*-vocalization (*rafʿ*) of the *wāw* in *wujdikum*, and on the *u*-vocalization (*rafʿ*) of the *qāf* in *qudir* (*Maʿānī* 3: 164).

The *a*-vowel in *ḍarr* “harm” is described as *naṣb* rather than *fath*:

اجتمع القراء على "لا أملك لكم ضرراً" بنصب الضاد ولم يرفع أحد منهم

The readers have agreed on *lā amliku lakum ḍarran* “It is not in my power to cause you harm” with *a*-vocalization (*naṣb*) of the *ḍād*, and none of them pronounced it with a *u*-vowel (*rafʿ*) (*Maʿānī* 3: 195).

Farrāʾ sometimes uses declensional and non-declensional terminology to refer to the same vowel, seemingly without preference whatsoever. For example, *rafʿ* and *ḍamm* are both used in the same sentence to refer to the *u*-vowel of *sūʾ*, as a variant pronunciation of *sawʾ* “evil”:

فمن قال: "دائرة السَّوءِ" فإنه أراد المصدر . . . ومن رفع السين جعله اسماً كقولك: عليهم دائرة البلاء والعذاب. ولا يجوز ضم السين في قوله: "ما كان أبوك أمراً سوءاً" ولا في قوله "وظننتم ظنَّ السوء" لأنه ضد لقولك: هذا رجل صدق، وثوب صدق. فليس للسوء هاهنا معنى في عذاب ولا بلاء، فيضمّ.

Whoever says *dāʾirat al-sawʾ* “an evil turn of fortune” intends it as a *maṣdar*...and whoever places a *u*-vowel (*rafaʿa*) on the *sīn* makes it a noun, like when you say *ʿalayhim dāʾirat al-balāʾ wa-l-ʿadhāb* “Upon them is a turn of punishment and tribulation.” The *u*-vowel (*ḍamm*) on the *sīn* is not permissible in *mā kāna abūka mraʾa sawʾ* “Your father was not a man of evil” or in *wa-ẓanantum ẓanna l-sawʾ* “You assumed an evil assumption” . . . *sawʾ* here does not have the meaning of punishment or tribulation, so it can take a *u*-vowel (*yuḍamm*) (*Maʿānī* 1: 450).

In his discussion of the variant pronunciations of *yakḥṭafu* in *yakādu l-barqu* *yakḥṭafu abṣārahum* “The lightning almost snatches away their sight” (Q 2: 20), Farrāʾ uses the roots *j-z-m* and *s-k-n* indiscriminately to refer to internal unvowelled consonants. I quote this passage at length, as it also illustrates the interchangeable use of *k-s-r* and *kh-f-ḍ* to refer to *i*-vowels:

والقرءاء تقرأ "يَخْطَفُ أَبْصَارَهُمْ" بنصب الياء والخاء والتشديد. وبعضهم ينصب الياء ويخفض الخاء ويشدد الطاء فيقول "يَخْطَفُ". وبعضهم يكسر الياء والخاء ويشدد فيقول "يَخْطَفُ". وبعض من قرءاء أهل المدينة يسكن الخاء والطاء فيجمع بين ساكنين فيقول "يَخْطَفُ". فأما من قال: "يَخْطَفُ" فإنه نقل أعراب⁵ التاء المدغمة إلى الخاء إذ كانت منجزمة

⁵ I have translated *iʿrāb* here simply as “vowel,” since it is clear that in this context, it cannot mean “declensional ending.” Though beyond the scope of this thesis, it is interesting to note that the word

The readers read *yakhaṭṭifu abṣārahum* with an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) on the *yā'* and the *khā'*, and with a *shadda*. Some of them pronounce the *yā'* with an *a*-vowel (*yaṣub*) and the *khā'* with an *i*-vowel (*yakhfiḍ*), and a *shadda* on the *ṭā'*, so they say *yakhiṭṭifu*. Others of them pronounce the *yā'* and the *khā'* with an *i*-vowel (*yaksir*) and a *shadda*, so they say *yikhiṭṭifu*. Some of the readers of Medina pronounce the *khā'* and the *ṭā'* without a vowel (*yusakkin*), so there are two consecutive unvowelled consonants, and they say *yakhṭṭifu*. As for those who say *yakhaṭṭifu*, they have moved the vowel (*i'rāb*) of the geminate *ṭā'* to the *khā'*, as it was unvowelled (*munjazima*) (*Ma'ānī* 1:17-8).

Like *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*, the *Ma'ānī* also uses declensional terminology to refer to word-final vowels that are not related to case or mood, but instead are determined by phonology or morphology. These encompass nouns on the pattern *fa'āli*, indeclinable nouns such as *al-āna* “now,” fixed particles, and epenthetic vowels.

In a passage explaining the ending of the exclamatory *hayhāt*, Farrā' compares this word to *darāki* “overtake” and *naḏāri* “wait” and refers to the final *i*-vowel as *khafḍ*:

فإذا وقفت على هيهات وقفت بالتاء في كليهما لأن من العرب من يخفض التاء، فدل ذلك على أنها ليست بهاء التأنيث، فصارت بمنزلة دراكٍ ونظارٍ.

If you pause at *hayhāt*, you pause at the *tā'* in both of them, because some of the Arabs put an *i*-vowel (*yakhfiḍ*) on the *tā'*, which indicates that it is not a feminine *tā'*, and so it becomes analogous to *darāki* and *naḏāri* (*Ma'ānī* 2: 235).

i'rāb developed its technical meaning over time, and that it was originally used with a range of non-technical meanings. Versteegh (1993: 128) notes that Ibn al-Kalbī uses this word to mean “speaking Arabic correctly.” The development of the technical meaning of *i'rāb*, along with terms for other concepts that are essential to the distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels, goes hand in hand with the systematization of the scheme of declensional terminology, and thus would be an interesting topic for further research.

Similarly, the declensional root *kh-f-d* is used to refer to the non-declensional *i*-ending of the noun *amsi* “yesterday”:

فأدخل الألف واللام على أمس ثم تركه مخفوضا على جهته الأولى.

He placed the definite article on *amsi* “yesterday,” then he left it with the *i*-ending (*makhfūd*), according to its original form (*Ma‘ānī* 1: 468).

In the next passage, Farrā’ speculates that *al-āna* takes a fixed *a*-ending by virtue of its similarity to the past-tense verb paradigm *fa‘ala*, which always ends in an *a*-vowel. He uses the term *naṣb* to refer to this fixed vowel:

وإن شئت جعلت الآن أصلها من قولك: أن لك أن تفعل، أدخلت عليها الألف واللام، ثم تركتها على مذهب فعل فأتاها النصب من نصب فعل

If you want, you can take the origin of *al-āna* to be *āna laka an taf‘al* “it is time for you to do.” You have placed *alif lām* on it, then you have left it on the pattern *fa‘ala*, and given it an *a*-ending (*naṣb*) from the *a*-ending (*naṣb*) of *fa‘ala* (*Ma‘ānī* 1: 468).

Farrā’ uses both declensional and non-declensional terminology to refer to epenthetic vowels, which are determined purely phonologically and have no relation to syntax, and thus are referred to only with non-declensional terminology in the post-*Kitāb* era. In discussing the final *i*-vowel on *fī* in a line of poetry, he uses the root *kh-f-d* rather than *k-s-r*. He compares this vowel to the epenthetic final vowels of *mudhu* and *mudhi*, for which he uses the terms *raf‘* and *khafḍ*. Both *naṣb* and *fath* appear in this passage to refer to the default vowels in these words:

فخفض الياء من "في" فإن بك ذلك صحيحا فهو مما يلتقي من الساكنين فيُخفض الآخر منهما، وإن كان له أصل في الفتح: ألا ترى أنهم يقولون: لم أره مُدُّ اليوم ومُدُّ

اليوم والرفع في الذال هو الوجه؛ لأنه أصل حركة مدّ والخفض جائز، فكذلك الياء من مصرخيّ خُفِضت ولها أصل في النصب.

He pronounced the *yā'* in *fiyyi* with an *i*-vowel (*khafaḍa*). If [the *yā'*] were a sound consonant, there would be two consecutive unvowelled consonants (*sākinayn*), so the last of the two is pronounced with an *i*-vowel (*yukhfaḍ*), even though it takes an *a*-vowel (*fath*) in its default form. Don't you see that they say: *lam arahu mudhu l-yawm*, and *mudhi l-yawm*. The *u*-vowel (*raf*) on the *dhāl* is the more common form, because it is the default vowel of *mudh*, and the *i*-vowel (*khafḍ*) is permissible. Similarly for the *yā'* in *maṣrakhīyy*. It takes an *i*-vowel (*khufiḍat*) despite the fact that its default vowel is an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*) (*Ma'ānī* 2: 76).

A particularly surprising use of the declensional root *naṣb* to refer to the *a*-vowel on the conjunctive particle *wāw*, which, unlike several of the examples above, is not related to any process of phonological or morphological change:

تنصب هذه الواو، لأنها واو عطف أدخلت عليها ألف الإستفهام وليست بأو التي واوها ساكنة

This *wāw* takes an *a*-ending (*tunṣab*) because it is a conjunctive *wāw* upon which the interrogative *alif* has entered, and it is not *aw*, the *wāw* of which is unvowelled (*sākina*) (*Ma'ānī* 1: 98).

These examples illustrate that, although the *Ma'ānī* clearly shows that Farrā' recognized some distinction between syntactic and non-syntactic vowels, his terminological use regarding non-declensional vowels differs substantially from that of Sibawayh and later authors.

3.4 MUQADDIMA FĪ L-NAḤW

The *Muqaddima fī l-naḥw* is attributed to 8th century scholar Khalaf al-Aḥmar (d. 796). The validity of this attribution is far from certain, but, regardless of its

authorship, Owens (1990: 180 ff) argues convincingly that the text itself is pre-850. The vowel terminology found in this text does not display the same degree of randomness found in Ibn al-Kalbī, suggesting that its author might have recognized, at least to some degree, a distinction between syntactically relevant vowels and other vowels. However, the text contains several significant instances of terminological inconsistency, illustrating that even if scholars in the early period were beginning to recognize the importance of this distinction, a terminological scheme to capture this distinction had not yet been fully developed or widely adopted.

I have not noted any instances of declensional terminology to refer to internal vowels in the *Muqaddima*. This might suggest that the author adhered to a system similar to that of Sibawayh in some respects, but given the brevity of the text and the paucity of references to vowels, this is impossible to prove.

The author of the *Muqaddima fī l-naḥw* acknowledges that the *u*-ending of *qaṭṭu* “never” is fixed, yet uses the root *r-f-ʿ* to describe it:

وكذلك قط: فإنه العرب بنتها على الرفع، تقول: ما رأيت قطّ مثلك

Similarly, *qaṭṭu*: The Arabs have fixed it with a *u*-ending (*rafʿ*), you say: *mā raʿaytu qaṭṭu mithlaka* “I have never seen anybody like you” (*Muqaddima* 92-3).

The noun *amsi* “yesterday” is vocalized with a final *i*-vowel regardless of syntactic position. The author explicitly recognizes that this is a fixed ending, and refers to it with the declensional term *khafḍ*:

وكذلك كل ما بنته العرب، ولا تتغير بنيته بأداة ولا غيرها مثل:
أمس، فإنه مخفوض أبدا

Similarly for all [endings] that the Arabs have fixed, and that do not change as the result of a particle, or of anything else, as in *amsi*, which takes an *i*-ending (*makhfūd*) always" (*Muqaddima* 91).

3.5 ABU 'UBAYDA AND AKHFASH

The exegetical works of Abū 'Ubayda and Akhfash are among the few extant Basran works from the early period that contain grammatical terminology. It has been suggested that the distinction in vowel terminology represents a divide between the Basran and Kufan schools, rather than a difference between earlier and later periods. Versteegh (1993: 127), for example, proposes that the inconsistency in terminological use in the Kufan school persisted for quite some time, whereas this distinction was part of the Basran system from an early date. He believes that Abu 'Ubayda never deviates from this terminological distinction. However, this is not the case. Talmon (2003: 240) has noted a number of instances of inconsistency in the works of Akhfash and Abu 'Ubayda. In addition to Talmon's data, I have counted several other examples of inconsistency in both of these works. This suggests that the inconsistent use of vowel terminology was a widespread phenomenon in texts composed in the pre-*Kitāb* period, rather than a characteristic of a particular school.

It does seem to be the case that Akhfash and Abū 'Ubayda do adhere to some system of declensional terminology, far more so than do Farrā' and the author of *Kitāb al-'Ayn*. I have not found any instances in the *Majāz* in which declensional

terminology appears in a word-internal context, apart from the single example noted by Talmon. This may also be the case in the *Ma‘ānī*, though I have not been able to do a thorough reading of that text. Regardless of whether the system of Abu ‘Ubayda and Akhfash bears similarity to that of Sibawayh, the fact that these early Basran exegetical works contain significant inconsistencies in use of vowel terminology that are not present in texts composed during the post-*Kitāb* period suggests that, even if the distinction between the two sets of terms was coming to be recognized in the early period, it had not yet been well-established and was not consistently applied until the late ninth century.

Talmon (2003: 240-1) notes one instance each in Abū ‘Ubayda’s *Majāz* and Akhfash’s *‘Arūḍ* of declensional terminology referring to internal vowels. The data from Abū ‘Ubayda concerns the internal *u*-vowel in *ghurf* (a type of tree):

الغرف: شجر تعمل منه الغرابيل، وكان أبو عمرو الهذلي يرفع ذلك

The *ghurf* tree is a tree from which sieves are made. Abu ‘Amr al-Hudhalī pronounced it with a *u*-vowel (*yarfa*) (*Majāz* 1:138).

In the *‘Arūḍ*, Akhfash uses both declensional and non-declensional terminology in sets to refer to internal vowels in his explanation of the difference between unvowelled (*sākin*) consonants and vowelled (*mutaḥarrik*) consonants:

أعلم أنّ الساكن من الحروف هو الموقوف الذي ليس فيه رفع ولا نصب ولا جر نحو ميم "عمر" وراء "برد" . . . أما المتحرك فكل مضموم أو مكسور أو مفتوح نحو باء "كُبر" و"كَبِر" و"كَبَر"

Know that the unvowelled [consonant] is that which is paused after and does not carry *u* (*raf*), *a* (*naṣb*), or *i* (*jarr*), as in the *mīm* of *‘amr* and the *rā’* of *bard* . . . as for the vowelled [consonant], each one has a

u-vowel (*maḍmūm*), *i*-vowel (*maksūr*), or *a*-vowel (*maftūḥ*) like the *bā'* in *kubar*, *kabir*, and *kabar* ('*Arūḍ* 136).

The use of declensional terminology in the works of these two authors extends to non-syntactic final vowels. Abū 'Ubayda, in the *Majāz*, explains the difference between the dual form *ṣinwān-i* and the plural form *ṣinwān-un*, which have the same consonantal skeleton, and are homophones when pronounced without final vowels. He states that the dual form is distinguished from the plural form by the fact that the former takes an *i*-ending regardless of grammatical case, whereas the latter declines fully. He uses the declensional term *majrūra* to refer to this fixed *i*-vowel:

وواحدہ صنو والاثنان صنوان، النون مجرورة في موضع الرفع والنصب والجر
كنون الاثنین، فإذا جمعته قلت: صنوان كثير، والإعراب في نونه: يدخله النصب
والرفع والجر

Its singular is *ṣinwun* and the dual is *ṣinwāni*. The *nūn* takes an *i*-ending (*majrūra*) in the nominative (*raf'*), accusative (*naṣb*), and genitive (*jarr*). If you make it plural, you say *ṣinwānun kathīrun*. The inflection of the *nūn* [of the plural]: the [declensional] *a*-ending (*naṣb*, *u*-ending (*raf'*), and *i*-ending (*jarr*) enter upon it (*Majāz* 1: 322).

Akhfash in his *Ma'ānī* describes the affirmative particle *lām*, which always takes an *a*-vowel, as *maṣṣūb*:

فهذه اللام لام التوكيد وهي منصوبة تقع على الاسم الذي تقع عليه إنَّ إذا كان بينها
وبين إنَّ حشو

This *lām* is the *lām* of emphasis, and it takes an *a*-vowel (*maṣṣūba*) and occurs on the noun of *inna* when there is something separating the noun from *inna* (*Ma'ānī* 116).

Akhfash, like Farrā', occasionally uses declensional terminology to refer to endings of past tense verbs. As we will see in Chapter 5, Sibawayh and later grammarians

use only non-declensional terminology in this context. This example concerns the zero-ending of the feminine verb *tabbat*, which is referred to as *jazm*:

تَبَّتْ جَزْمٌ لِأَنَّ تَاءَ الْمُؤنَّثِ إِذَا كَانَتْ فِي الْفِعْلِ فَهُوَ جَزْمٌ نَحْوُ: ضَرَبَ وَضَرَبَتْ. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُهُ وَتَبَّ فَهُوَ مَفْتُوحٌ لِأَنَّهُ فِعْلٌ مَذْكَرٌ قَدْ مَضَى.

[The ending of] *tabbat* is vowelless (*jazm*) because the feminine *tā'*, when it is on a verb, is vowelless (*jazm*), as in *ḍaraba* “he struck” and *ḍarabat* “she struck.” As for when he says *tabba*, it takes an *a*-ending (*maftūḥ*) because it is a masculine verb in the past tense (*Ma‘ānī* 588).

In addition to this data from Talmon (2003), I have found several other instances of declensional terminology referring to non-syntactic vowels in both the *Ma‘ānī* and the *Majāz*. In the *Ma‘ānī*, For example, Akhflash uses the root *n-ṣ-b* in reference to the *a*-vowel on the particle *lammā* “when”:

وقال بعضهم "لَمَّا"، فتثقل ونصب اللام وضعف الميم

One of them says *lammā*, making it heavier, and putting an *a*-vowel (*naṣaba*) on the *lām* and doubling the *mīm* (*Ma‘ānī* 514).

A particularly interesting use of declensional terminology in the *Ma‘ānī* concerns a zero-ending that is determined purely phonologically. In the sentence *jā'at rusulnā* “our messengers came,” *rusul* is the agent of the verb, and thus is in the nominative case and would ordinarily take a *u*-ending, but this vowel is sometimes unpronounced, not as a result of syntax but rather as a result of a phonological principle by which a vowel may be omitted in pronunciation when its inclusion would result in several consecutive vowelised consonants. Akhflash uses the root *j-z-m* to refer to this zero-ending:

سمعت من العرب من يقول "جاءت رُسُلُنَا"، جزم اللام وذلك لكثرة الحركة

I have heard some of the Arabs say *jāʿat rusulnā* "our messengers came." They pronounced the *lām* without a vowel (*jazama*) because of the abundance of vowels (*Maʿānī* 99).

A similar example concerns the *lām* in *wa-l-takun* "and let there be" as a variant pronunciation of *wa-li-takun*. Akhfash uses the term *jazm* to refer to this unvowelled *lām*:

وَأَتَكُن: جزم بعضهم اللام أيضا.

wa-l-takun: some of them also pronounce the *lām* without a vowel (*jazama*) (*Maʿānī* 228).

In his discussion of *inna llāha rabbī wa-rabbukum* "Indeed, Allah is my Lord and your Lord" in Q 3: 51, Akhfash mentions that some reciters read *anna* rather than *inna*, and refers to the initial *a*-vowel as *naṣb*:

فإنَّ على الإبتداء، وقال بعضهم "أَنَّ" فنصب على "وجئتم بأنَّ الله ربِّي وربكم"

Inna introduces the subject, and some of them say *anna* with an *a*-vowel (*naṣaba*) by analogy with *wa-jiʿtukum bi-anna llāha rabbī wa-rabbukum* (*Maʿānī* 221).

I have noted four instances of inconsistency in the *Majāz* of Abū ʿUbayda, in addition to the data I have presented from Talmon. One of them concerns the letters *ḥāʾ mīm*, known as *fawātiḥ*, that constitute the opening verse of Sūrat Ghāfir. Ordinarily, these opening letters are considered merely as unvowelled consonants, but if instead they are taken together to form a noun, this noun may decline according to functional position. Abū ʿUbayda uses the term *majzūma* in this passage to refer to these letters:

إذا سمّيت سورة بشيء من هذه الأحرف المجزومة دخله الإعراب.

If a *sūra* is named by unvowelled letters (*majzūma*), [these letters] can take declensional endings (*Majāz* 2: 194).

In another passage, we find the declensional *jarr* in a set with the non-declensional *fath*. This occurs in reference to *‘amm* in the vocative construction *yā bna ‘ammī*, which is sometimes pronounced with a short vowel ending rather than with the pronominal *yā’*. When the *yā’* is omitted, the final *mīm* in *‘amm* can take either an *i*-vowel or an *a*-vowel, which Abū ‘Ubayda refers to with *j-r-r* and *f-t-ḥ*, respectively:

جرّها بعضهم وفتحها آخرون.

Some of them have pronounced it with an *i*-ending (*jarrahā*), and others have pronounced it with an *a*-ending (*fataḥahā*) (*Majāz* 2: 26).

He also uses the term *jarr* to refer to the non-syntactic ending of the imperative *masāsi* “touch” in a verse of poetry, and compares this ending to the fixed *i*-ending of several other nouns on the pattern *fa‘āli*:

جرّ بغير تنوين وهو في موضع نصب لأنه أجرى مجرى قظام وحذام ونزال

It takes an *i*-ending (*jarr*) without *tanwīn* even though it is in the position of the accusative (*naṣb*), because it follows the pattern of *qaṭāmi*, *ḥadhāmi*, and *nazāli* (*Majāz* 2: 27).

Finally, he employs the root *r-f-‘* in reference to the fixed *u*-ending of *ba‘du* “after”:

بعد مرفوع بغير تنوين لأنه غاية

Ba‘du takes a *u*-ending (*marfū’*) without *tanwīn*, because it refers to an extremity (*Majāz* 2: 140).

We have seen in this chapter that the use of vowel terminology in the pre-*Kitāb* period was chaotic, and that declensional terms were often used interchangeably with non-declensional terms in non-syntactic contexts. In Ibn al-Kalbī's *Tafsīr*, the earliest text considered in this chapter, there seems to be no terminological distinction at all between syntactic and non-syntactic vowels, suggesting that *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr/khafḍ* and *jazm* originated as synonyms for *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr* and *sukūn/waqf*, respectively. This also seems to be the case in *Kitāb al-ʿAyn*. The Basran scholars Abū ʿUbayda and Akhfash, and the author of the *Muqaddima fī l-naḥw*, may have recognized two distinct sets of terminology, but all of their works nonetheless betray a lack of consistent adherence to a well-defined system. The *Maʿānī* of Farrāʾ does show evidence of some attempt to systematize declensional vowel terminology, more so than the other texts discussed in this chapter, but Farrāʾ' s system, as we have seen, differs in important ways from that of Sibawayh. In the next chapter, I will look at passages from Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, which marks the beginning of what would become widespread acceptance of the declensional scheme that remains in use today, and represents a sharp dividing line between the early and late periods.

Chapter 4: Vowel Terminology in Sibawayh's *Kitāb*

In Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, we find the first explicit acknowledgement of a distinction between terms for declensional vowels and those for non-declensional vowels. Sibawayh's remarkably consistent adherence to this distinction throughout the text is in stark contrast with the chaotic use of vowel terminology in the 8th century and early 9th century, which we saw in Chapter 3. The *Kitāb* marks the beginning of the systematization in use of declensional terminology that continues in the works of virtually all later grammarians. Of course, the *Kitāb* was a seminal work in the history of Arabic grammar for many reasons, and Sibawayh's status as an innovator is certainly not limited to the realm of terminology—he introduced and refined a large number of grammatical concepts, synthesized earlier ideas, and the structure and scope of the *Kitāb* set the precedent for later works. Although Sibawayh made many essential contributions to the Arabic grammatical tradition at nearly every level of the study of language, his introduction of the terminological distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels is undeniably among his most important contributions to the study of grammar. This has been widely recognized by contemporary scholars, including Versteegh (1997: 45), who states that Sibawayh's systematization of the declensional scheme is his “most essential innovation,” and Baalbaki (2008: 86), who considers this distinction to be one of the two “most fundamental axioms” of Sibawayh's grammatical theory, along with the tripartite division of speech. Particularly significant to the present study is

Baalbaki's observation that "[Sibawayh's] terminology represents a significant departure from earlier usage. In particular, his systematization of the declensional scheme is in sharp contrast with the earlier lack of distinction between declensional vowels and other vowels" (2008: 32). Sibawayh's systematization of the scheme for vowel terminology constitutes the clearest divide between early and late works, as the contrast between the use of vowel terminology between the pre-*Kitāb* and post-*Kitāb* periods is notably sharper than the contrast in syntactic and phonetic terminology.

In this chapter, I will present several passages from the *Kitāb* that highlight the clarity with which Sibawayh conceives of this distinction, and I will show that the examples that Sibawayh uses to illustrate the application of this distinction are the very same examples for which earlier grammarians used terminology in an inconsistent manner.

The distinction between two sets of vowel terminology is presented in the second chapter of the *Kitāb*, preceded only by the famous first chapter in which Sibawayh divides all of speech into noun (*ism*), verb (*fi'l*) and particle (*ḥarf*). The fact that Sibawayh makes this distinction in the opening treatise to the *Kitāb*, commonly referred to as the *Risāla*, which contains fundamental concepts that set the stage for the remainder of the book, indicates that the terminological scheme for declensional vowels is a crucial part of his syntactic theory. Versteegh (1997: 44) has suggested that this opening part of the text is where Sibawayh introduces the

innovations that he himself had introduced to the study of grammar, which further strengthens the hypothesis that no well-defined terminological system for vowels existed before the *Kitāb*. It is also notable that Sibawayh does not quote any other grammarians in this part of the text, since Sibawayh cites his predecessors on nearly every page throughout the remainder of the *Kitāb*.

In the beginning of the second chapter of the *Kitāb*, Sibawayh presents all of the vowel terminology and articulates the distinction between the two contrasting sets of terms, and gives examples of their proper use. He goes on to discuss the inflection of nouns and verbs in the dual and plural, and then discusses theoretical issues related to concepts that are integral to the phenomenon of inflection, such as resemblance (*muḍāraʿa*) and lightness (*khiffa*).

Sibawayh begins his chapter on the vowel endings of words by listing the eight terms that refer to vowel endings. He presents the two constituent sets of terminology as standing in contrast to one another—*rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm* on one hand, and *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *waqf* on the other—and groups the terms into pairs according to pronunciation. The terms *rafʿ* and *ḍamm* are presented as a pair, as they share the phonetic value *u*, and similarly for the pairs *naṣb* and *fath*, both pronounced as *a*, *jarr* and *kasr*, pronounced as *i*, and *jazm* and *waqf*, which refer to unvowelled consonants:

هذا باب مجاري أواخر الكلم من العربية

وهي تجري على ثمانية مجار: على النصب والجر والرفع والجزم، والفتح والضم والكسر والوقف. وهذه المجاري الثمانية يجمعهنّ في اللفظ أربعة أضرب: فالنصب

والفتح في اللفظ ضرب واحد، والجر والكسر فيه واحد، وكذلك الرفع والضم،
والجزم والوقف.

This is the chapter on the paths of the endings of words in Arabic

[The endings of words] follow eight [possible] paths: the accusative/subjunctive *a*-ending (*naṣb*), the genitive *i*-ending (*jarr*), the nominative/indicative *u*-ending (*rafʿ*), the jussive zero-ending (*jazm*); and the [non-declensional] *a*-ending (*fath*), *u*-ending (*damm*), *i*-ending (*kasr*), and zero-ending (*waqf*). These eight endings are grouped into four pairs according to pronunciation: the accusative/subjunctive *a*-ending (*naṣb*) and the [non-declensional] *a*-ending (*fath*) are phonetically identical, as are the genitive *i*-ending (*jarr*) and the [non-declensional] *i*-ending (*kasr*), the nominative/indicative *u*-ending (*rafʿ*) and the [non-declensional] *u*-ending (*damm*), and the jussive zero-ending (*jazm*) and the [non-declensional] zero-ending (*waqf*) (*Kitāb* 1:13).⁶

Immediately following this passage, Sibawayh gives the reason for the distinction he made in the previous paragraph, explaining that he has divided the eight terms into two contrasting sets in order to distinguish between syntactically determined vowel endings and other endings. The former are determined by a governor (*ʿāmil*) and thus can change with a change in syntactic context, whereas the latter are fixed regardless of syntactic context:

⁶ Versteegh has interpreted this passage twice (1977: 19, 1997: 36-7), and neither interpretation is quite accurate. The first is a complete misreading of the text—Versteegh reads Sibawayh’s mention of four pairs of vowels as referring to the phonetic correspondence between long and short vowels, for example between the short *a*-vowel *fathā* and the long *a*-vowel *alif*, rather than to declensional and non-declensional vowels. Versteegh later acknowledged this error, but his 1997 translation is still problematic. He translates *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm* as “nominative,” “accusative,” “genitive,” and “apocopate,” respectively. This is problematic for several reasons. One is that Sibawayh is not referring to abstract grammatical cases, but rather to the vowels that canonically instantiate these cases. Sibawayh here is discussing the declension not only of nouns, which inflect for case, but also verbs, which inflect for mood. Thus, for example, *naṣb* as used in this passage refers not only to the accusative *a*-ending of nouns but also to the subjunctive *a*-ending of verbs. A bigger issue with Versteegh’s 1997 translation is that he interprets *lafẓ* with its alternative meaning, “formal,” rather than “pronunciation,” which is clearly the meaning Sibawayh intends in this passage.

وإنما ذكرت ثمانية مجار لأفرق بين ما يدخله ضرب من هذه الأربعة لما يحدث فيه العامل وليس شيء منها إلا وهو يزول عنه، وبين ما يبنى عليه الحرف بناء لا يزول عنه لغير شيء أحدث ذلك فيه من العوامل.

I have mentioned eight endings in order to distinguish between, on the one hand, [words] that take one of these four [phonetic values] as the result of the action of a governor—and every one of these [endings] is changeable—and [endings] that are fixed on the final consonant (*ḥarf*) and do not change with respect to any governor (*Kitāb* 1: 13).

Then, he classifies words according to whether they take inflectional endings, which are determined by government, or whether their endings are fixed, and invariant with respect to the action of a governor. The inflected class encompasses only the regular, fully declinable (*mutamakkin*) nouns, and the imperfect (*muḍāriʿ*) verbs.⁷ Thus, the declensional terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm* are only appropriate in these two contexts, while the non-declensional terms *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf* are used in all other contexts:

فالرفع والجر والنصب والجزم لحروف الإعراب. وحروف الإعراب للأسماء المتمكنة، وللأفعال المضارعة لأسماء الفاعلين التي في أوائلها الزوائد الأربع: الهمزة والتاء والياء والنون.

[The terms] *rafʿ*, *jarr*, *naṣb*, and *jazm* are exclusive to consonants of declension. Consonants of declension occur only on fully declinable nouns and on verbs that resemble active participles and that begin

⁷ The term *muḍāriʿ* eventually became a technical term to refer to what is termed in Western grammar as the imperfect verb. This later technical usage evolved from its original, more general meaning of “resemblance.” The concept of resemblance is crucial to the distinction between syntactic and non-syntactic vowels, as the nature of verbs is to take fixed endings, and only those verbs that resemble nouns inflect for mood. The imperfect verbs are the only verbs that bear resemblance to nouns, and thus are the only verbs whose endings are declensional. I sometimes translate this word as “imperfect,” and sometimes with its literal meaning of “resemblance,” according to the context in which it appears.

with one of the four derivational letters: *hamza*, *tā'*, *yā'* or *nūn* (*Kitāb* 1:13).

Sibawayh illustrates the proper use of these four terms, *raf'*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm*, by systematically providing examples of each of them as they apply to declinable nouns and to imperfect verbs. He states that the declensional *a*-ending (*naṣb*) marks the accusative case in nouns, as in *ra'aytu Zayd-an* "I saw Zayd," and the subjunctive mood in imperfect verbs, as in *lan yaf'ala* "he will not do"; the declensional *u*-ending (*raf'*) is for the nominative case in nouns, as in *hādha Zayd-un* "This is Zayd," and the indicative mood in verbs, as in *sa-yaf'alu* "he will do"; the declensional *i*-ending (*jarr*) marks the genitive case in nouns, as in *marartu bi-Zayd-in* "I passed by Zayd." Because verbs are never inflected with an *i*-vowel, the term *jarr* can never refer to verb endings.⁸ The declensional zero-ending (*jazm*) occurs only on jussive verbs, as in *lam yaf'al* "he did not do" and never on nouns, as nouns have no analog of the jussive mood (*Kitāb* 1: 14).

In contrast with *raf'*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm*, the terms *fath*, *ḍamm*, *kasr*, and *waqf* are for non-syntactically determined endings, which, as Sibawayh states, occur in three contexts: nouns that do not fully inflect (*al-asmā' ghayr al-mutamakkina*), verbs other than the imperfect (i.e. perfect verbs and imperatives), and particles:

⁸ Verbs can end in an *i*-vowel for phonological reasons, as in the epenthetic *i*-ending to prevent two consecutive unvoiced consonants, or for morphological reasons, as in the jussive form of verbs with weak third radicals. However, these are not syntactically determined endings and thus the declensional term *jarr* is not appropriate in these contexts. As we saw in Chapter 3, Farrā' used *jarr* in this context.

وأما الفتح والكسر والضم والوقف فلأسماء غير المتمكنة المضارعة عندهم ما ليس باسم ولا فعل مما جاء لمعنى ليس غير، نحو سوف وقد، وللأفعال التي لم تجر مجرى المضارعة، وللحروف التي ليست بأسماء ولا أفعال ولم تجيء إلا لمعنى.

As for [the terms] *fath*, *kasr*, *ḍamm* and *waqf*, [they are] for indeclinable nouns that resemble, in their opinion, meaningful [words] that are neither nouns nor verbs and serve to indicate meaning, such as [the future marker] *sawfa* and [the perfect marker] *qad*; for verbs that do not decline like the imperfect; and for [words] that are neither nouns nor verbs and serve only to indicate meaning (*Kitāb* 1:14).

As he did for the declensional terms, Sibawayh systematically presents examples of the application of each of the non-declensional terms *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *waqf*. The term *fath* is used for the fixed *a*-endings of the uninflected nouns *ḥaytha* (a variant of *ḥaythu* “where”), *ayna* “where” and *kayfa* “how,” perfect verbs, such as *ḍaraba* “he struck,” and particles, such as the future tense marker *sawfa* and the conjunction *thumma*. The term *kasr* refers to the fixed *i*-endings of nouns on the pattern *fa‘āli*, and the genitive particles *li-* and *bi-*, as in *li-Zaydin* “for Zayd” and *bi-Zaydin* “with Zayd.” The term *ḍamm* is used for the fixed *u*-endings of the uninflected words *ḥaythu* “where,” *qablu* “before,” and *ba‘du* “after,” and *mundhu* “since.” The unvoiced final consonants of the nouns *man* “who,” *kam* “how many,” and *qaṭ* “only” imperative verbs, such as *iḍrib* “strike,” and the fixed particles *min*, *hal*, the negative particle *bal*, and the perfect marker *qad*. In Chapter 3, we saw that grammarians from the late 8th-mid 9th centuries use declensional terminology to refer to many of these fixed endings.

Table 2 summarizes Sibawayh’s terminology for vowels:

Phonological Value	Declensional	Non-declensional
<i>u</i>	<i>rafʿ</i>	<i>ḍamm</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>naṣb</i>	<i>fath</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>jar</i>	<i>kasr</i>
∅	<i>jazm</i>	<i>waqf</i>

Table 2: Sibawayh’s vowel terminology

Though Sibawayh is remarkably consistent in maintaining this terminological distinction throughout the text—his consistency is all the more remarkable given the massive size of the *Kitāb*—Talmon (2003: 241) has counted fourteen instances in which Sibawayh deviates from his own system and uses declensional terminology to refer to vowels that are not syntactically determined. Talmon attempts to explain some of these apparent inconsistencies by suggesting that Sibawayh may have understood *irāb* as referring not only to syntactically induced processes of change, but also to more general vowel change, related to phonological or morphological processes. For example, Sibawayh uses the verb *yujzamu* to refer to the fixed pronominal ending in *aʿṭaytukum* “I gave you” while discussing the shift from *aʿṭaytukumūhu* “I gave you (pl.) it” to *aʿṭaytukum dhāk* “I gave you (pl.) that,” which involves the deletion of an epenthetic vowel, resulting in an unvowelled *mīm*. In another passage, the verb *jazamū* is used for the unvowelled *lām* in *lam yalduh* “he did not bear him,” which results from the phonological process of change from its original form, *lam yalidhu*, in which the *lām* takes an *i*-vowel. Talmon explains Sibawayh’s use of *naṣb* to refer to the final *a*-vowel of the

perfect verbs *‘alima* “he learned” and *dhahaba* “he left” by suggesting that Sibawayh may have adhered to an early theory that the contrast between the *a*-ending of the perfect and the *u*-ending of the imperfect was a significant declensional feature. I believe that this is highly unlikely, because, as we saw earlier in this chapter, Sibawayh clearly states that the only inflected verbs are the imperfect verbs. Perfect verbs, such as *‘alima* and *dhahaba*, are excluded from the class of inflected verbs.

Though Sibawayh’s use of declensional terminology in contexts involving phonological change can be somewhat plausibly explained, other inconsistencies in Sibawayh’s use of terminology cannot be explained away in this manner. For example, in one passage, Sibawayh uses the term *rafʿ* to refer to the fixed *u*-ending of *qablu*, which does not result from any process of phonological change. This directly contradicts his own statement in the passage quoted above, in which he says that *ḍamm*, and not *rafʿ*, is the proper term for the ending of *qablu*. On several occasions, Sibawayh formulates the well-known rule preventing two consecutive unvowelled consonants (*iltiqāʾ al-sākinayn*) as *lā yanjazimu ḥarfāni*. The occurrence of two consecutive unvowelled consonants does not result from any process of change, and thus, according to Sibawayh’s own system, the non-declensional root *s-k-n* is the proper term in this context.

Despite the fact that Sibawayh’s use of vowel terminology in the *Kitāb* is not perfectly consistent, it is undeniable that he had a clear conception of a distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels, and that the vast majority of his

terminological usage throughout the text is consistent with this distinction. There is in fact no need to explain away the small fraction of his terminology that is not consistent with the distinction—the fourteen cases that Talmon discusses in which Sibawayh’s use of vowel terminology deviates from his own system do not indicate lack of clarity in his conceptual distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels; rather, these instances serve to emphasize Sibawayh’s role as an innovator. Because he was the first to introduce this declensional scheme, it is almost inevitable that he (or the “publishers” of the *Kitāb*) would, on a few occasions, use terminology in the manner in which it was commonly used by most grammarians of his time.

In this chapter, I have illustrated the clear distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowel terminology as presented in Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*, and highlighted the contrast between Sibawayh’s systematization of this terminology on the one hand, and the lack of systematization in the works of his predecessors, on the other. In Chapter 5, I will present passages from several grammatical texts composed during the century following the *Kitāb*, and show that grammarians in the late 9th – early 10th centuries adhere to Sibawayh’s terminological distinction with overwhelming consistency. This will further demonstrate the sharp contrast between the confusion surrounding the use of vowel terminology in the pre-*Kitāb* period, and its rigid systematization in the centuries following the *Kitāb*. This clear

contrast reaffirms the validity of examining vowel terminology as a method for dating grammatical works.

Chapter 5: Vowel Terminology in the Post-Kitāb Era

There is a dramatic difference between vowel terminology as it was used in the late 8th-early 9th centuries, before the Sibawayhian tradition had been well established, and the terminological system we find after the widespread acceptance of the *Kitāb*. As I have shown in Chapter 3, vowel terminology in the early period of the development of Arabic grammatical theory was characterized by inconsistency and lack of systematization. In Chapter 4, I have shown that Sibawayh set the precedent for the clear distinction between the two sets of vowel terminology. In this chapter, I will show that grammarians in the post-*Kitāb* era adhere to Sibawayh's distinction, regardless of their affiliation with any particular school of grammatical thought.

I will illustrate the use of vowel in the post-*Kitāb* era by presenting evidence from the works of four grammarians: two of them, the *Muqtaḍab* of Mubarrad (d. 898) and the *Uṣūl fī l-naḥw* of Sarrāj (d. 929), are Basran works, and the other two, the *Jumal* of Zajjājī (d. 949), and the *Muwaffaqī fī l-naḥw* of Ibn Kaysān (d. 932), belong to the so-called Baghdad school, which was characterized by an eclectic mixture of Basran and Kufan features.

Mubarrad and Sarrāj are considered the most prominent representatives of the Basran school in the 9th and 10th centuries, respectively, so it is perhaps not surprising that they follow Sibawayh's conceptual and terminological distinction between declensional and non-declensional vowels, as they also closely follow the

Kitāb on issues of syntactic theory in general. Nonetheless, the clarity with which both of these authors present the distinction, and their status as teachers of many other grammarians of their time, implies that this terminological distinction was widely recognized in the late 9th-early 10th centuries.

The consistency we find in the use of vowel terminology in the works of Zajjājī and Ibn Kaysān indicates that the recognition of this distinction was not unique to the Basran school, as both of these grammarians belong to the Baghdad school and incorporate a mixture of Basran and Kufan ideas. Ibn Kaysān employs a wide range of Kufan terms, including *jaḥd* for negation, as opposed to the Basran term *naḥī*, and *nasaq* for conjunction, in contrast with the Basran *ʿatf*. He prefers the Kufan term *kināya* for pronouns over its Basran counterpart *ḍamīr*, and refers to the active participle with the Kufan *al-fiʿl al-dāʿim* rather than the Basran *ism al-fāʿil*. The fact that both Zajjājī and Ibn Kaysān adhere to Sibawayh's system of vowel terminology with remarkable consistency, despite their theoretical differences with the *Kitāb*, further supports that vowel terminology represents a dividing line between the early and late periods.

Ibn Kaysān's strict adherence to Sibawayh's terminological distinction is particularly significant in light of the ways in which his work differs from all of the other works discussed in this chapter. His *Muwaffaqī fī l-naḥw* holds a less prominent position in the history of Arabic grammar than do the other three works, which suggests that the distinction between the two sets of vowel terminology was

recognized even by minor—and dissenting—writers in the 10th century. Unlike Mubarrad’s *Muqtaḍab* and Sarrāj’s *Uṣūl*, which are multi-volume texts intended to give a comprehensive theoretical account of the entirety of Arabic grammar, Ibn Kaysān’s *Muwaffaqī fī l-naḥw* is a short handbook, a mere 18 pages long in the published version, giving a concise, accessible overview of the fundamentals of usage, and illustrating points only with constructed examples, rather than with the abundance of Qur’ānic verses and lines of poetry that characterize many of the major works of grammar.

I will treat each of these four works individually, and will quote several passages from each of them at length in order to illustrate the clarity of the distinction between declensional and non-declensional terminology as it was understood in the late 9th-early 10th centuries, and also to highlight the didactic manner in which this distinction is presented in texts from this period.

5.1 MUBARRAD’S *MUQTADAB*

In the very first chapter of the *Muqtaḍab*, immediately following the tripartite division of speech into noun (*ism*), verb (*fiʿl*), and particle (*ḥarf*), Mubarrad discusses the difference between fully declinable (*muʿrab*) words and fixed (*mabniyy*) words, and distinguishes between the two complementary sets of vowel terms. As we saw in Sibawayh, the fact that Mubarrad makes this distinction at the very beginning of the *Muqtaḍab* suggests that he considers it to be a fundamental part of his grammatical theory. In his explication of the three grammatical cases of

nouns, Mubarrad uses the terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, and *jarr* to refer to the abstract cases of nominative, accusative, and genitive, respectively, in contrast with *ḍamm*, *fathḥ* and *kasr*, which refer to the vowels that canonically mark those cases:

وإعراب الأسماء على ثلاثة أضرب: على الرفع والنصب والجرّ. فأما رفع الواحد المعرب غير المعتلّ فالضمّ، نحو قولك: زيدٌ وعبدُ الله، وعمرو. والنصب بالفتح، نحو قولك: زيدا، وعمرواً، وعبدَ الله. وجرّه بالكسرة، نحو قولك: زيدٍ، وعمروٍ، وعبدِ الله.

The declension (*iʿrāb*) of nouns is of three types: the nominative (*rafʿ*), accusative (*naṣb*), and genitive (*jarr*). As for the nominative of singular declinable nouns that are not weak, it is [marked with] a *u*-vowel (*ḍamm*), as when you say *Zaydun*, *ʿAmrun*, and *ʿAbdullāh*. The accusative is [marked] with an *a*-vowel (*fathḥ*), as when you say *Zaydan*, *ʿAmran*, and *ʿAbdallāh*. Its genitive is [marked] with an *i*-vowel (*kasra*), as when you say *Zaydin*, *ʿAmrin*, and *ʿAbdillāh* (*Muqtaḍab* 1:142).

He states that the terms *marfūʿ*, *manṣūb*, *majrūr*, and *majzūm* are reserved for syntactically determined vowel endings, whereas their non-declensional counterparts *maḍmūm*, *maftūḥ*, *maksūr*, and *mawqūf* are used for fixed endings:

فهذه الحروف تسمّى بهذه الأسماء إذا كان الشيء معرباً، وإن كان مبنياً لا يزول من حركة إلى أخرى، نحو: حيث، وقبل، وبعد، قيل له مضموم ولم يقل مرفوع، لأنه لا يزول عن الضم. وأين وكيف يقال له مفتوح، ولا يقال له منصوب، لأنه لا يزول عن الفتح. ونحو: هؤلاء وحذار وأمس مكسور، ولا يقال له مجرور، لأنه لا يزول عن الكسر. وكذلك من وهل وبلى يقال له موقوف ولا يقال له مجزوم لأنه لا يزول عن الوقف.

These vowels are called by these names [only] when something is fully declinable (*muʿrab*), and if it is fixed (*mabniyy*) and does not change from one vowel to another, like: *ḥaythu* “where,” *qablu* “before,” *baʿdu* “after,” it is called *maḍmūm* and not *marfūʿ*, because it does not change from the *u*-ending (*ḍamm*). *Ayna* and *kayfa* are called *maftūḥ* and not *manṣūb*, because they do not change from the *a*-ending (*fathḥ*). Words like [the demonstrative pronoun] *hāʿulāʿi*, *ḥadhāri* “beware,” and *amsi* “yesterday” are *maksūr* and they are not

called *majrūr*, because they do not change from the *i*-ending (*kasr*). Similarly, *min* “from,” [the interrogative particle] *hal*, and *bal* “rather” are called *mawqūf* and not *majzūm*, because they do not change from the zero-ending (*Muqtaḍab* 1: 142).

Many of the examples that Mubarrad gives of *mabniyy* nouns in the above passage, including *ḥaythu*, *qablu*, *ba‘du*, *kayfa*, *ḥadhāri*, and *amsi*, are the very same words for which the pre-*Kitāb* grammarians often used declensional terminology, as I have illustrated in Chapter 3.

Though Mubarrad does not explicitly discuss terminology regarding the inflectional endings of verbs in this chapter, and does not give specific examples of the proper application of terminology for verb endings, he does make a categorial distinction between those verbs whose endings are determined by syntactic position and those whose endings are fixed. Here, he follows Sibawayh in that he considers only imperfect verbs to be inflected, whereas perfect verbs and imperatives take fixed endings:

اعلم أن الأفعال إنما دخلها الإعراب لمضارعها الأسماء ولولا ذلك لم يجب أن يعرب منها شيء. وذلك أن الأسماء هي المعربة. وما كان غير الأسماء فمآله لها، وهي الأفعال، والحروف، وإنما ضارع الأسماء من الأفعال ما دخلت عليه الزوائد الأربع التي توجب الفعل غير ماض ولكنّه يصلح لوقتتين: لما أنت فيه، ولما لم يقع.

Know that the inflectional endings (*i‘rāb*) only enter upon verbs due to their resemblance to nouns, and if not for that, it would not be necessary for anything among them to decline. That is because nouns are what are [inherently] declinable, and everything other than nouns ends up like them [nouns]. Those are verbs and particles. The only verbs that resemble nouns are those to which are added the four derivational letters that the non-past verbs need, although they refer to two tenses: present and future (*Muqtaḍab* 2: 1).

Accordingly, he refers to the endings of imperfect verbs throughout the text using the set of terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, and *jazm*, and uses *ḍamm*, *fath*, and *sukūn* to refer to the non-syntactically determined vowel endings of perfect verbs and imperatives. As we saw in Chapter 3, this is in contrast with Farrā's use of the term *naṣb* to refer to the fixed ending of the paradigmatic perfect form *faʿala*, and Akhfash's use of the term *jazm* to refer to the fixed zero-ending of the feminine verb *tabbat*. I will return to this point in Chapter 6, as the use of declensional terminology to refer to the endings of perfect verbs is a salient feature of KJN.

5.2 SARRĀJ'S UṢŪL

Like Sibawayh and Mubarrad, Sarrāj discusses the difference between the declinable (*muʿrab*) and the indeclinable (*mabniyy*) at the beginning of the *Uṣūl*, preceded only by his explanation of the properties division of speech into noun (*ism*), verb (*fiʿl*), and particle (*ḥarf*). In this passage on the inflection of singular nouns, Sarrāj makes an explicit distinction between the two sets of vowel terminology, and states the set of terms *marfūʿ*, *manṣūb*, and *majrūr* is only appropriate for vowels of declension:

الإعراب الذي يلحق الاسم المفرد السالم المتمكن . . . ويكون بحركات ثلاث: ضم وفتح وكسر، فإذا كانت الضمة إعراباً تدخل في أواخر الأسماء والأفعال وتزول عنها، سميت رفعا، فإذا كانت الفتحة كذلك سميت نصبا، وإذا كانت الكسرة كذلك سميت خفضا وجرا... فإن كانت الحركات ملازمة سمي الاسم مبنيا فإن كان مضموما⁹ نحو "منذ" قيل مضموم ولم يقل مرفوع ليفرق بينه وبين المعرب وإن

⁹ The text reads *fa-in kāna mafhūman*, This seems to be a printing error. I have corrected *mafhūman* to *maḍmūman*.

كان مفتوحا نحو أين، قيل مفتوح، ولم يقل منصوب، وإن كان مكسورا نحو "أمس"
و"حذام" قيل مكسور ولم يقل مجرور.

Declensional endings (*i'rāb*) are that which attach to the singular, sound, regularly declinable nouns and are [expressed with] three vowels: *u* (*ḍamm*), *a* (*fath*) and *i* (*kasr*). If the *u*-vowel (*ḍamma*) is a declensional ending that enters upon the ends of nouns and verbs and is changeable, it is called *rafʿ*, if the *a*-vowel (*fatha*) is like that, it is called *naṣb*, and if the *i*-vowel (*kasra*) is like that, it is called *khafḍ* or *jarr* . . . If the vowels are fixed, the noun is called *mabniyy*. If it takes the *u*-ending (*maḍmūm*), as in *mundhu* "since" it is called *maḍmūm* and is not called *marfūʿ*, in order to distinguish between [the non-declensional] and the declensional; if it takes the *a*-ending (*maftūḥ*) like *ayna* "where" it is called *maftūḥ* and not *manṣūb*; if it takes the *i*-ending (*maksūr*) like *amsi* "yesterday" and *Ḥadhāmi* [the nickname of a woman], it is called *maksūr* and not *majrūr* (*Uṣūl* 1: 45).

As with Mubarrad's examples in the *Muqtaḍab*, many of the examples that Sarrāj gives in these two passages are the same indeclinable words for which the early authors discussed in Chapter 3 use declensional terminology, or a mixture of the two sets of terms.

After clarifying the proper use of terminology for the vowel endings of nouns, Sarrāj discusses the endings of verbs. Here again, he makes a clear distinction between the two sets of terminology. The set *ḍamm*, *fath*, and *iskān* refers to the *u*-, *a*-, and zero-vowels in a general sense, and only when these vowels represent inflectional endings can they be called *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, and *jazm*:

وأما الإعراب الذي يكون في فعل الواحد من الأفعال المضارعة فالضمة فيه تسمى
رفعا والفتحة نصبا والإسكان جزما وقد كنت بينت لك أن المعرب من الأفعال التي
في أوائلها الحروف الزوائد، التاء والنون والياء والألف.

As for the inflectional endings (*i'rāb*) that are on the singular imperfect verb, the *u*-ending (*ḍamma*) is called *rafʿ*, the *a*-ending (*fatha*) [is called] *naṣb*, and the zero-ending (*iskān*) [is called] *jazm*. I

have clarified to you that the inflected (*mu‘rab*) verbs are those which begin with the derivational letters *ta‘, nūn, yā‘, and alif* (*Uṣūl* 1: 47).

Sarrāj makes a categorial distinction between inflected and uninflected verbs. In agreement with Sibawayh and Mubarrad, he states that only those verbs which resemble nouns (i.e. imperfect verbs) take inflectional endings, while the two other forms of verbs—the perfect and the imperative—take fixed endings:

فأما الإعراب الذي وقع في الأفعال فقد بينا أنه إنما وقع في المضارع منها للأسماء وما عدا المضارعة فمبني، والمبني من الأفعال ينقسم على ضربين: فضرب مبني على السكون، والسكون أصل كل مبني، وذلك نحو: اضرب واقتل ودحرج وانطلق . . . والضرب الثاني مبني على الفتح وهو كل فعل ماض كثرت حروفه أو قلت نحو: ضرب واستخرج وانطلق وما أشبه ذلك.

As for the inflectional endings (*i‘rāb*) that occur in verbs, we have explained that they only occur in those that resemble nouns, and all other verbs are uninflected. The uninflected (*mabniyy*) verbs are divided into two types: one type is fixed with a zero-ending (*sukūn*), as the zero-ending is the default of all indeclinable words, like [the imperatives] *iḍrib* “strike,” *uqtul* “kill,” *dahrij* “roll,” and *inṭaliq* “depart” . . . The second type is fixed with an *a*-ending (*fath*), and that is all perfect verbs, regardless of whether their composing consonants are few or many, like *ḍaraba* “he struck,” *istakhraja* “he took out,” and *inṭalaqa* “he departed,” and so forth (*Uṣūl* 1:51).

These passages from Mubarrad and Sarrāj demonstrate the clarity with which grammarians in the post-*Kitāb* era present the distinction between the two sets of vowel terminology. The works of the two grammarians of the so-called Baghdadi school, Zajjājī and Ibn Kaysān, will show that Sibawayh’s declensional scheme was adopted even by grammarians who do not follow the *Kitāb* on many theoretical issues in syntax.

5.3 ZAJJĀJĪ'S *JUMAL*

Zajjājī begins his chapter on declensional endings by making a categorial distinction between inflectional and non-inflectional vowels. In agreement with Sibawayh, Zajjājī considers only the fully declinable (*mutamakkin*) nouns, and the imperfect (*muḍāriʿ*) verbs to take inflectional endings, whereas the endings of all other words are fixed:

اعلم أن المعرب ما تغير آخره بدخول العوامل عليه . . . والمبني ما لم يتغير آخره بدخول العوامل عليه . . . ولا يعرب من الكلام كله إلا الاسم المتمكن والفعل المضارع. وسائر الكلام مبني غير معرب.

Know that the inflected (*muʿrab*) is that whose ending changes with the effect of a governor on it . . . and the uninflected (*mabniyy*) is that whose ending does not change because of any effect of a governor upon it . . . Nothing in the whole of speech inflects except for the declinable noun and the imperfect verb. The rest of speech is fixed (*mabniyy*), and not inflected (*muʿrab*) (*Jumal* 260).

Zajjājī then enumerates the four possible endings of fixed nouns, stating that nouns can end in *u-*, *a-*, *i-*, or zero-vowels, and uses the non-declensional set of terms *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *waqf* to describe these fixed endings. Like Sibawayh, Mubarrad, and Sarrāj, he clarifies that the declensional terms *marfūʿ*, *manṣūb*, *majrūr*, and *majzūm* refer only to the endings of governed nouns, and are not used for nouns whose endings are fixed:

والأسماء تبنى على أربعة أوجه: على الضم، والفتح، والكسر، والوقف. فالمبني منها على الضم: حيث، قبل، بعد، قط، وأول، والنداء المفرد في الأسماء الأعلام، نحو قولك: يا زيد، ويا عمرو، ويا جعفر، وما أشبه ذلك يقال له مضموم، ولا يقال له مرفوع، لأن المرفوع ما عمل فيه عامل. وكذلك المجرور والمنصوب، إنما يقال لما

عملت فيه العوامل، فأما ما لم تعمل فيه العوامل، وكان مبنيًا، فإنما يقال له: مضموم، ومتفوح، ومكسور، وموقوف، فرقا بين المعرب والمبني.

Nouns are fixed in four ways: with a *u*-ending (*ḍamm*), an *a*-ending (*fatḥh*), an *i*-ending (*kasr*) and a zero-ending (*waqf*). Those that are fixed with a *u*-ending (*ḍamm*) are *ḥaythu* “where,” *qablu* “before,” *ba‘du* “after,” *qaṭṭu* “never,” *awwalu* “first” and the vocative of singular proper nouns, as in *yā Zaydu*, *yā ‘Amru*, and *yā Ja‘faru*. Words that resemble those are called *maḍmūm*, and not *marfū‘*, because *marfū‘* refers to what is governed by a governor, and similarly for *majrūr* and *manṣūb*—they are only used to refer to that which is governed. As for what is not governed by a governor, it is fixed (*mabniyy*), and it is called *maḍmūm*, *maftūḥ*, *maksūr*, or *mawqūf*, to differentiate between the declinable (*mu‘rab*) and the indeclinable (*mabniyy*) (*Jumal* 262-3).

Zajjājī gives examples of nouns that take fixed endings. Nouns that take a fixed *i*-ending (*kasr*) are *amsi* “yesterday,” the demonstrative pronoun *hā‘ulā‘i*, and nouns on the pattern *fa‘āli*. Those that take a fixed *a*-ending (*fatḥh*) include *ayna* “where,” *kayfa* “how,” and *thamma* “therefore.” Those whose final consonant is always unvowelled include *man* “who,” *kam* “how many,” and *qaṭ* “only.” Zajjājī does not discuss nouns with fixed *u*-endings in this passage.

After discussing the vowel endings of nouns, Zajjājī turns to the fixed endings of verbs. Verbs can take two types of fixed endings: the *a*-vowel (*fatḥh*), as in perfect verbs, or the zero-vowel (*waqf*), as in imperatives. He clarifies that declensional terminology is only appropriate for governed verbs, and thus that perfect verbs and imperatives, respectively, are referred to as *maftūḥ* and *mawqūf*, rather than *manṣūb* and *majzūm*:

والأفعال تبني على وجهين: على الوقف والفتح. فالمبني منها على الوقف: فعل الأمر للمخاطب، إذا كان بغير لام، كقولك: اذهب، واركب، وقم، واقعد، وما أشبهه، يقال له موقوف، ولا يقال له مجزوم، لأنه لم يدخل عليه جازم فيجزمه.

والمبني منها على الفتح: الفعل الماضي، نحو قام وقعد وانطلق واستخرج، وما أشبه ذلك يقال له مفتوح، ولا يقال له منصوب، لأنه لم يدخل عليه عامل فينصبه، كما ذكرت لك.

Verbs are fixed in two ways: with a zero-ending (*waqf*) or an *a*-ending (*fath*). Those that are fixed with a zero-ending (*waqf*) are the second person [masculine singular] imperative, when it is without *lām*, as in: *idhhab* “go,” *irkab* “ride,” *qum* “stand,” and *uq‘ud* “sit,” and so forth. They are called *mawqūf*, and not *majzūm*, because no jussive governor enters upon them to place them in the jussive mood. Those that are fixed with an *a*-ending (*fath*) are the [third person masculine singular] perfect verbs, as in *qāma* “he stood,” *qa‘ada* “he sat,” *inṭalaqa* “he departed,” and *istakhraja* “he took out,” and so forth. They are called *maftūḥ*, and not *manṣūb*, because no governor acts upon them to place them in the subjunctive mood, as we have mentioned to you (*Jumal* 264).

Zajjājī then discusses particles, whose endings are never declensional, and can be fixed in one of four ways: with an *a*-vowel (*fath*), a zero-vowel (*waqf*), an *i*-vowel (*kasr*), or a *u*-vowel (*damm*):

فأما الحروف: فهي تبنى على أربعة أوجه، وهي: الفتح، والوقف، والكسر، والضم، كما بنيت الأسماء، فالمبني منها على الفتح: إنَّ، ولكنَّ، ولعلَّ، وليت، وثم، وسوف، والسين الدالة على الاستقبال، وواو العطف، وفاء العطف، وما أشبه ذلك. والمبني منها على الوقف: لم، ولن، ومن، وبل، وهل. والمبني منها على الكسر حرفان، كقولك: لزيد وبزيد. ولم يبين على الكسر غير الباء واللام الخافضتين. والمبني منها على الضم حرف واحد، وهو: منذ، في قولك: ما رأيته منذ يومين.

As for particles, they are fixed in four ways: with the *a*-ending (*fath*), the zero-ending (*waqf*), the *i*-ending (*kasr*), or the *u*-ending (*damm*), as nouns are fixed. Those that are fixed with an *a*-ending (*fath*) are [particles] *inna*, *lākinna*, *la‘alla*, *layta*, *thumma*, [the future marker] *sawfa*, the *sīn* that indicates future tense, the conjunctive *wāw*, and the conjunctive *fā’*. Those that are fixed with a zero-ending (*waqf*) are [the past tense negative particle] *lam*, [the future negative particle] *lan*, *min* “from,” *bal* “rather” and [the interrogative particle] *hal*. Those that are fixed with an *i*-ending (*kasr*) are two, as in *li-Zaydin* “for Zayd,” and *bi-Zaydin* “with Zayd,” and no particles are fixed with an *i*-ending (*kasr*) except the genitive governors *bā’* and *lām*. Only one particle is

fixed with a *u*-ending (*ḍamm*), and it is *mundhu* “since,” as in *mā ra’aytuhu mundhu yawmayn* “I have not seen him in two days” (*Jumal* 265).

Despite the clarity of the terminological distinction in the passages I have quoted from Mubarrad, Sarrāj, and Zajjājī, it is possible that these three works do contain some instances of inconsistency throughout the text and do not adhere perfectly to the distinction in every instance. As these are extensive works, a comprehensive examination of their use of vowel terminology is beyond the scope of this project. Even if there are some inconsistencies, it is undeniable that the terminological distinction was respected to a much greater degree in this later period than it was in the earlier period.¹⁰

5.4 IBN KAYSĀN’S *MUWAFFAQĪ*

Though Ibn Kaysān does not make an explicit distinction between the two sets of vowel terminology of the didactic type found in the works of Mubarrad, Sarrāj, and Zajjājī, he nonetheless maintains consistent use throughout the text of the *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm* set to refer only to endings he considers to be declensional, and the *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf* set to refer to word-internal vowels and non-syntactically determined final vowels. I have not noted a single instance in which he deviates from this distinction. The consistency of Ibn Kaysān’s

¹⁰ The editor of the *Muqtaḍab* states that Mubarrad does deviate from this distinction and sometimes uses declensional terminology to refer to fixed endings. The editor cites as an example an instance in which Mubarrad refers to the *hāʾ* in *fihā* as *makhfūḍ*. This does not in fact constitute an inconsistency in terminological use. Although the vowel on the *hāʾ* is fixed, Mubarrad is using *makhfūḍ* here not to refer to the vowel itself (which is an *a*-vowel and not an *i*), but instead to refer to the grammatical case of the pronoun, which is governed in the genitive (*khafḍ*) by *fī* (*Muqtaḍab* 142).

adherence to Sibawayh's declensional scheme is particularly significant in light of the ways in which the *Muwaffaqī* differs stylistically from the other works discussed in this chapter.

He makes the same categorial distinction between inflected and uninflected nouns and verbs that Sibawayh, Mubarrad, Sarrāj, and Zajjājī make, stating that only the fully declinable noun and the imperfect verb are inflected, while the rest of speech is fixed:

وليس يعرب من الكلام شيء إلا الاسم المتمكن والفعل المستقبل الذي في أوله ياء أو تاء أو نون أو ألف . . . وسائر الكلام مبني لا يتغير حركاته ولا آخره.

Nothing inflects in speech except the regularly declinable (*mutamakkin*) noun and the imperfect verb, which begins with *yā'*, *ta'*, *nūn*, or *alif* . . . and the rest of speech is fixed, and its vowels and endings do not change (*Muwaffaqī* 106).

Like the other authors discussed in this chapter, Ibn Kaysān gives examples of nouns whose endings are fixed:

وأما ما بني ولا يعرب فنحو كم ومن وأين وكيف وهؤلاء وحذام وحيث ومنذ لا يتغير آخره لأنه ليس بمتمكن.

As for what is fixed and does not decline, it is like *kam* "how many," *min* "from," *ayna* "where," *kayfa* "how," [the demonstrative noun] *hā'ulā'i*, [the woman's name] *Ḥadhāmi*, *ḥaythu* "where," and *mundhu* "since." Its ending does not change because it is not declinable (*Muwaffaqī* 113).

In his discussion of past tense verbs, he uses the non-declensional terms *fath* for those that end in an *a*-vowel (the third person masculine singular), and *waqf* and *s-k-n* for those that are unvowelled (e.g. the first person singular). This contrasts with Farrā's and Akhfash's occasional use of declensional terminology to refer to fixed

verb endings. In this passage, Ibn Kaysān differentiates the past tense verbs, which do not inflect, from the imperfect verbs, which inflect for mood:

والأفعال تكون ماضية فتبنى على الفتح نحو قام وذهب وعلم فاذا ثبتت على الوقف نحو ذهبت وعلمت كرهوا كثرة الحركات فسكنوها. وتكون مستقبلة فتجري بالرفع والنصب والجزم نحو يقوم ويعلم ويذهب ويقبل فهو رفع أبدا حتى يدخل عليها حروف النصب والجزم.

Verbs can be past tense, and they are fixed with an *a*-ending (*fath*), as in *qāma* “he stood,” *dhahaba* “he left,” and *‘alima* “he learned,” and when they are fixed with a zero-ending (*waqf*), like *dhahabtu* “I left,” and *‘alimtu* “I learned” [the Arabs] do not like so many [consecutive] vowels, so they pronounce them without a vowel (*sakkanūhā*). And [verbs] can be imperfect, and inflect in the indicative (*raf*), subjunctive (*naṣb*), and jussive (*jazm*), as in *yaqūmu* “he stands,” *ya‘lamu* “he knows,” *yadhhabu* “he goes,” and *yuqbilu* “he approaches.” They are always indicative (*raf*), except when a particle governing the subjunctive (*naṣb*) or jussive (*jazm*) (*Muwaffaqī* 108).

In his explanation of the forms of nouns in the vocative, Ibn Kaysān uses the declensional terms *marfū‘* and *manṣūb* to refer to the *u*- and *a*- endings, respectively:

والنداء يكون على أربعة أوجه: وجهان منها مرفوعان، ووجهان منصوبان. فكل اسم مفرد وليس بمضاف فهو رفع بغير تنوين، نحو يا زيد ويا عمرو ويا زيدان ويا عمران ويا زيدون ويا عمرون. وإذا كان قبله يا أيها فهو رفع وذلك نداء ما كانت فيه ألف ولام نحو يا أيها الرجل ويا أيها المرأة. وكل مضاف فهو نصب في النداء نحو يا عبد الله ويا صاحب الفرس ويا غلامي زيد. وكل نكرة موصوفة فهي نصب بالتنوين. يا رجلا عالما ويا رجلا في الدار ويا قوما صالحين.

The vocative is of four types: two of them are nominative (*marfū‘ānī*), and two are accusative (*manṣūbānī*). Every noun without a descriptor, and not in a construct, is nominative (*raf*) without *tanwīn*, as in *yā Zaydu*, *yā ‘Amru*, *yā Zaydānī*, *yā ‘Amrānī*, *yā Zaydūna*, and *yā ‘Amrūna*. When it is preceded by *yā ayyuhā*, it is nominative (*raf*), and that is the vocative of nouns with the definite article, as in *yā ayyuhā l-rajulu*, and *yā ayyatuhā l-mar’atu*. Every annexed noun is accusative (*naṣb*) in the vocative, as in *yā ‘Abdallāhi*, *yā ṣāhibā l-farasi*, and *yā ghulāmay Zaydin*. Every indefinite with a descriptor is accusative (*naṣb*) with

tanwīn [as in] *yā rajulan ‘āliman, yā rajulan fī l-dār, and yā qawman ṣāliḥīna* (*Muwaffaqī* 109).

The other works discussed in this chapter use the non-declensional terminology *ḍamm* and *fath* for endings of the vocative. However, this does not represent an inconsistency in Ibn Kaysān’s terminological use, but rather a theoretical difference regarding whether nouns in the vocative are governed or fixed. Ibn al-Anbārī states that Kufans believe vocative nouns to be inflected, whereas Basrans view them as fixed (*Inṣāf* 275). Because we know from the biographical literature that Ibn Kaysān took elements from both schools (see, for example, the *Inbāḥ* 3: 58), it is likely that he uses declensional terminology for the vocative because he views these nouns as governed in the nominative or accusative, and that he was not using declensional terminology for vowels he viewed as fixed.

The passages I have presented in this chapter show that, although there is some amount of variation among 9th and 10th century grammatical works regarding style, mode of presentation, syntactic terminology, and a number of minor theoretical issues, the clear distinction between two sets of vowel terminology is a common thread that ties these later works together, and separates them from texts that pre-date Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*. In the next chapter, I will illustrate the application of vowel terminology as a method for dating texts by examining the terminology found in KJN, and comparing it to the terminological use in the pre- and post-*Kitāb* eras to come to a conclusion about the time period during which the text was composed.

Chapter 6: Vowel Terminology in KJN

As we have seen, the system of terminology that is used today to refer to word-final vowels evolved gradually throughout the 8th century and culminated with Sibawayh's distinction as presented in the *Kitāb*, which achieved widespread acceptance by the end of the 9th century. Ibn al-Kalbī's use of the terms *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, and *jazm* as synonyms for *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *waqf*, regardless of syntactic context, suggests that the declensional set of terms originated simply as alternative terminology for vowels in general. During the late 8th-early 9th centuries, there seem to have been various efforts to systematize terminology. For example, Farrā' made a terminological distinction between syntactically determined vowels, which he referred to with *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm*, and lexically determined vowels, for which he used both sets of terminology seemingly interchangeably. Though Farrā' did have a terminological system, it does not match the system of Sibawayh. This suggests a gradual development of the final system.

An exhaustive survey of all instances of vowel terminology in KJN reveals that the author's use of declensional and non-declensional terminology is much more consistent with the earlier period than with the later period. Unlike Ibn al-Kalbī's *Tafsīr*, KJN shows some evidence of a terminological system. However, the system of KJN differs from Sibawayh's system, and that of later grammarians. This constitutes a strong argument in support of the hypothesis that KJN was composed sometime during the late 8th – early 9th century, roughly in the lifetime of Khalīl, rather than during Ibn Shuqayr's lifetime, in the 10th century.

Unlike the works of Sibawayh, Mubarrad, Sarrāj, and Zajjājī, KJN does not contain an explicit distinction between two sets of terminology. Nonetheless, the

text shows evidence of a fairly well-defined terminological system. In contrast with Sibawayh's system, however, the primary distinction in KJN is between internal and external vowels, rather than between syntactic and non-syntactic vowels. For internal vowels, only the set *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn* is used in KJN, whereas for final vowels, we find *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ/jarr*, and *jazm* both for fixed endings and declensional endings. The distribution of vowel terminology in KJN is summarized in Table 3:

Phonological Value	Internal Vowels	External Vowels	
		Declensional	Non-declensional
<i>u</i>	<i>ḍamm</i>	<i>rafʿ</i>	<i>rafʿ</i> or <i>ḍamm</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>fath</i>	<i>naṣb</i>	<i>naṣb</i> or <i>fath</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>kasr</i>	<i>khafḍ/jarr</i>	<i>khafḍ/jarr</i> or <i>kasr</i>
∅	<i>sukūn</i>	<i>jazm</i>	<i>jazm</i> or <i>sukūn/waqf</i>

Table 3: Vowel terminology in KJN

As this table shows, the author does acknowledge some difference between syntactic and non-syntactic final vowels: for the former, he uses only *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ/jarr*, and *jazm*; for the latter, he uses both sets of terms without any apparent distinction. KJN's exclusive use of the non-declensional set of terms to refer to internal vowels constitutes an important difference between KJN's system and the system of Farrā', who, as we saw in Chapter 3, sometimes uses declensional terminology in word-internal contexts. In this sense, KJN's system represents a sort of intermediate stage between Farrā' and Sibawayh, although the hypothesis that the declensional scheme developed in this fashion would be impossible to prove. However, KJN's system differs from Sibawayh's system in that KJN often uses *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm* for final vowels that are not syntactically determined, whereas

Sibawayh and later authors use only *ḍamm*, *fath*, *kasr*, and *sukūn/waqf* for fixed final vowels, with very few exceptions.

I will present examples of KJN's use of vowel terminology in a variety of word-final contexts. This will demonstrate the author's interchangeable use of declensional and non-declensional terminology for external vowels, which is the most notable feature of vowel terminology in KJN, and which highlights the similarity this text bears to the early texts discussed in Chapter 3.

KJN contains one chapter each for fixed *u-*, *a-*, *i-*, and zero-endings, which are referred to as *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, *khafḍ*, and *jazm*, respectively. In these chapters, the author explicitly recognizes these endings as non-syntactic. Like the pre-*Kitāb* era works discussed in Chapter 3, KJN uses a mix of declensional and non-declensional terminology to refer to fixed endings. In the chapter on the fixed *a*-ending, which he refers to as *naṣb*, the author gives as examples past tense verbs on the pattern *faʿala*, the particles *inna*, *layta* "if only," and *laʿalla* "maybe," and the noun *ayna* "where":

والنصب على البنية ما كان بناء بنته العرب مما لا يزول إلى غيره. مثل الفعل الماضي ومثل حروف: إنّ وليت ولعلّ وسوف وأين وما أشبهه.

The fixed *a*-ending (*naṣb*) is that which the Arabs have fixed, among the [words whose endings] do not change, like the past tense verb, and the words¹¹ *inna*, *layta*, *laʿalla*, *ayna*, and so forth (KJN 85).

Later in the text, in contrast with the passage quoted above, the author refers to the final *a*-vowel on *ayna* and *layta* as *fath*. This occurs as part of a discussion about the

¹¹ I am translating *ḥarf* here as "word" rather than "particle" because of the inclusion of the noun *ayna*.

origin of final vowels on particles, which take a zero-ending unless a final vowel is necessary to prevent two consecutive unvowelled consonants:

وإذا كان الحرف المتوسط منه ساكنا حرّك بالفتح، لئلا يسكنا، مثل: أين وكيف وليت وأنّ وحيث وأشباه.

When the consonant (*ḥarf*) in the middle of the word is unvowelled, it is vowelled with an *a*-vowel (*fathḥ*), in order to prevent two consecutive unvowelled consonants, like in *ayna*, *kayfa*, *layta*, *anna*, *ḥaytha* and so forth (KJN 149).

In his discussion of nouns involving annexation, like *khamsata ‘ashara* “fifteen,” which take an *a*-ending regardless of syntactic position, he employs both *naṣb* and *fathḥ*:

النصب من اسم بمنزلة اسمين مثل قولهم: أتاني خمسة عشر رجلا، ومررت بخمسة عشر رجلا، وضربت خمسة عشر رجلا. صار الرفع والنصب والخفض بمنزلة واحدة، لأنه اسم بمنزلة اسمين، ضم أحدهما إلى الآخر فألزمت فيهما الفتحة التي هي أخف الحركات.

The *a*-ending (*naṣb*) of a noun with the status of two nouns is like when they say: *atānī khamsata ‘ashara rajulan* “fifteen men came to me,” *marartu bi-khamsata ‘ashara rajulan* “I passed by fifteen men,” and *ḍarabtu khamsata ‘ashara rajulan* “I struck fifteen men.” The nominative (*rafʿ*), accusative (*naṣb*) and genitive (*khafḍ*) have the same status, because [*khamsata ‘ashara*] is one noun with the status of two nouns, one of which is annexed to the other, so the *a*-ending (*fathḥa*), which is the lightest of the vowels, becomes necessary (KJN 56).

Later in the same chapter, *naṣb* refers to *Ba‘labakka* in a verse of poetry from Imru‘ al-Qays:

نصب بعليّك لأنه اسم بمنزلة اسمين

He pronounced *Ba‘labakka* with an *a*-ending (*naṣaba*) because it is one noun with the status of two nouns (KJN 57).

Elsewhere in the text, however, the author refers to the *a*-ending of the relative pronoun *alladhīna*, which he classifies as one noun with the status of two, along with *khamsata ‘ashara* and *Ba‘labakka*, as both *naṣb* and *fathā* within the same line:

فإذا جمعوا زادوا على "الذي" نونا وجعلوه اسما بمنزلة اسمين، ضمّ أحدهما إلى الآخر فألزمت الفتحة التي هي أخف الحركات ولا يتغير "الذين" إلى غير النصب.

When they make it plural, they add a *nūn* to *alladhī* and they make it one noun with the status of two nouns, one of which is annexed to other, then the *a*-ending (*fathā*), which is the lightest of the vowels, is required. *Alladhīna* does not change to anything other than the *a*-ending (*naṣb*) (KJN 161-2).

In the chapter on words that take a fixed *u*-ending, which he refers to as *rafʿ*, the author gives *ḥaythu* “where,” *qaṭṭu* “never,” *qablu* “before,” and *ba‘du* “after” as examples. In the same passage, he discusses the dialectal variant *ḥaytha*, in contrast with *ḥaythu*. He uses the non-declensional terminology *maftūḥ* and *maḍmūma* to refer to these final vowels:

والرفع بالبنية: مثل حيثُ وقطّ. لا يتغيران عن الرفع على كل حال. كذلك قبل وبعد، إذا كانا على الغاية. وفي لغة بعضهم "حيثُ" بالفتح، لأنّ الفتحة أخفّ الحركات. فما كان مفتوحا فهو على القياس. وأما المضمومة كأنهم توهموا هذه الضمة التي في هذا الجنس، الذي لا يجري فيه الإعراب . . . 12

The fixed *u*-ending (*rafʿ*): like *ḥaythu* “where” and *qaṭṭu* “never.” These two do not change from the *u*-ending (*rafʿ*) in any circumstance. Similarly: *qablu* “before” and *ba‘du* “after,” when they indicate extremes. In the variant of some of them, [they say] *ḥaytha* with an *a*-ending (*fathā*), because the *a*-vowel (*fathā*) is the lightest of the vowels. Whatever takes an *a*-ending (*maftūḥ*), it is by analogy. As for what takes the *u*-ending (*maḍmūma*) . . . (KJN 148).

¹² The remainder of this sentence is missing from the manuscripts.

In the chapter on words whose unvowelled final consonants are not syntactically determined, the declensional term *jazm* is used to refer to *man* “who,” *mā* “what,” and the negative particle *lam*:

والجزم بالبنية: مثل من وما ولم وأشباهها. لا يتغير إلى حركة

The fixed zero-ending (*jazm*): like *man* “who,” *mā* “what,” [the negative particle] *lam*, and so forth. It does not change to a vowel (KJN 205).

However, in another passage on particles that take fixed zero-endings, we find the root *s-k-n*, rather than *j-z-m*, to describe this ending. In this passage, the author explicitly acknowledges that this ending is not determined syntactically, explaining that particles cannot occupy the functional positions that nouns can occupy, and thus cannot take declensional endings:

وذلك مثل: نعم وأجل وكم وهل ومن. وإنما سکنوه لأنه حرف جاء لمعنى وليس باسم فيكون فاعلا أو مفعولا أو مضافا فيدخله الإعراب.¹³

That is like: *na‘am* “yes,” *ajal* “certainly,” *kam* “how many,” [the interrogative particle] *hal* and *min* “from.” They pronounced each of them without a vowel (*sakkanūhu*), because they are particles (*ḥarf*) that add meaning, and they are not nouns that can act as agents or objects, or be annexed and thus take declensional endings (KJN 149).

Later in the text, the author discusses dialectal variants of the third person singular pronoun *huwa*, noting the alternative pronunciations *hū* and *huwwa*. He uses the non-declensional term *taskīn* to describe the unvowelled *wāw* in the first variant,

¹³ *Min* is vowelled as *man* in the text. I am reading it as *min* because *man*, as a noun, can occur in the positions mentioned in this passage.

and compares it to *man*, which he had referred to in the passage quoted above as

jazm:

وأما من قال "هو" بتسكين الواو فإنه أخرجه على مثال من وعن وأشباه ذلك.

As for whoever says *huw* with an unvowelled *wāw* (*taskīn*) they have formed it based on *min* “from,” ‘*an* “away” and so forth (KJN 267).

The term *jazm* is also used to describe words with final unvowelled consonants in pausal contexts:

والجزم بالوقف وإن شئت بالإسكان، مثل قولهم: رأيتُ زيدُ، وركبتُ فرسُ.

The zero-ending (*jazm*) in contexts of pause (*waqf, iskān*), like when they say *ra’aytu Zayd* “I saw Zayd” and *rakibtu faras* “I rode a horse” (KJN 204).

والجزم بردّ حركة الإعراب على ما قبلها، قولهم: هذا أبو بكرُ، هذا أبو عميرُ.
حوّل حركة الإعراب إلى ما يليه.

The zero-ending (*jazm*) because of the dislocation of the declensional vowel ending to [the consonant] that is before it is when they say: *hādhā abū bakir* “This is Abū Bakr” and *hādhā abū ‘amir* “This is Abū ‘Amr.” He moved the vowel to what follows it (KJN 205).

We also find declensional terminology in reference to the endings of geminate verbs in the jussive mood. These endings arise from phonological processes, rather than syntactic processes; thus, Sibawayh and later grammarians refer to them with non-declensional terminology. The author of KJN discusses the jussive verb *yamtuṭ* “to extend” and its alternative form *yamuṭṭa*, and refers to this *a*-ending as *naṣb*. In explaining the variant endings of the apocopate forms of

geminate verbs in general, the author uses the declensional terminology *rafʿ* and *naṣb* to refer to the *u*- and *a*-endings, respectively:

فإنّ "يمطّ" محلّه الجزم. إلا أنه نصب على التضعيف ومجازه "يمطط" فلما أدمم
الطاء في الطاء نصب على التضعيف. وكل ما كان على هذا المثال يجوز فيه الرفع
والنصب.

[The verb] *yamuṭṭa* is in the jussive mood (*jazm*), except that it takes an *a*-ending (*naṣaba*) due to gemination, and its underlying form is *yamṭuṭ*. When one *ṭā'* is assimilated to the other, it takes an *a*-ending (*naṣaba*) due to gemination. Everything that follows this pattern can take the *u*-ending (*rafʿ*) or the *a*-ending (*naṣb*) (KJN 196).

In the chapter on nouns with a fixed *i*-ending, the term *khafḍ* is used for nouns on the pattern *faʿāli*, whose endings are not syntactically determined:

والخفض بالبنية: مثل قظام ودراك ونزال وحذام وبداد ورقاش. لا تزول هذه
الأسماء عن الخفض إلى غيره

The fixed *i*-ending: like *qaṭāmi*, *darāki*, *nazāli*, *ḥadhāmi*, *badādi*, and *raqāshi*. These nouns do not change from the *i*-ending (*khafḍ*) to anything else (KJN 178).

Elsewhere in the text, we find terminology in mixed sets to refer to nouns on this pattern. Several lines after the above passage, the term *kasr* appears in reference to the final *i*-vowel of *ṭamāri* "a lofty place" in a verse of poetry. In the Qawala manuscript, the variant reading *ṭamāra* is included, and the *a*-ending is called *naṣb*:

قال "طمار" بالكسر ويقال طمار بالنصب.

He said *ṭamāri* with an *i*-ending (*kasr*), and it is [also] pronounced *ṭamāra* with an *a*-ending (*naṣb*) (KJN 180).

Other indeclinable nouns with *i*-endings discussed in the text include the plural demonstrative pronoun *hā'ulā'i* and *amsi* “yesterday.” In the author’s explanation of the derivation of the relative pronoun *alladhī* from *dhū*, he compares the fixed *yā'* in *alladhī* to the fixed *i*-ending (*kasra*) of *hā'ulā'i*:

ثم أدخلوا على ذو الألف واللام للتعريف ويلزم الياء كما ألزمت الكسرة في هؤلاء
في كل وجه.

Then they placed the definite article on *dhū*, and the *yā'* became obligatory, like the *i*-ending (*kasra*) in *hā'ulā'i* is obligatory in every aspect (KJN 161).

In contrast with the use of the non-declensional *k-s-r* to refer to *hā'ulā'i* above, the declensional *kh-f-ḍ* appears in reference to the fixed *i*-ending of *amsi*:

وأمس أيضا مخفوض في الفاعل والمفعول به. تقول أتيتّه أمس، وذهب أمس بما
فيه، وكان أمس يوما مباركا وإن أمس يوم مبارك.

Amsi also always takes an *i*-ending (*makhfūḍ*), as an agent or an object. You say: *ataytuhu amsi* “I reached him yesterday,” *dhahaba amsi bi-mā fihi* “Yesterday has gone, with whatever was in it,” *kāna amsi yawman mubārakan* “Yesterday was a blessed day,” and *inna amsi yawmun mubārakun* “Yesterday was indeed a blessed day” (KJN 181).

Another interesting use of declensional terminology in non-syntactic contexts concerns the shortened form of nouns in the vocative. The author comments on the apocopate form *Ḥāri*, shortened from *Ḥārithu*, in a verse of poetry by Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā. He refers to the internal *i*-vowel in *Ḥārithu* with the non-declensional root *k-s-r*, but uses *kh-f-ḍ* for the *i*-vowel in *Ḥāri*, which has become external by the deletion of the final consonant, but is not syntactically relevant. This further illustrates that the primary terminological distinction in KJN is between

internal and external vowels, rather than between syntactic and non-syntactic vowels:

خفض حار لأنه أراد: يا حارث. فرخّم الثاء وترك الراء مكسورة على الأصل.

He placed an *i*-ending (*khafaḍa*) on *Ḥāri* because he meant: *yā Ḥārithu*. He apocopated the *thā'* and left the *rā'* with its *i*-vowel (*maksūra*) according to its original form (KJN 138).

Several lines later, in the same chapter, the non-declensional term *maftūḥa* is used to refer to *Marwa* as the apocopate form of *Marwānu* in a verse from al-Farazdaq:

أراد: يا مروان. فترك الواو مفتوحة على الأصل.

He meant: *yā Marwānu*. He left the *wāw* with its *a*-vowel (*maftūḥa*) according to its original form (KJN 138).

A distinguishing feature of the vowel terminology in KJN is the consistent use of declensional terminology to refer to the endings of past tense verbs. As we saw in Chapter 3, Farrā' uses *naṣb* to refer to the *a*-ending of the pattern *fa'ala*, and Akhfash refers to the unvowelled final consonant of the verb *tabbat* with the declensional root *j-z-m*. Though Talmon (2003: 242) has noted one isolated instance in which Sibawayh uses the declensional root *n-ṣ-b* in regard to past tense verb endings, this is not common in the *Kitāb* and is not characteristic of post-*Kitāb* terminological use. Thus, KJN's frequent, almost exclusive use of declensional terminology to refer to these endings is a feature that clearly sets it apart from 10th century works.

In the discussion of words with fixed *a*-endings, as we saw earlier in this chapter, the author refers to the *a*-ending of the third person masculine singular

fa'ala as *naṣb*. This occurs in several other places throughout the text, for example in reference to *shā'a* "he willed" in a verse from al-Aswad ibn Ya'far:

نصب شاء لأنه فعل ماض وجزم يفعل لأنه جواب المجازاة

He placed an *a*-ending (*naṣaba*) on *shā'a* "he willed," because it is a past tense verb, and he placed a zero-ending (*jazama*) on *yaf'al* because it is the apodosis of a conditional (KJN 201).

The past tense verb *qāla* "he said," from a verse by Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā, is referred to as *manṣūb*, in contrast with the imperfect *yaqūlu* "he says," which is referred to as *marfū'*:

معناه: قال. فصرف من منصوب إلى مرفوع

The meaning [of *yaqūlu* "he says"] is *qāla* "he said." It changed from an *a*-ending (*manṣūb*) to a *u*-ending (*marfū'*) (KJN 202).

In commenting on a line of poetry from 'Ubayd Allāh ibn al-Ḥurr, he notes the poet's use of the masculine *ta'ajjaja* "burned (intr.*)" when the expected form of the verb would be *ta'ajjajat*, in gender agreement with its feminine agent, *nār* "fire." The term *naṣb* is used to refer to the final *a*-vowel of *ta'ajjaja*:

قال: تأجج نصبا ولم يقل تأججت

He said *ta'ajjaja* "burned (intr.*)" with an *a*-ending (*naṣb*), rather than *ta'ajjajat* (KJN 197).

Elsewhere in the text, the author uses declensional terminology for other past tense verb conjugations as well. This occurs systematically in his discussion of the vowels on the suffixal pronoun *tā'* in the singular forms of the first person, second person masculine, and third person feminine conjugations. The fixed *u*-

ending of the first person singular verb in the past tense, as in *ana kharajtu* “I left,” is called *rafʿ*, and never *ḍamm*:

وتاء النفس: رفع أبدا. تقول: خرجت وقدمت وذهبت وأعطيت. رفعت التاء لأنها تاء النفس

The *tāʾ* of the first person always takes a *u*-ending (*rafʿ*). You say: *kharajtu* “I left,” *dhahabtu* “I went,” and *aʿtaytu* “I gave.” You placed a *u*-vowel (*rafaʿta*) on the *tāʾ* because it is the *tāʾ* of the first person (KJN 277).

The *a*-ending of the second person masculine singular, as in in *anta kharajta* “you (m.s.) left,” is called *naṣb*, rather than *fathḥ*:

وتاء المخاطب المذكور: نصب أبدا. تقول: أنت خرجت، أنت ذهبت، أنت أعطيت. نصبت التاء في هذه كله.

The *tāʾ* of the second person masculine singular always takes an *a*-ending (*naṣb*). You say: *anta kharajta* “you (m.s.) left,” *anta dhahabta* “you (m.s.) went,” and *anta aʿtayta* “you (m.s.) gave.” You placed an *a*-vowel (*naṣabta*) on the *tāʾ* in all of these (KJN 278).

Similarly, the unvowelled final consonant in the third person feminine singular, as in *hiya kharajat* “she left” is referred to with the declensional term *jazm*, rather than *sukūn* or *waqf*:

وتاء فعل المؤنث: تكون جزما أبدا، مثل خرجت وطمعت وقامت. فإذا استقبلها ألف ولام كسرت. تقول: خرجت المرأة. كسرت التاء لإلتقاء الساكنين ... وكل مجزوم وساكن إذا حرّك حرّك إلى الخفض

The *tāʾ* of the third person singular feminine verb always takes a zero-ending (*jazm*), as in *kharajat* “she left,” *zaʿanat* “she departed,” and *qāmat* “she stood.” When the definite article follows it, it takes an *i*-ending (*kusirat*). You say: *kharajat-i l-marʿa* “the woman left.” You give the *tāʾ* and *i*-ending (*kasarta*) [to prevent] two consecutive unvowelled consonants. Every unvowelled consonant (*majzūm wa-sākin*), if it becomes vowelled, it is with an *i*-vowel (*khafḍ*) (KJN 275).

Also of note in this passage is the author's use of both *kh-f-d* and *k-s-r* to describe the epenthetic *i*-vowel that is added to the end of these verbs when they are followed by the definite article, though this vowel is phonologically determined rather than syntactically determined. Farrā', as we saw in Chapter 3, also uses the declensional root *kh-f-d* to refer to this type of ending.

Unlike for the other conjugations discussed so far, KJN does not use declensional terminology in reference to the *i*-ending of the second person feminine singular, as in *anta kharajti* "you (f.s.) left." Instead, he refers to this ending as *kasr*:

وتاء مخاطبة المؤنث: كسر أبدا. تقول أنت خرجت، أنت ذهبت، أنت رأيت.

The *tā'* of the second person feminine singular always takes an *i*-ending (*kasr*). You say: *anti kharajti* "you (f.s. left)" *anti dhahabti* "you (f.s.) went" and *anti ra'ayti* "you (f.s.) saw" (KJN 278).

This may be related to the fact that verbs do not have an analog of the genitive case, in that the *i*-ending of verbs is never syntactically determined, just as nouns do not have an analog of the jussive mood. However, this is only speculative, as it difficult to determine with certainty due to the limited instances of vowel terminology in reference to this conjugation.

Throughout the entire text of KJN, I have noted only two exceptions to the terminological system as I have presented it in Table 3. Both involve the use of declensional terminology to refer to internal vowels. The first concerns the final vowel of the noun *Shahanshāh* in a line of poetry from al-A'shā. The final vowel of

this word is phonologically determined—it matches the medial vowel on the following verb. The author refers to this vowel as *rafʿ*, *naṣb*, or *khafḍ*:

فهذه الهماء من "شهنشاه" تتبع ما بعدها من رفع ونصب وخفض. تقول شهنشاه ادخل، شهنشاه اذهب، شهنشاه اضرب. فأذا وقفت قلت: شهنشاه.

This *hāʾ* in *Shahanshāh* follows [the medial vowel] of what comes after it, whether it is a *u*-vowel (*rafʿ*), an *a*-vowel (*naṣb*), or an *i*-vowel (*khafḍ*). You say *Shahanshāhu dkhul* "O King, enter," *Shahanshāha dhab* "O King, go," and *Shahanshāhi ḍrib* "O King, strike." In pause, you say *Shahanshāh* (KJN 57).

The second exception concerns the initial vowel of the particles *inna* and *anna*. In the following passage, the initial *i*-vowel of *inna* is referred to with the non-declensional root *k-s-r*, but for the initial *a*-vowel of *anna*, both the declensional *n-ṣ-b* and the non-declensional *f-t-ḥ* are used:

وهذه اللام إذا أدخلت على خبر "إن" كسرت ألف "إن" وإن توسّطت الكلام انتصبت "أن" . . . فتحت "أن" لما توسّطت الكلام . . . كسرت الألف من "إن" للام الخبر. ولولا ذلك لكانت مفتوحا لتوسّطها الكلام.

This *lām*, when it enters upon the predicate of *inna/anna*, the *alif* of *inna* takes an *i*-vowel (*kusirat*), and if [*inna/anna*] comes in the middle of speech, [the *alif*] of *anna* takes an *a*-vowel (*intaṣabat*) . . . You place an *a*-vowel (*fataḥta*) on *anna* when it comes in the middle of speech . . . You place an *i*-vowel (*kasarta*) on the *alif* of *inna* due to the *lām* of the predicate. If not for that, it would take an *a*-vowel (*maftūḥ*) because it comes in the middle of speech (KJN 251-2).

In the Bashīr al-Āghā manuscript, the declensional *intaṣabat* in this passage is replaced with the non-declensional *fataḥta*. This could be the result of a later transmitter in the post-*Kitāb* era "correcting" the author's use of terminology that

did not adhere to Sibawayh's system. This would further support the hypothesis that KJN was composed in an earlier period.

The passages quoted in this chapter demonstrate the similarity KJN bears to the works composed in the pre-*Kitāb* era. The author's use of the two sets of terminology without any apparent distinction in external, non-declensional contexts is reminiscent of the terminological use in *Kitāb al-'Ayn* and the *Ma'ānī* of Farrā'. The fact that KJN does not contain declensional terminology in reference to internal vowels, with the exception of the two passages just mentioned, shows that the author does have some conception of a distinction between declensional vowels and other vowels. However, the terminological system in KJN differs significantly from Sibawayh's system, as we have seen from the author's discussion of past tense verb endings, and of vowels in other word-final non-declensional contexts.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

These results strongly suggest that KJN was composed sometime between the late 8th – early 9th centuries. This result is at variance with the conclusions of Owens, Versteegh, and Baalbaki, who all believe the book to have been written in the 10th century, and support the attribution of KJN to Ibn Shuqayr. This study cannot conclusively support Ryding’s belief in the validity of KJN’s attribution to Khalīl, though it does not at all rule out that possibility—the surviving information about Khalīl’s use of vowel terminology is limited, and is not a sufficient basis on which to draw reliable conclusions. A comparison of the theoretical content of KJN with Sibawayh’s citations of Khalīl in the *Kitāb* would be a next step in an attempt to determine whether Khalīl could have authored KJN. Such a study has yet to be performed.

While an internal analysis of the text, of the type I have proposed in this thesis, is the most reliable way to determine the time period of its composition, we might substantiate the results of this study by situating the text in its historical context. It is important to consider the fact that KJN has survived to the present day despite its lack of theoretical sophistication. Given that there were much more comprehensive grammatical texts in existence by the 10th century, for example those of Mubarrad, Sarrāj, and Zajjājī, it is somewhat surprising that a work of such a disorganized nature would be preserved. One possible reason for its preservation would be its importance as a historical document—if indeed it was composed

during the 8th century, this would undoubtedly make it one of the earliest Arabic grammar books ever written, giving it tremendous value from a historical standpoint. If Khalīl was the true author, this would only add to KJN's value as a piece of the early history of the Islamic sciences.

If we are going to accept the 8th century dating, regardless of the validity of the attribution to Khalīl, we must answer the question of how and why KJN came to be associated with the name of Ibn Shuqayr. It is plausible that Ibn Shuqayr was a transmitter of the text and that he used it as a resource in his teaching, which would explain the biographers' connection of his name with KJN. As has been discussed, the value of the text in the 10th century would most likely not have been in its theoretical content, but rather in its historical relevance, and possibly in the fact that it contains a substantial amount of poetic material. Although Ibn Shuqayr was certainly a grammarian, as is evidenced by the titles of the other works attributed to him, and by the fact that Zajjājī lists him as one of his teachers, many biographers place more emphasis on his role as a transmitter of history. Poetry was of course an integral part of the early history not only of the Arabic language itself, but also an integral part of the transmission of the oral history of pre-Islamic and early Islamic times. Thus, it would make sense on this basis that Ibn Shuqayr would have transmitted KJN, and may have been one of few well-known scholars in his time to have done so.

The tendency for medieval biographers to attribute works to prominent scholars in the early history of linguistic sciences may cast doubt on Khalīl's authorship, but it is worth considering the possibility that Khalīl did in fact compose the text. The question then arises, why later biographers would hesitate to attribute it to him. The answer to this question may lie in historians' tendency to accept and promote particular ideologies. A prominent example of this tendency concerns the Basran and Kufan schools—later grammarians and biographers did not simply report information on early grammarians and their theories; they also helped create the very idea of the schools themselves. As Khalīl is identified as a Basran grammarian, partly by virtue of his connection with Sibawayh, the fact that KJN contains a significant amount of Kufan features might lead biographers to either doubt Khalīl's authorship, or to choose not to attribute the text to him.

As early as the late 9th century, Khalīl's image as a figure of almost mythic proportions had already begun to solidify. Certainly by the time of Ibn Mas'ar in the early 11th century—the earliest surviving record of the attribution of KJN to Ibn Shuqayr—Khalīl was recognized as one of the founders of the discipline, and his status as not only a leading authority on many aspects of Arabic linguistic sciences, but also as a man of impeccable character was unquestioned. Attributing to him a grammatical work of such scattered nature as KJN might weaken this image, and also call into question the extent of his true contributions to the *Kitāb* of Sibawayh.

Finally, in this thesis, I have focused on KJN as a case study in order to illustrate how vowel terminology can be a valuable method for determining the time period during which grammatical texts were composed, but this method is more broadly applicable, and has the potential to bring a new perspective to our understanding of the development of Arabic grammar as a science.

References

Primary Sources

- Abū 'Ubayda, *Majāz* = Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā al-Taymī, *Majāz al-Qur'ān*. 2 vols. Ed. by Muḥammad Fu'ād Saẓgīn [Fuat Sezgin]. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1954.
- Akhfash, *Ma'ānī* = Abū l-Ḥasan Sa'īd b. Mas'ada al-Akhfash al-Awsaṭ, *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*. 2 vols. Ed. by Hudā Maḥmūd Qarā'a. Cairo 1990.
- Akhfash, *Arūḍ* = Abū l-Ḥasan Sa'īd b. Mas'ada al-Akhfash al-Awsaṭ, *Kitāb al-'arūḍ*. Ed. by Aḥmad Muḥammad 'Abd al-Dā'im 'Abdullāh. Cairo 1989.
- Farrā', *Ma'ānī* = Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Ziyād al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*. 3 vols. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Alī al-Najjār. Beirut: 'Alam al-Kutub, 1983.
- Ibn al-Anbārī, *Inṣāf* = Abū Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Anbārī, *Kitāb al-inṣāf fī masā'il al-khilāf bayna l-naḥwiyyīn al-baṣriyyīn wa-l-kūfiyyīn*. Ed. by Jawdah Mabruk Muḥammad Mabruk. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 2002.
- Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzha* = Abū Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-udabā'*. Ed. by Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī. al-Zarqā': Maktabat al-Manār, 1985.
- Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* = Abū l-Faraj Muḥammad b. Abī Ya'qūb Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Ed. by Riḍā Tajaddud. Tehran, 1971.
- Ibn Kaysān, *Muwaffaqī* = Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Kaysān, *al-Muwaffaqī fī l-naḥw*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatlī and Hāshim Ṭaha Shalāsh. *Al-Mawrid*. 103-124, 1975.
- Ibn Mas'ar = Abū l-Maḥāsīn al-Mufaḍḍal b. Muḥammad b. Mas'ar b. Muḥammad al-Tanūkhī al-Ma'arrī, *Tārīkh al-'ulamā' al-naḥwiyyīn min al-baṣriyyīn wa-l-kūfiyyīn wa-ghayrihim*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulw. Riyad: Dār al-Hilāl, 1981.
- Khalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddima* = Abū Muḥriz Khalaf b. Ḥayyān al-Aḥmar al-Baṣrī, *Muqaddima fī l-naḥw*. Ed. by 'Izz al-Dīn al-Tanūkhī. Damascus: Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-Irshād al-Qawmī, 1961.

- Khalīl, *Jumal* = Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī, *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Qabāwa. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1985.
- Khalīl, *Kitāb al-‘Ayn* = Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī, *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*. 8 vols. Ed. Maḥdī al-Makhzūmī and Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā’ī. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-‘Alamī li-l-Maṭbū‘āt, 1988.
- Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* = Abū l-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*. 4 vols. Ed. by Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Khālīq ‘Uḍayma. Cairo 1994
- Qiftī, *Inbāh* = Jamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Qiftī, *Inbāh al-ruwāh ‘alā anbāh al-nuḥāh*. 4 vols. Ed. by Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 1986.
- Sarrāj, *Uṣūl* = Abu Bakr Muḥammad Ibn al-Sarrāj, *al-Uṣūl fī l-naḥw*. 3 vols. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatī. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1985.
- Sībawayh, *Kitāb* = Abū Bishr ‘Amr b. ‘Uthmān Sībawayh, *Kitāb Sībawayh*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1955.
- Sīrāfī, *Akḥbār* = Abū Sa‘īd al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abdallāh al-Sīrāfī, *Akḥbār al-naḥwiyyīn al-baṣriyyīn*. Ed. by Ṭaha Muḥammad al-Zaynī and Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Khafājī. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Khānjī, 1955.
- Suyūṭī, *Bughya* = Jalāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu‘āt fī ṭabaqāt al-lughawiyyīn wa al-nuḥāt*. 2 vols. Ed. by Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Maṭba‘at ‘Īsa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1964-65.
- Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam* = Yāqūt b. ‘Abdallāh al-Rūmī al-Ḥamawī, *Mu‘jam al-udabā’*. 7 vols. Ed. by Iḥsān ‘Abbās. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1993.
- Zajjājī, *Īḍāḥ* = Abū l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq al-Zajjājī, *al-Īḍāḥ fī ‘ilal al-naḥw*. Ed. by Māzin al-Mubārak. Beirut: Dār al-Nafā’is, 1979.
- Zajjājī, *Jumal* = Abū l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ishāq al-Zajjājī, *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. by Alī l-Ḥamad. Irbid: Dār al-Amal and Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1984.
- Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt* = Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn wa-l-lughawiyyīn*. Ed. by Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Maktabat Muḥammad Sāmī Amīn al-Khānjī, 1954.

Secondary Sources

- Baalbaki, Ramzi. 1981. "Arab Grammatical Controversies and the Extant Sources of the Second and Third Centuries A.H.". *Studia Arabica et Islamica: Festschrift for Ihsān 'Abbās*. Ed. Wadād al-Qāḍī. Beirut: American Univ. of Beirut. 1-26.
- _____. 2007. "Introduction: The early Islamic grammatical tradition". *The Early Islamic Grammatical Tradition (The Formation of the Classical Islamic World*, vol. 36), ed. by Ramzi Baalbaki, xiii-1. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- _____. 2008. *The Legacy of the Kitāb*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Bernards, Monique. 1997. *Changing Traditions: al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb*. Leiden, New York, & Koln: Brill.
- Carter, Michael G. 1973. "Ṣarf et Khilāf, Contribution a l'Histoire de la Grammaire Arabe". *Arabica* 20. 292-304.
- _____. 1985. "When Did the Arabic Word *Naḥw* First Come to Denote Grammar?". *Language & Communication* 5. 265-272.
- _____. 1998. "Another Khalīl: Courtier, Teacher, and Sage", *Early Medieval Arabic. Studies on al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad*. Ed. Karin Ryding. 16-43. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- _____. 1999. "The Struggle for Authority: A Re-examination of the Baṣran and Kūfan Debate". *Tradition and Innovation: Norm and Deviation in Arabic and Semitic Linguistics*. Ed. Lutz Edzard and Mohammed Nekroumi. 55-70. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Kinberg, Naphtali. 1996. *A Lexicon of al-Farrā's Terminology in His Qur'ān Commentary with Full Definitions, English Summaries, and Extensive Citations*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Owens, Jonathan. 1988. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- _____. 1990. *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

- Ryding, Karin. 1992. "Morphosyntactic Analysis in *al-Jumal fī al-Naḥw*: Discourse Structure and Metalanguage". *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics IV*, Ed. Ellen Broselow et al., 263-77. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- ___ . 1998. "Aspects of the Genitive: Taxonomy in *al-Jumal fī l-naḥw*", *Early Medieval Arabic. Studies on al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad*. Ed. Karin Ryding. 92-142. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schoeler, Gregor. 2006. *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*. Ed. by James E. Montgomery. Trans. by Uwe Vagelpohl. London & New York: Routledge.
- Talmon, Rafael. 1997. *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age. Kitāb al-ʿAyn and its Attribution to Khalīl b. Aḥmad*. Leiden, New York, & Koln: Brill.
- ___ . 2003. *Eighth Century Iraqi Grammar. A Critical Exploration of pre-Khalīlian Arabic Linguistics*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Versteegh, Kees. 1977. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*. Leiden: Brill.
- ___ . 1993. *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam*. Leiden, New York, & Koln: Brill.
- ___ . 1997. *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought III: The Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. London & New York: Routledge.