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Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

Chapter V looks specifically at how qiyas determines the relationship of asal and faras.

Chapter VI examines how al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarraj approach two specified topics, the tamyz and the verb of wonder (fil al-taqajjab).

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

Chapter VIII consists of an examination of material taken from the Usul by Ibn Ya'ish and incorporated into his commentary on the Mufassal of al-Zamakhshari.
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## Transliteration

### Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ئ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vowels and Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ؤ</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ئ</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ئ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ؤ</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ئ</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Comparatively little attention has been given by scholars in the West to the detailed study of the development of Arabic grammatical thought. While they have been interested in the grammatical tradition of the Arabs, they have largely directed their efforts to preparing editions of the classics of Arabic grammar. The first detailed European study of the Arabic grammatical tradition is Gustav Flügel's work of 1862, *Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber*, but this is essentially an account of the lives and works of the grammarians based on the then available biographical sources and no attention is given in it to the study of grammatical thought. The first proper study of grammatical thought by a Western scholar is the essay by Gotthold Weil which appears in the Introduction to his edition of the *Kitāb al-iṣnaf* of Ibn al-Anbārī which was published in 1913. ¹ This essay remains important and other later European scholars who have given attention to Arabic grammatical thought can be seen to have based themselves firmly on the work of Weil. ² In the Middle East useful studies have been made of the lives and works of individual grammarians, ³ but more general works on grammatical thought have tended to be biographical in nature and little emphasis has been put on critically examining the development of the ideas and techniques of the grammarians. ⁴

Although there is considerable scope for undertaking research on the development of Arabic grammatical thought there are certain limits on what can be done. This is because there are some quite considerable gaps in the works readily available of grammarians from the period
between the time of Sibawayh in the late 8th century and that of al-Zamakhshari in the late 11th and early 12th centuries. Many works of this period appear to be irrevocably lost although manuscripts of works thought to be lost are still being discovered and catalogued. Although research into Arabic grammatical thought is hindered by the loss of much valuable material it has been greatly assisted in recent times by the publication of further grammatical texts based both on long-known and newly discovered manuscripts.

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

In the history of Arabic grammatical studies the later 9th and early 10th centuries constitute the period of al-Mubarrad and his immediate followers amongst whom was Ibn al-Sarrāj. While there are positive reasons for taking the later 9th century as a point of departure there is an important, but negative reason for so doing. Because of the action of time the works of scholars who flourished in the period
between Sibawayh and al-Tabarrud had largely to have been lost and
their contribution to grammatical thought can only be imperfectly known
through later secondary sources. There are extant works such as the
Ramal of al-Malal which was the subject of a commentary by Ibn Jumaj
and has survived through the commentary, but major works of grammar
from this period do not appear to have survived.

Probably the most important work of grammar from the period
between the Litab of Sibawayh and the Mentadab of al-Tabarrud was the
Ramal' of al-Lakhfsh al-Mustasj (d. 630) who was a scholar whose views
are frequently quoted by later grammarians. He manuscripts of this
work are yet known and, indeed, there is no evidence that later scholars
like al-Sayyi (1445-1505) and 'Abd al-Qadir al-Shafti (1621-82) had
at their disposal copies of this work. This would tend to confirm that
this work amongst others of al-Lakhfsh's was lost at a comparatively
early date, although one of the pupils of Ibn al-Sayyi, al-Kashfsh, wrote a commentary on it. It is possible by consulting secondary
sources to discover the views of a scholar like al-Lakhfsh on any
points and even to find quotations from his works, but this cannot be
any substitute for being able to consult his works at first hand which
is vital for obtaining a truly accurate view of the development of
grammatical thought. Because of this loss of works of scholars like
al-Lakhfsh, it is necessary in attempting to take up in detail from
primary sources the history of grammatical thought after Sibawayh to
make a start with the work of al-Tabarrud.

Although the point just made constitutes a somewhat negative
argument for taking the later part of the 9th century as a point of
departure for the present study, there are more positive considerations
for so doing. The Banasa school of grammar, which became the school
of Arabic grammar, reached an important stage in its development with
al-Tabarrud for, when he moved from Banasa to take up residence in
Baghdad, the Baqama school itself was virtually removed from its term
of origin to Baghdad. Up until the arrival of al-Mubarrad in Baghdad, the grammatical school which had flourished there was that of Kufah and it had long been established in the metropolis. Indeed, the earliest Kufan grammarians of note, al-Kīmīyā (6304) and al-Fārābī (6322), both left Kufah to take up residence in Baghdad.

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

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

While there are particularly clear reasons for beginning a study of grammatical thought with the later 9th century, the period of al-Mubarrad, terminating it with the early 10th century, the period of his students, is somewhat more arbitrary but is justified simply by the need to limit the scope of the study. However, there are other considerations for setting such a limit. From among the pupils of
This study gives attention to the work of Ibn al-Sarrāj and, if al-Mubarrad can be said to have inaugurated a particular phase in the development of the Basran school, then his pupil, Ibn al-Sarrāj, brought it to a particular highpoint with his renowned work, the *Uqūl*. Al-Mubarrad's most outstanding pupils were al-Zajjāj, whose work has largely been lost, and Ibn al-Sarrāj, whose major work on grammar is extant. The grammatical works of lesser grammarians pupils of al-Mubarrad are also largely lost like those of al-Zajjāj and in any case did not attract much attention. In short, this means that the work of al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj form together a convenient subject for a study which covers the work on grammar of two generations of scholars.

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

In considering the further development of the Basran school in the period between Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad an important point which emerges is that the Basran study of grammar was continued and developed by comparatively few specialists. Sibawayh was succeeded by his older contemporary and pupil, al-Akhfash al-Ausaf (d. 830), and he was succeeded by his pupils, al-Jamai (d. 840) and al-Wezini (d. 862), of
whom the latter was also a pupil of the former. These two scholars were succeeded in turn by their pupil, al-Mubarrad. Al-Akhfash was undoubtedly a more distinguished scholar than his two pupils, al-Jarai and al-Mazini, and his views are very frequently quoted by later authors. His most famous work, which is often mentioned by name, is the Masa'il. It is apparent that he wrote two works of that name, the Kitab al-masa'il al-kabir and the Kitab al-masa'il al-saghir, but often the two titles are not clearly distinguished and reference is made simply to the Masa'il. It is recorded that Ibn al-Sarraj made particular use of the Masa'il which is an indication of the esteem in which the work was held. However, the Masa'il does not seem to have been given the attention in later times which a work like the Usuli of Ibn al-Sarraj was given and after a period of popularity it fell into disuse. Al-Akhfash's pupils, al-Jarai and al-Mazini, were scholars of note and their views are referred to by later scholars but they had the stature neither of their teacher, al-Akhfash, nor far less of their pupil, al-Mubarrad, and no further mention of their work is necessary here.

Abu l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd al-Mubarrad (826-998) was born in Basra and as was natural his training in the linguistic sciences was in the Basra tradition. He began his grammatical training by studying the Kitab of Sibawayh under al-Jarai and on this scholar's death he continued his study of the Kitab with al-Mazini. An eye-witness account indicates that al-Mubarrad distinguished himself even as a pupil studying under al-Mazini.
Al-Mubarrad did not remain in Basrah but at some time moved to Samarra which was then the seat of the caliphal government. It is said that the reason for his coming was that he was summoned to settle a dispute between the caliph, al-Mutawakkil (847–61), and his well-known intimate, al-Fath b. Khāqān, over a point of Qur’an vowelling. Be that as it may, al-Mubarrad did definitely move in court circles in Samarra but on the murder of the caliph, al-Mubarrad moved to Baghdad and appears to have resided there until his death in 898.

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

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

Al-Mubarrad’s most important work on grammar is the Muqdadab which is discussed below. Apart from this work it is also worth mentioning his Radd ‘alā Sībawayh in which he criticised certain views taken by Sībawayh. This work has not survived but its contents are known from the Intisār of Ibn Wallād (d. 943) which is a refutation.
of al-Mubarrad and a vindication of Sibawayh. This work has survived and Āqīmah, the editor of the Muqtadab, makes use of it in his marginal notes. Al-Mubarrad also wrote quite a number of works on grammar apart from the two mentioned here and many of them were directly concerned with the study and elucidation of the Kitāb of Sibawayh. However, these works have not survived and do not seem to have attracted much attention on the part of later scholars. They are only known as titles and these can be ascertained from the biographical sources.

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

A specialised commentary on the Muqtadab has survived and that is the Tafsīr al-masa’il al-mushkīlāt fī awal al-muqtadab by Sa‘īd b. Sa‘īd al-Fāriqī (d. 1001). In the Muqtadab there are a number of very complicated, but artificially constructed sentences which were used to train students and in his commentary al-Fāriqī undertakes to analyse and explain such sentences. Āqīmah has incorporated into his
marginal notes those parts of this commentary which are strictly relevant to the text of the Muqtadab. It is clear from what al-Fāriqī writes in the introduction to his commentary that the Muqtadab enjoyed considerable popularity in the later 10th century amongst beginners and those who had gone a little deeper into grammar.  

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

> قل لي: ذكر كتاب عموزي الذي صنفه فقال قائل: هو أحسن من المقتضب. فقلت: أبو بكر (ابن السراج). ديني هكذا، وأنسى:
>
> عفت بكثي قبلي قلي إلى آبتاكا
> بكهاما فأنت أقول الفضل للمستَفد

There is also a rather derogatory remark about the Muqtadab which Yaqut records Abū 'Ali al-Fārisī as having made:

> قال إبراهيم: نظرت في المقتضب فيها اختلفت منه بئشة، إبه مسالة واحدة وهي وقوع إذا هوا نسلت في قوله تعالى: وأين نصبهما سِناءً إياها قدَّمنا أفَيدهم إياها هم يقتظون.

This remark is nothing more than an attempt to belittle the value of the Muqtadab and is really a rather fatuous comment because, as 'Aḍīmah notes, with respect to the point on which Abū 'Ali al-Fārisī did reputedly
benefit from the Muqtadab, there is in fact no more information given there than in the Kitāb.  

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

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

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

As a grammar, the Muqtadab is quite a large-scale work and in the printed edition occupies four volumes. One of the very obvious characteristics of this work is the lack of any systematic arrangement of its chapters. In the Kitāb the chapters on accidence and syntax are to a large extent kept separate even if beyond this there is no clear
scheme for arranging the material. However, in the Muqtadab there is not even any separation of the chapters on accidence and syntax. On this point it is worth noting that Ibn al-Sarrāj is specifically described as giving the material in the Usul an excellent arrangement and this may well indicate that previous works like the Muqtadab and the Kitab were felt to be somewhat deficient in this respect. This would tend to suggest that there is no reason for supposing that the rather haphazard order of the chapters in the Muqtadab does not represent very much the original order in which al-Mubarrad composed the work.

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

The most important continuator of the work of al-Mubarrad was his pupil, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī, generally known as Ibn al-Sarrāj. Although the date of the death of Ibn al-Sarrāj is given as 316 A.H. (929 A.D.), there is no information on when he was born. The editors of his brief work on grammar, the Muḥāj al-lāhu, El-Chouemi and Demerdji, place his birth between the years 260-5 A.H. and this is based on facts known about him. Firstly, according to an anecdote, Ibn al-Sarraj was present at the entry of the caliph, al-Muktasim, into Baghdad in 289 A.H. At that time Ibn al-Sarraj was in love with a slave girl and in some verses drew a comparison between her and the pomp of the caliphal procession. Secondly, and this seems a stronger argument, he was a pupil of al-Mubarrad who died in 285 A.H. and before the death of his teacher he had made a reputation for himself as a pupil of
distinction. As to the places where he resided, it appears that Ibn al-Sarraj, unlike al-Mubarrad, spent all his life in Baghdad and the editors of the Mu'jas point out in this connection that Yaqiūt styles him the "Baghdadi" and that anecdotes about him are set in Baghdad.

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

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

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

وَرَأَيتَ أَبِنَ السَّارِجِ يُهَا وَقَدْ هُضِرَ سَنَةَ الزَّضِاح
سُلُمْتُ عَلَيْهِ بَعْدَ موْتِ الْبَرْدِ، شُقَّ الْزِّضِاحِ
مِن مَسَأْلَةُ فَقَالَ لِدِينَ السَّارِجِ: أَلَيْهِ يَأْأَبِي بَكَرُ
فَأَحَبَّ فَأَحَبَّ فَقَتَنَّهُ الزَّضِاحَ وَقَالَ: لَوْ كَنْتُ فِي
مَطْرِيْتِي وَكَانِيُّ أَجْلَيْلَ، دَيْ بِحَمْلِ هَذَا. وَهُدَى
كَنَا نُشْمِهَا دِينَ الزَّكَاةَ وَالْفَطْنَةَ لِدِينِ يَسِينِ بِي
رَجَاءٍ وَأَنْتُ قَنْطُّي فِي مَثِلِ هَذَا. فَقَالَ: قَدْ هُبَنَّيْتَ
According to the tailpiece to this story Ibn al-Sarraj was as good as his word and went on to become the leading grammarian after the death of al-Zajjaj.

Ibn al-Sarraj’s reputation as a scholar is firmly based on his major work of grammar, the Usul. Although this work did not become one of the great classics of grammar that were in wide use in the later Middle Ages, nevertheless, it was apparently quite widely used in the centuries after its composition and remained a work well-known to specialists in grammar. The biographical sources make clear that the Usul was a work that was well thought of although, because such sources tend to take over much material directly from earlier works, it is not easy to date from them the period when such commendatory remarks were first made. With perhaps a shade of hyperbole, Yaqut records the remark in praise of Ibn al-Sarraj’s scholarship in the Usul: "وقد قال ما نال الأخبار كأنه مكلف بأصوله."

Another commendation of the Usul is recorded by Yaqut in listing Ibn al-Sarraj’s works:

Apart from such commendations of Ibn al-Sarraj and his scholarship, the continued use of the Usul itself testifies to the high esteem in which its author was held. However, it is not possible, due to the lack of the necessary evidence, to give a complete account of the later
history of the use of the *Usūl* but certain details can be given. First of all, a number of commentaries on it were written. The earliest commentary was composed by Ibn al-Sarrāj’s own pupil, al-Rumānī (909–94). The next was done by Ibn Bābshād (d. 1077), an Egyptian scholar of distinction, whose works had some popularity. The next two commentators are scholars of the Islamic West. The first is Ibn Badhish (1055–1133) who has already been mentioned as having written a commentary on the *Fugādah*. The second, who is the last attested commentator, was the notable North African grammarian, al-Jazūlī (d. ca. 1209–19). His teacher was another eminent North African scholar, Ibn Barri (1106–87), and it is recorded that in an hour of need al-Jazūlī pawned his copy of the *Usūl* which he had made himself while studying the work with Ibn Barri.

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

From the evidence of the commentaries written on the *Usūl* and of the Fahrasah of Ibn Khayr it is clear that the *Usūl* was in general use down to the 12th century and in particular in the Islamic West. This last point is supported by the fact that two of the four texts used by al-Fatīḥ in preparing his printed edition of the *Usūl* were found in North Africa. After the time of Ibn al-Sarrāj’s pupil, al-Rumānī, it is difficult to trace the history of the use of the *Usūl* in the Eastern Islamic world because the Kashī al-zunūn of Hajjī Khalīfah does not mention any further commentaries from that region, and there are no sources of information for the East comparable with the Fahrasah.
The *Usūl*, however, did remain an important work and was one consulted by scholars undertaking very detailed studies of grammar. Al-Suyūṭī (1445–1505) frequently cites Ibn al-Sarrāj in the *Ashbāb wa-l-nazāʾir* and in it quotes passages from the *Usūl*. ⁵⁰ The *Usūl* is also the earliest work which al-Suyūṭī draws on in his treatise on grammatical methodology, the *Iqtirāb*. ⁵¹ 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī (1621–82) also found the *Usūl* valuable and in his introduction to the *Khizānāt al-adab* lists the *Usūl* as one of the works which he particularly consulted. ⁵² It is of interest that it is the earliest grammar after the *Kitāb* in al-Baghdādī’s list of works consulted. It is also worth noting here that Ibn Yaḥyā also found the *Usūl* a valuable work. This is because he takes over material from the *Usūl* as it stands and works it into his commentary on the *Mafāṣal* of al-Zamakhshārī. This is a matter which will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter. ⁵³

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

To a certain extent al-Mubārrad also uses the same device in the *Muqtaṣab*.

Among other works on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj was a commentary on the *Kitāb* but this has not survived and never had the popularity of
the later commentary on the Kitāb by al-Sīrāfī. 55 Another work on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj is the Jumal al-ugūl which was also known as the Kitāb al-ugūl al-qāghīr and is clearly an abridgment of the Ugūl. 56 There is also mention in the biographical sources of another work by Ibn al-Sarrāj whose title has the consonantal skeleton علٌ١، but what this work is or what the correct vocalisation of this word is cannot be said. 57 There is no reason to suppose that this is a work on grammar called the Jumal which is to be differentiated from the above-mentioned Jumal al-ugūl. References to a work on grammar by Ibn al-Sarrāj called the Jumal would simply involve an abbreviation of the fuller title Jumal al-ugūl.

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

قد انتهينا إلى الموضوع الذي ينتمي فيه كتاب الأمول وكتاب الجمل بعد ذكر النهاي والأنف واللام. ثم ذكر بعضه إحدى ابنه التصريف زيارة المسائل في الجمل ليس فيها ذلك.

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

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

وذكر المعرى في رسالة الخفاف أن أبا علي الغارسي كان يذكر أن أبا بكر ابن السراج
This work had a certain popularity and is mentioned by Ibn Khayr in his Fahrasah and he gives the same two chains of transmission back to its author which he gives for the Usul. The Nulaz was also the subject of a commentary by al-Rummani and this work is again mentioned by Ibn Khayr.

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

The next most distinguished grammarian from among the pupils of al-Mubarrad was Ibn Durustawayh (872-958) who wrote a number of grammatical works. He was reckoned to hold very firmly to the Basran
school and wrote a work called the *Radd ‘alā Tha‘lab fī dhātilāf al-mahdiyin* which was a reply to Tha‘lab’s exposition of the differences between the grammatical schools, the *Dhātilāf al-mahdiyin*. Among lesser Basran grammarians of this generation it is worth mentioning the names of Habramān (d. 956) who was a pupil of both al-Mubarrad and al-Zajjāj, and ‘Ali b. Sulaymān al-Athfash al-Saghīr (d. 928) who studied both under the Basran, al-Mubarrad, and the Kufan, Tha‘lab.

Then the generation of Basran scholars who were pupils of al-Mubarrad are taken into consideration, it is clear that they produced no other work of grammar which can compare in reputation with the *Usūl* of Ibn al-Sarrāj, and this is confirmed by the fact that no such work has survived. For this reason an assessment of Basran grammatical thought in the early 10th century must be firmly based on a study of the *Usūl*.

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

Although considerable work has still to be done on the history of Kufan grammatical thought, with particular need for a study of the *Ma‘āni l-Qur‘ān* of al-Farrā‘, certain general judgments can be made on the development of the school. It is clear that the only Kufan scholars who were grammarians of note were al-Kisā‘ī (d. 804) and
When individual Kufan grammarians are particularly mentioned it is these two scholars who are singled out on most occasions. Outside the field of grammar, Al-Kisa'i is best remembered as the scholar who established one of the three sets of Kufan canonical Qur'an readings. Al-Farra' is best remembered as the author of the still extant and partly published Ma'sūl al-Qur'an. This is a verse-by-verse, surah-by-sura commentary on the Qur'an which is predominantly concerned with grammar. This work was held in high repute and was used by al-Baghdādi in the Khizānat al-adab.

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

In the history of the Basran school, the later 9th and early 10th centuries constitute the period of al-Tabarrad and his pupils, and correspondingly in the history of the Kufan school, the same time-span constitutes the period of the outstanding scholar, Tha'lab, and his pupils. While it cannot be denied that Tha'lab was a distinguished philologist as a grammarian he was much less than an equal of al-Tabarrad. It appears that the main weakness of Tha'lab as a grammarian was that he had learned his grammar by studying the works of his Kufan predecessors and did not have much aptitude for reasoning things out on his own. This is made clear by an account of his teaching style as it appeared to his contemporaries.
Part of the reason why Tha'lab did not become a good grammarian was that he had not been trained up to the level of the best Basran grammarians. Although he received a philological training from Kufan teachers, Tha'lab himself draws attention to his own personal study of the works of al-Farra\.76 No doubt much of his grammatical knowledge was acquired in precisely this same way and he seemed to lack the advantage of a really thorough grammatical training with a teacher. There is evidence indicating that Tha'lab studied grammar under Salmah b. 'Asim but this scholar cannot be ranked with al-Mubarrad's grammar teachers, al-Jarmi and al-Mazini.77 Tha'lab's lack of grammatical training with particular regard to the Kitāb, which he did study although it was a Basran work, is made clear by an anecdote. Tha'lab's son-in-law, who to his annoyance used to go to al-Mubarrad to study the Kitāb, was asked why al-Mubarrad was more knowledgeable on the Kitāb than Tha'lab, and he answered that the former had studied it under scholars whereas the latter had studied it under himself.78 It also seems to be the case that in the main the Kufans regarded grammar as a subject which was to be studied as an introduction to a general philological training and they did not lay the emphasis on studying grammar for its own sake which the Basrans did.

Although Tha'lab wrote several works on grammar these have not survived.79 He does cover grammatical questions in his Majālis which has survived, but this provides no real basis for making meaningful comparisons with the output of the Basran school.80 It is clear that neither Tha'lab nor those of his pupils who remained within the Kufan tradition produced works that were the equal of contemporary Basran works, and this is confirmed by the fact that no such works have survived.
For this reason the present study is centred on the Basran school, although in a later chapter attention will be given to the Basran approach to Kufan scholarship at this period.

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

A study of any Arab grammarian inevitably involves reference to the works of other grammarians and some indication is now given of the principle works referred to in the present study which were composed outside of the period considered in this present study. In a detailed study of grammatical thought it is necessary to refer chiefly to the more compendious works of grammar and for this reason little attention is given to such small-scale works as the well-known treatises of Ibn Hishām. The main earlier work which is consulted in this present study is, of course, the Kitāb of Sibawayh. Of later works particular reference is made to the Sharh al-mufassal of Ibn Ya‘īsh. Although
the profundity and originality of this work is open to question, it is one which has been widely used in the Islamic world. As evidence of this may be cited the very frequent references to it in the Ashbāh wa-l-maṣāʾir of al-Suyūṭī. 84 Another work consulted is the commentary by al-Raḍī al-Astarābādhi on the Kāfiyyah of Ibn Ḥājib. 85 A compendious work to which reference has also been made but which is not so well-known is the Manhāj al-sālik of the famous Spanish scholar, Abū Ḥayyān Athīr al-Dīn. 86 This work is a commentary on the Alfiyyah of Ibn Ḥālīk and is particularly useful because of the attention given to making clear the views of Sibawayh and to relating the views of the Basran and Kufan scholars as well as those of later scholars of the Islamic West.
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CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS, AND DEFINITION

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

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

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

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

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

At various points in the Usūl Ibn al-Sarrāj explains the order in which he is dealing with the various topics to show that they are
being treated in a systematic manner. In particular, at the beginning of the *Uṣūl* Ibn al-Sarraj states that he will present his material in a convenient and well-ordened fashion and in the clearest possible terms:

\[
\text{فقد أعلنته في هذا الكتاب أسرار الأمر وجممتته} \\
\text{بمجرد كسره وفصله تفصيلاً يظهره. ورتب} \\
\text{أنواره وصنفه في حرابه بأضواء ما أمكن من} \\
\text{القول وأبين ليصبح إلى القلوب فهم ويسهل} \\
\text{على حرابة مفهلاً.}
\]

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

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

\[
\text{الأسباب، التي تتبع جملة أصناف:} \\
\text{الدُّول: مستداً له هنر} \\
\text{الثاني: هنر اكتساباً بنيته عليه} \\
\text{الثالث: فاعل بَنِي عيَن فعل، وذلِك الفعل هدبيث منه} \\
\text{الرابع: مخمل به بَنِي على فعل فهو هديث فنه ولام} \\
\text{دَكِر من فعل به فقام مقام الفاعل} \\
\text{الاصغر: متنبي بالفاعل في اللغة.}
\]

The main point of interest about the list itself is that Ibn al-Sarraj
identifies a particular use of the nominative case which he calls the
mushabbah bi-l-fā'il ǧūl ǧāl, or simply the mushabbah bi-l-fā'il. ¹²
This consists of the subject of kāna and analogous verbs and of the
subject of particles which behave like kāna and the verb proper and
this includes words like the negative particle mad in the Hijazi usage.
Although other grammarians took account of the uses of the nominative
case which Ibn al-Sarraj classifies as mushabbah bi-l-fā'il, the
expression itself for this class seems to be particular to Ibn al-Sarraj.

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

This passage consists of a definition of what a fā'il is and an
explanation of why the definition is worded as it is. The first point
Endo in the definition is that for a noun to be a fa’il it must follow the verb whose subject it is because, if the noun precedes the verb, it is not a fa’il but a subjunctive; this is a point commonly made clear by the grammarians. The second point made in the definition is that for a noun to be a fa’il it must be the subject of a verb in the active voice (fi’l alladhi buniya li-l-fa’il). By this condition Ibn al-Sarrāj distinguishes between the fa’il (active subject) and the mas’ūl alladhi lam yunsūra fa’iluḥu (passive subject). On this point it may be mentioned that Ibn Ya‘ish expressly criticises definitions of the fa’il which are so worded as to differentiate it from the mas’ūl alladhi lam yunsūra fa’iluḥu.

The third point which Ibn al-Sarrāj makes in his definition of the fa’il is that in defining whether a noun is a fa’il or not, no distinction is to be made as to whether the noun is a true fa’il or not. This stipulation arises out of Ibn al-Sarrāj’s classification of verbs into what are true verbs and what are not. What Ibn al-Sarrāj considers as true verbs will be dealt with later when discussing the question of the division of verbs into transitive and intransitive, but it is unnecessary to discuss verbs which are not true verbs in dealing with the fa’il. Ibn al-Sarrāj’s particular classification of
this sort of verb is not one which seems to be followed in later works
but it is of interest for illustrating problems which the term fa‘il
itself presented to the grammarians. The verbs which are not real
verbs are of three types: 16

الضرب الأول: أفعال مستمرة للذات
وفيها بيان أن ناقليها في الحقيقة مفعولون غير
مات زيد، وسقظ المانع، ومفرق بك.
والضرب الثاني: أفعال في اللفظ وليست بأفعال
حقيقية وإنما تدل على الزمان فقط وذلك قوله:
كان عبد الله أظفك، وأفعم عبد الله عاقل.
وقد
تكرر في نقد فعلته، وإنما تكرر أن عبد الله أظلم
فيها مفهوم بأن الصباح أن على وهم عاقل
والضرب الثالث: أفعال منقولة. تراب بها
في الرافع الذي جملت له نكر قولك: لا
أرينها داهنا. فانوها إما هو للمتكلم كأن ينوي
نفسه في اللفظ وهو للمناظر في الكلام وتأويله:
د ما كوننها داهنا ين إلى هم رأيت. وسيلة
قوله تعالى: وَلَدَ خَمْسَةَ أَيْدِ وَأَيْضَ صَمْيطَونَا.
لم
ينهيهم عن الموت في وقت ذاك وليس لهم
نكرية وتأويلية ولكن صناعة: كونها على الإسلام.
فإن الموت دين منه فمتى صادفكم مادفعكم عليه.
وهذا تعصير ابن العباس (المبكر) رحمه الله.

The first class of unreal verb is illustrated by examples like
مفرق بك، وسقظ المانع، مات زيد. It would clearly be incor-
rect to describe the subject in any of these examples as a fa‘il, if
due regard is given to the literal sense of that word. Indeed, Ibn al-Sarraj observes that the *fāʿīl* in such examples is really a *māfiʿūl*. However, it would be incorrect to call the subject in these examples the *māfiʿūl alladhi lams yuṣamma fāʿīluhu* because this would imply that there is a definable, though unspecified *fāʿīl*, when in fact the question of the true *fāʿīl* is more one for philosophy or theology than one for the grammarians. Although it would be fair to call the *fāʿīl* "unreal" for this reason, there does not seem to be a strong case for classifying the verbs themselves in the above examples as "unreal". 17

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

Ibn al-Sarraj's third class of unreal verb is rather difficult to define and the discussion of the examples which he gives is centred on points of idiom and rhetoric rather than of grammar proper. The discussion of the example *wa lā ʿrīsāla fulāna* involves the explanation of an idiomatic way of speaking, and the discussion of the Qur'anic *wa lā ʿrīsāla fulāna* involves explaining the force of the rhetoric of the Qur'anic diction.

The introduction by Ibn al-Sarraj of a classification of the various types of verb into his discussion of the *fāʿīl* reflects the
more general problem created by the Arabic terminology for the gram­
matical subject of a sentence. In English this problem does not really
arise because the single expression "subject" can be used in analysing
any type of sentence. The Arab grammarians called the subject of
nominal sentences the muhtada', but the term fa'īl was only just one
possible term for the subject of verbal sentences. The Arabic term
fa'īl will translate literally into English as "doer" or "agent" or, if an exact technical expression is wanted, as "active subject". The
Arab grammarians and, as the Usūl shows, Ibn al-Sarraj in particular
were always to a greater or lesser degree sensitive to the underlying
meaning of the term fa'īl and did not use it as a comprehensive term
for the subject in verbal sentences.

It is clear that the subject of verbal sentences is not always
a fa'īl in the strict sense of a "doer", as the sentence in the passive
voice illustrates. The grammarians considered that such
a sentence implies that someone struck Zayd, say 'Amr: َمَرْبُوفُ حَوَّلَبَ َثَبَب. For the grammarians the term "Zayd" in the passive sentence is as much
the object of the action of the verb as it is in the active sentence.
Accordingly, the subject of the passive sentence is called the maw'ūl
alladhi lam yusamma fa'īlubu and this can be translated into English
as the "passive subject". Because the Arab grammarians felt that there
was a real difference between the active and passive subject, Ibn
al-Sarraj is careful to word his definition of when a noun is an active
subject in such a way as to differentiate it from the passive subject.

The use of the term fa'īl, as has been mentioned, is also unsuitable
with regard to its underlying meaning of "doer" for the subject of kāna
and analogous verbs, and so the term ism is used as in ism kāna, for
instance. Ibn al-Sarraj recognises that the use of the term fa'īl
without qualification for the subject of the verb kāna and analogous
verbs is unsuitable. Accordingly, he calls it the mushabbah bi-l-fa'īl
which might be rendered into English as the "quasi active subject". The subject of āna and analogous verbs is only one type of quasi active subject and a second type is formed by the subject of sentences introduced by the particle mā in the Hijazi use together with other negative particles behaving similarly. 20 In an example like حكم حكم the negative particle follows the Tamimi usage, the sentence consists of a mubtada' and a khabar and the presence of the negative particle, which here has no power of government, does not affect the construction. However, in an example like حكم حكم the negative particle in the Hijazi usage functions like the verb of negation laysa, and accordingly the subject of the sentence is, in the terminology of Ibn al-Sarraj, a quasi active subject just like the subject of the verb laysa.

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

والقيق ينقسم قسمين: أمهما أن يكون
الفعل ديتمشي الفاعل إلى ما سواء ولا يكون فيه
دليل على مفعول غير: قتله وقعته وانكسر.
The division of verbs into transitive and intransitive is a very basic one but Ibn al-Sarraj goes further by dividing the former into those which can be said to have a tangible effect on their direct object and those of which this cannot be said. This distinction is also made briefly by al-Mubarrad in the Muqtadab. In English to distinguish between the fi'il al-mu'aththir and the fi'il ghayr al-mu'aththir it would be necessary to talk perhaps of "physical" and "mental" verbs. Ibn Ya'ish also distinguishes between the two sorts of transitive verb using the term 'ilaj rather than mu'aththir. Of the transitive verb he writes:

The division of verbs into transitive and intransitive is a very basic one but Ibn al-Sarraj goes further by dividing the former into those which can be said to have a tangible effect on their direct object and those of which this cannot be said. This distinction is also made briefly by al-Mubarrad in the Muqtadab. In English to distinguish between the fi'il al-mu'aththir and the fi'il ghayr al-mu'aththir it would be necessary to talk perhaps of "physical" and "mental" verbs. Ibn Ya'ish also distinguishes between the two sorts of transitive verb using the term 'ilaj rather than mu'aththir. Of the transitive verb he writes:
When Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses the mafūl bihi he again returns to the question of the classification of transitivity and intransitivity and he goes into further detail: 25

قد تقدم قرئنا في المفصل في المقدمة أن المصدر
ولما كانت هذه تكون على ضربين: ضرب ملفها ملاقي
شيئاً وذراً فيه، وضرب ملفها لا يلقي شيئاً ود
يؤثر فيه، فسمي الفعل المدقع ستميا، وما لم
يقل في سماحة. فأما الفعل الذي هو غير متعم
 فهو الذي لا يلقي مصدره صمدد كقول: قام، وأحمـ
... والزمان التي لا تتعمد في ما كان منها طلقاً أو هركة لجسم في ذاته، وجديدة له أو ندر من
أفعال النفس غير متشابه بئى هارج عنها.
أما الذي هو طلقاً، فنحو: أسو، وأحمـ... وأها هركة
الجسم بحرف ملاقياً لثنيّ: آخر ففيه: قام، وقـ...،
أنت ترى أن هذه الأفعال ممونة لحركة الجسم
وهي في ذاتها. فإن قال قائل: فدل بهد هذه الأفعال
من أن تكون المكان وأن تكون فيه،قيل: هذا د
بعد منه لكل فعل والتمد والفتر المتعمد في هذا
سواء... لأن الفعل يصنع لبدل على المكان كما يصنع
بدلاً على المصدر والرطان. وأما أفعال النفس التي
تتميى فكل هركة للجسم كانت ملاقية لخيرها وما
Ibn al-Sarrāj is, of course, inaccurate when he writes at the beginning of the above passage that transitive verbs are... because, as he mentions in the passage quoted previously, not all transitive verbs can be said to have an effect on their direct object. The way in which Ibn al-Sarrāj deals with the question of transitivity and intransitivity in verbs is of interest because he considers this to depend on whether or not their respective infinitives are transitive. The Basran grammarians held that verbs are derived from their respective infinitives which are more basic than the verbs themselves and, accordingly, Ibn al-Sarrāj attributes a verb's power to govern a direct object to the power of its infinitive so to do. Ibn Ya‘īsh makes this same point clear when he defines transitivity...
In a later chapter the question of Ibn Ya'ish's incorporation of material from the Usul into his Sharh al-mufassal will be dealt with in detail, but it is worth noting here that Ibn Ya'ish does seem to be influenced in this passage by his reading of the Usul. Just like Ibn al-Sarraj he also makes the incorrect statement that all transitive verbs have an effect on their direct object. In addition, Ibn Ya'ish also uses the verb lagā as a non-technical term to explain the technical term ta'add, and similarly he uses the idea of movement (harakah) in explaining transitivity. However, Ibn Ya'ish's analysis of types of verb is not as thorough as that of Ibn al-Sarraj.

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

According to Ibn al-Sarraj the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ūl divides up into two classes: 29
The first of these two classes can be further divided into three
varieties: 30

Ibn al-Sarraj does not explain very clearly in the case of the hal
why the accusative in outward form may represent what is nominative in
meanings, and all he writes in explanation is: 31

Ibn Ya’ish makes the same point much more clearly when he explains why
the accusative of the hal cannot be said to be a true mar’ul: 32

However, it has to be said that the hal does not necessarily
qualify the subject of the sentence and that the sabib al-hal may be some
other term. In the case of Ibn al-Sarraj this objection would appear
to be met by the fact that he states that the class of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul into which the ḫal falls is one in which the accusative in outward form may be (nominative in meaning. However, the point of classifying the ḫal in this manner would seem to be to distinguish the ḫal from the mafṣul proper, rather than to give a universally valid description of it.

The second variety of mushabbah bi-l-mafṣul where the accusative in outward form is nominative in meaning and the regent governing it is a verb proper, is the accusative of the ṭamyiz. This description, however, does not apply to the use of the ṭamyiz in enumeration and measurement and in the present discussion such usages are specifically excluded. In explanation of his classification Ibn al-Sarrāj writes:
Although this analysis of tamyiz as it stands supports Ibn al-Sarraj's way of classifying this particular use of the accusative case, it is an analysis which can appear over-simple when compared with that of later grammarians. Abu Ḥayyān, for instance, writes in the Manhaj al-sālih that the grammarians divide uses of the tamyiz into several categories:

This passage provides a more highly developed analysis of tamyiz constructions than Ibn al-Sarraj does, although Abu Ḥayyān does mention that there are certain scholars who do not accept the tamyiz manqūl min al-mar'ūl and some treat the tamyiz manqūl min al-mudāf as having the meaning of an original fa'il which would accord with Ibn al-Sarraj's analysis of tamyiz constructions of this type. Even if tamyiz
constructions are analysed along the lines laid down by later scholars, the same point may be made as was made in the case of the hal, namely, that in the case of the mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul the accusative in outward form may be nominative in meaning. However, there is no evidence that Ibn al-Sarrāj would analyse the tamyīz as other than standing in for an implied faʾīl.

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

The second class of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul consists of only one item and this is the accusative used in exception after illā in positive sentences and as an alternative to the badal construction in negative sentences. Ibn al-Sarrāj describes this variety of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul as follows: The meaning of the first part of this description is clear, because it serves to distinguish this type of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul from all other types. Ibn al-Sarrāj does not suggest that the exceptive accusative admits of being interpreted as nominative in meaning unlike the other types of mushabbah bi-l-maf'ul. The second part of the description, is somewhat less clear but can be explained by using an illustration like قام القوم إلا زيدا. Here the term زيد in the accusative is to be thought of as part of what is denoted by the term القوم in the nominative until it is expressly excepted from it. Ibn Ya‘īsh takes much the same consideration into account when he explains why the term in the accusative after illā cannot be treated as a true maf'ul.
However, the statement by Ibn al-Sarrāj is only valid if the mustathnā minhu is a term in the nominative, but the point of this remark may be to show that there is some affinity between this mushabbah bi-l-maf‘ūl and the others where the accusative in outward form may be nominative in meaning.

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

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

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

In the Kitab Sibawayh does not give a formal definition of the noun but merely gives some examples of nouns. In the Muqaddab al-Mubarrad goes into more detail and offers the following definition of the noun:

أما الأسماء، فما كان وقعا على معنى آخر، فرس وفس وورد وغمر، وما أشيره ذلك، وتتعتبر الأسماء بوئمة، وكل ما دخل عليه هرفس حرف الابر فهو اسم، وأيضاً اسمه في ذلك فلا ياسم.

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

Not all definitions of the noun are of this order. Al-Sīrafi, a pupil of Ibn al-Sarrāj, is quoted by Ibn Ya‘ish as giving the following definition of the noun which may be taken as typical of definitions by later grammarians:

كمة دلت على معنى في نفسها من غير أئتران، ومنه أن هنالك. 46 This would translate as "a word conveying a meaning in itself unconnected with a specific time". Al-Zamakhshari similarly writes:

اسم ما دل على معنى في نفسها ردالة حكيمة عن الااقتران، and Ibn Ya‘ish notes that most grammarians would add the words زمان جمالي. 47 From Ibn Ya‘ish’s comments on al-Sīrafi’s definition it emerges that the wording of the definition establishes two differentiae (faṣal) by which the noun is distinguished from the particle and the verb respectively.
Ibn al-Sarraj's basic definition of the noun is: 49

Neither here nor later in his discussion does Ibn al-Sarraj introduce the idea that a noun is with a view to differentiating between the noun and the particle but, rather, he is only concerned with differentiating between the noun and the verb. His use of the term is a way of expressing the idea behind the phrase in later definitions, and this is made clear by his justification of his definition: 50

Ibn al-Sarraj does mention that the noun, unlike the verb, does not indicate a notion in using the standard phrase of the later definition, when he rebuts an objection (often mentioned by the
grammarians) to the generally accepted definition of the noun and he explains the word *كَبْلُ* as if it would be unknown in this sense to his readers:

The relation of Ibn al-Sarraj's approach to the definition of the noun to the ideas of the logicians is not difficult to show. In the *Kitāb al-alfāz al-musta'melah fī al-mantiq* al-Farābī defines the noun as all that is divisible in time. This sort of definition can be seen as ultimately stemming from Aristotle who writes: "is a nature divisible by number."

Al-Zajjāj, an older contemporary of Ibn al-Sarraj, is recorded as having a definition of the noun which has a certain resemblance to the sort which the logicians put forward: "is divisible in number." Although this definition can be said to owe something to the ideas of logic, it does not have a really close connection and the presence of the terms *مدفع* and *مكان*, tends to move the definition away from the ideas of the logicians.

When discussing the definition of the noun in the *Idāb fī 'ilāl al-nahw*, al-Zajjājī (d. ca. 949), who was a pupil of both al-Zajjāj and
Ibn al-Sarrāj, mentions that the grammarians and the logicians define it in a different manner although some of the grammarians incline to the logicians' view. Al-Zajjājī himself frames his own definition to meet the needs of grammar but admits the validity of the logicians' definition:

This passage confirms that by the time of al-Zajjājī some of the grammarians were taking over the logicians' definitions of the noun although the majority appear to have based their definitions purely on the needs of grammar. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj's ideas on the definition
of the noun are influenced by logic, yet they are not so profoundly influenced as the sort of definition based on logic which al-Zajjājī quotes above. However, it does appear from the evidence available that Ibn al-Sarrāj was the first grammarian who can be definitely attested as defining the noun along lines laid down by the logicians.

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

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

As typical of later definitions of the verb may be cited that by Ibn Ya'qūb: 57 Ibn al-Sarrāj's definition of the verb largely corresponds with this except that, as was the case with the noun, he does not include the expression to distinguish the verb from the particle: 58

This definition by Ibn al-Sarrāj also links up with the ideas of the
logicians; al-Fārābī, for instance, writes in definition of the verb in the Kitāb al-alfāz. It is significant that Ibn al-Sarrāj considers that a verb conveys both a notion and a time. According to Ibn Fāris, al-Kisā'ī had defined a verb as: مَتَدَلُّ بِمَعْنَى وَمَعْنَى زمانِ، but the way Ibn al-Sarrāj does so is completely in accordance with the practice in logic which is based on Aristotle's definition in On interpretation (in the Arabic translation of which the verb is called kalimah, the usual term of the logicians);

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

Unlike their definitions of the verb and the noun, the grammarians' definitions of the particle seem to be firmly based on their own ideas and are unrelated to the work of the logicians. Indeed, in logic itself little attention was given to parts of speech other than the verb and noun. Sibawayh defines the particle, which he calls ُ هَرَفَ جَاهَ لَعْمِنِ، 62 In the Jumal al-Zajjājī, gives what was to become the standard definition of the particle: 63 Although the standard definition of the particle was in use by the time of al-Zajjājī, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not mention it when discussing the particle. In definition of the particle Ibn al-Sarrāj writes:

اءَلَفَ مَثْبَتَ أَنْ يَجَزُّ أَنَّ يَجِبُ مَنْ كَيْبُ مَنْ الْأَسْمَاء، أَئِنْ تَرَى أَنْكَ لَتَنْسَبْ إِلَى مَنْطَقَةٍ كَيْبُ مَنْ الْأَسْمَاء:
 dari efektif, dan tidak ada yang memperkuat atau mengatakan bahwa ini adalah bagian dari daftar.

Wadaiyūn 'An yakeen, hada yakeen: hada yakeen, wadaiyūn 'An yakeen.

Dari efektif, dan tidak ada yang memperkuat atau mengatakan bahwa ini adalah bagian dari daftar.
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CHAPTER III

REGENTS, THEIR CLASSIFICATION, AND RELATED THEORY

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

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

In his discussion of the regent in the Usūl Ibn al-Sarrāj classifies the various regents according to whether they are nouns, verbs, or particles and he further subdivides these three classes in the manner shown in the accompanying table.⁶ Amongst the particles he even includes
TABLE 1

THE DIVISION OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH INTO REGENTS
ACCORDING TO IBN AL-SARRAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The noun in the <em>mubtada'</em> and <em>khabar</em> construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nouns with verbal regimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>The active participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>The assimilated adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>The infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Nouns with verbal force (e.g. <em>ruwayda</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nouns with the regimen of particles (i.e. the <em>muḍāf</em> in the construct)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particles governing nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>inna</em> and similar particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particles governing verbs (i.e. entailing the use of the subjunctive and jussive moods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particles without regimen (e.g. interrogative particle <em>a</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**The "Hundred Regents" According to al-Jurjani**

#### A The 'awāmil al-lafziyyah (98)

- **a** The 'awāmil al-sama‘īyāh (91 regents in 13 classes)
  1. Prepositions (17)
  2. Inna and similar particles (6)
  3. mā and lā functioning like layṣa (2)
  4. Particles governing the accusative (7)
     - (wa, illā, yā, ayā, hayā, ay, a)
  5. Particles governing the subjunctive (4)
  6. Particles governing the jussive (5)
  7. Particles governing the jussive used in conditional sentences (9)
  8. Expressions entailing tamyīz (4)
     - (numerals 11-99, kam, kadha, ka‘ayvin)
     - (governing the accusative: ruwayda, balha, dunaka, ‘alayka, bayyaha, hā; governing the nominative: hayhāt, shattān, sar‘an)
  10. kāna and similar verbs (13)
  11. Verbs of appropinquation (4)
  12. Verbs of praise and blame (4)
  13. Verbs of doubt and certainty (7)

- **b** The ‘awāmil al-qiyāsīyāh (7 regents)
  1. The verb
  2. The assimilated adjective
  3. The active participle
  4. The passive participle
  5. The infinitive
  6. The first element (mudāf) in the construct
  7. The first element (mumayyiz) in the tamyīz construction

#### B The ‘āmilān al-ma‘nawiyyān (2 regents)

- **1** Regent of the mubtada‘ and khabar, i.e. ibtīdā‘
- **2** Regent of the imperfect tense, i.e. its taking the position of a noun without an express substantive regent
those which do not function as regents at all. For the purposes of
comparison a table has also been drawn up listing the "hundred regents"
according to al-Jurjānī's reckoning so that this scholar's approach may
be compared with that of Ibn al-Sarrāj. 7 The approach of al-Suyūṭī
to the regent in the Ashbāh wa-l-nasa'ir is completely different to
that of Ibn al-Sarrāj because the latter aims at providing a classifi-
cation of the regents while the former aims mainly at setting down various
rules as to how the regents function. 8

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

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

All regents except two are classified as verbal regents and these
two are ibtidaī and the regent governing the imperfect indicative verb.
In the *Uṣūl ibtida* is not specifically called a *ma‘nā*, a form of expression which in itself would prepare the way for the formal division of regents into verbal and notional. However, the idea that *ibtida* is specifically a *ma‘nā* does appear in the *Jumal* of al-Zajjājī, a pupil of Ibn al-Sarrāj:

Like the *Uṣūl*, the *Sharh al-jumal* of Ibn Bābshādh is a work intended for beginners and, accordingly, it seems probable that Ibn al-Sarrāj would have referred to notional and verbal regents if this classification had been current in his day for these expressions did become a basic part of grammatical terminology.
If the concept of the notional regent is taken to be one which only developed after the time of al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarraj, then statements made by Abu Hayyan about views which al-Mubarrad is said to have held must have an element of anachronism about them. One view which al-Mubarrad is said to have held about why the mubtada' is in the nominative is:  

\[ \text{ filmed by the}\] al-Mubarrad writes on why the mubtada' is in the nominative:  

\[ \text{ filme}\]  

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

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

\[ \text{ filmed by the}\]  

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

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

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

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

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

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

وذهب آخرون إلى أن الأثبتاء وامثبتاء جميعا
يحصلن في المجر. قالوا: لأننا وحدنا المجر لد يقع
This passage from Ibn Ya‘īsh provides an excellent example of how grammatical thinking could become more complex. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarrāj simply puts forward his view about the nature of the regent determining the case of the khabar and does not feel compelled to justify it. Later grammarians, however, thought more deeply about the point and were able to offer reasoned critiques of views like that of Ibn al-Sarrāj and put forward in their place more subtly formulated views.

As has been mentioned above the existence of the third type of noun regent which Ibn al-Sarrāj classifies also depends on the way in which a particular construction is explained. This type consists of nouns with the governing power of particles and in fact this refers to the construct. Ibn al-Sarrāj states that the construct either indicates possession and is equivalent to the use of the particle ʿāl, or it
indicates of what sort a particular thing is and is equivalent to the use of the particle min. 23 In the course of discussing the latter case, Ibn al-Sarraj specifies exactly what the regent is when he explains the relationship of the expressions \( \text{ذرب من ذكر} \) and \( \text{ذرب من هزن} \).

However, this type of noun regent does not exist if the view of certain later scholars on the regent governing the genitive in the construct is followed. Ibn Ya'ish, for instance, when analysing the expressions \( \text{ذرب من هزن} \) writes: 25

Ibn al-Sarraj follows the view of Sibawayh in holding that the first element in an idāfah construction puts the second into the genitive, and he considers that this construction simply conveys the meaning of either of the particles \( \text{ل} \) or \( \text{من} \). 26 The view taken by Ibn Ya'ish is,
however, rather more subtle involving the use of taqdir so that the idafah construction is seen not merely as conveying the meaning of either li or min but the term in the genitive itself owes its grammatical case to these notional particles. Again, this is a case of later grammarians putting forward more complex grammatical explanations.

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

What is of note about this explanation of the verb's power of government is that Ibn al-Sarrāj explains the principle which determines the use of the accusative case, which is a grammatical case particularly to be explained by the governing power of the verb. When Ibn al-Sarrāj details the various uses of the accusative at a later point in the Uṣūl he again refers to what determines the use of this case: 28
The second class of accusative usage listed in this passage is in fact the accusative of the *tamyiz* used in counting and measuring and it is treated by Ibn al-Sarraj as different because it is not an accusative usage dependent on the verb.

In these passages Ibn al-Sarraj sets out the idea that the use of the accusative is generally to be explained by the fact that it is not essential for the formation of semantically complete utterances. In a sentence like *المحذوف من زيد غزرا* the essential part according to this principle is because this is an expression which in itself is semantically complete. Similarly in sentences like *بهاء زيد راكبًا* and *زبيد مرقًا* the use of the accusative to express the *tamyiz* and the *bal* respectively is to be explained by the fact that *بهاء زيد* and *تصرَّب زيد* are in themselves semantically complete utterances, while the terms in the accusative serve only to provide added information. On various occasions Ibn al-Sarraj refers to this "formal redundancy" of the accusative by calling it a *faqlah* and this term is also used by later grammarians and is further discussed later in this chapter. 29

Of course, omitting terms in the accusative in this way is purely an analytical device of the grammarians and they can be considered only as "formally" redundant because they are not redundant in any real sense. The principle of the formal redundancy of accusative terms is based on the fact that a verb and its subject are sufficient in themselves to form meaningful utterances, and Ibn al-Sarraj refers to this by using the expression *استضافة الفعل الفاعل*. However, it is to be noted that not all uses of the accusative can possibly be considered as
formally redundant because in certain constructions the accusative is used to express what is the subject or predicate of the sentence. This point will be given further consideration in discussing the approach of later grammarians to formal redundancy.

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

In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj likens the term in the accusative after ʿilla to the marʿūn and this implies that it is dependent for its grammatical case on the regimen of the verb. In commenting on the expression ʿilla of the word ʿilla he makes this specific:

Ibn al-Sarrāj here draws attention to the principle of the formal redundancy of the accusative by making the point, which in terms of this principle is valid but in practice is meaningless, that were it possible
to introduce a term like جاَفَي الْتَّوْمَمَت نَبِيد without also introducing the exceptive particle, then the term would have to go into the accusative. This particular line of argument seems to be peculiar to Ibn al-Sarraj.

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

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

لِبَأَ قَلْتَ: جاَفَي الْتَّوْمَمْ فَهُمْ عَنْ السَّمَّاعِ أَنَّ
نَبِيدا فِعَلَمْ فَلِبَأَ قَلْتَ: إِذَا نَبِيدا كَانَتْ لِبَأَ
بَدَدْ من قَدَلْكَ: أَكَنْ نَبِيدا وَأَوْسَتْنَى فِي مِن
جاَفَي نَبِيدا فَكَانَتْ بَدَدْ مِنَ الْفَعَلِ.

Although he holds this view about the regent al-Mubarrad accepts that the accusative after مَلاا is to be explained by formal redundancy: 35
Ibn al-Sarraj does refer to the idea that *illa* can be related to the expression *أُسْتَشْنِىء* but he simply uses this as an analogy and does not use it as a formal explanation of the use of the accusative:

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

This represents a neat way of proving the principle of formal redundancy and it is perhaps indicative of the attention which Ibn al-Sarraj gives to this question that other grammarians do not seem to have put this construction to the same use. Al-Mubarrad, for instance, simply takes the view that after the double *illa* one of the terms is in the nominative due to the regimen of the verb and the other is in the accusative in
accordance with the principle accepted by the grammarians that the term after illā goes into the accusative unless there is a specific reason why this should not happen: 38

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

The term ‘umdah’ covers those uses of the nominative and the accusative such as the muftada’, khabar, fa’il, subject of inna, and the predicate of kāna, which are the basic elements in creating meaningful sentences. The term ‘fadlah’ covers those uses of the accusative which can be seen as formally redundant and is even used by later authors like al-Astarabadhi and Abu Hayyān to cover uses of the genitive. 40

In explaining the meaning of the term ‘umdah’ al-Astarabadhi mentions that it covers the subject of inna and the predicate of kāna because these uses of the accusative have an affinity with uses of the nominative
and cannot be likened to those uses of the accusative which are to be explained by formal redundancy. In defining the term 'umdah in this way al-Astarābādhī introduces a consideration which is not taken into account by Ibn al-Sarrāj because the latter does not make the point clear that not all uses of the accusative can reasonably be explained by formal redundancy.

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

اعلم أنه قدّم الكلام في الإعراب على التوقفات لذكائها الفوائد للمملكة والاعدة فيها التي لم تقلوه صنفها، وما مداها فضيلة يستقل الكلام دونها.

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

الفعل إنها اهتمى بالربيع لقوته والمفعول بالنصب لضعفه. والمعنى بقية الفعل كتبه بالزوم الفعل وعدم استخناص الفعل كنها وليس المفعول كذل ك، بل يجوز استخدامه وذكائه. أدع أرى أنهما يقولان: فرب ند، ويكون الكلام مستقلًا وإن لم تذكر مفعول، ولو أستهدفنا تجذيف الفعل ولم نقم مقامه شيئاً فنحو: فرب نداء، من غير فاام لم يكن الكلام... فنما سيراً بأن أعطيوا...
It is possible to relate the view of later grammarians like Ibn al-Sarrāj regarding the function of the accusative case to an idea suggested in the Kitāb of Sibawayh. In the Kitāb Sibawayh relates many uses of the accusative case to its use with the numerals 11-99 and he refers to this by the stock phrase ‘ishrūn dirham. The ideas underlying Sibawayh's frequent reference to this expression are outside the scope of this present study, but one particular use of the accusative which he likens to that with ‘ishrūn dirham is treated in a way which can be related to the ideas of the later grammarians about formal redundancy. However, Sibawayh does not give any definite expression to the idea that the use of the accusative case is in general to be explained by formal redundancy. The particular usage in question is as follows:

The gist of Sibawayh's argument here is that the example "darā'ī ḥalf darāk Farsānā šafṣafūbūbūsālān kālaamā" is a semantically complete utterance consisting of mubtada' and khabar, and because of this the additional element which amplifies the meaning is put into the accusative. Here Sibawayh uses the verb istaffāf which Ibn al-Sarrāj also uses in presenting the principle of formal redundancy. Although this particular instance can be used to show how the ideas of later grammarians on the use of the accusative
can be traced back to Sibawayh, nevertheless, there does not appear
to be another instance in the Kitāb of a similar correspondence. It
would appear that the idea of formal redundancy with regard to the
accusative case only properly developed after the time of Sibawayh.
Al-Mubarrad does make passing reference in the Muqtadab to this idea
but unlike Ibn al-Sarrāj he lays no great emphasis on it.

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

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

According to this principle with regard to a sentence like

although the expression is in itself
formally complete, nevertheless, it does contain within itself a
"suggestion" of a term in the accusative to come which in this instance
is specifically . Clearly, all transitive verbs when used in
sentences involve the "suggestion" of a direct object in the accusative
whether or not it is expressly mentioned. Indeed, when Ibn al-Sarrāj
defines the intransitive verb he specifically mentions the absence of
Ibn al-Sarrāj again introduces the notion of a "suggestion" when he discusses the bāl: 48

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

When dealing with the mafʿūl maʾahū, after having dealt with the mafʿūl lahu, Ibn al-Sarrāj again draws on the idea of the verb involving a "suggestion" of terms in the accusative: 50
Ibn Ya‘ish introduces this same consideration when he explains why the preposition \( l_j \) which is used with the maf‘ul lahu may be omitted but not the conjunction \( w_a \) which is used with the maf‘ul ma‘ahu: 

\[
\text{وَذَلِكَ لَا دُنٌ ذِيدَةٌ الفَعْلِ عَلَى مَفْعُولَهُ لَهُ أَقْرَىَ مِنَ}
\]

\[
\text{ذِيدَةٌ عَلَى الْمَفْعُولِ مَعْهُ. وَذَلِكَ لَا دُنٌ ذِيدَةٌ لَّهُ ذُدُرٌ فَعَلٌ}
\]

\[
\text{صِنَمْلِهُ لَهُ سَوَاءٌ ذِكْرَتْهُ أَوْ لَمْ تَذِكْرُهُ إِذْ الحَافَل}
\]

\[
\text{دَيْفُ مَحْمُودٌ إِنََّ لَفْغْيٌ وَكِلَّةٌ دَيْفُ مَحْمُودٌ}
\]

\[
\text{لَا ذِيدَةٌ فَعَلٌ}
\]

\[
\text{فَيْئَا يُبْلَمُهُ أَنَّهُ بِهِنَّ لَا خَبَرٌ أَوْ وَقَاءٍ}
\]

In this passage it is worth noting Ibn Ya‘ish’s remark:

\[
\text{لَا دُنٌ ذِيدَةٌ مَفْعُولٌ لَهُ سَوَاءٌ ذِكْرَتْهُ أَوْ لَمْ}
\]

\[
\text{تَذِكْرُهُ إِذْ الحَافَلِ دَيْفُ مَحْمُودٌ إِنََّ لَفْغْيٌ وَكِلَّةٌ}
\]

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

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

It is clear that a verb can only involve the "suggestion" of certain types of accusative expression and the grammarians particularly note that the verb does not involve the "suggestion" of a maf‘ul ma‘ahu. Only a transitive verb can have a "suggestion" of a direct object.

Two other uses of the accusative which the verb presupposes, and which the grammars specifically mention, are the bāl and the maf‘ul lahu but
other uses could clearly be added. In works of grammar later than the 
Iğül the idea that the verb presupposes certain uses of the accusative
is not given any particular prominence and only appears incidently,
whereas in the Iğül Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to it in explaining the verb's
power of government and in enumerating the uses of the accusative as
well as introducing it as appropriate at other points. Something
similar to the later more developed idea of the verb involving a
"suggestion" of certain accusative usages can be found in the kitāb of
Sibawayh when the point whether a sentence like 

\[ \text{ذَهَبَتُ الشَّامُ} \]

is like one with an accusative of place is discussed:

\[
\text{وَقَدْ قَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ: ذَهَبَتُ الشَّامُ، ضَبَبَهُ بَالْمَهْمَم}
\text{إِنْ كَانَ مُكَاَنًا يَقُولُ عَليِّهِ الْمَكَانَ وَالْمَسْحُورُ. وَهَذَا ضَادَّ}
\text{لَا ذَلِكَ لَيْسَ فِي ذَهَبٍ دَلِيلٍ عَليِّ الشَّامَ وَفِي هَذِهِ دَلِيلٍ}
\text{عَليِّ المَسْحُورِ وَالْمَكَانَ.}
\]
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CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF QIYĀS AND TAQDIR

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

اَعْلَمْ أَنَّ إِنكار الْقِيَاشِ فِي النَّصِ لَا يَحْقِقُ لِذَٰلِكَ
الْقَوْلِ كَقِيَاشٍ وَلِهذَا قَلِيلٌ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَوْلِ
بِالْمِتاَبِيسِ مَسْتَنَبِتَةَ مِنِ أَسْتِقْمَاءِ كَلَامِ الْحَرَبِ
فَيْنَ أَنْكُرُ الْقِيَاشَ فَقَدْ أَنْكُرَ النَّصَ.

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

جَنَّ مَا شَاءَ قِيَاشَ وَقِيَاشَ وَلَمْ يَشَاءَ فِي اسْتِقْمَالِ
الْحَرَبِ لَمْ يَشَاءَ. فَإِنَّ جَنَّ وَقِيَاشَ أَنَّ يَعْلَ
فِي قَالِ اسْتِقْمَاءَ صُنُّ اسْتِقْمَاءٍ وَاسْتِقْمَاءَ وَهُمْ
كَانَ عَلَى هَذَا المَثَالِ. وَلِكَنَّهُ جَاءَ عَلَى الأَصِلِّ
وَاسْتَنْفَلَهُ الْحَرَبَ كَذَا كَذَا.

The grammarians' understanding of qiyaṣ is in fact often best illustrated in their discussions of situations where they consider that
the demands of *qiyās* are disregarded in actual usage. Ibn al-Sarrāj, for instance, notes that there are certain aspects of the use of conjunctions to which the normal rules of usage do not apply:  

In the example, Ibn al-Sarrāj holds that there is a rule of usage which should have applied and, if it had been followed, the construction would have been anomalous in the view of the grammarians just as the verb *إسْتَعْتَزَى* in the passage quoted previously is morphologically
anomalous. However, there is this difference that the form of this verb cannot be applied to other verbs at will, whereas this construction can be used where necessary. Although this construction may oppose what *qiyās* dictates, it can itself be described as *qiyās* because it is a construction to be followed or, as the grammarians would say, *maslahah.*

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

Already by the late 3rd century A.H., the work of the grammarians was to a large extent to explain, rework, and develop the material on the Arabic language contained in the writings of the earliest authorities of whom the most important by a very long way was Sībawayh. No further basic research seems to have been done by way of consulting reputable informants, and the only activity that approximated to basic research was the continued study of early written sources such as the Qur'an and the material recorded in collections of poetry and proverbs, which was undertaken with a view to extracting further information on usage. Ibn al-Sarrāj himself makes clear that by his time the study of grammar was essentially derivative.
Even if grammatical studies were very solidly based on the work of the early scholars, there was scope for the later grammarians to apply *qiyās* in dealing with usages and constructions which were not covered in the works of the early scholars and on which no information could be found by studying the diction of the Qur'ān and early poetry. On this point Ibn al-Sarrāj makes a remark of general significance when discussing one particular usage:

فإذا لم يجمع سجاع الشيء من العرب

This is, of course, similar to the practice in Islamic jurisprudence where *qiyās* (analogy) is applied in situations for which the Qur'ān, sunnah, and consensus of the scholars (ijmāʿ) do not provide.

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

وعلم أن جميع ما جاء في الاستمداد وهُبره من الْتَقْرِيم

والتألفَر فهذٌ حافظ في كان إذا أن تنصل بينها وبين ما عملت فيه كما لم تتحمل فيه. فإن فصلَ مظرف

ملغيُّ جَاَز. فأما ما يَبيِّن فقوله: كان منطَلُقا بعبد

الله، وكان منطَلَقا اليوم عبد الله، وكان أحالة

صاهبونا، وزيد كان قد أَعثَرَ فَلَمْ يَعثَرَ، والزيد كان قائمًا

فَلا مَعَاه تَرَى: كان قد أَعثَرَ فأَعثَرَ. وَكَذَا أَعثَرَ

كان. قال الله تعالى: وَكَانَ عَظِيمًا عَظِيمًا

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

والفحصة والتأخير في الأغفار الهيلية. فكانت 
الاغفار الهيلية: ما لم تفرقن. تقول: أبره صنطل تم 
كان زيد تزيد: كان زيد ابره صنطل تم وأبى. 
قهبة: كان زيد تزيد: كان زيد ابره. 
بارة: كان زيد تزيد: كان زيد ابره. 
بارة: كان زيد تزيد: كان زيد ابره. 
فان تلته: كان في داره زيد ابره. 
وانت تزيد: كان زيد في داره ابره. 
لم يكن لأن الظروف 
لذب فليس من كان في شيء وقد فلست به 
بينها وبين هبره. وان ثبت: كان في داره 
ابره زيد: حل نذك قدست الحفر بكميتها 
وثي جملته فصار مثل قوله: كان صنطلها زيد.

In addition to the sort of change of word order envisaged above, 
Ibn al-Sarrāj further states that the subject of *kāna* can be made to 
precede the verb and at the same time this can also be done to the 
predicate:
Although he does not mention the point Ibn al-Sarrāj is now discussing changes of structure with reference to a model sentence of the type 

\[ \text{كان زيد منطلقاً أبوه} \]

whereas previously the model sentence was of the type 

\[ \text{كان أبوه منطلقاً زيد} \]

This raises the question of the alternative ways of constructing the predicate of the model sentence 

\[ \text{كان أبوه منطلقاً زيد} \]

In the Jumal al-Zajjājī notes that one may say 

\[ \text{كان زيد منطلقاً أبوه} \]

although this is a point worth consideration Ibn al-Sarrāj himself does not discuss it, but if it is permissible to say 

\[ \text{أبوه كان} \]

there would seem to be no reason for disallowing this construction were the predicate 

\[ \text{منطلقاً أبوه} \]

to be changed to 

\[ \text{أبوه منطلقاً} \]

The whole exercise of laying down possible word order with kāna where its predicate is complex is clearly based on the application of qiyās because many of the alternatives are tortuous and could hardly be supported from attested usage. Even for some of the most simple changes Ibn al-Sarrāj has to rely on qiyās as is the case with 

\[ \text{أبوه} \]

which he treats as analogous to 

\[ \text{كِانَ زيد} \]

a completely acceptable construction. It is while discussing this point that Ibn al-Sarrāj makes the general remark about the scope of qiyās quoted earlier:

\[ \text{وقال قوم:} \ 	ext{أبوه قائم كان زيد} \ 	ext{ف염أ نذأ} \ 	ext{لذ ذا} \ 	ext{يعمل فيه كان} \ 	ext{قد يتقدم} \ 	ext{قبل كان} \ 	ext{والنتيجة} \]
The type of change in normal word order with kāna which is discussed here appears to have been a particular concern of Ibn al-Sarrāj because later grammarians like Ibn Ya'īsh are more interested in examining kāna together with analogous verbs to establish which simple changes of word order are permissible with each verb. However, the only other verb apart from kāna which Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses in this respect is layṣa.

Another example of the application of qiyās by Ibn al-Sarrāj is found in his discussion of the use with the verb zamma and analogous verbs of the pronoun which the Basrans generally called the damīr al-sha’īn or damīr al-qissah.

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

Ibn al-Sarrāj's sanctioning of the use of the feminine pronoun in the example ُدِيْنَتْهَا زِيدُ قدْامُ is governed solely by the application of qiyās since he concedes that it is an unattested usage. Of course,
in certain constructions a feminine pronoun is normally found as is the case with *inna/anna* when there is a term following of feminine gender and this is illustrated by the Qur'anic phrase  

\[ فَأَنْتَ تُخْبِئُونَ لاَ تَشْعُدُونَ \]

In tracing the basis of Ibn al-Sarrāj's reasoning it is possible to treat a sentence like  

\[ ظَنْنَتُ نَزِيدَ قَامَّةً \]

in which the nominative follows the pronoun as similar to one like  

\[ ظَنْنَتُ نَزِيدَ قَامَّةً \]

in which the accusative follows the pronoun, because in the latter case there is a view that the feminine pronoun is possible although in this particular instance a slightly different line of argument is used:  

\[ تَقَوَّلُ : ظَنْنَتُ أَهْلَكَ قَامَّةً تَرِيدُ ظَنْنَتُ الظَّنَّ \]

\[ فَتَكُونُ الْهَاكُمُ كَانَةً مِنَ الْظَّنَّ كَأَنَا كَانَتُتُ : ظَنْنَتُ أَهْلَكَ قَامَّةً الظَّنَّ ، ثُمَّ كَانَتُ مِنَ الْظَّنَّ \]

\[ وَأَجَازَ بَعْضُهُمُ : ظَنْنَتُهَا أَهْلَكَ قَامَّةً سَرِيدُ الْظَّنَّ \]

However, this passage occurs before Ibn al-Sarrāj turns to the construction  

\[ ظَنْنَتُ نَزِيدَ قَامَّةً \]

and a usage which the Kufans permit, and which Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions directly after proposing this construction, has a more close connection with the application of *qiyās* here:  

\[ فَأَمَا الْكَوْفِيُّونَ فِيْيَزُوزُونَ تَأْنِيَتَ الْكَحْوَلَ وَتَذْكِيرُهُ \]

\[ إِذَا وَقَعَ بِهِمْ ظَنَنَتْ. يَقُولُونَ : ظَنَنَتْ هَذِهِ قَامَّةً ، وَظَنَنَتْهَا هَذِهِ قَامَّةً \]

It is clear why the Kufans permit the use of both the masculine and the feminine pronoun here because the masculine can be seen as representing the basic usage in the construction while the feminine occurs as a result of a very natural attraction of gender. However, Ibn al-Sarrāj's sanctioning of the construction  

\[ ظَنْنَتُ نَزِيدَ قَامَّةً \]

is somewhat different from this because he holds that the feminine pronoun
owes its gender to the purely notional term qiggah.

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

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

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

An example of the application of qiyās in a very marked way is provided by relative clause predication. In their grammars both al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarraj give considerable attention to recasting
sentences so that they consist of a relative clause which is introduced by the relative pronoun alladhi or the definite article and which is predicated of an element in the original sentence. By this procedure a simple sentence like جُبَرْ يَزْبَحُ or of which a suitable English translation would be "relative clause predication". As a result of the changes in the example given the original verbal sentence becomes a nominal one with a muqtada' and a fa'il sadd masadd al-khabar.

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

One of the simplest forms of verbal sentence is one of the type جُبَرْ يَزْبَحُ and by the process of relative clause predication this can be converted to جُبَرْ يَزْبَحُ and As well
As sentences like this in the singular, sentences in the dual and plural were also considered and the necessary changes made which this operation dictates. The grammatical analysis which Ibn al-Sarrāj gives for the changes which are made to the simple sentence ذهب زيد can be taken as similar to that given for equivalent changes made to more complicated sentences:

Although relative clause predication is in essence a theoretical exercise it does have a practical aspect because there is certainly a difference in emphasis between ذهب زيد and ذهب زيد. However, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not consider this point and treats the subject purely as a mechanical exercise. Al-Astārābādī does draw
attention to this point and explains how the sentence 
and differ in emphasis: 28

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

Because a subject like relative clause predication involves to 
a large extent discussion of constructions which are grammatically 
possible but which are often rather barbarous, there is considerable
scope for the use of grammatical reasoning to prescribe what is permissible since attested usage is of little help. The reasoning employed can be somewhat involved as is the case with Ibn al-Sarrāj's discussion of the validity of the construction 

When relative clause predication is applied to verbs which govern more than one direct object even the most basic changes raise points of usage. If the sentence 

is recast so that the word has the rest of the sentence predicated of it, Ibn al-Sarrāj argues that giyās calls for the introduction of a pronoun prefixed by the particle īya into the resulting sentence rather than framing it in other ways:
When Ibn al-Sarrāj discusses relative clause predication with the infinitive, the essentially artificial nature of this whole procedure becomes very clear from the way in which one particular point is discussed and this is very revealing of the methodology of the Arab grammarians. Ibn al-Sarrāj permits relative clause predication with the infinitive so that, for instance, 

\[ \text{ضَرَبَتْ عَنْهَا شُرَبْيَا} \]

becomes 

\[ \text{ضَرَبَتْ عَنْهَا شُرَبَيْبَ} \]

and the infinitive 

\[ \text{ضَرَبَتْ عَنْهَا شُربَيْبَ} \]

becomes. However, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not allow relative clause predication with the بَحَل and for this reason he does not allow it with certain infinitives and other expressions which are grammatically analysed as representing the بَحَل construction:

\[ \text{فَمِنْ نَصِبِ الْمَصَادِرِ إِذَا كَانَتَ نَكْرَةً فِي الْخَالِ} \]

32
The criterion used to reject relative predication with infinitives in ḥāl constructions is that such usages are basically anomalous and cannot be subject to changes which can validly be applied to regular constructions. If relative clause predication is possible with infinitives there would seem to be no real reason why it should not be admissible when the infinitive is analysed as a ḥāl, even if those uses of the ḥāl where the term is indefinite cannot logically be made subject to this process. This confirms that the grammatical methodology which Ibn al-Sarraj employs does not take into account whether constructions thrown up by relative clause predication are likely to occur in practice but, rather, whether they are admissible on the basis of considerations dictated by purely formal grammatical analysis.

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

In spite of the fact that the idea of taqdir is very important in the thought of the Arab grammarians, no attempt was made by them to define the term and the various aspects of its use. Thus, although it is convenient and legitimate to talk about taqdir as a definable aspect of grammatical methodology, it would be incorrect to say that it was a technical term of the same order as for instance the term ʿāamil.
The grammarians make use of the actual word ṭaqdīr in expressions like "implying...", and "what is implied is...". They do not use the word in the sense of a precisely defined procedure which they would apply in certain situations.

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

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

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

is admissible if a term like *amr, hadith, or qisah* is implied after *kāna* which is a device that the Arab grammarians considered analogous to the explicit *damir al-sha'ān*. 37 In support of this usage Ibn al-Sarraj also cites a verse into which such a notional term must be introduced to allow a grammatically sound analysis. His approach to this question is rather different from that of Sibawayh in the *Kitāb*. 38

The latter puts forward the idea of a suppressed term with certain usages of *kāna* so as to explain the syntax of a number of verses of poetry including the one cited above, but he does not consider it
admissible to form sentences like on the
analogy of these purely poetical usages.

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

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

The concept of *taqdir* is particularly used in the discussion of constructions in which the speaker's intentions are seen as dictating how precisely he expresses himself. This often involves consideration of differences of expression which have little or no effect on meaning. This is illustrated in the discussion, which Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from al-Mazini, of the sentence which, by the process of relative clause predication, can be changed to . The concept of *taqdir* is particularly used in the discussion of constructions in which the speaker's intentions are seen as dictating how precisely he expresses himself. This often involves consideration of differences of expression which have little or no effect on meaning. This is illustrated in the discussion, which Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from al-Mazini, of the sentence which, by the process of relative clause predication, can be changed to .
According to al-Māzini, if in relative clause predication the inseparable pronoun is used attached to the participle this is done on the "implication" of the use of the pronoun object with the verb proper, but if the inseparable pronoun prefixed by the particle īya is introduced later on in the sentence this is done on the "implication" of the position that the substantive for which it stands would have occupied.

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

وأما قدر ذلك: قُصُم وَجِهَا وَأَكْرِمُ أَبَا عَن أَمْهَانًا، مَشْهُورًا بِالضَّارِبِ رَجُلٌ فَقَدْ قَدِمَ تَقْصِيرًا فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ. وَفِي هَذَا حُسْنًا عَن دَيْنِي آن يَنْتَخِبُ عَلَى التَّقْصِيرِ أَيْضاً بِالْأَدْهَلِ يَنْتَخِبُ آن يَكُونُ هَذَا وَذلِكَ الْفَرْعَ الْأَخْرَجُ قَدْ بَيْنَتْ بِالْوِجْهِ الْأَحْسَنِ مَنْهَا بَيْنَتْ فِي قَضْلَا: هُوَ أَهْسَنُهِمْ وَهَوْهَا، وَكَذَلِكَ يُصْبِرُ عَنْهِمْ قَوْلَهُمْ: هُوَ الْعُفْوُ كُلُّهَا، وَلَا أَشْهَبُ ذلِكَ. فَإِنَّا نَصْبَتْ عَلَى تَقْدِيرِ التَّقْصِيرِ أَمْجُزَّ أَن تَدْخِلَ عَلَى الْأَلْفِ وَالْلَّامِ، فَإِنَّا نَصْبَتْ عَلَى تَقْدِيرِ الْمَفْحُولِ وَالْتَشْقِيبِ بِقَوْلِهِ: الْضَّارِبِ رَجُلًا، هَازَ أَن تَدْخِلَ عَلَى الْأَلْفِ وَالْلَّامِ.

Here Ibn al-Sarrāj draws the rather notional but not inconsistent conclusion that if the accusative in the expression ādām 🏠 is used on the "implication" of the tamyiz the expression ādām 🏠
is inadmissible, but if the accusative is used on the "implication" of a correspondence with the active participle followed by the direct object the expression is admissible. The approach adopted here seems to be peculiar to Ibn al-Sarrāj. 43
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CHAPTER V

QIYAS AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF ASL AND FAR’

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

When a resemblance between two grammatical phenomena was observed the grammarians would proceed to identify which of the two it was that the other had come to resemble. They would describe the basic phenomenon as the asl and the other which had come to resemble it as a far’. This same relationship of asl and far’ was also considered to exist in respect of a single phenomenon if it had both a primary and a secondary aspect. For instance, the use of the particle wa as a conjunction proper was seen as its primary use (asl), whereas its use with the maf‘ūl ma‘ahu was seen as a secondary use (far’). Similarly, the use of the particle
fa as a conjunction was seen as its primary use, whereas its use with the verb in the subjunctive on the implication of a suppressed particle an was seen as a secondary use. When an English translation of the terms agl and far is required, it is necessary to resort to expressions like "ground-form" and "by-form" respectively, although in certain instances the terms can be translated as "primary usage" and "secondary usage".

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

In the Luma' al-adillah much of Ibn al-Anbarī's discussion of giyās in grammar consists of a very literal application to it of the techniques of giyās in fiqh in all its intricacies. However, this falls outside of the scope of this present study because such an approach is largely irrelevant to actual grammatical practice. The influence of fiqh can of course be seen in the definitions of giyās quoted above. Insist of the influence of fiqh, Ibn al-Anbarī's discussion, in its more fundamental aspects, of how giyās governs the relationship of agl and far is worth quoting to explain this relationship: 3
The particular example given here to illustrate Ibn al-Anbarī's explanation of the mechanics of qiyās is a rather simple and obvious one but the exercise shows how the relationship of ʿasl and farʿ could be rationalised, although here the influence of qiyās in fiqh is strong.

The operation of qiyās is very important where the 'illah involved is what the grammarians called tashbih and the relationship of ʿasl and farʿ of the verb and the particle inna provides one of the best examples of such a relationship based on tashbih because it is an example to which the grammarians gave particular attention. Ibn al-Sarrāj observes that inna and analogous particles resemble the verb because they all govern the nominative and the accusative and he considers it significant that these particles end in an indeclinable fathāh like the perfect tense of the verb. Although Sībawayh makes clear the resemblance of these particles to the verb, he does not mention this formal consideration, but this point was picked up by the later grammarians who also considered significant in this respect the use of the mun al-wiqāyah with inna and similar particles.
Ibn al-Sarrâj deals very briefly with the relationship to the verb of *inna* and analogous particles: 7

\[\text{قهبنب من الأفعال بما قبل مفعول كذل.}\]

ضرب زيدا رجل. وأصلت هذه الأحرف في المبتدأ والمجركة أصلت كان وفرق بين هما بأن قدم المنصوب بالحرف على المفعول كأنهم جعلوا ذلك فرقًا بين الحرف الفعل.

Ibn Ya‘îsh, however, deals with this question much more fully: 8

دشئة من الأفعال بما قبل مفعوله في فاعلة.

ضرب زيدا قائم لمجركل. وفمتهم المنصوب فيها على المفعول مرفقاً بينها وبين الفعل. فالفعل ما بين كأن الأول في الفعل.

In the passage from the *Usûl* Ibn al-Sarrâj states that the verb differs from *inna* because in the case of the latter the term in the accusative must precede the one in the nominative, as if thereby a distinction is drawn between particle and verb. However, in an earlier passage in the *Usûl* he states more definitely that it is the mark of differentiation between them. 9 Ibn al-Sarrâj does not introduce the terms *asâl* and *far’a* into the above discussion but Ibn Ya‘îsh does establish a relationship of *asâl* and *far’a* between the verb and *inna*. 
The grammarians came to hold the view that the far' in comparison to the agl is subject to certain restrictions in its usage and al-Suyūṭī gathers together a number of examples of this in the Ashbāh wa-l-nażā’ir. In the case of inna Ibn Ya‘īsh observes that its inferior status as a far' is manifest in the fact that with it the term in the accusative must precede the term in the nominative, inasmuch as with the verb the precedency of the term in the nominative over the term in the accusative embodies the agl whereas the placing of the accusative in front of the nominative embodies a far'. Ibn al-Sarraj simply treats the word order with inna as a mark of differentiation but Ibn Ya‘īsh treats it as the sign of the lower status of the far' with regard to the agl.

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

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

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

ناَالْتَّلِمِيْهَا فَيْنِيَ الَّذِي يَنْتِقِلُ بِهَا إِلَى تَعَلُّم
كِلَامَ الْأَرْبَعِينَ لَنْ نَسْمَعَ نَحْنُ وَلَا نُرِيَّنَا كِل
كِلَامًا مِنْهَا لَفَظًا. فَإِنَّا سَمِنَّا بِعَضْعاً فَنَسْمَنَّا عَلَى
The second variety of ‘illah arises from the grammarians’ explanations of points like the relationship of inna to the verb:

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

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

وهل شهدتموها بما قدم فعله على مفعوله لأنها هو الأصل وذلك فرع ثان. فأي ملة دعته إلى إجاظتها بالفرع دون الأصل أو أن قياس اطرد في ذلك؟

However, it seems clear that the answer would have been very similar to that which could be given by consulting the passage quoted from
Ibn Ya‘ısh: that through this is manifest the inferiority of the far’ to the aṣal.

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

وَأَيْنَ قُولُكَ اَکْسُ وَجْهًا, وَالكَرِيمَ أَبَا, فَإِنَّ أُصَابِيًا يَشْهَدُونَهُ بالصَّارِبِ رَبِّيَّةٌ وَذَٰلِكَ تَقُدُّمُ تَفْقِيرُهُ

Ibn al-Sarraj considers the analysis of the construction اَکْسُ وَجْهًا as a tamyiz to represent the aṣal, whereas the analysis based on an affinity to the construction الصَّارِبِ رَبِّيَّةٌ, to which the former construction has been assimilated, represents a far’. This use of the terms aṣal and far’ does not involve the strict technical meaning discussed in this chapter.

Another instance of the use of the terms aṣal and far’ is found when Ibn al-Sarraj discusses possible alternative word order for the sentence ِهِنَذَ سَنَطَالَةٌ وَأَبْوَأْ قَالَ:

فَإِنْ قِلْتَ: مِنْدَ أُبُوَا قَالَ مِنَ النَّطَالَةِ جَارُ. وَالدَّهْنِ

عَندَى أَنْ تَقُدُّمُ سَنَطَالَةٌ لَّنَّ الْأَمِّ لِلمُسْمِرْ وَالْحَلَّةِ فَرَعُ وَلَدَ يَنْبِغيُّ أَنْ يُقَدِّمَ الْفَرَعُ عَلَى الْأَمِّ إِلَّا

فِي ضُرْورَةِ شَرْهٍ

Here a predicate which consists of a single term is seen as more basic
than one which consists of a sentence complete in itself. Although Ibn al-Sarrāj uses the terms *aql* and *farā* in this connection, these terms again are not used in a strict technical sense.

Ibn al-Sarrāj also uses the terms *usul* and *furu* in the course of a discussion of the rather rare use in positive statements of the *faʿ al-sabābiyah:* 19

The meaning of the general remark on *usul* and *furu* as it applies in this particular instance is that the use of the particle *fa* purely as a conjunction represents the *aql*, whereas its use with the subjunctive represents a *farā*; and it is better to go beyond the normal use with the
fa al-sababiyyah because the use of the subjunctive clearly marks its function, whereas fa used simply for conjunction does not have an analogous accompanying marker of its purpose. In this context the terms aql and far are used as strict technical terms unlike their use in the two preceding instances cited.

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

When discussing the position of the marful ma’ahu in the sentence Ibn al-Sarraj writes:

In the Ashbah wa-l-naga’ir al-Suyuti quotes Ibn ‘Usfur on the same
question in the course of discussing the point that furū‘ are inferior in status to usūl: 21

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

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

Although Ibn al-Sarraj gives a practical explanation of why the maf‘ul ma‘ahu should be restricted in the position it may take in the sentence, it is apparent that he does take what is tantamount to the
more theoretical view of Ibn 'Uṣfūr but he expresses it in somewhat different terms:

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

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

In the above passage from the Uṣūl the phraseology used in describing usages which are extensions of more basic usages is of interest. The use of the expression ʿarzūmū waḥadū may be compared with that of the expression ʿarzūmū waḥadū used by Ibn al-Sarraj in connection with the maf'ūl ma'ahu. The verbs sarrafa, tagarrafa, and their derivatives are commonly used by the grammarians
in discussing the relationship of *agl* and *far* in the above passage Ibn al-Sarraj uses the verb *sarrafa* in making the point that a usage which is an extension of a more basic usage has certain restrictions placed on it which do not apply to the basic usage (،) Al-Mubarrad in the *Mugtadab* shows no interest at all in this topic. It seems likely that at the time of Ibn al-Sarraj relationships of *agl* and *far* were treated as a rather theoretical subject and discussion of it did not intrude to any great extent into general works of grammar. Indeed, it is from a theoretical work from this period, the *Idāh ‘ilal al-nahw* of al-Zajjājī, that some idea can be obtained about the stage of development of grammatical theory in this field as it affects the particle *inna*,

Although questions of *agl* and *far* are not discussed as such in the *Kitāb* of Sibawayh, the verb *sarrafa* is used in the sense referred to here because al-Khalil states in a passage quoted earlier when he deals with the point that with *inna* and analogous particles the nominative cannot be made to precede the accusative: In the passage quoted above from the *Usul* Ibn al-Sarraj also likens extended usages which have certain restrictions placed on them to the set expressions of proverbs and this is a comparison often made by the grammarians. By the 10th century the grammarians were discussing relationships of *agl* and *far* but it is unclear in what precise stages the grammarians developed their ideas on this subject. As has been mentioned, the subject is not one which is dealt with in the *Kitāb* although it did develop out of ideas present in that work. In the *Usul* Ibn al-Sarraj does give some attention to what are relationships of *agl* and *far* but he rarely uses these terms themselves, and al-Mubarrad in the *Mugtadab* shows no interest at all in this topic. It seems likely that at the time of Ibn al-Sarraj relationships of *agl* and *far* were treated as a rather theoretical subject and discussion of it did not intrude to any great extent into general works of grammar. Indeed, it is from a theoretical work from this period, the *Idāh ‘ilal al-nahw* of al-Zajjājī, that some idea can be obtained about the stage of development of grammatical theory in this field as it affects the particle *inna*.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TAMYIZ AND THE VERB OF WONDER

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

Tamyiz

It is curious that although there are a number of uses of the accusative which are clearly analogous and which are generally known as the tamyiz, Sibawayh does not have a term to cover such uses of the accusative, inspite of the fact that he does discuss several of them. Indeed, in the Kitab there is no unified discussion of usages which could be seen as involving tamyiz. ¹ Although there is no term for tamyiz in the Kitab, the term mufassir is used in the Ma‘āni l-Qur‘an of al-Farra’ who was a pupil of Sibawayh’s Kufan contemporary, al-Kisa‘ī. ² In the Muqaddimah fi l-nabī of the Basran scholar, Khalaf al-A‘mar (d. 796), the expression “الإشارة إلى الأعداد من الألف إلى الألف” is used for the noun functioning as a tamyiz with the numbers 11-99 and this term is clearly
based on the fact that a noun in the singular is here used for what is plural in meaning. However, this expression, which is limited to one particular use of the *tamyiz*, was not generally accepted and by the time of al-Mubarrad the familiar and more comprehensive expression *tamyiz* was in use together with other less important terms like *tabyin* and *tafṣīr*.

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

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

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

وهو دفع الإيمام في جملة أو عصر بالنصق على أحد مثاله: فمثلا، في الجملة طاب زيد نفسه، ونصب كرمًا ورفقاً، فهذا... ومثاله في الجملة: كندى رافد هنالًا. وطلال زينى ومنوان صنا، وفسيزان برًا، وفثيرون درعُلًا.

Al-Mubarradi, on the other hand, defines the tamyız in a far more cursory way and only illustrates his definition in terms of its use with the numbers ٩٩-١١. Ibn al-Sarraj for his part does not attempt to provide a real definition of the tamyız.

One of the points which needs some attention in discussing the tamyız is the question of the use of singular and plural nouns. Al-Mubarrad turns to this point after discussing tamyız constructions of the type ١١١١١ when he moves on to discuss the related expression

ويميز أن تقول: وهرَهِم هُبًا: أن أَتْ أَفْرَهُ الناس غِيْرًا: أَتْ أَفْرَهُ الناس غِيْرًا: إِنَّهَا ْعِبْدٌ، وأَجْمَعُ الناس دِرَارًا. وَلَد يَجْزُ عَنْدِي: عَشْرُونَ دِراهمًا يَا قَدِّيٓش! 

والفصل حينما أَلْكِ إِذَا قَلَتَ: عَشْرُونَ، فقد أَتَتَ عَلَى العدَدَ فَلَمْ يَجِدَ إِلَّا إِذَا ذَكَرَ مَا يُذْكَرُ عَلَى الجِنْسِ. فَإِذا قَلَتَ: هُوَ أَفْرَهُ الناس غِيْرًا: هَازَ أنَّهُم، إذا قَلَتَ: هُوَ أَفْرَهُ الناس غِيْرًا: هَازَ أنَّهُم.
After his own discussion of this point Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from this passage but his own explanation of the occasions on which it is possible to use the plural in the tamyīz is based on using the regent as the criterion:

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

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

وَقَالَ الْمُبَارَّرُ:ُ فَنَّبَعَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، *فَسَأَلَّهُ النَّاسَ حَقًَّا،َ وَأَجَّلَ النَّاسَ دُروةً*.
Although the question of number with the tamyiz is in essence relatively simple to understand, the grammarians still took a lot of trouble to explain it exactly. 14

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

(هذا حاه ما ينصب انتصاب الاسم بعد المقدس) 
وذالله فقير، ويعين رجل، والله داره رجل، وهم بلال، وبلال وما أشبه ذلك. وإن شئت قلت: ويعين من رجل، وهم بلال، بينها كهدوها في كوكبها.

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

ومن السبب، ويعين رجل، والله داره رجل، وهم بلال، له شجاعة، إلَّا أن إذا كان في الدخل ذكر منه عصم
أن تدخل من تكيدا لذالك النكر، فتقوق ويعين
من رجل، والله داره من فارس، وهم بلال، عض تجاع,
ولا يجوز: مشرون حسن د رهم، ولد: هو أفراد من
In his section on the use of the tamvīz in measurements Ibn al-Sarraj appears to borrow from this passage but adds an explanation of what precisely is meant: 17

... وإذا كان في الأول ذكر منه حسن أن تدخل ...

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

وقال أبو العباس (المبارك) - رحمه الله - فإنما قولهم:

حسباً بيد رجل، وأكرم به فارساً، وما أشبه ذلك.

ثم تقول: حسباً به من رجل، وأكرم به من فارس، والله دره من شاعر، وأنت لا تقول: حضرون من رجل، ولا آخر صناد من عبد فالعدل بينهما أن الأول كان يلبس فيه الشميز، بالحال فأدخلت من لائحة لل شيء. ألا ترى أنلا لوقت بأكرم به فارساً، وحسباً به جلباً، فإن أنني في هذه الحال. وكذلك إذا اقتلت كرم ضربت رجلاً، وكرم ضربت من رجل، خارج ذلك لأن كرم قد يتراخي عنه شيء،
In the Mufassal al-Zamakhsharı makes no reference to the use of min instead of the tamyız and what Ibn Ya‘ish writes is not particularly useful. The latter does make the point that min can separate the bāl from the tamyız and in doing this he incorporates without attribution into his own work part of the above passage which Ibn al-Sarrāj quotes from al-Mubarrad. Later discussion of the use of min, such as is found in the Manhaj al-sālik of Abū Hayyān, cannot be directly related to what is found in earlier works because, as has been mentioned in an earlier chapter, the grammarians eventually classified uses of the tamyız according to how the various constructions could be analysed, and this influenced their discussion of the use of min.

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

وأعلم أن النبي إذا كان العامل فيه فعلًا حاز
تعريئ لتصريف الفعل فالنقرات تشقات ذيَّان و تصبت
عراك فان ست قدمت فقات، تشقات و ضعا
تصبت، وهذا قد يجزء سبوعية لأنه يجاه كقولك:
فضرون درس و هذا أفرهم فيدغ. وليس هذا
 مضنى لكل لأن مضنى درس ف الإما فاعل في الدهم
لم يؤعد ف فعل، أراد ترى أن نقل: هذا زيد
فاني و دم يجزء: فما هذا زيد، لأن العامل غير فعل
و نقل: رأيكيا هذا زيد، لأن العامل فعل. فلذالك أجزاء.
In his *Naqād Kitāb Sībawayh*, which is quoted by Ibn Wallād, al-Mubarrad criticises Sībawayh's view for being inconsistent and considers his own view to be supported by *qiyaṣ* and attested usage.

In his discussion of *tamyīz*, Ibn al-Sarrāj mentions the view of al-Mubarrad on this question but he does not make his own view clear at this point. However, he rejects this usage later on in the *Uṣūl* in the chapter on inversion where he bases his view on Sībawayh’s analysis of the nature of the *tamyīz*.

Ibn Ya‘qīb takes the same view but expresses himself in a rather more technical manner.
When dealing with the question of placing the بِئل at the beginning of the sentence Ibn al-Sarrāj writes that the Basrans treat it like the تَمْيِز, and this would indicate that the general view of the Basrans of this period was that the تَمْيِز could be placed at the beginning of the sentence when the regent is a verb. Ibn al-Sarrāj, however, does not take this view and later scholars like Ibn al-Anbārī and Ibn Ya‘īsh consider the view which he takes to be the true Basran one. In fact, there was always a division of opinion among Basran scholars on this point.

Verb of wonder

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

In dealing with the theoretical aspects of the grammarians' approach to the verb of wonder it is particularly worth remembering that the approach of the Arab scholars was rather different from that which a scholar today might adopt. The latter might look at the verb of wonder in a manner similar to Wright who, in explanation of the
The first formula literally means: what has made Zeid excellent? can anything make him more excellent than he is? The second: make Zeid excellent (if you can, you cannot make him more excellent than he is)? or, more literally: try (your ability at) making excellent upon (ب) Zeid.

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

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

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

The explanation that ما replaces the term شئ was not accepted by those who held that ما must have a clause dependent on it (silah) when used in senses other than its interrogative and conditional senses, but
al-Mubarrad argues that this view is mistaken: 32

If someone asked: Have you ever seen an arm in the fire and the smoke? Then he said: Yes, I saw smoke in the fire and the smoke is an understood silah or a view that was held by certain of the Kufans and is, according to Ibn Ya’ish, the most generally accepted view attributed to al-Akhfash. 33

Al-Mubarrad also takes up the question of why an expression of the form سَبَرَتْ يَدْ أَبَهِيْهِ مُهْمَّةً should convey the idea of wonder and astonishment: 35

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

When he deals with theory connected with the verb of wonder Ibn al-Sarraj is much more concise than al-Mubarrad and, although he holds the same views, there are differences in the arguments which he uses. In explanation of how the verb of wonder is to be interpreted he writes:
In this passage Ibn al-Sarrāj introduces several analogies to support the contention that the term *ma* is indefinite when used with the verb of wonder. The analogy drawn from the expression *إِنِ السَّا* is also discussed by al-Mubarrad who goes into more detail. Ibn al-Sarrāj by way of analogy also makes use of the expression *شيء نابِرَ...* and this analogy is also used by Ibn Ya‘ish in a slightly different form.

In a later passage Ibn Ya‘ish also makes use of the proverb which Ibn
al-Sarraj cites, ""Tis an evildoer that makes a dog growl." 41

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

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

Ibn Ya'ish takes this same consideration into account when discussing how the verb of wonder formed on the pattern أَحْسَنْ زَيْدًا is to be analysed. The view of the majority of grammarians was that the verb of wonder formed on this pattern is not in fact an imperative but simply assumes the outward form of it. 43 Al-Zamakhshari criticises this view as arbitrary and prefers to follow the view of al-Zajjaj that the verb is a true imperative. Commenting on the sentence أَكْرَمْ يَزِيدِ he writes: 44
Ibn Ya'ish, however, criticises this view on several counts and this includes the consideration that a sentence containing a verb of wonder forms a proposition: 45

إنه وإن كان بلغما الأمر فليس بأمر وإنما صحيح
كتمت للصدق والكذب فيفه أن يقال في جواب:
صدقت أو كذبت، لأنك في صني: حسن نبذها.

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

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

فإن قال قائل: فقد قالوا: لا أعطاه، وعدد أعطى
يعطى، و وما أولاه، بالله،قيل: هذا على هذين الزوائد لأن الأول مما يعطى إذا شانول وأعطى
غيره إذا ناوله. وكذلما ولي وأولي غيره.
Al-Mubarrad expands on this approach but his whole argument based on analogy is rather weak and not really to the point: 49

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

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

وقد قالوا: ما أعطاه الدهر، وأولده الليخ. فهذا}
Although Ibn Ya‘ish cites Sibawayh in support of his view, it seems clear that the latter does permit the verb of wonder to be formed regularly from the fourth form of the verb and al-Astarabādī states specifically that this is the view of Sibawayh.\(^{52}\)

Although al-Mubarrad, Ibn al-Sarraj, and Ibn Ya‘ish admit the possibility of forming the verb of wonder from the fourth form of the verb, a later grammarian like Abu Ḥayyān also lists examples of the verb of wonder formed anomalously from augmented forms of the verb other than the fourth: \(^{53}\)

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

From time to time in works of Arabic grammar there are discussions of points which are in a broad sense theological in nature and in
al-Mubarrad’s chapter on the verb of wonder certain such points are discussed in detail. An examination of his treatment of such questions provides excellent examples of his rather discursive style and his tendency to digress. The standard Basran explanation of the verb of wonder is capable of producing some theological argument and al-Mubarrad deals with this point:

"If you say that a person is better than another, you must say that in a certain way. In the treatment of the verb of wonder, there are certain points that are discussed in detail. An examination of his treatment of such questions provides excellent examples of his rather discursive style and his tendency to digress. The standard Basran explanation of the verb of wonder is capable of producing some theological argument and al-Mubarrad deals with this point."
Although al-Mubarrad does not say so the point which gives rise to the above discussion is in fact one of the Kufan objections to the Basran explanation of the verb of wonder.

Another point which raises difficulties of a theological nature, and which al-Mubarrad discusses, is the apparent use in the Qur'an of the verb of wonder with reference to the state of mind of God himself.

When discussing the verb of wonder of the pattern ٍأٍهٍ. ٍرٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍزٍر
من هذا وکنيه - والله أعلم - التقرير والتصویغ وتفريغ: أي شيء أصبهم على النار، أي دعاهم إليها واضطرهم إليها. كما تقول: صبرت ريبة على القتل. ونهي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن بصبر الروح. ومثل ذلك قوله:

قلت له: اخبرنا وافداً، أمثال بطنان من نفس قليل.

فهذا مجزأة، ولا يقال لله عز وجل لأنه إله يعجف ما يرد عليه جاداً يعجف ولا يقهر فيتبع كف普遍 مثل. وعلاقه الديوب يجت من هذا.
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CHAPTER VII

THE USUL AND THE KUFAN SCHOOL OF GRAMMAR

The Kufans

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

In his Introduction to the Kitab al-insaf Weil observes that the points at issue between the two schools of Basrah and Kufah are portrayed in this work as they appeared to the grammarians of Ibn al-Anbari’s day. ³ For this reason the study of much earlier works provides information about the differences between the Basrans and Kufans when the issues were still being debated. In fact, the Usul of Ibn al-Sarraj is a product of the period when the first monographs were composed which dealt with the points at issue between the schools, and to which the later works of al-‘Ukbari and Ibn al-Anbari are almost certainly
These first monographs seem to have been completely lost and for this reason the *Usūl* is the only work from the same period which deals with points at issue between the schools.

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

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

The attitude towards the Kufan school of scholars who lived long after its heyday is well-known from works like the *Kitāb al-insāf* of Ibn al-Anbārī in which criticisms of the Kufans and their ideas abound. In the *Iqtirāb al-Suyūṭī* gathers a selection of views on the Kufan school which are more or less severely critical but he does begin with
a balanced appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the Basrans and Kufans respectively based on the consensus view of the scholars: 5

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

In discussing the use of the damir al-sha’n in sentences of the type 6

Ibn al-Sarraj observes that the Kufans put the participle, which they call the fi’il da’im, into the accusative if it is placed adjacent to the pronouns.
Unfortunately, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not give any reason why the Kufans permit this usage and he abruptly rejects it as inconsistent with giyās and not founded upon sāma‘ and he offers no further explanation of this.

Another Kufan usage which Ibn al-Sarrāj rejects for the same reasons is the use of the definite article with the bāl in a construction of the type “بَنَيَّانَ” —a construction which the Kufans parse in a different way than the Basrans do:

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

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

One point at issue between the Kufans and the Basrans was that the former permitted the formation of the elative from the roots b-y-d and s-w-d whereas the latter did not and treated them like all other roots denoting colour. To justify their view the Kufans would cite evidentiary verses but the Basrans considered that such verses constituted no authority for the usage but merely represented a poetic licence which was not to be followed. In the Uṣūl Ibn al-Sarraj mentions one such verse and he relates al-Mubarrad's view both on the verse and on the sort of scholars who use such verses as grammatical evidence.
Although this particular criticism is not directed against the Kufans by name it is very much in the spirit of the criticisms which the Basrans made of the Kufans and the usage in particular which leads to the general criticism of unsound scholarship is one allowed by the Kufans.

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

والفراء كَيْبُزَّ: إن هذا وَعْمَرُو قَالُواٰ! فإنَّهُ الَّذِي مَنْداكَ وَعْمَرُو قَالُواٰ، وإنَّهُ وَعْمَرُو قَالُواٰ، إِن كَانَ اسْمُ إِنْ دَيْنِبَنَّ غَيْرَ الإِلَامِ فَخَرَجَهُ وَمَا ذَكَرْنَاهُ فِي هَذِهِ الْمَسَأَلَة. وَهَل ذَلِكَ يَنْشَدُونَ هَذَا الْبَيْتَ مِمَّا ِبَلْ أَمْسِيَ بِهِ مَسَأْلَةٌ أَنْ قَيَارًا بِهَا لَعْرِبُ ُفَيْضِ قَيَارًا وَنَسْبًا، وَكَذَلِكَ لَوْ قَالُ: الْمُلْبَنَ، فِإِفْرَادُ الْفَلِ وَنَشْيَثُهُ فِي هَذَا مَنْدَمَّ سُوَاءً
From this passage it emerges that al-Kisa'i from among the Kufans supports a usage of the type 

Ibn al-Sarraj undertakes to refute the types of usage supported in this passage at a later point in the *Uqul* in the course of his chapter on 

After discussing the alternative constructions and he turns to the construction 

ومن ذلك: إن زيد في الدار وعمرو لست بجامع ودتفاها لست بجامع ولا تقدم لقاءً.

أحدهما أن يرى أن الحياء نظرية الشناعة والجاهزية.

أو قوله: إن زيد في الدار وعمرو لست بجامع ودتفاها لست بجامع ولا تقدم لقاءً.

وقد قدمت هذا النوع في النصوص ونحو النص، ودأب في النص والرقم واعتبر، 

ولأن يعمل في الشناعة عاملان، كذكرت لم يجري في المعطوفات والمعطوف عليها. فإذا لم يكن الكلام معطوفاً على العامل الذي كتب مناردًا إعادته، وإن لا تفعيله.
Although Ibn al-Sarraj gives considerable attention to refuting Kufan usages of the type "إنَّ زيداً خامِرُ قاَيِئَانَ" there are various other aspects to this issue but in his actual refutation Ibn al-Sarraj is very thorough. 14

Another of the points at issue between the Basrans and Kufans was whether it is permissible to say طَحَامَلَكَ مَازِدَ أَكْلًا. This is a question discussed by Ibn al-Anbari in the Kitāb al-ingāf but in his notes Weil is not able to cite any alternative sources of information on this point. 15 However, in the Usūl Ibn al-Sarraj deals with this question:

Although Ibn al-Anbārī devotes a little more space to this question
he in fact adds little to what Ibn al-Sarrāj writes but rather expands his subject matter to suit his format in presenting the Basran-Kufan controversies.

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

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

The Baghdadīs

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

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

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

In the first passage one of the leading Kufan scholars, al-Farra', is expressly described as one of the Baghdadis which would mean that those Ibn Qutaybah calls the Baghdadis are in fact the Kufans. In the second passage the derivation of the word insan is discussed and certain of the Baghdadis are said to oppose the Baarens, but in the discussion of this point in the Kitāb al-Insāf it is the Kufans who oppose the Basran view. If the Adab al-kāṭīb is a work which supports the view that the
Kufans and the Baghdadis are one and the same group of scholars, there is information in other works which would lead to a rejection of this view. In the Usūl there are a number of references to the Baghdadis apart from the much more frequent references to the Kufans and it does appear from this work that some distinction is drawn between the two groups. A discussion of a number of the occasions on which the Baghdadis are referred to provides a further opportunity to consider the treatment in the Usūl of the views of grammarians outside of the Basran tradition.

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

وقد يقول البخاريون الذين في مذهب الكوفيون يقولون: إن ليس من كلمة الحرف.

وينكرون أن إن احترف حاز. وينددون:

سَنَفَرَ الْكَلَامِ فَذَا هَمَّ

سَيَوْفُ الْقَلْبِ عِلْمًا البَابَ فَقُصُوا

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

On another occasion in the Usūl the Kufans and the Baghdadis are mentioned side by side:
The point dealt with here is the grammatical analysis of sentences containing what the grammarians call in al-mukhaffafah which is followed by lam al-farighah. At the beginning of the passage the Kufans and the Baghdadis are grouped together as if they were two distinct parties of grammarians with similar views on the point under discussion. The only two scholars mentioned by name are al-Kisa'i and al-Farra' who are in fact Kufan scholars.

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

\[\text{ود يجوز: ما أحسن ما ليس زيد ود ما أحسن ماذال زيد كمًا جاز ذلك كأن ود. ولكن يجوز ما أحسن ما ليس يذكركم زيد وما أحسن ماذال يذكركم زيد.}

Unfortunately, Ibn al-Sarrāj does not give any more information on the usage which he and the Baghdadis permit. The use of kāna alone from among verbs of its type after the verb of wonder is a usage which is
generally recognised by the grammarians, and on this Ibn Ya‘ish writes: 28

وقد قالوا: ما أحسن ما كان يزيد. توضع ربيا هنا
ندخل وكان ناقداً هنا وزيد فاعل. وما أحسن المصادر والتفصيل: ما أحسن كرون زيد.

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

قال إبراهيم البضائي (الجرح) – رحمه الله: والبضائيون
يقولون: والله أن زيد منطق، فيشتركون أن: وهو منديل قياس لأنه تضمن قال: أهلف بالله على ذلك، أشهد أني منطلق.

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

وماذهب في ذلك أربعة (1) إجبارهما واعتبار النقل وهو منديل الكسائي والمباديءين (2) وإجبارهما واعتبار الكسر (3) ووجود النقل وهو منديل التلا، (4) ووجود الكسر وهو الذي يضمن أهلهنا وهو العياس وهو ورد السياح وهو مذهب البصريين.

It should be noted that although this passage from the Manhaj al-salik expressly deals with أَنْ unaccompanied by the particle la, the same is the case with the passage from the Uṣūl as the example shows, even if this is not expressly stated. When أَنْ was used in
oaths and the particle la followed the vowelling inna was accepted without controversy. Although Abū Hayyān mentions the views of the two leading Kufan scholars, he does not mention the Kufans as a group but he gives the view of the Baghdadis as does the Uṣūl. Ibn al-Sarrāj, quoting al-Mubarrad, merely states that the Baghdadis favour the use of anna, but Abū Hayyān adds that they found the use of inna acceptable. Although al-Mubarrad favours the Baghdad view, Ibn al-Sarrāj writes earlier in the Uṣūl that the vowelling inna is to be used at all times in oaths, and this would agree with what is the best Basran view. 31

Although al-Mubarrad accepts the Baghdad view on this occasion, Ibn al-Sarrāj does quote al-Mubarrad being highly critical of the Baghdad view of the nature and power of government of the exceptional particle illā. 32
The view quoted here on the nature of *illa* and its power of government is described in later works like the *Kitab al-ingaf* as a Kufan view held by al-Farrâ' in particular. 33 Al-Mubarrad's attack on this position is based on the fact that it is quite obviously inconsistent, whereas in the *Kitab al-ingaf* Ibn al-Anbarî's attack is rather more formal and theoretical. 34

Kufan influences on the *Usūl*

In a previous chapter a passage has been cited from Yaqût in which he quotes al-Marzubânî who considers that Ibn al-Sarraj derived the contents of the *Usūl* from the *Kitab* of Sibawayh, "although he relied in it on the *Masa'il* of al-Akhfash and on Kufan ideas and opposed Basran principles in many matters...." 35 The idea that Ibn al-Sarrâj is indebted in the *Usūl* to Kufan grammatical thought is patently untrue because a study of this work leads to no other conclusion than that Ibn al-Sarrâj was a scholar firmly within the Basran tradition.
However, there are indications that Ibn al-Sarrāj was not uninfluenced by Kufan grammatical thought.

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

The particular attention given to the sort of sentences discussed in this passage and the prescribing of the accusative in them seems to stem from the Kufan approach to sentences introduced by the demonstrative pronoun. The use of the accusative in the examples in the above passage was called taqrib by the Kufans. Taqrib is the use of the demonstrative pronoun with the same governing force as kāna and, according to Tha‘labā, the use is so called because the demonstrative pronoun is made to “approximate” to the verb kāna. As taqrib is a purely Kufan concept and was not recognised by the Basrans, it is worth quoting a discussion of it by Abū Hayyān although he does not mention the sort of sentence
to be explained by taqrīb which are mentioned in the above passage from the *Usul*.

In the passage from the *Usul* quoted previously the first type of sentence for which Ibn al-Sarraj prescribes the use of the accusative are ones like 

and 

in which the subject is a unique entity. From the standpoint of normal Basran grammatical analysis such sentences would not be mentioned for special consideration because the last element could be put into the nominative or accusative at will depending on whether it is treated as a ḫāl or not.

The second type of sentence mentioned by Ibn al-Sarraj for which he prescribes the use of the accusative are those introduced by the demonstrative pronoun in which something is affirmed in one particular instance but is generally applicable to the class into which the thing it is affirmed of falls, as in the examples  and  Again, from the standpoint of normal Basran analysis such sentences would not constitute a class needing special consideration.

Ibn al-Sarraj's special treatment of the above two types of sentence seems to have its basis in the Kufan concept of taqrīb as a
والعلم أن هذا إذ أن كان أمر اسم فيه الأفب
واللام خرج على ثلاث مهمل : أهدى أن ترى الأسم
الذي بعد هذا كم نرى هذا فعلا : ينسى الموضوع
كفره : هذا التمثيل فاره. جملت الأف بيولا لهذا إذ
كانا عاصرين ولا يجوز هنا النص Phú والذين ابتغي
أن يكون ما بعد هذا واحدا يؤدي عن جميع
جهنن فالفعل هينيند مصروب كفره : ما كان
من السباع في المروف : هذا الأسد خروظا. ألا
ترى أنك تعتبر عن الأسد كله بالمحف. والمعرف الثالث
أن يكون ما بعد هذا واحدا لا نظير له فالفعل
هينيند أيا مصروب. وإنما نصبت الفعل لأن هذا
ليس بصفة للأسد إنها دخلت ترقبا . وأما المشي
ال قريب فهذا أول ما أضررك عنه. فلم يقدروا بدلا
من أن يرفعوا هذا بأسد وحده مستمل. فلما
دخل الأسد بمرافقة هذا نصب فعله الذي
كانت يراقبه قلوبه : ومثله : والله غفور رحيم.
فإذا أدخلت عليه كان ارتفع به ومجرب متمطر
يتم بهتكلم فنصبته خلولته.
أيا نصبت فعل الأفب الذي دل نظير له
مثل قوله : هذه الشمس ضياء للعباد
وهو التمثيل فإن التمثيل قد نظير له يكون
أيضا من قوله هذا مستحنكا. ألا ترى إذا
قلت : طلع القدر لا يذهب الروم الى
نائب فنصبنا أن نقول هذا عضوره.
It is clear from the above passage that Ibn al-Sarrāj makes use of Kufan grammatical discussion although he does not mention the term taqrīb in this connection. However, he does mention the concept of taqrīb when discussing the construction ۵۱۶ where the particle ha is followed first by a personal and then by a demonstrative pronoun, and he also gives an indication of what taqrīb is: ۴۲

Another of the concepts to which the Kufan grammarians make reference to explain certain points of grammar is the notion of sarf or khilafoon. This explanation is used on various occasions by al-Farra in the Ma'ānī l-Qurʾān and when he introduces the notion of sarf for the first time he writes: ۴۳

... فإن قلت: وما الصرف، قلت: أن يأتي بالواو
مقطعون على كلام في أوله هادئة لا تسقيم
إيامتها على ما عطف عليها، فإذا كان كذلك
فهو الصرف، كقول الشاعر:

كأنها عن خُلْطٍ فتأتي سَلْفٌ
لا سِبْعَةٌ عَن خُلْطٍ فتأتي سَلْفٌ

ألا ترى أنه لا يجوز إعادة لا في تأتي.
For the Kufans a common explanation based on meaning could be found for certain uses of the accusative and subjunctive and they called this factor *sarf* or *khilaf*. 44 However, in such cases the Basrans did not resort to the abstract idea that it was the meaning which governed the use of the subjunctive or accusative and they produced rather more concrete explanations of what the regent is.

Ibn al-Anbari, for instance, in the *Kitāb al-insaf* firmly rejects the idea of *sarf* in all its applications. 45

Ibn al-Sarrāj makes no reference to the term *sarf* when discussing the main types of usage which the Kufans explained by this concept. 46 For instance, he explains the use of the subjunctive after conjunctions like *wa* and *fa* as being due to the action of an understood, but unexpressed particle *an* and this fully accords with the normal Basran explanation. 47

However, in discussing conditional sentences Ibn al-Sarrāj refers to a particular use of the subjunctive and states that the Kufans call it *sarf* and he himself goes on to make specific use of the term in explaining further similar uses of the subjunctive: 48

"وَتَمَنَّى إِنْ تَتَمَّ اَنْظَمَ آَنْلَدْ اَنْوَذْ إِنْ تَجَمَّعْ مَعَ قَيَامَةِ اِسْمَآءَ اَنْلَدَ، وَكَذَلِكَ إِنْ تَتَمَّ"
In this passage two similar uses of the subjunctive are introduced, one related to a verb forming part of the protasis of a conditional sentence and the other related to a verb linking up with the apodosis. Of the first use Ibn al-Sarraj gives two examples, where both sentences convey rather the same meaning and the second differs only by lacking the conjunction wa. The use of the subjunctive does appear slightly unusual in these sentences and the mood expected instead would be the indicative functioning as a ‘hal, if the meaning which Ibn al-Sarraj intends were
to be conveyed. However, this usage can be related to another which is mentioned in Arabic grammars.

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

أَلْتَ أَدْهَرُكَ وَيَكْلُونَ بَيْنِي
وَأَمْرُكُ امْلَوَّهُ وَأَمْرُكُ

and:

وَلَبِسَ عَبْاِتُ وَأَمْرَ عَيْنِي
أُحِبَّ إِلىَ يَنْ لاَبَسَ الْفَتْوَةُ

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

Although Ibn al-Sarraj adopts the term sarf it would appear that he does so only because it is a convenient term and he does not put forward the Kufan view that sarf is a concept which explains uses of the subjunctive. In the passage quoted from the Ugul it may well be
that Ibn al-Sarrāj adopts the term *garr* because in this instance he is particularly indebted to a Kufan source.
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CHAPTER VIII

IBN YA'ISH AND THE USUL OF IBN AL-SARRAJ

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

Although Ibn Ya'īsh's commentary is such a famous work it is not one whose quality is indisputable and many who use it would agree with J. W. Fück's judgment on its author that "his style is verbose and sometimes slovenly." If the quality of this work has been called into question, its claims to originality have also been challenged. When comparing the Sharh al-kāfiyyah of al-Astarabādhī with the Sharh al-mufassal of Ibn Ya'īsh, H. Fleisch writes: "Il est plus difficile a comprendre qu'Ibn Ya'īsh. Mais quand on connaîtra les sources de celui-ci, il est probable qu'il apparaîtra comme un diligent copieur, peu original." As a concrete example of this Fleisch refers the reader to a study by G. Troupau of al-Sīrafi's commentary on the
chapter of Sībawayh’s Kitāb dealing with phonetics. In giving the
results of his study of this material Troupeau writes: "Ces renseigne-
ments nous étaient parvenus, en partie, dans le commentaire tardif
d’Ibn Ya‘īś qui les avait repris à son compte, sans mentionner sa
source:....." 5

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

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

One topic where Ibn Ya‘ish has made particular use of the *ugul* is the *hal*. Ibn al-Sarraj begins his discussion of the *hal* by stating that the *hal* together with the *tamyiz* constitute the class of *mushabah bi-l-maf'ul* whose regent is a true verb.  

He then explains why the *hal* is put into the accusative and this consists of showing how the general theory of accusative usages which he has explained earlier relates to the *hal*. Ibn Ya‘ish works this explanatory passage into his treatment of the question why the *hal* is not a true *maf'ul* but only resembles it:  

---

(Sharb al-Mufaddal)  

ولكانت الحال مضمولة  

لياب أن تكون مضمونة وكرة  

كسائر المضمولين. خلا لانقشت  

بالكرة دل على أنها ليست  

مضمولة وإن تثبت أنها  

ليس بتضمينة فين تثبت  

المضمولة ...

---

فأما الذي سمرته الحال (أبو)”  

كما قلنا: جاء عبد الله رأبا،  

وأقبل منه سمن، واجلس  

بكر محظا. فعبد الله سرح  

باجاء، وحمسن. جاء عبد الله في  

هذه الحال. وركب منمستب  

لشيء بالمضمول...

---

لا هو حتى به بعد  

من حيث أنها تجي به بعد  

قياس الكلام واستخناد الفعل  

بائه وآن في الفعل دليل  

عليها كأن فيه دليل  

عليها كأن فيه دليل  

على الفعل. آلا أرى أنك  

إذا قلت: تتمت فلا بد  

بئ أن تكون قد قلت  

[ ...]
Immediately after this passage from the Usūl Ibn al-Sarrāj explains why the ḥakīm is so called and Ibn Ya‘īsh makes use of this passage at the beginning of his commentary on al-Zamakhshārī’s treatise on the ḥakīm. Preceding this Ibn Ya‘īsh gives his own explanation of what the ḥakīm is:

"أعلم أن الحاكم عنيته الداخل أو الداخل عليه: جاء زيد راکبا، و أقبل عبد الله بكيا، و لقيت الأمير مانفسا، والمحتى: جاء عبد الله في هذه الحال ولقيت الأمير في هذه الحال، واعتبار بأنه يقع في جواب كيف، إذا قال: أقبل عبد الله ضاحكا، فكان سائل سأل: كيف أقبل، فقلت: أقبل ضاحكا كما يقع الفصول له في جواب لم فعلت..."

To this explanation Ibn Ya‘īsh adds the passage from the Usūl: 9
After this explanation of the term *hal* Ibn al-Sarraj goes on to define what sort of description the *hal* may provide and he states that it may not be an innate quality but only a transient one. Ibn Ya’ish incorporates this point into his commentary on al-Zamakhshari’s remark that the *hal* has an affinity to the *zarf* and he himself states more precisely that it is particularly related to the *zarf* of time. In taking over this passage Ibn Ya’ish compresses the examples given in it by making the various *hals* apply to one subject whereas Ibn al-Sarraj has three different subjects:
Ibn al-Sarrāj next turns to the question of the indefiniteness of the hāl and he explains that the hāl must be indefinite because it simply serves to convey extra information, whereas if the definite article were prefixed to it, it would become an epithet differentiating the noun it qualifies from something else. Ibn al-Sarrāj then goes on to specify in detail the difference between the hāl and the adjective and Ibn Ya‘ish incorporates a considerable part of this discussion into his own treatment of this point. This occurs in the broader context of his discussion of the verb as the regent governing the accusative of the hāl.
عامل الموسيقى فذكره الله
يحسن في الحابل في صاحب
المال إذا أن عمله في المال
على سبيل الفضله لأنها
بارية جزى الفضل وصله
في الصحة في سبيل النهاية
عليها. إذا كانت صنعة
للموسيقى جزى جزير هون
التعريج. وهذا أهدف الروي
بين الصحة والمال. وذلك...

... أن الصحة تفرق بين
اسمين مشتركين في اللظة
والمال زيادة في الفائدة
والخبر وإن لم يكن اللسان
مشتركاً في لفظه. أدا ترى
أيام إذا قالت: سرت
بيت القائم. فأثبت لا تقول
ذلك إلا في الناس رجل آخر
اسم زيد وهو غير قابع.
فقولت بالقائم بينه وبين
من له هذا الأسد وليس
بقاع. وقول: سرت بالفرزدي
قابع. وإن لم يكن أحد اسمه
الفرزدي قابع.، [ منقول قابع]
After completing his discussion of this question Ibn al-Sarraj turns to the point that the *ḥāl* may refer both to the subject and the object of a sentence. Here Ibn Ya'ish again draws on the wording of the *usūl* when he criticises what he considers to be a weakness of expression in al-Zamakhshari's treatment of the point: 13

واعلم أن الحال يجوز أن تكون من المفصل كما تكون من الفاعل. تقول: ضربت نما فأنا تجاهل قلبي لزيد، ويجوز أن تكون الحال من النهاة في ضرب الموضع إذا أنك... (البیت) "والأما من جرهم يبينا لهيئة (الفاعل أو المفصل) فقال: المزة ثابتًا، ش الكبرى لئها دورها المزال، ونقول: ضربت نما فأنا، ويجوز أن تكون الحال من النهاة في ضرب الموضع إذا أنك..."
One of the standard questions which the grammarians discuss in dealing with the ḥaṣb is the ambiguous sentence

रायत नांदा मुस्ता मुज़ा ।

Ibn Ya'ish's treatment of this point consists of little more than a repetition of the relevant passage from the Usūl: 14
Although Ibn Ya'ish's debt to the Uṣūl is particularly noticeable in his treatment of theḥāl, other borrowings of material can be noted as, for instance, in his discussion of exceptive sentences. Ibn al-Sarrāj starts his chapter on exceptive sentences by discussing the use of the accusative case in positive exceptive sentences when it follows the particleilla. After this he attempts to define what illa resembles in its function and when Ibn Ya'ish explains the nature of exception he incorporates this material from theUṣūl. First of all Ibn Ya'ish writes:

"أَلْفَ عَلَمْ أَنَّ الْعَاشَاءَ، عَسَفَ عَنْهُ، فَبَعْدَ الْعَاشَاءَ، عَسَفَ الْلَّفْظَ

عَنْ عَمْرِهِ بِإِبْرَاحِ الْمَسْتَنَّى مِنْ أَنْ يُشْتَهِيَّ الْمَنْتَهَى.

وَحَقَّ قَبْلَ مَنْ تَحْقَقَ صَنَاعَةً مَّا. كَيْلَ الْعَاشَاءَ، كَيْلَ.

وَلَا لِي كَثْبَ تَحْقَقَ إِبْرَاحَ الْعَاشَاءَ. فَإِذا قَلَّ تَحْقَقَ قَلْمُ الْعِمَّ.

إِذْ زَيْدَ، تَبَيَّنَ بِذِلَّةِ إِذْ زَيْدَ، أَنْ لَا يَكُن دَخَلًا

"جَبَّ الصَّدْرَ. إِنَّ ذِكْرَهُ اكْتُرَتْ أَكَلَ وَأَقْتُرَتْ بِهِ

صدِلُهُ عَدَا. وَهَذَا مَعْنِى قَولَ الْمَرْجِيَّينَ: إِلاَّ إِبْرَاحَ

إِبْرَاحٌ بَعْنِ مِنْ كُلٍّ أَيْ إِبْرَاحِهِ مِنْ أَنْ يُشْتَهِيَّ
On to this passage Ibn Ya'qub grafts the extract from the Usuli:

(Shah al-Mufassal)
Ibn Ya‘ish also draws on the *Usul* for material on the points of issue between the Basrans and Kufans and this is seen in his discussion of the dispute over the regent of the *khabar* of *inna* and similar particles: 18

---

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

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

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