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Which differences? Notes for a project on Sicilian and Andalusian grammarians

MIRELLA CASSARINO (Università degli Studi di Catania)
ANTONELLA GHERSETTI (Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia)

Andalusian and Sicilian grammarians

In an important article titled “The Andalusian Grammarians, are they different?,” Michael Carter turned his attention to the detectable peculiarities in the grammatical thought of al-Andalus that he took as being representative of the entire Maghrib area:

Following the practice of those less familiar with this part of the Arab world than Ibn Khaldūn, we shall take al-Andalus as standing for the whole maghrib (henceforth Maghrib), as the “West”, a single geographical unit embracing both the African and the Spanish domains between which scholars moved freely. However, a chronological division will be made between al-Andalus under the Umayyads (139-423/756-1031) and al-Andalus under the subsequent régimes up to the Reconquista of 1492. The two periods are highly asymmetric, but the qualitative difference between them is equally extreme.  

The grammarians of the Arab West, above all those active in the Umayyad epoch, such as al-Qālī (d. 356/967), went for their training to famous schools in the East where they acquired their knowledge, in a spirit of emulation and competition, before spreading it through their teachings in their lands of origin where there was a strong felt need of normalizing the language.  

In his article, Carter dwells on the existing differences between ahl al-Mašriq and ahl al-Maġrib, both in the approaches and in the terms used—it seems that in the West the use of mnemonic processes of knowledge acquisition was prevalent, to the

1 In this article pages 67-74 and the Bibliography are by Mirella CASSARINO, pages 74-76 by Antonella GHERSETTI. We wish to express our gratitude to the editors, Lutz Edzard and Stephan Guth, for having accepted to publish this special section on Arab-Sicilian and Andalusian Grammarians in the Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies. The essays contained in it are the fruit of the reworking of some of the papers presented at the 28th Conference of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants (Palermo, 12-15 September 2016) in the frame of the panel “Arab-Sicilian and Andalusian Grammarians”.


3 This is demonstrated in the experience of ‘Ṣā‘id b. al-Ḥasan al-Rabāʿī (d. 1026), who travelled from Baghdad to the Maghrib because in that area of the Arab world there was a felt need of “luġa”. See CARTER 2012: 32 e n. 5.

4 CARTER 2012: 40-43.
detriment of comprehension—both in juridical and theological schools and this had important effects on grammatical methods.\(^5\) It is enough to consider the well-known case of the Andalusian grammarian Ibn Maḍāʾ al-Qurṭubī (d. 591/1196),\(^6\) who belonged to the ṣāḥīḥ school that promoted an approach to texts free of personal interpretations (\textit{ruʿy}) and of the imitation of authoritative models (\textit{taqlīd}). This grammarian, rejecting in absolute terms the concept of linguistic causality\(^7\) and bringing into discussion the grammatical theory of regency (\textit{naẓariyyat al-ʿāmil}),\(^8\) was the protagonist of a process of reform and of simplification of the Arab linguistic tradition, already felt as necessary by many of his predecessors.\(^9\) Other aspects that seem to have characterized Andalusian grammarians, in particular those active between the end of the Umayyad epoch and the\textit{ Reconquista}, were a striking individualism and a particular eccentricity: this was the case, for example, of Ṭallā al-Munaǧǧim, a contemporary of al-Zubaydī (d. 379/989), of Muhammad b. Yahyà al-Rabâḥ (d. 358/968) and of others, usually described as strange or solitary spirits.\(^10\) We might add to the grammarians mentioned by Carter references to grammarians from Sicily who undoubtedly gravitated in the Maghrib orbit and had contact with the learned men of al-Andalus.

It is not superfluous to recall here (with the aim of better framing the question of relations between Sicilian and Andalusian grammarians) that the duration of the Islamic presence in the two areas of the Arab-Islamic West was very different. Sicily, situated at the centre of the Mediterranean, was conquered, Arabized and Islamicized somewhat later compared to other areas of the Western Mediterranean (827–965). Indeed it entered to form part of the\textit{ Dār al-Islām} from the ninth century onwards and remained within it for a relatively brief period of time. The Christian reconquest of the island by the Normans began as early as 1061, a fact that had prevented the constitution of a strong power such as that of the Umayyads in Spain. The Islamic conquest of Spain, on the other hand, began as is known with the landing in Gibraltar in 711, and continued with the foundation of the Emirate of Cordoba in 753 and then concluded with the foundation of the Umayyad caliphate of al-Andalus in 929. In 1031 the Mulūk al-Ṭawāʾif epoch began. In Spain the reconquest went through alternating phases and periods of stasis and the last Moorish realm, Granada, was taken in 1492. The advent of the Normans in Sicily generated an exodus of the island’s intellectual elite (and thus of grammarians too), above all towards al-Andalus where they

\(^5\) It is not by chance that the Arab biographical dictionaries usually indicate the affiliation of grammarians to a given juridical school. We know, for example, that the Andalusian Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) was ṣāḥīḥ and that for this reason he rejected the\textit{ istiḥsān} (a term translatable with juridical preference or legal equity)—a concept that grammar borrowed from the law—and which Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 577/1181) on his part, belonging to the ṣāḥīf school, considered with suspicion. The\textit{ istiḥsān} was probably accepted by the Ḥanafīes.


\(^7\) CARTER 2012:34.

\(^8\) CAMPANELLI 2016.

\(^9\) Considerable attention is given to this matter in the as yet unpublished doctoral thesis of Marta Campaneli,\textit{ Complessità ed astrattezza della tradizione linguistica araba: la teoria della reggenza e la contestazione di Ibn Maḍāʾ al-Qurṭubī} (presented at the University of Rome La Sapienza in 2016).

\(^10\) CARTER 2012: 35-40.
Which differences?

found refuge in the courts of the Iberian peninsula. This was, inevitably, a unidirectional migration that marked the end of reciprocal cultural exchange. In al-Andalus, as the research carried out for example by Salvador Peña, Binaghi, and Marta Campanelli demonstrates, grammatical production continued to be abundant and at times particular. It is enough to consider the results presented by those scholars who edited the ECA, the Enciclopedia de la Cultura Andaluca, to realise the number of linguists and grammarians who were active there, but who no longer had anything in common with Sicilian production, given that the island was by that time out the orbit of Islam.

Sicily, al-Andalus and the “hidden aspects”

Arab sources, especially historical and prosopographic sources, provide us with glimpses of how the relations between learned men of al-Andalus and Sicily during the ninth and tenth centuries were rather intense and productive both in circles more directly connected to religious sciences as a whole and in what we might call “lay” circles. As authoritative scholars of Islamic Sicily have already usefully observed, “It proves extremely difficult, with regard to intellectuals from al-Andalus and Sicily, to say which was a greater influence on the other”. It is enough here, and for reasons of available space, to mention some significant examples. So let us consider, as far as Quranic studies are concerned, the case of Ḥalaf b. Ibrāhīm al-Qurtubī b. al-Ḥaṣṣār, muqriʾ from al-Andalus, who died in 1117 and was a pupil, in Sicily, of Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Azdī, known for being one of the most famous qāriʾ of the island and the case of various Andalusian scholars who, on Spanish soil, studied under the guide of a Sicilian master, i.e. ʿAbd al-Ḥaq b. Hārūn al-Ṣiqillī. And again in the field of ʿilm al-qirāʿāt, we note how ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Ḥalaf b. Muḥrīz al-Anṣārī al-Ṣaṭībī al-Andalusī was a pupil both of ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Hammūs al-Ṣiqillī, and of Ibn al-Fahām al-Ṣiqillī (1030-1122), albeit in Egypt this time and, to be precise, in Alexandria. It is indeed to Ibn al-Fahām that we owe the glosses to a well-known grammar text composed by Ibn Babašāḏ (469/1077) of whom he was a pupil in Cairo together with Ḥalaf b. Ibrāhīm, he too a conveyor of the master’s work.

Definite reciprocity in cultural exchange is also to be found in the field of prophetic traditions. We know, indeed, that Muḥammad b. Muslim al-Qurašī al-Mazarī al-Ṣiqillī (he died in Alexandria in 1135) trained under the guidance of Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-

---

12 Binaghi 2016.
13 See fn. 8.
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The traditionist, just as the traditionalist of Murcia Muḥammad b. Yūnus b. Saʿāda, who was faqīh and qāḍī at one and the same time, was a pupil of the most celebrated of the Imām al-Mazārī. And now we come to some examples relating to the field that interests us here, the grammatical and lexical area. The sources give us the name of Ibn al-Bīr b. al-Ṣiqīlī, born in Sicily towards the end of the tenth century, and who, after having studied in Alexandria—we find him there in 1024—and then in Mahdia, returned at the end of the Kalbite period, when Sicily was torn by the conflicts between the four qāʿīd who contested domination of the island. It was one of these, Ibn Mankūd, who warmly welcomed him to Mazara, the city in which Ibn al-Bīr practised his teachings and where he also had occasion to meet Ibn Raṣīq al-Qāyrawānī (d. 418/1027-28). From Mazara the philologist was obliged to move to Palermo, where he continued his activity as teacher and where he remained until 1068. Arab sources do not provide the titles of his works, but they do grant him some achievements, paramount his having transmitted al-Ǧawhārī’s dictionary to his pupil Ibn al-Qaṭṭār, who, it seems, disseminated it in Egypt. We also owe to him his having contributed to the survival of the poetic tradition of al-Mutanābbī (d. 355/965) not only in Sicily, but also in Egypt where he lived in exile after the arrival of the Normans. Lastly, it seems that he carried out the revision of the work of laḥn al-ʿāmma by Ibn Makkī al-Ṣiqīlī, which will receive attention below. We also find, among the others active in Sicily, the Andalusian Ṣāʿīd b. al-Ḥasan al-Rābaʿī (d. 417/1026), not by chance nicknamed al-tugāwī. This last, following the death of the ḥāġīb (chamberlain) al-Mansūr b. ʿAbī Ṭāmir, royal lord of al-Andalus from 978 to 1002, whose teacher he had been together with ʿAbū ʿAlī al-Qāfī and Ibn al-Qūṭīyya, left Spain to travel to the Kalbite court in Sicily. From there he travelled again to Córdoba, before passing away on our island during a further journey. Saʿīd b. Fathūn al-Qūṭīyya, another grammarian, was instead active in Sicily right up to his death. He was an expert in metrics, in music and philosophy and it is to him that we owe the editing of a Kitāb al-ʿafāl that was to have some role in the training of Ibn al-Qaṭṭār and in the writing of his homonymous work. This was organized as a compendium and comment to the Kitāb al-ʿafāl of Ibn al-Qūṭīyya al-Qūṭībī (d. 367/977), of which a manuscript copy exists, held in the Lucchesiana Library in Agrigento. With the advent of the Normans on the island, Ibn al-Qaṭṭār indeed emigrated to Andalusia. We find him having been welcomed to the court at Zaragoza (testified in a rhymed prose epistle that has come down to us), where the Banū Hūd dynasty had supplanted the Banū Tuǧīb dynasty in governing the city. From there he moved in the end to Egypt where he probably arrived with the fame of his writings having preceded him. Here he became educator to the children of the wāżūr al-ʿAfḍāl and taught metrics, grammar and lexicography successfully. The double name of al-Ṣiqīlī and al-Miṣrī that is sometimes attributed to him by biographers and the great numbers of pupils who in Egypt acquired and transmitted his writings is tes-

23 de Simone: 21.
timony to the success and the importance of his work. I feel it is important to make reference here to another network of evident relations: if there is indeed no doubt, given that we find it declared in the Taqīq al-lisān, that the work of al-Zubaydī al-Isbīlī (m. 379/989) was fundamental for the writing of the Taqīq al-lisān of Ibn Makkī al-Ṣiqillī (d. 507/1107), it is also true that the grammarian al-Zubaydī had been a pupil, in his turn, of other Sicilian masters, of Abū ʿImrān al-Ṣiqillī and Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Billānūbī al-Ṣiqillī. Textual relations (this is a more recent acquisition) exist between the work al-Mudḥal ilā taqwīm al-lisān wa taʾlīm al-bayān by the Andalusian Ibn Hišām al-Lakhmī and those of laḥn al-ʿāmma by his two predecessors, al-Zubaydī e Ibn Makkī. The work of Ibn Hišām al-Lakhmī, published by José Pérez Lázaro in 1990, indeed opens with two brief polemical texts, not by chance titled Radd ʿalà al-Zubaydī (Confutation against al-Zubaydī), and Radd ʿalà Ibn Makkī (Confutation against Ibn Makkī), in which he rectifies some deviations from the norm recorded by his predecessors. Also to be borne in mind is the fact that both al-Zubaydī and al-Qālī, who attracted the interest of Ibn Ḥāzm of Cordoba (d. 456/1064), perhaps due to the absence in the works of both men of any form of speculative thought on language, were active in the court of the first Andalusian Umayyad caliph ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Nāṣir. Both probably represented, as Salvador Peña has observed, “the official trend of linguistics in al-Andalus at the time, being very well acquainted with each other”. It therefore seems that in no way did al-Qālī, pupil in Baghdad of Ibn Durustuwayhi (d. 347/958), of Ibn Durayd (d. 323/934) and of Ibn al-Sarrāǧ (d. 316/928) seek a role in the transmission to the West of the innovative ideas in the linguistic–grammatical field expressed, as is known, by what is called the School of Baghdad. Furthermore, among the pupils of the grammarian al-Zaḡgāḏī (d. 337/949), we find Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Ṣiqillī al-Dimaṣqī al-Nahwī, who died in Mecca immediately after having completed his pilgrimage. He was born in Sicily and also became a grammarian and poet. It is not inappropriate to recall, apropos of differing tendencies that were already forming in al-Andalus, that Ibn Ǧundal (d. 401/1011), in his commentary on the Kitāb di Sibawayhi, confuted al-Zubaydī and went well beyond the transmission of data or of simple models of prescriptive grammar.

The examples given, far from being comprehensive, do however give the idea of the density and the intensity of relations between the scholars with linguistic interests of Ṣiqilliyya and of al-Andalus. They also demonstrate how the weave of relations extended well beyond these two areas of the Maghrib and touched the entire Arab–Islamic world of

24 Rizzitano 1975.
26 Cassarino 2007.
28 Fierro 2005.
29 Peña 2013: 237.
30 Binaghi 2016.
32 Campanelli 2016.
that time. Only an in-depth knowledge of these relations, corroborated by textual analysis, might allow for a more correct and nuanced reconstruction of both Western grammatical thought and of the more comprehensive developments of linguistic science disciplines in the Arab–Islamic East and West.

**New elements in research**

Relations of a historical, political, social and cultural nature between Muslim Sicily and al-Andalus in the broad sense have been the object of various studies for some time. These enquiries have aimed above all at tracing, in comparative terms, elements of commonality and difference characterizing the Islamic conquest and presence in the two jaziras. The theme in question, the study of political, economic and cultural contact between the two areas over the course of their Islamic history and beyond, has indeed enjoyed renewed interest. Proof of this is the conference recently held in Barcelona with the title, “Sicily, al-Andalus and the Maghreb: Writing in Times of Turmoil”, which sought, in interdisciplinary terms and also through the filter of literary production, to deal with the effects of conflict, processes of exclusion or inclusion, of knowledge sharing that took place during periods of crisis, of disorder and of changes in power in the areas indicated. Even in the case of this academic initiative, however, as has happened in the past, the role of the linguistic disciplines and more precisely the grammar was marginal, even although they occupy a central position in the Arab–Islamic tradition. To take an interest in language, it is worth emphasizing, means to use it as a point of departure for reflection and to reach an analysis for understanding culture and human relations in their complexity. Thus, after brief and preliminary notes on some particular linguistic–grammatical developments in the Maghrib, I have mentioned some relations, still to be explored, that existed in the ninth and tenth centuries between the grammarians of Sicily and those of al-Andalus. I will now raise some questions that the research group formed during the occasion of the 28th conference of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants on an initiative by Antonella Ghersetti and myself, will be able to direct its attention to over the course of its future research. The research group’s aim, in essence, is to study Arab texts of a linguistic–

33 AL-DURU correctly makes reference to the “Mediterranean” dimension of Sicily.
35 The conference, organized by Nicola Carpentieri and by the Department of Medieval and Ancient Studies, took place between 4-5 May 2017 at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. The proceedings are currently at press.
36 EDZARD & WATSON (eds.) 2006.
38 The panel “Arab-Sicilian and Andalusian Grammarians”, conceived and coordinated by Antonella Ghersetti and myself, saw interventions from Francesco Binaghi, Oriana Caperio, Mirella Cassarino, Francesco Grande and Cristina La Rosa. The group’s work, thanks to the initiative of Cristina La Rosa and Francesco Grande, then led to another two meetings, both dedicated to the “Circulation and transmission of Arab grammatical thought in Sicily and al-Andalus” in which other scholars took part with
grammatical nature produced in Spain and in Sicily, this last being a context much less explored than the Andalusian one. Eventual elements of difference will be acknowledged, but so too will the common processes of development in the field of what is defined as the Arab linguistic tradition.

Open questions

Naturally a series of questions—preannounced in the title of this preface and to which I will now make reference—must be taken into consideration. In the wake of suggestions arising from linguistic studies concerning other areas, I would like to begin precisely with the relevant chronological arc and geographical picture. If the former can on the whole be limited to the Islamic presence in the two jaziras, which was, as is known, much longer and more rooted in the Iberian peninsula, the geographical picture should, in my opinion, include other areas, precisely because of the nature and the modalities of transmission and circulation of knowledge in Islam. In our case the objective is to include, in the widest all-inclusive picture, the work of Sicilian and Andalusian grammarians in order to understand the role that they fulfilled (this is particularly valid for the “Sicilians” that up to now have been less studied). These role and impact may also emerge from a simple examination of the pages of the Muʿgam al-ʿulamāʾ waʾl-sūʿarāʾ al-ṣiqilliyin by Ḥṣān ʿAbbās. And this, even if the single works, various grammatical commentaries, lahn al-ʿāmma writings, garīb treatises, thematic lexicons (mubawwab) are explained and justified in the specific context that produced them, sometimes an extremely limited context, as in the case of polemical texts or those regarding amendments to the language.

An important aspect, methodological in nature, that must be borne in mind regards the extent of the field covered by the discipline. The works cited in the part relative to relations between Andalusian grammarians and Sicilian grammarians are almost always not works of “grammar” in the strict sense. We find ourselves, for example, dealing with grammatical commentaries concerning Mutanabbian verses, with small treatises on metrics, didactic manuals, lahn al-ʿāmma texts. Also to be borne in mind is the complexity of the linguistic substrate in Sicily and in al-Andalus. After all, it is a well-known fact that the philological–grammatical disciplines are linked and that they share with law the same modality, i.e. the principle of divergence of thought and the practice of discussion, deriving from the very constitution of the schools. The idea, therefore, of turning our attention not only to disciplines and texts that are grammatical, but also to texts of linguistic and philological character could lead to interesting results: commentaries on poetry, linguistic–grammatical tafsīr, lexicons, etc. The contributions presented here constitute a first step in this direction.

their own contributions, including Antonella Ghersetti and Marta Campanelli. The first of these took place at the Department of Humanities of the University of Catania (4-5 April 2017), the second took place at the Department of Asian and North African Studies at the University Ca’ Foscari, Venice, on 15-16 November 2017.

40 ʿABBĀS 1994.
41 CARTER 2011.
In the light of progress made in the field of linguistic studies, attention should also be brought to bear on the aims of single works, on the various generations of grammarians and on their horizons of expectations. We can adopt, beginning with the texts (some of which are published, others still await critical editions), both a general theoretical approach and more specific perspectives that allow us to bring into focus philological problems relating to individual texts or texts that interpret particular moments of given traditions. The approach adopted by Salvador Peña with regard to the work of various Andalusian grammarians can, in my opinion, be an example for our current and future research, above all if combined with welcome collaboration with Arab scholars interested in publishing the Arab linguistic–grammatical heritage.

The questions that will have to be dealt with regarding relations between Sicily and al-Andalus in the field that interests us here are various and are very complex. For example, the question of the presumed “peripheral” nature of the Maghrib and the consequences that this is supposed to have had on the teaching/learning of Arabic and on the activity of the grammarians. Ibn Ḥaldūn expressed himself clearly on this with regard to education, which also involves the philological disciplines, he makes a clear distinction between Mashriq and Maghrib. He even writes of the “degeneration” of grammar, although he extends his reflection to the entire Arab–Islamic area. Equally important is the question that has its point of departure in the development of grammatical studies, in an initial phase directed at the codification and systemizing of all the material derived from pre-Islamic sources and from the Quran, but which from the tenth century onwards was increasingly connected to humanistic logic and culture. In other words, how much of all this is it possible to perceive in the work of the grammarians of Sicily and of al-Andalus?

First results

The papers of this monographic dossier focus on Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ (d. 515/1121). This is a prominent personality in the field of linguistic and philological studies in Muslim Sicily whose scholarly production seems to have been understudied, with some exceptions, until today. The essays contained in this section are thus intended as a timely contribution to a better assessment of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s role in the development of linguistic and philological studies in Muslim Sicily, and in the Arab-Islamic empire more generally.

The papers of Capezio, Grande and La Rosa converse with each other, highlighting the multifaceted scholarly profile of this Sicilian man of letters whose biographical details constitute a vivid representation of the intellectual tradition of a big Sicilian family and of its fortune (and/or misfortune) over time. Born and raised in Muslim Sicily, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ

42 See, for example, the paper “Protos euretes in al-Andalus; la prima generazione dei grammatici andalusi nell’opera di al-Zubaydī (m. 379/989)” presented by Antonella Ghersetti to the above mentioned Meeting “Circulation and transmission of Arab grammatical thought in Sicily and al-Andalus” (Catania, 4-5 April 2017). The paper will be published in the Proceedings edited by Francesco Grande and Cristina La Rosa.

43 See, for example, LENTIN 2006-2007 and NEF 2011.

spent the last part of his life in exile between al-Andalus and Egypt, where he died. Although being in line with the linguistic tradition of the Eastern part of the Arab-Islamic empire, his scholarly activity shows traits of originality in different fields. His works on metrics, on morphology and on literary criticism offer more than one reason of interest in that they point to aspects of novelty in his detailed approach to morphology, in his wide-ranging analysis of obscure verses of poetry and in his peculiar position in relation to poetic meters and verses serving as textual evidence. The thorough investigation of the manuscript tradition of one of his treatises carried out by Oriana Capezio and the comparison with other treatises of the same genre belonging to the Eastern and Andalusian tradition carried out by Cristina La Rosa also help in assessing the position of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ as a connection between the two extremities of the Arab-Islamic world.

Kitāb al-Bārīʾ fi ʿilm al-ʿarūḍ, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾʾs treatise on metrics, was held in high esteem by Arab scholars. The peculiarities of this work in comparison with the canons of other similar important treatises are scrutinized in CAPEZIO’s piece. Through a thorough investigation of the extant manuscripts, starting from the oldest copy preserved in Cairo (where Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ died) and dating back to one century after the author’s death, Capezio underlines the relevance of Kitāb al-Bārīʾ for the construction of a canon and its wide circulation in the Eastern and Western areas of the Arab world, from Yemen to al-Andalus. Capezio’s minute investigation into the different renderings in the manuscript tradition of the text also helps in tracing the itinerary of the text in the Arab world. Although a Sicilian school of metrics properly speaking did not exist, the spread of Kitāb al-Bārīʾ confirms the significance of this Sicilian scholar in the field of philological and literary studies. The manuscript tradition is investigated though the lens of a case study (the meter ṭawīl) describing the variation of šawāhid (verses serving as textual evidence), metrical transcriptions and visual rendering of the prosodic circles. This survey is a cue to the different receptions of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾʾs treatise and its adaptation to different environments and local traditions. The absence of samples of Sicilian poetry among the šawāhid, though considered deceptive by scholars of the past, can be taken as a hint at his dependence on Eastern and Western canonical works and thus constitute a meaningful element for a better evaluation of his position in the framework of the Arab metrical tradition. Investigation carried out on šawāhid, which have a normative value, is particularly apposite since they contribute to the building of a corpus and a canon of poetry, also defining the images of poets considered relevant in a specific period and environment. Capezio thus suggests that Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ succeeded in establishing a Western corpus building on the Eastern one.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾʾs contribution to grammatical studies, with a focus on his treatise on morphology Kitāb ʿabniyat al-ʿasmāʾ, is at the core of GRANDE’s paper. This fine-grained enquiry into Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾʾs originality puts forward the hypothesis of his particular, semantically-oriented approach to morphological phenomena. In the meantime, it aims at highlighting traits of novelty in the broader context of the Arab Linguistic Tradition (henceforth ALT), where the main innovative traits would concentrate on the level of meaning. Questioning the common view of the conservatism of ALT and of its tendency to focus on a formal approach to linguistic analysis, Grande’s paper attempts to single out a certain degree of novelty in Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾʾs peculiar approach to morphological phenomena. A similar approach has been investigated in scholarly literature for some Eastern authors like ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Gūrgānī or Rāḍī al-Dīn al-Astarābādī, whose positions are briefly summarized.
in this article, but a systematic investigation was still lacking for other authors. Grande’s enquiry into semantically-oriented original approaches first expounds on Ibn Hišām’s treatment of the article al- based on the notion of ʿahdiyya (previous knowledge), which is analyzed in its triple development. It moves then to the case of Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ whose original semantic approach, he explains, can be pinpointed not only in the author’s treatment of the maṣdar as a self-contained object of investigation, but also in his detailed explication of the morphological pattern of affixation, analyzed in conversation with Sībawayhi’s Kitāb on the same point. Grande concludes suggesting that traits of novelty concentrating on the level of meaning in ALT could be rooted in linguistic Quranic exegesis and in its peculiar semantic approach.

La Rosa’s paper focuses on some morphological and lexical issues discussed in Maǧmū‘a min ši‘r al-Mutanabbī wa-ğawāmiḍihī, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s commentary on obscure verses by al-Mutanabbī. This title is analyzed in conversation with the commentaries corpus of al-Mutanabbī’s poetry and in particular is compared with the analogous works of Ibn Ǧinnī and al-Iflīlī. The comparison with them, the first representing the mainstream tradition rooted in al-Mašriq and the second one embodying the Andalusian tradition, aims at offering a better understanding of Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s peculiar features as a grammarian and a philologist in relation with the central position of the Sicilian context. This is a welcome contribution since this scholar’s commentary has been until now somehow neglected in favor of his two well-known treatises on morphology. La Rosa’s essay, underlining how both Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ and al-Iflīlī heavily depend on Ibn Ǧinnī’s commentary, helps in better assessing Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s dependence on the Eastern linguistic tradition and characterizes him, although with his own approach focused on syntax and his peculiar terminological choices, as a continuator of Ibn Ǧinnī’s tradition in the commentary of al-Mutanabbī. This paper, delving into the analysis of morphological phenomena like ilḥāq (adjunction) and tahffīf (lightening), and lexical/semantic points treated in the Maǧmū‘a, also cleverly emphasizes the multifaceted intellectual profile of Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ and his mastery of grammar, lexicography and literary criticism.
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Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ et la métrique arabe en Sicile entre le XIᵉ et le XIIᵉ siècle*

ORIANA CAPEZIO (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”)

Abstract
Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ (d. 515/1121), well known for his anthology of the Sicilian poets, Kitāb al-Durra al-ḥaṭīra, spent his life between Sicily, Andalus and Egypt. In his Kitāb al-Bāriʾ he analysed the fifteen meters codified by al-Ḫalīl. The manuscripts of this work were widely disseminated and today are kept in libraries between Yemen and Andalus, thus showing its large diffusion. Kitāb al-Bāriʾ was conceived as a continuation of the oriental tradition and contributed to the formation of a scientific corpus in the Western part of the Muslim empire. Despite the absence of a Sicilian metrical school, his work fits into a larger tradition of that era’s metrical works. There are, however, some noteworthy differences that appear in the verses used as šawāhid, in the kitāba ʿarūḍiyya and in the graphic representation of the circles. Following my previous paper on Kitāb al-Bāriʾ, I would like to present in this contribution a case study on the ṭawīl metre.

1. Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ

ʿAlī b. Ġaʾfar b. ʿAlī al-Šantarīnī al-Saʾdī al-Šiṣiqīlī, plus connu sous le nom d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ (433-515/1041-1121), fut homme de lettres, grammairien, lexicographe, expert de métrique, secrétaire, poète et historien, figure polyvalente à la croisée des chemins entre l’artiste et l’artisan de la parole. 1 Il naquit en Sicile dans une famille d’intellectuels : Yāqūt nous rappelle que son père était un fin connaisseur de la langue et de la grammaire arabe et que son grand-père faisait partie des meilleurs poètes de son temps. 2 Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ vécut longtemps sur son île natale dans un contexte serein et pacifique mais l’occupation normande le contraignit à l’exil. En effet, en Sicile, les conditions de ceux qui se consacraient à la culture s’étaient dégradées. 3 Sa présence en Égypte est attestée en 500/1106-7 et c’est dans ce pays qu’il passa les dernières années de sa vie. 4 Nous ne connaissons pas avec
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exactitude l’intervalle de temps qui s’écoulait entre son départ de Sicile et son arrivée en Égypte. À ce propos, Rizzitano remarque que :

Ibn al-Qatṭāʾ fu anch’egli fra gli esuli, anzi fra quanti sostarono in Andalusia—come già il padre Giāfār—prima di fissare la propria dimora. Optò per Saragozza, dove la dinastia dei Banū Hud si era resa padrona della città dopo averne cacciato i Banū Tuğib (1039-1110), ma non sappiamo quanto vi rimase.5 À son arrivée en Égypte, il fut accueilli avec tous les honneurs tant à la cour que dans les milieux intellectuels ; il se consacra à l’enseignement de la métrique, de la grammaire et de la lexicographie.

Au Caire, Ibn al-Qatṭāʾ créa une véritable école dans laquelle il transmit le Kitāb al-Ṣiḥāb d’al-Ǧawhārī et reçut le titre de ʿluqawī. La date vraisemblablement la plus précise de sa mort nous est transmise par Ibn Ḥallikān, qui indique qu’elle serait advenue en 515/1121.6 Il rapporte qu’Ibn al-Qatṭāʾ composa aussi, entre autres ouvrages,7 un très beau traité sur la métrique (luḥu ʿarūḍ ḥasan ḡayyīd).8

Al-Suyūṭī nous apprend qu’il composa le Kitāb al-ʾafʿāl, le Abnīyat al-ʾasmāʾ, mais aussi le commentaire du Kitāb al-Ṣiḥāb, une histoire de la Sicile et le Kitāb al-Durrā al-ḥaṭṭāra min ʿūrāʾ al-ʾal-gazīra.9 Ce dernier, parvenu partiellement à travers les recensions d’Ibn ʿĀgīb et d’Ibn al-Ṣāyyārī, a été étudié par Umberto Rizzitano, qui en a publié le texte et une traduction partielle.

2. Le Kitāb al-bārīʾ fi ʿilm al-ʿarūḍ

2.1 Contexte

Le Kitāb al-Bārīʾ fi ʿilm al-ʿarūḍ d’Ibn al-Qatṭāʾ10 est un ouvrage de métrique arabe dont la date de composition — entre le Vᵉ/XIᵉ et le VIᵉ/XIIᵉ siècle — permet de le situer dans une époque où les études de philologie, de grammaire et de prosodie sont florissantes. Ibn al-Qatṭāʾ se confronta ainsi à d’illustres savants et métriciens qui nous ont laissé des traités très importants pour l’histoire de la métrique arabe. On peut notamment citer al-Ǧawhārī


8 IBN ῾ΗΑΛΛΙΚΑΝ, Waṭayṭ al-ʾaʾyān, III: 322-323 [n° 447].


(m. 393 ?/1003 ?), dont Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ s’inspira en reprenant souvent des exemples tirés de son ‘Arūḍ al-warraqa ou, à une époque immédiatement postérieure, al-Ḥaṭīb al-Ṭibrīzī (m. 509/1109), auteur du Kitāb al-Qāfī fi ‘l-arūḍ wa’l-qawāfī qui deviendra par la suite le principal ouvrage de référence, ou encore al-Zamaḥṣarī (m. 538/1144), auteur de al-Qisṭās al-mustaqīm fī ‘ilm al-arūḍ.

En commençant à étudier le Kitāb al-Bāriʾ fi ‘ilm al-arūḍ, j’espérais y trouver parmi les vers utilisés comme modèles (šawāhid) ceux des poètes siciliens, avec lesquels Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ avait composé son Kitāb al-Durra al-ḥaṭīra min šu’ārāʾ al-ǧazīra. Une telle convergence aurait, en effet, attesté l’existence d’une école de métrique en Sicile. Malheureusement, on n’en trouve pas trace puisque on trouve dans son ouvrage les mêmes šawāhid présents dans les traités des métriciens arabes de son époque.

Une considération similaire sur l’œuvre d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ apparait dans la réflexion que Rizzitano consacre à l’anthologie Kitāb al-Durra al-ḥaṭīra. Il espérait trouver dans la poésie des échos de la vie sicilienne de l’époque, mais il est amené à remarquer l’absence de données historiques et la répétition de thèmes et de formes poétiques qui étaient déjà présents dans les traités des métriciens arabes de son époque.

Dans leur introduction à cette anthologie, Giorgio Levi Della Vida et Francesco Gabrieli observent toutefois que : 12

I saggi dei versi qui addotti non si distaccano dai soliti temi bacchici, amorosi e sentenziosi della poesia araba dell’epoca ma meritavano di essere pubblicati per il contributo che portano alla conoscenza della vita letteraria nell’Isola, e dei suoi principali rappresentanti, soprattutto dei principi della dinastia kalbite, segretari e funzionari.

Malgré l’absence de références ponctuelles à la poésie sicilienne, le Kitāb al-Bāriʾ se présente comme un ouvrage de métrique qui, tout en étant placé dans la continuité de la grande tradition « orientale », a contribué à la formation d’un corpus scientifique et mé-

11 RIZZITANO 1958: 341 ; introduction de Levi Della Vida et Gabrieli, p. 22 et suivantes. [Si l’étude de ces reliques s’accompagne souvent de la déception d’y trouver trop de spasmes d’amour et trop peu d’événements historiques, l’attente la plus fréquente est d’y trouver des éléments capables de nous documenter sur des événements de la Sicile kalbite (...), alors les mêmes fragments nous convainquent une fois de plus qu’en Sicile des siècles X et XI l’art de créer des verses ne fut pas un privilège réservé au poète professionnel, mais un divertissement des virtuoses appartenant aux catégories les plus diverses de la société arabo-musulmane].

12 Dans RIZZITANO 1958: 22. [Les essais des vers ci joints ne se détachent pas des thèmes bachiques, d’amour et sentencieux de la poésie arabe de l’époque, mais ils méritent d’être publiés pour la contribution qu’ils apportent à la connaissance de la vie littéraire dans l’île et ses principaux représentants, surtout des princes de la dynastie kalbite, des secrétaires et des fonctionnaires].
trique dans l’Occident musulman. L’ample diffusion de l’ouvrage est attestée par la pré-
sence d’une douzaine de manuscrits qui circulèrent vers l’est, allant de l’Égypte au Yémen,
et vers l’ouest, jusqu’à al-Andalus. En me focalisant sur le mètre ṭavīl, j’ai pu vérifier la
présence de variantes dans les nombreux manuscrits que j’ai étudiés. L’analyse de
l’ouvrage permet en effet de constater des différences dans le choix des vers utilisés, dans
l’écriture métrique (kitāba ṣarūḍiyya) ou encore dans la représentation des cercles. Ces
éléments m’ont permis d’avancer des hypothèses sur le parcours du texte dans le temps et
dans l’espace.

2.2 Contenu
Le Kitāb al-‘Arūḍ al-bāri’ commence par la définition de ‘arūḍ et de ses principales com-
posantes :

Sache que le ‘arūḍ est une science faite de la connaissance des mesures de la poésie
des Arabes (awzān ši’r al-’arab) (...). Le ‘arūḍ est le nom avec lequel on fait réfé-
rence à la [dernière] partie (gaż‘) de la [première] moitié du vers (...) ‘Arūḍ signifie
aussi « côté » (nāḥiya) et « chamelle indocile ». Le ‘arūḍ est le bois que l’on pose
horizontalement au milieu de la tente ou qui indique la direction que prennent les
Arabes lorsqu’ils se déplacent. De même, cela qualifie la distinction entre composi-
en vers (manzām) et en prose (manţūr) (...). Le « vers de la poésie » (al-bayt
min al-ši‘r) ressemble à la « tente en poil » (al-bayt min al-ša‘r) des Arabes, vu que
la tente ne tient debout que grâce aux asbāb et aux awtād (...). 13

L’auteur se propose d’écrire un précis à visée didactique basé sur la leçon d’al-Ḥallī. Les
différents exemples poétiques qui émaillent le texte le rapprochent, par sa richesse, de
l’œuvre d’al-Tibrīzī, Kitāb al-Kāfī fi ‘l-‘arūḍ wa’l-qawāfī. On constate aussi de nombreuses
références au Kitāb al-Waraqa d’al-Ġawharī mais aussi au Šiḥāb. Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ explique
l’art métrique arabe en mettant en exergue les formes les plus connues et les plus utilisées
chez les Arabes. 14 Au terme de sa présentation des mètres, il fait brièvement référence aux
principaux pilastres sur lesquels la rime (qāfiya) se construit et, en particulier, il se rapporte
aux « frontières » de la rime (ḥudīd al-qāfiya). Ensuite, il insère de tout petits traités sur
des sujets spécifiques et termine avec la liste des variantes métriques (bāb ihtišār al-
zungāfiyya).

2.3 Diffusion : les manuscrits
Le traité d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ sur ‘arūḍ et qāfiya a été conservé dans plusieurs manuscrits préser-
vés dans des bibliothèques des pays arabes et européens. Les manuscrits portent des titres
différents, probablement pour donner plusieurs informations sur ce que contient
l’ouvrage. 15

13 Kitāb al-‘Arūḍ al-bāri’ bi’l-ihtišār al-ḡāmi’ / éd. Aḥmad M. ṬABD al-DAYIM, p. 84. La traduction est la
mienne.
14 Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ s’arrête sur le mutaqārib : il fait seulement une brève allusion au seizième mètre—le
mutadārik—en le proposant comme « extension » du précédent et en le définissant muḥṭara‘ ou ḥabab.
15 C’est probablement la raison pour laquelle Amari avance l’hypothèse de l’existence de deux traités
écrits par Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ : « Scrisse due trattati di versificazione. L’uno intitolato Il salutifero nella
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Le Caire, Dār al-Kutub : Kitāb fihi al-ʿArūḍ waʾl-muhmalāt waʾl-qawāfī wa-fihi abyāt al-muʾāyāh wa-ṣarḥūhā, 4ʿarūḍ ši, 626/1228-29 ; al-ʿArūḍ al-bārī, 9ʿarūḍ, 630/1232-33 ; al-ʿArūḍ al-bārī (muḥtaṣar), 58ʿarūḍ, s.d.


Le manuscrit le plus complet et le plus ancien du traité dʾIbn al-Qatṭāʾ porte le titre Kitāb fihi al-ʿArūḍ waʾl-muhmalāt waʾl-qawāfī wa-fihi abyāt al-muʾāyāh wa-ṣarḥūhā [4ʿarūḍ] conservé au Caire. Il contient une première partie où sont présentés les mètres arabes (al-ʿarūḍ) ; on trouve ensuite les petits traités suivants :

- bāb al-muhmalāt [f. 21a]
- muḥtaṣar al-ṣaḥīfī fiʾl-ʿilm al-qawāfī [f. 22 b]
- bāb al-taṣṣīrī waʾl-ʿaqfīya [f. 38 b]
- abyāt al-muʾāyāh wa-ṣarḥūhā [f. 40 a]
- bāb iḥtiṣār al-zihāfā [f. 50 b]

Dans les autres manuscrits que j’ai étudiés, il y a toujours une première partie sur la présentation des mètres et parfois quelques-uns de ces petits traités.17

---

16 Voir BELTRAMI 1926 : LXXIV ; CODAZZI 121.
3. Étude de cas : le ʿtawīl

3.1 De l’importance des ʿšawāhid

L’analyse des mètres dans l’ouvrage d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ suit un schéma précis : présentation des vers ; scansion ; illustration des différentes possibilités de ʿarūd et ʿdarb (respectivement : dernier pied du premier hémistiche et dernier pied du deuxième hémistiche) et étude des variantes présentes qui apportent des changements à l’intérieur du mètre même.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ insère presque systématiquement (ce qui est attesté surtout dans les manuscrits les plus anciens) les nombreuses variantes sous la rubrique ʿizhāfūt, sans faire mention des ʿɪlāl 19 que chaque mètre possède à l’intérieur de ses pieds. Il utilise fréquemment l’expression yaḡūzu [c’est permis] à laquelle suit une des ʿizhāfūt, alors qu’il recourt à l’expression ɡāʾ ʿan al-ʿArab [cela a lieu chez les Arabes] quand il introduit une ʿilla. Pour le mètre ʿtawīl, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ présente les différentes variantes : qabd, kaff, ḥarm, ʿilm, aṣlum et šarm.

Mes observations sur le mètre ʿtawīl18 sont issues de la comparaison entre les manuscrits les plus anciens conservés à la Dār al-Kutub du Caire qui remonteraient à la période comprise entre 626/1228 et 630/1232 – et ceux des siècles suivants, y compris l’édition Makka 1985 basée sur un manuscrit yéménite copié en 1070/1659-60 et conservé à Sanaa.

La première observation concerne la présence des vers utilisés comme ʿtawīl : ʿšawāhid (verses serving as textual evidence, illustrating the various types of mètre) (V. 477-495). The total number of verses listed is 157. They show a clear order: first of all, according to the canonical row. STOETZER 1989: 73.

18 Je me limite ici à présenter le ʿtawīl, mais il n’est pas rare de retrouver également, dans le traitement des autres mètres, des variantes par rapport à la pratique courante dans les traités de métrique.
21 W. Stoetzer remarque que : « The edition of the ʿIqd al-Farīd published at Cairo in 1946 contains a list of ʿšawāhid verses (sg. ʿšāhid) (verses serving as textual evidence, illustrating the various types of metre) (V. 477-495). The total number of verses listed is 157. They show a clear order: first of all, according to the canonical row ». STOETZER 1989: 73.
qui consacre un sous-chapitre (‘L’examen des vers-témoins’) de son étude sur la métrique aux šawāhid,22 soutient que :

La métrique arabe repose sur les mêmes principes de base. Le mètre, ou modèle de vers, peut donc y être défini comme un algorithme, le commun multiple de tous les exemples de vers dérivés dudit modèle, qui indique les positions où l’on trouve systématiquement une syllabe brève ou une syllabe longue ou à deux syllabes brèves en alternance avec une longue.23

Dmitry Frolov, qui consacre aussi aux šawāhid un chapitre spécifique (‘Poetic šawāhid as Part of Theory’) de son étude Classical Arabic Verses. History and Theory of ‘Arūḍ, affirme :

All the levels of the theory were based on the foundation of specially selected normative verse lines, šawāhid (“testimonies”). These šawāhid formed an integral part of the theory and a lot of attention was paid to them by medieval scholars.24

Il signale en outre l’existence, dans l’histoire de la métrique arabe, d’un genre de traités particulier, nommé šarḥ al-šawāhid, en concluant qu’on peut faire plusieurs observations sur le lien entre les exemples et la théorie de la science métrique et entre le choix des vers témoins et l’image du poète et de la poésie qu’on voulait offrir à l’époque.25

3.2 Le ṭawīl : la sélection des vers

En prenant comme étude de cas le ṭawīl, mon but est d’analyser les divergences dans la sélection des vers présentés dans les manuscrits. En l’absence d’un manuscrit autographe, qui aurait pu montrer le véritable choix d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ, on peut postuler que de telles variations ont été introduites par les copistes. L’ouvrage d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ nous est en effet parvenu à travers des manuscrits dont les plus anciens datent d’un siècle après la mort de l’auteur. On ne peut cependant pas exclure que, lors de son enseignement oral, l’auteur présentait à ses élèves la double possibilité envisagée par Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi (m. 328/940) : en effet, dans le ʿIqd al-farīd, nous trouvons déjà deux possibilités de vers utilisées pour le mètre ṭawīl et, plus précisément, avec le troisième darb.

Le parcours retracé ici commence avec les manuscrits les plus anciens qui nous sont parvenus : le Kitāb fīhi al-ʿarūḍ ṭal-bāriʿ (Dār al-Kutub 4 ʿarūḍ 5 qui remonte à l’an 626/1228-29) et al-ʿArūḍ al-bāriʿ, (Dār al-Kutub 9 ʿarūḍ, qui date de 630/1232-33).

25 « There is good reason to believe that šawāhid in metrical treatises are important not only from the point of view of metrics but also from the point of view of the history of Arabic poetry. Pieces whose authors are mentioned seem to be selected so as to create a certain image of the poet and the poetic tradition as a whole ». FROLOV 2000: 339.
Les deux premières possibilités de ḍarb et ʿarūḍ qui reflètent la chaine décrite auparavant sont présentées dans la section de ces manuscrits consacrée au ṭawīl ; l'on y propose des vers respectivement de Garîr (m. 111/729) :

Des nuages noirs les uns sur les autres désaltèrent le sable en donnant naissance à la pluie Ce n’est rien d’autre que l’amour de celui qui vit dans le désert et de Ṭarafa b. al-ʿAbd (VIe siècle) :

Les jours te révéleront ce que tu ignorais
Et celui à qui tu n’offris pas subsistance te portera des nouvelles

Au moment de présenter le troisième ḍarb du mètre ṭawīl, qui est maḥḏīf et dont le ʿarūḍ est maqḥūd, on retrouve, dans les manuscrits les plus anciens de la Dār al-Kutub, un vers de Abū al-Aswad al-Duʿālī :

Les personnes judicieuses ne t’offrent pas toutes de (bons) conseils, et celles qui te donnent des conseils ne sont pas toutes judicieuses

À partir des manuscrits successifs – Ambrosiana (706/1306), Escorial (748/1347) et Vaticana (VII/XIII-XIV siècle), un changement important intervient dans la présentation de la troisième possibilité de ḍarb du mètre ṭawīl. En effet, le vers est substitué par celui de Yazīd b. al-Ḥaḍḏāq (VIe siècle), présent dans la plupart des traités de métrique. Dans ce dernier, le poète décrit sa monture, les armes et la rébellion contre les Banū Nuʿmān et exhorte les siens à agir avec droiture :

O Banū Nuʿmān, détournez vos poitrines de nous ou bien vous resterez tête basse


---

26 ABŪ UBAYDA, Naqḍ al-Garîr wa l-Farazdaq, I: 159.
28 LEVI DELLA VIDA 1935: VIII.


### 3.3 *Kitābā ʿarūḍiyyya*

L’écriture métrique (*kitāba ʿarūḍiyyya*) a été créée par des spécialistes de métrique qui ont reproduit, en se basant sur la prononciation, une graphie artificielle pour effectuer la scansion du vers. La scansion métrique traditionnelle s’articule en différentes phases : transcription du vers en écriture métrique ; séparation des lettres vocalisées et quiescentes (*taqīf*); leur transcription en symboles (*al-rumūz al-ʿarūḍiyyya*) et l’identification des pieds (*taf’ilat*). Cette séquence – qui est présente, bien qu’avec des variantes, dans toutes les éditions des traités de métrique – ne correspond pas à celle que nous retrouvons dans les manuscrits d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭā. L’écriture métrique est une méthode mnémonique utilisée pour faciliter l’apprentissage par cœur du mètre. Si l’on prend comme cas d’étude le *ṭawāl* dans l’œuvre d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭā, nous notons déjà de grandes différences d’un manuscrit à l’autre. La *kitāba ʿarūḍiyyya* se trouve dans sa forme complète dans presque tous les manuscrits pour le premier vers de chaque mètre. Comme on peut le voir dans les manuscrits les plus anciens, la présentation du premier vers est suivie par la séparation des lettres vocalisées et quiescentes (*taqīf*) et l’identification des pieds (*taf’ilat*).

Fig. 1: Dār al-Kutub, 4 ʿarūḍ. Ibn al-Qaṭṭā, *Kitāb fihi al-ʿarūḍ*, 626/1228-29, f.3a, lignes 6-8.
Déjà, dans le deuxième exemple, on ne trouve que le vers et l’on n’assiste que rarement à la séparation des vocalisées et des quiescentes ou des séquences des pieds.

Dans le manuscrit ar. 331 de l’Escorial, la section du taqīʿ et la définition des tafīlāt pour tous les vers sont totalement absentes. Seul le premier vers est rapporté entièrement, tandis que pour les suivants, nous ne trouvons que le premier mot du vers − satubdī pour le deu-
xîème ʿdarb, ʿaqīmū pour le troisième ʿdarb. La même typologie de description est reprise pour la section zihāfāt. À l’inverse, dans le manuscrit ar. 328³ de l’Escorial, nous nous trouvons face à un texte indéniablement plus complet : il offre bien plus d’informations que le précédent.

Toutefois, ce sont les manuscrits conservés à la Biblioteca Ambrosiana – ainsi que ceux de la Biblioteca Vaticana – qui offrent la description la plus longue et la plus précise du mètre ṭawīl. Dans ces manuscrits, chaque vers est suivi de la séparation des lettres vocalisées et quiescentes (taqṭī) et de l’identification des pieds (tafīlāt) ; nous y trouvons aussi la spécification de pied sain ou modifié, qui s’avère précieuse dans le domaine de la métrique.

Fig. 5: Ambr. ar. X76 sup., Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ, al-ʿArūḍ al-bāriʾ bi-l-iḥtiṣār al-ḡāmiʾ, 706/1306, f. 74a, lignes 13-16. © Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana.

Fig. 6: Ambr. ar. X76 sup., Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ, al-ʿArūḍ al-bāriʾ bi-l-iḥtiṣār al-ḡāmiʾ, 706/1306, f. 74a, lignes 18-21. © Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana.

3.4 La représentation graphique du 1er cercle
Une dernière observation concerne la théorie des cercles attribuée à al-Ḥalīl, qui traduit la science métrique en forme graphique. En se basant sur un principe arithmétique, al-Ḥalīl subdivisa les quinze mètres sur la base du nombre de consonnes contenues dans les pieds qui composent les hémistiches (par exemple, ṭawīl, basīṭ et madīd qui constituent le premier cercle, chacun ayant vingt-quatre consonnes).
Les mètres matérialisés dans les cercles représentent leur forme théorique qui trouve rarement une application dans la pratique. Les pieds s’insèrent l’un dans l’autre à l’intérieur du cercle et, en déplaçant le point de départ, on passe d’un mètre à l’autre.

Il semble que le premier auteur se référant à la théorie des cercles ait été al-Zaǧǧāǧ (m. 255/869), qui mentionne la forme théorique du mètre basīṭ dans le cercle (aṣl al-dā‘ira). Toutefois, la première représentation graphique chez les auteurs orientaux n’a, semble-t-il, eu lieu que dans l’œuvre métrique de son élève Abū l-Ḥasan al-ʿArūḍī (m. 342/953-4). Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi (m. 328/940) consacre aussi un chapitre de son al-ʿIqd l-farīd à la métrique d’al-Ḫalīl ; ce chapitre contient une partie théorique, le Muḫtaṣar al-farš , qui est suivie d’une longue urǧūza où Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi introduit les cinq cercles, les commente et les représente graphiquement en traçant des lignes (ḫuṭṭ) pour les lettres quiescentes et des cercles (ḥalaqāt) pour les lettres vocalisées.

Concernant le ṭawīl, je voudrais faire encore une dernière remarque, qui ne se veut qu’un aperçu du rendu graphique du premier cercle dans les manuscrits d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ, pour lequel la relecture d’une des rares descriptions des cercles proposée dans le Miʿyār al-naẓāẓī d’al-Zanǧānī (m. 655/1257) m’a été utile. Les manuscrits les plus anciens de l’ouvrage d’Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ semblent, malgré des variantes, respecter cette description. Nous retrouvons, en effet, dans la représentation graphique du premier cercle la circonérence, la subdivision entre les lettres vocalisées (indiquées au moyen de petits cercles qui ont parfois un petit point au centre, comme dans les manuscrits conservés à la Biblioteca Vaticana), et les quiescentes (représentées par une ʿalif), ainsi que l’ajout des possibilités inhabituelles (muḥmal), c’est-à-dire des formes présentes au niveau théorique mais qui ne sont jamais utilisées.

* * *

Grâce à l’analyse d’un nombre consistant de manuscrits et des variantes attestées, cette étude de cas sur le ṭawīl m’a permis de mettre en exergue certains traits spécifiques, šawāhid – kitāba ʿarūḍīyya – représentation graphique des cercles, typiques d’un ouvrage qui, en se basant sur la tradition orientale, unit, à travers la Sicile, l’Orient et l’Occident arabe.


29 Sa succession de pieds fait quatre fois faʿalun mafāʿīlun. Le cercle doit être lu en sens antihoraire. Le watīd maḡmūʿ faʿū = faʿuw commence et, suivi par le sabab ḥaṭṭ (lun), forme le premier pied ; le madīd commence par le sabab ḥaṭṭ (lun du ṭawīl) ; le basīṭ débute par le sabab ḥaṭṭ (l = ʿiy de mafāʿīl, selon ʿuẓ ṭawīl).

30 CANOVA 2015: 132-134.
Fig. 7: Dār al-Kutub, 4 'arūd, Ibn al-Qattā‘ī, Kitāb fihi al-'arūd, f.3a, 626/1228.
Fig. 8: Ambr., ar X76 sup., Ibn al-Qaṭṭāṭ, al-ʿArūḍ al-bārī bi-l-iḥtiṣār al-ḡāmi’, f. 74, 706/1306. © Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana
Fig. 9: Dār al-Kutub, 9ʿarūḍ, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ, al-ʿArūḍ al-bāriʿ, f. 27a, 630/1232-33.
Fig. 10: Dār al-Kutub, 4 ʿarūḍ, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ, Kitāb fīḥi al-ʿarūḍ, 626/1228.
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Abstract

In this study we investigate some aspects of the linguistic thought of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ (d. 515/1121) with the intent of contributing to a better knowledge of this eminent personality of Arab Muslim Sicily. To this aim, we offer a description of the milieu of linguistic thought to which al-Qaṭṭāʾ belonged, with particular reference to some members of that milieu, who are known to modern scholars for efforts distinguished by theoretical and methodological originality. We also clarify some semantically-oriented original traits of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s morphological analysis, as emerging from his treatise Kitāb ʾabniya al-ʾasmāʾ waʾl-ʿafāl waʾl-muṣādir, as precisely such traits make it possible to number him among the infrequent bearers of semantic originality in the context of medieval Arabic linguistic thought.
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Arabic linguistic thought, conservatism and originality

From an historical perspective, the chronological limits within which linguistic thought developed in the medieval Arab Muslim world can be set approximately between 180/796, the date of Sībawayhi’s death, and 911/1505, the date of al-Suyūṭī’s death.1 If we turn to epistemological considerations, modern scholars have long noticed that, within that time-span, Arabic linguistic thought is characterized by strong conservatism in terms of objectives, contents and methodology. However, modern scholars differ in their assessment of this phenomenon. In asserting that “les grammairiens arabes se sont fastidieusement répétés, copiés les uns les autres”, Fleisch2 is reluctant to judge such conservatism positively; whereas Guillaume3 gives the opposite advice when he affirms that Arabic linguistic thought “was founded on a remarkably self-consistent set of general principles (of axioms, so to speak) defining its object, its aims, and its methods”.

In particular, in the methodology of Arabic linguistic thought, and particularly in grammatical description, conservatism mainly manifests itself as the tendency, on the part of different schools (Kufan, Basran, Baghdadian, Andalusian, Egyptian4), to focus linguist-

---

1 CARTER 2007: 184, 189. The date of Sībawayhi’s death is not a matter of certainty. Here, his death is dated to 180/796 following BAALBAKI 2002: 1, BAALBAKI 2008: 1 and BAALBAKI 2014: 2.
2 FLEISCH 1961, i: 46.
3 GUILLAUME 2007: 175.
tic analysis on the level of form rather than of meaning. In all likelihood, the historical reason that lies behind this attitude is the obscurity that the Arab grammarians and lexicographers might have perceived in the variety of Arabic they wanted to describe, the so-called kalām al-ʿArab. It can be hypothesized, in fact, that in transmitting and investigating the kalām al-ʿArab, the Arab grammarians and lexicographers not so infrequently took great pains in understanding it, so they felt somehow forced to access it primarily through its form rather than its meaning, the former being clearer to them than the latter. It is telling in this respect that precisely the study of obscure words (ğarīb) was an important part of the Arab lexicographers’ work since the very beginnings of Arabic linguistic thought, though further investigation is required to validate such a hypothesis.

Be that as it may, the fact that conservatism tends to tally with a formal approach in the methodology of Arabic linguistic thought implies that the rare traits of originality present take place on the level of meaning. This is illustrated by al-ʿUrğānī’s (d. 177) interpretation of the word-order pair ǧumla ʾismiyya-ġumla ʾiṭiyya, e.g., al-zaydūnā katabū / kataba al-zaydūnā “the Zayds, they wrote/the Zayds wrote”. While Arabic linguistic thought usually derives this syntactic pair from a formal opposition, which consists of the agreement, or lack thereof, between the verb and the noun, al-ʿUrğānī interprets it as the result of a semantic opposition, in which informational saliency affects either the utterance-initial noun (i.e., al-zaydūnā in al-zaydūnā katabū) or the utterance-initial verb (i.e., kataba in kataba al-zaydūnā).

5 VERSTEEGH 1997: 228.

6 Technically speaking, the definition of this variety of Arabic is quite fluid in the literature. A matter of wide consensus among Arabists is that kalām al-ʿArab is basically the linguistic material attested to in the Koran and pre-Islamic poetry (GUILLAUME 2007: 177), but according to some definitions it may also include the linguistic data collected from the Bedouin (kalām al-ʿArab) and even the Prophet’s sayings (hadīṭ): cp. BAALBAKI 2014: 30, 37. See also LEVIN 1999: 270 for a narrower definition of the variety of Arabic under discussion.

7 BAALBAKI 2014: 7, 36-37.

8 Outside Arabic, it is well established among linguists that an epistemological connection exists between an obscure language and the resort to a formal approach to analyze it. Lepschy exemplifies this state of affairs by means of the formal approach that American structuralists developed to account for Amerindian languages, which effectively appeared rather puzzling to them (LEPSCHY 1966: 151-2).


10 Al-ʿUrğānī himself adheres to this formal interpretation in terms of syntactic agreement in his work al-Muqtaṣīd fī šarḥ al-ʿIdāh. See, e.g., al-ʿUrğānī, al-Muqtaṣīd fī šarḥ al-ʿIdāh: 327-8, in which he defines the element that can co-occur with the verb of a ǧumla ʾismiyya and cannot co-occur with the verb of a ǧumla ʾiṭiyya as a unit that carries syntactic information and is incorporated into that verb (i-ṭāʾ il ʾil-lāh-u ṣāḥīḥ, e.g., a sort of agreement-marker. This passage reads as follows: wa-ʾlam ʾanna l-fāʾ'il u l-fāʾ'īl wa l-fāʾ'il wa l-fāʾ'il la ṣāḥīḥ taqūla l-ʾiṭiyya ʾalay-hi nabwaa ʾan taqūla l-zaydūnā ʾadābha [... fī-ṭālāma lam yaquūla ʾil-lāh darabā ࠤlām u ṣāḥīḥa l-zaydūnā ṣāḥīḥa l-ibīdālā lā wāl- fāʾ'il la ṣāḥīḥa l-ʾiṭiyya ʾil-lāh darabā. On the different approaches of al-ʿUrğānī ‘grammarian’ (al-Muqtaṣīd fī šarḥ al-ʿIdāh) and of al-ʿUrğānī ‘rhetorician’ (Dalāʾil al-ʾiṭīḥād), see, among many others, VERSTEEGH 1997: 259-260.

11 al-ʿUrğānī, Dalāʾil al-ʾiṭīḥād: 147. Concretely, al-ʿUrğānī exemplifies the semantic opposition between ǧumla ʾismiyya and ǧumla ʾiṭiyya by means of interrogative utterances (al-istīḥām) such as a- faʿalā, a-ʿanta faʿalā. In these utterances, the informational saliency, which consists of the speaker’s
In the literature, few other examples of semantic traits of originality are seemingly reported, the most notable of which are those developed by al-Astarābāḏī (d. 688/1289) and Ibn Hišām (d. 761/1359). By contrast, it seems that the semantic originality that Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾī (d. 515/1121) brought to Arabic linguistic thought has not yet received scholarly attention. In what follows, we first outline the main aspects of semantic originality of al-Astarābāḏī’s and Ibn Hišām’s linguistic thought in the form of a review of the literature, then proceed to clarify the contribution of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾī in the same respect.

Yet before proceeding further, a caveat is in order: ascertaining the pervasiveness of a formal approach in the conservative transmission of Arabic linguistic thought should not mislead us into oversimplification. In the transmission of such knowledge, the semantic dimension was marginal but not totally absent. Evidence for this assertion comes from the formative stages of Arabic linguistic thought: as Baalbaki points out, Sībawayhi avails himself of “technical terms which refer to formal aspects” and which, at the same time, “have distinct semantic functions”, although “[he] does not formulate a semantic theory in the Kitāb” for these terms, relegating them to a marginal role. We can draw an example from morphology to understand this point. In Sībawayhi’s view, the construct of affixation (ziyāda) can but must not involve a semantic dimension, contrary to standard assumptions in modern Western linguistics. On the one hand, Sībawayhi explicitly states that affixation may “introduce an element of meaning” (tadḥulu li-māʾānī). On the other hand, he also asserts that this function is not quintessential to affixation, the other important function of it being that of ‘ilmāq, i.e., “reducing one [anomalous] pattern to another [more regular] pattern” (tulḥiqu latīʾan fi-l-latīʾ) regardless of their meaning. For instance, the Arab grammarians regard the Quranic hydronym kawār as instantiating an unexpected consonant w, which disrupts the regular pattern faʿal, thus yielding the anomalous pattern fawʿal. They also propose to re-conceptualize the unexpected consonant w as an affix that, in merely formal terms, occupies the position of a root consonant (ilḥaq), rather than introducing an element of meaning. This analysis allows them to re-interpret the anomalous pattern fawʿal as a regular quadriconsonantal pattern, which is effectively attested to in nouns such as gaʿfar.

Furthermore, the formal approach itself was not immune from sporadic traits of originality, in spite of the Arab grammarians’ tendency to transmit it conservatively from one generation to the next. An indicative example is the conceptual organization of Arabic grammatical theory devised by Ibn al-Sarrāḡ (d. 316/928), the original character of which

---

14 Baalbaki 2008: 173. Cp. also the discussion concerning the notion of faḍla in the next section.
15 Sībawayhi, Kitāb, iii: 213. This translation is based on Baalbaki 2002: 7.
16 Sībawayhi, Kitāb, iii: 213. In this connection Baalbaki himself remarks that “this ziyāda is different from the one which uniformly introduces an element of meaning”: see Baalbaki 2002: 3.
17 Baalbaki 2002: 4. Cp. also Sībawayhi, Kitāb, iii: 211, which puts forward a similar analysis for faʿwal (e.g., gaʿwal).
Guillaume\textsuperscript{18} highlights as follows: “The same preoccupation with clarifying the foundations of grammatical theory and with finding new, more explicit ways to formulate it is also perceptible in Ibn al-Sarrāḡ’s (d. 316/928) \textit{usūl}, a descriptive treatise following an entirely new and systematic order of exposition”. Guillaume\textsuperscript{19} also highlights the isolated nature of this formal originality by observing that Ibn al-Sarrāḡ’s successors fossilized his conceptual organization of Arabic grammatical theory into a “canonical mode of exposition for grammatical treatises” so that “no major evolution occurred in subsequent centuries” for such a theory.\textsuperscript{20}

Bearing this in mind, we can now address the issue of (non-marginal) semantic originality in Arabic linguistic thought.

Al-Astarābāḏī and the Arabic system of case endings

Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Astarābāḏī was an Arab grammarian of Iranian origin. He was born on an unknown date in the city of Astarābāḏ (present-day Iran), which is traditionally described as producing scholars proficient in all the sciences. In al-Astarābāḏī’s time, however, the cultural potential of that milieu was probably limited by historical accidents, such as the Mongol invasions, which may explain why his commentary (\textit{ṣarḥ}) on the syntactic treatise \textit{Kāfiya} of Ibn al-Ḥāqīb (d. 646/1249) was not circulated or developed by subsequent grammarians in spite of his scholarly prowess. Another possible explanation for the inadequate reception of al-Astarābāḏī’s commentary—with the notable exception of al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505)—was its innovative nature vis-à-vis the predominating conservatism of Arabic linguistic thought at that time. Al-Astarābāḏī may have died in 686/1287 or more likely in 688/1289.\textsuperscript{21}

The conservative methodology of Arabic linguistic thought we have just alluded to devoted considerable attention to the system of case endings (\textit{iʿrāb}), which constituted a central feature of the variety of Arabic described by the Arab grammarians and lexicographers. The resulting theory stands out for its conceptual simplicity: briefly,\textsuperscript{22} what assigns the case ending to the noun is a particle or a verb\textsuperscript{23} that precedes the noun in question. As a corol-

\textsuperscript{18} Guillaume 2007: 176.

\textsuperscript{19} Guillaume 2007: 176.

\textsuperscript{20} The systematic character that originally informs Ibn al-Sarrāḡ’s conceptual organization of grammar is apparent, for instance, from his description of the syntactic behavior of parts of speech in logical-combinatorial terms. Cf. the key-word \textit{yaʿalīfu} in the following passage (Ibn al-Sarrāḡ, al-\textit{Usūl fi l-nabw}, I: 41): \textit{wa-llāqī yaʿalīfu minhu l-kalāmu l-ṭalāqatu l-ismu wa l-riʿa wa l-baṣr l-īsnu qud yaʿalīfu maʿa l-īsni ... wa-yaʿalīfu l-īsnu wa l-riʿa [...] wa-lā yaʿalīfu l-riʿa maʿa l-baṣr wa l-baṣr qud yaʿalīfu maʿa l-ḥarf}. See Ghersetti to appear for further details and references.


\textsuperscript{22} This is admittedly a simplified account of the canonical theory of case endings in Arabic linguistic thought, which abstracts away from case-assigners such as the covert element referred to as \textit{ḥyādī} by the Arab grammarians. See GUILLAUME 1998: 44-58 for details.

\textsuperscript{23} It would be tempting to restate in modern terms this theoretical scenario by assuming a pattern of complementary distribution. On this view, three parts of speech are found in Arabic, two of which (verb,
lary, the phonological realization of the case ending assigned to the noun depends precisely on the nature of the constituent that precedes it. The particle assigns the case ending \(i\) to the noun; the verb assigns the case ending \(u\) to the first instance of a noun in the utterance, as well as the case ending \(a\) to the second instance of it; and a covert constituent, which has a verb-like and/or a particle-like nature, assigns the case ending \(u\) to the noun. For instance, in the utterance \(daraba Zaydun 'Amran 'Zayd hit 'Amr\)’, the verb \(daraba\) assigns the case ending \(u\) to the proper noun \(Zayd\) and the case ending \(a\) to the proper noun \(Amr\). A theory of case along these lines is formal in the sense that no semantic considerations are invoked to explain the phonological realization of the case endings, the position of the utterance constituents only being relevant. Keeping to the example \(daraba Zaydun 'Amran\), there is a tendency for the Arab grammarians to elaborate only very minimally upon the idea that the case ending \(u\) is assigned to the agent of the utterance \(Zayd\), and the case ending \(a\) to its object \(Amran\). However, al-Astarābāḏī takes the opposite approach by affirming that the case ending \(u\) is assigned to any necessary part of the utterance (‘unda’), such as the subject and the predicate, and the case ending \(a\) is assigned to any optional part of it (‘fadla’), such as the object and the other complements. A parallel with the modern linguistic notion of minimum clause will be useful to elucidate al-Astarābāḏī’s theory of case endings, and especially the dialectics between ‘unda and ‘fadla’ upon which this theory is founded. To begin with, let us consider the utterance \(John ate an apple\), from which we can derive the minimum clause \(John ate\) if we omit its object \(an apple\). The relevant fact about this omission is that it deletes a portion of meaning, e.g., ‘an apple’, from the utterance, e.g., \(John ate an apple\), without compromising the latter’s overall semantics (and grammaticality) and yielding a minimum clause that is made of a subject and a (verbal) predicate, e.g., \(John ate\). The same remarks apply to the utterance \(John ate yesterday\), if we omit its complement of time

particle) assign the case ending and the other (noun) receives it. Nonetheless, the ability of the verb to receive the case ending (cp. the imperfective forms \(yaf'alu, yaf'al\)) falsifies an interpretation of this sort.

24 See the end of this paper for further examples concerning the particle and the noun to which it assigns the \(i\)-ending.

25 On the contrary, modern Western linguistics is inclined to endorse this interpretation.

26 See, e.g., al-ASTARĀBĀḎĪ, Šārḥ al-Kāfyā, i: 52: \(ṭumma ‘lam ‘anna mādīqa hāḏhi l-ma'āni fi kulli xomin ḫawa l-mutakallima [...]. wa-kāḏa l-‘āmilu fi kulli wāḥidin min-a l-mubāda‘a wa l-ḥabarī ḫawa l-‘alāyru ‘alā maḏḥabī l-kifāyya wa l-farrā‘a ‘iḏ kullu wāḥidin min-humā ẓāra ‘unda datan bi l-‘alāy.


28 This is a simplified overview of al-Astarābāḏī’s theory of case endings, which says nothing about the case ending \(i\). A more complete presentation of this theory could probably treat the case ending in question as a syntactically-conditioned allomorph of the case ending \(a\): \(a\) becomes \(i\) when preceded by a preposition (e.g. \(masā‘an ‘in the evening’ → \(fī l-masā‘ī ‘il.’), except for diptotes. Cp. GUILLAUME 1998: 59-62 and BOHAS, GUILLAUME, KOLLOUGHLI 1990: 66-68.

29 This parallel is for clarification purposes only. It does not imply any assimilation of the modern notion of minimal clause to al-Astarābāḏī’s notions of ‘unda and ‘fadla’. More research would be needed on this subject.
This semantic situation is tantamount to saying that in the minimum clause only the subject and the (verbal) predicate qualify as the necessary parts of the utterance, not unlike the ‘umda in al-Astarābāḏī’s view, whereas the object and other complements are an optional part of it (cp. their omittability), not unlike the faḍla in his view. By way of illustration, the utterance Zaydun muntaliqun ‘Zayd is leaving’ includes two instances of ‘umda (the subject Zaydun and the predicate muntaliqun), whereas the aforementioned object ‘Amran is an instance of faḍla similarly to complements of time and manner (e.g., masāʾan ‘in the evening’, al-battata ‘surely’). This theory of case endings is semantic since it has at its core the notions of ‘umda and faḍla, which ultimately are but two sets of pieces of information one speaker conveys to another, such as substance, attribute (cp. the subject and the predicate that define the ‘umda), time, manner (cp. the complements of time and manner that define the faḍla).  

The mainstream formal theory of case endings and al-Astarābāḏī’s semantic theory of case endings seem to be equally capable of explaining the presence of case endings in a simple utterance like daraba Zaydun ʿAmran, where the case endings u and a can be analyzed either as two outcomes of the verb daraba that precedes the nouns bearing them; or as an opposition necessary vs. optional part of the utterance. However, al-Astarābāḏī’s semantic theory of case endings is seemingly superior to its formal counterpart when it comes to a more complex instance of utterance, which involves a passive form. Arabists have in the past noticed the difficulties experienced by the mainstream formal theory of case endings with respect to al-Astarābāḏī’s theory, but the passive utterances they have taken into consideration belong to a somewhat ad hoc set of utterances often mentioned in the Arab grammarians’ treatises, e.g. sīra farsaḥāmī ‘Two leagues were travelled’. Here, we would like to discuss the same theoretical scenario by means of a more concrete instance of passive utterance, drawn from the linguistic data gathered by Sībawayhi. The author of the Kitāb mentions a kind of passive utterance, in which the internal object displays an alternation of case endings u/a, e.g., duriba bi-hi darban daʾiʿan / darban daʾiʿan ‘a weak blow was hit with it’. A certain amount of idealization is undeniable in this linguistic data (cp. the stereotyped example duriba etc.), but the very alternation of case endings u/a in it plausibly points to a real context of dialectal variation. 

As has just been illustrated, the mainstream formal theory predicts that the verb assigns the case ending u to the first instance of a noun in the utterance, so that it accounts for one member of the alternation only, i.e., darban daʾiʿan, leaving the other, i.e., darban daʾiʿan, unaccounted for. By contrast, al-Astarābāḏī’s semantic theory of case endings provides a straightforward explanation for both members of the u/a alternation by interpreting them as two effects of two different communicative attitudes on the part of the speaker. If the speaker places informational saliency on the piece of information ‘weak blow’ (cp. the

30 This theory has also a pragmatic dimension insofar as it takes into account the role of the speaker and his intentions: see LARCHER 2014: 267-316.
32 Quoted in OWEINS 2006: 95.
33 See OWEINS 2006: 94-5, who also considers the possibility of free variation. However, a non-variationist interpretation is also possible. This interpretation, which invokes pragmatic factors such as a different distribution of the informationally salient constituent, is discussed immediately below.
notion of internal object in modern Western linguistics), this element functions as a necessary part of the utterance ('umda), and therefore receives the case ending $a$. If the speaker does not place informational saliency on the piece of information ‘weak blow’, the same element functions as an optional part of the utterance (fadla), thereby receiving the case ending $\alpha$.\footnote{This notion merely serves a clarification purpose. The question whether it can be assimilated to the notion of maf'il mulaq is not relevant here. Consequently, the difference in terms of case-assignment between the Western notion of internal object, as applied here, (alternation of case-endings u/$a$) and that of maf'il mulaq (case-ending $a$ only) raises no interpretive difficulties.}

Insofar as al-Astarābāḏī worked out a semantic theory of case endings, thus departing from the formal theory of case endings that the Arab grammarians conservatively accepted and transmitted from one generation to another, we can credit him as a bearer of semantic originality in Arabic linguistic thought. His semantic originality is particularly remarkable in light of its ability to analyze certain facets of the utterance that Arabic linguistic thought traditionally takes great pains to analyze by means of its formal approach. That said, the disruption that al-Astarābāḏī represents with respect to mainstream Arabic linguistic thought should not prevent us from recognizing his continuity with it.\footnote{In Guillaume’s own words: “Il s’agit là, incontestablement d’une rupture avec ce qui est alors en usage.” (Guillaume 1998: 60).} Suffice it here to mention two facts. In first place, the notion of fadla is already found in the work by al-Mubarrad (d. 285/822).\footnote{AHMED TAHAs 2008: 100.} Secondly, and more importantly, al-Astarābāḏī himself presents his semantic theory of case endings as a development of some views held by al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822)\footnote{For instance, al-Astarābāḏī derives the semantic ‘autonomy’ of the ‘umda-constituents mubtada‘ and ḥabar (as opposed to the semantic ‘dependency’ of the fadla-constituents) from their capability of governing each other, a theoretical construct that he ascribes, among others, to al-Farrāʾ. This is apparent from the passage quoted above in connection with the notion of ‘umda: wa-kağā l-ʿāmīlu fl kullī wāḥidin min-ā l-mubtada‘ai wa-l-ḥabarī huwa l-ʿājaru ‘alā maḏhahi l-kisā‘yyi wa-l-farrāʾi ʿid kullī wāḥidin min-humā sāra umdātān bi-l-ʿājār (al-ASTARĀBĀDĪ, Šarḥ al-Kāfiyyah, i: 52).} who is well known for his strong interest in the linguistic exegesis of the Koran (cp. his huge work Maʿānī l-Qurʾān).\footnote{For instance, in this work al-Farrāʾ discusses mubtada‘s and ḥabar’s capability of governing each other, of which al-Astarābāḏī will avail himself to develop his formulation of the notion of ‘umda (cp. the locus probans mentioned in the previous fn.). See, e.g., al-FARRĀʾ, Maʿānī l-Qurʾān ii: 302: wa-qawlu-hu wa-qālati mraʿatu fī ruʿāna qurratu ‘aynīn li wa-lu-ka raʾīs at qurratu ‘aynīn bi-l-ʿīmārī huwa wa-mīhu-hu fl l-quṣūrī kaṣfūn yurfa‘u bi-l-ʿīmārī. In this passage al-Farrāʾ analyzes the words of Pharaoh’s wife reported in the Quranic verse 28:9 (“Said Pharaoh’s wife, ‘He will be a comfort to me and thee…”’; Arberry’s translation) as a mubtada‘ (i.e., qurratu ‘aynīn) that receives its $u$-ending from a covert ḥabar, i.e., ḥawa, which governs it. On the linguistic aspects of al-Farrāʾ’s Maʿānī l-Qurʾān, see also BERTONATI 1988.} The epistemological link between al-Farrāʾ and al-Astarābāḏī therefore provides the crucial indication that the semantic originality revealed by Arabic linguistic thought may possibly find its ultimate origin in the linguistic exegesis of the Koran.
Ibn Hišām and the Arabic definite article

The attentive reader will have noticed that the formal theory of case endings, just outlined in the previous section, in turn hinges on a classification of the parts of speech, namely the tripartite classification of Arabic words into noun, verb, particle (ism, fiʿl, harf). One of the tersest formulations of this classification goes back to the incipit of Šibawayhi’s Kitāb and has enjoyed great fortune up until recent times, as virtually no modern grammar of literary Arabic discounts the model of classification of Arabic words into ism, fiʿl, harf: “The words are noun, verb and particle” (fa-l-kalimu smun wa-fiʿlun wa-harf). The conservatism that pervades the Arab grammarians’ classification of parts of speech is self-evident.

To this we could add that the classification in question also entails a certain amount of formalism, as shown by the influential analysis of the particle carried out by Šibawayhi in the aforementioned incipit of his Kitāb. In this passage, in fact, he does not set out a positive semantic definition of the particle (e.g., what denotes time, place, manner etc.), preferring instead to define it negatively as what is semantically neither a noun nor a verb: “the particle that occurs to [convey] a meaning, which is neither nominal nor verbal” (harfun gāʿa li-maʾnān lāsya bi-smīn wa-lā fiʿl).

Hence, it seems safe to maintain that the formal aspect prevails over the semantic one in the analysis of the particle developed by Arabic linguistic thought from Šibawayhi onward. Concretely, the Arabic definite article is among the particles that receives an analysis of this sort as, according to a recent study by Baalbaki, even definiteness (taʿrīf), which represents its key property, is one of “the technical terms which refer to formal aspects” in the Kitāb (e.g., the position the article fulfills with respect to the noun). Such a formal (positional, etc.) analysis will also become conservative when the subsequent grammarians continue to pursue it, assigning a marginal role to the semantic properties of the Arabic definite article that they could identify, such as the latter’s reference to previous knowledge (ʿahdiyya). However, a case can be made for a semantic treatment of the Arabic definite article on the part of Ibn Hišām.

Gamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf b. Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Hišām al-Nahwī was a faqīḥ and grammarian. He was born in 708/1310 in Cairo, where he spent most of his life and died in 761/1360. As a Šaʿīʿ doctor, he became professor of Qur’anic exegesis (tafsīr) at the Qubba Mānsūriyya in Cairo. As a grammarian, he authored the treatise Muṣnī l-labīb ‘an kutub al-ʿārīb, which won the complete admiration of Ibn Ḥaldūn (d. 808/1406). This is a description of syntax arranged to start from each Arabic harf in alphabetical order. In the Muṣnī l-labīb ‘an kutub al-ʿārīb, Ibn Hišām also deals with the Arabic definite article, which he regards as an instance of particle, and provides a more fine-grained account of the aforementioned notion of ʿahdiyya by classifying it into three subnotations, namely, maʿḥūd ǧikriyyan, maʿḥūd ḍihnīyyan, maʿḥūd ḍudūriyyan.

41 BAALBAKI 2008: 173. Cp. also the beginning of this paper for the interplay between the (prevailing) formal approach and the (marginal) semantic approach in Šibawayhi’s work.
They roughly correspond to the modern linguistic constructs of textual anaphora, extra-textual anaphora, and deixis, respectively. Thus, by means of his tripartite and semantically-oriented classification of the Arabic definite article, Ibn Hišām brings forth a perspective that, because of its uniqueness within Arabic linguistic thought, is undeniably original; although this assertion must be tempered by the acknowledgement that in the same classification Ibn Hišām foregrounds a significant trait of continuity with mainstream Arabic linguistic thought. In fact, as just alluded to, Ibn Hišām takes as the departure point of his tripartite and semantically-oriented classification of the Arabic definite article the traditional (and marginal) notion of ‘ahdiyya. A dialectics between originality and continuity therefore emerges in Ibn Hišām’s linguistic thought, which constitutes a notable aspect of similarity with al-Astarābādī’s thought. Another aspect of similarity that one grammarian shares with the other is a strong background in the linguistic exegesis of the Koran—as just alluded to, Ibn Hišām was appointed professor of this discipline.

**Ibn al-Ḡattā’ and Arabic prefixation**

‘Alī b. Ğa’far b. ‘Alī al-Šantarīnī al-Sa’dī al-Ṣiqillī, also known as Ibn al-Ḡattā’, was an anthologist, historian, grammarian, lexicographer and poet, who was born in Sicily in 433/1041. In that period the island was first ravaged by civil war, then conquered by the Normans, leading him to leave Sicily in 1061. After a short stay in Andalusia, he finally settled in Egypt, where he died in 515/1121. There he circulated the Kitāb al-Qādir: 19

According to the Arabic linguistic tradition, Ibn al-Ḡattā’ is the author of two thematic glossaries (mubahwawab) devoted to the morphological patterns (‘abniya) found in the kalām al-ʿArab. While one thematic glossary, the so-called Kitāb al-ʿafāl, only deals with verbal patterns, the other, transmitted under the title Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʿasmā’ wa l-ʿafāl wa l-maṣādir, revolves more broadly around the patterns of nouns, verbs and the hybrid category they give rise to: the verbal noun (maṣdar).


44 See the end of the previous section.

45 See also the end of the previous section.

46 RIZZITANO 1986: 818-19, CAPEZIO 2015: 139-41. See also the editor ‘Abd al-Dāyīm’s Introduction to Ibn al-Ḡattā’ Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʿasmā’ wa l-ʿafāl wa l-maṣādir: 19-23 and the other contributions in this volume.

47 BAALBAKI 2014: 258-60, 264-5.
The Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir is of particular interest here because of the potential it bears in terms of semantic originality. A good indication of its general tendency to originality is its inclusion of all sorts of Arabic morphological patterns, even those not mentioned by Sībawayhi, in its collection. Moreover, the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir opts to treat the verbal noun as a self-contained object of investigation, in sharp contrast to previous works of the same genre, and in so doing relies upon a definition of verbal noun that is semantic, to the extent that it decomposes this kind of lexeme into a peculiar combination of two semantic primitives, i.e., the nominal and verbal properties (componental analysis).48 From this vantage point, the choice of pinpointing the verbal noun as a self-contained object of investigation is fairly indicative of the particular tendency to semantic originality of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir and of its author Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ. In the remainder of this section, we further corroborate the hypothesis that an original attitude to semantic originality informs the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir by means of a case study of a fundamental ingredient of Arabic morphological patterns—affixation—and, especially in the interpretation of it offered by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ in this treatise.

Within the theoretical framework of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir, affixation (ziyāda and related terms: zā’id etc.) in essence has a consonantal nature and performs the function of increasing the length of morphological patterns. The root (ʾādir) shares with affixation the same nature and function, as it manifests itself as triconsonantal, quadriconsonantal and so on. Both consonantal affixes and root consonants can co-occur with vowels when increasing the length of morphological patterns. This theoretical framework is apparent in the conceptual structure of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmā’ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir, which organizes the morphological patterns according to a criterion of increasing length of root consonants and consonantal affixes, owing much to Sībawayhi in this regard. By way of illustration, Sībawayhi mentions the morphological patterns fuʿal, faʿal, afʿal precisely in this order of increasing length, as does Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ in his Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir. What is more, the latter grammarian, like the former, makes use of the fundamental terminological pair ʾāl/zāʾid.49

Since the criterion of increasing length involves no semantic factor and revives the criterion of increasing length adopted by Sībawayhi, the theoretical framework of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir is plausibly one of the many instances of formal and conservative approach that characterize Arabic linguistic thought. This observation does not deny the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir the semantically origi-

---

48 From a textual perspective, this choice is reflected in the conceptual structure of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʾasmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir, which deserves a separate treatment to the verbal noun patterns, contrary to previous works, such as the Kitāb al-ḥarām authored by al-Zubaydī (d. 379/989). See BAALBAKI 2014: 285.

49 IBN al-QAṬṬĀʾ. Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʾasmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir: 135, 140; SĪBAYAWHI. Kitāb, iv: 242-245. For simplicity’s sake, the terminological pair ʾāl/zāʾid is rendered here as root/affix in the wake of BAALBAKI 2002: 1. This terminological pair is effectively part and parcel of a broader lexical set, which also includes ziyāda (affixation) muẓād (affixed) etc. See, e.g., IBN al-QAṬṬĀʾ, Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʾasmāʾ wa’l-afāl wa’l-maṣādir: 92, 109. But cp. also LARCHER 1995, who brings solid arguments in favor a more accurate translation—and conceptualization—of the terminological pair ʾāl/zāʾid.
nal character we have alluded to immediately above and is instead meant to highlight the aspects of continuity that this treatise instantiates along with its aspects of originality.

Returning to the comparison between the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asāmā’ wa l-’afāl wa l-mašādīr and the Kitāb, a closer look at the passages that expound the morphological pattern fu’ul reveals a certain difference between the two treatises. While Sībawayhi exemplifies the morphological pattern fu’ul by means of the word ġumud without explaining the latter’s meaning, Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ supplements Sībawayhi’s example with the gloss ‘name of a mountain’ (ism gābat).50

Insofar as this gloss helps to elucidate the meaning of the word ġumud and is not found in Sībawayhi’s work, it can qualify as a sort of semantic originality on the part of Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ. However, the semantic originality under scrutiny is not as crucial, given that it is not original to Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ: the practice of glossing obscure words, the meaning of which Sībawayhi omitted to record, is typical of the genre of thematic glossary to which the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asāmā’ wa l-’afāl wa l-mašādīr belongs.51 It is also worth noting that the semantically-oriented practice of glossing obscure words mainly arose and developed in the milieu of the linguistic exegesis of the Koran, as evidenced by the type of thematic glossary traditionally known as gārib al-Qurʾān.52 It follows that the original glosses that Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ associates with the morphological patterns in the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asāmā’ wa l-’afāl wa l-mašādīr lack conceptual originality yet bear testimony, again (cp. the two previous sections), to an epistemological link between semantic originality in Arabic linguistic thought and the background of linguistic exegesis of the Koran.

On the other hand, a major trait of semantic originality that we can in all likelihood fully ascribe to Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ alone emerges from a careful examination of a passage of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-’asāmā’ wa l-’afāl wa l-mašādīr, drawn from its chapter on affixes (Bāb ḥurūf al-zawāʿid).53 The passage in question describes the w-affix as follows: “w can be inserted within a noun or a verb, but not in first position, except for the [expression of] oath; it can be inserted within them in second position, as in kawāṭ” (wa l-wāwu tulḥaqi fi

51 BAALBAKI 2014: 60. In principle, we can hypothesize that Sībawayhi omitted to record the meaning of ġumud since it was a toponym well-known to him and to the educated people of his time; and that, on the contrary, Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ felt the need to expound the meaning of the same word as, centuries later after Sībawayhi, it had become incomprehensible to Ibn al-Qāṭṭāʾ himself and to his educated audience. However, textual research militates against this hypothesis. The early lexicographer Abū ’Ubayda (d. 209/824), who died about thirty years after Sībawayhi, glosses precisely the word ġumud as the name of a mountain located in Najd under the sphere of influence of the Banū Naṣr tribe, which plausibly shows that this word was already obscure in Sībawayhi’s time. Abū ’Ubayda’s gloss, which had been transmitted by the geographer Yāqūt (d. 626/1229), reads as follows: al-ġumudu bi-ḍammatayni qaṭṭa abā ’ubaydata ḥaww gābalan li-banī nāṣrīn bi-naṣād (cp. YĀQŪT, Mu’gām al-Buldān, ii: 161). See also BAALBAKI 2014: 19, 165 for further information about Abū ’Ubayda. However, it is also worth pointing out that the different kinds of linguistic analysis carried out by Sībawayhi and Abū ’Ubayda (nahu and lugha, respectively), might have plausibly influenced the absence vs. the presence of glosses associated with nominal patterns and related words such as fu’ul and ġumud.
52 BAALBAKI 2014: 63.
53 IBN al-QAṬṬĀʾ, Kitāb ‘abniyat al-‘asāmā’ wa l-‘afāl wa l-mašādīr: 99.

The passage of the Kitâb that describes the same affix differs markedly from the previous page in that it does not admit the occurrence of w in first position, i.e., as an affix that can occur at the beginning of a noun or verb: “regarding w, it can be inserted in second position, as in ḥawqal” (ammâ l-wâwu fa-tuzâdu ūniyatan fî ḥawqal).

In essence this difference boils down to the interpretation of the expression of oath, which in the variety of Arabic investigated by Sibawayhi and Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ frequently takes on the form of a string wa, as in wa-llâhi lâ af’alu. On the one hand, Sibawayhi purports that wa is a sort of variant of the particle bi, underscoring two syntactic properties of this expression of oath. First, wa has the ability to co-occur with the name Allâh, just like the particle bi does. Second, wa has the ability to assign genitive, just as the particle bi does. In Sibawayhi’s own words: “the bā’ [that assigns] genitive serves to join and connect [words] […] and the wo used for the expression of oath fulfills the role of the bā’” (wa-bā’u l-ḏârri inna-mâ hiya li-l-izāq wa’l-ṯâlithâti wa’l-wâwu llâtî takûnu li-l-qasami bi-manzilatā l-bâ’). In sum, due to its focus on two syntactic properties of wa, which involve no semantic factors (co-occurrence, genitive-assignment), Sibawayhi’s analysis of wa is formal.

On the other hand, it can be argued that Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s affixal analysis of wa, which we have just illustrated, is semantically-oriented. The argument is built as follows. First, as discussed at the end of the Introduction, from Sibawayhi onward the affix that performs the function of ilhâq is combined with a pure morphological pattern, as is the case for jaw’al (cp. kawâr), or fa’wal (cp. ḍadwal). Second, the affixal wa that co-occurs with the name Allâh (e.g., wa-llâhi lâ af’alu) is not combined with a pure morphological pattern, but with a morphological pattern plus the article al (cp. the string Al in Allâh). On these grounds, this instance of wa must perform a function other than ilhâq. Third, as discussed at the end of the Introduction, from Sibawayhi onward the only other function, besides ilhâq, assigned to the affix by even the formal approach of Arabic linguistic thought is semantic. Hence, by exclusion, the affixal wa that co-occurs with the name Allâh performs a semantic function: in this case, that of conveying the meaning of oath.

A semantically-oriented analysis along these lines, which is culled from Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s twofold characterization of the w-affix as word-initial and related to oath (i.e., wa), appears to stand as an interesting trait of originality within Arabic linguistic thought. It is very instructive in this regard that three centuries after Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s death and beyond, both the erudite works al-‘lqâin fî ‘ulûm al-Qur’ân, authored by al-Suyû티 (d. 911/1505), and Tâq al-‘Arîs, authored by al-Zâbîdî (d. 1205/1790), provide thorough and exhaustive reviews of the several interpretations associated with the string wa in all of its contexts of occurrence, yet neither of them mentions Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’’s analysis of wa in terms of an affix when they

55 Sibawayhi, Kitâb, iv: 237.
57 Sibawayhi, Kitâb, iv: 217.
discuss the instance of \textit{wa} that expresses oath.\textsuperscript{58} The only analysis referred to in this connection by al-Suyūṭī and al-Zabīdī is that of Sībawayhi, as is easily gleaned from a simple comparison between his definition of the \textit{wa} that expresses oath, which we have immediately above, and their definitions of the same instance of \textit{wa}. Thus, al-Suyūṭī asserts that “the \textit{wa} that expresses oath is a genitive-assigner” (\textit{fa l-ğarratu wāwū l-qasam}).\textsuperscript{59} Likewise, al-Zabīdī states that “the \textit{wa} that expresses oath is an alternant of \textit{bi}” (\textit{wāwū l-qasamī ... badalun min al-bā}).\textsuperscript{60}

What is more, at the beginning of the chapter forty-one of his grammatical treatise al-Muzhir \textit{fi 'ulām al-luğā wa-anwâ'ī-hā} al-Suyūṭī explicitly mentions the treatise \textit{Kitāb 'abniyat al-'asmā} wa l-'afāl wa l-masādir, in which Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ analyzes the \textit{wa}-affix as word-initial and related to oath (i.e., \textit{wa})\textsuperscript{61} and yet in the same work al-Suyūṭī refrains from mentioning this analysis by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ.\textsuperscript{62} It is of the utmost importance to note at this point that the failure to mention Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s affixal and semantically-oriented analysis of the \textit{wa} that expresses oath on the part of al-Suyūṭī and al-Zabīdī cannot necessarily be ascribed to their ignorance of the morphological work of the Sicilian grammarian. On the one hand, as we have just observed, in the \textit{Muzhir \textit{fi 'ulām al-luğā wa-anwâ'ī-hā} al-Suyūṭī explicitly and copiously cites Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s \textit{Kitāb ‘abniyat al-'asmā} wa l-'afāl wa l-

\textsuperscript{58} The lack of an analysis of \textit{wa} in terms of a word-initial affix in al-Suyūṭī’s and al-Zabīdī’s work is regarded here as a sort of \textit{qualitative} evidence of the original nature of such an analysis on the part of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ (in the sense that this kind of evidence focuses on how al-Suyūṭī and al-Zabīdī used to deal with the body of knowledge elaborated on by their predecessors, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ included). It would be also possible to provide \textit{quantitative} evidence to the same effect. The gist of the proposal is to study the grammatical literature between Sībawayhi’s \textit{Kitāb} and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s treatise to ascertain whether the Sicilian grammarian really developed an original analysis or took it from one of his predecessors. The scope of this paper prevents a thorough presentation of this kind of quantitative evidence. However, quantitative evidence of this sort is at least in part implied by the qualitative evidence adduced in this study. In fact, the tendency to encyclopedism and erudition on the part of the possible analyses of \textit{wa} (qualitative evidence), they had to check and peruse the grammatical literature between Sībawayhi’s \textit{Kitāb} and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s treatise (quantitative evidence), included those works that are lost to us. For instance (see BAALBAKI 2014: 86-7), in the treatise al-Muzhir \textit{fi ‘ulām al-luğā wa-anwâ’ī-hā} (i: 453, ii: 275-6, 289) al-Suyūṭī takes extracts from the \textit{Kitāb al-Nawādīr} authored by Yūnus Ibn Habīb (d. 182/798), one of Sībawayhi’s teachers, who is also mentioned by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ among the sources of his treatise (see \textit{IBN al-QAṬṬĀʾ}, \textit{Kitāb ‘abniyat al-'asmā} wa l-'afāl wa l-masādir: 90).

\textsuperscript{59} al-SUYÛTÎ, al-'Iṣqân fi ‘ulām al-Qurˈân, ii: 303.

\textsuperscript{60} al-ZaBÎDÎ, Tāṣ al-'arîs, xl: 520 (s.v. al-wāw al-mufrada).

\textsuperscript{61} The locus probans is the following: ḡikrū ‘abniyat al-'asмā’i wa-haṣrī-hā qāla aḥā l-ğāsimī al-tiyān-i bni gağiʕara l-sa’dīyyu l-ṣuľğīyuu l-ma’rīf bi-bni l-quaṭṭī fī kitābī ‘l-abmiyāḥ (al-SUYÛTÎ, al-Muzhir fi ‘ulām al-luğā wa-anwâ’ī-hā, ii: 4). In this passage, the Kitāb al-abniya al-Tiṣāni the Egyptian polymath refers to is precisely the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-'asмā’ wa l-'afāl wa l-masādir, as is inferred from the very phrase ‘abmiyāḥ al-'asмā’ in the section heading ḡikr ‘abniyat al-'asмā’.

\textsuperscript{62} See al-SUYÛTÎ, al-Muzhir fi ‘ulām al-luğā wa-anwâ’ī-hā, ii: 10-12. In this passage, the Egyptian polymath includes ‘t, y, m and even h, but not w, among the word-initial affixes (i.e., prefixes): al-maḍīdī min-a l-ṭuğīyyī gīrū l-muḍa‘āfī min-hū mā tulīq-i hy ziyādatun wāḥidatun qabla l-fā’i ‘alā waqīnī a-fal [...] wa ‘alā tu-fal wa-ha qāfūn [... ] wa ‘alā wā-fal [...] wa ‘alā na-fal [...] wa ‘alā mā-fal [...] fa-amūnī ziyādat l-hā qabla l-fā’i fa-nāf-hū ba’ād-hum [...] fa-aṣbata-hu ba’ād-hum fa-qāla yağī’ta ‘alā hīja’t hizabr [...] wa-qabla l-aynī ‘alā fā’il. 
maṣādir, in which such an affixal and semantically oriented analysis is found. On the other hand, al-Zabīdī’s dictionary contains several loci probantes, which quote this work of Ibn al-Ḳattā’i. To begin with, al-Zabīdī’s refers to Ibn al-Ḳattā’i as the source of some obsolete words recorded in the Tāq al-ʿarīs, such as qartama and qarṣama, and the editors of this dictionary cite passages of the Kitāb al-ʿafāl by Ibn al-Ḳattā’i, in which the latter effectively mentions the same words. More to the point, in the Tāq al-ʿarīs al-Zabīdī considers an extract from the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʿasmā’ wa ʾl-ʿafāl wa l-maṣādir itself and locates it with accuracy “at the end (fī dāhir)” of the treatise in question. This kind of intertextuality plausibly shows that al-Zabīdī was familiar with Ibn al-Ḳattā’i’s treatises, Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʿasmā’ wa ʾl-ʿafāl wa l-maṣādir included.

To summarize the main results of this section, a first examination of the Kitāb ‘abniyat al-ʿasmā’ wa ʾl-ʿafāl wa l-maṣādir seemingly reveals an appreciable tendency on the part of Ibn al-Ḳattā’i toward semantically-oriented originality, which is plausibly rooted in the milieu of the linguistic exegesis of the Koran (cp. his practice of glossing obscure words, e.g., ḡumud). The most conspicuous instance of an originality of this kind is his treatment of w as a word-initial affix wa, provided as such with the meaning of oath. This semantic originality is to a certain extent due to Ibn al-Ḳattā’i, as both his predecessors (Ṣibawayhi) and successors (al-Suyūṭī, al-Zabīdī) reject an interpretation of w as a word-initial affix wa.
and/or subscribe to a formal interpretation of *wa*, which denies the latter a semantic content in its function as a word-initial affix, instead regarding it as a genitive-assigning particle.

**Conclusions**

This paper has plausibly substantiated the hypothesis that Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ can be considered, along with the perhaps most famous grammarians al-Astarābāḏī and Ibn Hišām, as one of the few bearers of semantic originality in the context of medieval Arabic linguistic thought, as is shown by the construct of a word-initial and meaningful affix *w*(a). Such a construct is seemingly absent in Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb*, whereas Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ posits it and identifies it with the so-called *wāw al-qasam*. This paper also stresses the point that the traits of semantic originality introduced into Arab linguistic thought by al-Astarābāḏī, Ibn Hišām and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ share a common epistemological aspect: they possibly find their ultimate origin in the milieu of the linguistic exegesis of the Koran. Further research is needed to acquire a better understanding of how, on the whole, the original aspects of the semantic approach pursued by al-Astarābāḏī, Ibn Hišām and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ position themselves within the historical development of Arabic linguistic thought, which witnessed at least three stages—early, or formative, classical, and late, or post-classical. At the current research stage it seems safer to maintain that the semantically-oriented approach co-existed with the formal approach since the beginnings of Arabic linguistic thought, albeit in an implicit or embryonic form, so the original character of Late grammarians such as al-Astarābāḏī, Ibn Hišām and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ lies mainly in their efforts to make the semantically-oriented approach more explicit and central.
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The Maǧmūʿa min šiʿr al-Mutanabbī wa-ġawāmiḍihī by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ al-Ṣiqilli: A Morphological and Lexical Analysis*
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Abstract
The Maǧmūʿa min šiʿr al-Mutanabbī wa-ġawāmiḍihī, the ‘Collection of some verses of al-Mutanabbī and its unclear points’, composed by the renowned Sicilian grammarian ‘Alī b. Ğarfār Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ (d. 515/1121 A.D.) was edited for the first time by Umberto Rizzitano in 1955 and then by Muḥsin Ġayyāḍ in 1977, but it has never been studied from a morphological and lexical point of view. This paper sets out to assess the contribution of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ to grammatical and philological studies in the Siculo-Andalusi context. In particular, this study focuses on some morphological issues presented by the Sicilian Grammarian, such as ilḥāq (BAALBAKI 2002, 2008), taḥfīf (BAALBAKI 2008), the structures of the demonstrative pronouns and the ismu l-fāʿil. Moreover, some verses of which Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ gives a lexical/semantic commentary will be analyzed. To highlight Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ’s contribution to grammatical theory, the excerpts proposed will be compared to Ibn Ğinnī and al-Iffīli’s commentaries on al-Mutanabbī’s poems.

Keywords: Arabic Grammatical Theory, Arabic Linguistics, Morphology, Lexicon, Sicily, al-Andalus

The treatise
The Maǧmūʿa min šiʿr al-Mutanabbī wa-ġawāmiḍihī by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ (d. 515/1121) is a grammatical commentary to thirty-five verses composed by al-Mutanabbī (d. 354/965). In it, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ focuses on some morphological and syntactical issues that are central to the debate among Arab contemporary and later grammarians. Nevertheless, the work has been overshadowed by the famous Kitāb al-ʾafʿāl (The book of verbs) and Kitāb ‘abniyāt al-ʾasmaʾ (The book of the pattern of nouns). The Maǧmūʿa was neglected for a long time to the point that it was mentioned for the first time by Ibn al-Qifṭī (d. 646/1248) in his famous work Inbāḥ al-ruwāt ‘alā anbāḥ al-nuḥāḥ (Information of the Narrators on Renowned Grammarians) (ḠAYYĀḌ 1977: 239), about a century after its composition. Umberto Rizzitano was the first to show some interest for the work in 1955. This scholar, in fact,

* I would like to thank Mirella Cassarino and Antonella Ghersetti for inviting me to contribute with this study to the present monographic dossier of JAIS and for reading these pages. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and Dr Fouad Omeghras for helping me to properly understand some verses. Any imprecision, however, is my own responsibility.

1 On this see GRANDE’s contribution in this monographic dossier.
published the edition, preceded by a brief introduction in which he gave some information about the unique code, the manuscript n. 27 ṣīn naḥw, kept in the Dār al-kutub of Cairo (RIZZITANO 1955: 208), which probably contains about two thirds of the work. Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a learned the poems of al-Mutanabbī by oral transmission from his master Ibn al-Bīr ʿr al-Ṣiqillī (who lived between the X and the XI century, see RIZZITANO online) who, in his turn, received them orally from his master Ibn Rīḍīn, one of the main representatives of the Mutanabbian school in Egypt (RIZZITANO 1955: 208; ĠAYYĀḌ 1977: 239). Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a based his commentary on the works of Ibn Ṣinnā (d. 392/1002), of which he often cites verbatim entire passages, al-ʻIfīlī (d. 441/1050) and al-Wāḥīdī (d. 468/1076) (RIZZITANO 1955: 208).

In 1977, Muḥṣin Ġayyāḍ published a new edition of the Mağmū‘a, with the title Šarḥ al-muškil min šī‘r al-Mutanabbī, ‘Commentary of the obscure verses by al-Mutanabbī’. According to Ġayyāḍ, the work is part of a collection also containing a little book of grammar, the Šifā‘ al-mařīd fī aḥyāt al-qařīd, ‘Curing the sick through poetry’, that is seven folios long and bears the signature of Šaraf al-Dīn ʿAmad b. ʿUṭmān al-Sanġārī, born in 625/1227. Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a’s commentary occupies four folios. According to Ġayyāḍ, the thirty-five verses presented in the work are a selection by al-Sanģārī himself who was a grammarian too (ĠAYYĀḌ 1977: 239). In fact, Ġayyāḍ’s edition includes another sixty-seven verses by Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a transmitted by the pseudo al-ʻUkbarī (d. 616/1219) in his Dīwān Abī Ṭāyīyīb al-Mutanabbī al-musammā bī l-tibyān fī šarḥ al-dīwān (The Dīwān of Abī Ṭāyīyīb al-Mutanabbī called clarification regarding the explanation of the dīwān).²

Aims and methodology

The purpose of this paper is to present the analysis, as far as we know carried out here for the first time, of the grammatical commentary by Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a edited by Rizzitano,³ to highlight the author’s grammatical thought. In particular, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a’s commentary of al-Mutanabbi’s verses dealing with morphological and lexical issues will be presented here.⁴

In order to try to identify a possible common ground with the Andalusian Grammatical tradition, the excerpts chosen will be compared with those taken from the Tafsīr šī‘r Abī Ṭāyīyīb al-Mutanabbī by al-ʻIfīlī (the only Andalusian grammerian who authored a commentary of Mutanabbi’s verses), that Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a uses as a source, according to Rizzitano. In his Commentary, al-ʻIfīlī devotes special attention to the lexicon and to the garīb used by al-Mutanabbi, and passes then to the establishment of the general meaning of the verses (HINDI HASSAN, vol. 2: 39). His main source is the commentary by Ibn Ṣinnā. The Tafsīr

² This work has been edited by Kamāl ṬĂLĪB in Bayrūt, Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmīyya in 1998. Abū l-Baqā‘ ʿAbd Allāh Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-ʻUkbarī has been considered by the tradition as the author of the Tibyān fi šarḥ al-dīwān, but many scholars, starting from Blachère, highlighted this false attribution and indicated some other grammarians as the alleged authors of the work (see DIEZ 2009: LIV).

³ The verses by Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘a edited by ĠAYYĀḌ will be the object of a forthcoming publication. Note that Ġayyāḍ never mentions RIZZITANO’s pioneering work in his edition: neither in the introduction nor among the sources he used for his study.

⁴ The Syntactic issues will be the subject of a forthcoming publication.
šiʿr Abī Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī made al-Iflīlī famous. Philologist, teacher of Arabic grammar and man of letters, he was born in Cordoba in 352/963 the offspring of a family that was native to Syria. In his Commentary to the verses of al-Mutanabbī, every line is paraphrased in a succinct way and every poem is preceded by an introduction about the circumstances that led to its composition (PELLAT online). This Andalusian grammarian mentions the verses in chronological order and not, as usual, according to the alphabetical order of the rhymes (HINDI HASSAN, vol. 2: 39).

The Tafsīr was published in 1996 by Muṣṭafā ‘Alayyān in Beirut and, excepting for the unpublished doctoral thesis by Mohamed Hindi Hassan (1989) who gives the critical edition of the work based on one of the available manuscripts (HINDI HASSAN 1989: 30), it has never been studied.

It has, then, been neglected despite the fact that contemporary and later grammarians held the Tafsīr in very high esteem. Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), for example, in his Risāla fī fadl al-Andalus, mentions al-Iflīlī’s Tafsīr as an excellent work and the first commentary to al-Mutanabbī’s poetry appeared in al-Andalus. Ibn Ḥazm also wrote a Taʿaqqub ‘note’ to al-Iflīlī’s commentary (MOHEDANO BARCELÓ 2004: 517).

The Tafsīr is relevant especially from a methodological point of view since the author explains how to approach the commentary of a poetic work.

The main source of al-Iflīlī has been Ibn Ḥāznī’s Fasr šarḥ al-Mutanabbī, although he mentions some other grammarians such as Abū ʿAlī al-Ṣiqillī (d. 392/1001). al-Iflīlī is considered as one of the pioneers of this genre of work in al-Andalus (vol 3: 517-518) and he actually contributed, together with his master Abū Bakr al-Zubaydī (d. 379/989), to the constitution of the core of the philological and literary studies in Cordova and in al-Andalus (MOHEDANO BARCELÓ 2004: 517) to the point that his Commentary deeply influenced the work of later Andalusian grammarians (MOHEDANO BARCELÓ 2004: 518).

The excerpts of Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ī’s Maǧmūʿa and of al-Iflīlī’s Tafsīr have also been compared to those taken from Ibn Ḥāznī’s Fasr since both, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ī and al-Iflīlī, at times, cite it more or less verbatim. Besides, the passages in which Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ī, openly or otherwise, refutes the thesis of Ibn Ḥāznī, who represents the Classical Arabic Grammatical tradition, have been underlined in order to verify if and in which way Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ī’s grammatical theories are set against it or not.

Al-Mutanabbi’s verses will be given below together with their English translation by Wormhoudt or Arberry. Then, the English translation of the commentaries of Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’ī, Ibn Ḥāznī and al-Iflīlī will be given followed by my analysis.

---

5 Ibn Ḥāznī has written two commentaries: the Fasr: šarḥ Ibn Ḥāznī al-kabīr (The Clarification: the great commentary of Ibn Ḥāznī) and the Fath al-wahhāb `alā muškilāt al-Mutanabbi, edited by Ḥayyād in 1973, which is the abridged version of the Fasr.

6 Note that the words in squares, mainly concerning translations from Arabic, have been added to clarify the text. Bracketed words, instead, are implicit in the Arabic text and have been added to make the meaning of the comment explicit.
1 Morphology

1.1 Ilḥāq (Adjonction)

Qaṣida Bādin ḥawāka sabartā am lam tašbirā, ‘Your yearning is apparent, whether you show fortitude or not’ (ARBERRY, 2009: 128), metre kāmil, rawā rāʾ

He gelds the stallion warriors by staining saffron the steel they wear (ARBERRY, 2009: 130)

Gelded stallion warriors have his saffron dye whatever they wear as armor (WORMHOUDT 2002: 493)

Ḫanṭā, a group of them is ḥanṭā ‘hermaphrodite’. The hermaphrodite is the one who has something of the man and something of the woman. Muḥanṭā ‘weak person’ derives from al-inḥināt (becoming or being effeminate) that indicates the weakness, the double and the weak.

You say ḥanaṭa l-say’u when something becomes weak. Ḫanṭā is a perfect tense verb whose pattern is faʿala like dakhrağa and its aṣl (origin, root) is ḥantaṭa. They hated the union of what is double (that is the two ʾā) and they changed (badalāt) the second letter with alif. Similar examples are anẓā, ḥanṭā, ḥanḍā and ʿandā. If they hear the [double] hated letter, they suppress it. They changed double letters with alif like in taqaddā, albāzá, qassā, afārah and tazannā. These letters are: the first, the second and the third radical of faʿala. Regarding the first radical, it is like saying dirād, about an old she-camel, in it the fāʾ is repeated because of ilḥāq in the word ṣalīn which is the aṣl of everything. With respect to the second radical, they said: Ḥadrād is a man name in which the ʿayn is repeated because of ilḥāq such as in Ḥaʿfar. Regarding the third radical, they said: in qaʿduḏ the dāl is repeated because of ilḥāq such as in ṣurṭan. The grammarians also have stated that in Yahyā and muḥnā [the alif] is present because of ilḥāq and that in ṣardāw and ṣalwā it is a mark of feminine gender. After that, they contradicted themselves by saying: the alif in ṣaḥmā, ʿazhā and qaḥtarā is a feminine gender mark and is not due to ilḥāq. This is a corrupted discourse that has no need to be proved. They often fell in the error of thinking that the Arabs agreed on the union of two feminine gender marks. They said: in ṣaḥmā, ʿalqāh, ʿizhāh and qaḥtarāḥ (feminine gender) it is not acceptable to combine two feminine marks and the Arabs have done so in the majority of their discourses. And they did so because of their approximation and to teach what has no
This verse is dedicated to Ibn al-ʿAmīd. Here, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ focuses on the word ḥanṭā. In the first paragraph of his commentary, he considers it a substantive and states: “its plural is ḥanṭā and its meaning is ‘the one who has something of the man and something of the woman’, that is hermaphrodite”. Besides, he adds “muḥṣannaṭ—to be effeminate or weak—is taken from al-inḥīnāt—effeminacy or laxness—that is weakness, being double and without strength” so, the term is referred to something which is weak and without any strength.

In this case, the verse by al-Mutanabbi can be translated as follows: “Some of the stallions, from the courageous men, are effeminate/hermaphrodite because of the saffron dyeing of the armour they wear”. In fact, in Ibn Sīda’s commentary we read (see almutanabbi.com): fa-yaqūlu: sayyara al-fuḥūl min al-kumāti ināṭan, bi-ṣīḥgati mā yalbasūna min al-durū’i wa’l-ḡawāṣin wa’l-baydu bi’l-damm, ‘some of the stallions, from the courageous men, have become effeminate because of the dying of their armour and helmet with blood. (My translation)’.

In the second paragraph, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ considers the word ḥanṭā as a past tense verb of pattern fa’lala like dahrağa, that has been deprived of one of its two ʾay, that gave to the verb a certain heaviness ‘ṭiqal’ (BAALBAKI 2002: 22). The second /t/ underwent, therefore, substitution (iḥdāl) with alif maqṣūra. This fact, when it occurs in final word position, gives, in fact, lightness to the verbs, that are already considered by Arab grammarians as heavy, unlike nouns that are considered as lighter (BAALBAKI 2002: 22). Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ mentions some other similar verbs such as ‘anṭā, hanṭā, ḥandā and ‘andā. The phenomenon involved here is the ʾilḥāq which is a derivational process by attachment “that appends (yulḥiq) one morphological form to another” (BAALBAKI 2002: 1).

According to the Arab grammatical tradition, it is possible to obtain a new term by ʾilḥāq in two ways: the first one is by doubling a segment of the verb, the second one is by inserting a new letter that has to be placed in the same position of the one that has been substituted. The term ḥanṭā belongs to the second kind. Nonetheless, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ states that lexicographers and linguists only accept the first way of creating a word by ʾilḥāq, that is by doubling a ʾharf asliya. The first method, in fact, is productive: any poet that needs it can double the last consonant and obtain a term of pattern fa’lala. The kind of ʾilḥāq by infixation, instead, is not productive and cannot be freely used, but it is necessary to use the appended words already available and admitted by the grammarians (BAALBAKI 2008: 150-151).

Moreover, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ criticises the statement of some grammarians—he does not name them—according to whom alif in buhmā ‘barley-grass’ (Lane 1863: 268-269), ‘izhā ‘ignoble man’ (see Kazimirski 1860: 247) and qa’bāţarā ‘grand animal’ (Kazimirski 1860: 664) is not of the feminine nor of ʾilḥāq. Discussing the words belonging to the second group, buhmā, qa’bāţarā, ʾulqāḥ ‘a kind of plant’ (Kazimirski 1860: 345) and ʾizhāḥ (beṣma and ʿifṣara) Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ affirms that some grammarians mistakenly inter-

---

7 RIZZITANO’s edition of the Mağmūʿa, in this text, will be indicated with the abbreviation IQ.

interpreted alif maqsūra and tā’ marbūta as two marks of the feminine gender, which is not allowed in fūṣḥā. According to Baalbaki (2002: 14), qa’batārā is an augmented quinqueliteral that is problematic since the grammarians did not find a six-letter-word to which they could append it. The final alif is not explainable as the mark of feminine gender, because the term has the tanwīn and a feminine variant of the word having it exists. For these reasons, the alif maqsūra can only be explained as a result of the phenomenon of takfīr al-kalima ‘augment of enlargement’ (BAALBAKI 2002: 18). This solution solves the problem of the limit of the process of ilhāq that cannot be applied to quinqueliterals. Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’, however, does not mention the phenomenon of takfīr al-kalima (BAALBAKI 2002: 18).

Ibn Ḥinnī, (AHMAD 1984, vol. 2: 315) states:

Hanţahum means that he made them effeminate when he dyed their iron armours with their red blood. You say ħanīṭa l-rağulu, the man is effeminate, yaḥnaţu, ḥanāţu, when something breaks and bends: tāhannaţa l-ţīlīdu, when [the skin] bends. You say humūţan of a woman who is tender and sweet and miḥnāţun has the same meaning. al-Ḥantā is the one similar to a woman for weakness and fragility; this term derives from ḥantā, the one who has what belongs to the woman and to the man. In the ḥadīṯ, the ihtināţ is forbidden, that is to turn the mouth of the skin outwards and to drink this way. When you double it inwards you say al-qab’u e qaba’tu l-ṣif’u (for the translation of this passage see LANE, vol 1: 814). al-Kumāţu is the plural of kāmīyyun, who fights with his own arms. You say hūwa yakmī a’dan, that is he beats them and defeats them. Another plural is akumā’un.

Al-Ifliī (‘ALAYĀN 1996, vol. 4: 171) only gives the explanation of the meaning of the verse:

The hermaphrodite is the one who has something of the man and something of the woman. And al-kumāţ are the courageous ones, and one is kāmīyyun. Al-mu’āsfar, the yellow colour of the garments, is what is dyed red or something similar. Hanţā al-fuhūl min al-kumāţ means: it made them like the hermaphrodites because of their inability to fight, their weakness in spearing [the enemy], because of the blood they made flow on the armours they defend themselves with and the instruments they are able to use. They make it yellow with their blood that flows and protect it with what drips from their wounds.

The phenomenon of ilhāq is not analysed neither by Ibn Ḥinnī nor by al-Ifliī in the comments mentioned above, nor is the term ilhāq overtly used by them. As concerns Ibn Ḥinnī, in his Sirr sinā‘at al-ţrāb ‘The secret of the art of the inflection’ (1993: 691), though mentioning some examples of ilhāq, usually prefers the use of the word ziyāda, which refers to augmented letters, in opposition to asl, which refers to the letters belonging to the root of the word (BAALBAKI 2002: 2). The grammarian never devotes a whole chapter to the phenomenon in none of his works, but, at times, he mentions some rules concerning, for instance, augmented letters involved in ilhāq, which patterns can be considered examples of ilhāq and which ones are inadmissible, and the limits of the phenomenon in presence of iḍgām (see IBN ḤINNĪ 1913: 74-76 and IBN YĀTĪS 1973: 65, 127-130, for iḍgām: 453. See also BAALBAKI 2002: 5, 10, 20).
Al-Iflīlī seems to be interested by a few grammatical issues such as the use of some particles and conjunctions like illā, mūḏ, munḏu, an and fa-, enclitic pronouns and apocope of the triliteral noun, (HASSAN 1989: 42-44). Ilḥāq does not seem to be among the phenomena dealt with in al-Iflīlī’s treatise.

In general, as Baalbaki states, Arab grammarians, and especially early grammarians, dedicated a little space to the rules of ilḥāq in their works about morphology.\(^9\)

1.b Monoliteral particle bi- and taḥfīf

*Qasīda Husāšatu nafsīn wadda’at yawma wadda’ū* ‘A bit of soul departed the day they went’ (WORMHOUT 2002: 33), metre ṯawīl, ṯawī ‘ayn

By my heart, it was she whose spirit came to me in darkness while the carefree slept (WORMHOUT 2002: 33)

The bā’ is connected to a hidden verb, that is *afdihā*: ‘I ransom her with what is between my lungs’, that is my soul. It was said: he meant: she wants to ask for the death of my spirit that is between my lungs” (IQ: 211). The letter bi-, here, has not a morphologic function, but a syntactic one since it is linked to a *muḍmar* verb.\(^10\)

Ibn Ğinnī (AHMAD 1984, vol. 2: 354) states:

My heart is my soul; al-ḍayāǧīǧ means night darkness, its singular is ḍayāǧūǧ and its *aṣl* is ḍayāǧūǧ, but they lightened the word by eliding the ǧīm at the end of the word. A similar example is makkūkūn, plural makākī. You can say tadaǧdaǧa al-ḥaylu when it gets darker and darker.


God made my soul, that is between my lungs, the ransom of my lover who appeared to me, while I was dreaming, in the night darkness, when the ones who do not love sleep. The *aṣl* of al-ḍayāǧīǧ, (the night darkness) is ḍayāǧūǧ, but they lightened the word by eliding the last ǧīm (on taḥfīf see, Baalbaki 2008, p. 59-62) and they made the ya’ necessarily quiescent. The two phrases of the verse are contradictory; [the poet] assured that he fell asleep with his passion (though being in love), but he de-

\(^9\) “The later grammarians were well-disposed toward assigning to ilḥāq an ultimate purpose that would justify its existence as an independent phenomenon. In this respect, it seems that they wanted to surpass the earlier grammarians, who merely stated that the ziyaḍa of ilḥāq appends one word to another […] and did not go beyond this self-explanatory level to determine a more specific purpose for ilḥāq” (BAALBAKI 2002: 10).

\(^10\) The syntactic phenomenon of idmār in Ibn al-Qaṭṭāl’s *Maǧmūʿa* has been the subject of my recent communication in the Study Days ‘Circulation and transmission of Arabic grammatical thought in Sicily and in al-Andalus’ (Catania, 4-5 April 2017) whose publication is due in the next months for a Monographic dossier edited by Francesco Grande and me.
nied to the others the possibility to sleep and love at the same time. He said that others sleep because they do not love. In the line, there is no contradiction because it is possible that he fell asleep for awhile, then he saw the apparition of the lover in a dream, and he woke up during the night. The ones who do not love spend the whole night sleeping.

The three commentaries show slight differences. First of all, the Andalusian grammarian focuses on the meaning of the verse, then he concentrates on taḥḥif. So does Ibn Ḫinnī. The brief comment of Ibn al- QTestāʿ, instead, only highlights the presence of the monoliteral particle bi-, at the beginning of the line, that the grammarian attributes to an underlying verb that is afdī ‘I ransom’. He focuses on a morphological element, different from taḥḥif, which he reputes worthy of mention.

In general, verbs are concerned with the process of taḥḥif because they are considered ‘heavier’ than nouns (BAALBAKI 2008: 59), but here a noun undergoes the elision of the second of the two identical consonants. al-Ḫillī’s grammatical comment seems to depend on Ibn Ḫinnī’s Fasr. Ibn Ḫinnī, however, devotes some paragraphs to the phenomenon of taḥḥif in all of his works, although focusing mostly on taḥḥif al-harakāt and on taḥḥif al-hamza (see, for instance, IBN ḪINNĪ 1913: 339 and IBN YĀʾĪṢ 1973: 456). The term makkūkun, plural makākī, ‘drinking cup’, is also mentioned by al-Ẓahirī in his commentary (http://www.almotanabbi.com/poemPage.do?poemId=135) is a similar example in point.

1.c The demonstrative

Qaṣīda ʾAḥtaru dahmāʾa taynī yā maṭarū ‘I take the black of these two O rain (WORMHOUDT 2002: 273), metre munsārīḥ, rawī ṭā‘:

أختارُ ذُهَّاءا تَأْنِينِ يا مَطَرُ وَمنْ لَهُ في الفَضَائلِ الخيُّر

I take the black of these two O rain O you the choicest among the virtues (WORMHOUDT 2002: 273)

Meaning: O (you that are generous like the) rain, I chose the black one between these two and I also chose who has the best virtues

Sayf al-Dawla offered to al-Mutanabbī two horses, one black and one brown-red, and let him choose one of them and he improvised: ‘O (you that are generous like the) rain, I chose the black one between these two horses’. He elided hā that is for deixis, just like when you say: I chose the best between the two, ḏaynī meaning ḥāḏaynī. It was said: al-Mutanabbī answered I chose the black one and then it seemed good to him [to say] ṭaynī and made it the substitute (fa-ʿaṭla ṭaynī baṭa-lan min dahmā) of dahmā’. 11 After that, Sayf al-Dawla ordered to give him both of the horses. (IQ: 217)

11 The ʿibdāl luġawī, wich has a semantic value, will be analysed in my Syntactic study. In this case, it might be a badal al-ʿḍāb ‘permutative of recanting’ (see ESSEESY 2006: 124) since al-Mutanabbī, after choosing the black one, prefers to say that he chooses both of the horses.
Ibn Ġinnī (Ahmad 1984, vol. 2: 27) gives a very succinct comment of the verse:

I chose the black one between the two horses, o you that are similar to the rain for its abundance.

In his work al-Iflīlī (‘Alayn 1996, vol. 1: 248) states:

\[ \text{al-Ḫayru is the plural of ḥayra, ḥayra al-šay'} \text{ means the best thing. He said to Sayf al-Dawla: 'I chose the black one between these two horses.' He elided hā, that is a deictic, just like when you say at the masculine: I chose the best between the two (ḏayni) and you mean hāḏayni. His similitude with the rain concerns his abundance in generosity and his extreme altruism. He said to him: O rain, o you that have the highest degree of virtue.} \]

Ibn Ġinnī does not mention the elision of hāʾ in the demonstrative pronoun in the Fasr, but he deals with it in his al-Ḫasāʾīs, where he states that the particle hāʾ has no meaning in itself nor semantic contribution (Rabadi 2016: 21). Both Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ and al-Iflīlī, instead, devote a grammatical note to this issue. The Sicilian grammarian seems to depend, at least in part, from the Andalusian philologist, even if he adds a new element since he considers the demonstrative pronoun the substitute of dāhmāʾ.

Qaṣīda Kam qatīlin kamā qutiltu šahīdi ‘How many slain, as I was, are martyrs’ (Wormhoudt 2002: 25), metre ḥaṭṭī:

\[ \text{هَذِهُ مُهْجَتِي لَدَيِّكِ لَحِيَنِ فَانْقُصِي مِنْ غَذَابُّ} \text{ or فَزِيدي} \]

Here is my heart for you at my death, diminish its pain in me or increase it (Wormhoudt 2002: 27)

When he says hāḏihi there are two possibilities: the first one is that it indicates the word ‘muhǧatī’ (soul) that is ‘yours’ (ladaykī), referring to the meaning of the deictic. The second one is that hāḏihi is an exclamation with the elision of the exclamatory particle (yā) and ladaykī is related to the meaning of residing [at your’s] (mutaʿallīqa bi l-istiqrār). (IQ: 211)

From the comment of Ibn Ġinnī (Ahmad 1984, vol. 1: 874):

\[ \text{al-Ḫayn is death and al-ḥāʾin is the departed.} \]

From the commentary of al-Iflīlī (Hindi Hassan 1989, vol. 1: 33):

\[ \text{al-Ḫayn is death. He says: 'I found that the power on my body is yours, make of it what you desire: stop the torture or increase it.' He did not say stop haunting me because he finds the lover’s punishment pleasant. This is a kind of ġazal.} \]

Also in this verse, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ gives a brief grammatical analysis with special emphasis on the demonstrative hāḏihi. Ibn Ġinnī and al-Iflīlī focus, instead, on the meaning of the verse. The three comments appear rather different. It is not possible to state that the Andalusian grammarian and Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ depend here on Ibn Ġinnī’s Fasr.
Rain cloud, rain cloud’s son who was son of rain cloud who was son of him (WORMHOUT 2002: 167)

Meaning: like the clouds is the munificent, the son of the munificent and the son of the son (from the son to the grandfather, they are generous like the clouds that profusely pour rain)

This is the verse in which al-Mutanabbî has corrupted the language. He was wrong and repeated his error for four times: that means that all the savants agreed on the fact that it is possible to say: hatina l-matara wa’l-dam’u (it rains profusely and tears fall copiously), yahtanu, hatanan and hutūnan and the active particle is hātin. At the same time, it is possible to say hatala with lām and the active particle is ḥātil. No savant and no Arab ever said hatina, yahtanu on the pattern of ‘faʾila yaf’alu’ with the active particle hatin on the pattern faʾil. No narrator reported this point until I drew attention to it. (IQ: 215-216)

Ibn al-Qaṭṭâ does not depend on Ibn Ğinnî who does not give any grammatical comment of the active participle.

In Ibn Ğinnî’s Fāsr (AHMAD 1984, vol. 3: 684), in fact, we read:

al-ʾĀrid are the clouds and al-hatin means very rainy, that is he and his ancestors are generous like the clouds.

The grammarian (AHMAD 1984, vol. 3: 112) deals with the variants of this verb, but he does not mention its ism al-fāʾil:

You can say haṭala l-samāʾu, taḥṭilu, haṭlan and ḥatalānan or hatalat, taḥṭulu, ḥatalan and taḥṭālan or hatana, tahtinu, hatnan and tahtānan and they are the clouds pouring rain. (See also IBN ĞINNI 1913: 185)

al-Ifīlī (HINDI HASSAN 1989, vol. 3: 396) states something similar:

al-ʾĀrid are the clouds that expand and then it rains. After that, they disappear when it is the moment to do it. al-Hatin means munificent, that is he is generous, his father is generous and also his grandfather is generous.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭâ questions the pattern of the active particle of the verb indicated by al-Mutanabbî as faʾil with scriptio defectiva of /a/. He also underlines that he is the first Arab grammarian to highlight this point. The verb hatana is also included in another famous work of Ibn al-Qaṭṭâ, the Kitāb al-ʾafāl (ABĀD 1945: 343): “hatala: the teardrops and the rain fall copiously, hutūlan (is the maṣdar)” “hatana, hutūnan alternate.”
2 Verses with a lexical comment

2.a Qaṣīda Aḥyā wa-asyarū mā qāsaytu mā lā qatalā ‘I live, the easiest I suffer is deadly’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 23), metre basīṭ, rawī lām

Earth was too narrow until their fugitive thought he saw nothing yet thought it a man (WORMHOUDT 2002: 25)

(al-Mutanabbī) was asked about this verse and somebody objected: how does he see “what is not something”? “What is not something” does not exist and you cannot see what does not exist, it is a contradiction! He was answered: he meant that everything he pays attention to, he thinks it is a man. But the truth is that ‘a thing’ in this line means ‘a human being’, that is if he sees anything (different from a man) believes that it is a man searching for him and this is so, because he fears men.

In Ibn Ǧinnī (Aḥmad 1984, vol. 3: 65) we read:

Who is not used to him (al-Mutanabbī) has challenged this verse. How can you see “a nothing”? Who is not keen on this language does not become successful in it and does not understand its perfection. You and nothing are equal. They agreed on the fact that equality is possible between two things or more, just like when you say that Zayd and ‘Amr are equal. It is not possible to say Zayd is equal, but this is allowed because the people (qawm) is a group as a meaning and the synthesis of all this is: you and nothing to which you pay attention are equal. He cancelled the adjective and the substantive indicating it remained. Just like when you say: ra’ā ġayr šay’ that is, nothing to which you are interested, nothing you are thinking about.

Ibn al-Ḳaṭṭāṭ does not seem to depend on Ibn Ǧinnī who concentrates on the concept of taswiy between two things. The Sicilian grammarian, instead, highlights the expression yarā ġayr šay’ that, in his opinion, is a contradictory sentence without any sense. The word šay’, in fact, should be interpreted as meaning ‘man’ and not ‘thing’. al-Ĭflīlī’s comment is not present in the editions examined.

2.b Qaṣīda Fuʿāđun mā tusallihi l-mudāmu ‘This is a heart wine cannot console’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 101), metre wāfir, rawī mīm

Not everyone is excused as a miser nor is everyone blamed for stinginess (WORMHOUDT 2002: 101)

He says: the avaricious is not blamed for the avarice and the generous does not apologize for his avarice. (IQ: 215)
Ibn Ġinnī’s note (AHMAD 1984, vol. 3: 504) is pretty short:

(This verse) is like Abū Tammām’s line: *Li-kullin min Banī Ḥawwā’a *‘ugdrun wa-lā *‘ugdrun li-Ṭā’ī la’īm ‘Every one of the Banī Ḥawwā’a has an excuse, the vile Ṭā’ī have no excuses’.

al-Iflīlī’s comment (HINDI HASSAN 1989, vol. 2: 2018), even longer than Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ’s, is quite brief too:

Only the poor can be forgiven for his avarice and not the rich. It is supposed to mean: the noble Lord cannot be forgiven for his avarice, for spending money for him, nobleness is made by generosity. The vile cannot be blamed for his meanness because his state is given to him only by money and nothing else.

The three semantic comments are quite different, especially that of Ibn Ġinnī which is a little sparse in comparison to the others, since the grammarian only cites a poetic verse to explain al-Mutanabbī’s line.

2.c *Qaṣīda Wā ḥarra qalbāhu mimman qalbuhu šabimu ‘O hot is his heart for the cold hearted’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 315), metre basīṭ, rawī mim

إذا ترحلْت عن قومٍ وقَد قَدَروا ألاّ تُفارِقُهُم فالرَّاحِلونَ هُم

If you go from folk and they are able to not let you go, it is they who depart (WORMHOUDT 2002: 317)

The meaning of the verse is: it is them who leave. They say: I left from a place, that is I moved (*raḥaltu min al-makān, ay tanaqqaltu). I made him leave, that is I made him move and travel (*raḥhaltu ḅayrī ay naqqaltuhu). They say: this means: if you go away from a people that is able not to abandon you, then, the ones who go away from you are them.

al-ʿUkbarī (IQ: 218-219) reports:

Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʾ stated: They say: I left from a place, that is I moved (*raḥaltu min al-makān, ay tanaqqaltu). I made him leave, that is I made him move and travel (*raḥhaltu ḅayrī ay naqqaltuhu). They say: this means: if you go away from a people that are able not to abandon you, then, the ones who go away from you are them. He speaks to himself and invites Sayf al-Dawla not to blame him for his journey providing evidence in his favour. That is, if the traveller leaves a people who, though able to treat him well by supporting his desire, neglect him to the point that he leaves them, he stops giving his news to them. So, they are responsible for his leaving, they made him leave, they bothered him and expelled him. Some words of al-Ḥakīm12 have been reported: the one who did not want you is the one who keeps

12 Al-Ḥakīm is, usually, the name with which al-Mutanabbī refers to the Greek philosopher Aristotle.
you at distance and you get away from him. Ibn Wākī affirmed: this is taken from Ḥabīb’s words: wa-mā l-qafru Bālūdī l-qawā’i bāli llāfī nābat bī wa-fīhā sākinūhā hiya l-qafru, ‘what is solitude in the exterminated deserts if it is not the one that has grown up in me? And in it there are its inhabitants. It is desolation.’ (IQ: 218-219).


The man left: when he moves from his home and you made him leave. Then he added, by giving Sayf al-Dawla some information about his journey and supporting his affirmation; if the traveller leaves a people and they, though able to cure his sickness, support his desire and ignore him until he leaves them, he stops coming back to them. In this case, they expelled him and offered him, they made him leave.

Both Ibn al-Qattā’ and al-Ġfllī focus on the meaning of the verse, recited by al-Mutanabbī to explain to Sayf al-Dawla the reasons of his journey. The comment of the pseudo-‘Ukbarī seems to be taken from al-Ġfllī’s.

2.d Qaṣīda al-Qalbu al-Thamū yā ‘āgdū bi-dā‘hī ‘A heart O censurer knows its ills best’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 335), metre kāmil, ṭawī hamza

ما الخِلُّ إلا من أَوَدُّ بقلبه وأرى بطرفٍ لا يرى بسَوائِهِ

A friend is one I love only for his soul I see with an eye seeing none as his equal (WORMHOUDT 2002: 335)

It means: my best friends is only myself. It has been said: it means ‘my true friend is only the one whose affection is deep as if he loved with my heart and saw through my eyes. (IQ: 219)

Ibn Ğinnī (AHMAD 1984, vol. 1: 43-46), after mentioning the synonyms of the word ‘friend’ and ‘friendship’, dwells on the use of the particle bi-, added to sawā‘ī, and he says that it is generally not used, but Mutanabbī was obliged to do it for reasons of adherence to the rhyme scheme of the qaṣīda. Then, he passes to the meaning of the verse:


14 Ḥabīb b. Aws Abū Tammām (d. 231/845-846, or 232), famous Arab poet and anthologist, renowned for his Kiidb al-Ḥamāsa, ‘The book of valour’, an anthology containing more than eight hundred early poems, considered one of the primary sources for Arabic poetry (see RITTER online).

15 Ibn Ğinnī reputes the particle bi-as superfluous in this verse since it is attached to the agent of sawīl which means guyur ‘except’. Arabic Grammarians have devoted some studies to the use of bi-. This particle can be added to make intransitive verbs transitive or it can be added to some transitive verbs to express a particular function (for example, muqābala ‘recompense’), but it has also been considered superfluous. The Egyptian grammarian Ibn Hišām (d. 1308 A. D.), for example, judges it redundant.
The meaning is that there is no true friend like you, do not be misled by the words of someone who tells you ‘I am your best friend’. [...] The meaning can be that the real friend is the only one that does not differ from me, and therefore, I love through his heart and I see through his eyes. The one that is for you such a shelter deserves to be called best friend.

al-Iflīlī (‘ALAYĀN 1996, vol. 2: 124) states:

Only who is close to you and is fair is a sincere advisor and a cherished loyal friend. The heart of the loyal man loves like the heart of his friend. He takes the side of his friend because he esteems him and loves him. He shares his point of view and supports him in all his actions.

It does not seem that Ibn al-Qaṭṭā depends on Ibn Ğinnī who makes a consideration about the particle bi- that the Sicilian grammarian does not relate at all. al-Iflīlī and Ibn al-Qaṭṭā’s comments, both centred on the semantic aspects of the line, are different.

2.e Qaṣida Ġalalan kamā bi fa-l-yaku l-tabriḥu ‘Bad as it is for me it may yet be worse is wormwood a food for this singing fawn?’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 69), metre kāmil, rawī ḥā′

جمالاً كما بي فَلْيَكُ التَّبِْْيحُ أَ غِذاءُ ذا الرَّشَاءِ الْغَنِّ الشِّيحُ

Bad as it is for me it may yet be worse; is wormwood a food for this singing fawn? (WORMHOUDT 2002: 69)

He was blamed for this verse and it was said: there is no relationship between the first and second hemistich. It is not so, but this relationship is strange and this is because, when he mentioned his love and his torment for this gazelle, he said: do you think that my lover cultivates wormwood? I swear that she only cultivates the seeds of the hearts. It has been said: when the poet stops before the houses that loved him, he mentions that they make his desire and his torment become huge. And he shows confusion and that he is busy in correcting his mistakes, just like in Zuhayr’s verse: qif bi’l-diyārī llatī lam ya’fuḥā al-qidamu balā wa-gayyarahā al-arwāḥu wa-al-diyāmī (stop before the houses the remains of which have not been cancelled by the time, but they have been modified by the winds and the eternity). The first hemistich has negated the second because the poet said: they have not been cancelled by the passing of time. It has been said that the meaning is that the passing of the time alone has not cancelled them, but the passing of time, together with the wind and

when attached to the agent or to the object of a verb. Regarding the agent of the verb, ḥā′ is superfluous in the sentence aḥsin bi-Zaydun ‘how beautiful is Zayd’ instead of aḥsana Zaydun. With regard to the examples in which bi- is attached to the object of the verb, Ibn Hišām gives the case of the verb qara’a, that can be followed by bi- when it means ‘reading being blessed’, so qara’tu bi’l-sīratī ‘I read the Surā’ with the sense of blessing is allowed, but it not possible to say qara’tu bi-kitābika ‘I read your book’ because the verbe has not the sense of blessing (see GULLY 2013: 160-165).
eternity cancelled them. It has also been said that this means that the houses have not disappeared in his eyes and in his soul, even if the winds and the passing of time changed them. Despite this, they renew themselves during their consumption, their memory is renewed and they are not consumed. As the poet says: *a lā layta al-manāzila qad bulīnā fa-lā yarmīnaʿ an surarin ḥāzinā* meaning ‘If only they were consumed!’ but they renew themselves and their memory is renewed. (IQ: 221)

Ibn Ḥinn (AHMAD 1984, vol. 1: 722) gives a long comment:

*al-Ǧalalu* means both big and little, here, in the verse, it indicates something big. *al-Ṭabriḥ* is the difficulty. They say *barraḥa bihi al-amru* if something hit him hard. *Al-raṣāʾu* is a stupid boy. [...] *al-Aġann* is the one that has a voice appropriated for singing. *al-Šīḥ* is a famous plant; his sentence *fa-l-yakun l-ṭabriḥ* means *fa-l-yakan*, but he has elided the *nūn* because it is quiescent and because the first *t* of *at-ṭabriḥ* is quiescent too. The condition, here, would be to put it in the oblique case because of the meeting (of the two *sukūn*) since it is a sane particle and, if he did not elide it, it would be vocalized. The elision of the *nūn* here is not like in the verse: *lam yaku sayʿan yā īlāhi qabīlawā* (there has been nothing before you, o my God) as (the poet) elided the *nūn* of *yakun* because it is quiescent and it is similar, for its pronunciation, the adding and the nasality, to the weak long letters. It has been elided like in *fa-l-yakun l-ṭabriḥu*, but it must be vocalized (with *kasra*), and so, it is not possible to elide it. But (al-Mutanabbī) did not give any importance to the vowel of the *nūn* since it was not compulsory [...].

Also the elision of the *nūn* of *fa-l-yaku l-ṭabriḥu* is easy [this, although it was eliminated from *lam yaku* as though it was quiescent]. Concerning the *wāw* of *yakūn*, it is evident in the declension of the word and the *damma* indicates it because it is a part of it. In the verse, there is something else horrible, that is the fact that (the poet) elided the *nūn* despite the duplicating of the consonant and this is not used, except if he has eliminated the *nūn* first and then put the double consonant. The meaning of the verse is: when someone finds himself in adversity, might he be like me, great in the difficulties. The sentence is complete. Then, he added another sentence in the second hemistich and said, amazed by the beauty of the praised (the lover) and by her shapes: do you believe that she feeds on wormwood? [that is, as though she really was a gazelle because of her beauty and her shapes].

Also al-Ifīlī (HINDI HASSAN 1989, vol. 1: 130-131) gives his explanation:

*al-Ǧalalu:* is among words with opposite meanings (*mina l-aḍḍād*), here it means big. *al-Ṭabriḥu* is the adversity, that is, might the adversity be huge as my adversity. I find myself in difficulty and others invoke the lover, but it is not like this. Then, he continues by stating: is the food of this young gazelle, to whom I answered, wormwood? He knows that the truth is not what he stated, but he doubted of his own statement. The *qāḍī* Abū al-Ḥasan16 claimed: between the two hemistichs there is a

---

16 Abū l-Ḥasan Muhammad b. Muhammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥusaynī al-Kūfī was a Syrian *qāḍī* who lived in the 10th century (See JIWA 2009: 196).
subtle link, I mean, when he made the greatness of his difficulty known, explained who caused it: it is the young gazelle mentioned. Abû ‘Alî Ibn Fûrrâğa 17 said: it is considered subtler than this, in fact, he means: this gazelle only feeds on the hearts. […] It is as if he said: might what afflicts me be enormous! Do you really think that the food of who did this to me is wormwood? No, I swear, the only food is the lover’s hearts. This is what they said, but it is not in the verse. This is a trick and they made it for al-Mutanabbî. Al-āganna is the one having a nasal voice, as if he spoke with his nose.

The one grammarian to underline a grammatical question is Ibn Ğinnî who focuses on the elision of the nūn of fa-l-yaku and its correctness. This is a kind of tâḥfîf very common in poetry (CARTER 2006-2009, vol. 2: 17).

2.1 Qaṣîda ‘Awhi badilun min qawlatī wāhan ‘O pain! And the word means, O wonder!’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 505), metre munsarîh, rawî hâ’

When she smiled my cheeks grew wet with rain whose lightning was her teeth (WORMHOUDT 2002: 505)

Ibn Ğinnî explained this verse with a ridiculous explanation as he affirmed that every time that his lover smiles in front of him and kisses him, her saliva flies to his face. The meaning of the verse is that he says: she smiles in front of me and shows her joy and her teeth, white like the flash, I cry and my tears appear on my face like the rain. He compared her front teeth, because of the white of her smile, to the flash and the tears, for their abundance, to the rain. Just as if he said: the origin of this rain is the flashing of her teeth. (IQ: 15-16)

Ibn Ğinnî (AHMAD 1984, vol. 3: 759), in the Fasr, gives this brief comment:

Her front teeth flash, in these verses the poet showed that she fell upon him and was very close to him. The saliva indicates the kisses that there were between the two lovers.

But in the Fâṭḥ al-wâhî he says:

When she smiles, her front teeth appear and this means that she is very close to him; his cheek is wet by her saliva. And this indicates that she is she fell upon his face and that she embraces him. (See almotanabbi.com/poemPage.do?poemId=284).

al-Iflîî (ALAYÂN 1996, vol. 4: 253) claims:

al-Ṭanāyā are the four teeth that are in the middle of the upper and lower parts of the mouth and they are known. Then he said: my cheek gets wet every time she smiles, careless of what I complain and of what I fight and I hate. The poet’s expression min matar refers to his tears profusely pouring on his cheek. Moreover, he said that the flash of that rain, that is his tears dropping, is her smile, the white of her teeth and the flicker of those bright lights coming up. In this verse there is a beautiful similitude and metaphor.

2.g Qaṣīda Firāqun wa-man fāraqtu ġayru muḏammimi ‘Parting, one I part from is not to blame’ (WORMHOUDT 2002: 433), metre ṣawīl, rawi mim

Some seek a world they do not want joy of the beloved or evil of a criminal (WORMHOUDT 2002: 435)

This verse contains the praise and the satire. The meaning of the invective is that he asks to Kāfūr: To whom do you ask for the world, if you do not put it at its right place? You put it in the hands of whom deserves it. (IQ: 223-224) ¹⁸

Ibn Ğinnī’s comment (AHMAD 1984, vol. 3: 589-590) is short and the grammarian says that the poet talks to himself.

al-Ḥalfī’s analysis (ʿALAYĀN 1996, vol. 3: 222) is as follows:

He said to Kāfūr: for whom do you want to obtain the world, striving to search for it and competing for it, showing passion for it, if you do not search for it with the joy of a lover that elevates it and shows it and with the lack of dignity of an enemy that leaves it and neglects it? According to what some Arabs relate, he suffered for this verse, he was asked “what is joy?” He answered: to glorify the protectors of the faith, to denigrate the enemies and to remain with justice and abundance.

2.h Qaṣīda ‘Aduwwuk a maḏmūmun bi-kulli lisānī ‘Your enemy is condemned in every tongue’ (ARBERY: 106), metre ṣawīl, rawi nūn

God decreed, Kāfūr, that you should be the first, and He has not decreed that a second to you should be seen (ARBERY: 108).

This verse contains the praise and the satire. (IQ: 224)

¹⁸ al-Mutanabbi dedicated many poems to the eunuch Kāfūr. See, among others, LARKIN 2008.

Then he said: God has established, Kāfūr, that you are the first of the virtuous ones, the most generous, of unique beauty in creation and unique for the greatness of your importance. God did not judge that, there was, other than you, another king to equal you, to follow you in the joy and who resembles you.

Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ introduces then the last six verses, which have no grammatical or semantic comment (IQ: 224) and, therefore, are not object of the present analysis.

Final remarks

The study of the Maǧmūʿa adds a further element not only to the complex mosaic of Siculo-Arabic grammatical studies, which remains very little known today, but more generally to Siculo-Arabic literary and philological studies. In fact, some of the last verses presented in this article contain some observations, regarding the belonging of the lines to elegy or to invective, which are typical of the works of literary criticism. The works of Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ and al-Iffīlī differ more in the approach they adopt than in their content, since al-Iffīlī’s Tafsīr focuses more on the semantic meaning of the verses than on their grammatical analysis.19 Both grammarians, however, often depend on Ibn Ġinnī and on the Arab grammatical tradition of the Eastern part of the empire he represented. In fact, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ’s grammatical thought, as it emerges from this first part of my analysis, seems to be by and large set against the background of the Arab traditional theories of the Mašriq, even if he sometimes refutes Ibn Ġinnī’s commentary on some verses. Nevertheless, Ibn Ġinnī, Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ and al-Iffīlī have different roles in the transmission of al-Mutanabbī’s poetry: Ibn Ġinnī can be considered as the pioneer, among the three grammarians, since his work contains many notes, about the occasion that led to the composition of the poems, that he might have written as a result of his personal encounters and dialogues with the poet (DIEZ 2009: XXXVIII). Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ and al-Iffīlī have been among the continuators of this tradition, though in very different chronological, geographical, and cultural contexts.


With regard to the morphological issues introduced by Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ, some phenomena can be underlined.

The taḥřīf ‘lightening’ is a process applied to some terms whose patterns were judged phonetically or morphologically intolerable (BAALBAKI 2008: 59). In the specific case of dayāǧī(ǧ), Ibn al-Qaṭṭāʿ does not deal with the phenomenon, while Ibn Ġinnī and al-Iffīlī concentrate on it: the letter ġim has been elided this phenomenon is known as a tarḥīm

19 This emerges by the reading of the whole work. M. Hindi Hassan (1989: 42-44) states: “Al-Iffīlī, además de comentarista, se muestra interesado por cuestiones gramaticales, retóricas y estilísticas”, then he mentions less than twenty grammatical issues, dealt with by the grammarian all over the treatise, mainly concerning syntax, nouns declension and functions of some particles.
‘euphonic elision’ (see BAALBAKI 2008: 60). The Andalusian grammarian and Ibn Ğinnī recognize in dayāğīg al-āṣl the subjacent form of the word. The concept of takfīf is expressed through the verb ḥaffafā ‘they lightened’.

Another case of elision, for which, however, the term takfīf is not used, is the expression fa-l-yaku t-tabrīḥ. But once again, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ neglects it, while Ibn Ğinnī devotes considerable space to it. The drop of the nūn in yakun or yakān is a very frequent poetic licence. Despite this, Ibn Ğinnī objects to its occurrence in this verse for phonetical reasons: the lām of the article in al-tabrīḥ is assimilated to the first letter of the word, t: t-tabrīḥ therefore, according to the grammarian, the correct pronunciation should be fa-l-yakunī t-tabrīḥ with the necessary (darāriyya) vocalization of the nūn, to avoid the sequence of two consonants with sukūn, which in Arabic is forbidden. This example of elision, here, is expressed through the verb ḥaddafā and the substantive ḥafīf. Ibn Ğinnī considers lam yaku as the far‘, the attested and irregular form, of the āṣl lam yakun, which is for him the attested regular form. The two forms, however, coexist. (GRANDE 2016: 214-216). Perhaps, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ does not deal with the expression lam yakun because he considers it a normal poetic license or because his source for the comment of this verse was not the Fāsr. In any case, he seemed not to be concerned with this phenomenon.

The phenomenon of elision has a close relation with another one, on which Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ dwells at length. It is the phonological and morphological phenomenon of verbal derivation implying ibdāl, substitution, ilḥaq and takfīr al-kalima. With the term ibdāl, grammarians mean two phenomena: a morpho-phonological one and a lexical one. Here, the phenomenon concerned is ibdāl naḥwī, grammatical substitution, referring to morphophonological changes in words (HAMEEN-ANTTILA 2006-2009, vol. 2: 280). The concept of ibdāl is dealt with in the paragraph about ilḥaq. Unlike Ibn Ğinnī, who adopts the general term of ziyaḍa (BAALBAKI 2002: 4), Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ explicitly uses the word ilḥaq and focuses on the opposition between the supporters of the hurūf al-zawā‘id and the proponents of the hurūf al-āṣlīyya, traditionally the Basrians, to establish which letters can be added to words for qiyās, and the substantives which, according to Baalbaki, has to be interpreted as the phenomenon of takfīr al-kalima. Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘, however, does not mention this expression and limits the discourse to ilḥaq, thus obscuring the morphological implications of the phenomenon.

Regarding the semantic and lexical comment of the other verses, it is crucial for the understanding of al-Mutanabbi’s verses which, taken isolated and not supported by an explanation, appear obscure. In addition to this, the morphological and semantic comments by Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ are interesting because they often contain some explicit value judgements about al-Mutanabbi’s verses and Ibn Ğinnī’s work too: for example, Ibn al-Qaṭṭā‘ says “This is inconceivable and who needs this is only the ignorant!” (Kāmil from the qaṣīda

---

20 As Grande (2016: 214) recently showed, al-Suyūṭī shares Ibn Ğinnī’s consideration of the alternation lam yakun/lam yaku and “derives the form yaku from the form yakun by means of a deletion-rule (ḥafîf) that targets the sound n in yakun, and is driven by the need of “lightening” (takfīf) the verb. al-Suyūṭī further elaborates on this point in the Iṣṭirāḥ to identify “lightening” and the related deletion-rule with a form of rational justification (‘illa) of the (apparent) irregularities of Arabic grammar.”
bādin hawāka  sabarta am lam tašbirā metre kāmil, rawī ṭār”), or “it was said: there is no relationship between the first and second hemistich. It is not like this, but this relationship is strange” (Qaṣīda Ǧalālan kamā bī fa-l-yaku l-tabīru, metre kāmil, rawī ṣār). The ‘strange’ relation between the two hemistichs becomes ‘a subtle link’ for al-ᠢffiti. Besides, Ibn al-Qedā shows all his disapproval of Ibn Ǧinnī’s thought when he says that he gives a ridiculous explanation of a verse (Qaṣīda ʿAwhi badīlun min qawlatī wāhan, metre mun-sārīh, rawī ṭār”). In order to corroborate his theories, Ibn al-Qedā supports his opinions through examples taken from poetry of the pre-Islamic and classic periods.

The morphological and semantic data presented in this analysis have to be integrated with the data obtained from the syntactical study of the Maḏmū’a and discussed against Arab traditional theories of the Mašriq and of al-Andalus. That will also help establish Ibn al-Qedā’s role in Sicilian literary and philological studies and his contribution to them.

Although the Maḏmū’a is less famous than other grammatical works by Ibn al-Qedā, it has a certain relevancy in Arab grammatical studies. This is not only due to the fame of al-Mutanabbī himself as a panegyrist, to whom many authors dedicated a great number of commentaries, but also to Ibn al-Qedā’s role in the preservation of the poet’s tradition both in Sicily and abroad. In addition to this, the work influenced the thought of later grammarians and especially that of the pseudo al-ʿUkbarī, who made considerable use of the Maḏmū’a as a source in his Tibyān, and al-Bādī’ī (d. 1073/1662) who mentioned the work in his al-Ṣūbḥ al-munabbī ṣam ḥayfīyīyat al-Mutanabbī (The Prophetic Dawn about the quidditas of al-Mutanabbī).21
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