

# Numerals in Arabic grammatical theory :

An impossible quest  
for consistency ?

الأعداد في التراث  
أو العربي النحوي  
البحث عن  
المستحيل الاتساق



# Numerals in Arabic grammatical theory: An impossible quest for consistency?

Proefschrift  
ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor  
aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen  
op gezag van de rector magnificus prof. mr. S.C.J.J. Kortmann,  
volgens besluit van het college van decanen  
in het openbaar te verdedigen op dinsdag 11 december 2012  
om 12.30 uur precies

door  
Jean Nicolas Druel  
geboren op 21 januari 1971  
te Angers (Frankrijk)

Promotor: Prof. dr. C.H.M. Versteegh

Manuscriptcommissie:

Prof. dr. H. Motzki

Prof. dr. C. Gilliot (Universiteit van Aix-Marseille, Frankrijk)

Prof. dr. A. Marogy (Universiteit van Cambridge, Verenigd Koninkrijk)

# Numerals in Arabic grammatical theory: An impossible quest for consistency?

Doctoral Thesis  
to obtain the degree of doctor  
from Radboud University Nijmegen  
on the authority of the Rector Magnificus prof. dr. S.C.J.J. Kortmann,  
according to the decision of the Council of Deans  
to be defended in public on Tuesday, December 11, 2012  
at 12.30 hours

by  
Jean Nicolas Druel  
Born on January 21, 1971  
in Angers (France)

Supervisor: Prof. dr. C.H.M. Versteegh

Doctoral Thesis Committee:

Prof. dr. H. Motzki

Prof. dr. C. Gilliot (University of Aix-Marseille, France)

Prof. dr. A. Marogy (University of Cambridge, Great-Britain)

À mon père.





# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Transliteration conventions</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>I Preliminary chapters</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2 Literature review</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Psychological vs. linguistic approach . . . . .	23
2.2 Prescriptiveness vs. descriptiveness . . . . .	29
2.3 Characterising Sibawayh's method . . . . .	32
2.4 Prescriptiveness of post-Sibawayh grammar . . . . .	46
2.5 The pedagogical turn . . . . .	48
2.6 The contact of Greek logic and grammar . . . . .	49
2.7 Mu'tazilah and grammar . . . . .	53
2.8 The closure of the linguistic corpus . . . . .	58
2.9 Semantics in post-Sibawayh grammar . . . . .	61
2.10 Conclusion . . . . .	70

<b>II</b>	<b>Presentation of the issues linked with the numerals</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Preliminary remarks</b>	<b>75</b>
3.1	Explicit grammatical commentaries . . . . .	76
3.2	Prime examples . . . . .	78
3.3	Grammatical tests . . . . .	80
3.4	The testimony of canonised tradition . . . . .	84
3.5	Extrapolation . . . . .	96
<b>4</b>	<b>Numerals in isolation</b>	<b>101</b>
4.1	A limited set of roots . . . . .	101
4.2	Many patterns and irregularities . . . . .	102
4.3	Coalescence of numerals in compound numerals . . . . .	119
4.4	Conjoined numerals . . . . .	121
4.5	Morphosyntactic issues linked with numerals . . . . .	122
4.6	Semantic considerations . . . . .	135
4.7	Conclusion . . . . .	151
<b>5</b>	<b>Numerals in the sentence</b>	<b>153</b>
5.1	The numerals' morphological class . . . . .	153
5.2	Syntactic slots occupied by numerals . . . . .	155
5.3	The special case of <i>ʾaḥad</i> . . . . .	158
5.4	Conclusion . . . . .	161
<b>6</b>	<b>The expression of the counted object</b>	<b>163</b>
6.1	The appositional construction . . . . .	164
6.2	The predicative construction . . . . .	165
6.3	The annexational construction . . . . .	166

6.4	The specifying construction . . . . .	166
6.5	Summary . . . . .	167
6.6	Issues related to the counted object . . . . .	169
7	Conclusion	185
III	Three different frames to tackle numerals	187
8	Sibawayh's approach to numerals	191
8.1	Introduction . . . . .	191
8.2	The link with the counted object . . . . .	194
8.3	Between "three" and "nineteen" . . . . .	203
8.4	The logic at stake in the <i>Kitāb</i> . . . . .	208
8.5	Beyond Sibawayh ... . . . .	211
9	Al-Mubarrad's approach to numerals	213
9.1	Introduction . . . . .	213
9.2	Morphology and syntax of numerals . . . . .	216
9.3	Expression of definiteness . . . . .	225
9.4	Numerals in annexation . . . . .	226
9.5	The specifier complement <i>tamyīz</i> . . . . .	229
9.6	The logic at stake in the <i>Muqtaḍab</i> . . . . .	236
9.7	Beyond al-Mubarrad ... . . . .	238
10	Ibn as-Sarrāj's approach to numerals	241
10.1	Introduction . . . . .	241
10.2	Specifying the numerals . . . . .	246

10.3	<i>Kam</i> is an unspecified numeral . . . . .	255
10.4	Issues on the numerical specifier and <i>kam</i> . . . . .	257
10.5	Compound morphosyntax . . . . .	262
10.6	The logic at stake in the <i>ʿUṣūl</i> . . . . .	264
10.7	Beyond Ibn as-Sarrāj ... . . . .	266
<b>IV</b>	<b>Results of the study</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>A comparison of the three grammarians</b>	<b>271</b>
11.1	Formal differences between the three treatises . . . . .	271
11.2	Example of treatment of specific issues . . . . .	276
11.3	Differences in methodology . . . . .	281
<b>12</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>301</b>
<b>V</b>	<b>Bibliographical references</b>	<b>307</b>
<b>VI</b>	<b>Annexes</b>	<b>325</b>
	Index of Qurʾānic verses . . . . .	327
	Index of poetic lines . . . . .	333
	Index of Classical authors . . . . .	339
	Index of proper names . . . . .	344
	General index . . . . .	349
	List of tables . . . . .	356
	Summary in Dutch . . . . .	359
	Author's résumé . . . . .	365

# Acknowledgments

This study has been made possible thanks to the help of many people: my family, my Dominican brothers and sisters, my friends, my students, and my professors. All of them, all of you, have loved me, encouraged me, supported me, endured my difficult moments, and rejoiced with me in the festive ones.

From an early age, my parents have strongly encouraged me to study. They spared no expense or effort to give me the best education and they have always been there to support me.

In the Dominican Order, I have received much more than I have brought. My Dominican professors were brothers and masters who sought to hand down wisdom, as much as they did knowledge. This is especially true of the brothers at the IDEO, our institute in Cairo, where I live and study. It has been they who have encouraged me to pursue this doctorate. I would also like to thank the brothers in Jerusalem who have welcomed me in the final stage of this study and who have provided a peaceful and studious environment where I have been able to put my ideas together. Lastly, I would like to thank the brothers in Lille who have welcomed me during my visits to Nijmegen.

My friends have endured my lack of time and freedom, but they have always supported me and encouraged me to give my best. I especially feel indebted to all of those of them who have not had the chance to pursue their own education.

My students have always been an inspiration to me. They have forced me to present my ideas in a simple and convincing way. My only regret is that I have not had enough time to teach in the last two years.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank the professors who have helped me, inspired me, taught me integrity, and been an example. At the risk of forgetting someone, I would like to especially mention Prof. Christian Cannuyer (Lille), Vincent Holzer (Paris), Nabila al-Assyouti (Cairo), Alaa

Elgibali (U. of Maryland), Zeinab Ibrahim (Cairo), el-Said Badawi (Cairo), Zeinab Taha (Cairo), Khaled Fahmi (al-Manūfiyyah), Yishai Peled (Tel Aviv), Shmuel Moreh (Jerusalem), Simon Hopkins (Jerusalem), and Ramzi Baalbaki (Beirut).

The project of this study was born in the aftermath of my master degree in teaching Arabic as a foreign language at the American University in Cairo. I began to read Classical Arabic grammarians with Dr. Zeinab Taha, and was fascinated by the refinement of the interpretative layer these grammarians were adding to the description of the language itself. After losing some time in a subject that was far too difficult for me (namely, variant readings of the Qurʾān), I turned to the grammar of numerals. At first, I expected to not only understand why numerals behave the way they do in Arabic, but also to find some linguistic variation with time.

In the end, I discovered that the numerical system, as complicated as it seems, has not varied much since the first centuries of Islam. However, the grammarians' interpretations of the reasons behind the way numerals behave have varied a lot between the II<sup>nd</sup>/V<sup>III</sup><sup>th</sup> and the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> centuries. What we teach to Arabic students today largely reflects the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century era of grammatical interpretation. I hope this limited study will help both scholars and students understand what happened to numerals in the early development of Arabic grammar.

# Transliteration conventions

The romanization system that will be used in this paper is the same as in the *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* (Versteegh 2006b, viii) with the following differences for the ending vowels and *tā' marbūṭah*:

The *tā' marbūṭah* will be romanized as a *h* at the pause and as a *t* elsewhere, as in *madrasah* and *madrasatun mašhūratun*). The *'alif maqṣūrah* will be romanized as an *á* in *'iḥdá*, and as an *ā* in *'aṣā*.

ا	ā	س	s	ل	l
ب	b	ش	š	م	m
ت	t	ص	ṣ	ن	n
ث	ṭ	ض	ḍ	ه	h
ج	j	ط	ṭ	و	w or ū
ح	ḥ	ظ	ẓ	ي	y or ī
خ	x	ع	‘	ى	á
د	d	غ	ġ	ء	’
ذ	ḏ	ف	f	ة	h or t
ر	r	ق	q		
ز	z	ك	k		

Table 1: *Transliteration system*





## Part I

# Preliminary chapters



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The chapters on the syntax of numerals are among the strangest in Classical Arabic grammar, because of the incredible number of syntactic rules that apply, in particular in the expression of the counted object: numerals and counted object either agree or disagree in gender and number, numerals are either annexable or not, expression of definiteness is far from straightforward, and so on. In addition to these syntactic rules, numerals also have different morphosyntactic behaviour: some have adjectival patterns, others have nominal, participial, compound, dual, external masculine plural patterns, some are declinable, others are indeclinable, among other issues.

Lastly, the expression of the counted object is also problematic. Here is a summary of the main rules that apply in Classical Arabic:<sup>1</sup>

“One” and “two” are adjectives that agree in number and gender with their counted objects, as in *waladun wāḥidun* “one boy” and *waladāni ṭnāni* “two boys” in the independent form,<sup>2</sup> and *ma’a bintayni ṭnatayni* “with two girls” in the oblique form.

Between “three” and “ten”, it is possible to annex the numeral to its counted object, as in *ṭalāṭatu ’awlādin* “three boys” (annexational construction). It is also possible to use the numeral in an adjectival slot, as in *al-’awlādu ṭalāṭatun* “the boys are three” (predicative construction), and *al-’awlādu ṭ-*

---

<sup>1</sup>See Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1423–1501); Wright (1967, I, 253–264; II, 234–249); Fleisch (1990, I, 506–524).

<sup>2</sup>The three nominal cases have received different names in English: nominative, accusative and genitive; *u*-form, *a*-form, and *i*-form; independent, dependent and oblique forms. We will use this third set.

*ṭalāṭatu* “the three boys” (appositional construction). In all three cases, the numeral carries a final *tāʾ marbūṭah* when it counts masculine nouns, and not when it counts feminine nouns. The counted object is in a plural form in all cases.

Between “eleven” and “nineteen”, there are also three possible constructions in order to express the counted object: *ṭalāṭata-ʿašara waladan* “thirteen boys” (specifying construction), *al-ʿawlādu ṭalāṭata-ʿašara* “the boys are thirteen” (predicative construction), and *al-ʿawlādu ṭ-ṭalāṭata-ʿašara* “the thirteen boys” (appositional construction). Compound numerals are made of two parts that disagree in gender, except for “eleven” (*ʿaḥada-ʿašara* and *ʾiḥdā-ʿašrata*) and “twelve” (*ʾiṭnā-ʿašara* and *ʾiṭnatā-ʿašrata*), where both parts agree in gender. All compound numerals are invariable in both parts, except “twelve” that takes the dual declension in its first part (*ʾiṭnā-ʿašara* and *ʾiṭnay-ʿašara*). The counted object is in the singular in the specifying construction, and in the plural otherwise.

Between “twenty” and “ninety”, one can express the counted object in the same three constructions as with compound numerals: *ʾiṣrūna waladan* “twenty boys” (specifying construction), *al-ʿawlādu ʾiṣrūna* “the boys are twenty” (predicative construction), and *al-ʿawlādu l-ʾiṣrūna* “the twenty boys” (appositional construction). Decades have the same form to count masculine and feminine nouns. Just like with compound numerals, the counted object is in the singular in the specifying construction, and in the plural otherwise.

With “one hundred” and “one thousand”, one can express the counted object in the same three construction as with numerals between “three” and “ten”: *miʾatu waladin* “one hundred boys” and *ʾalfu waladin* “one thousand boys” (annexational construction); *al-ʿawlādu miʾatun* “the boys are a hundred” and *al-ʿawlādu ʾalfun* “the boys are a thousand” (predicative construction); and *al-ʿawlādu l-miʾatu* “the hundred boys” and *al-ʿawlādu l-ʾalfu* “the thousand boys” (appositional construction). *Miʾah* and *ʾalf* are used to count masculine and feminine nouns. The counted object is in the singular in the annexational construction, and in the plural otherwise.

A specific difficulty arises from the fact that *miʾah* and *ʾalf* can also be counted, between “two” and “nine” for the former, and with no limit for the latter, as in *ṭalāṭu miʾati waladin* “three hundred boys” and *ṭalāṭatu ʾālāfi waladin* “three thousand boys”. In this case, *miʾah* and *ʾalf* follow the rules mentioned above, except that *miʾah* remains in the singular after “three” to “nine”.

It appears from what precedes that the annexational and specifying constructions are in a complementary distribution for the expression of the

counted object between “three” and “one thousand”. This point is at the core of the discussions on numerals in the Arabic grammatical tradition. Grammarians try to explain why compound numerals and decades are not annexable. Other issues do not receive as much attention.

More difficulties arise from the fact that ideally all numerals should be interchangeable in order to express any quantity of any counted object. What is more, all nominal groups consisting of a numeral and its counted object should also ideally be able to occupy any syntactic slot that the counted object can occupy in the sentence.

This large syntactic and morphological diversity contrasts with a remarkable semantic unity: Numerals express an exact countable quantity, applicable to objects that are either counted (cardinals) or classified (ordinals). Although it is possible to discern some semantic diversity among numerals, common sense has no difficulty to understand that there is an obvious semantic link between expressions like “first”, “four”, “twenty men”, “to triple”, “one eighth” or “three thousand years”.

What is more, this semantic unity is clearly the reason why there are chapters devoted to numerals in Arabic grammars and especially to the expression of the counted object. Otherwise, there would be no justification for grammarians to discuss in the same chapters substantives and adjectives that behave so differently.

In other words, numerals display at the same time a great morphosyntactic diversity and a great semantic unity. Because of this particularity, we believe that the way Arabic grammarians tackle the grammar of numerals reveals their approach to the link between formal and functional grammar, i.e., the way they articulate morphosyntactic and semantic dimensions of the language they study.

To put it in an oversimplified way, there seems to be two major trends that oppose historians of Arabic grammar. On the one hand, some of them insist on the fact that the history of Arabic grammar is the history of its gradual formalisation, at the expense of its functional and communicative dimension, which relegates semantic studies to separate fields of Arabic philology such as rhetorics and Qur’ānic exegesis (Carter, Baalbaki). Contrary to this view, other historians of Arabic grammar hold that Arabic grammarians show a growing interest in semantics that is manifest in the categories used to describe the language, either just after Sibawayh (Owens, Ṭāhā) or after the confrontation between grammar and Greek logic (Bohas, Guillaume, Kouloughli).

The present study aims to show, through a detailed analysis of the evolution of the grammar of numerals between the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> and the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century, that these two views are equally true because they describe two concomitant phenomena. Our research hypothesis is that there is, on the one hand, a progressive “reduction” into formal rules of a communicational descriptive grammar that once focused on the intention of the speaker and the understanding of the interlocutor, while there is, on the other hand, a gradual introduction of formal semantic criteria in grammatical definitions, aiming at a one-to-one correspondence between syntactic structures and meanings expressed.

In this study, we will focus on three major grammarians, namely Sibawayh (d. 180/796), al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898), and Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928).<sup>3</sup> After a literature review covering the last forty years of academic research in the methodology of Arabic grammarians in these centuries (chapter 2), we will present in detail all the morphological, morphosyntactic and semantic issues linked with numerals described by Arabic grammarians (chapters 3 to 7). We will then focus on the way these three authors account or not for the inner consistency of these issues within their grammatical methodological frames (chapters 8 to 10). Finally, in chapter 11, based on the way these three grammarians deal with numerals, we will be able to check our hypothesis that the search for consistency in the linguistic behaviour of numerals moves from a functional to a formal dimension of semantics.

---

<sup>3</sup>See in annex, p. 339, a table of the Classical authors cited in this study, sorted by their date of death. See also p. 344 the index of proper names, sorted alphabetically.

## Chapter 2

# Literature review: The links between semantics and syntax in the Arabic grammatical tradition

### Introduction

Medieval Arab historians who wrote the history of grammatical ideas “co-terminously with the descriptive writings”, as Owens (1990a, 1) puts it, present contrasting views on this history. They tend to describe the diversity within this grammatical tradition in a way that leaves little space to historical development as such, focusing instead on perceived *madāhib* “schools” and excluding dissenting voices, or treating them in a caricaturesque and anachronic way (Carter 2000, 264).

This surprising synchronic way of writing history corresponds to the “strictly synchronic approach” that Medieval Arabic grammarians themselves have toward language (Versteegh 1995, 98). These conjoined phenomena make “the diachronic syntax of Arabic [...] a hard nut to crack”, as Dévényi (1987–88, 196) puts it.

Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli summarise this typically scholastic scholarship, which reinforces the impression of homogeneity of the tradition:

Of course, the commentator could always express his disagreement on some point or another with the author upon whom he commented, but then, as the general system became more and more elaborate, all the possible solutions to a given problem were eventually worked out, together with the argumentation for and against every solution, so the only way one could disagree with somebody on some point was to accept somebody else's position on this point (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1990/2006, 15).

Since the nineteenth century, historians of Arabic grammar have tried to critically understand this tradition, at times deconstructing the traditional views (Weil 1913b<sup>1</sup> is an early example of this trend) and at times accepting it at face value. Gradually, the availability of more edited texts has made it possible for scholars to study specific issues in the development of the Arabic grammatical tradition.

Among the early editions made according to modern standards are the following works: the grammatical anthology by Silvestre de Sacy (1829); Ibn al-'Anbārī's *'Inṣāf* (partially edited by Košut 1878, then by Weil 1913b); al-'Astarābādī's *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyyah* (1858); az-Zamaxšārī's *Mufaṣṣal* (Broch 1879); Sibawayh's *Kitāb* (Derenbourg 1881–89/1970); Ibn al-'Anbārī's *'Asrār al-'arabiyyah* (Seybold 1886); Ibn Ya'īs's *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal* (around 1900); and as-Sirāfi's *'Axbār an-naḥwiyyīn* (Krenkow 1936), to mention only the most important ones.

As for the early studies in the history of Arabic grammar, we find a great diversity of topics studied: Goldziher (1871/1967) studies the link between Arabic grammar, law and orthodoxy; Vernier (1891–92) publishes a grammar based on grammatical sources; Machuel (1908) studies grammatical terminology; Weiß (1910) studies Aristotelian influences in Arabic grammar; Weil (1913b), mentioned above, deconstructs the traditional view of the competing schools of Kūfah and Baṣrah; Weil (1915) studies the grammatical methods as such; Beck (1946) focuses on specific grammatical issues; Muṣṭafā (1948) investigates the identity of the first grammarian; Reuschel (1959) attempts to qualify al-Xalīl's (d. 170/786) influence on his pupil Sibawayh (d. 180/796); and Ḍayf (1968) studies the grammatical "schools".

These topics will be discussed extensively in the next decades, along with "new topics" such as the Greek influence on Arabic grammar, the link between grammar and Qur'ānic exegesis, the Bedouin informants of the grammarians, diglossia, the identity of the *naḥwiyyūn* in the *Kitāb*, to name only the main issues, some of them under discussion until the present day.

In this literature review, we will focus on the studies published after the seventies and contributing to the issue of the grammatical methods used by

<sup>1</sup>The introduction (pp. 1–116) is published separately in Weil (1913a).



Arabic grammarians. As we will see in detail below, scholars have tried to characterise the methods of Arabic grammarians as being descriptive or prescriptive, functional or formal, communicative, structural, semantic, speculative, pedagogical, logical, juridical, aiming at consistency, subdividing categories or aiming at a limited set of rules, and so on. Some scholars have also pointed out the artificiality of applying some of these criteria to the Arabic grammatical tradition.

Another issue, which is not discussed as such in the secondary literature, is the periodisation of the Arabic grammatical tradition. Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli (1990/2006) separate between a formative period until the end of the III<sup>th</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century, an apogee in the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century, and a maturity and decline period until the X<sup>th</sup>/XVI<sup>th</sup> century. Versteegh (1997b) believes that Sibawayh inaugurates a shift in the grammatical tradition, and so do the contact of logical doctrines with grammar at the end of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century and the works of al-Jurjānī in the V<sup>th</sup>/XI<sup>th</sup> century (Versteegh 1981, 1997b). Owens (1991) and Tāhā (1995) consider Ibn as-Sarrāj to be a turning point between early and later grammarians. Baalbaki (2008) divides the grammatical tradition into three periods, pre-Sibawayh, Sibawayh, and post-Sibawayh. Carter (1999) discerns four stages in the Arabic grammatical tradition: before Sibawayh; Sibawayh; from Sibawayh to Ibn as-Sarrāj; and after Ibn as-Sarrāj. Since our study focuses on Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj, we will not consider in this review the pre-Sibawayh grammatical methods and we will not consider grammarians after the VI<sup>th</sup>/XII<sup>th</sup> or VII<sup>th</sup>/XIII<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Before reviewing these issues, we would like to introduce a distinction that will help us understand many of the subsequent questions posed by the methods of the Arabic grammarians, namely, the dichotomy between *lafḍ* and *maʿná*, which we can for the time being translate as “utterance” and “meaning”.

## 2.1 Psychological vs. linguistic approach

Kouloughli (1985) has received little attention in the literature and we would like to present his view here in detail. In this article, the author proposes a new understanding of the couple *lafḍ* and *maʿná* and its meaning in the Arabic tradition, where it has a central position in all the disciplines that are concerned with language and texts, such as grammar, rhetorics, and poetry. He proves that this pair of terms refers to different notions depending on the context and the epoch when it is used. He opposes two extreme views of the

meanings that these two terms have in the Arabic tradition, being conscious that this is a distorted presentation and that authors are actually situated somewhere between these two extremes. The interest of this presentation is that it enables us to understand clearly what is at stake before we consider the continuum. At one end of the continuum is a psychological approach and at the other end a linguistic one.

La *première* [problématique] qui a ses racines dans ce qui semble être le « sol primitif » des représentations arabes sur le discours et ses fonctions et devrait en conséquence être la clef de lecture de la grande majorité des textes anciens, est essentiellement une *problématique psychologique*, fondée sur une conception intentionaliste du *ma'nā* et caractérisée par l'absence de relation fonctionnelle (c'est-à-dire biunivoque) entre *lafẓ* et *ma'nā*.

La *seconde* qui naît de manière progressive et diffuse, et trouve son expression la plus aboutie dans les travaux de 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Gurġānī (XI<sup>e</sup> siècle), est une *problématique linguistique*, fondée sur une conception conventionaliste du terme *ma'nā* et marquant l'avènement d'une vision fonctionnelle de la relation *lafẓ/ma'nā* (Kouloughli 1985, 43-44).

According to the psychological approach, *ma'nā* is not an "object", not even an intellectual one, but an "activity": "*ma'nā*, en tant que « nom d'action [x] du verbe *'anā/ya'nī* signifie donc primitivement « le fait-de-viser »" (Kouloughli 1985, 45). He bases this interpretation on a text by 'Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī (d. 400/1010). In this sense, it is not possible to speak of the *ma'nā* of a particular concept but of an utterance. It is possible to express *ma'nā* by different means: signs (*'išārah*), written texts (*xaṭṭ*), counting on fingers (*'uqad*) and through the situation itself (*naṣbah*). This means that *ma'nā* is not primarily attached to the utterance but to the utterer, and more precisely to his intention (Kouloughli 1985, 45).

In this frame, *lafẓ* is not an isolated word but the utterance, understood as the totality of the linguistic sign, signifier and signified, and not only the signifier. This is the natural consequence of the fact that *ma'nā* does not refer to the signified, leaving it to the *lafẓ* to assume both the signified and the signifier (Kouloughli 1985, 46).

The result of this situation is that the same *ma'nā* can be expressed by different *'alfāḍ* and that the same *lafẓ* can express different *ma'ānī* so that "ce qu'il y a de commun à ces deux cas de figure, c'est l'idée d'une « indétermination » de la relation *lafẓ/ma'nā* en tant que telle" (Kouloughli 1985, 47), hence the many Qur'ānic variant readings, dialectal and poetic variants, and the fact that language is fundamentally perceived as equivocal.

According to 'Abū Hilāl, there is some sort of "residual" *ma'nā* in the *lafẓ* itself, just like when a parrot utters a word. The parrot does not "intend"

anything, so that it expresses no authentic *ma'ná*. However, there is a signified embedded in the parrot's utterance. This shows well how *lafḍ* can both assume the signified and the signifier, without being an authentic *ma'ná* understood as the psychological intention of the utterer, or, in other words, "le *lafz*, en tant qu'il est un *instrument* pour signifier les intentions se trouve, en quelque sorte indirectement, investi de *ma'ná*" (Kouloughli 1985, 49).

At the other end of the continuum is what Kouloughli calls the linguistic approach to the opposition *lafḍ* vs. *ma'ná*, which is best represented by al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078). His research on Qur'ānic 'i'jāz "inimitability" led him to the fundamental discovery that there is a strict correlation between a minimal variation in form and a minimal variation in meaning of utterances that are otherwise similar (Kouloughli 1985, 59).

Al-Jurjānī thus had to redefine the terms *ma'ná* and *lafḍ*. If a minimal difference in *lafḍ* implies a difference in the meaning perceived by the listener / reader, and if one supposes that there is an intention behind this minimal difference in *lafḍ*, as must be the case with a qualified utterer, then one has to conclude that the intention of the utterer is strictly correlated to the *lafḍ* he will use to express it and that, in other words, the semantic value of this *lafḍ* is nothing else than the *ma'ná* intended by the utterer (Kouloughli 1985, 59–60).

This shift introduced by al-Jurjānī practically reduces the *lafḍ* to the signifier, a mere sequence of sounds, and gathers in the *ma'ná* both the signified and the intention of the utterer. The consequence of this shift is that different *alfāḍ* cannot have the same *ma'ná* any more because a difference in *lafḍ* reveals a different intention of the utterer. Another consequence of this shift is that there is a one-to-one relationship between *lafḍ* and *ma'ná*, which also implies that the intention of the utterer can be accessed through the utterance.

Early grammarians kept themselves primarily busy with *lafḍ*, understood as the linguistic manifestation of *ma'ná*, i.e., signifier and signified. Kouloughli (1985, 53) adds that this is how one should understand the definition that Arabic grammarians give of their discipline as "technique du *lafz*" (*ṣinā'ah lafḍiyyah*), which has too often been understood as an exclusive interest in signifiers. In this psychological approach, the *ma'ná* of an utterance is not the literal meaning of the utterance but its "communicative value".

Kouloughli (1985, 55) goes on saying that the grammatical tradition has progressively evacuated the communicative and functional aspects of language from its scope, focusing on formal aspects of language because of an "empire tyrannique de la théorie du marquage casuel (*'amal*)" that has finally dictated the structure of grammatical treatises.

The author is clear that these two approaches of the relationship between *lafḍ* and *ma'ná*, psychological vs. linguistic, are caricatures of two extreme positions and that each author has a particular stand on a continuum that goes from one extreme to another. This will help us formulate our hypothesis in a more specific way: What is at stake in the evolution of the grammar of numerals from Sibawayh to Ibn as-Sarrāj is the beginning of this progressive shift from a psychological understanding of the couple *lafḍ* vs. *ma'ná* to a linguistic understanding.

Frank (1981) also deals with meaning among grammarians between the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> and the VIII<sup>th</sup>/XIV<sup>th</sup> century. Unfortunately, he does not aim at a historical perspective of what meaning means. According to him, in the sources he studied, meaning refers primarily to two different things, “1) the purpose or aim (*al-qaṣḍu*) of the speaker, what he wishes (*ʿarāda*, *yurīdu*) or intends (*qaṣada*, *yaqṣidu*) by his utterance and 2) the equivalent restatement or the analytic paraphrase of it” (Frank 1981, 268–269). In these two meanings we can recognise Kouloughli's psychological and linguistic *ma'ná*, but in a way that is maybe more difficult to exploit further.

In a more specific way, Frank identifies four types of meanings in grammatical works of the first four centuries of Islam: “1. Meaning as the intent of the sentence, i.e., the intention or purpose of the speaker in making his utterance. [...] 2. The meaning of a noun or a verb as its referent. [...] 3. Meaning as the semiotic equivalent [rephrasing or *ta'wīl*]. [...] 4. Meaning as the content or conceptual significate of a word, phrase, or sentence” (Frank 1981, 314–315). He adds that these meanings “are found in three domains as they exist in three basic modes: in the mind (*fī l-qalbi*, *fī ḍ-ḍamīri*) as mental or as psychological acts, in words as linguistic or semiotic entities, and in the world as referents” (Frank 1981, 316).

It is true however that “the problem [of what is a formal theory of meaning] seems not to have posed itself and it is hardly required for us to attempt to formulate a theory for them, forcing the texts to answer a question they do not raise and, more pertinently, the answer to which is not needed for our understanding of their responses to the questions they do raise” (Frank 1981, 314), but does this mean that one cannot try to understand in what direction grammarians have evolved? The relevance of Kouloughli's approach as compared to Frank's is that it includes the second term *lafḍ*, enabling a dynamic view of the evolution of the Arabic tradition.

Ayoub (1991) expresses the same idea as Kouloughli, whom she does not quote, in different terms. For her, it is too simplistic to oppose form and meaning and pretend that Sibawayh's *Kitāb* focuses only on form:

L'opposition pertinente pour entendre les propos du Livre dans leur juste résonnance n'est point forme/sens, mais forme/substance: Le sens lui-même se prête à la forme. Ou, dit autrement, le formel dans le Livre inclut, à la fois, le syntactique et le sémantique (Ayoub 1991, 40).

We can recognise Kouloughli's intuition that *lafḍ* gathers both the signifier and the signified in early grammars, which means that what she calls "substance" could be equated with the "intention of the speaker". We will come back later to Ayoub's article, whose main focus is on the theory of 'amal "(syntactic and semantic) operation" in the *Kitāb*.

More recently, Versteegh (1997b, 228) has also dealt in detail with the issue of the changing meaning of the couple *lafḍ* vs. *ma'ná*. He firstly recognizes, like Frank, that the grammatical tradition lacks clear definitions of the term *ma'ná*, and that most Arabic grammarians took the meaning of *ma'ná* for granted, relying on their common sense.

This leads him to the same conclusion as Kouloughli (1985), namely that "these two definitions represent two different approaches towards the semantic component of speech" (Versteegh 1997b, 229), either as the intention of the speaker, who uses speech to express what he has in mind, or as something "inherent in speech itself, which can be brought out by a process of interpretation by an exegete or a linguist" (Versteegh 1997b, 229). He immediately adds that these two approaches do not exclude one another, even if "the Islamic tradition kept the two disciplines apart, so that it could, for instance, be said of a scholar that he did well in grammar but knew nothing about lexicology. Because of this division of tasks the contribution of Arabic lexicography towards the development of a semantic theory is small" (Versteegh 1997b, 232). It seems, however, that Versteegh does not insist as much as Kouloughli on the evolution that is at stake in the shift from one paradigm to another, and that is at the heart of our research question.

We would like to reproduce here the sixteen different possible aspects of meaning that are listed by Versteegh (1997b, 230–231) and that will help us add some clarity in the debate about the role of semantics in the Arabic grammatical tradition, taking the risk described above by Frank to "[force] the texts to answer a question they do not raise", basically because texts do not raise the question of the evolution of grammatical theories:

- linked with the speaker:
  1. the intention of the speaker or his purpose in making an utterance (related terms *maqṣūd*, *qaṣd*, *murād*, *niyya*, all meaning "intention")

- linked with the message:
  2. the message which the hearer extracts from the speech (related term *mafḥūm* “what is understood”)
  3. the equivalent of an expression or utterance, i.e., its interpretative analysis or paraphrase (related terms *tafsīr*, *ta’wīl*, both meaning “explanation”)
  4. the motif or theme of a poem (related term *ḡaraḍ* “purpose”)
  5. the intent or the mood of the sentence (especially in the phrase *ma’ānī l-kalām* “meanings of speech”)
  6. the communicative purpose of speech (related term *fā’ida* “advantage”)
- linked with the extra-linguistic world:
  7. the referent in the extra-linguistic world (related term *musammā* “what is named”)
  8. the intrinsic causal determinant of accidents in physical objects, or qualifier (in Mu’tazilite thinking, related term *illa* “cause”)
- linked with thought:
  9. the conceptual correlate of a word, phrase or sentences
  10. the essential qualities of an object that are perceived by the mind in the sense of the Aristotelian forma
  11. abstract correlate of physical objects in the sense of Platonic ideas
- linked with the linguistic sign:
  12. the semantic content of a set of radicals, its lexical meaningful
  13. the underlying structure of a surface sentence (related terms *’aṣl* “origin, principle”, *taqḍīr* “assigning”)
  14. the function of a morphological or syntactic category (related term *mawḍi’* “position”)
  15. abstract notion (vs. concrete notion, in the expression *ism ma’nā* “abstract noun” vs. *ism ‘ayn* “concrete noun”)
  16. that for which an expression has been established (in the theory of the *wad’ al-luḡa* “imposition of speech”)

As for the term *lafḍ*, Versteegh simply says that it “always indicates a physical correlate of whatever *ma’nā* stands for” (Versteegh 1997b, 228). Unlike Kouloughli, Versteegh does not explicitly mentions the possibility that *lafḍ* could assume some of the semantic aspects mentioned above. In Kouloughli’s “psychological” paradigm, *ma’nā* refers only to the first aspect of Versteegh’s categorisation, which we will note [m. 1], and *lafḍ* not only assumes the physical correlate of the intention (the actual utterance) but also Versteegh’s [m. 12] to [m. 14], i.e., the semantic aspects linked with the actual utterance. As for Kouloughli’s “linguistic” paradigm, *ma’nā* refers to both Versteegh’s [m. 1] and [m. 12–14], and *lafḍ* to their physical correlate, the actual utterance.

In this study, we propose to follow Versteegh’s definition of *lafḍ* as the “physical correlate of whatever *ma’nā* stands for” and to focus on the evolution of the different dimensions of *ma’ānī*. From now on, we will refer

to intentional semantics [m. 1], communicative semantics [m. 2–6], extra-linguistic semantics [m. 7–8], cognitive semantics [m. 9–11] and formal semantics [m. 12–16]. These can be further grouped into intersubjective, pragmatic semantics [m. 1–6] and objective, formal semantics [m. 7–16].

Although this classification of Versteegh primarily aims to distinguish the different meanings the term *ma'ná* takes in Arabic Classical texts, we will use it to characterise the different dimensions of semantics involved in Classical Arabic grammar treatises.

Accepting the risk of systematising things too much, we can represent more precisely what is at stake in Kouloughli's view of the evolution of the psychological dialectic *ma'ná* [m. 1] vs. *lafđ* [incl. m. 12–14] towards the linguistic dialectic *ma'ná* [m. 1.12–14] vs. *lafđ*.<sup>2</sup>

With this classification of meanings, we wish to trace the evolution of the equilibrium between *lafđ* and *ma'ná* in the Arabic grammatical tradition, as studied by modern scholarship in the last forty years because we believe that this is the key to understanding the evolution of this tradition and that modern scholarship is not always clear on its use of the term “meaning”:

From the point of view of the historiographer the most fascinating aspect of the development of the science of language in the Arabic world is the perseverance of the dichotomy of *lafz/ma'ná* in spite of a constantly changing perspective in the use of *ma'ná*. [...] It is surprising how easily the term ‘meaning’ is often used without any specification in studies on linguistic theory or speech production (Versteegh 1997b, 275).

Let us now consider the different issues that contemporary scholars have tackled in order to describe and evaluate the Arabic grammatical tradition. Our review of the literature will cover scholarly research done since the seventies, and focus on the grammatical methods that characterise the grammatical tradition, mainly in the four centuries after Sibawayh.

## 2.2 Prescriptiveness vs. descriptiveness

It seems that Peterson is the first contemporary author to have tackled the issue of prescriptiveness and descriptiveness in the Arabic grammatical tradition. He writes that “it is fair to say that the Arab grammarians were primarily descriptive in their methods and prescriptive in their intention” (Peterson 1972, 504). He justifies his position by saying that the formalism

<sup>2</sup>One can also account for Bohas' distinction between *ma'ná* I [m. 12] and II [m. 14] (Bohas 1984, 27). See Versteegh (1997b, 247–248) for the application of [m. 14] to *ma'ná* II.

that Fleisch (1957) charges them with can better be compared to structuralism, “in the sense that most twentieth-century linguistics, including generative-transformational approaches, is structuralist” (Peterson 1972, 503). In other words, they combine surface formalism in their definitions and abstract analyses of deeper levels. In this sense, he adds, Arab grammarians are not in any sense merely descriptive. Unfortunately, this description, just like many further quotations we will discuss, shows little interest in historical developments, as Peterson tends to generalise his judgement to the whole tradition.

In a more historical perspective, Carter characterises the shift that he sees in post-Sibawayh grammar. He opposes the *Kitāb* to Baṣran grammar as it developed in Baġdād after Sibawayh:

Le caractère essentiel de grammaire baṣrienne — rigidement formelle et impitoyablement prescriptive — provient de l’« islamisation » de leur discipline propre par les grammairiens de Bagdad qui, en épurant sélectivement le contenu du *Kitāb*, créèrent exactement le type de système grammatical visant à la justification interne que l’Islam attendait d’eux (Carter 1973b, 302).

In another formulation, he writes that “l’élément descriptif de la grammaire du second siècle (celle que l’on trouve dans le *Kitāb*) fut virtuellement éliminé lorsque la grammaire se trouva inféodée aux besoins de l’Islam au siècle suivant” (Carter 1973b, 303). The same ideas on the “islamicisation” of grammar are again expressed in Carter (1984, 213–214).

Apparently, Carter is the only scholar to address frontally the link between Islam at large and grammar. A few years later he summarises his views by saying that “the close interdependence of Arabic grammar and the Islamic religion is already well known, both with regard to the origins of grammatical science and its application in dogma, exegesis and law” (Carter 1991, 9). As we will see below, other scholars limit their research to the field of law and exegesis, where terminological and methodological influence can be perceived.

Carter does not hesitate to call Baṣran grammar, as opposed to Sibawayh, “pedantic” and “sterile” (Carter 1973b, 304), an accusation that is also addressed by Baalbaki (2001, 186; 206 and 2007a, 3) to most grammarians after al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj.

According to Carter, post-Sibawayh Baṣran grammarians are not to blame for this shift in their methods. They applied their undeniable intelligence to what the Sunna asks them to do, namely “restaurer sans relâche les lois éternelles régissant une langue parfaite” (Carter 1973b, 304). As for Kūfan grammarians, he believes that their works rarely rise above the level of



controversy and *ad hominem* arguments (Carter 1973b, 304). Insisting once more on this post-Sibawayh change in grammatical methods, Carter (1981/83, 117) writes that “these games [such as the proper name test]<sup>3</sup> mark the profound shift in direction which grammar underwent as it changed from a descriptive to a prescriptive discipline”.

Baalbaki presents a more subtle view of the equilibrium between descriptiveness and prescriptiveness of Arabic grammar, especially in Sibawayh’s work, saying that it manages at the same time to be descriptive and to manipulate and evaluate attested usages in order to reveal the underlying harmony of the language (Baalbaki 1979, 7).

In a more specific way, Baalbaki (1979, 22) adds that the manipulation of linguistic material to discover the major principles according to which language works “must not be considered as an element of a prescriptive approach by SIBAWAYHI, as he uses it only to describe the language, without imposing unattested data, or using his conclusions to promote particular utterances at the expense of others.”

Versteegh seems to be following another path when he writes about the underlying rules in the language that “it is the task of the grammarian to determine those rules, and thus to codify the inner system of speech, in other words, to unravel the «secrets of the Arabic language» (*asrār al-‘arabiyya*)” (Versteegh 1978, 261). His thought becomes clearer, as far as the debate over prescriptiveness and descriptiveness is concerned when he writes about Sibawayh that “il n’est pas dans son intention de donner une description de la langue arabe, et encore moins une grammaire prescriptive, mais il veut, au contraire, expliquer les faits linguistiques, tels qu’il les rencontre dans le *kalām al-‘Arab*” (Versteegh 1981, 48). A few years later, he develops the same idea about the specific task that grammarians have, namely, explaining the underlying rules of the language, not to codify them (Versteegh 1989b, 246).

Grammarians are thus looking for reasons that explain why Arabs speak the way they actually and spontaneously do.<sup>4</sup> This is linked, in Versteegh’s view, to the origin of grammar, which “grew out of the preoccupations of the early Islamic scholars with the text of the *Qur’ān*, particularly the exegetical interpretation, rather than the analysis of the various readings (as [he] supposed elsewhere, Versteegh 1983)” (Versteegh 1990c, 238–239).

<sup>3</sup>See below, p. 80, about these grammatical tests.

<sup>4</sup>This is also valid, according to Versteegh, for variant readings of the *Qur’ān*. Sibawayh can reject “uncompromisingly all non-canonical variant readings” even if they have a better standing in Arabic, and this, according to the underlying principle that the existing has the preference over the theoretical (Versteegh 1983, 149).

It is in this explanatory frame that Versteegh comments on Sibawayh's use of *qiyās*:

In the *Kitāb* Sibawayhi made very clear that in this respect he did not share the opinion of his Basran predecessors: unlike them he did not use analogy (*qiyās*) as an instrument to measure the correctness of speech or even as a method for the production of new analogical forms. For Sibawayhi analogy was only an explanatory device with which the correctness of linguistic theories rather than linguistic forms could be gauged (Versteegh 1997b, 240–241).

Bohas (1981, 215) seems to agree with Versteegh's theory of the Arabic grammatical tradition as a explanative corpus of the language of the Arabs, but he goes a step further when he writes, based on his reading of Ibn Jinni's *Xaṣā'is*, that the background aim of Arabic grammarians is to prove the unique and exceptional position of the Arabic language, in which the word of God was revealed.

Finally, Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli criticise the superficial dichotomy that the opposition between descriptiveness and prescriptiveness covers when applied to a presumed shift in the Arabic grammatical tradition after Sibawayh. Rather, they say that Sibawayh's aim is twofold: to teach how to speak the language of the Arabs correctly and to enjoy the knowledge of the language, as well as the prestige attached to this knowledge (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1989, 261).

After 1989, the opposition between prescriptiveness and descriptiveness is not used to characterise the change in grammatical methods after Sibawayh. In other words, scholars agree that grammatical methods change after Sibawayh but this change does not primarily lie in a shift from descriptiveness to prescriptiveness, except for Levin (2000) and Carter (1999, 66).

## 2.3 Characterising Sibawayh's method

### 2.3.1 The ethical theory

Scholars have endeavoured to characterise Sibawayh's grammatical methods in terms that would be less caricaturesque than in the early period of Western scholar activity. Carter (1968) was a pioneer in a direction that other scholars took after him, namely, the legal origin of Sibawayh's method.

In the same spirit [as in Itkonen 1991, 343], unscientific though it may be, I can also record my own sense of "relief and exhilaration" on discovering (through a hint from a much later grammarian) that Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* became immediately comprehensible when read like an 8th-century legal text (Carter 1994b, 411).

Primarily, this hypothesis of Carter was his contribution to the debate on the origin of the grammatical tradition itself, and on the "Greek hypothesis" in particular, which kept Western scholars busy in the seventies and early eighties. We will not deal here with this debate as such, see Talmon (1990, 265–266) and Baalbaki (2007b, xx) for a detailed account of this debate and its antecedent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Carter describes Sibawayh's attitude toward language as being as far as possible from a logical phenomenon, namely, a form of human behaviour:

Loin d'être l'expression de principes logiques, le langage est, pour Sibawayhi, exactement le contraire, c'est-à-dire une forme de comportement humain. On ne pourrait guère trouver de contraste plus grand entre approches linguistiques que celui qui sépare Sibawayhi des Grecs du fait que, si la logique est à la fois abstraite et absolue, le comportement humain est concret et conventionnel (Carter 1972a, 82).

The consequence of this "ethical" view is that Sibawayh is compelled to treat words as people, having rights and duties (Carter 1972a, 83). The linguistic criteria developed by Sibawayh are thus, in Carter's theory, the prolongation of moral and juridical criteria, which leads him to write that "les quatre critères de rectitude linguistique sont tirés directement de la morale : ce sont *ḥasan*, *qabīḥ*, *mustaqīm* et *muḥāl*, dans leur sens littéral respectif de « bon », « mauvais », « juste » et « faux »" (Carter 1972a, 83).

Faithful to his view of the structural links between grammar and Islam, Carter (1973a, 147) explains in more detail his interpretation of Sibawayh's method: "Sibawayh regarded speech as a form of human behaviour", and he studies the different "ways" people speak, just like "ways of behaving". The hypothesis of Carter is that *naḥw* "way" is a "back-formation from the word *naḥwīyyūn*, which Sibawayhi uses to refer to 'those who concern themselves with the way people speak.'"

As any other human behaviour, language is a relationship between two people, and it is subjected to rules. In the case of language, Carter is also the first one to have noted the importance of the listener in Sibawayh's grammatical method:

It is the listener who determines rightness: much of what we say, as Sibawayhi points out, is conditioned by what we think our listener expects, whose questions we continually anticipate (Carter 1973a, 149).

In his keynote speech at the second Israeli symposium on the Arabic grammatical tradition in Haifa in november 1990, Carter says that grammar understood as a 'way' is analogous to Sunna, the 'Way' *par excellence*, and finds its place in the coherent system of medieval Islam at large (Carter 1991,

19–20). For him, this accounts for the minor role that the categories of true and false have played in the grammatical tradition:

For example, if the above outline is correct, it would account for the fact that truth and falsehood only play a minor role in grammar, having at first (with Sibawayhi) played none at all. Since in the Muslim view only God can see into people's hearts, there was no way for a grammarian, at least a purely formal one such as Sibawayhi, to determine the truth of an utterance, and he, like the lawyers, simply assumed that actions (including linguistic ones) can only be judged by their appearance. It was none other than Ḥalil himself who is supposed to have declared, in verse,

والله اعلم بالقلوب وانما لك ما بدا منهم بالألسن

'Only God knows what is in men's hearts, and all you have is what shows in their tongues' (Carter 1991, 19 quoting al-Marzubānī's *Nūr al-qabas*, 65.7).

He later formulates the same idea in a more straightforward way, by introducing a distinction between "the meaning of what people say" [m. 9] and "what they intend to say" [m. 1]:

By eliminating truth and falsehood as linguistic criteria at the very start of his *Kitāb*, Sibawayhi establishes that he has no interest in the meaning of what people say, only in how they say what they intend to say (Carter 1994b, 408).

This "ethical" interpretation of Sibawayh's method, which initially aims to answer the question of the origin of Arabic grammar, is further explored and compared to different authors of different periods in Carter (1997) and Carter (2001).

In a way that relates with Carter's theory, Baalbaki has further explored the idea that words have rights and duties, and has described at length the hierarchical classification of words according to these rights and duties by Sibawayh:

SIBAWAYHI's analysis of utterances and his application of the concept of *taqdir* are related to his set of considerations by virtue of which the sounds, words, etc. are to be classified and treated. Thus there are criteria for this classification, in a certain order or hierarchy, of sounds, words, etc., and the different positions in this hierarchy determine, for SIBAWAYHI, the treatment each 'merits'. This concept of 'merit' is among the concepts that relate harmony to hierarchy, as we shall see later (Baalbaki 1979, 14).

In his *Kitāb*, [Sibawayhi] invariably tries to establish an organized system of hierarchies where every element occupies the specific position which it 'merits' based on a number of criteria, such as *hiffa* (lightness), *tiqal* (heaviness), *tamakkun* (declinability), and *taṣarruf* (plasticity). By arranging linguistic items hierarchically, Sibawayhi not only tries to disclose the underlying order and organisation of Arabic but also to justify various aspects of usage, such as the discrepancies between words in causing 'amal, in being marked or unmarked, and in being triptotes or diptotes (Baalbaki 2007b, xxxv).

The arrangement of linguistic elements according to a hierarchical order is thus a prominent feature of Sibawayhi's phonological and morphological analysis (Baalbaki 2008, 120).

Versteegh, following a track he initiated at the end of the seventies, describes the method of Sibawayh as the reintroduction of the recourse to native speakers as the most reliable source of linguistic knowledge: "From the times of Sibawayhi onwards they returned, therefore, to *samāʿ* as the most reliable source of linguistic knowledge and the ultimate criterion of truth in linguistic matters" (Versteegh 1989a, 292). What is more, the Arabic language has the property of being "extensible" (*saʿat al-kalām*) and native speakers have some freedom to "expand" its syntactic constraints (*ittisāʿ*) (Versteegh 1990b, 284).

It is only in Versteegh (1995) that he seems to integrate elements of Carter's theory and articulate them to his own view of Sibawayh's method as an explanation of underlying structures of the actual speech of Arabs:

From the very beginning of grammatical theory, Arab grammarians treated the facts of language as a system in its own right, within which the linguistic units behaved just like members of a society. Language has its own laws, and from these laws linguistic units derive certain rights and duties. Since language is part of God's creation, there can be no arbitrariness in this system and for every phenomenon, for every apparent exception, there must be an explanation in terms of the overall system. The ultimate task of the grammarian is to explain to the believers why they talk as they do. Obviously, such a conception of the task of the grammarian could hardly be termed descriptive, but it would be wrong to regard the grammarians as normative, either. The only term that covers their conception of the function of linguistics seems to be 'explanatory' (Versteegh 1995, 7–8).

### 2.3.2 The enunciative theory

A new interpretation track appeared at the end of the eighties, namely the "enunciative theory". It is first introduced by Guillaume (1985) and further developed by Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli in the following terms:

Fondamentalement, la démarche de Sibawayhi se distingue de celle des grammairiens classiques par la place centrale qu'elle accorde à la dimension énonciative du langage. Chez lui, l'analyse des énoncés ne consiste pas à dégager les règles formelles qui gouvernent l'assemblage des éléments qui les constituent (les parties du discours), mais bien plutôt à retracer les opérations, tout à la fois formelles et sémantiques qui permettent au locuteur de construire la séquence linguistique, la « profération » (*lafẓ*) correspondant à son « vouloir-dire » (*ma'nā*) subjectif [...] (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1989, 261, referring to Kouloughli 1985).

This description of the grammatical method of Sibawayh is centered on the speaker and on his enunciation, i.e., the actualisation of his intention (*ma'nā* [m. 1]) in a particular formulation (*lafẓ* [incl. m. 12–14]). The authors further explain that for Sibawayh the success of a linguistic strategy is determined by the degree of compatibility between choices that the speaker

has to make at different levels, semantic [m. 12–14], syntactic, morphological and phonetic when he expresses his intention [m. 1]. This is the frame in which they interpret Sibawayh's criteria, as described by Carter (1972a). What happens in later classical grammarians is that they reduce these criteria to only two values, "correct" *ṣaḥīḥ* and "incorrect" *fāsid* (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1989, 261).

For the authors, Sibawayh's grammar is concerned by the underlying structures of the language, as revealed by the enunciative choices made by the speaker, as well as by the result of this hidden process, of which he is not aware as a native speaker.

It seems that Belguedj and Angheliescu had a very similar view, a decade before Guillaume, but they have not followed this track in their later publications. Angheliescu gives below clear examples of how Sibawayh focuses on the speaker and on his view of language as behaviour:

L'insistance des grammairiens sur *at-taqdīm wa t-ta'ḥīr* „pré-position et post-position", nous paraît bien oiseuse si on la considère seulement comme un problème de l'ordre des mots. Il ne faut pas oublier que les deux noms d'action proviennent des verbes actifs et se réfèrent donc à l'*intention* de mettre un membre de l'énoncé dans une certaine position (en avant ou en arrière). De même, un vocable comme '*amīla*, fréquemment utilisé par Sibawayhi, est pleinement significatif, parce qu'il veut dire „tu l'as fait actionner" (il s'agit d'un '*āmil* sur un certain terme de l'énoncé) (Angheliescu 1975, 11 referring to Belguedj 1973).

She gives the example of the sentence *Zaydun ḍarabtu-hu* "Zayd, I hit him", where the verb does not operate on *Zayd*. The locutor can also decide to vocalise *Zaydan ḍarabtu-hu* if he wants the verb to operate on *Zayd*. Angheliescu (1975, 11) says that "Les contraintes d'ordre grammatical s'exercent donc, dans un cadre que le locuteur choisit lui-même."

According to Belguedj, the reason why the speaker would chose a particular flexion can be motivated not only by an intended meaning, but also by a phonetic preference for one sound over another (Belguedj 1973, 180).

The position of Versteegh (1990b, 284) is slightly different. He acknowledges that the speaker has a central role as a criterion of correctness in the *Kitāb* but he also says that the elements of the language behave according to their own rules.

In later articles, Versteegh is even clearer that this can by no means be called a "communicative grammar". The study of the language has always been based on a written corpus, not on communicative phenomena, although grammarians say that they are analysing the Bedouin observed speech (Versteegh 1996, 591). In a more detailed way he writes:

His [Sibawayhi's] method set the trend for the entire Arabic grammatical tradition. Henceforth, the main purpose of the grammarians became the explanation of the surface form of the language, in particular the declensional endings. This is not to say that Sibawayhi was not aware of the communicational function of language. In many cases he explains the difference between utterances by referring to the extra-linguistic context and the expectations of the listeners (on the distinction of speech acts in the *Kitāb* see Buburuzan 1993). His use of the term *ma'nā* is significant in this respect. It denotes both the categorial meaning of linguistic elements, and the intention of the speaker. But when he mentions the intention of the speaker, it is in the form of a paraphrase of the utterance, serving no other purpose than to make sure that the meaning of the utterance is understood (Versteegh 2004, 273).

This, because “the rules of grammar do not refer to the speaker, but to the elements of the language” (Versteegh 1990b, 284). According to Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli, the rules of grammar evaluate the success of the speaker's enunciation by checking the listener's comprehension [m. 2] and the communicative purpose of the sentence [m. 6]. Ultimately, according to Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli (1989, 261), Sibawayh's criteria enable him to evaluate the semantic [m. 12–14], syntactic, morphological and phonetic choices made by the speaker expressing his intention [m. 1].

At this point, there seems to be a discrepancy between Versteegh (1990b) and Versteegh (1996). In the former, Versteegh says that for Sibawayh the native speaker is the “ultimate source and criterion for the correctness of speech” while in the latter he says that in Sibawayh's actual practice he does not describe and explain the observed speech of the Bedouin. The only logical conclusion—that will be confirmed below, p. 59 as we will see—is that this native speaker is a fiction, though a necessary and efficient fiction in Sibawayh's system.

A late development of this enunciative theory can be discerned in Baalbaki (2008), who seems to draw it a step further in the direction of a communicative interpretation:

In this part of the *Kitāb* [the first part, devoted to syntax], Sibawayhi's linguistic analysis is far more vivid and engaging than in the rest of the book, chiefly because syntactical study is where Sibawayhi's treatment of speech as a social activity and as interaction between a speaker and a listener is most visible (Baalbaki 2008, 31).

In a more specific way, Baalbaki adds that Sibawayh recognises to the speaker the quality of *ultimate operator* (*ʿamal*) “for the importance of intention (*niyya*) and hence meaning in *ʿamal* as a whole” (Baalbaki 2008, 98). This is a clear recognition that meaning is ultimately on the side of the intention of the speaker, which drives Baalbaki to write that “it ought to be clear by now that Sibawayhi is more interested in the relationship between *ʿamal* and the intention of the speaker than in the merely formal aspects related to *ʿamal*” (Baalbaki 2008, 197).

In his review of Baalbaki (2008), Larcher translates Baalbaki's interpretation of Sibawayh's treatment of meaning in the frame of Kouloughli's (1985) criteria, although with a different terminology:

Dans la quatrième [partie], intitulée « The balance between form and meaning », Baalbaki pose que la tradition grammaticale arabe est vue comme faisant pencher la balance du côté du *lafẓ* et non du *ma'nā*, autrement dit qu'elle est plus « formaliste » que « sémanticienne », mais qu'une telle affirmation n'est pas vraie de toute cette tradition en général et de Sibawayhi en particulier. Pour Baalbaki ce dernier tient au moins la balance égale entre *lafẓ* et *ma'nā*, voire la fait pencher du côté du *ma'nā*. En outre ce dernier est clairement vu comme une intention (sens littéral du mot) que le locuteur communique à l'auditeur, ce qui tire le *ma'nā* arabe, non du côté d'une sémantique « objective » (référentielle), mais du côté d'une sémantique « intersubjective » (pragmatique) (Larcher 2011, 122).

In other words, the importance that Sibawayh gives to the intention of the speaker as “ultimate operator” reveals a psychological approach to the dichotomy between *lafẓ* and *ma'nā*, in Kouloughli's wording. This clearly gives to Sibawayh's grammatical method a communicative quality, where the speaker is at the center of the communication process. The role of the grammarian is to unveil the hidden process that lies between the intention of the native speaker, understood as “ultimate operator” (Baalbaki 2008, 98), and its actual realisation in a speech oriented at a listener.

In this respect, Larcher (2011, 122) draws our attention to the following example commented by Baalbaki:

One of Sibawayhi's *ṣawāhid* is *wa-sāqiyayni miṭli Zaydīn wa-Ġu'al \* sabqāni mamšūqāni maknūzā l-aḍal* (“Two cupbearers like Zayd and Ġu'al, tall, slender and dense of muscle”). Obviously, *sabqāni*, *mamšūqāni* and *maknūzā*, which are in the nominative, agree neither with *sāqiyayni* nor with the two proper nouns (Baalbaki 2008, 180).

Instead of rejecting the independent form in the second hemistich, Sibawayh implicitly comments it as a case of *isti'nāf* (beginning of a new sentence), i.e., as the answer to a potential listener's question *man humā?*, which Baalbaki (2008, 180) explains as follows: “Obviously, the *lafẓī* rules pertaining to noun modification give way here to meaning as the ultimate reflection of the speaker's intention.”

In exactly the same kind of research as Baalbaki (2008), Marogy wants to “investigate the fallacy of the one-sided attitude to language ascribed to Sibawayhi, whether formal or functional, and restore the neglected complementary account of syntax and pragmatics to its focal position in the *Kitāb*” (Marogy 2010, xii). She concludes that “the *Kitāb* might be described as an instance of communicative grammar i.e. a grammar whose main purpose,



according to Leech [1983], is to relate syntax, pragmatics and semantics to each other" (Marogy 2010, 29).

In a recent article, Ayoub (2011, 145) deals with the criteria of correctness of speech in the *Kitāb*. Based on a study of the "ethical" criteria *mustaqīm* "right", *muḥāl* "wrong", *ḥasan* "good", *qabīḥ* "bad", and *kaḍīb* "false". While Carter (2004, 61–65) considers that the pair *mustaqīm* / *muḥāl* evaluates the semantic correction of an utterance, and the pair *ḥasan* / *qabīḥ* evaluates its structural correction, Ayoub shows that each pair refers together to *lafẓ* and *ma'ná*, and that the difference between them is that the pair *mustaqīm* / *muḥāl* evaluates the mere existence of the utterance, in terms of syntax and meaning, whereas the pair *ḥasan* / *qabīḥ* evaluates its quality as an utterance, also in terms of syntax and meaning.

A *muḥāl* utterance is an utterance that is unintelligible, for structural and/or semantic reasons. This is the case of *'ataytu-ka ḡadan* "I came to you tomorrow" (K. I, 7.15), and *Zaydun majnūnun bi-hi 'axū 'Abdi l-Lāhi* "Zayd is crazy about him the brother of 'Abdallāh" (K. I, 207.15). The point, for Ayoub, is that these sentences cannot be corrected because it is impossible to know what is intended. An example of an amendable expression (*mustaqīm qabīḥ* "right [but] bad") is *qad Zaydan ra'ayta* "Zayd you saw", because, although it is ill-formed, it is intelligible.

What is at stake in Sibawayh's grammar is clearly to first evaluate the existence of a true enunciative utterance, its communicative purpose [m. 6] (*mustaqīm* or *muḥāl*), and then to evaluate the quality of *mustaqīm* utterances (*ḥasan* or *qabīḥ*).

Some utterances are also labelled by Sibawayh as *kaḍīb* "lie". The expressions *ḥamaltu l-jabala* "I carried the mountain" and *šaribtu mā'a l-baḥri* "I drank the water of the sea" (K. I, 7.16) are *mustaqīm* but they are a lie [m. 9]. Ayoub notes that Sibawayh does not use this criterion in his grammar, except in the two preceding examples:

*Kadhib*, en revanche, relève d'une théorie de l'adéquation au monde : l'énoncé est empiriquement faux. Le *kadhib* ne joue pas de rôle dans la théorie grammaticale (Ayoub 2011, 171).

### 2.3.3 Semantics and underlying levels in the *Kitāb*

Far from this enunciative track (later transformed into a communicative one), most scholars have embarked since the early nineties on a description of Sibawayh's method as showing little interest in semantics, in comparison with

both earlier and later grammarians. It is now clear that what these scholars mean by “semantic” actually corresponds to a “formal *maʿnā*” (Larcher’s “objective, referential semantics”, our [m. 7–16]), and not an “intentional *maʿnā*” (Larcher’s “intersubjective, pragmatic semantics”, our [m. 1–6]).

Ayoub (1990) is quite radical about Sibawayh’s method. Here is what she writes about *tamṭil* “[underlying] representation”, a tool by which Sibawayh restores, as she says, the intended meaning in a expression that is, as such, not used in the language:

Au fond, le pur arabe, complètement intelligible, est celui qui ne se parle pas. Le *tamṭil*, en tant que voulant le règne de l’univoque, sans partage, s’inscrit lui-même nécessairement en tant que monstrueux, en tant que ‘ce qui ne se dit pas’, la langue étant essentiellement équivoque. [...] Si cette lecture du *tamṭil* est correcte, faut-il entendre la grammaire du Livre comme une grammaire formelle ? (Ayoub 1990, 11).

What she apparently means by this is that through *tamṭil* Sibawayh reformulates the intended meaning in “pure Arabic”, where the operation relationships are functioning perfectly, at a deeper level than the actual utterance. In other words, she believes that Sibawayh’s *tamṭil* corresponds with the intention of the speaker (*maʿnā* [m. 1] = *lafḍ*), and since *tamṭil* usually does not fit the rules of actually uttered language, she concludes that pure Arabic is that which cannot be spoken, asking herself whether Sibawayh’s grammar is completely formal or not, which would be very far from what an enunciative grammar could be.

Ayoub (1991) gives a much more detailed presentation of Sibawayh’s method. We have already mentioned her idea that formal grammar in the *Kitāb* does not exclude a semantic dimension:

Dans le Livre, il n’y a pas d’un côté “forme” entendue comme gouvernement et de l’autre le sens, que l’on entende par cela l’intention du locuteur ou quelque autre notion, mais la théorie du gouvernement même se fonde sur des analyses sémantiques et rend compte tant d’opérations syntaxiques que sémantiques ou relatives à l’énonciation. En somme, on a tort de croire que la théorie du gouvernement ne traite que de forme en oubliant le sens: Elle traite de la forme même du sens. Voilà ce qu’on tentera de montrer dans les développements qui suivent. Le formel sera entendu comme relationnel. On le savait déjà par l’analyse de la notion du *tamṭil*, ce que la grammaire représente, l’objet de la représentation est la relation entre les termes, non les termes eux-mêmes (Ayoub 1991, 40–41).

In a comparison between al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822) and Sibawayh (d. 180/796), Dévényi says that “Sibawayhi first explains the *ʾiṣṣāb* endings in his formal grammatical model and then tells us what consequences these have in relation to the meaning” (Dévényi 1990a, 105) whereas in the case of al-Farrāʾ “it is directly the meaning (*maʿnā*) that determines *ʾiṣṣāb* and not vice versa” (Dévényi 1990a, 106). She adds that for Sibawayh, *ʾiṣṣāb* is “an entity existing

in itself" that may express different meanings. Unlike Sibawayh, al-Farrā' "makes a one-to-one correspondence between the form of a sentence and its meanings" (Dévényi 1990a, 106), in a way which is much less formal than Sibawayh.

According to Versteegh (1994, 275), the early exegetical tradition was mainly concerned by the meaning of the text of the Qur'ān, endeavouring to find out the intention of God in the text, through paraphrase and restitution of underlying elements. The shift that Sibawayh and the grammarians after him have introduced is a focus on the deep structure of language itself.

In order to explore and at times restore this deep structure, which they equate with an underlying level of "operation" of some words on others, Sibawayh and his followers use the tool of *tamṭīl* (in the *Kitāb*) or *taqdīr* (after Sibawayh, Versteegh 1994, 285). Whereas Ayoub (1990) equated *tamṭīl* with a semantic reconstruction, Versteegh (1994) distinguishes two different types of reconstruction of the underlying level, structural (*tamṭīl*) and semantic (*ma'nā* [m. 3]):

It is important to note that in the examples given above the relation between the *tamṭīl* and the actual utterance is not one of paraphrase: the representation does not constitute a semantic reconstruction of the sentence. This becomes particularly clear when we look at the meaning (*ma'nā*) of the third example, which is not identical with its *tamṭīl*. Unlike the abstract representation the semantic paraphrase of the sentence is a complete, 'utterable' sentence:

	<i>mā ṣana'ta wa-aḥāka</i>
<i>tamṭīl</i>	* <i>mā ṣana'ta aḥāka</i>
<i>ma'nā</i>	<i>mā ṣana'ta ma'a aḥika</i>
	"what did you do with your brother?" (Versteegh 1994, 278).

The same idea is summed up in Versteegh (1997b, 239) where Sibawayh and the following grammarians are said to have "occupied themselves with the formal-syntactic aspect of language to the exclusion of other aspects, such as the lexical meaning of the words". In this article Versteegh even seems to come back again to the views expressed in Versteegh (1990b) about the centrality of the speaker's intention in Sibawayh's method:

In conclusion we may say that Sibawayhi at least once explicitly mentions the role of *ma'nā* as the semantic correlate (the lexical meaning) of words [m. 9] and sets of radicals [m. 12], and that in some passages he refers to the purpose of speech as a medium to communicate the intention [m. 1] of the speaker to the listener [m. 2]. But in the majority of instances in the *Kitāb* *ma'nā* denotes the syntactic function of a word or category [m. 14] (Versteegh 1997b, 243. The additions between square brackets are ours.)

It appears from the above quotations that, against Baalbaki (2008), Versteegh considers that it is Sibawayh who was responsible for a shift from the

psychological (intersubjective, pragmatic) approach to a linguistic (objective, referential) approach.

In a somewhat less dichotomous way, he adds that “Sibawayhi acknowledges the existence of a semantic level but since he takes its existence for granted he does not appear to feel any need for dealing with it explicitly” (Versteegh 1997b, 260). However, the “semantic level” which is dealt with in this quotation must correspond to the intentional *ma‘ná* [m. 1], otherwise it would contradict the previous quotation.

The only logical way to reconcile Versteegh (1990b) and Versteegh (1997b) is therefore to consider that *ma‘ná* [m. 1], understood as the intention of the (native) speaker, is the ultimate source of correctness as a background (an efficient and necessary idealisation), leaving the foreground activity of the grammarian to focus on formal *ma‘ānī* [m. 12–14], and excluding the lexical meanings [m. 7]. In other words, the shift that Sibawayh operates, according to Versteegh, is that he inverts the priority of the Qur’ānic commentators between their background interest in formal *ma‘ānī* [m. 12–14] and their foreground interest in intentional *ma‘ná* ([m. 1], the intention of God). As for the meaning produced by reformulation (communicative semantics [m. 3]), it is a tool used by both exegetes and grammarians (Versteegh 1994, 275, 278).

This is how we understand the following quotation:

One might almost say that from the times of Sibawayhi onwards the Arab grammarians accepted the existence of a semantic aspect of speech but felt this to be outside the scope of their own task, which was the elucidation of the syntactic changes in speech (the theory of governance and declensional endings). The analysis of the lexical meaning of words was left to the lexicographers, who codified these meanings in their dictionaries (Versteegh 1997b, 274).

Thus, Versteegh, referring to Dévényi, distinguishes Sibawayh’s approach from that of al-Farrā’, as far as semantics are concerned, in the following terms:

For the most part, Sibawayhi includes only syntactic arguments in his explanation of linguistic phenomena, whereas al-Farrā’ very often invokes semantic constraints in his linguistic argumentation (Versteegh 1997b, 241, referring to Dévényi 1990a,b).

Baalbaki (2008, 171–172) seems to have very similar analyses regarding Sibawayh’s attitude towards semantics. Although Sibawayh recognises the pertinence of notions such as synonymy and homonymy, he does not use them in the *Kitāb* and focuses instead on syntax and morphology.

However, faithful to his presentation of Sibawayh’s communicative grammar Baalbaki acknowledges the absence of interest of Sibawayh in referential,

objective, formal *ma'ānī* and, at the same time, his focus on the intention of the speaker, which gives its *ma'nā* to each utterance:

As we shall see in the next section of this chapter, *ma'nā* according to Sibawayhi is directly related to the intention of the speaker and the type of message he wants to impart to the addressee or listener, and is thus part of a wider process of communication which requires analysis. The speaker's intention is what gives each usage the desired *ma'nā*, and it is in this context that Sibawayhi's frequent usage of expressions in which *ma'nā* is assigned to a certain case-ending, part of speech, particle, notion, etc. can be best understood (Baalbaki 2008, 173–174).

What Baalbaki does here is that, unlike Versteegh, he considers the meaning of syntactic structures [m. 14] to be in a dialectic situation vis-à-vis the intentional *ma'nā* [m. 1], exactly like in the psychological paradigm described by Kouloughli (*ma'nā* [m. 1] vs. *lafḍ* [incl. m. 12–14]), while in the linguistic paradigm, the dialectic is *ma'nā* [m. 1.12–14] vs. *lafḍ*, which seems to be nearer to Versteegh's view of Sibawayh's method.

### 2.3.4 A limited set of rules

Owens describes Sibawayh's methodology, and especially his substitution technique, in the following words:

Certain items were identified as typically occurring at certain grammatical positions. Sometimes these positions are explicitly named and clearly have an existence independent of the items that realize the position; in other cases the positions at which the items occur are not named but nonetheless implicitly have a fixed status within the overall grammatical structure. Very often a position is identified in conjunction with a typical filler, and other members of the paradigm, often morphologically or syntactically more complex, are identified relative to this typical filler (Owens 1990a, 35).

This technique enables Sibawayh to reduce the number of possible cases to a limited set of rules. For example, the surface form of the compound *xamsata-ʿāšara* “fifteen” is attached by Sibawayh to the existing simple underlying pattern *xamsatan wa-ʿāšaratan* (Owens 1990a, 43).

Baalbaki insists on the fact that a characteristic of Sibawayh's method is to limit as much as possible the number of rules he uses to describe the language (or rather, the underlying decisions that the native speaker makes when he wants to formulate his intention). It is thus part of Sibawayh's method to “minimize the exceptions and so keep intact the general rules which he endorses” (Baalbaki 1990, 22). For example, in the case of *xamsata-ʿāšaru-ka* “your fifteen” which Sibawayh qualifies of “bad language” without justification (see below, p. 130), Baalbaki says that “it is clear that, for him, this usage is weak because it is both scant, and irreconcilable with the *qiyās*

which stipulates that nouns which are indefinite (*nakira*) and *mabnī* remain *mabnī* in case of *ʾidāfa*” (Baalbaki 1990, 22).

In a more general description, Baalbaki writes that “the first and surely most important concept to which *taqdīr* is related is that of the preservation of ‘basic rules’” (Baalbaki 2008, 70) and he later gives his interpretation of these “basic rules”:

Hence it is legitimate to introduce the concept of ‘basic rule’ to refer to the usage which Sibawayhi considers to be most common and most representative of a form, pattern, particle, etc. and which, in spite of the presence of deviating material, must be recognized as the actual manifestation of accepted norm. Obviously, Sibawayhi is keen to deal with a relatively small number of ‘basic rules’ which are considerably more manageable than a large body that would result from an indiscriminate approach which gives equal weight to the normal and the anomalous” (Baalbaki 2008, 135).

In the presence of variants that do not comply to these basic rules, Baalbaki (2008, 155–159) mentions three different tactics adopted by Sibawayh: He either ignores (deliberately?) these variants, or he judges them negatively (just like *xamsata-ʿaṣaru-ka* mentioned above), or he interprets data in a way that does not contradict the rule, sometimes surprisingly, as the *ʾalif* in *kilā* and *kiltā* (“both [masc. and fem.]”) which he refuses to interpret as a dual marker because it would create further inconsistencies.

### 2.3.5 Consistency at a lower and a larger scale

Carter insists on Sibawayh’s search for consistency, both at a lower and a larger scales, and of course, his article on the construction *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman* is an advocacy for consistency in the *Kitāb* on both these scales (Carter 1972b).

Versteegh has explained this search for consistency in a general way that applies to the whole grammatical tradition:

For the Arabic grammarians speech is a system in equilibrium, whether it is the result of a revelation from Allāh (*tawqīf*), or of an agreement between men (*iṣṭilāḥ*). Each and every letter, word, category, has its own place and its own rights. Every phenomenon can and must be explained, and every deviation from the original form (*aṣl*) is the result of a well-defined cause (*ʾilla*), and occurs according to well-defined rules (Versteegh 1978, 261).

According to him, this trend has been reinforced by the introduction of logic doctrines because, as he puts it, “chaque élément de la langue devenait une preuve de la perfection du tout” (Versteegh 1980, 49).

In a more specific way, Baalbaki writes that “the main concept that SIBAWAYHI employs in discovering underlying harmony in the language is

that of *taqdīr*, 'suppletive insertion', which is the assumption of the virtual occurrence of parts of the utterance, mainly the operants or '*awāmil*, believed by him to have been elided" (Baalbaki 1979, 7–8).

Following her own interpretative track about '*amal* "(syntactic and semantic) operation" in the *Kitāb*, Ayoub reaches the same conclusion that there is a very strong internal unity to Sibawayh's method, and that it applies to phenomena that modern linguistic tradition would consider as separate:

On touche là, à travers la question du gouvernement, à un point de spécificité de cette théorie grammaticale. Elle fait la part des propriétés géométriques du langage et les articule, d'une manière qui lui est propre, à la référence et à l'énonciation. De là vient l'importance cardinale de la théorie du '*amal* où les trois types d'opérateurs se conjoignent. Elle articule des domaines qui sont sentis exclusifs l'un de l'autre dans le champ de la linguistique contemporaine: l'énonciation, la pragmatique et la syntaxe, ce qui se disait aussi grammaire de phrase et grammaire de discours. Ils le sont par le biais d'un attachement à la littéralité de la marque, à la matérialité de la langue comme forme phonétique, agencements, relations (Ayoub 1991, 81).

Since then, Baalbaki has been the champion of this cause, namely, revealing the consistency of the *Kitāb*, both at a local level and between chapters. He does not hesitate to call "spectacular" the chapter in the *Kitāb* which deals with the *fā'* that is followed by the subjunctive (Baalbaki 1990, 186) because of its local and wider consistency. The same goes for the chapters on the vocative and the generic negation *lā* (Baalbaki 2006). He further says, describing Sibawayh's *Kitāb*:

Undoubtedly, it is the first coherent description of Arabic grammar, especially syntax and morphology. It is also one of the earliest authored works in any Islamic discipline; that is, it is not the product of oral communication between a teacher and his disciples, but a real attempt at composing a coherent whole which has a beginning and an end, and which systematically examines the material defined by the discipline. The ultimate proof of this lies with the numerous cross-references which Sibawayhi makes throughout the *Kitāb* and the amazing consistency with which he analyzes, in separate parts of it, phenomena which he considers to be parallel or analogous (Baalbaki 2007b, xix–xxx).

Humbert (1997, 554–555) summarises the three main arguments in favour of a written origin of the text, as presented first by Schoeler (1985, 1989): The division in chapters with titles that are too precise to be the product of an oral teaching, the many cross-references in the text, and the fact that nobody ever read the book before Sibawayh, who died at an early age.

Humbert (1995, 83–92) has also shown, based on her study of the manuscripts, that the written work of Sibawayh has gained the authority of an oral teaching thanks to al-Mubarrad's copy, where he had introduced a transmission chain and critical commentaries of al-'Axfāṣ al-'Awsaṭ (d. 215/830), al-Jarmī (d. 225/839) and al-Māzinī (d. 248/862). These—at time

lengthy—glosses are still present in the modern editions, which are all based on al-Mubarrad's vulgate.

In his book devoted to the legacy of the *Kitāb*, Baalbaki (2008) devotes no less than three sections to the issue of consistency in Sibawayh's method: "The classification of data within a coherent system" (152–170), "The tools of checking system validity" (215–226) and "The internal unity of the *Kitāb*" (226–230).

The other analytical methods presented in Baalbaki's (2008) chapter two are "The preservation of 'basic rules' (134–152), "The balance between form and meaning" (170–191), "The role of the speaker and the listener" (191–207), and "The use of *miṭāl* and *ṣāhid*" (207–215). These issues have been dealt above.

We will now consider the studies on the grammatical methods of later grammarians. We will focus on the way scholars characterised the breaks in the Arabic grammatical tradition after Sibawayh.

## 2.4 Prescriptiveness of post-Sibawayh grammar

At an early stage, modern scholars have expressed their opinion that a great deal of spirit was lost in Arabic grammar after Sibawayh. As we have seen above, the first criterion that these scholars used to oppose Sibawayh to the later grammarians was that of prescriptiveness vs. descriptiveness. Carter makes this very harsh description of the evolution of post-Sibawayh grammar, which he links to the evolution of Islam at large:

L'histoire de la grammaire arabe n'est guère mieux que l'histoire des vicissitudes du *Kitāb* entre les mains de grammairiens de plus en plus prescriptifs : tout comme l'Islam en général devint de plus en plus consciemment normatif, le contenu purement descriptif du *Kitāb* se trouve réduit à un corpus fossilisé et improductif de données archaïques, et les arguments formels grâce auxquels Sibawayhi (comme n'importe quel linguiste compétent) était capable d'arriver à des considérations prescriptives furent élaborés et développés au point de perdre tout contact avec les réalités des structures et des processus linguistiques qui avaient constitué le propos original de Sibawayhi (Carter 1973b, 301).

Versteegh (1983, 158) sees two main reasons behind this prescriptive attitude of early Arab scholars: the "confusion of many speakers with regard to the use of the declensional endings, and the constant decay of the Classical standard". These two reasons—which could easily be regarded as one—are "intensified by the fact that a correct recitation of the Qur'an depended precisely on the knowledge of the rules of grammar". The "grammatical



doctrine” that they produced was an answer to these problems. It consisted of a canon of rules extracted from the language of the Bedouins that was available to apply to the language.

This has led grammarians to retrospectively evaluate the language of the Arabs and refute some of their expressions that did not comply with the rules they had formulated. This is what 'Abū Janāh (1980) and Baalbaki (1985, 23) mention about al-Mubarrad.

In a later article, Baalbaki comes back to the prescriptive turn in post-Sibawayh grammar in more specific terms. He says that later grammarians have departed from the “delicate balance” Sibawayh had established between analogy (*qiyās*) and actual use (*samāʿ*). Post-Sibawayh grammarians took a prescriptive direction, and eventually subjected attested usage to their own rigid rules (Baalbaki 1995, 123).

It is only thanks to grammarians like al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078), according to Baalbaki, that an attempt was made to fuse again the study of *naḥw* and *balāghah*, which were clearly separated at his time (Baalbaki 1995, 132). We have seen above that whatever communicative value scholars attribute to the grammatical method of Sibawayh, he is widely considered as the one who autonomised the study of syntax from that of exegesis. Baalbaki continues by saying that “this attempt [of al-Jurjānī] was again short-lived, and *balāghah* itself was later plagued with rigidity and the lack of continued revision of theory” (Baalbaki 1995, 132).

This judgement of post-Sibawayh grammar as being prescriptive is again formulated in Baalbaki (2007b, xxxvi), Baalbaki (2008, 237) and Marogy (2010, 37).

Angheliescu (1985) represents another voice in this debate that seems to be rooted in the late forties and which focused on the opposition between normative and theoretical grammar. She concludes that the normative turn that the Arabic grammatical tradition takes after Sibawayh is not that of a prescriptive grammar understood as a pedagogical simplification but of a theoretical one, i.e., a grammar focused on formal explanations and the search for causes.

L'évolution - ou l'involution - de la grammaire vers la normativité est donc une question de langage: il ne s'agit pas d'une simplification didactique, mais d'une accentuation du caractère de théorie formelle de cette grammaire. Les éléments de théorie empirique ont toujours existé dans la grammaire arabe; leur spécificité consistait, peut-être, dans cette “immatérialisation de la fonction des voyelles finales” dont parlait L. Massignon (1954, 11). L'idée d'expliquer les choses visibles par ce qu'on ne voit pas (il faut mentionner à ce propos la conception du sens comme quelque chose de “caché”, de “secret”) pourrait être suggérée par le système de l'écriture arabe (Angheliescu 1985, 9).

Yet, most of these studies are primarily based on the comparison of later works with the *Kitāb*, with which these grammatical works contrast, and not on an in-depth study of these works themselves. Scholars who have dealt with later grammarians apparently link post-Sibawayh's prescriptiveness with two phenomena: the need for a pedagogical tool, which was briefly mentioned above, and the contact between Greek logic and grammar, which helped formalise and systematise Sibawayh's teaching, opening the way to the search for grammatical causes.

## 2.5 The pedagogical turn

Post-Sibawayh shift has been described as that of speculation vs. pedagogy, as stated by Carter:

Regrettably the emphasis in Arabic grammar shifted very quickly from the speculative to the merely pedagogical, and in the reduction of Sibawayhi's theories to a canon of rules much was lost (Carter 1972b, 495).

As we have seen above, Carter links the pedagogical turn of Arabic grammar with the evolution of Islam, which needed to secure and systematise the Arabic language as “seul authentique véhicule de toute tradition passée, de toute discussion actuelle et de toute norme future” (Carter 1973b, 300). He detects this shift as early as in the work of al-Farrā' (d. 207/822):

Nous croyons possible de discerner les premiers signes de ce changement qualitatif de la grammaire arabe dès l'époque d'al-Farrā' : son allusion à des « débutants dans l'instruction » implique clairement que la grammaire était devenue à son époque objet d'enseignement — conception qui est entièrement absente du *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi, rédigé seulement une trentaine d'années auparavant (Carter 1973b, 301).

In exactly the same manner, Carter adds that al-'Axfāš (d. 215/830), a disciple of Sibawayh, mentions fictitious poetic lines forged to test students and that similar pedagogical tricks are found in al-Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab* (Carter 1973b, 301).

For Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli, a definitive shift in the direction of a canonical model for later grammar happened with Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl*:

The importance of this event has for a long time been underestimated, for many reasons (among others, the fact that the *Kitāb al-Uṣūl* was not published until quite recently [in 1973]), and the accepted idea had been that Sibawayhi had, in fact, laid down the basic rules and methods of grammar, while the later grammarians' contribution consisted only in expounding his theory in a more explicit and systematic form, or in finding new applications for it (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1990/2006, 4–5).

Guillaume is more specific describing the nature of the change that Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl* triggers:

Toutefois, la réalisation la plus significative en ce domaine reste incontestablement le *Kitāb al-ʿUṣūl* d'Ibn as-Sarrāğ (mort en 316/928), l'un des plus jeunes disciples d'al-Mubarrad: organisant pour la première fois la matière grammaticale selon un ordre rigoureusement systématique fondé sur des principes explicites et clairement définis, il offre un modèle totalement reproductible, où la place de chaque question, de chaque classe de données et de chaque discussion est déterminée, de façon univoque, par son statut dans l'organisation générale de la théorie. Il s'agit là d'une véritable révolution scientifique, en ce qu'elle permet aux grammairiens de dépasser le stade de l'improvisation individuelle et d'installer leur discipline dans une perspective réellement cumulative. De fait, l'ordre d'exposition de la matière grammaticale élaboré par Ibn as-Sarrāğ devait progressivement s'imposer comme le 'modèle canonique', repris, avec des variantes mineures, par la quasi-totalité des traités grammaticaux depuis le VI<sup>e</sup>/XII<sup>e</sup> siècle (Guillaume 2000, 273).

In another direction, Suleiman (2003, 41–43) expresses the same ideas as Carter on the pedagogical role of Arabic grammar in Islamic society. He gives an example of the failure of a grammatical theory (*tarāfuʿ*) because it contradicts what has been taught for centuries, which goes against pedagogical consistency.

Looking at this issue from the other side, namely from the perspective of the *Kitāb*, Carter says that is it an “ouvrage d'allure si descriptive et si spéculative qu'il en est à peu près inutilisable comme manuel pédagogique” (Carter 1973b, 301), which is illustrated in Baalbaki (2008, 263–272) by the use of *taqdīr* “suppletive insertion” and *taʿlīl* “reconstruction”. These reconstructed underlying levels are felt by the speaker and the student as highly artificial and speculative, in other words, not pedagogical.

However, Baalbaki (2005, 43) does not consider that there is a “pedagogical turn” in post-Sibawayh. In the opposite, he believes that Sibawayh has renounced the pedagogical aim of grammarians before him and has inaugurated a speculative grammar that was not oriented at learners but at preserving its theoretical consistency.

## 2.6 The contact of Greek logic and grammar

The other reason behind the prescriptiveness turn of post-Sibawayh grammar is certainly the contact between Greek logic and grammar at the end of the III<sup>th</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century and Ibn as-Sarrāj's grammatical treatise is very representative of this contact:

The effort to systematize grammar and codify *uṣūl* must be seen within the general context of the ever-growing preoccupation of the grammarians after Sibawayhi with logic (Baalbaki 2007b, xxxvii).

This point has been studied in detail by Versteegh in the early eighties. He says that “pour les grammairiens qui vinrent trois générations plus tard [après al-Farrāʾ (d. 207/822)] la logique grecque était déjà devenue quelque chose de familier, et il est bien facile d’en démontrer les traces dans leurs œuvres” (Versteegh 1980, 41–42). He mentions the following grammarians in particular, among the most famous ones: Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912), az-Zajjāj (d. 311/923), Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-Xayyāt (d. 320/932),<sup>5</sup> az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949), as-Sīrāfi (d. 368/979), al-Fārisī (d. 377/987), ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994) and Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1001).

He identifies two questions that arose as a consequence of the confrontation with Greek logic: the issue of the relationship between words and significations and the issue of the criteria of correct speech:

Deux questions en particulier se posèrent [suite à la confrontation avec la logique grecque] : en premier lieu le problème de la relation entre mot et signification. Est-ce que les significations sont identiques pour toutes les nations, et seuls les mots différents selon les langues, ou bien, les significations sont-elles intimement liées aux mots et donc différentes pour chaque nation ? Voici le problème de l’universalisme contre le relativisme. L’autre question est celle des critères de la parole correcte. Est-ce que la parole doit obéir aux lois de la pensée humaine, ou bien à des lois syntaxiques indépendantes ? (Versteegh 1980, 42).

The first issue can be reworded as follows: If meanings differ from one language to another, then they belong to the scope of grammar, while if they are the same, whatever the language, then they belong to the scope of logic (Versteegh 1980, 42–43). In the second case, grammarians should limit their research to the behaviour of words (*ʿalfāḍ*) in a given language while logicians should study the meanings (*maʿānī*) that can be expressed in any language.

According to Versteegh, this clear separation preached by logicians was not only the result of their logical choices but also of personal considerations, namely, the fact that as non-Arabs they could not compete with the Arabic grammarians for a social recognition:

Pour les premiers logiciens arabes (ou plutôt arabophones, car la plupart d’entre eux furent des Chrétiens nestoriens de langue syriaque) il s’agissait de se trouver une place dans la société scientifique arabo-islamique. Le moyen de s’assurer cette place, ils le trouvèrent en avançant une séparation stricte entre le *lafẓ* « expression » et le *maʿnā* « signification » (Versteegh 1989b, 253–254, referring to Elamrani-Jamal 1983; Endreß 1977, 1986; Versteegh 1980).

<sup>5</sup>And not Ibn al-Xayyāt. See Kaḥḥālāh (1957, IX, 23).

When one reads the works of these grammarians it is clear, according to Versteegh, that the use of logic is limited to terminology and classification, not to a complete reworking of grammatical theories. Thus, he calls this entry of logic in grammar a “nouvelle mode”, i.e., an imitation of foreign models rather than the discovery of new opinions (Versteegh 1980, 46). This “new fashion” was almost inevitable, even for those grammarians who opposed it, such as as-Sirāfi (d. 368/979), and who had to superficially reshape their teaching using the new terminology and classification (Versteegh 1980, 48).

Elamrani-Jamal has also tackled this issue of the links between logic and grammar. His aim is firstly to refute the Greek hypothesis about the origin of Arabic grammar but he also deals with contacts between logic and grammar in later periods. He remarks that in the end of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century, grammar is fully developed when it is confronted to Greek logic:

La grammaire arabe est un art achevé lorsqu'elle est confrontée à partir de la fin du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avec la logique. A ce titre, aucune explication d'origine sociologique liée à la communauté de l'Islam ne pourra en rendre compte entièrement, en tant qu'elle est distincte d'autres sciences qui sont aussi appelées traditionnelles, comme les sciences du *ḥadīṭ* (traditions du Prophète) ou du *fiqh* (Droit). Aussi la dernière thèse sur les origines de « la grammaire arabe » soutenue par Carter, qu'il affirme explicitement « substituer à l'hypothèse grecque », ne pourra être retenue comme une explication totale car elle ne peut rendre compte de l'existence autonome d'une science grammaticale (Elamrani-Jamal 1983, 73 referring to Carter 1972a).

Later, Versteegh (1990a, 207) gave a more detailed account of the new shape that Arabic grammar adopted under the pressure of the new fashion, which did not affect the actual content of the traditional linguistic theories but their presentation. The same content was presented in a more organised and rigorous way.

An illustration of this is found in the separation of verbs in three grammatical tenses, past, present and future, which entered Arabic grammar in the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century to fit the logical representation of time that was widely accepted by then (Versteegh 1981, 55).

In a similar manner, Carter (1981/83, 117) notes about post-Sibawayh grammarians that “their energies went instead into the task of reducing Sibawayhi's huge corpus of all kinds of partially inflected words to a finite number of categories based on nine ‘factors preventing full inflection’ (*mawānī' al-ṣarf* [...])”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Carter quotes here az-Zamaxšarī's (d. 538/1144) *Mufaṣṣal* 9.19 (§ 18) for the expression of these ‘nine *mawānī' min aṣ-ṣarf*’. However, they are found more than two hundred years earlier in Ibn as-Sarrāj's (d. 316/928) *ʿUṣūl* (II, 80–93).

It is however clear for Versteegh that a merger never happened between logic and grammar, except maybe in a few individual authors like Ibn ‘Aqīl (d. 769/1367) in some limited issues (Versteegh 1991, 89). At a wider scale, grammarians rather rejected the pretention of logic, partly because of their “superior attitude” towards foreign input and partly because they could not accept to restrict themselves to the only formal of speech, leaving the semantic side to philosophers (Versteegh 1990a, 209–210).

Troupeau is certainly less radical than Versteegh in his conclusion on the “rationalisation of grammar”:

En fait, la rationalisation de la grammaire arabe avait commencé beaucoup plus tôt [que ce que prétend Fleisch (1957)], avec des grammairiens de la première moitié du X<sup>e</sup> siècle, comme Ibn al-Sarrāj (m. 928) et al-Zajjāji (m. 949). Ces grammairiens de Bagdād, en effet, ne se contentèrent plus d’énumérer et de décrire les phénomènes grammaticaux à la manière empirique de leurs prédécesseurs ; mais, influencés par la logique aristotélicienne, ils essayèrent de classer et d’expliquer ces phénomènes d’une manière rationnelle, au moyen de la recherche de leurs causes (‘illa, pl. ‘ilal) (Troupeau 1994, 13).

We have seen above, p. 43, that Baalbaki insisted on the fact that Sibawayh was eager to describe the language with a limited set of basic rules, or rather principles, that apply widely, sometimes at the expense of simplicity or evidence because some speculative thinking is required to let actual use fit within these basic rules.

Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli say that this speculative simplicity has disappeared from al-Mubarrad’s *Muqtaḍab* and other post-Sibawayh works, where it has been replaced by a “heterogeneous” approach, apparently based on a “philological” interest in minority forms in the language.

It is, for instance, typical of this approach that al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898), in his *Muqtaḍab*, devotes a whole chapter to the irregular plural of *qaws* (‘bow’) *qisiyy*, this chapter being somewhat longer than the one in which he discusses the much more general and, we should feel, important problem of the assignation of the nominative to the subject of the verbal phrase (*Muqtaḍab*, I:8–9 and 39–41, respectively). This kind of approach, in which facts of different nature and rules of different degree of generality are put together in what seems a haphazard order, is also quite perceptible in the two other main grammatical works of the period, the *Ma‘ānī l-Qur‘ān* by al-Farrā’ (d. 207/822), who was in his time the leader of the so-called ‘Kūfan’ school (see below, pp. 6–8), and a shorter work bearing the same title by al-Axṣāf al-Awsaṭ (d. 221/835), a disciple of Sibawayhi (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1990/2006, 5).

Owens (1990a) has adopted a similar criterion, namely heterogeneity vs. standardisation that he uses to evaluate the change that happened between the *Muqtaḍab* and the *‘Uṣūl*. In this book that was fiercely attacked by Carter (1994a) he describes the evolution of grammar between Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj in a way that can be labelled as a “sophisticated simplification”:

On the one hand, the most important development that occurred was surely the erection of a sophisticated, easily intelligible system for presenting the facts of Arabic grammar. Sarraj's *'Usuwl* marks a milestone in that it ordered data of a most diverse nature – distributional, semantic, pragmatic [...] – within a small number of grammatical categories whose independence rested in their abstracting away from the set of individual features they represented. A formal prerequisite for this organization, though hardly a sufficient condition, was the mutual one-to-one assignment of linguistic items to classes [...] Each item was unambiguously assigned to a single grammatical category; each category represented a unique set of items (Owens 1990a, 242).

The early evolution of Arabic syntactic theory can thus be seen as a period in which a set of diverse, if basically similar, linguistic ideas was developed into a conceptually explicit, simple and well-organized grammatical description. It culminates in Sarraj's *al-'Usuwl fī l-Nahw*, and its end sets the stage for the evolution of Arabic grammatical theory in new and original directions (Owens 1990a, 243).

In other words, the rationalisation of Sibawayh's grammar is twofold, according to Owens. The classes used to describe the language are multiplied in order to serve a one-to-one assignment of linguistic items and classes, and they are organised in a simple way, i.e., explicit and rational. Owens (1991, 235) considers that this is the core of the main shift that happened in tradition.

To this picture, Troupeau adds that rationalisation is motivated by the search for causes, along with the introduction of logic:

C'est dans le *Kitāb al-Uṣūl* d'Ibn al-Sarrāj que nous observons les débuts de la rationalisation de la grammaire, par l'introduction de divisions de la logique et la recherche des causes. On disait que la grammaire était demeurée folle jusqu'à ce qu'Ibn al-Sarrāj la rendit raisonnable par ses *Uṣūl*, et al-Marzubānī prétendait qu'Ibn al-Sarrāj avait traité la matière du *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi au moyen des divisions formelles des logiciens. Certes, des ouvrages sur les causes grammaticales avaient été composés par des grammairiens du siècle précédent, comme Quṭrub (m. 821) et al-Māzinī (m. 862), mais ces œuvres ne nous étant pas parvenues, c'est dans l'introduction du *Kitāb al-Uṣūl* que nous trouvons la première mention de ces causes (Troupeau 1994, 14, referring to as-Suyūṭī's *Buġyat al-wu'āh*, 44).

What lies behind this search for rational causes is Mu'tazilah, a philosophical and theological movement that flourished in Baġdād in the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century. We cannot enter in the complexity of the history and the doctrine of Mu'tazilah. In the following pages we will simply review what the historians of Arabic grammar have written in the past decades in order to focus on the linguistic implications of Mu'tazilah.

## 2.7 Mu'tazilah and grammar

It is noticeable that the Miḥnah (ca. 218–246 AH / 833–861 AD), the inquisition-like persecution of non-Mu'tazilites, also referred to as Traditionalists, hap-

pened during the lifetime of al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898). It is thus the main political and religious context of his scholarly activity. Muʿtazilites were not at first preoccupied with grammar, however, elements of their doctrine have clear linguistic implications (creation of the Qurʾān, human convention for the assignment of meanings to words, nominalism). See Frank (1981); Loucel (1963–64); Peters (1976) for more details.

Troupeau describes the rationalisation of grammar in the first four centuries of Islam as the work of “the great Muʿtazilite grammarians”, in the steps of Ibn as-Sarrāj. It culminates in the VI<sup>th</sup>/XII<sup>th</sup> century with Ibn al-ʿAnbārī (d. 577/1181):

Mais c’est surtout sous l’influence de la logique que la méthode de Baṣra évolua profondément à Baġdād, durant ces quatre siècles. On a vu que la logique avait été introduite dans la grammaire, au début du X<sup>e</sup> siècle, par Ibn al-Sarrāġ, et que les grands grammairiens muʿtazilites du milieu de ce siècle en avaient généralisé l’emploi. Cette utilisation de la logique aboutit à une rationalisation de la méthode de Baṣra primitive, telle qu’al-Mubarrad l’avait introduite à Baġdād au siècle précédent. Déjà très avancée dans l’œuvre d’Ibn Ġinnī, à la fin du X<sup>e</sup> siècle, cette rationalisation est achevée, au XII<sup>e</sup>, dans l’œuvre d’Ibn al-Anbārī: elle constitue l’un des principaux aspects de l’évolution de la grammaire arabe, et l’on peut dire qu’elle est l’œuvre des grammairiens de Baġdād (Troupeau 1962, 405).

As far as grammatical methods are concerned, which is the focus of this review, the debated issue at the end of the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> century is that of the determination of “causes” (*ʿillah*, pl. *ʿilal*) in grammar. Grammarians can unearth the causes behind linguistic phenomena by using their reason because, in the Muʿtazilite views, language is a human convention. As pointed out by Carter, the political and religious implications of this simple claim are enormous:

If language could be proved to be a mere human institution, it would follow that the Qurʾān was created and consequently subject to all the limitations of human endeavour, thus enabling the Muʿtazila to claim that dogma and law should be constructed on the basis of reason only (Carter 1983, 68).

Troupeau (1994, 13) notes that the term “cause” (*ʿillah*) is said to have been introduced by al-Xalīl b. ʿAḥmad (d. 170/786), according to a tradition that goes back to az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949). He adds that the word *ʿillah* is found in the *Kitāb*, but in the general meaning of “reason”, not “logical cause” and that it is only in Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *ʿUṣūl* that these “causes” are explicitly mentioned:



Après avoir défini ce qu’il entend par la grammaire, Ibn al-Sarrāj poursuit: “Les causes alléguées par les grammairiens sont de deux sortes : la première sorte est ce qui fait parvenir à la langue des Arabes, comme lorsque nous disons : tout agent a une voyelle /u/ ; l’autre sorte est appelée “la cause de la cause”, comme lorsque nous disons : pourquoi l’agent a-t-il une voyelle /u/ et l’aji [sic] sur lui, a-t-il une voyelle /a/ ? Et pourquoi, si le *yā* et le *wāw* sont vocalisés et si la voyelle qui les précède est /a/ parlent-ils convertis en un *alif* ? Cela ne nous procure pas le fait de parler comme parlent les Arabes, mais on en déduit leur sagesse dans les fondements qu’ils ont établis et par lesquels se manifeste la supériorité de cette langue sur les autres langues. Or mon propos, dans ce livre, est de mentionner seulement la cause qui, lorsqu’elle est généralisée, fait parvenir à leur langue, et de mentionner les fondements et ce qui est usuel” (Troupeau 1994, 14).

In a very different perspective, Baalbaki notes indeed that post-Sibawayh grammarians do not refer to grammatical causes (*‘ilal*) in the same way as Sibawayh. He says that in the works of grammarians such as al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898), Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), al-ʿAstarābādī (d. 686/1287) or as-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) argumentation is much more theoretical than in the *Kitāb*, because, in a way, they assign some independent life to the causes themselves, which weakens their link to the grammatical phenomena they wish to explain (Baalbaki 2008, 59).

The impression that causes have an “independent life” can only be reinforced by the fact that early post-Sibawayh grammarians like Quṭrūb (d. 206/821) and al-Māzinī (d. 248/862) are said to have composed books entirely devoted to the study of grammatical causes (Troupeau 1994, 14).

As is clear from Troupeau’s quotation above, Ibn as-Sarrāj distinguishes two types of causes, descriptive and explicative. Later grammarians have refined their criteria and multiplied the types of causes they discern in grammatical texts. While az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) observes three different causes at work in grammar, didactical (*taʿlīmiyyah*), analogical (*qiyāsiyyah*) and dialectical (*jadaliyyah*) or speculative (*naḍariyyah*) causes, ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994) counts as many as six different types of causes, analogical (*qiyāsiyyah*), rational (*ḥikmiyyah*), necessary (*darūriyyah*), conventional (*waḍʿiyyah*), exact (*ṣaḥīḥah*), and false (*fāsīdah*). These are presented in Troupeau (1994, 15).

Troupeau also says that this search for grammatical causes was not shared by everyone in the Islamic West, where this trend was violently criticised by the grammarian Ibn Maḍāʾ (d. 592/1196), under the influence of Ibn Ḥazm’s (d. 456/1064) doctrine. Nakamura (1974, 100) writes that Ibn Maḍāʾ says that the tool of *taqdīr* must be avoided, along with any reconstruction of non-existing forms, and that the theory of *ʿamal* should be abolished:

When Ibn Maḍāʾ says that the Arabic grammar has become deteriorated and complicated on account of the *raʾy* of the grammarians, what does he mean concretely by *raʾy*? Technically it is the theory of regent (*naẓariyyah al-ʿamil*). For this reason, he asserts first of all the abolition of this theory (Nakamura 1974, 100).

Versteegh insists on the fact that this search for grammatical (and rational) causes, which is typical of the Mu'tazilah, is the other side of the Arabic grammatical tradition after Sībawayh:

In the treatise I have translated and commented here [az-Zajjājī's *ʿĪdāh*] one finds the other side of Arabic grammatical theory [other than morphology and syntax], its preoccupation with issues that belong more to a general theory of language and linguistics than to a grammatical theory in the narrow sense of the word. This particular type of linguistic treatise flourished in the 3rd-5th/9th-11th centuries, during the period when the Mu'tazilite influence in linguistics was manifest (Versteegh 1995, xiii).

In this respect, (Versteegh 1995, 7) considers that az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) occupies a special place in the Arabic grammatical tradition because, despite his opposition to the intrusion of logical notions in grammar, his Mu'tazilite opinions lead him to present and formulate his linguistic theories in the new logical frame.

According to Versteegh, almost all grammarians of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> and IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> centuries have in common that "most of them are said - or accused - to have been Mu'tazilites. This applies, for instance, to Quṭrub (d. 206/821), Māzinī (d. 249/863), Mubarrad (d. 285/898), Fārisī, Ibn Ğinnī, Sīrāfī, Rummānī, Zaġġāġī." (Versteegh 1996, 595). Among the topics that are dear to Mu'tazilite grammarians he mentions the origin of language, metaphors, the doctrine of *ʿāmil*, the dichotomy between *ism* and *ṣifah* in relation with the divine attributes, the nature of language, created or not, and the inimitability of the Qur'ān. He adds that what concerns them most behind all these topics is the relationship between thought and speech, between *ʿalfāḍ* and *maʿānī*, between grammar and rhetorics (Versteegh 1996, 595-597). And in Versteegh (1997b) he also mentions the following topics: the creation of the Qur'ān, the difference between *ism* and *musammá*, the identification of *ism* with *tasmiyah*, the status of language as an act of the speaker.

Versteegh explains that although the Mu'tazilah had lost its sympathy in the general public after the Miḥnah (Versteegh 1997b, 266), its ideas, methods and terminology infiltrated the domains of grammar, rhetorics and the principles of jurisprudence (Versteegh 1996, 596).

He concludes about the Mu'tazilites that "it was through their efforts that the other disciplines were forced to reconsider their options. In the end, we could say, Greek thought through the good services of the Mu'tazila conquered the Islamic world as well" (Versteegh 1996, 600).

Bernards is very careful about the link of al-Mubarrad with the Mu'tazilah and its influence on his grammar:

To be sure, al-Mubarrad had great admiration for the famous Mu‘tazilite al-Jāhiz, but he was also personally acquainted with the above-mentioned Qur’ān scholars Ibn Mujāhid and Ismā‘īl b. Ishāq al-Qādi who were both opposed to Mu‘tazilism. It should be recalled, too, that al-Mubarrad taught grammar at *Jāmi‘ al-Manṣūr*, and access to this mosque was not free of control. Moreover, *Jāmi‘ al-Manṣūr* was situated in the quarter of *Bāb al-Baṣra*, a stronghold of the traditionalists who included the followers of Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), the man who had led the opposition to the pro-rationalistic policies of the caliphs prior to al-Mutawakkil. Whether al-Mubarrad held “rationalist” or “Mu‘tazilite” views in his grammatical theories is a dead-end question since we do not have a definition of what a rationalist or Mu‘tazilite grammar would be, if at all, nor is such an inquiry a goal of this study. What we are able to establish at this point is that on a social and political level, the Mu‘tazila did not play any significant role in al-Mubarrad’s life (Bernards 1997, 34–35).

The picture is quite different for Ibn as-Sarrāj, according to Carter (2000, 270), who describes his *Kitāb al-‘uṣūl fī n-naḥw* as based “on a purely rational foundation, i.e. independent of descriptive, pedagogical or religious considerations”, which he links to the Mu‘tazilah in a way that prefigures ar-Rummānī’s grammar (Carter 1984, 218):

In this Ibn as-Sarrāj slightly anticipated a trend which was already under way in legal reasoning, developments being inspired by the preoccupation of the Mu‘tazila with demonstrating the ultimate rationality of Islamic thinking. Ibn as-Sarrāj represents a major step in the evolution of grammar: even his pedagogical text *al-Mūḡaz* is conspicuous for its use of *taqṣīm* or dichotomous classification, an important new technique which is totally absent from Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab* of al-Mubarrad (Carter 2000, 270).

These *taqāṣīm* “exhaustive divisions” are also underlined by Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli (1990/2006, 10) in Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *‘Uṣūl*, but they do not mention a link with Mu‘tazilah. They link it with logic, which Ibn as-Sarrāj had studied with al-Fārābī (d. 339/950), one of the most famous philosophers of his time.

On the other hand, they mention the two fields that grammarians had before them, to study the grammatical principles or the grammatical causes as such. They say that few works have survived from the second field:

As for the *‘ilal* approach, it seems to have given rise to rather important literature throughout the period; most of it, however, is no longer (or perhaps not yet) accessible to us, with two exceptions: the *Kitāb al-Idāh* by al-Zaḡḡāḡī (d. 340/951) and the *Xaṣā’is* by Ibn Ğinnī (d. 392/1002). Although these two works are quite different in many ways, they are founded on identical presuppositions: (a) that the grammatical theory evolved by the Arabic tradition is not only able to describe facts as they are, but also to explain why they are so; and (b) that this explanatory power of grammar is a consequence of the pervasive order, harmony and rationality which uniquely characterizes *kalām al-‘Arab*, as opposed to other human idioms (Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli 1990/2006, 11–12).

In addition to these two treatises, one can also mention Ibn al-Warrāq's (d. 381/991) *ʿIlal an-naḥw* (Versteegh 2006a).

We will conclude this too brief survey of the links between Muʿtazilah and grammar by the idea expressed by Suleiman that this search for causes is linked with wider imperatives:

The study of the causes in AGT [Arabic grammatical tradition] was also tied to a wider ideological imperative whose object was (a) to prove that the internal 'logic' and harmony of Arabic grammar reflect the same in the language in its pre-descriptive state, and (b) this in turn reflects and proves the 'wisdom of the Arabs' (*ḥikmat al-ʿArab*) (Suleiman 2003, 44).

Besides the formal contact of Greek logic and grammar, which is obvious in Ibn as-Sarrāj's treatise and which found its expression in a Muʿtazilite influence, another phenomenon has been described that also contributed to the formal turn in Arabic grammar after Sibawayh, namely, the closure of the linguistic corpus studied by grammar.

## 2.8 The closure of the linguistic corpus

The issue of the corpus on which Arabic grammarians work is briefly mentioned by Carter (1973a, 149) and Carter (1981/83, 109–110): It is more than probable that Sibawayh considered Arab vocabulary to be a finite corpus, hence his use of proper names as an permanent source of new words in the language. Doing grammatical research on a closed corpus or on an open corpus has great implications, since an open corpus constantly challenges the grammatical solutions found to account for the data, while a closed corpus enables the grammarians to focus on the rules and refine them. The fact that the linguistic data collected on the field by grammarians are considered to belong to a closed corpus means that "les grammairiens du IX<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècle décrivent virtuellement le même état de langue que ceux du II<sup>e</sup>-VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle" (Versteegh 1989b, 248).

Carter later tackles this issue in itself:

More disturbing still is the difference in attitude to data. The traditional Arab grammarians, after an initial and relatively short phase of truly descriptive grammar, were left with a corpus of data which was no longer the product of direct observation but had acquired the nature of legal evidence whose authenticity was guaranteed by the reliability of its transmitters. This material legitimized a self-consciously prescriptive grammar whose purpose was to perpetuate an ideal form of Arabic for reasons that are well known (Carter 1987–1988, 213).

Owens later adds that Ibn as-Sarrāj was able to systematically classify language utterances only because at his time the language described by grammarians is not spoken any more but is a closed corpus, which comprises written poetry, the Qurʾān, and the previous grammatical works (Owens 1991, 234–235).

Versteegh (1993a, 6) mentions this issue again, referring to Owens (1990a, 102), and further develops it in Versteegh (1995, 8) by saying that the corpus of the language described by the grammarians was closed in two ways, firstly because it was limited to the Qurʾān and pre-Islamic poetry and secondly because literate people were believed to spontaneously abide by the rules of grammar, which implied that they did not need any overt grammatical norm.

We have already mentioned above, p. 37, what seems to be Versteegh's position about the corpus explained by Sibawayh: He says he is describing and explaining the observed speech of the Bedouins while he actually describes and explains the language of the Qurʾān and poetry (Versteegh 1996, 591). Versteegh (1997a, 41–42) explicitly mentions this fiction, which Sibawayh must have been aware of, just like any other grammarian.

The fiction was possible because at the time of Sibawayh, there must still have been Bedouins fluent in Classical Arabic:

In the early centuries of Islam there were certainly Bedouin who could be and were used as informants. But in the course of the centuries there were no longer any pure Arabic-speaking Bedouin around, and the native speaker, the pure Bedouin, became a fictional figure, although the grammarians continued to talk about “their language” (Versteegh 1997a, 42).

Levin takes a quite different approach to this issue. He does not mention the discrepancies that Sibawayh must have been aware of. See Kapeliuk (2003) for an appraisal of Levin's ideas and a praise for Sibawayh's “modern methods”. Rather than mentioning the discrepancies between the Bedouin actual language and the language studied by Sibawayh, Levin (2000) focuses on the dialectal variants that the *Kitāb* describes in much detail. He writes, in a way that articulates Sibawayh's both prescriptive and descriptive aim:

It is clear that Sibawayhi's prescriptive remarks do not form any deviation from his descriptive method, since they were made for the sake of people interested in learning the language of the ‘Arab, either as a foreign dialect or even as a foreign language. (Levin 2000, 254, referring to Levin 1994)

More generally, the issue of the Bedouin informants of Arabic grammarians of the two first centuries is dealt with extensively in Gouttenoire (2010). The author does not present the case of Sibawayh but she deconstructs the literary theme of the “trip to the desert” of these grammarians, according

to the sources. She shows that it primarily serves an ideological purpose of IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century grammarians.

Carter (2000, 266) sees a clear trace of the conscious move of the closure of the linguistic corpus in Ibn Wallād's (d. 332/944) *Intiṣār*, edited by Bernards (1997). Ibn Wallād mentions (pp. 74–76) a dispute about the decision to put an end to inductive reasoning (*istiqrā'*), and to replace it by analogical deduction of causes (*'ilal*) based on general principles (*'uṣūl*) that could account for all linguistic phenomena.

He further comments on the closure of the linguistic corpus, which Ibn Wallād links to the antagonism between Kūfah and Baṣrah, by saying that the coherence of the abstract set of *'uṣūl* “was no longer dependent on linguistic evidence but on systematic reasoning. It had therefore become necessary, in order to preserve the original *uṣūl* from further change, to eliminate induction as a means of discovering new facts” (Carter 2001, 63). This dispute finally polarized between Kūfan grammarians who rejected the strict limitation of the data and Baṣran grammarians who accepted it.

Carter goes so far as to affirm that “all the polemic which developed later between these two schools is a logical by-product and rhetorical elaboration of the original Baṣran and Kūfan positions on induction” (Carter 1999, 57). Unsurprisingly, he parallels this development in the Arabic grammatical tradition with the closure of the legal corpus in the early IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century (Carter 1999, 67).

Then, Carter proposes his view of the four stages of the development of more than ten centuries of Arabic grammatical tradition: 1. Pre-Sibawayh collection of linguistic data, “with almost no processing or analysis”; 2. Sibawayh endeavours to “survey the entire known language” and categorise it through induction and self-conscious analogy; 3. Rationality of the language being taken for granted, “the rationality of the analytical method itself is scrutinized” by authors like Ibn as-Sarrāj, “completing the transition from descriptive to prescriptive grammar set in train by his master al-Mubarrad”; 4. Closure of the linguistic corpus in the early IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century by grammarians who “must now prove that the norms are themselves logical both in origin and structure”. Sibawayh's *Kitāb* is “reduced to a database, and although all his descriptive and functional categories are taken over they are now subordinated to reasoning which is identical with the *uṣūl al-fiqh*, as Ibn al-Anbārī declared in the twelfth century” (Carter 1999, 66–67).

Baalbaki (2007b, xli–xlii) refers to Carter's description on this issue of the closure of the linguistic corpus on which grammarians based their interpretations. He had written earlier in a more specific way that the corpus of *ṣawāhid*

“(linguistic) witnesses” was practically closed by the end of the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> century, with the notable exception of some *‘aḥādīṭ* “prophetic sayings” that entered this corpus later as *ṣawāḥid*. Baalbaki (1995, 129) adds details about the date when the corpus of prose was closed:

For prose, the corpus was open roughly up to the end of the second/eighth century in the case of the urban areas (*amṣār*) and up to the end of the fourth/tenth century in the case of the Bedouin. It is clear that by the time of Ibn Ġinnī (d. 392/1002), who himself frequently consulted Bedouin informants, it was rare to encounter an eloquent (*faṣīḥ*) Bedouin the purity of whose dialect is totally untarnished (Baalbaki 2008, 40–41).

The extinction of “native speakers” of Classical Arabic is directly linked with the supposed semantic and communicative dimension of grammar. Indeed, if Classical Arabic is no longer a living language, i.e., a language that nobody can be said to have an innate sense of its rules, its grammatical description can hardly focus on its communicative value, even if the myth of these native speakers survived their actual disappearance for some time.

We can now consider the issue of the role of semantics in post-Sibawayh grammar, not in contrast with prescriptiveness, but with formalism, to see how a formal semantic dimension emerged, as opposed to enunciative and communicative semantics.

## 2.9 Semantics in post-Sibawayh grammar

### 2.9.1 What is a formal grammar?

This fundamental question is not dealt with by our authors, and it seems that some of them have a negative judgement of what a “formal grammar” is. They oppose it, depending on their own theoretical frame, to a “lively” approach, or to an enunciative, communicative or functional grammar, which are positively labelled.

Technically speaking, a formal grammar is a grammar concerned with the linguistic forms, as opposed to the meanings conveyed by these forms. In a more specific way, Baalbaki assimilates structure and form to “case-endings, uttered and elided operants, and the syntactic function of words” (Baalbaki 1991, 89). A formal grammar is thus a grammar that focuses on *‘i‘rāb*, syntactic operations and functions, and on morphological derivations.

### 2.9.2 An increased formalism after Sibawayh

Carter (1972a, 84–86) considers that post-Sibawayh grammarians have abandoned Sibawayh's view of words as entities having rights and duties in the sentence and have worked in a strictly normative context. He even adds that the end of this process was the identification of grammar with law:

At all events grammar had unmistakably identified itself with law by the 6th/12th century. To the evidence supplied by Haarmann can be added the contributions of Goldziher, e.g. the composition by grammarians of books especially for the use of lawyers, and other information which will not be enlarged upon here (Carter 1983, 77 referring to Goldziher 1871/1967 and Haarmann 1974).

He dates back the origin of this identification of grammar and law to the canonisation of the huge corpus of *'aḥādīṭ* "sayings of the Prophet":

By the 3rd/9th century there are clear indications that the grammarians had begun to realize the significance of their particular skills in interpreting the law. This resulted directly from the achievement of Šāfi'ī [204/820] in elevating to canonical status the Sayings of the Prophet collectively known as the *Ḥadīṭ*. For while traditionally regarded as the end of a process ('closing the gate of *iğtihād*', with no possibility of further Revelation), the very success of Šāfi'ī led to a period of intense scholarly activity around the sifting, authentication and classification of thousands of individual *ḥadīṭs*, an undertaking for which the qualifications of the grammarian were indispensable. Opponents of the *Ḥadīṭ*, namely the Mu'tazila, seized this opportunity to attack the *Ḥadīṭ* in its most vulnerable state, as can be judged by the hostile counterpolemic of *Ta'wīl muḥtaliḥ al-ḥadīṭ* by Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889). Many of the arguments he refutes are entirely linguistic in nature [...] (Carter 1983, 67).

However, as Gilliot (1997, 371) puts it, *'aḥādīṭ* are not a source of linguistic witnesses (*šawāhid*) because they are sometimes transmitted according to their meaning and not verbatim. For later grammarians, their absence in early grammatical works surely did not encourage them to use them as witnesses.<sup>7</sup>

Baalbaki shows that the formalisation of grammar is due to a clear-cut separation between *naḥw* "grammar" and *balāḡah* "rhetorics":

It is the inability to distinguish between the relation of *naḥw* to *ṣarf* and the relation of *naḥw* to *balāḡa* which caused widespread misunderstanding among those contemporary Arab scholars who have, following a wrong interpretation of the tradition, always thought of *ṣarf* and *naḥw* as one unit, and of *balāḡa* as another unit only distantly related to the first (Baalbaki 1983, 7–8).

This track was inaugurated by Belguedj some ten years before. He formulated the hypothesis that the separation between *naḥw* and *balāḡah* was a conscious decision of post-Sibawayh grammarians. They chose not to deal

<sup>7</sup>This point is dealt with in more detail below, see p. 89.



with the intention of the speaker, which they left to *balāḡah* to study, and focused on the grammatical techniques (Belguedj 1973, 183–184).

The consequence of this theoretical separation is that grammarians tend to focus more and more on the syntactic relationships, and especially ‘*amal*’ “operation” as expressed by the case-endings, at the expense of the meaning intended by these relationships:

Case-endings represent for the Arab grammarians, and especially in the second and third centuries, mostly a syntactical phenomenon which is usually related with meaning, and not an exercise which serves the concepts of ‘*āmil*’ and ‘*ma’mūl*’ as can be felt from the writings of most grammarians from the fifth century onward (Baalbaki 1983, 8–9).

In a different conceptual frame, Guillaume (1986)<sup>8</sup> says that the shift that happened at the end of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century is “the transition from the study of *kalām* in the sense of ‘actual speech’ to the study of *kalām* in the sense of ‘language’” (as quoted by Versteegh 1996, 592). This “nouvelle grammaire”, as Guillaume labels it, was more technical, more structure-oriented, less concerned by the functional dimension of language. Versteegh (1989b, 259) quotes a fierce criticism addressed by Ibn Xaldūn (d. 808/1406) to his contemporary grammarians who are ignorant of “linguistic habit” and whose books are devoid of Bedouin poetry and discourse. Versteegh adds that this late period of Arabic scholarship has also produced subtle and sophisticated works:

Il n’est pourtant nullement paradoxal que ce soit à cette époque, dès le VII<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle que l’on rencontre les grandes synthèses de la réflexion linguistique arabe, comme par exemple les ouvrages d’al-Astarābādī, dans lesquelles toute la subtilité et toute la sophistication de cette tradition ont culminé (Versteegh 1989b, 259).

It has thus become a new doxa that grammarians (beginning with Sibawayh, for Versteegh, after him, for Carter and Baalbaki) have focused their interest on structure and form, at the expense of a focus on meanings:

It is generally accepted that Arab grammarians were predominantly concerned with structure and form—especially case-endings, uttered and elided operants, and the syntactic function of words—and rarely resorted to the criterion of meaning as the main arbiter in grammatical analysis. Despite some differences between grammarians in their emphasis on structural and formal (i.e. *lafẓī*) considerations or on meaning, preference of the first over the latter took place at a fairly early stage in the history of Arabic grammar—a tendency which certainly grew with time, and eventually tarnished the image of grammarians and lost them their credibility (Baalbaki 1991, 89).

This does not mean that there was no significant methodological development after Sibawayh, but later works “can hardly match his insight into

<sup>8</sup>And not 1987, as stated in Versteegh (1996, 592).

grammatical issues and often reduce his lively and dynamic approach into a set of rigid rules" (Baalbaki 2007b, xxxvi). The opposition between Sibawayh's "lively and dynamic approach" and later grammarians' "rigid" and normative approach has been linked by Baalbaki with a shift in the equilibrium between *lafẓ* and *ma'nā*:

The Arabic grammatical theory is generally known for its preoccupation with *lafẓ* (form) more than *ma'nā* (meaning). Unfortunately, the preponderance of *lafẓ* over *ma'nā* is widely assumed to be true of the various stages of development of the discipline, perhaps as a result of the fact that until a few decades ago the grammatical tradition has been indiscriminately judged by almost exclusive reliance on later sources and commentaries considered to be representative of the whole tradition including earlier works. (Baalbaki 2008, 170).

Baalbaki (2008, 192) adds that post-Sibawayh grammar "fails to maintain [Sibawayh's] insight into the pragmatic role which he ascribes to the speaker, the listener, and the context in which speech takes place". According to him, post-Sibawayh grammarians base their research on the same corpus, use the same terminology, arguments and analytical tools as Sibawayh (Baalbaki 2008, 231), but in a stricter way that leaves no place for the communicative interaction between the speaker and the listener:

Before all this, it may be appropriate to point out that the differences between Sibawayhi and the later authors—which are largely due to the degree of strictness with which they apply the same set of analytical tools and methods to grammatical study—should not obliterate the fact that the main features of the whole tradition are basically those of the *Kitāb* (Baalbaki 2008, 235).

His conclusion is that this change in equilibrium between formal and semantic considerations characterises post-Sibawayh grammar at large:

In fact, the imbalance between *lafẓ* and *ma'nā* became a distinctive feature of the tradition almost in its entirety as Sibawayhi's dynamic and vivid approach was gradually abandoned. To be sure, the *Kitāb* does include a great deal of formal analysis and does embrace speculative elements in which Sibawayhi intervenes in constructions by proposing unuttered elements, particularly 'awāmil, which he claims to be responsible for certain formal aspects of those constructions and for various relationships among their constituent elements. It is clear, however, that this aspect of his syntactical analysis comprises a semantic component whose link with *lafẓ* he is normally keen to highlight. Hence, formal considerations in the *Kitāb* cannot be studied in isolation of meaning (Baalbaki 2008, 272–273).

This interpretation, which is summarised in Marogy (2010, 37), has been challenged in two different ways, firstly by showing that post-Sibawayh grammarians do include a semantic dimension in their grammar and secondly by emphasising on the fact that the contact with Greek logic had forced the grammarians to reconsider their position towards semantics. Larcher's criticism of Baalbaki's (2008) view gathers both these arguments, that we will consider separately below:

J'avoue être en désaccord cordial avec cette vision : je ne pense pas en effet que la grammaire arabe se soit jamais désintéressée du sens (comment d'ailleurs pourrait-il en être autrement dans un univers herméneutique ?). Simplement, dans une tradition s'étendant sur de nombreux siècles, on peut admettre qu'il y a des moments et, plus encore, à *tout* moment, des *individus* plus attentifs que d'autres à cet aspect des choses. Sibawayhi était sans conteste l'un de ceux-là et cela fait maintenant près de trente ans que son exceptionnel intérêt pour des questions de nature énonciativo-pragmatique a été reconnu. Mais cela fait trente ans aussi que ce même intérêt a été reconnu à l'autre bout de la chaîne chez les grands grammairiens du VII/XIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle, au premier rang desquels Raḍī al-dīn al-Astarābādī (m. 688/1289)... Et entre les deux, on trouve des propositions remarquables touchant le sens chez Mubarrad, Ibn al-Sarrāḡ et bien d'autres (Larcher 2011, 123).

### 2.9.3 A rediscovery of the semantic dimension in post-Sibawayh grammarians

Thanks to more in-depth studies on post-Sibawayh grammarians, the unique and isolated position of Sibawayh has been challenged, especially with regards to his attitude towards intentional and communicative semantics [m. 1–6] and functional grammar. Owens notes for example that al-Mubarrad's description of the dependent form displays a functional dimension:

Sibawayhi, and even more so, 'Aḥfaš, offer a largely formal account in their description of the accusative form, the accusative characterizing a position of structural separation [...]. In Mubarrad the emphasis shifts to a functional one; accusatives are associated with a position, an object (Owens 1990b, 260).

In exactly the same manner, he says that al-Mubarrad's approach to the *tamyīz* is primarily based on semantic considerations, whereas in the *Kitāb* the parallel passages do not rely on semantic constraints to explain this construction:

Sibawayhi identifies certain formal features which the specification, *tamyīz*, possesses: it is always indefinite and singular for instance. Nonetheless, the unifying parameter for the category came to be a semantic one: the *tamyīz* grew most directly out of the class of items characterized in terms of their meaning, 'explanation', *tafsīr*. Semantics also played an increasingly important role in the interpretation of the possessive construction, where in Sibawayhi's earliest formulation no general prepositional paraphrases are proposed, these first appearing with Mubarrad (Owens 1990b, 260).

What is surfacing here is certainly a semantic concern, however linked with the syntactic functions and structures, i.e., semantic constraints in the syntactical definitions themselves, which correspond to [m. 13] and [m. 14]. The difference with the *Kitāb* is not their appearance, since it is very clear that they were present in Sibawayh's analyses, though not in the definitions. Ultimately, the difference lies in that they are now in a dialectic relationship with the *lafḍ* (i.e., *ma'nā* [m. 13–14] vs. *lafḍ*), not with the intention of the

speaker (*ma'ná* [m. 1] vs. *lafđ* [incl. m. 13–14]). In order to understand Owens when he says that “semantics also played an increasingly important role”, one must understand here “objective, referential semantics” [m. 7–16], not “intersubjective, pragmatic semantics” [m. 1–6].

Ṭāhā has written her PhD thesis on this very topic:<sup>9</sup> the emergence of a semantic dimension in post-Sibawayh grammar. She recognises that this dimension was never absent but that it surfaces clearly in Ibn as-Sarrāj, who represents a turning point on this respect:

But my examination has led me to the conclusion that there was never a total absence of semantics in the approach of the early Arab grammarians. Instead, there was, among the earliest writers, a lack of focus on semantics, since the primary goal of Sibawayhi was to explain the surface syntactic structures of the Arabic language together with its morphological derivation and inflection systems. [...] Explained in the following pages is the position of Ibn as-Saraaj as a turning point in the history of Arabic linguistic thinking – a scholar in whose work semantics and syntax complemented each other in the description of the language (Ṭāhā 1995, 6).

Basing her research on the treatment of transitive verbs by Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj, she shows that “Ibn al-Sarraaj achieved a far more elaborate and comprehensive description of the different syntactic and semantic roles of verbs in general and transitive ones in particular” (Ṭāhā 1995, 126), whereas Sibawayh “chose to ignore semantics it [sic] in order to concentrate on the linear description of surface sentence structure” (Ṭāhā 1995, 312–313). Thus, she calls “anecdotic” the presence of semantic criteria in the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab* (Ṭāhā 1995, 315). Once more, in order to understand this assumption, one must read “objective, referential semantics”, not “intersubjective, pragmatic semantics”.

In a way that expresses more precisely her theory of the appearance of a semantic dimension in post-Sibawayh grammar, Ṭāhā says that the efficiency of the classification introduced by Ibn as-Sarrāj is made possible by the introduction of semantic criteria in the syntactic definitions:

Al-Mubarrad’s approach in describing verb in/transitivity is similar in many respects to that of Sibawayhi. Although al-Mubarrad continued to classify verbs on the bases of their morphological Forms and Patterns, he added other criteria for his classifications. In many instances the lexical meaning of the verb itself contributed to the classification (Ṭāhā 1995, 119).

This seems to correspond to what we have already quoted above about Dévényi’s opinion on al-Farrā’, as quoted by Versteegh:

For the most part, Sibawayhi includes only syntactic arguments in his explanation of linguistic phenomena, whereas al-Farrā’ very often invokes semantic constraints in his linguistic argumentation (Versteegh 1997b, 241, referring to Dévényi 1990a,b).

<sup>9</sup>Her main ideas are summarised in Ṭāhā (2010).

In a later article, Ṭāhā states anew what she sees as a major difference in grammatical method, as far as verbal transitivity is concerned:

The most striking difference between the 10th-century grammarian Ibn as-Sarrāj and Sibawayhi is that the morphological aspect of determining transitivity is almost absent in Ibn as-Sarrāj's treatment of the issue. His analysis was mostly, if not entirely at times, based on the meaning denoted by the verb itself (Ṭāhā 2009, 415).

In one of the rare critical studies available on al-Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab*, al-Māḍī (2009) takes the same direction as Ṭāhā, exploring the semantic dimension of grammar. After a rather ahistorical introduction, he defines the different "grammatical meanings" (*ad-dalālah an-naḥwiyyah*) dealt with in the *Muqtaḍab*: *ad-dalālah al-mu'jamiyyah* "lexical meaning" which he describes as the semantic meaning of the root [m. 12], *ad-dalālah al-waḍi'fiyyah* "syntactic meaning" [m. 14], *ad-dalālah as-siyāqiyyah* "contextual meaning", which he describes as the six possible moods of the sentence [m. 5], *'ixbār* "predication", *ta'kīd* "confirmation", *istifhām* "interrogation", *suxriyyah* "irony", *ta'ḍīm* "glorification" and *ta'ajjub* "astonishment", and, lastly, *ad-dalālah al-isti'māliyyah* "[actual] use meaning" which is the meaning attested by actual use if it differs from an original meaning, especially if an element has been elided in speech:

وهي الدلالة التي تظهر من كثرة استعمال التراكيب النحوية في الكلام مما يكون الاستعمال سبباً في تركها ودالاً عليها في الوقت نفسه، وهذه الظاهرة ظهرت بشكل واضح عند المبرد في باب الحذف إذ كانت المسوغ له في أحيان كثيرة. وهذا ظاهر قوله: «والحذف موجود في كل ما كثر استعمالهم إياه»، فالاستعمال يكون دليلاً على الحذف ودالاً عليه [...] (الماضي ٢٠٠٩، ٢٦ نقلاً عن المقتضب ٤١٤٦/٢)

This last meaning corresponds either to [m. 2] or [m. 3], depending on whether one insists on the reconstruction process of the elided utterance or on the understanding of an expression attested by use.

Thus, according to al-Māḍī, the types of meanings that al-Mubarrad deals with are either communicative [m. 2.3.5] or formal [m. 12.14], i.e., either linked with the message and its communicative value (*fā'idah*) or linked with the linguistic sign. Interestingly, he does not mention the intention of the speaker as a possible source of meaning in the *Muqtaḍab*. It is however not sure that with this simple interpretative grid the author would be able to exhaust the possible semantic dimensions in the *Muqtaḍab*.

### 2.9.4 Semantics forced on grammarians

As we have seen above, Versteegh does not insist on a shift in grammatical methods that would have happened after Sibawayh. His position is that Sibawayh inaugurates a new grammatical method that will prevail until the confrontation between Greek logic and grammar at the end of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century. For this reason, it is only after this confrontation that a second change occurs in the relationship between grammar and semantics (the first shift happened from meaning-oriented exegesis to structure-oriented grammar with Sibawayh in the second half of the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> century):

Not only did the grammarians feel forced to alter the presentation of their ideas and theories, for instance, by including proper definitions of the notions they operated with, but a general dissatisfaction with the purely formalistic approach of conventional grammar led to a number of attempts to change the character of linguistics as a discipline by introducing a renewed interest in the semantic aspect of speech (Versteegh 1997b, 259).

Versteegh (1997b) considers that al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078) is “the most interesting representative of this new approach”. The publication in 1982 of his *Muqtaṣid*, a large commentary on al-Fārisī’s *ʿĪdāh*, made possible a renewed insight in his methods:

In this commentary al-Ġurġānī’s opinion does not exhibit any major differences with standard grammatical theory, but in his other writings he criticizes the grammarians openly for not taking into account the semantic differences between various constructions, but concentrating exclusively on the formal-syntactic differences (Versteegh 1997b, 259).

Of course, the shift that was inaugurated and exemplified by al-Jurjānī does not mark a stop in ancient formal methods, nor does it mean that there was no interest in semantics before. Versteegh (1997b, 264) writes that the interest in semantics has come to the first plan, and that the old method still had followers after the V<sup>th</sup>/XI<sup>th</sup> century.

A later stage of the study of the relationship between *lafẓ* and *maʿnā* is the science of *waḍʿ al-luġah* that studies the conventional link between words and meanings. The first author who dedicated a treatise to this new science was al-ʿĪjī (d. 756/1355) but it is only in the XII<sup>th</sup>/XVIII<sup>th</sup> century that it was acknowledged as a separate science (Versteegh 1997b, 272–273).

We will not explore this path any further. Suffice it to say, for the sake of our review, that “the general attitude of the linguists towards meaning changed drastically when they were challenged by the universalist claims of the logicians who tried to monopolize the study of meaning” (Versteegh 1997b, 274). In a later article, Versteegh links this focus on form in the

early grammatical tradition to a disinterest in other languages than Arabic and in universal categories that could have applied to all languages. The confrontation with Greek logic has challenged this view by forcing Arabic grammarians to consider the issue as such (Versteegh 2000, 300).

Versteegh recognises that if Arabic grammarians did not turn into comparative linguists, at least they could not ignore semantic questions any more:

In the aftermath of this confrontation the grammarians became even more fixed on their own language, although the contact with logical ideas may have made them more receptive to another development in Arabic grammar, the interest in semantics with had been almost completely absent in the predeceasing period. With both the efforts of linguistically oriented rhetoricians such as al-Ġurġānī (d. 471/1078) and as-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) semantics became an integral part of the discipline (Versteegh 2000, 305).

As expected, Baalbaki is less straightforward than Versteegh on a semantic turn that Greek logic would have imposed on grammar. He rather considers that authors like al-Jāhīd (d. 255/869), Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002), al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078) or as-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185) are exceptions:

In contrast to the above-mentioned general tendency of later authors to give priority to *lafẓ* in their grammatical analysis, there were a few attempts to restore a central role to *ma'nā* and to highlight the speaker's awareness as the most essential arbiter to usage (Baalbaki 2008, 273).

But these attempts were “short-lived, and *balāghah* itself was later plagued with rigidity and the lack of continued revision of theory” (Baalbaki 1995, 132). He gives the example of as-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) for whom the separation between syntax and semantics is a fact:

In his introduction to *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm* [pp. 2–3], SAKKĀKĪ (d. 626) tries to justify the structure of his book by pointing out the link between a number of linguistic 'ulūm, including *ṣarf*, *naḥw*, *ma'ānī* and *bayān*. The mere need for such justification shows how these 'ulūm have become isolated and compartmentalized (Baalbaki 1983, 7).

According to Baalbaki, other such attempts are found in Ibn Jinnī's *Xaṣā'is* and al-Jurjānī's work, in particular his *Dalā'il al-'i'jāz* and *'Asrār al-balāghah* (Baalbaki 2007a, 8–13).

This view of Baalbaki differs quite a lot from that of Versteegh but not that much from that of Larcher mentioned above, with whom he only disagrees on how to interpret the historical evolution of the Arabic grammatical tradition. While Larcher made clear that at all times some individual grammarians had an interest in semantics and others did not, Baalbaki would answer that there is a tendency that began after Sibawayh to autonomise more and more syntactic and semantic issues, although some grammarians are exceptions. As for Versteegh, he would agree that an underlying interest in semantics in

the early grammarians was forced to the surface after the confrontation with Greek logic.

## 2.10 Conclusion

The first overall impression that we get from this review is that all authors follow their own interpretative track, linked with their entry point in the field. Carter, who studied Sibawayh at the beginning of the period that we consider in this review, renewed the field of study by proposing a new view on his methods. However, he is not as keen as Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli to grant any value to later grammatical systems. The same goes for Baalbaki who mainly focused on Sibawayh's grammatical methods and legacy and who considers that Sibawayh's *Kitāb* represents both a summit and a unique case in the history of Arabic grammar. The case of Versteegh is almost the opposite of Carter and Baalbaki since he both studied pre-Sibawayh grammatical and exegetical methods and later grammarians under Greek logic influence. As for Owens, he confesses his ahistorical approach to the Arabic grammatical tradition (Owens 1995, 438).

Having focused our review on Sibawayh and the following four centuries for the most part, we have certainly biased our own view on pre-Sibawayh grammatical activity, as well as on later stages of grammar. These inherent limitations to the exercise being taken into account, it is still striking that Sibawayh is overrepresented, while al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj are very often mentioned with others, implying that they have not been studied much for themselves, which is especially true in the case of al-Mubarrad.

Lastly, it should also be mentioned that most studies written in Arabic deal with the traditional account of the history of Arabic grammar, which makes them of less interest for this review (al-'Anṣārī 1972; Ḍayf 1968; al-Ḥadīṭī 1975, 1980; Ṭbādah 2002; Jum'ah 1980; al-Maxzūmī 1955; Yāqūt 1992). The same can be said of the introductions to the edited texts of *al-Muqtaḍab* (ʿUḍaymah 1966–79) and *al-'Uṣūl* (al-Fatḥī 1973/85/96) which are almost purely factual and offer no historical perspective nor analysis.

Our main concern was the semantic dimension of Arabic grammar in the first centuries. It seems that there is some misunderstanding between the scholars who have dealt with this issue. This misunderstanding is the result of a lack in clear definition of what “meaning” means, which has been pointed out in the literature. Thus, we argue that it is not irreconcilable to say at the same time that 1) much of Sibawayh's method has been lost in the first generations after him, which scholars either link with an ethical



approach (Carter), a communicative approach (Baalbaki, Marogy), or an enunciative approach (Bohas, Guillaume, Kouloughli), 2) that a semantic dimension clearly surfaces in al-Mubarrad and even more in Ibn as-Sarrāj (Owens, Ṭāhā), 3) that the confrontation with Greek logic has forced the grammarians to deal explicitly with semantic issues that had been ignored 3a) beginning with Sibawayh (Versteegh) or 3b) after him (Bohas, Guillaume, Kouloughli) and 3c) that these attempts were short-lived (Baalbaki), and lastly, 4) that at all times individual grammarians had an interest in semantics and others not (Larcher).

However, these views all have in common that they lack a third dimension. They consider only two criteria, namely “having an interest in semantics” vs. time. The model proposed by Kouloughli has three dimensions, “having an interest in intentional semantics [m. 1]” vs. “having an interest in formal semantics [m. 12–14]” vs. time. The model we propose to use has no less than six dimensions, since five dimensions of semantics are evaluated against time: intentional semantics [m. 1], communicative semantics [m. 2–6], extra-linguistic semantics [m. 7–8], cognitive semantics [m. 9–11] and formal semantics [m. 12–16].

This classification of the different types of meaning brings more insight into the picture in two different ways. Firstly, it enables us to add communicative semantics [m. 2.5.6] as a separate entity, and secondly, it helps us to realise that some dimensions could be constant through time (reformulation [m. 3] is always present while the extra-linguistic referent [m. 7] and the conceptual correlate [m. 9] are usually ignored or treated by separate sciences). It also casts a new light on the fact that syntactic functions and morphological patterns carry a semantic dimension as well [m. 14], which we labelled as “formal” since it focuses on the linguistic signs, as opposed to the message or the intention of the speaker. It is in this sense that grammarians talk about the meaning of the *ʾidāfah* or the meaning of the pattern *fāʿil*. It is in this sense that Ayoub (1991, 40) says that “le formel dans le Livre [Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*] inclut, à la fois, le syntaxique et le sémantique”.

With these criteria, it becomes possible to describe the fundamental interest of Sibawayh in intentional [m. 1] and communicative semantics [m. 2.3.5.6], which is not at the expense of formal semantics [m. 12–14] but of extra-linguistic semantics [m. 7] and cognitive semantics [m. 9]. At the same time, this model can account for the gradual surfacing of formal semantics [m. 12–14] in post-Sibawayh grammarians, this time at the expense of intentional [m. 1] and communicative semantics [m. 2.5.6], as is claimed by some scholars, reformulation [m. 3] being a constant with time. It can also describe the Muʿtazilite interest in extra-linguistic [m. 7.8] and cognitive

semantics [m. 9], which were not taken into account before the confrontation with Greek logic.

## **Part II**

# **Presentation of the issues linked with the numerals**



## Chapter 3

# Preliminary remarks: Five methods to collect grammatical information

In chapters 3 to 7, we will simply describe the issues linked with numerals in three grammatical treatises: Sibawayh's (d. 180/796) *Kitāb*, al-Mubarrad's (d. 285/898) *Muqtaḍab*<sup>1</sup> and Ibn as-Sarrāj's (d. 316/928) *ʿUṣūl*. Our aim here is not to enter into the interpretations of these grammarians—unless necessary to understand the issues themselves—but only to give a general overview of all grammatical issues linked with numerals at large. In the next part of this study (chapters 8 to 10) we will see the wider theoretical frame in which each of these three grammarians addresses the issues presented here.

In the three treatises that we study here (as well as in most of the classical works in grammar) there are at least five methods for the (modern) reader to collect grammatical information, which are clearly distinct and should not be confused.<sup>2</sup> We will thus collect information on numerals: 1. as the object

---

<sup>1</sup>In a few cases, his *Radd ʿalā Kitāb Sibawayh* will also be mentioned. In this work, known to us through its refutation by Ibn Wallād (d. 332/944), al-Mubarrad criticises Sibawayh's teaching on specific issues and this sheds an interesting light on his theories. Bernards (1997), who has edited and studied both the *Radd* and its refutation, believes that the *Muqtaḍab* was authored after the *Radd* and that it expresses a later stage of al-Mubarrad's thinking.

<sup>2</sup>See Iványi (1991, 201–203) for the twelve different ways in which Sibawayh introduces linguistic material in the *Kitāb*, according to their origin. These are (i) common use introduced by *naḥwa qawli-ka* ("as when you say"), (ii) fabricated examples (*tamīl* "representation"), (iii) uncertain use introduced by *zaʿama* ("to claim"), (iv) examples taken from the actual use

of the explicit grammatical commentary; 2. as prime examples that refer to specific grammatical rules; 3. in a series of morphological, syntactical and semantic tests; 4. in quotations from the tradition (Qurʾān, *ḥadīth*, poetry, grammatical tradition) where they are used either as linguistic evidence or counter examples; and lastly, 5. through extrapolation.

With the necessary precaution, it is possible to gather grammatical information in these five different cases. However, it is very important to remember not only what information was gathered but also how, or in other words, what the status is of the information gathered. The question at stake here is the legitimacy of a certain amount of interpretation that is necessary, especially because not all the points are dealt with at the same level of detail.

Lastly, a legitimate question that the researcher has to ask himself is that of the unity of the corpus studied. In other words, do our three grammarians describe the same language? We can consider with Versteegh (1989b, 248) that “le choix authentique de données linguistiques sur le terrain a donné lieu à la formation d’un corpus reçu et fixé. Si bien que les grammairiens du IX<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècle décrivent virtuellement le même état de langue que ceux du II<sup>e</sup>-VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.” There are however two distinct levels that are not always easy to distinguish in our texts, the level of the language described by the grammarians and the level of the language they use to describe that language. This means that even if we can be sure that there is no variation in the language described, this does not mean that there is no variation in the language used to describe it. This is for example the case of the *nisbah* form *ṭulāṭiyyun* “threefold” used to describe three-consonant radicals, which is not found in the *Kitāb*, but once in the *Muqtaḍab* and more than fifty times in the *ʿUṣūl*. We will mention other cases when we come across them in our study.

### 3.1 Explicit grammatical commentaries

This source of data is of course the safest one for the reader. Not only does the author deal with numerals, but he also discusses the different grammatical issues he considers. The majority of the data collected for this study was collected in explicit grammatical passages. Each grammatical

---

introduced by *qawl al-ʿArab* (“language of the Arabs”), (v) non-canonical examples introduced by *ḥaḍafū* (“they elided”), *istaḡnaw* (“they did not need”) or *ʿawwaḍū* (“they replaced”), (vi) dialectal use of the type *qāla baʿḍu-hum* (“some of them say”) or *fi luḡati Tamīm* (“in the dialect of Tamīm”), (vii) erroneous use of the type *qabīḥ* (“ugly”) or *mā jāza* (“it is not correct”), (viii) Qurʾānic quotations, (ix) sound poetry, (x) poetry corresponding to type (v), (xi) poetry corresponding to type (vi), (xii) poetry corresponding to type (vii), which is true poetic licence.

treatise contains chapters devoted to the expression of numerals and their counted object, and it is from there that the investigation should begin.

Interestingly, in Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, the first chapter to deal with numerals extensively is *hādā bābu ṣ-ṣifati l-muṣabbahati bi-l-fā'il* "chapter on adjectives that resemble the active participle" (K. I, chapter 41; 81.19–88.8). Numerals are dealt with again in chapter 413 titled *hādā bābu l-'asmā'i llati tūqa'u 'alā 'iddati l-mu'annaṭi wa-l-mudakkari li-tubayyina mā l-'adadu 'idā jāwaza l-iṭnayni wa-l-iṭnatayni 'ilā 'an tabluḡa tis'ata-ʿašara wa-tis'a-ʿaš(i)rata* "chapter on nouns that are used to count nouns in the feminine and the masculine to specify the quantity above two and up till nineteen" (K. II, chapter 413; 177–179). The following chapters, 414 (K. II, 179–181) and 415 (K. II, 181), deal with other issues linked with numerals.

In al-Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab*, numerals are dealt with in four chapters (M. II, 153–187), the first of which is the longest and deals with the main issues related to numerals: *hādā bābu l-'adadi wa-tafsīri wujūhi-hi wa-l-'illati fī-mā waqa'a min-hu muxtaliḡan* "chapter on numerals, the commentary of their forms and the cause behind that, which has a different shape" (M. II, 153–174).

Lastly, in Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl*, numerals are dealt with in the following sections: *bāb tamyiz al-'a'dād* "chapter on specifying the numerals" (ʿU. I, 311–314); *bāb kam* "chapter on *kam*" (ʿU. I, 315–320); *masā'il min hādihī l-'abwāb* "issues related to these chapters" (ʿU. I, 321–328). In the outline of the *ʿUṣūl*, these sections correspond to the cases when the noun in the dependent form is not situated after the agent of a verbal sentence.

Of course, in each treatise these chapters do not gather all the grammatical teachings on numerals. Specific issues are dispersed throughout corresponding chapters. For example, the morphology of compound numerals is dealt with in a chapter dealing with compounds generally, the *maṣdar*-like use of numerals is dealt with in a chapter on substantives used as *maṣādir*, and so on.

Despite all this, there is already a certain amount of extrapolation that readers must go through when they wish to gather information about a specific topic. This is because they look for answers to their own questions in the text instead of understanding the text's own logic and consistency.

The other difficulty that the reader faces when trying to collect data from a grammatical treatise (and this is especially true of Sibawayh's *Kitāb*) is that the authorship of the data is not always clear. Sibawayh often quotes lengthy passages and interpretations from other grammarians and it is not obvious when he is speaking in his own name, or whether he agrees with what he

quotes.<sup>3</sup> The same difficulty is also found in Ibn as-Sarrāj's *'Uṣūl*, although not to the same extent. Thus, any doubtful authorship will systematically be mentioned.

## 3.2 Prime examples

Once the author has explained in detail what is at stake in a particular numeral, he sometimes uses this numeral as a quick and clear representative for the rule, a “prime example”.<sup>4</sup> This is the case for *xamsata-‘ašara*, which is quite systematically used as a representative for one particular type of noun-noun compound where both terms are indeclinable and carry a final *fathah*. It is evidently more practical to say that a compound is “like *xamsata-‘ašara*” rather than to repeat that this compound is made up of two indeclinable nouns that carry an invariable *fathah*.

In this case, an interesting use of *xamsata-‘ašara* as a prime example is when the generic negation *lā*<sup>5</sup> together with the noun it negates is compared analogically to the compound cardinal *xamsata-‘ašara* (K. I, 300.13–301.14; M. IV, 357.10–358.9; *'U*. I, 380.1–4; II, 66.6–7). Our grammarians draw an analogy between *xamsata-‘ašara* and *lā rajula* inasmuch as both expressions are considered to be indeclinable compounds.

Some comparisons are quite straightforward, as in the case of the use of *xamsata-‘ašara* as a prime example of indeclinable nouns (M. II, 50.2–5; *'U*. I, 146.1–7), whereas other cases are not as clear, as in the comparison between *xamsata-‘ašara* and *'ayyu-hum* in the expression *idrib 'ayyu-hum 'afḍalu!* “hit the one who is the best!”<sup>6</sup> (K. I, 350.20–22).

Other cases are rather unexpected, for instance when *xamsata-‘ašara* is compared to the construction of annexed nouns in the vocative, as in *yā bna*

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 46, about the glosses that made their way into al-Mubarrad's vulgate of Sibawayh's *Kitāb*.

<sup>4</sup>Carter (1972b, 485) calls them *locus probans*, and Owens (1990a, 45) “cue word” and “archetypal member of [their] class”.

<sup>5</sup>The generic negation *lā* operates on a noun in the dependent form deprived of *tanwīn*, as in *lā rajula fī d-dāri* “there is no man in the house”. If the negated noun is separated from *lā* it takes the independent form and the *tanwīn*, as in *lā fī d-dāri rajulun*. Grammarians discuss the behaviour of the dual and plural final *nūn* in this construction. Compare *lā muslimīna fī l-madīnati* “there are no Muslims in the city” to *lā 'uḍunay la-hā* “she has no ears”. Lastly, the *tanwīn* of the negated word is maintained if this word is followed by an explanatory word, as in *lā ṭālī'an jabalan ḡāhīran* “there is no one ascending the hill visible”. See Wright (1967, II, 94–98) and Howell (1883/2003, V, 522–532; §547) for more details.

<sup>6</sup>See Baalbaki (2006, 239) for a detailed account of the expression *idrib 'ayyu-hum afḍalu!* and the indeclinability of *'ayyu-*.



*ʾumma!* “you, son of [my] mother” (*M.* IV, 251.3–4; *ʾU.* I, 341.13–15; 380.5–6), or in the comparison with the intensive *nūn* in the verbs (*M.* III, 19.4–10).

Another famous case of a prime example is the expression *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman*, which serves to represent a specific syntactic link between two nouns where the first term cannot be annexed to the second term for some reason and the second term is in the indefinite dependent form. Just like the morphological type *xamsata-ʿašara*, this specific syntactic construction is simply referred to as the *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman*-like construction. This is particularly true in the *Kitāb*, where Carter (1972b, 490–495) has pointed out twenty-two such comparisons: with the *ḥāl* construction; *inna* (see also *M.* IV, 156.15–16); the *mafʿūl lahu* (see also *ʾU.* I, 209.10–11); the dependent form of the *ḍurūf*; the syntax of *kam* (see also *M.* III, 66.9–67.8; *ʾU.* I, 315.3–6; 318.9–11); and *ʾillā* when followed by a dependent form.

This way of using numerals as grammatical examples is not a problem *per se*. However, at some point the authors add grammatical information on an expression that has been first compared to the *xamsata-ʿašara* compound type or to the *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman* construction type in a chapter that is not devoted to numerals at all. In this case, one should carefully ask oneself whether the added information is retroactively valid for the whole class (and thus applicable to the prime example itself), or whether it is only valid for the specific case dealt with.

In the two cases mentioned above, numerals are used as prime examples outside chapters devoted to numerals. However, it should also be noticed that within numerals, *ṭalāṭah* (or sometimes *xamsah*) is used as a prime example for all numerals between “three” and “ten”, *ʾiṣrūna* is systematically used as the prime example for all the decades, and *ṭalāṭah wa-ṭalāṭūna* is the prime example for the conjoined numerals between “twenty-one” and “ninety-nine”. This means that everything that is said of *xamsah* should be valid for the other units (usually excluding “one” and “two”), everything that is said of *ʾiṣrūna* applies to the other decades, and so on. It is thus clear that even at this simple level the reader has to go through a certain amount of extrapolation.

Of course, this way of dealing with grammatical examples is not specific to numerals and every reader of these grammatical treatises has already met Zayd who is either standing, departing, or beating his best enemy ʿAmr, or the sound of the crow (*ġāqi*) which is used as the prime example of onomatopoeia.

Grammatical treatises tend to use the same prime examples. This clearly makes it easier for the reader to compare them and get to the point, but the other side of the coin is that the authors sometimes use the same prime

examples to deal with different grammatical issues and the reader has to be very careful not to miss the point dealt with.

### 3.3 Grammatical tests

It is a well-known phenomenon that in classical grammatical treatises, grammarians “test” specific morphological and syntactic features by using a word in a specific context. It is as if the grammarians were asking themselves, “What happens if...?” Baalbaki (2008, 215–226) calls these tests “tools of checking the system validity”. He mentions three “testing devices” in the *Kitāb*: “word formulation” or artificial word forging, which is a morphological test (Baalbaki 2008, 219–220), the proper noun test (220–224), and *’ilḥāq* ‘attachment’, which consists in referring rare forms to attested ones in order not to multiply “basic rules” (224).

Next to the proper name test, there are other types of morphosyntactic tests, as well as syntactic and semantic tests.

#### 3.3.1 Morphosyntactic tests

The case of the “proper name test” is maybe the most salient one. It is not certain that people would ever have been called *Darabta* (literally, “you hit”) or *Kam* (lit., “how many”). However, grammarians spent quite some energy to find out what would happen to these words and expressions if they were to be called in the vocative or if one wanted to build their diminutive form.<sup>7</sup>

As almost any word in the language, numerals have been tested as proper names. The first obvious effect of this test is that they lose their numerical meaning. The aim of this test is for grammarians to see what remains of their initial morphology and what is lost. For example, since the relative adjective of the proper name *Itṇā-‘Ašar* is *Itṇiyyun* (and not *\*Itṇā-‘Ašariyyun*), it proves that the second part –‘Ašar still behaves as an added morpheme in the proper name *Itṇā-‘Ašara* (just like a *tā’ marbūṭah*, or a plural marker –*ūna* or –*āt*, or the *tanwīn*).

---

<sup>7</sup>See Carter (1981/83) on the “proper name test”. Carter draws up a list of no less than 14 morphological principles that al-Xalīl (d. 170/786) and Sibawayh (d. 180/796) apply to proper names: trilateralism, impossibility of the succession of four short vowels, integration into the Arabic morphological system, and so on (111–114).

In the opposite, the “mourning form” (*nudbah*)<sup>8</sup> of *It̤nā-‘Ašar* is *wā It̤nā-‘Ašarāh!* (K. I, 281.12–13) (and not \**wā It̤nāh!*), which clearly shows that here the noun is treated as a whole.

Grammarians will then discuss the morphosyntactic frame in which to interpret this second part in *It̤nā-‘Ašar* in a way that can consistently account for this behaviour in both cases, or in other words, which morpheme can be added to a noun, which must be elided in the relative adjective form but not in the mourning form?

Because of their varying morphological forms, numerals have been widely used in other morphological tests: What is the diminutive of *it̤nāni*, *talāṭah*, *sittah*, *ṭamāniyah*, *talātūna*, and so on? What is the vocative form of the proper name *Talātātun-Wa-Talātūna*? What relative adjective is built on *it̤nā-‘ašara*? Are compound numerals still indeclinable when used as proper names? Does *talātātun wa-talātūna* behave the same way in the position of *mudāf*, if it is a proper name, or if it means “thirty-three”?

### 3.3.2 Syntactic tests

Numerals are also used as syntactic testers (i.e., they reveal interesting syntactic rules when used in specific positions). For example, this is the case for the rule that stipulates that the masculine supersedes the feminine. Interestingly, all three grammarians, (Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj), choose the chapter devoted to expressions of the type *xāmisu xamsatin* “one of [a group of] five” and *xāmisu ‘arba‘atin* “the one that completed a [group of] four and made it five” in order to mention and illustrate this rule.<sup>9</sup>

Sibawayh is very clear that *hādā ḥādī ‘aḥada-‘ašara* can refer to “one [masc.] of [a group of] eleven [masc.]” where ten of them are females and one is a male (K. II, 178.22–23) and in the following expression: *huwa xāmisu ‘arba‘in* “he is the fifth [masc.] of [a group of] four [fem.]”, it is logical that “four” remains in the feminine if it refers to a group of four women to which a male is added (K. II, 178.24–179.1).

A similar example is given by al-Mubarrad in *M. II*, 182.2–3. *Rābi‘u ‘arba‘atin* “one [masc.] of four [masc.]” applies in the case of a group of three women and one man. Ibn as-Sarrāj uses exactly the same example

<sup>8</sup>This “mourning form” is built with the particle *wā* (sometimes *yā*) before the name and the addition of a long ‘*alif*’ at its end as in *wā Zaydāh!* “alas, Zayd!” For more details, see chapter 155 (*bāb an-nudbah*; K. I, 278–280).

<sup>9</sup>See below, p. 132, for more details on these two types of expression, and p. 170, on gender agreement rules.

as Sibawayh in *ʿU*. II, 427.2. He expresses this rule overtly by saying that *al-ʿArabu tuḡallibu t-taḏkira ʿidā xtalāṭa bi-l-muʿannaṭi*<sup>10</sup> (“Arabs give the preference to the masculine if it is mixed with the feminine”; *ʿU*. II, 427.4).

Numerals here are clearly used as syntactic testers in order to illustrate a rule, and this is because they generate clear gender conflicts.

Another interesting syntactic test is predication (*ʿixbār*): What happens if the verb, the complement, the adverb, and so on, receives a predicate?<sup>11</sup> In the following Qurʾānic verse, al-Mubarrad (*M*. III, 104.6–8) interprets the independent form in *naḫṣatun wāḥidatun* “one blast” as a case of *tawkīd* “emphasis”, which is *baʿīd* “far-fetched” as opposed to the dependent form:<sup>12</sup>

﴿فَإِذَا نُفِخَ فِي الصُّورِ نَفْخَةٌ وَاحِدَةٌ﴾ (الحاقة، ١٣)

And when the trumpet is blown with a single blast, ... (*Q*. 69, 13)

He modifies the sentence in order to make it a predicate of *aṣ-ṣūru*: *al-manfūxu fi-hi naḫṣatun wāḥidatun aṣ-ṣūru* “what has been blown in it a single blast is the trumpet”; or to make it a predicate of *an-naḫṣah*: *al-manfūxatu fi ṣ-ṣūri naḫṣatun wāḥidatun* “what has been blown in the trumpet is a single blast”. He does this to prove that it is possible to predicate of an indefinite *maṣḍar* (*naḫṣatun*). The same verse is quoted by Ibn as-Sarrāj in a similar discussion on predication (*ʿU*. II, 297.20).

The predication test is also found in the *ʿUṣūl*. In the expression *hāḏā ṭālīṭu ṭalāṭatin* “this is one of three”, the *muḏāf ʿilayh* can receive a predicate, as in *allaḏīna hāḏā ṭālīṭu-hum ṭalāṭatun* “those of which this one is the third are three” (*ʿU*. II, 331.1–2). However, the same cannot be done with *hāḏā ḥādī ʾaḥada-ʿašara* “this one is one of eleven” because in this case the first –*ʿašara* has to be deleted<sup>13</sup> and the only possible solution would be to say *\*allaḏīna hāḏā ḥādī-him ʾaḥada-ʿašara*, which does not convey the expected meaning (*ʿU*. II, 331.4).

In this case, the predication test reveals the specific behaviour of compound numerals, which cannot be in the position of *muḏāf*.

Baalbaki (2008, 215) says that Sibawayh does not use drills that became typical of later grammarians, such as *al-ʿixbār bi-l-laḏī* or *bi-l-ʿalif wa-l-lām*, he

<sup>10</sup>Amund Bjørnsnes (University of Oslo) is currently working on the critical edition of Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *ʿUṣūl*. In a draft of his edition (p. 776), he follows the lesson of the Turkish manuscript Hacı Ağa 1077/2, fol. 136r., *bi-t-taʿnīt*.

<sup>11</sup>See Carter (1995) for a presentation of these tests.

<sup>12</sup>The English translation of the Qurʾānic verses are quoted from Shakir (1983).

<sup>13</sup>Instead of expected *\*hāḏā ḥādīya-ʿašara ʾaḥada-ʿašara* which would be too heavy.

adds that “the closest that Sibawayhi gets to this is the chapter on the relative or interrogative particle *ayy*, where he begins by examining relatively simple constructions beginning with *ayy*, such as *ayyu llaḏīna ra’ayta fī l-dāri afḏalu*” (“which one of those whom you saw in the house is the best?”; Baalbaki 2008, 217).

### 3.3.3 Semantic tests

Lastly, numerals are also used as semantic testers. As an introduction to a chapter where various issues linked with *kam* “how many” are treated, al-Mubarrad comments on the following peculiar question: *kam ṭalāṭatan sittatun ʾillā ṭalāṭatāni?* (“How many threes is ‘six’, if not two?”; *M. III*, 64.3), saying that *ṭalāṭatan* is the *tamyīz* of *kam*; *sittatun* its *xabar*; and *ṭalāṭatāni* its *badal* and that the meaning of the question is “which of the numerals is ‘six’ if not two threes?” (*ʾayyu šayʾin min al-ʿadadi sittatun ʾillā ṭalāṭatāni?*; *M. III*, 64.5).

Because of the clear meaning of numerals, there is no possible doubt on the meaning of the whole sentence, although it involves difficult syntactic features (*kam*, *tamyīz*, *ʾillā* and *istiṭnāʾ*).

Another interesting case of a semantic test is al-Mubarrad’s interpretation of the following Qur’ānic verse, which he quotes four times in the *Muqtaḍab* (for the agreement of the counted object: *M. II*, 158.1; for the syntax of *sawāʾ*: *M. III*, 232.4; for a variant reading: *M. IV*, 304.12 and 305.1):

﴿فِي أَرْبَعَةِ أَيَّامٍ سَوَاءٌ لِّلْمَسْأَلِينَ﴾ (فَصَّلَتْ ، ١٠)

[...] in four periods: alike for the seekers (*Q. 41*, 10)

In *M. III*, 232.4, al-Mubarrad quotes this verse as an example of elision of the verb operating on its *mašdar*.<sup>14</sup> This elision is possible if there is something in the sentence that points out the meaning of the verb. Here, the presence of *ʾarbaʿah* “four” in the verse shows that the action actually took place (*ʾanna qawla-hu ʾarbaʿah qad dalla ʿalā ʾanna-hā qad tammat*; *M. III*, 232.4–5), this, probably because if it had not taken place, one would not know how many days it took. Because it is semantically unambiguous, the verb operating on

<sup>14</sup>In this use, this *mašdar* corresponds to the later *mafʿūl muṭlaq*. According to Levin (1991, 917), the first occurrence of the expression *mafʿūl muṭlaq* is found in Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *ʾUṣūl* and *Mūjaz*. However, it is found only twice in the *ʾUṣūl*, in the sections’ titles (*ʾU. I*, 159.8; 11), and nowhere in the text itself, where Ibn as-Sarrāj uses the expression “*mašdar* treated like a *ḥāl*” (*mašdarun yaqūmu maqāma ḥālīn*). Could it be that a later editor has added the titles and the expression *mafʿūl muṭlaq*? Levin does not raise this question.

the *maṣḍar* has been elided and the expression *sawā'an* “alike” stands for the *maṣḍar* in the expression *istawat istiḡā'an* “it is completely equivalent”.

Ibn as-Sarrāj also comments on the question *kam ṭalāṭatan sittatun 'illā ṭalāṭatāni?* ('U. I, 327.13) as well as on *kam 'iṣrūna xamsatan 'illā 'arba'u xamasātin?* “how many is twenty [in terms of] fives, if not four fives?” ('U. I, 327.17–18), where the specifier *xamsatan* is separated from *kam* by *'iṣrūna*. Here, there is no possible doubt on the syntactic role of *xamsatan* because of the meaning of the whole expression.

In the sentences *allaḏi la-hu 'indī mi'atu dirhamin 'illā dirhamayni* “what I owe him is a hundred dirhams less two” and *allaḏi la-hu 'indī mi'atun 'illā dirhamāni* “what I owe him is a hundred dirhams not two” ('U. I, 304.7–8), numerals present no syntactic difficulty and the only reason why they are used is that their distinctive meaning immediately shows what is excluded from what. By saying that the equivalent of the first expression is “98 dirhams”, Ibn as-Sarrāj confirms the meaning of the syntactic construction used, in a very simple way.

In the same manner, in the sentence *la-ka 'alayya 'aṣaratun 'illā xamsatan mā xalā dirhaman* “I owe you ten [i.e., dirhams] less five but one dirham”, he adds “i.e., six dirhams” ('U. I, 304.19–20) so that the meaning of each syntactic construction is clear. All three examples are found in a section of the 'Uṣūl, which is a collection of issues linked with the *istiṭnā'* “exclusion”.

Another example of a semantic test is found in the discussion of the expressions *lā 'ātī-ka 'ilā 'aṣrin min aṣ-ṣahri* and *lā 'ātī-ka ḥattā 'aṣrin min aṣ-ṣahri* “I shall not come to you until the tenth of the month”. Ibn as-Sarrāj contrasts this with *'ātī-ka ḥattā 'aṣrin min aṣ-ṣahri* “I shall come to you until the tenth of the month”, i.e., “I come to you again and again until the tenth” ('U. I, 428.3–6). Ibn as-Sarrāj is probably making the point that the negative sentence is not the opposite of the affirmative sentence.

### 3.4 The testimony of canonised tradition

In addition to these occurrences of numerals, there are quotations of the Qur'ān, the *ḥadīṭ* and poetry that contain numerals and that are typically used as *ṣawāhid* “witnesses” in order to prove a linguistic fact or to serve as counter examples (see Gilliot 1997). To this list, one should of course add the

language of “the Arabs” (individuals, tribes, etc.) which is quoted everywhere in grammatical works (Baalbaki 1985, 11).<sup>15</sup>

This obvious fact points to a phenomenon that has received much attention, namely the closure of the linguistic corpus (see above, p. 58). Grammarians tend to draw their examples from a limited pool of Qur’ānic, poetic and Bedouin “witnesses”. In other words, it is as if the corpus of “witnesses” itself were canonised. Practically, they seem to function as “cruces” that grammarians have to comment on.

The relevance of doing so is evident. Just like the systematic use of the same prime examples, it enables a quick comparison between authors. However, a more detailed reading reveals that the same *šawāhid* are not always used to prove or illustrate the same point in grammar, and one may sometimes be misled by the use of a particular *šāhid* and miss the point because one reads it through the mirror of another grammarian’s use.

In what follows, we shall present some typical examples (as found in our three texts) of *šawāhid* related to numerals that come from the Qur’ān, the Prophetic traditions (*ḥadīṭ*, pl. *’aḥādīṭ*), poetry and the language of the Arabs as canonised by the grammatical tradition.

### 3.4.1 From the Qur’ān

Quotations from the Qur’ān are a source of linguistic data. However, our authors treat them quite differently. Altogether, there are 38 different verses<sup>16</sup> containing numerals that are found in our texts.<sup>17</sup> Out of these 38 verses, 21 are found in the *Kitāb*, 31 in the *Muqtaḍab* and only 12 in the *’Uṣūl*. Since the authors may quote the same verse more than once, these verses are actually found 23 times in the *Kitāb*, 39 times in the *Muqtaḍab* and 13 times in the *’Uṣūl*.

<sup>15</sup>See Baalbaki (2008, 35–47) for an account of these “attested data” in the *Kitāb*. He says that “a rough estimate on the basis of Hārūn’s indices of the *Kitāb* reveals that Sibawayhi’s *šawāhid* (pl. of *šāhid*; lit. evidence, proof) include about 1050 lines of poetry, 447 Qur’ānic verses, 350 speech patterns or idiomatic expressions and 41 proverbs” (Baalbaki 2008, 37). This is not comparable to the improbable 9.735 “sentences” which Yāqūt (1992) says Sibawayh analyses in the *Kitāb*, as quoted by Sara (2007, 3) and Marogy (2010, 30). See Larcher (2011, 121–122) for a review of Baalbaki (2008) on the issues of *samā’* and *luḡat al-Ḥijāz*, which, Larcher says, is not a Bedouin dialect but a conventional name for the language of the *Qur’ān*.

<sup>16</sup>See the list in the annex.

<sup>17</sup>39 if one adds Q. 41, 6, which is the same as Q. 18, 110; 41 if one considers separately the verses Q. 112, 1 and 2, which are quoted together, and Q. 92, 19 and 20, which are also quoted together.

One can therefore say that al-Mubarrad tends to quote the Sacred Book almost twice as much as Sibawayh (39 times, compared to 23 in the *Kitāb*). He often quotes a verse only to provide linguistic evidence, and not to analyse it. He relies on the *Kitāb* for almost half of these quotations (13 out of 31 different verses) and provides 18 new verses.

This impression is confirmed by the total number of Qur'ānic quotations found in the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab*. According to Hārūn's table, Sibawayh quotes 417 different verses (488 quotations altogether)<sup>18</sup> whereas al-Mubarrad quotes 617 different verses (832 quotations altogether).<sup>19</sup>

Ibn as-Sarrāj has a quite different stand towards the Qur'ān, which he quotes far less than his predecessors (13 times, compared to 23 times in the *Kitāb* and 39 in the *Muqtaḍab*, for the only verses containing numerals). Almost all these verses are already found in the *Kitāb* (11 out of 12 different verses) and the last verse is found in the *Muqtaḍab*, which means that Ibn as-Sarrāj does not add new verses to the corpus. This impression is also confirmed by a general count of Qur'ānic quotations in the *ʿUṣūl*, according to aṭ-Ṭanāḥī's tables: 302 different verses are quoted 364 times altogether.

Out of these 38 different verses containing numerals, six are quoted for their variant readings (Q. 6, 160 in M. II, 185.9; Q. 11, 81 in M. IV, 395.10; Q. 23, 52 in K. I, 247.10–11; Q. 31.27 in K. I, 246.4–5 and ʿU. I, 249.12–13; Q. 41, 10 in K. I, 236.4 and M. IV, 305.1; Q. 112, 1 in M. II, 314.2).

Only seven of these 38 verses are common to all three treatises (Q. 2, 228; 6, 160; 7, 155; 23, 52; 72, 18; 112, 1; 4). These seven verses are quoted for the same grammatical reason in each treatise, except for Q. 7, 155 which is an interesting case:

﴿وَأَخْتَارَ مُوسَىٰ قَوْمَهُ سَبْعِينَ رَجُلًا لِّمِيقَاتِنَا﴾ (الأعراف، ١٥٥)

And Musa chose out of his people seventy men for Our appointment (Q. 7, 155)

This verse is quoted by Sibawayh (K. I, 12.15) as an example of a doubly transitive verb, just like *ʿaṭā* “to give” and *kasā* “to dress”, whereas al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj quote it as a case of elision of a particle (*qawma-hu* instead of *min qawmi-hi*) which puts the *majrūr* (*qawm*) in the position of *mafʿūl* (M. II, 321.5; 342.10; ʿU. I, 178.1–2). Sibawayh mentions the elision of the particle as a possible underlying interpretation but still regards these

<sup>18</sup>The discrepancy with Baalbaki's count can probably be explained with the fact that in some cases Hārūn considers a single word to be a Qur'ānic quotation. Maybe these were not taken into account by Baalbaki, who does not say if his count includes repeated verses or not.

<sup>19</sup>Our count is based on ʿUḍaymah's tables.



verbs as doubly transitive (ʿIbādah 2002, 28). This example is a case where the same verse receives different interpretations and too quick of a reading would have one miss the real point of Sībawayh by assimilating it into the later tradition.

The case of *Q.* 112, 1–2 is also worth noticing:

﴿قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ ۝ اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ﴾ (الإخلاص، ٢-١)

Say: He, Allah, is One. Allah is He on Whom all depend (*Q.* 112, 1–2)

None of our authors mentions it as a use of *ʾaḥad* in an isolated form where *wāḥid* would be expected.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, as will be made clear later on, *ʾaḥad* is either found in the position of *muḍāf* (*ʾaḥadu r-rijāli* “one of the men”), in conjoined numerals (*ʾaḥadun wa-ʿiṣrūna* “twenty-one”), or in negative sentences where it means “nobody”, as in *lam ʾara ʾaḥadan* “I saw nobody”. It is never found alone in a positive sentence meaning “one”, as here in *Q.* 112, 1.

Instead, they quote this verse because of the problematic pronunciation of the *tanwīn* in *ʾaḥadun* with the following *ʾalif waṣl* in *al-Lāh* (*K.* II, 298.16; *M.* II, 314.2; 315.11–12; *ʾU.* II, 369.14); al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention a variant reading, i.e., the elision of the *tanwīn* in *ʾaḥadun*.

Other cases deal more directly with the grammar of numerals, as in the following verse, which is a typical crux in the grammar of numerals in the *Qurʾān*:<sup>21</sup>

﴿وَلَبِثُوا فِي كَهْفِهِمْ ثَلَاثَ مِائَةٍ سِنِينَ ۖ وَازْدَادُوا تِسْعًا﴾ (الكهف، ٢٥)

And they remained in their cave three hundred years and (some) add (another) nine (*Q.* 18, 25)

Here, the expression *ṭalāṭa miʾatin sinīna*<sup>22</sup> is unexpected and al-Mubarrad interprets *sinīna* as a *badal* of *ṭalāṭa miʾatin* (*M.* II, 171.4) saying that it is not correct to read it as *ṭalāṭa miʾati sinīna*, as some *Qurʾānic* readers do by annexing *ṭalāṭa miʾati* to *sinīna* (*M.* II, 171.8). This verse is not quoted by Ibn

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1424).

<sup>21</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1451–1453).

<sup>22</sup>We chose to transliterate numerals between *ṭalātu miʾatin* and *tisʿu miʾatin* in two words and without a hyphen because they are never considered as compounds by our authors but as an *ʾidāfah* construction where *miʾah* is treated as a counted object. See below, p. 181. This corresponds to the *Qurʾānic* orthography as well. Cf. Wright (1967, I, 258; §325, rem. b) and Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1447) on the spelling of hundreds in one word.

as-Sarrāj, who instead quotes the poetic line *ʿidā ʿāša l-fatā miʿatayni ʿāman* “if the boy lived two hundred years” (*ʿU. I*, 312.14) saying that in poetry one may find a noun in the indefinite dependent form after “one hundred”.<sup>23</sup>

Verses can also be quoted only to confirm the meaning of an expression, as is the case with expressions of the type *rābiʿu ʿarbaʿatin* “one of four” (*M. II*, 181.3) and *rābiʿu talāṭatin* “the fourth of three” (i.e., “the one that completed [a group of] three and made it four”; *M. II*, 181.7). Since the meaning of these expressions is not obvious—or at least to show that they are very different—al-Mubarrad quotes Qurʾānic verses with two examples of each (*M. II*, 181.4–5.8–9):<sup>24</sup>

﴿إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ﴾ (التوبة، ٤٠)  
﴿لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ ثَالِثُ ثَلَاثَةٍ﴾ (المائدة، ٧٣)

[...] when those who disbelieved expelled him, he being the second of the two (*Q. 9*, 40)

Certainly they disbelieve who say: Surely Allah is the third (person) of the three (*Q. 5*, 73)

As for the expressions of the second type he quotes:

﴿مَا يَكُونُ مِنْ نَجْوَى ثَلَاثَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ رَابِعُهُمْ وَلَا خَمْسَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ سَادِسُهُمْ﴾ (المجادلة، ٧)  
﴿سَيَقُولُونَ ثَلَاثَةً رَابِعُهُمْ كَلْبُهُمْ﴾ (الكهف، ٢٢)

Nowhere is there a secret counsel between three persons but He is the fourth of them, nor (between) five but He is the sixth of them (*Q. 58*, 7)

(Some) say: (They are) three, the fourth of them being their dog (*Q. 18*, 22)

It also occurs that variant readings are quoted,<sup>25</sup> as in the Qurʾānic *man jāʿa bi-l-ḥasanāti fa-la-hu ʿašru ʿamtāli-hā* (“he shall have ten like it”; *Q. 6*, 160; *M. II*, 185.8) that is also sometimes read *fa-la-hu ʿašrun ʿamtālu-hā*. This is a reading, which he says “linguists prefer” (*fa-hādihi l-qirāʾatu l-muxtāratu ʿinda ʾahli l-luġati*; *M. II*, 185.9).

This verse is quoted in a discussion about the annexation of a numeral to a qualifier, which is “ugly” (*qabīḥ*; *M. II*, 185.6) except if this qualifier “resembles the noun and comes at its place” (*muḍārīʿun li-l-ismi wāqīʿun mawqīʿa-hu*; *M. II*, 185.5) as is the case with *ʿamtāl* in the verse quoted. Interestingly, al-Mubarrad says that he prefers the reading where the numeral is not annexed.

<sup>23</sup>See Jumʿah (1980, 438–439).

<sup>24</sup>See below, p. 132, for more details on these expressions.

<sup>25</sup>See Baalbaki (1985) on the treatment of Qurʾānic variant readings by early grammarians.

The same verse is also used in *M. II*, 149.1 as evidence of a masculine noun (*ʿamṭāl*) referring to a feminine (*ḥasanāt*) and is thus treated as a feminine (*ʿašru* is the form used with feminine nouns). The same comment on the same verse is found in Ibn as-Sarrāj (*ʿU. III*, 477.5–6).

Curiously, *Q. 7*, 160 is not quoted in our texts, although it contains an interesting case of a plural counted object used after a compound numeral:<sup>26</sup>

﴿وَقَطَعْنَاهُمْ اثْنَتَى عَشْرَةَ أَسْبَاطًا أُمَمًا﴾ (الأعراف، ١٦٠)

And We divided them into twelve tribes, as nations (*Q. 7*, 160)

### 3.4.2 From the Prophetic traditions

There are no explicit quotations from the Prophetic tradition in Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, although the study of *ḥadīṭ* is said to have been his first aim, as Carter (1973b, 302) puts it, "Sibawayhi quitta sa Šīrāz natale avec l'intention primitive d'étudier le *ḥadīṭ*".<sup>27</sup> However, in the tables of his edition Hārūn (1966–1977, V, 32) mentions seven Prophetic traditions. In the *Muqtaḍab*, Uḍaymah does not provide a table of *ʿaḥādīṭ* and does not point out the only case where a *ḥadīṭ* is explicitly quoted by al-Mubarrad (*M. II*, 184.5–6). As for the *ʿUṣūl*, aṭ-Ṭanāḥī (1986, 35) mentions three *ʿaḥādīṭ* in his tables, one of which is explicitly quoted as such by Ibn as-Sarrāj (*ʿU. I*, 401.1–2).

It is generally accepted that the first one to have elevated the Prophetic traditions to a canonical status is aš-Šāfiʿī (d. 204/820), and among his opponents were the Muʿtazilites (Carter 1973b, 67). This formation period corresponds to the period when Sibawayh's *Kitāb* was produced, which means that both the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl* were written well after the Prophetic traditions had acquired a canonical status.

However, according to the Andalusian grammarian Ibn aḍ-Ḍāʿī (d. 680/1281), the first grammarian who used *ḥadīṭ* as a linguistic source is Ibn Xarūf (d. 609/1212). This common opinion is challenged by al-Ḥadīṭī (1981, 423–427), whose aim is to prove that the recourse to *ḥadīṭ* is as old as grammar itself, although quotations may be few and implicit.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1438–1439; 1449–1450).

<sup>27</sup>Carter quotes az-Zubaydī's (d. 379/989) *Ṭabaqāt an-naḥwiyyīn*, 66. Az-Zubaydī quotes ʿAbū ʿAlī [l-Qālī] l-Baġdādī (d. 356/967), whom Carter mistakenly identifies with al-Xaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071), who also mentions Sibawayh, in his *Tārīx Baġdād*, XII, 195.

The absence of explicit Prophetic traditions in the *Kitāb* and the early grammar works has raised questions among Islamic scholars. This is especially true of Salafī scholars for whom this absence is apparently problematic. 'Abū Ḥātim Bin 'Āšūr published a paper on the web portal al-'Alukah<sup>28</sup> where he collects as many as 46 implicit references to Prophetic traditions in the *Kitāb*.

### In the *Kitāb*

If one considers the 46 cases pointed out by Bin 'Āšūr, it is clear that the fact that Sibawayh quotes expressions found in the enormous *ḥadīṭ* corpus does by no way mean that he actually intends a specific *ḥadīṭ*. This applies to short expressions such as *fa-bi-hā wa-ni'mat* "in that case it's all right" (N° 7 in Bin 'Āšūr's list; K. II, 279.6). Other examples of common expressions in the language of the Arabs that are also found in the Prophetic traditions (and which Bin 'Āšūr pretends are "quoted" in the *Kitāb* as '*aḥādīṭ*') are *ḥayya 'alā ṣ-ṣalāh* "come to prayer!" (N° 12, K. II, 48.6; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 73) and *ibhārra l-laylu* "the night is dazzling [out of darkness]" (N° 15; K. II, 257.10;12). Altogether, the supposed '*aḥādīṭ*' that are five words or less (and are thus difficult not to be considered as mere idiomatic expressions) make up 38 out of the 46 cases.

Some of the eight other cases (N° 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 13) are more convincing, such as the following, which is the only one to contain a numeral:

ما من أيام أحب إلى الله عز وجلّ فيها الصومُ منه في عشر ذي الحجة.

There is no day that God, powerful and glorious, loves more than the tenth of Dū l-Hijjah for fasting (N° 1; K. I, 199.14; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 56).

### In the *Muqtaḍab*

As for the *Muqtaḍab*, 'Uḍaymah does not mention any *ḥadīṭ* in the tables, nor does he point out the following phrase, which is interesting because it contains the verb '*ālaḥa*' "to make something a thousand" (Form IV) and because al-Mubarrad introduces it with the expression *wa-jā'a fī l-ḥadīṭ*<sup>29</sup> "and we find in the *ḥadīṭ*" (see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 93):

<sup>28</sup><http://majles.alukah.net/showthread.php?t=54941> retrieved on September 6th, 2012.

<sup>29</sup>In the *Muqtaḍab*, the word *ḥadīṭ* is used with the same religious meaning only in M. IV, 254.5-6; although, as 'Uḍaymah points it, it refers to a *xabar*, not a *ḥadīṭ*.

أول حيّ ألف مع رسول الله ﷺ جهينة وقد آلفت معه بنو سليم بعد.

The first living being who made a group of a thousand with the Prophet of God, peace and blessing of God be upon him, is [the tribe] of Juhaynah and after them the Banū Sulaym (*M. II*, 184.5–6).

This *ḥadīṭ* is found in the canonical collections, although in a different textual form: *ḥaddaṭanā ‘Abd ar-Raḥīm b. Sulaymān ‘an Zakariyyā’ qāla: ‘awwalu man ‘allafa bayna l-qabā’ili ma’a Rasūli l-Lāhi ṣallā l-Lāhu ‘alay-hi wa-sallam Juhaynah* “Zakariyyā” told ‘Abd Allāhi b. Sulaymān who told us that the first tribe who made a group of a thousand with the Prophet of God, peace and blessing of God be upon him, is Juhaynah” (*Muṣannaf VIII*, 329, #36). Here, Form II is used in the verb *‘allafa* instead of Form IV *‘ālaḥa*.

If one goes back to the list of potential *‘aḥādīṭ* in the *Kitāb* established by Bin ‘Āṣūr, there are a few more phrases that are also found in the *Muqtaḍab* such as № 1 quoted above (*M. III*, 250.3, see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 57; 91), № 6, *‘innī ‘abdu l-Lāhi [...]* *‘ākilan kamā ya’kulu l-‘abdu* “indeed I’m the slave of God, eating just like a slave eats” (*K. I*, 219.10–11; *M. IV*, 311.3–4; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 60; 93), and № 10, *lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata ‘illā bi-l-Lāhi* “there is no power and no strength save in God” (*K. I*, 308.18; *M. IV*, 371.1–2; 387.9). Altogether, al-Ḥadīṭī (1981, 97) mentions thirteen quotations of *‘aḥādīṭ* in the *Muqtaḍab*.

### In the *‘Uṣūl*

In the case of the *‘Uṣūl*, aṭ-Ṭanāḥī (1986, 35) mentions three *‘aḥādīṭ* in his tables: Bin ‘Āṣūr’s № 1 (*‘U. I*, 131.9–10; *II*, 44.14–15; 18–19; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 91; 100), № 9, *labbayka ‘inna l-ḥamda wa-n-ni’mata la-ka* “here I am, indeed praise and grace are yours!” (*K. I*, 413.16; *‘U. I*, 272.1; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 104–105), and a third one, which is found only in the *‘Uṣūl*, *‘a-ra’ayta man lā ‘akala wa-lā ṣariba wa-lā ṣāḥa fa-stahalla* “have you seen whom who does not eat nor drink nor shout ever raise his voice?” (*‘U. I*, 401.1–2; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 107). This last *ḥadīṭ* is the only one of the three to be introduced by the expression *qawlu n-nabiyyi* “saying of the Prophet”.

Lastly, the following two expressions listed by Bin ‘Āṣūr are also found in the *‘Uṣūl* (but not in aṭ-Ṭanāḥī 1986, 35): № 10 quoted above (*‘U. I*, 386.9; 11) and № 11 (which is also found in the *Kitāb*), *an-nāsu majziyyūna bi-‘a’māli-him ‘in xayran fa-xayrun wa-‘in šarran fa-šarrun* “people are retributed according to their deeds, if good then good and if bad then bad” (*K. I*, 109.21–22; *‘U. II*, 232.8–9; 248.1–2; see al-Ḥadīṭī 1981, 71; 106).

In conclusion, there are only two *ʾaḥādīt* that contain a numeral in our texts: *mā min ʾayyāmin ʾaḥabba ʾilā l-Lāhi...* (N<sup>o</sup> 1; K. I, 199.14; M. III, 250.3; ʾU. I, 131.9–10; II, 44.14–15; 18–19) and *ʾawwalu ḥayyin ʾālaḥa maʿa Rasūli l-Lāhi...* (M. II, 184.5–6).

### 3.4.3 From poetry

Altogether, we found 38 different poetic quotations that contain numerals in our three grammatical treatises.<sup>30</sup> Since some of these quotations contain more than one line, the total number of lines is 43. Out of these 38 different poetic quotations, 25 are found in the *Kitāb* (29 in total, since four of them are repeated), 22 (25) in the *Muqtaḍab*, and only 14 (17) in the *ʾUṣūl*. Out of these 38 different quotations, only 8 are common to all three treatises.

Half of the 22 poetic quotations found in the *Muqtaḍab* are also found in the *Kitāb* (13 out of 22); al-Mubarrad provides the rest (9 out of 22).

As for the *ʾUṣūl*, almost all its poetic quotations are already found in the *Kitāb* (10 out of 14); the last four being unique to the *ʾUṣūl* (i.e., not found in the *Muqtaḍab*).

Sībawayh comments on the following poetic line by al-ʿAjjāj (d. 90/708):

*xawwāʾ<sup>a</sup> ʿalā mustawayātīn xamsīn / kirkiratin wa-ṭafīnātīn mulsin.*

It [the camel] laid down on five [equal] levels / the chest and [the four other] bald callosities (K. I, 183.2).

<sup>a</sup> Manuscript A mistakenly reads *ḥawwāʾ*.

His commentary states that “this” can be either considered a *naʿt* or a *badal*. It is not clear what exactly is meant here by “this”. It could mean either *xams*, *kirkirah* or *ṭafīnāt*, or all three. However, the two probable interpretations are either that *xams* is an *ism* in the function of *badal* or that it is an *ism* treated like a *ṣifah* in the function of *naʿt*.

Sībawayh also quotes the following poetic line:

*Ka-ʾanna xuṣṣayy-hi min at-tadalduli / ḍarfū ʿajūzin fī-hi ṭintā ḥanḍalin.*

As if his testicles, because of the dangling, / [were] the bag of an old woman with two colocynths in it (K. II, 182.18).

The expression *ṭintā ḥanḍalin* “two colocynths”, which is used here as a grammatical proof, is a case where the numeral “two” is annexed to a

<sup>30</sup>See the complete list in annex.

collective noun instead of the expected *ʔintāni min al-ḥanḍali* or the even better *ḥanḍalatāni*, possibly followed by the adjective *ʔintāni*.

The same line is also quoted by al-Mubarrad (in a slightly different version; *M.* II, 156.3) to confirm his position that the dual is a subcase of the plural and that its use is a secondary form as compared to the annexation, although this is valid only in poetry. It is interesting to note that the analogical form (annexation) is tolerated here as poetic license and that the secondary form (the dual) is the one that is actually used.<sup>31</sup> This poetic line is not quoted by Ibn as-Sarrāj.

Another case is the following line by al-ʔAʕšā (d. 7/629):

*fī jubbin ṭamānīna qāmatan*

in an eighty fathom [deep] well (*K.* I, 18).

Sibawayh quotes this line as a counterexample of the adjectival use of nouns. The general rule is as follows: In *marartu bi-ḥayyatīn ḍirāʕun ṭūlu-hā* “I passed by a cubit-long snake” (*K.* I, 197.14) the noun *ḍirāʕ* occupies an adjectival slot but it remains in the independent form because it is not an adjective.

The same poetic line is quoted by Ibn as-Sarrāj in *ʔU.* II, 27.21 as an example of a noun used in an adjectival slot. The difference with Sibawayh is that it is not a counterexample; it is only later in the text that Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions Sibawayh’s view that the oblique form is less common (*ʔU.* I, 28.4–5). Al-Mubarrad does not quote this line.

In other words, authors quote the same poetic lines to serve different purposes and only an attentive reading can prevent the reader from believing that since the “witness” is the same, it serves the same purpose.

#### 3.4.4 From the canonised language of the Arabs

Needless to say, the same remarks that were made in the previous section are valid for “witnesses” that are taken from the language of the Arabs, or more precisely by the expressions in the language of the Arabs, which the grammatical tradition has practically canonised. Some of them could be considered as idioms, or everyday language, whereas for others it is difficult to know whether they are fabricated or not.

<sup>31</sup>See Ayoub (1990) on this paradox.

Indeed, it is very striking that all three authors (and later grammarians as well) constantly seem to draw these examples from the same pool of quotations. This fact creates a strong impression of uniformity between the grammatical works, and they clearly function as “cruces” that grammarians have to comment on.

A more in-depth look at these quotations is not an easy task because of their great number and because one has to decide whether small variations between two quotations should be counted as two separate entries or as the same quotation. The following remarks are based on a quick survey of more than 70 different quotations related to the grammar of numerals taken from our three grammar treatises. This survey is by no means systematic or comprehensive, but it gives a first impression of how our grammarians handle these quotations.

Out of these 70 different quotations, almost 40 are found in the *Kitāb*, 30 in the *Muqtaḍab* and 50 in the *ʿUṣūl*. Only ten of them are common to all three treatises. While only eight are common to the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab*, and seven are common to the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl*, there are 15 quotations that are common to the *Kitāb* and the *ʿUṣūl*. Another interesting fact is the number of quotations that are proper to only one treatise: Seven of the 70 different quotations are found only in the *Kitāb*, seven in the *Muqtaḍab*, and twenty in the *ʿUṣūl*.

The impression that these three treatises draw their grammatical examples from the same pool of quotations can thus be slightly corrected. This is certainly true for the relationship between both the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl* with the *Kitāb*, however it is not true for the relationship between the *ʿUṣūl* and the *Muqtaḍab*.

Both the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl* rely on the *Kitāb* for half of their quotations. However, in the case of the *ʿUṣūl*, its second half is largely unique and is not found in the *Muqtaḍab*. Only seven quotations of this second half are found in the *Muqtaḍab*. In other words, what has already been noticed for the Qurʾānic and poetic quotations is also true for the general language quotations. The *ʿUṣūl* relies either on the *Kitāb* or on unique sources for its quotations, but not on the *Muqtaḍab*.

Roughly speaking, one can say that the *Muqtaḍab* relies on the *Kitāb* for half of its quotations (Qurʾānic, poetic or general language); and if compared to the *Kitāb*, it quotes more Qurʾān, the same amount of poetry, and less general language. As for the *ʿUṣūl*, it relies much more on quotations from general language and less on the Qurʾān and poetry than the two other treatises.



Here are only a few of the very numerous “witnesses” taken from the language of the Arabs. We will come across them throughout this study. Among the quotations that are common to all three texts, the following may be mentioned: *humā xayru ṭnayni fī n-nāsi* “they are the best two of the people” (K. I, 86.5–6; M. III, 34.9; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 222.13; *hādā xayru...*); *marartu bi-him ṭalāṭata-hum* “I passed by the three of them” (K. I, 157.6; M. III, 239.5; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 165.5; II, 22.9–10); *ʾafradtu-hum ʾifrādan* “I isolated them completely” (K. I, 157.11; M. III, 239.6–7; *ʾafradtu-hu bi-murūri ʾifrādan*; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 22.15–16; *ʾafradtu-hu ʾifrādan*); *la-hu xamsun min al-ḡanami dukūrun* “he has five [fem.] [heads] of male livestock” (K. II, 179.9; M. II, 186.7; *ʾindī ṭalāṭun...*; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 428.5; *la-hu ṭalāṭatu dukūrin min al-ḡanami*); *mā kāna ʾaḥadun miṭla-ka* “there was no one like you” (K. I, 20.10; M. IV, 90.4; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 84.2; 85.10); *ṭalāṭatu šusūʾin* “three sandal thongs” (K. II, 185.12; M. II, 160.6; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 430.8–9); *ṭalāṭatun ʾaṭwāban* “three [in terms of] dresses” (K. I, 257.23; M. II, 168.14; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 324.5; 9: *ʾindī xamsatun ʾaṭwāban*); *huwa nasīju waḥdi-hi* “he is one of a kind” (K. I, 159.3; M. III, 242.4; *hādā nasīju...*; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 166.7); *wulida la-hu sittūna ʾāman* “[a child] was born to him [while he was] sixty years [old]” (K. I, 75.5; 88.12–13; 93.19; 97.15–16; M. III, 105.4; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 194.3; II, 255.10–11).

Other expressions that are not common to all three treatises are worth noticing: *marartu bi-rajulin miʾatun* (or *miʾatin*) *ʾiblu-hu* “I passed by a man whose camels are a hundred” (K. I, 197.15; 198.4; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 28.3); *ʾaxaḍa Banū Fulānin min Banī Fulānin ʾiblan miʾatan* “the So-and-so took a hundred camels from the So-and-so” (K. I, 197.16; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 27.19–20); *hāʾulāʾi ṭalāṭatun qurašīyyūna* “those are three Qurayshites” (K. II, 181.9; <sup>U</sup>I. II, 429.11); *la-ka miʾatun bayḍan*<sup>32</sup> “there are a hundred helmets for you” (K. I, 251.22; K. I, 232.19; 262.3; *ʾalay-hi miʾatun...*; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 322.5); *ḍuriba bi-Zaydin ʾiṣrūna sawṭan* “because of Zayd he was beaten twenty lashes” (M. IV, 51.15; <sup>U</sup>I. I, 79.12; *min ʾajli Zaydin*); *hādīhi ʾiṣrū-ka* “these are your twenty” (M. II, 178.3–4; IV, 30.17; <sup>U</sup>I. III, 263.6); *hādīhi ʾiṣriy-ya* “these are my twenty” (M. IV, 249.1; <sup>U</sup>I. III, 263.6).

Finally, the following are expressions that are found only in one of the three texts studied and which are thus unique to their authors: *hādā ṣawtu kilābin* “this is the voice of dogs” (K. II, 182.16); *hāʾulāʾi niswatun ʾarbaʿun* “these are four women” (M. III, 341.4); *ḍarabtu Zaydan miʾata sawṭin* “I beat Zayd a hundred lashes” (M. IV, 51.9); *alladī la-hu ʾindī miʾatu dirhamin ʾillā dirhamayni* (or *dirhamāni*) “what I owe him is a hundred dirhams less two

<sup>32</sup>In K. I, 232.19 and 262.3 Derenbourg vocalises *biḍan*, whereas in K. I, 251.22 he vocalises *bayḍan*. It seems that the singular *bayḍan* is better because it corresponds to the singular of *dirhaman* in *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman*. Since *بيضاً* has to be a singular in this slot, it can only correspond to the noncount form of *bayḍah* “egg, helmet, white truffle” which is vocalised *bayḍ*, not the plural form of *ʾabyaḍ* “white man” and “sword” which is *bīḍ* (Lane 1863–1893/1955–1956, I, 282–284).

(or ‘not two’)” (‘U. I, 304.7–8); *marartu bi-rajulin maqtū’i ’iḥdā l-’uḍunayni* “I passed by a man one of whose ears was cut off” (‘U. II, 16.21–22).

From the perspective of the modern reader, all these quotations belong to general grammatical knowledge and should be treated with caution since one risks to misinterpret them due to a feeling of *déjà vu*, as was the case with the previous types of “witnesses” mentioned above.

## 3.5 Extrapolation

The last of the five different methods to collect grammatical information on numerals is extrapolation. In many cases, the texts do not explicitly address issues linked with numerals, and one can only try to guess what the opinion of the author is. It could either be that the author considers this issue to be self-evident, or that he quotes the opinion of another grammarian whom he trusts and whose opinion he endorses. In some cases, we could also suppose that he is avoiding the issue.

### 3.5.1 The gender of numerals

A particularly clear example of a rule not explicitly mentioned is the question of the gender of numerals, which is traditionally tackled as follows. What is the morphological link between the two forms of the cardinals between “three” and “ten” when used before feminine and masculine nouns (*talāt* vs. *talātah*)? In other words, is the form carrying the feminine marker derived from the other form? Or is it the other way round? Or any other link?

In the *Kitāb*’s chapter 368, Sibawayh quotes Yūnus’ (d. 182/798) opinion that the *tā’ marbūṭah* has been added to the feminine *talāt* in order to build the masculine form *talātah* (K. II, 119.6–10). At this point, Sibawayh does not mention his own point of view, which he reveals no less than 44 chapters later, in chapter 412, where he writes that all numerals between “three” and “ten” are feminine, even if they do not show the feminine final *hā’*, which they lose before feminine nouns (K. II, 176.13–18). He does not say why this feminine marker should be erased before a feminine noun. One can just infer—based on Sibawayh’s other similar teachings—that it would be too heavy, but this last point is a supposition. It should be also noticed that Sibawayh does not refute Yūnus explicitly, neither in chapter 368 not in chapter 412. The attentive reader can only notice that Sibawayh’s teaching is not compatible with Yūnus’.

Sibawayh's teaching is quoted word for word by Ibn as-Sarrāj in his *ʿUṣūl*, with a remarkable difference. Compare the following two texts:

(١) اعلم أنّ ما جاوز الاثنين إلى العشرة ممّا واحده مذكّر فإنّ الأسماء التي تبين بها عدّته مؤنّثة فيها الهاء التي هي علامة التأنيث وذلك قولك له ثلاثه بنين [...] وإن كان الواحد مؤنّثا فإنّك تخرج هذه الهاءات من هذه الأسماء وتكون مؤنّثة ليست فيها علامة التأنيث وذلك قولك ثلاث بنات (في الكتاب ٢، ١٧٦ . ١٣-١٨).

(٢) فإذا جاوز الاثنين فيما واحده مذكّر فإنّ أسماء العدد مؤنّثة فيها الهاء وذلك ثلاثه بنين [...] فإن كان واحده مؤنّثا أخرجت الهاء وذلك قولك ثلاث بنات (في الأصول ٢، ٤٢٤ . ١١-٩).

(1) Know that what is above two until ten and whose singular is masculine, the noun that specifies its number is feminine and carries the feminine marker *hā'* as in *la-hu ṭalāṭatu banīna* [...] and if the singular is feminine, you remove these *hā'āt* from these nouns, which are then feminine without a feminine marker, as in *ṭalāṭu banātin* (K. II, 176.13–18).

(2) And if it is above two and its singular is masculine, the numeral nouns are feminine, with the *hā'* as in *ṭalāṭatu banīna* [...] and if its singular is feminine, you remove the *hā'*, as in *ṭalāṭu banātin* (*ʿU. II*, 424.9–11).

The most striking difference between the two quotations lies in the absence of the phrase *wa-takūnu mu'annaṭatan laysat fī-hā' al'āmatu t-ta'niṭi* "which are then feminine without a feminine marker" in (2). One could not be clearer about the gender of *ṭalāṭ*. So the question is: Should (2) be understood as a short recension of (1), meaning that the silence in (2) should be filled by (1), or is the silence in (2) the expression of a different grammatical opinion? The former is probably the most logical answer because it is improbable that Ibn as-Sarrāj would remain silent on a difference in opinion. Yet, this is a very clear example of an extrapolation of meaning in the *ʿUṣūl*.

In his *Muqtaḍab*, al-Mubarrad does not discuss Sibawayh's teaching overtly but he explains that the *hā' at-ta'niṭ* in numerals used before masculine counted objects is part of the masculine pattern of the numeral, just like in *nassābah* "genealogist"; it was not "added" to the numeral like it is added in *ḍaribah*. Numerals that do not carry the *hā' at-ta'niṭ* are annexed to feminine nouns (M. II, 157.8–12). Just like Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad does not mention why this *hā' at-ta'niṭ* should be deleted before feminine nouns.

The teaching of al-Mubarrad is found in one single chapter. It contradicts Sibawayh's teaching on the question of the gender of numerals (for al-Mubarrad, *ṭalāṭah* is masculine just like *nassābah*, whereas for Sibawayh all numerals are feminine); on the other hand both authors agree on the fact that the final *hā'* is deleted before feminine nouns, without giving any reason;

lastly, it is impossible to say whether al-Mubarrad still considers *ṭalāt* to be masculine after the elision of the final *hā'* or if he considers it to be feminine. Our hypothesis is that he would still regard them as masculine because there is no reason why the elision of the final *hā'* should change the gender of the numeral.

This issue is a very typical one, inasmuch as one sees clearly that the texts do not enter into a dialogue with one another, they do not tackle the issues in the same manner, although at a surface level they agree on the description of the language (the facts that the forms carrying the *tā' marbūṭah* are found before masculine nouns and the forms deprived of the *tā' marbūṭah* are found before feminine nouns), which is an extremely basic observation after all.

As for the gender of compound cardinals, it is to the reader to extrapolate from both the gender of cardinals between “three” and “nine” and the morphological formation of compounds. For example, Sibawayh considers that the second part of compound numerals has the status of a compensatory *nūn* (see below, p. 205). Since he considers that *ṭalāt* and *ṭalāṭah* are feminine, one can probably extrapolate that he would consider *ṭalāṭa-‘aš(i)rata* and *ṭalāṭata-‘ašara* to be feminine as well, because there is no reason why the addition of a morpheme that has the status of the compensatory *nūn* should modify the gender of the first term.

### 3.5.2 *Xumaysah?*

Other issues are easier to deal with, such as the diminutive forms of certain regular numerals. While the authors spend some time discussing the diminutive form of *ṭamāniyah* “eight” (*ṭumayyinah* vs. *ṭumayniyah?*) and *ṭalāṭūna* “thirty” (*ṭulayyitūna* vs. *ṭulaytūna?*), nowhere do they give the diminutive form of *‘arba‘ah* or *xamsah* (see below, p. 110). Of course, these can be deduced from the regular cases but sometimes it is not particularly obvious. For example, *xumaysah* poses no particular difficulty, but one might ask the question, what is the diminutive form for *‘arba‘ah*: *rubay‘ah* or *‘urbay‘ah*?

### 3.5.3 *Twentieth?*

A less evident case is the ordinal “twentieth”. Nowhere in these grammatical treatises do the authors mention the ordinal forms of the decades or the hundreds or the thousands. Is it self-evident for them that *‘iṣrūna* means both “twenty” and “twentieth”, or that *al-bābu l-mi‘atu* means “the hundredth chapter” or that *al-laylatu l-‘alfu* means “the thousandth night”? Are these

expressions a modern coinage or are they too trivial to be mentioned? (See below, p. 145.)

Fleisch (1990, I, 522, §107*e*) says that decades have both a cardinal and an ordinal meaning. At the beginning of §107, he gives the following three references: az-Zamaxšarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (95, §324), Ibn Ya'īš's *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal* (VI, 34–36)<sup>33</sup> and al-'Astarābādī's *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah* (II, 158–160).<sup>34</sup> Only al-'Astarābādī mentions the fact that decades have an ordinal meaning instead of the expected *fā'il* pattern \**āširūna* (*Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah*, II, 160.1–3).

### 3.5.4 Numerals as *xabar*

The same goes for the use of numerals in the position of *xabar* in a nominal sentence, as in *al-'awlādu xamsatun* “the boys are five”, which apparently poses no particular difficulty even though the only two examples found in Sībawayh's *Kitāb* are cases where the nominal sentence is embedded in a larger sentence, as in *marartu bi-ṭawbin sab'un ṭūlu-hu* “I passed by a garment, which is seven in length” (K. I, 197.14) and *marartu bi-rajulin mi'atun 'iblu-hu* “I passed by a man whose camel are a hundred” (K. I, 197.15).

In his *Muqtaḍab*, al-Mubarrad uses this construction but never comments on it, as in *wa-ḥurūfu l-ḥalqi sittatun* “and the guttural consonants are six” (M. II, 140.9); *qad 'alima 'anna-hum xamsatun* “he knows that they are five” (M. III, 239.13); or *jawāri-ka 'arba'un* “your maids are four” (M. III, 342.6). Nothing seems to forbid one to use it with other numerals such as *ḍanantu 'awlāda-ka 'iṣrīna* “I thought your boys to be twenty” and *al-'awlādu xamsata-‘ašara* “the boys are fifteen”, but this is clearly an extrapolation.

Just like Sībawayh, Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on the peculiar expression *marartu bi-rajulin mi'atun 'iblu-hu* (ʿU. II, 28.1–3) which seems to be a grammatical crux. However, unlike Sībawayh and al-Mubarrad, he gives more insight into this construction and says that if there is “some sort of cause” *šay' min as-sabab*<sup>35</sup> between the substantive (*rajul*) and the word used as an adjective (*mi'ah*), it is possible to put it in the position of *mubtada'*, as in *marartu bi-rajulin mi'atun 'iblu-hu* “I passed by a man whose camel are a hundred”, otherwise an adjectival slot would be preferable (ʿU. II, 27.17–18), as in *marartu bi-rajulin mi'atin 'iblu-hu*.

<sup>33</sup>Fleisch (1990, I, 522) quotes an edition dated 1882–1886, pp. 324–325.

<sup>34</sup>Fleisch apparently quotes the same edition as us, but he gives the pages 147–150.

<sup>35</sup>Carter (1985, 2009) studies the term *sabab* in the *Kitāb* and in the later tradition. He shows (1985, 61–64) how its extend has considerably reduced, and how it came to refer only to *al-wajh* in *ḥasanun wajhu-hu*, which is the case here in *mi'atun 'iblu-hu*. See below, p. 195, for an account of *sabab* in the *Kitāb*.



## Chapter 4

# Numerals in isolation

After these preliminary remarks, which will be our methodological guidelines in the interpretation of the texts, we will focus on the separate issues at stake in the grammar of numerals in general. The purpose of presenting these issues in a systematic way is to have an overall view of them before considering the different theoretical frames in which our grammarians tackle numerals (ch. 8, 9 and 10).

We will consider numerals from three different perspectives: in chapter 4 we will treat numerals in isolation (roots, patterns, declinability, meaning); in chapter 5, numerals in the sentence (their different syntactic slots); and in chapter 6, in the expression of the counted object (gender agreement, number, definiteness and indefiniteness, and so on). At this stage, we will not distinguish between cardinals and ordinals.<sup>1</sup>

### 4.1 A limited set of roots

Numerals in Arabic are expressed through a very limited set of roots, either biliteral: *tn* and *m*<sup>2</sup>; trilateral *whd*, *tlṭ*, *rb*<sup>3</sup>, *xms*, *sds*, *sb*<sup>4</sup>, *ṭmn*, *ts*<sup>5</sup>, *ʕr*, *ʕf*; or quadriliteral, if one takes into account the Semitic parallels for “four” and “eight”: *ʕrb*<sup>6</sup> and *ṭmny*.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1485–1495) and Fleisch (1990, I, 520–522; §107) for the issues linked with ordinals.

As for biliteral *tn* and *m*, they are implicitly integrated into the trilateral system by the addition of a third radical *yā* in the pattern *fā'il* in *tānin* / *aṭ-tānī*, see below p. 104, or in the Form IV verb *'am'a* “to make something a hundred”, see below, p. 107.

Other roots are usually not considered to be numerals in Arabic, although they would in other languages. The root *ṣfr* serves to express “zero” but it is not found in our grammatical treatises. There is apparently no root to express “one million” and no clue is given in our texts as to its form.<sup>2</sup>

The word *'awwal* “first” is also problematic.<sup>3</sup> It is not treated at the same place as numerals in our texts, although there is no other word for “first”. The *fā'il* pattern in *wāḥid* could have served as a parallel to the other ordinals (*tānī*, *tālīṭ*, and so on) but it is already being used to express the cardinal meaning “one”. If the pattern of *'awwal* is obvious (the elative *'af'al*, which is confirmed by its feminine *'ulā*),<sup>4</sup> its root is far from clear. Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to have a complete discussion on this issue (*'U* III, 339.8–340.5). The only possibility for its root is to be *wwl* because if it were *'wl* its *'af'al* form should be *\*'āwal*, not *'awwal*, and if its root were *w'l* its *'af'al* form should be *\*'awal*,<sup>5</sup> after a regular phonetic assimilation. Ibn as-Sarrāj adds that there are other cases in Arabic where the root begins by a doubled letter, as in *ad-dadan* “game” (root *ddn*) and *kawkab* “planet” (root *kkb*). Sībawayh and al-Mubarrad are silent on this point.

## 4.2 Many patterns and irregularities

The number of patterns that these few roots can take is very large. Some of these patterns are productive, in the sense that they apply to most of the roots, sometimes at the cost of small morphological modifications. Other patterns are not productive, and apply to only one or two roots.

<sup>2</sup>In his *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah*, (II, 152.9–14), al-ʿAstarābādī mentions the expressions *'alfu 'alfin* “one million” and *'alfu 'alfi 'alfin* “one milliard”. Cf. as well Wright (1967, I, 259; §326).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 521–522; §107*b–c*) and Wright (1967, I, 260; §328, rem. *a*).

<sup>4</sup>Blau (2002, 43, §69) mentions the existence of feminine *'awwalah* in Post-Classical Arabic, as well as expressions like *at-tawrātu l-'awwalu* “the Old Testament”, where *'awwal* refers to a feminine (48, §101).

<sup>5</sup>Al-Fatli vocalises *لّ*, which makes no sense in the text.



### 4.2.1 The patterns *faʿl*, *faʿal*, and *fiʿl*

The patterns *faʿl*, *faʿal*, and *fiʿl* can be applied to some of the roots above in order to express the cardinal value of numerals. These patterns correspond to trilateral triptotic nominal patterns. They can take the feminine suffix marker *-at-*: *faʿl-(at-)un*, *faʿal-(at-)un*, *fiʿl-(at-)un* as in the following numerals: *xams-(at-)un*, *sitt-(at-)un*, *sabʿ-(at-)un* and *tisʿ-(at-)un*. The feminine plural suffix *-āt-* can also be added to these numerals, with the regular pattern modifications, as in *xamas-āt-un* instead of \**xams-āt-un*.

These patterns can also take the masculine external plural marker: *ʿiṣr-ūna*, *xams-ūna*, *sitt-ūna*, *sabʿ-ūna*, and *tisʿ-ūna*. Curiously, no author has commented on the fact that this masculine external plural marker is usually reserved to male human beings in Arabic grammar (see below, p. 126, for more details).

There are a few peculiarities that should be noticed. When applied to the root *ʿlf*, the pattern *faʿl* cannot take the feminine suffix (*ʿalfun* “one thousand”), so that the same form applies to masculine and feminine counted objects.

The root *sds* exhibits a double phonetic assimilation into *sitt-(at-)un* in the pattern *fiʿl*. This point is briefly alluded to by Sibawayh (*K.* II, 382.17–18), it is not mentioned in the *Muqtaḍab*, and it is treated with great care by Ibn as-Sarrāj (*ʿU.* III, 242.12; 270.3–4; 432.3; 433.3–4).

The root *ʿṣr* is the only one to surface in more than one of these patterns.<sup>6</sup> Compare *ʿaṣar-at-un* “ten [for masculine counted objects]”, *ʿaṣr-un* “ten [for feminine counted object]”, *ʿiṣr-ūna* “twenty”, *-ʿaṣar-aʿ* “-teen [in compounds for masculine counted objects]”, *-ʿaṣr-at-aʿ* “-teen [in compounds for feminine counted objects]” and for this last form the dialectal variant *-ʿaṣir-at-aʿ* is also reported by the grammarians (pattern *faʿil*).<sup>8</sup> We will represent this dialectal variant as *-ʿaṣ(i)rata*. See below, p. 119, for issues linked with the formation of compound numerals.

Lastly, the root *whd* also presents some irregularities.<sup>9</sup> The pattern *faʿl* can be applied to it, but only in the position of annexation, as *waḥd-* in *waḥda-hu* “him alone” (this point is mentioned explicitly only in *K.* I, 168.17), and when the pattern *faʿal* is applied to the same root, the *wāw* is transformed into an

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 518–519; §106ff).

<sup>7</sup>In Post-Classical Arabic, the second part of compound cardinals may be spelt اَعَشْر *hiḍāʿṣar* “eleven” (Blau 2002, 43, §70). Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1462) reports that the *ʿayn* of *-ʿaṣara* is sometimes made quiescent because of the succession of two many *fataḥāt*.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1461–1462).

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1474–1478).

*hamzah*, as in *ʾaḥad* “one” instead of \**waḥad* (K. II, 392.3–4; M. I, 299.4; ʾU. III, 307.5–12). The feminine counterpart of *ʾaḥad* is *ʾiḥdā* (see below, p. 109, for the pattern *fiʾlā*).<sup>10</sup>

#### 4.2.2 The augmented patterns *faʿāl* and *ʾafʿal*

The augmented pattern *faʿāl* applies to the root *tlṭ* alone and the augmented pattern *ʾafʿal* applies to the root *rbʿ* (as well as to the root *wwl*, as was made clear above, p. 102, where it is an elative). These patterns are treated here as triptotic nominal patterns. They can take the feminine suffix marker, singular and plural, and the masculine external plural marker as in *ṭalātun*, *ṭalātātun*, *ṭalātātun* and *ṭalātūna*.

There are other examples of triptotic nouns in the pattern *ʾafʿal*, like *ʾarnabun* “rabbit” and *ʾafʿā* “viper”, which are labelled by Fleisch (1990, I, 407–408) as very ancient Semitic words, and whose origin is far from clear. He also mentions *ʾafkalun* “fright”, *ʾazmalun* “confused noise” and *ʾaṭlabun* “small stones” (Fleisch 1990, I, 415).

The trilateral augmented pattern *faʿāl* referring to triptotic nouns is much more common, as noted by Fleisch (1990, I, 353–354) and examples include *ʾatānun* “jenny”, adjectives like *jabānun* “coward”, and many Form I *maṣādir* (such as *ḡahābun* “to go” and *damārun* “to destroy”).

#### 4.2.3 The pattern *fāʿil*

The pattern *fāʿil* is very common in the language. It is used to express the ordinal meaning of numerals between “two” and “nineteen”. It corresponds to a trilateral triptotic active participle pattern. This pattern which also accepts the feminine suffix marker applies to all the roots mentioned above, with the exception of *mʾ* and *ʾlf*: *wāḥid-(at-)un* “one”, *ṭālīt-(at-)un* “third”, *rābiʿ-(at-)un* “fourth”, *xāmis-(at-)un* “fifth”, *sādis-(at-)un* “sixth”, *sābiʿ-(at-)un* “seventh”, *ṭāmin-(at-)un* “eighth”, *tāsiʿ-(at-)un* “ninth” and *ʿāšir-(at-)un* “tenth”.

All three authors link the meaning of this pattern to the corresponding verbs of the same root (K. II, 177.21–178.3; M. II, 181.3–182.1; ʾU. II, 426.3–8).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>Blau (2002, 43, §69) mentions the feminine form *احدة* in Post-Classical Arabic, as in *احدته*. He does not vocalise it. Is it *ʾaḥadah*, *ʾaḥdah*, *ʾiḥdah*? He also mentions occurrences of *ʾaḥad* referring to a feminine in Post-Classical and Neo-Arabic, as in ... *al-kaffayni tunaqqī ʾaḥada-humā l-ʾuxrā* “... the two palms one of which cleans the other” (Blau 2002, 48, §100).

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 520–521; §107a).

Interestingly, all of them tackle the issue of the ordinals in a chapter devoted to expressions of the type *xāmisu* 'arba'atin "the fifth of four", which meaning they equate with *alladī xamasa l-'arba'ata* "the one that made the [group of] four to be five". See p. 132 for more details on these expressions.

There are a few irregularities linked with this very productive pattern. We have already mentioned the fact that it does not apply to *m'* and *'lf*, as well as the cardinal meaning of *wāḥid-(at-)un*. These facts are not mentioned in our texts.

When applied to the root *tn*, this pattern surfaces as *tānin* (fem. *tāniy-at-un*) after the addition of a *yā'* to the biliteral root in order to fit the trilateral pattern. Our authors use this form without questioning it.

Another major irregularity is the form *ḥādin* (fem. *ḥādiy-at-un*) "first [in compounds and conjoined numerals]": *ḥādiya-ašara* "eleventh" and *al-ḥādī wa-l-īsrūna* "the twenty-first". Its formation is far from clear. At a surface level, it is formed on the weak root *ḥdy*, however its semantic link with the root *wḥd* points toward a complex root modification from *wḥd* to *ḥdy* which is commented by none of our authors.

Lastly, since our authors consider the root of 'arba' and *tamānin* to be trilateral (*rb'* and *tmn*), they have integrated them without discussion in this productive pattern, as in *rābi'-(at-)un* and *tāmin-(at-)un*.

#### 4.2.4 The verbal patterns

Verbal patterns can also apply to the numerical roots mentioned above.<sup>12</sup>

##### The pattern *fa'ala* (Form I)

The pattern *fā'il* is semantically linked with the verbs of the first pattern built on the corresponding roots, as for *xāmisun*, which corresponds to the verb *xamasa* "to make something five" which is quoted by Sibawayh (*K. I*, 157.10–12; *II*, 178.2–3 (twice)). The following verbs are also found: *ṭalaṭa* (*M. II*, 181.7; 8), *raba'a* (*K. II*, 178.3; *M. II*, 181.7; 183.5) and *sadasa* (*M. II*, 183.5) which mean "to make something three, four, and six".

The verb *saba'a*, *yasba'u* is found in *K. II*, 270.14 in a list of verbs having a similar vocalic pattern *fa'ala*, *yaf'alu*, but is difficult to interpret it since there is no context.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 524; §107k).

A legitimate question is the following: Do these verbs actually exist in the language or are they fabricated for the sake of the explanation? While Sibawayh says that *xamasta-hum* is a case of *tamīl*<sup>13</sup> (K. I, 157.10–12), al-Mubarrad expresses no such reservation.

Ibn as-Sarrāj has a clear position. Just like Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad he says that forms *xāmis* and *xāmisah* are “built like an *ism al-fā‘il*” and that they correspond to the verb *xamasa* (ʿU. II, 426.3–8), but he also says earlier in the ʿUṣūl that these verbs do not really exist and that the ordinals are derived from the cardinals:

(٣) ليس له [رَابِعٌ] فعل معلوم إنما هو مشتقٌّ من العدد وليس بمشتقٍّ من مصدر معروف  
كما يُشتقُّ ضَارِبٌ من الضَّرْبِ ومن ضَرَبَ.

(3) It [*rābi‘un*] has no known verb; indeed it is derived from the numeral [itself] and not from a known *maṣḍar*, like *ḍāribun* which is derived from *aḍ-ḍarb* and *ḍaraba* (ʿU. II, 332.11–13).

The semantic comparison in the *Kitāb* to an implicit verb *xamasa* becomes a clear morphological comparison in the *Muqtaḍab* accompanied by a full list of verbs. This contrasts with the clear-cut affirmation of Ibn as-Sarrāj that these verbs do not exist, although he himself compares the meaning of *xāmisun* to the theoretical verb *xamasa*.

### The patterns *fa‘‘ala* and *ʿaf‘ala* (Forms II and IV)

Other verbs are also found in our texts, and it is not always clear whether they really exist or whether they only serve the purpose of the demonstration. This is the case of the following verbs, which mean “to make something one, two, three, and so on”: *waḥḥada*, *ṭannā*, *ṭallaṭa*, and their *maṣādir*: *tawḥīd*, *taṭniyah*, *taṭlīt*, and so on.

While Forms I, if they exist, are directly linked with the *fā‘il* pattern of the ordinals and are always used to comment them, Forms II and IV seem to have an independent existence and are found in sentences commenting other points of grammar. Their meaning is very near, if not identical to Form I. However, their active participle is never found in the texts.

The following verbal forms are built on the root *wḥd* in the Form II “to put a word in the singular”: *waḥḥada* (M. III, 107.6; 9; 11; ʿU. I, 121.4; 6; 223.3; 227.14; 422.16; 17; II, 347.13; 348.18; 354.1; 358.5 (twice); III, 239.11; 476.1).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup>See Ayoub (1990) and Versteegh (2009, 447) on *tamīl* as a testing tool.

<sup>14</sup>Both occurrences in ʿU. I, 121.4; 6 are actually corrections of Bohas (1991, 195) made on ms. R.

The passive *wuḥḥida* is also found (ʿU. II, 7.6); the *maṣḍar tawḥīd* (ʿU. I, 255.13; 257.11, 13; 323.17; II, 33.21; 77.2); the passive participle *muwaḥḥad* as opposed to either *jamʿ* “plural” or *muṭanná* “dual” (M. III, 252.7; IV, 128.17; ʿU. I, 325.1); or *muwaḥḥad* meaning “unified, unique” (ʿU. I, 257.15; 419.12; II, 263.3).

The root *ṭny* in the Form II “to put in the dual” is extremely common in all three texts, both as a verb (*ṭanná*) and *maṣḍar* (*taṭniyah*).

The root *tlṭ* in Form II has the specific meaning “to express a quantity of three” but, by extension, it also seems to mean “to put a word in the lesser plural form [which begins with three]”.<sup>15</sup> Interestingly, it is not found in the *ʿUṣūl* but only in the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab*: *tallata* (K. I, 86.17; II, 179.15; 181.15), *taṭliṭ* (K. I, 87.19; II, 144.9; 179.5; 11 (twice); 12 (twice); M. II, 167.6; 170.2), *muṭallat* (K. II, 144.10).

Except for the root *tsʿ*, which is only found twice: *tassaʿa* (K. I, 86.18; M. II, 161.4), the numerical roots between “four” and “eight” are not found in our corpus in the verbal patterns of Forms II and IV.

The root *ʿsr* in the Form II is found only in the *Kitāb*: *ʿaššara* (K. II, 181.15), and *taʿšīr* (K. II, 144.9).

Lastly, al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention the verbs corresponding to “one hundred” and “one thousand”, *ʿamʿá* (Form IV, after the restitution of a third radical *yā*) “to make something a hundred” and *ʿallafa* (Form II) or *ʿāla* (Form IV) “to make something a thousand” (M. II, 184.3–4):

(٤) فإذا بلغت المائة قلت كانوا تسعة وتسعين فأمايتهم إذا جعلتهم مائة فكأنوا تسعمائة  
فألفتهم إذا أردت فآلتهم وألفتهم إذا أردت أفآلتهم.

(4) If you reach a hundred you say *kānū tisʿatan wa-tisʿīna fa-ʿamʿaytu-hum* “they were ninety-nine and I made them a hundred” if you make them a hundred and *kānū tisʿa miʿatin wa-ʿallafu-hum* “they were nine hundreds and I made them a thousand” if you want [the form] *faʿʿala*, and *ʿālaftu-hum* “I made them a thousand” if you want [the form] *ʿafaltu-hum* (M. II, 183.3–4).

Al-Mubarrad adds that “all this is actually said” (*kullu ḍālika yuqālu*; M. II, 184.4) and he quotes the *ḥadīṭ* mentioned above, p. 91 أول حيّ ألف مع رسول الله

<sup>15</sup>The apparently innocent problem of knowing if the plural begins with “two” or “three” has been hotly debated by grammarians, Qurʾānic commentators and jurists. See Versteegh (1993b) on this issue. However, things are maybe not as simple for Sibawayh himself, who writes in K. II, 324.2 that the dual is a plural, as is clear from the use of the pronoun *naḥnu* that refers equally to “two” or to “three”. Al-Mubarrad also considers that the dual is a subcase of the plural (M. II, 156.3). Yet, more research on this issue is needed.

(ﷺ) to support his point, as well as the following poetic line where he says the meaning of the verb *'allaḥa* is made clear:

*ṣabahnā-hum bi-ʿalfin min Sulaymin / wa-sabʿin<sup>a</sup> min Banī ʿUṭmāna wāfi.*

We welcomed them in the morning with a thousand [men] of [the tribe of] Sulaym / and seven faithful of the Banū ʿUṭmān. (*M. II*, 184.8)

<sup>a</sup> The fact that *sabʿin* applies to men is unexpected and not commented by al-Mubarrad.

Needless to say, the following contemporary meanings of these words are not found in our corpus: *muṭallaṭ* “triangle”, *murabbaʿ* “square, squared”, *musaddas* “revolver, hexagon”, *tawḥīd* “monotheism” and *taṭlīt* “trinitarian faith”, as well as the verbs *waḥḥada* “to unite, to unify; to proclaim the unity of God”, *ṭallaṭa* “to say that God is three persons”, and *rabbaʿa* “to square”.

#### 4.2.5 The pattern of *ṭamānin*

The case of *ṭamānin* (fem. *ṭamāniyah*) receives much attention in our texts. The interpretation chosen by all three grammarians is to consider it a triliteral root with two added morphemes, a middle *'alif* and a final *yāʾ*, and they discuss which of these two added morphemes should be elided when building the diminutive form of *ṭamānin*.

Sībawayh quotes the opinion of al-Xalīl who says that the origin of the final *yāʾ* in *ṭamānin* is the double *yāʾ* suffix *-yy-* of the relative adjectives (*yāʾ al-ʿiḍāfah*; *K. II*, 16.1–2). Later in the same chapter, Sībawayh repeats this comparison and adds—this time approving this explanation, since he does not mention any grammarian—that this suffix does not have its original meaning of relative adjective (*K. II*, 17.18–19). However, in practice, *ṭamānin* is treated like any other *ism manqūṣ* (*K. II*, 52.1–2). Later in the *Kitāb*, Sībawayh also quotes the opinion of ʿAbū ʿAmr (b. al-ʿAlāʾ, d. 154/771), who compares the morphology of *ṭamāniyah* to *ʿaḍāfir*, i.e., the *'alif* is added to the root whereas the *yāʾ* is part of it (*K. II*, 116.8–17), thus implicitly describing the root as quadriliteral.

The opinion of al-Mubarrad is that in *ṭamāniyah* the two added “consonants” do not have the same status because “the *yāʾ* is attached (*mulḥaqah*) in the slot of a vocalised consonant (*wāqiʿah fī mawqiʿ al-mutaḥarrik*), whereas the *'alif* is not attached (*ḡayr mulḥaqah*) and is in a slot where only a long vowel could be” (*M. II*, 255.5–6).

For Ibn as-Sarrāj, *ṭamānin* gathers “two added morphemes” (*zāʿidatāni*) and the speaker has the choice to elide either morpheme in order to build the diminutive (ʿU. III, 46.18–19).

He is the only one to discuss the fact that although *ṭamānin* surfaces in a plural-like pattern it is not diptotic. He also says, without quoting al-Xalīl or Sibawayh, that the origin of the final *yāʾ* in *ṭamānin* is the *nisbah* suffix *-yy-*, as in *\*ṭamaniyyun*. One of the two *yāʾ* has been elided and compensated by the *ʾalif* in the third position (ʿU. II, 91.11–15). In other words, *ṭamānin* does not have a quadriliteral root.

In the end, it seems that only ʾAbū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlāʾ clearly considered the root of *ṭamānin* to be quadriliteral (*ṭmny*).

#### 4.2.6 The pattern of ʾiḥḍā

The case of ʾiḥḍā is also tricky. It is used as the feminine form of ʾaḥḍ, but its derivation from it is far from obvious since there is no other case in the language of a pattern *fiʿlā* derived from *faʿal*. Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj do not comment on the pattern of ʾiḥḍā.

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to discuss the morphology of ʾiḥḍā and simply says that it does not correspond to a masculine form, from which it would be derived (M. II, 163.12–14).

#### 4.2.7 The morphology of miʾah

The word *miʾah* “one hundred” deserves a special treatment. Its root is very peculiar, yet it does not seem to have triggered much curiosity among our authors and they did not perform the classic morphological tests, such as: diminutive, vocative, relative adjective (*nisbah*), or proper name. Needless to say, the orthography of its *hamzah* is not discussed by our authors.<sup>16</sup>

The only morphological discussion about *miʾah* is its plural form, probably because it is *not* used after numerals between “three” to “ten”.

Interestingly, although *miʾūna* and *miʾāt* are mentioned and commented on by Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj (K. I, 87.11; II, 196.11–18; M. II, 169.4;<sup>17</sup> 170.3; ʿU. I, 311.1; II, 446.11) as valid external plural forms for *miʾah*,

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 258; §325).

<sup>17</sup>The text has the plural form مائتين *miʾatīna* (M. II, 169.4), which has to come from the puzzling مائتون *miʾatūna*. This plural form مائتين is found only here in the *Muqtaḍab*, along with two other

Fleisch (1990, I, 290; 295) does not mention them, and inversely, none of our three authors mentions the broken plural *miʿan* مائى reported by Fleisch (1990, I, 499).

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to quote al-ʿAxfāš’s theory that the plural form of *miʾah* is either of the pattern *faʿīl* where the *lām* has been turned into a *nūn* and the *fathah* into a *kasrah* (as in *sinīnun* and *miʾīnun*, a fully declinable pattern) or it is of the pattern *fiʿlīn*, just like *ḡislīn* “something that has been washed” where the *ʾayn* is deleted (as in *sinīnun* and *miʾīnun*, also a fully declinable pattern), Ibn as-Sarrāj apparently says that this second interpretation is correct (ʿU. III, 328.5–329.8).

The end of the paragraph is quite confusing since Ibn as-Sarrāj does mention the form سنون next to سنين but it is impossible to decide what he intends since he makes absolutely no comment on them (ʿU. III, 330.1–4). These two forms have no link with the discussion above where the point is to choose between *faʿīl* and *fiʿlīn* for the pattern of *sinīn* and *miʾīn*. Could the mention of *sinūn* be a later addition by a copist, in order to harmonise the ʿUṣūl with the Kitāb?

#### 4.2.8 The diminutive pattern *fuʿayl*

Our grammarians do not spare any effort to discuss the diminutive forms of every possible type of word, and what looks like a morphological game apparently serves to gain a deeper understanding of the behaviour of the roots of the words. This is indeed one of the morphological tests to which they submit almost any word in the language.

The regular pattern for the diminutive is the triliteral triptotic nominal pattern *fuʿayl*, which is adapted according to the initial pattern of the word.<sup>18</sup> In other words, one can potentially form the diminutive of any other pattern. Unfortunately, it would take us too far to consider these rules here. They are dealt with in much detail in *K.* II, 104–146 (ch. 359–396), *M.* II, 236–293 and ʿU. III, 36–63.

In a nutshell, in order to build the diminutive form of a noun, the general morphological rule is to go back first to the masculine singular form (i.e., to

---

occurrences that are clearly dual forms. Later in the same chapter, the text has the plural form مئین *miʾīna* (*M.* II, 170.1) which comes from the more analogical مئون *miʾūna* and which is found six times in the *Muqtaḍab*, all of them in chapter 93. Is al-Mubarrad really talking of three different alternative plural forms for *miʾah*, namely *miʾūna*, *miʾāt* and *miʾatūna*? Rather, we propose that مائین is here a misspelling for مئین and that only the two forms *miʾāt* and *miʾūna* should be kept.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 524; §107f).



clean the word from any suffix), then to apply the *fuʿayl* pattern, and then to eventually restore the suffixes, as in *šujayr-at-un* “shrub” which is formed on *šajar-at-un* “tree”.

### The diminutive form of “regular” roots

In the case of numerals, some roots are not problematic, which is probably the reason why they are not discussed in the texts. The forms are not even mentioned and it is only through conjecture and application of the general rules that one can predict the following forms: *xumays-(at-)un*, *subayʿ-(at-)un*, *tusayʿ-(at-)un* and *ʿuṣayr-(at-)un*. The diminutive form of *ʿalf* is not discussed either but there is no reason to reject the form *ʿulayfun*.

The case of *ʿarbaʿah* is not straightforward, but none of our three authors mentions it. As mentioned above p. 98, theoretically its diminutive form should be built on its surface form, and thus be *ʿurbayʿ-(at-)un*, but one can not rule out *rubayʿ-(at-)un* as a plausible alternative.

### The diminutive of *ṭalāt* and the decades

The case of *ṭalāt* is indirectly discussed with that of *ṭalātūna*, for which the question is whether the final *-ūna* is a real plural marker (and should thus be kept as such after the diminutive is formed) or another added morpheme, just like the inner *ʿalif*. If *-ūna* is a plural marker, then the diminutive form of *ṭalāt-ūna* is *ṭulayyit-ūna*, otherwise it is *ṭulaytūna*, i.e., the word is treated as a whole and the *ʿalif* is elided (K. II, 119.6–10; ʿU. III, 49.5–7).

In the *Muqtaḍab*, al-Mubarrad does not mention the diminutive of *ṭalātūna* but only that of *at-Talātā*<sup>19</sup> “Tuesday” (*Ṭulayyitā*; M. II, 277.2–3). He refutes Sibawayh, who, according to him, believes that the diminutive form of *at-Talātā* is *Ṭulaytā*, which is interesting since Sibawayh refuses to form the diminutives of the days of the week in the first place (K. II, 138.7–15). Should we infer that al-Mubarrad would recommend the form *ṭulayyitūna* as the diminutive of *ṭalātūna*?

From this discussion, one can infer that the diminutive form of *ṭalāt* is *ṭulayyit*, because no morpheme has to be deleted. One can also infer the diminutive forms of the “regular” decades (which were themselves inferred from the general rules): *xumaysūna*, *subayʿūna*, and *tusayʿūna*. One can even infer the diminutive of *ʿiṣrūna* to be *ʿuṣayr-ūna*. Interestingly, in all these

<sup>19</sup>See below, p. 118, on this vocalisation.

cases, the diminutive form is the same whether one considers the suffix *-ūna* to be a plural marker or not.

The case of *ʿarbaʿūna* should also be straightforward, as soon as the case of *ʿarbaʿah* is decided. The two plausible forms are thus *ʿurbayʿūna* and *rubayʿūna*.

### The diminutive of *itnāni*, *sittah* and *tamāniyah*

Other diminutive forms are explicitly discussed: the diminutives of *itnāni*, *sittah* and *tamāniyah*.

In the case of *itnāni* the ending is interpreted by all grammarians as a dual ending and the biliteral root is turned into a trilateral one through the addition of a *yāʾ*, just like in *ibn*, resulting in the diminutive *tunayy-āni* (K. II, 125.6–10; 136.10–12; M. II, 92.15; 269.11; ʿU. III, 60.12–14). Interestingly, in the case of Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj, they both mention the diminutive of *itnāni* in a quotation from al-Xalil on the diminutive of *itnā-ʿašara*, from which the case of *itnāni* is deduced; there is no way to know whether they endorse al-Xalil’s opinion or not.

The diminutive form of *sittah* is built on its non-modified root *sds*: *sudaysah*. This form is found only in ʿU. III, 270.3–4. Neither Sibawayh nor al-Mubarrad mentions it.

For the diminutive form of *tamāniyah*, see above p. 108 the discussion about its root and pattern. The two possible forms discussed are *tumayyinah* (where the final *yāʾ* has been elided and the *ʿalif* turned into a double *yāʾ*) and *tumayniyah* (where the *ʿalif* has been elided).

In K. II, 102.9–10, Sibawayh briefly mentions that the diminutive of *tamānī* (which is the form used before feminine counted objects) is *tumaynun* and that *yāʾ al-ʾidāfah* is elided. At this point, no much detail is given. Later in the *Kitāb* he quotes the opinion of ʿAbū ʿAmr, who prefers the form *tumayniyah* (K. II, 116.8–17) because the root is quadriliteral. Al-Mubarrad also chooses the form *tumayniyah* (M. II, 255.5–6) but he does not consider the root to be quadriliteral. Ibn as-Sarrāj (who, as we know from ʿU. II, 91.11–15, does not consider the root to be quadriliteral) says that the speaker has the choice between the two forms (ʿU. III, 46.18–19) and then reproduces, without mentioning it, a short recension of *Kitāb* II, 116.8–19 where Sibawayh quotes ʿAbū ʿAmr!

In the end, it seems that the form chosen by all three authors is *tumayniyah* (after the elision of the *ʿalif*), but in each case the reasons behind this choice are far from clear.

From these forms, one can infer the diminutive form of *sittūna* and *tamā-nūna*: *sudaysūna*, and either *tumayyinūna* or *tumaynūna*, just like *tulayyitūna* and *tulaytūna* (see above p. 111).

As one can see, the grammarians give only a few forms explicitly, from which one has to infer the other ones. They do not want to teach the correct form as much as they want to discover the underlying regular patterns hidden in the language.

### The diminutive of *wāḥid*, *ʾaḥad*, *miʾah* and the compounds

The diminutive forms of *wāḥid*, *ʾaḥad*, *miʾah* and the compounds are very problematic, they are not discussed by our grammarians, and one may wonder why, since they could have constituted interesting cases. What morphological changes would happen in *wuwayḥid*, the theoretical diminutive of *wāḥid*? Is *ʾuḥayd* a valid conjecture for *ʾaḥad*? Could the biliteral root *m* be compensated for by a *yā* in the third position, giving the form *muʾayyah*? And is *tulayyiṭa-ʿašara* a good guess for the diminutive of *ṭalāṭata-ʿašara*?

In the case of *ʾaḥad* we have al-Mubarrad's testimony. He is the only one of our three authors to authorise the formation of diminutives of the days of the week; he says that the diminutive of *ʾAḥad* "Sunday" is *ʾUḥayd* (M. II, 276.1–277.1).

#### 4.2.9 The relative adjectives

The formation of the relative adjectives (*nisbah*) serves as another morphological testing device, just like the diminutive forms, which the grammarians try to build with any word in the language.

However, the relative adjective forms are easier to build than the diminutive forms since they only require the addition of the suffix *-iyy-* to the masculine singular form of the noun, as in *qāḥir-iyy-un* "Cairene" formed on *al-Qāḥir-ah* "Cairo". Maybe the reason why our grammarians did not systematically apply this test to numerals is that it is too obvious. This explains why Sibawayh only studies the case of compound numerals and why al-Mubarrad is completely silent on this issue. Unlike them, Ibn as-Sarrāj has

a whole chapter devoted to the formation of relative adjectives (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. III, 63–85) and he discusses in detail the case of “two”, “eight” and compound numerals.

According to Ibn as-Sarrāj, the relative adjective built on the numeral “two” is *ṭanawiyyun*, which means that a third radical *wāw* has been added. Since this adjective is built on the masculine singular form of the noun, it corresponds to all the surface forms that this numeral can take, in both genders. In other words, *ṭanawiyyun* is the relative adjective of *itnāni*, *itnatāni* and *ṭintāni*. However, other grammarians are said by Ibn as-Sarrāj to have accepted other forms, built on the other surface forms: *itniyyun* (which Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions as a valid possibility), *itnatiyyun* and *ṭanītiyyun* (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. III, 77.9–78.7).

The relative adjective built on the numeral “eight” is *ṭamāniyyun*, after the elision of the ending *yāʾ* (which Ibn as-Sarrāj considers to be the trace of a *nisbah* suffix *-iyy-*, <sup>ʿ</sup>U. II, 91.11–15) and the addition of the suffix *-iyy-* (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. III, 74.8).

It is not possible to build relative adjectives for compound numerals, except if they are used as proper names.<sup>20</sup> This is al-Xalīl’s opinion, as quoted by Sibawayh (K. II, 84.13–16), as well as that of Ibn as-Sarrāj (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. III, 69.9–12). Al-Mubarrad is silent on this point. The reason given by al-Xalīl and Ibn as-Sarrāj is that since the second part of the compound must be deleted in order to build the relative adjective, there would be a confusion between the adjectives built on the units and those built on compounds. If these numerals are used as proper names, there is no difficulty: *Xamsiyyun* and *Ṭanawiyyun* (or *Itniyyun*) are the relative adjectives corresponding to the proper names *Xamsata*–‘Ašar and *Itnā*–‘Ašar (K. II, 84.4.12–14; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. III, 69.9–12).

In other words, *xamsiyyun* is altogether the relative adjective of the proper names *Xamsah*, *Xams*, *Xamsata*–‘Ašar, *Xamsa*–‘Aš(i)rah and of the numerals *xamsah* and *xams*.

The fact that Sibawayh does not mention his own opinion on these forms but simply quotes al-Xalīl, and the silence of al-Mubarrad should remind us that, although there is no reason to believe that they would have rejected these forms, we extrapolate when we say so.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, III, 1377; 1379–1380).

#### 4.2.10 The pattern *fuʿul* (or *fuʿl*) and its plural *ʾafʿāl*

The trilateral triptotic nominal pattern *fuʿul*,<sup>21</sup> plural *ʾafʿāl*, means a portion, as in *tuluṭun* “a third”, *rubuʿun* “a fourth”, until *ʿuṣurun* “a tenth”.<sup>22</sup> Its plural is the triptotic pattern *ʾafʿāl*: *ʾaṭlāt*, *ʾarbāʿ*, until *ʾaššār*.

Although it is well attested in the Qurʾān (*tuluṭ*: Q. 4, 11 (twice); 12; 176; 73, 20 (twice); *rubuʿ*: Q. 4, 12; *xumus*: Q. 8, 41; *sudus*: Q. 4, 11 (twice); 12; *tumun*: Q. 4, 12) this regular pattern is not commented on as such by our grammarians (and none of these verses is quoted by them). It is found only in the following occurrence: *tuluṭ* (K. I, 64.2; 4; ʾU. II, 47.9).

This triptotic plural pattern *ʾafʿāl* is also the pattern used for the plural of *ʾalf*: *ʾālāf* “thousands”.

The following peculiarities can be noted. The pattern *fuʿul* does not apply to *whd* for evident semantic reasons, nor to *tn* where it is replaced by the word *niṣf* “half” (pl. *ʾanṣāf*).

It does not apply either to *ʾlf* and *mʾ* but apparently for no other reason than linguistic use.

#### 4.2.11 The pattern *faʿīl*

Although not dealt with as such by any of our authors, numerical roots can surface in the trilateral triptotic nominal pattern *faʿīl*, which has the same fraction meaning as the preceding *fuʿul* pattern.<sup>23</sup>

The following occurrences are found in our corpus: *rabīʿ* pl. *ʾarbiʿā* “a fourth” (K. I, 91.15; II, 200.10; M. II, 277.6; ʾU. I, 250.5), *xamīs* pl. *ʾaxmisā* “a fifth” (K. II, 200.10; M. II, 209.8), *sadīs* pl. *suds* “a sixth” (K. II, 216.12; ʾU. III, 19.2).

The other possible forms *ṭalīt*, *sabīʿ*, *ṭamīn*, *tasīʿ* and *ʿašīr* are not found in our texts, although Kazimirski (1860) mentions them (except for *ṭalīt*).

<sup>21</sup>There is another vocalisation to this pattern, which is probably more recent (it is not found in the Qurʾān): *fuʿl*, pl. *ʾafʿāl*.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 523; §107h) and Wright (1967, I, 263–264; §336).

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 523; §107h) and Wright (1967, I, 263–264; §336).

#### 4.2.12 The pattern *fiʿl*

Numerical roots can also surface in the trilateral triptotic nominal pattern *fiʿl*, which expresses a period of time, as in *sayru ribʿin* “a trip during which camels are watered every four days”.<sup>24</sup>

This pattern is not found in our treatises.

#### 4.2.13 The “deflected” patterns *fuʿāl* and *mafʿal*

The last patterns to be presented here are *fuʿāl* and *mafʿal*.<sup>25</sup> The following forms are attested in our texts: *ʾuhād* “one by one”, *tunā* “two by two”, *tulāt* “three by three”, *rubā* “four by four”, as well as *mawḥad* “one by one” and *maṭnā* “two by two” (*K.* II, 15.1–15; 266.14–16; *M.* III, 380.10–381.8; *ʾU.* II, 83.8–9; 88.11–13; III, 147.1–2).

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to add that this pattern also conveys an idea of *takṭīr* “multiplication” (*M.* III, 381.8).

Apparently, there is no reason to doubt that the following forms are also possible, although they are not mentioned: *xumās*, *sudās*, *subā*ʿ, *ṭumān*, *tusā*ʿ and *ʾuṣār*, as well as *maṭlat*, *marba*ʿ, *maxmas*, *masdas*, *masba*ʿ, *maṭman*, *matsa*ʿ and *maʿṣar*. However, it seems that these patterns are not productive any more and the forms quoted in our texts (i.e., until “four”), which are quoted from poetry and from the Qurʾān, are probably the only one actually used.

There are three verses in the Qurʾān that contain these words:

﴿فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثَلَىٰ وَثَلَاثَ وَرُبْعَ﴾ (النساء ، ٣)

﴿أَنْ تَقُومُوا لِلَّهِ مَثَلَىٰ وَفُرَادَىٰ ثُمَّ تَتَفَكَّرُوا﴾ (سبا ، ٤٦)

﴿أُولَٰئِكَ أَجِبَحَّةٌ مَثَلَىٰ وَثَلَاثَ وَرُبْعَ﴾ (فاطر ، ١)

[...] then marry such women as seem good to you, two and three and four (*Q.* 4, 3)

[...] that rise up for Allah’s sake in twos and singly, then ponder (*Q.* 34, 46)

[...] on wings, two, and three, and four (*Q.* 35, 1)

While *Q.* 35, 1 is quoted by both Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad (*K.* II, 15.4; *M.* III, 381.1–2), and *Q.* 4, 3 by al-Mubarrad only (*M.* III, 381.2), *Q.* 34, 46 is quoted

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 524; §107f) and Wright (1967, I, 264; §337).

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 523–524; §107i), Wright (1967, I, 262–263; §333) and Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1495–1498).

by none of the authors, and the word *furādā* “one by one” is not found in our texts. Ibn as-Sarrāj does not explicitly quote these Qur’ānic verses.

There are two lines of poetry that contain the words *mawḥad* and *maṭnā* (K. II, 15.8; M. III, 381.6), and *’uḥād* (M. III, 381.4 (twice)). Ibn as-Sarrāj does not quote poetry linked with these words.

These two patterns are said by our grammarians to be *ma’dūl* “deflected, swerved”<sup>26</sup> because they were modified from their initial pattern. Both patterns are adjectival and diptotic, and are used only in the indefinite, to qualify another indefinite substantive (K. II, 15.3; M. III, 319.13). Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with these “deflected” patterns in the section devoted to the diptotic declension and does not mention their use in a sentence as indefinite qualifiers (’U. II, 88.9–14).

If these forms are quoted in our texts, it is apparently because of their specific meaning and declension and because they trigger a discussion about their triptotic declension when used as proper names (see below, p. 124).

The diminutive forms of *’uḥād* and *tunā*’ (*’uḥayyid* and *tunayy*) are also discussed by Sībawayh (K. II, 15.9–10) and Ibn as-Sarrāj (’U. II, 83.9–10). They found these forms more interesting to discuss than the diminutive of the much more common *mi’ah*. In his *Muqtaḍab* al-Mubarrad does not mention the diminutive forms of *ma’dūl* numerals, nor does he discuss their declension.

From the relative adjectives built on these “deflected” forms,<sup>27</sup> *tunā’iyyun* “twofold, bilateral”, *ṭulāṭiyyun* “threefold”, *rubā’iyyun* “fourfold”, and so on, in the *Kitāb*, only *Sudāsiyyun* is found (K. II, 17.20) and it is dealt with as a proper name. It is all the more interesting since *sudās* itself is not found in the *Kitāb*. This is typical of Sībawayh’s method, since he prefers to focus on the most complicated issues rather than to present the general cases. The case of *Sudāsiyyun* gathers three difficulties: It is “deflected”, the root *sds* is restored if compared to *sittah*, and it is a proper name.

In the *Muqtaḍab*, the only relative adjective built on a “deflected” numeral is *ṭulāṭiyyun* and it is found only once in M. I, 391.3 in an expression that will later become usual: *al-’asmā’ aṭ-ṭulāṭiyyah* “the trilateral nouns”.

The situation is very different in the *’Uṣūl* where Ibn as-Sarrāj describes both the nouns and the verbs as *ṭulāṭiyyah* (’U. I, 73.7; 123.1; 350.2 and 55 other occurrences), *rubā’iyyah* (’U. I, 73.7; 123.1; 14 and 30 other occurrences), and *xumāsiyyah* (’U. III, 12.1; 37.3; 39.4 and 5 other occurrences). The adjective

<sup>26</sup>Troupeau (1976, 65) translates *ma’dūl* as “déviié”.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 263; §335).

*sudāsiyyun* is also found once in the expression *ḡulāmun sudāsiyyun* “a six-year-old lad (?)” (‘U. III, 270.4).

Relative adjectives built on “deflected” forms are triptotic, although no author mentions it explicitly. See below, p. 124, the issues linked with the diptotic declension of *ma’dūl* numerals, and of their diminutive form, when used as adjectives and as proper names.

#### 4.2.14 The days of the week

This presentation of the patterns that numerical roots can take would not be complete without mentioning the large number of nouns and verbs built on the same roots, whose meaning is linked with numerals. We will mention here only the days of the week by way of example, since the list is potentially unlimited.

The names of the days of the week constitute a special category of nouns with a numerical root. Since their only common point is their meaning, they will be dealt with in more detail in the semantic section below. As for now, let us simply list their pattern: *fa’al* (*al-’Aḥad*,<sup>28</sup> “Sunday”), *fa’ālā’* (*aṭ-Ṭalāṭā’*, “Tuesday”), *’aḫilā’* (*al-’Arbi’ā’*, “Wednesday”), *fa’īl* (*al-Xamīs*, “Thursday”), *al-Ṭnāni* “Monday” has no clear pattern because of its biliteral root *ṭn* which is not restituted here as trilateral *ṭny*, and as for *al-ḡum’ah* “Friday” and *as-Sabt* “Saturday” they do not have a numerical root.

The pattern of *aṭ-Ṭalāṭā’* is not obvious. Sibawayh quotes other nouns in the singular that share the same pattern: *barākā’* “sangfroid”, *’ajāsā’* “large camel herd, part of the night”, as well as the adjectives *’ayāyā’* “unable, impotent” and *ṭabāqā’* “impotent (?)” (K. II, 348.20–21), but al-Mubarrad does not mention this pattern and Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes Sibawayh saying that he knows no other noun than *aṭ-Ṭalāṭā’* to have this pattern, next to the adjectives *’ayāyā’* and *ṭabāqā’* (’U. III, 195.1–2). Kazimirski (1860, I, 233) vocalises *aṭ-Ṭulāṭā’*, whereas no explicit vocalisation is mentioned in Ibn Maḏūn’s *Lisān* (II, 122).

As for *al-’Arbi’ā’*, Sibawayh says that he knows no other singular noun in the same pattern (K. II, 345.18), and Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the alternative vocalisation *al-’Arba’ā’* (’U. III, 189.7), which is the vocalisation mentioned by Kazimirski (1860, I, 810) along with *al-’Arbu’ā’*. All three vocalisations are mentioned in *Lisān*, VIII, 109.

<sup>28</sup>All three authors consider that the names of the days of the week are proper names (K. I, 228.20–23; M. II, 276.1; ’U. I, 158.1–2), hence their capitalisation in transliteration for clarity’s sake.



## 4.3 Coalescence of numerals in compound numerals

Compound cardinals between “eleven” and “nineteen”, as well as their ordinal counterparts, are made up of two nouns whose patterns have been presented above. However, there are specific morphological issues linked with the coalescence in compound numerals as such.<sup>29</sup>

### 4.3.1 The two nouns that were made one

Compound numerals occupy a very special place in these grammatical texts and have been commented extensively by the three authors. Their morphology is quite problematic and it is necessary to understand where the problem lies before entering the discussions between the grammarians.

Compound nouns in Arabic can behave very differently and grammarians have struggled to find a theoretical frame that would account for these differences. We will deal here only with compounds made of two nouns, i.e., what Baalbaki (2003, 89) calls group 3. The prime examples used by our three grammarians comprise very different types of nouns: proper names (*Ḥaḍra-Mawt*, *Ba‘la-Bakk*, *Ma‘dī-Karib*, *Mār-Sarjis*, *Rāma-Hurmuz*, ‘*Amra-Wayh*); both cardinal and ordinal numerals (*xamsata-‘ašara*, *ḥādiya-‘ašara*); time, space and manner complements (*ḥayša-bayša*, *bayta-bayta*, *kaffata-kaffata*, *šağara-bağara*, ‘*axwala-‘axwala*, *bayna-bayna*, *šabāḥa-ma-sā’a*, *yawma-yawma*, *ḥīna-‘idin*); proper names of verbs (*hay-hāt*, *ḥayya-hal*); substantives (‘*ayḍa-mūz*, ‘*anta-rīs*, *xāzi-bāz*, *xizbāz*, *xāzi-bā*); and nouns in the vocative (*yā bna ‘umma!*)

This list could grow even longer if one were to include the other types of compounds, either formed from the fusion of two particles, or made of a particle and the noun on which it operates (Baalbaki’s (2003) groups 1 and 2).

What is ultimately at stake in these compound nouns is the declension of their two parts. The three main possibilities are the following. 1) The first part is indeclinable (and carries an invariable vowel) while the second part is declinable (triptotic or diptotic); 2) the two nouns are in an annexational construction, with the first part being declinable and the second part in the oblique form (unless diptotic); or 3) both parts are indeclinable and carry an invariable vowel. Interestingly, Sībawayh, who presents these issues in the

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 510–512; §106*n-q*) for the compound cardinals and Fleisch (1990, I, 522; §107*d*) for the compound ordinals. Cf. Howell (1883/2003, II, 813–814; IV, 1457–1459) as well.

most detailed way, says that the same compound can be heard in all three shapes: respectively *Ḥaḍra–Mawtu*, *Ḥaḍru–Mawta* and *Ḥaḍra–Mawta* (*Mawt* is said by him to be diptotic because it is a feminine proper name, hence its independent form *Mawtu* and its *muḍāf* 'ilayh form *Mawta*).

As for compound numerals, it would be easy to consider them indeclinable in both parts if this was also the case for “twelve”. The fact that *iṭnā–‘ašara* / *iṭnay–‘ašara* is declinable in its first part and indeclinable in its second part has triggered pages of commentary in our three treatises and the authors have endeavoured to find an explanation not only for this behaviour but also for the fact that other numerals do not behave the same way.

We will study these commentaries in much detail in the next part of this study because it would take us too far here, and because these issues are linked with the wider theoretical frame they adopt. See p. 207 for Sibawayh’s position, p. 218 for al-Mubarrad’s position, and p. 262 for Ibn as-Sarrāj’s position.

#### 4.3.2 Gender issues in the morphology of compound numerals

Another issue that is linked with compound numerals is the gender asymmetry between their two parts: *‘aḥada–‘ašara* and *iṭnā–‘ašara* are the only two compound cardinals to behave like compound ordinals where both parts surface in the same gender: *ṭālīṭa–‘ašara*, *rābi‘a–‘ašara*, and so on, *ṭālīṭata–‘aš(i)rata*, *rābi‘ata–‘aš(i)rata*, and so on.

In all other cardinal compounds, both terms surface in opposite gender: *ṭalātata–‘ašara*, *‘arba‘ata–‘ašara*, before masculine counted objects and *ṭalāta–‘aš(i)rata*, *‘arba‘a–‘aš(i)rata*, before feminine counted objects. Al-Mubarrad is the only one of our three grammarians to address this question.<sup>30</sup>

He notes that numerals that refer to greater quantities have a common form in the masculine and the feminine. Although compound numerals refer to greater quantities, they do have different forms in the masculine and the feminine. His interpretation is that they are made up of two nouns that refer to lesser quantities (*M. II*, 168.10–12). Both parts of the compound surface in opposite gender as in *xamsata–‘ašara* and *xamsa–‘aš(i)rata* because it is not correct to fuse two nouns carrying a feminine marker. He formulates this principle as follows: *lā tudxil ta’nīṭan ‘alā ta’nīṭin* (*M. II*, 163.1). As for the apparent “double feminine” forms *‘iḥdā–‘aš(i)rata* and *iṭnatā–‘aš(i)rata*, he

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 256; §322, rem. b).

justifies them by saying that *ʾihdā-* and *iṭnatā-* cannot be compared to regular feminine forms because *ʾihdā-* does not correspond to a regular masculine and because *iṭnatā-* does not correspond to an existing singular (*M.* II, 163.12–15). He probably means that, since *iṭnāni* and its feminine *iṭnatāni* are not part of a regular series that would include *\*iṭn* and *\*iṭnah*, it is normal that their behaviour is different.

Strangely, al-Mubarrad does not mention the double feminine forms in the ordinal compound numerals: *ḥādiyata-ʿaš(i)rata*, *tāniyata-ʿaš(i)rata*, *tālātata-ʿaš(i)rata*, and so on, where it is difficult to pretend that both terms are not regular feminine forms.

Because of all these morphological difficulties in compound numerals, the grammarians have applied to them all their morphological tests and it is no surprise that one may come across their diminutive form, their relative adjectival form, or their use as proper names in vocative constructions.

## 4.4 Conjoined numerals

In order to express cardinals and ordinals between “twenty-one” and “ninety-nine” one simply uses the particle *wa-* to conjoin two numerals, as in *ṭalāṭatun wa-ṭalātūna* “thirty-three”. Each part follows the rules that apply to it with no other change.

Sibawayh does not mention this issue at all in his *Kitāb*. Al-Mubarrad explains that, unlike lesser numerals (which build up compound numerals), “twenty-one” and the following numerals have not been made one word because there is no other example in the language of a compound noun where one of the terms has the same declension as *muslimūna* (*M.* II, 167.3–4). He adds that all numerals up till “ninety-nine” behave the same (*M.* II, 167.5–7). As for Ibn as-Sarrāj, he does not comment on the conjoined numerals but he only mentions the form *ʾaḥad* in *ʾaḥadun wa-ʿiṣrūna* “twenty-one” (*ʿU.* I, 85.4).

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention the two possible forms for “twenty-one” in the masculine: *ʾaḥadun wa-ʿiṣrūna* and *wāḥidun wa-ʿiṣrūna* (*M.* II, 166.16). However, he makes no further comment. He also says that “twenty-two” is *iṭnāni wa-ʿiṣrūna*, and that *iṭnāni* is uttered “in the same way as you used to say it before connecting it to ‘twenty’” (*ka-mā kunta qāʾilan qabla ʾan taṣila-hu bi-l-ʿiṣrina*; *M.* II, 166.16–17).

It is not clear whether our authors have a preference for *ʾaḥadun wa-ʿiṣrūna* over *wāḥidun wa-ʿiṣrūna*, nor whether *ʾihdā wa-ʿiṣrūna* is a valid

option, and if it is, whether it is preferable over *wāḥidatun wa-ʿiṣrūna*. They say nothing about the other decades. Are the following forms valid options: *ʾaḥadun wa-ṭalātūna* “thirty-one”, *ʾaḥadun wa-ʾarbaʿūna* “forty-one”, and so on, and in the feminine: *ʾiḥdā wa-ṭalātūna*, *ʾiḥdā wa-ʾarbaʿūna*, and so on?

Az-Zamaxšarī (d. 538/1144) mentions the only form *ʾaḥadun* in conjoined numerals (*Mufaṣṣal*, 95.1–2, §322). In a passage devoted to the phonetic change of *wāw* into *hamzah* (from \**waḥad* to *ʾaḥad* in *ʾaḥada-ʿašara* and *ʾaḥadun wa-ʿiṣrūna*), Ibn Yaʿīṣ (d. 643/1245) does not mention the possibility of using *wāḥid* and *wāḥidah* (*Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, X, 14.21–22),<sup>31</sup> and al-ʿAstarābādī (d. 686/1287) says that both forms *ʾaḥadun* and *wāḥidun* are sometimes found in conjoined numerals (*Šarḥ al-Kāfīyah*, II, 146.20–21).<sup>32</sup>

## 4.5 Morphosyntactic issues linked with numerals

After these morphological considerations, and before we consider numerals in a sentence, there are a few more issues that need to be discussed: the declinability of numerals, their annexability, and the addition of the definite article.

### 4.5.1 The declension of numerals

It is very remarkable that all types of declension are found in numerals: triptotic declension (including the weak root declension), diptotic declension, dual declension, external masculine and feminine plural declension, invariability.

#### The triptotic declension

The following numerals have a full triptotic declension: *wāḥid-(at-)un*, *ṭalāt-(at-)un*, *ʾarbaʿ-(at-)un*, *xams-(at-)un*, *sitt-(at-)un*, *sabʿ-(at-)un*, *tisʿ-(at-)un*, *ʿaš-run*, *ʿašaratun*, *miʾatun*, *ʾalfun* and its plural *ʾālāfun*.

The case of *ṭamānin* (fem. *ṭamāniyatun*) is slightly different because of the presence of a final *yāʾ* in its pattern (if not in its root, see the discussion above, p. 108). Hence, it follows the triptotic declension of *manqūṣ* nouns: *ṭamānin*,

<sup>31</sup>Fleisch (1990, I, 514; §106*u*) quotes the edition of Jahn dated 1882–1886, p. 774.

<sup>32</sup>We do not understand why Fleisch (1990, I, 514) gives the reference II, 163.2–5 in what seems to be the same edition as ours.

*ṭamāniya*, *ṭamānin*. The addition of the *tā' marbūṭah* rules out this peculiarity and *ṭamāniyah* follows the regular declension: *ṭamāniyatun*, *ṭamāniyatan*, *ṭamāniyatin*.

The ordinals *ṭānin* (fem. *ṭāniyatun*) and *ḥādin* (fem. *ḥādiyatun*) behave exactly like *ṭamānin*.

### The diptotic declension

It seems that Ibn as-Sarrāj is the first grammarian to express clearly the rule of the two *mawāni' min aṣ-ṣarf* ("reasons that cause a word to be diptotic"; 'U. II, 80–93, § 2.11.1). According to this rule, a noun is diptotic if it gathers at least two reasons for being diptotic (or if a reason is repeated twice), from a list of nine reasons, which are: (i) having a verbal pattern, (ii) having an adjectival meaning, (iii) carrying a feminine suffix that was not added to a masculine form, (iv) carrying an ending *-ān* to which a *tā' marbūṭah* cannot be added, just like *ḡaḍb-ān* ("angry"), feminine *ḡaḍbā* (not \**ḡaḍb-ān-ah*), (v) being a proper name, (vi) being "deflected" (*ma'dūl*),<sup>33</sup> (vii) being in the plural, (viii) being of foreign origin, and (ix) being compound.<sup>34</sup>

Both Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad endeavour to find rational explanations outside this theoretical frame.

Although not stated explicitly by our authors, all numerals carrying a *tā' marbūṭah* are diptotic when used as proper names, for males and females (*Wāḥidatu*, *Talāṭatu*, *Mi'atu*, and so on).

<sup>33</sup>See above, p. 116, on 'adl "deflection".

<sup>34</sup>For example, all proper names ending with a *tā' marbūṭah* are diptotic, because they are proper names and because their *tā' marbūṭah* was not added to a masculine form (Mrs. *Jamīlah* is not a female Mr. *Jamīl*!) The proper name *Zaynab* is diptotic because it is a proper name and because it is of foreign origin. Curiously, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that the two reasons that cause *Zaynab* to be diptotic are its being a proper name and being feminine ('U. II, 87.9–10). The proper name *Hind* is not diptotic because it does not carry a feminine marker. *Muḥammad* is not diptotic because its being a proper name is not sufficient, but *'Aḥmad* is, because it is a proper name and it has a verbal pattern. The proper name *Jamīl* is not diptotic, because it has lost its adjectival meaning so that the only reason it has to be diptotic (being a proper name) is not sufficient. The case of plural nouns is less straightforward. Being a plural is not a sufficient reason for being diptotic ('aklub "dogs" is not diptotic), but plurals of plurals (*jam'u jam'in*) like 'akālib "dogs" are diptotic because the same reason for being diptotic is present twice. In the same manner, *darāhim* "dirhams" is diptotic because it has the pattern of a plural of plural. Plurals that are used as proper names are not considered to be plurals anymore, just like adjectives used as proper names lose their adjectival meaning. Thus, the proper name *Masājīd* is diptotic not because it has a plural pattern but because its pattern is not standard in the singular so that it resembles a foreign noun, in addition to its being a proper name ('U. II, 87.15–18).

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to mention the diptotic declension of numerals when used in an “absolute” meaning, i.e., the numeral in itself, as in *mā fī yadī-ka ʿillā ʔalāṭatu* instead of *ʔalāṭatun* (“you only have three in your hand”; ʔU. II, 98.17). In their absolute meaning, numerals are treated as their own proper names. They are diptotic because they are proper names and because they carry a *tāʾ marbūṭah* which is not added to a masculine form.

On the other hand, if the speaker intends<sup>35</sup> *ʔalāṭatun min ad-darāḥimi* “three dirhams”, he should fully decline *ʔalāṭah* in the first sentence (ʔU. II, 98.18–19) and say *ʔalāṭatun*.

In the following sentence, numerals are diptotic because it is clear that what is intended is their absolute meaning: *ʔalāṭatu ʾakṭaru min iṭnayni wa-ʾaqallu min ʾarbaʿata* (“three is more than two and less than four”; ʔU. II, 98.19–20).

Another consequence of the definite meaning of numerals in this use is that it is not correct to say *\*rubba ʔalāṭata ʾakṭaru min iṭnayni!* (“many a three is more than two!”; ʔU. II, 98.20–99.1) because *rubba* must be annexed to an indefinite noun (cf. ʔU. I, 416.2–3), but in its absolute meaning *ʔalāṭah* is definite.

Although this absolute use of numerals is very obvious (numerals used for their numerical value!) it is mentioned by Ibn as-Sarrāj alone.

The *maʿdūl* forms of numerals also follow the diptotic declension. Sibawayh does not say this explicitly, but he quotes al-Xalīl’s comparison of *maʿdūl* numerals to *ʾuxar*, another diptotic *maʿdūl* adjective (K. II, 15.1–2).

In a chapter devoted to the rules of the triptotic and diptotic declensions al-Mubarrad explains that among the five categories of nouns that are diptotic, both definite and indefinite, are the indefinite *maʿdūl* adjectives such as *maṭnā*, *ṭulāṭ* and *rubāʿ* (M. III, 319.13).

Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with *maʿdūl* words because being *maʿdūl* is one of the nine reasons that can cause a word to be diptotic (ʔU. II, 88.8). *Maʿdūl* numerals are diptotic for the two reasons that they are *maʿdūl* and they have an adjectival meaning (ʔU. II, 88.14).

There are other issues that are connected to the declension of *maʿdūl* numerals and that are explored in more detail by our authors. Are *maʿdūl* numerals still diptotic when used as proper names? Are the diminutive forms of *maʿdūl* numerals still diptotic? And when used as proper names? What is

<sup>35</sup>See above the enunciative theory, p. 35, on the importance of the intention of the speaker in Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*, as supposedly opposed to later grammarians.

at stake in these questions can be put as follows: Are *ma'dūl* numerals still considered to be *ma'dūl* when put in the diminutive or when used as proper names? As mentioned above p. 117, it seems obvious for them that relative adjectives built on “deflected” forms are not considered to be deflected any more. They are triptotic.

The same goes for “deflected” nouns used as proper names, they are not considered to be “deflected” any more. In chapter 310 (*K. II*, 39.22–40.16), Sibawayh says that *ma'dūl* nouns such as *'ams* or *saḥar* become fully declinable when used as proper names although they are diptotic otherwise. When used as proper names, they are no longer to be treated as “deflected”, because they stand on their own with no semantic link to a “non-deflected” form. This is not the case of the proper name *'Umar*, which is diptotic because it is “deflected” from the proper name *'Āmir* (*K. II*, 14.8–12; *M. III*, 326.5–7). In other words, the difference between the proper names *'Ams* and *'Umar* is that *'Ams* is used as a proper name in its deflected form (*'ams*) whereas *'Umar* is the deflected form of another proper name (*'Āmir*). As for the deflected numerals used as proper names, they most probably behave like *'Ams*, not like *'Umar*.

Although the diminutive form of *ma'dūl* numerals is not explicitly given by Sibawayh, he says that as proper names, they are not diptotic any more (*K. II*, 15.9–10). In his *Muqtaḍab* al-Mubarrad does not mention the diminutive forms of *ma'dūl* numerals, nor does he discuss their declension. He mentions the fact that the diminutive of the “deflected” proper name *'Umar* is not considered as deflected anymore (*M. III*, 378.12–13). There is no reason to believe that he would treat differently the diminutive of *ma'dūl* numerals used as proper names.

Ibn as-Sarrāj says that (according to Sibawayh?) the diminutive forms of *ma'dūl* numerals *'uḥayyid* and *ṭunayy* are fully declinable (*'U. II*, 83.9–10). In the *Kitāb*, Sibawayh meant the case when these diminutive forms are used as proper names, but it does not make a difference in the end because if the proper names *'Uḥayyid* and *Ṭunayy* are fully declinable, it means that they are not considered *ma'dūl* anymore, which implies that the adjectives *'uḥayyid* and *ṭunayy* are also left with only one reason to be diptotic, namely, being adjectives.

### The dual declension

The numerals *iṭnāni* “two (masc.)”, *iṭnatāni* “two (fem.)” and *ṭintāni* “two (fem., alternative form)” are unanimously regarded as a dual, although their singular forms *\*iṭn*, *\*iṭnah* and *\*ṭint* are not attested. Our grammarians settle for the

parallel with *ibn*, *ibnah* and *bint* to consider that these forms are plausible, if not existent (K. II, 84.13–16; 136.11–12; 177.5–6; <sup>36</sup>U. II, 368.15–16; M. II, 92.15–16; 269.11).

The dual declension is apparently not affected by the absolute use of numerals described by Ibn as-Sarrāj, as in the expression *ṭalāṭatu ʾaḳṭaru min iṭnayni wa-ʾaḳallu min ʾarbaʿata* (“three is more than two and less than four”; <sup>37</sup>U. II, 98.19–20) mentioned above p. 123.

As presented above p. 119 in the morphology of compound numerals, *iṭnā-ʾašara* and *iṭnatā-ʾaš(i)rata* follow the dual declension in their first part (*iṭnay-ʾašara* and *iṭnatay-ʾaš(i)rata*). This problem will be dealt with below, p. 206 for Sibawayh’s opinion, p. 220 for al-Mubarrad’s opinion, and p. 264 Ibn as-Sarrāj’s opinion.

Numerals between “three” and “ten” also have a dual form,<sup>36</sup> although it is not clear whether the *tāʾ marbūṭah* should be maintained or dropped: *ṭalāṭatāni* “two threes” (M. III, 64.3 (twice); 5; <sup>37</sup>U. I, 327.13;17) and *ṭalāṭayni* (<sup>37</sup>U. I, 327.16; 328.1). The only other dual found in our text is *xamsatāni* “two fives” (<sup>37</sup>U. I, 327.13).

As for *miʾah* and *ʾalf*, there is no difficulty.<sup>37</sup> Their dual forms are *miʾatāni* (K. I, 87.5 (twice); 8; 10; 252.16; 253.4; 6; M. II, 169.1; 2; <sup>37</sup>U. I, 312.12; 14; 317.18) and *ʾalfāni* (K. I, 87.6; <sup>37</sup>U. I, 312.12).

### The external masculine plural declension

None of our author comments on the fact that decades follow the external masculine plural declension and none of them raises any doubt about the fact that this declension is usually linked with male human plurals.<sup>38</sup>

The only discussion that is found in our three grammars is whether the suffix *-ūna* / *-īna* really is a plural suffix (see above p. 111 the discussion about the diminutive form of *ṭalāṭūna*).

In addition to decades, one should also mention the plural *miʾūna* “hundreds”, which is declined as an external masculine plural (see above, p. 109).

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, II, 844).

<sup>37</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, II, 844).

<sup>38</sup>See Fleisch (1990, I, 290, §61 i) for other substantives with external masculine plural forms such as *ʾalamūna* “worlds”, *ʾahlūna* “families”, *ʾarḍūna* “earths”.



### The external feminine plural declension

The cardinals between “three” and “ten” have a plural form which follows the external feminine plural declension: *ṭalāṭātun* “threes”, *ʿarbaʿātun* “fours”, until *ʿašarātun* “tens”.

However, the only forms actually found in our corpus are the following: *xamasātun* (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 327.18) and *ʿašarātun* (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 311.10; 312.8).

As presented above p. 109, the numeral *miʾah* also has an external feminine plural form *miʾātun* which follows the same regular pattern (K. I, 87.11; 88.7; M. II, 169.4; 170.3; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 311.11; 313.1).

### The indeclinable numerals

As made clear above p. 119 in the morphological issues of compound numerals, both cardinal and ordinal compounds carry an invariable *fathah* on both parts, except *iṭnā-ʿašara* and its cardinal cognates *iṭnatā-ʿaš(i)rata* and *tintā-ʿaš(i)rata*.

All other compounds of both genders carry the same *fathah* on both terms: *ṭalāṭata-ʿašara*, *ʿarbaʿata-ʿašara*, ..., *xamsa-ʿaš(i)rata*, *sitta-ʿaš(i)rata*, ..., as well as their ordinal counterparts: *ṭālīṭa-ʿašara*, *rābiʿa-ʿašara*, *xāmisa-ʿašara*, ..., *sādisata-ʿaš(i)rata*, *sābiʿata-ʿaš(i)rata*, ... (K. II, 178.7–11; M. II, 161.4–6; 182.12–13; IV, 29.4–6; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 311.15; II, 140.3–6; 426.10–13).

The case of “eighteen” is as follows. A final *yāʾ* is restituted in order to carry the invariable *fathah* as in *ṭamāniya-ʿaš(i)rata*.<sup>39</sup> The feminine form is not problematic: *ṭamāniyata-ʿašara*.

The same goes for the ordinal *ḥādiya-ʿašara*, *ṭāniya-ʿašara* and their feminine counterparts *ḥādiyata-ʿaš(i)rata* and *ṭāniyata-ʿaš(i)rata* where a *yāʾ* is also restituted.

Ibn as-Sarrāj explains that compounds of the same type as *xamsata-ʿašara* carry an invariable final *fathah* on both terms which, as one can assume, includes *ṭamāniya-ʿaš(i)rata*, *ḥādiya-ʿašara* and *ṭāniya-ʿašara*. However, he also explains that in *ʿAyādī-Sabā* and *Qālī-Qalā*<sup>40</sup> Arabs “do not like the *fath* in the *yāʾ*, and it is not possible to add a vowel to the *ʿalif*” (*karihū l-fatḥa fī l-yāʾi wa-l-ʿalifu lā yumkinu taḥriku-hā*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. II, 140.10–11). Why should this be

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1462–1465).

<sup>40</sup>*ʿAyādī-Sabā* is the name of a tribe that was known for fighting one another, used adverbially it means *iftirāqan* “with disunion”. *Qālī-Qalā* is a place name.

different for “eleventh”? Is the form *ḥādī-‘ašara* also found? Fleisch (1990, I, 522) says that az-Zamaxšarī (d. 538/1144) accepts the forms *ḥādī-‘ašara* “eleventh” and *ṭānī-‘ašara* “twelfth” as valid options (*Mufašṣal*, 95; §324). Except for the discussion about *‘Ayādī-Sabā* and *Qālī-Qalā* by Ibn as-Sarrāj, our authors do not mention this issue.

## 4.5.2 The annexation of numerals

Annexation of numerals is a very complex topic, which crisscrosses our study for it is at the heart of most of the problems that have kept our grammarians busy as far as numerals are concerned.

### Definition

Generally speaking, annexation (*‘iḍāfah*) is a syntactic construction involving two nouns, where the first one is deprived of both the article and the nunation, and agreed according to its position in the sentence, whereas the second term is put in the oblique form, with or without the article, in the singular or in the plural, as in *fataḥtu bāba l-bayti* “I opened the door of the house” or *marartu bi-ṭalāṭati ‘awlādin* “I passed by three boys”. In these sentences, one says that *bāb* and *ṭalāṭah* are “annexed” (*muḍāf*) to the second term, which is called “that to which something is annexed” (*muḍāf ‘ilayh*).

This syntactic construction can express different meanings: possession, as in *baytu Zaydin* “Zayd’s house”; measure, as in *raṭlu zaytin* “a rotl of oil”; species, as in *ṭawbu xazzin* “a silk cloth”; time adverb, as in *ṣalātu l-ḡum‘ati* “Friday prayer”; direct object in the active form, as in *sāriqu l-bayti* “the robber of the house”; or in the passive, as in *maḍrūbu r-ra‘si* “[the one whose] head is hit”; an adjectival relation, as in *ḥasanu l-wajhi* “beautiful of face”; a partitive meaning, as in *‘aḥadu r-rijāli* “one of the men” or *‘ajmalu l-banāti* “the most beautiful girls”; and, lastly, the expression of the counted object, as in *ṭalāṭatu ‘awlādin* “three boys” or *ṭalāṭatu-hum* “the three of them”. Some of these meanings can also be expressed with other constructions. Compare for example *ḥasanu l-wajhi* with *ḥasanun wajhan* (*tamyīz*) or *yahsunu wajhu-hu* (verb) and *ḥasanun wajhu-hu* (predication), *baytu Zaydin* with *baytun li-Zaydi* (particle), *ṭawbu xazzin* with *ṭawbun min xazzin* (particle), and so on.

The core of the problem with numerals is twofold. Because of their specific morphology, decades and compound numerals do not behave like the other numerals when annexed, and the different meanings that annexation can express lead to a possible confusion when it comes to numerals.

### Annexation of “one”

The expression *wāḥidu-hu* (or *wāḥidu-hā*), which is very common in all three texts, always means “its singular” and not the numeral “one” (K. II, 86.17; 87.1; 88.1; 93.11; ...; M. I, 279.8; II, 189.6; 207.3; 224.5; ...; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 64.7; 152.7; II, 413.5; 416.12; ...)

Al-Mubarrad is the only author to comment on the impossible annexation of *wāḥid* and *wāḥidah* in their numerical meaning. He says that analogically it should be possible to say \**wāḥidu rijālin* “one of men” and \**ṭintā rijālin* “two of men” (which are possible forms in poetry; M. II, 156.1–2), but the singular (*rajulun*) and the dual (*rajulāni*) are used instead (M. II, 155.14). This statement implies that for al-Mubarrad the *ʾiḏāfah* construction is the base form (*al-ʾaṣl*) for the expression of the counted object.

The numeral “one” in the position of *muḏāf* is expressed by *ʾaḥad* (fem. *ʾiḥdā*) and is followed by a definite noun either in the dual or in the plural.<sup>41</sup> However, in this case the meaning of the annexation is not the expression of the counted object, but a choice among two or more items. Compare for example *ʾaḥadu-hum* “one of them” (partitive) to *xamsata-hum* “the five of them” (counted object).

Sibawayh does not comment on this construction explicitly in the *Kitāb*, but he uses it repeatedly in his metalanguage: *ʾalā ʾaḥadi l-mafʿūlayni* “on one of the two complements” (K. I, 13.12–13); *li-ʾanna ʾaḥada-humā* “because one of the two” (K. I, 45.15); *ʾiḥdā ṭ-ṭāʾifatayni* “one of the two types” (K. I, 415.13).

The same remark goes for the *Muqtaḏab*. Al-Mubarrad makes no explicit comment on this construction, although he uses it very often.

Ibn as-Sarrāj devotes a paragraph to *ʾaḥad* and *ʾiḥdā*, in which he explains that they are always in the position of *muḏāf* and that they cannot be put in the dual nor in the plural (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. II, 17.2–4). He illustrates his point by examples of the type: *marartu bi-rajulin maqtūʾi ʾiḥdā l-ʾuḏunayni* “I passed by a man one of whose ears has been cut off” as opposed to the incorrect \**marartu bi-rajulayni maqtūʾay ʾiḥdā l-ʾādāni* “I passed by two men one of whose ears has been cut off” (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. II, 16.21–22), because in this expression *ʾiḥdā* cannot be put in the dual. The reason given is that the meaning of *ʾaḥad* and *ʾiḥdā* means one item of one group (one of the two ears), not one item of each group (one ear of each man) (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. II, 17.2–4).

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 507; §106c and d).

### Annexation of “two”

The only occurrence of *itnāni* in the position of *muḍāf* is found in the poetic line quoted above p. 92: *ṭintā ḥanḍalin* “two colocynths” (K. II, 182.18; M. III, 156.3).<sup>42</sup> Unlike al-Mubarrad, Sibawayh does not draw from this example the conclusion that annexation is the base form for the expression of the counted object.

Next to this poetic use, both Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad quote the incorrect expression *\*itnay-himā* “the two of them” where the pronoun is supposed to express the counted object in *\*marartu bi-himā ṭnay-himā* “I passed by both the two of them” (K. I, 168.17) and *\*marartu bi-ʾaxaway-ka ṭnay-himā* “I passed by both your two brothers” (M. III, 241.2). They reject these expressions because the annexation of *itnāni* to the dual pronoun *-humā* is redundant.

Al-Mubarrad is clearer than Sibawayh when he adds that “something cannot be annexed to itself” (*wa-š-šayʿu lā yuḍāfu ʾilā nafsī-hi*; M. III, 241.2), which is the case in *itnay-himā* but not in *xamsata-hum* because *-hum* does not strictly refer to “five”.<sup>43</sup>

### Annexation of cardinals from “three” to “ten”

For numerals from “three” to “ten”, annexation is a common way to express the counted object<sup>44</sup> and there are many occurrences of this construction in the corpus. The second term is in the plural, either in the indefinite or with the definite article as in *ṭalāṭatu ʾabwābin* “three dresses” and *xamsatu l-ʾaṭwābi* “the five dresses” (K. I, 86.8–10; M. II, 164.4–5; ʾU. I, 311.5–10). None of these numerals is found annexed to a singular substantive.

There is one occurrence where annexation expresses possession, as in *xamsatu-ka* “your five” (ʾU. I, 325.14).

### Annexation of compound cardinals

Our authors are divided on whether compound cardinals can be annexed to their possessor.<sup>45</sup> Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj qualify as “bad language” (*luḡah radīʾah*; K. II, 47.19; ʾU. II, 140.8) the expression *xamsata-ʿašara-ka* “your

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 507–508; §106f).

<sup>43</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1426).

<sup>44</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 508–510; §106h–m).

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, II, 814).

fifteen” whereas al-Mubarrad seems to approve it (*M.* II, 178.10; 179.4; 6; IV, 30.16).<sup>46</sup> He even discusses, and rejects, the possibility to decline *xamsata-‘ašara* in this case (*M.* II, 178.10–180.12) as in *xamsata-‘ašaru-ka*, *xamsata-‘ašara-ka* and *xamsata-‘ašari-ka*, which he says was the position of Sibawayh (*M.* II, 180.7)! We will come back to this issue in the *Muqtaḍab* where al-Mubarrad gives a proper interpretation of this annexation (see below, p. 226).

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to mention the possibility to annex compound numerals to a pronoun referring to their counted object, as in the following quotation of al-ʿAxfāš: *ʾatayna-nī tamāniya-‘aš(i)rata-hunna*<sup>47</sup> and *ʾataw-nī tamāniyata-‘ašara-hum* “the eighteen of them came to me” in the masculine and the feminine (*ʾU.* II, 22.13). It is not clear, however, whether he approves of this use.

### Annexation of decades

The decades cannot be annexed to their counted object, but there is no problem to annex them to their possessor, as in *ʾiṣrū Zaydin* “Zayd’s twenty” (*M.* III, 32.12), *ʾiṣriy-ya* “my twenty” (*ʾU.* I, 312.17; 262.6; *M.* I, 249.1) and *ʾiṣrū-ka* “your twenty” (*M.* II, 178.4; IV, 30.17; *ʾU.* III, 263.6).<sup>48</sup> Sibawayh does not mention this construction.

The fact that both meanings—possession and counted object—are very different is clear from the two expressions *talātū-hum* “their thirty” (according to *M.* II, 178.4 and *\*talātū-hum* “the thirty of them” in the erroneous *\*ʾaxaḍtu ʾiṣrīna dirhaman wa-talātī-him* (*M.* II, 180.11). What is rejected is not annexation *per se* but the second meaning it can take, because in the case of *talātūna* its counted object has to be indefinite and singular, so that the (definite plural) suffix pronoun *-hum* cannot express it. This is an interesting case of a semantic issue that has a clear syntactic effect. Depending on the intended meaning of annexation, it is either possible or impossible syntactically. Only the speaker knows what is intended and sometimes this knowledge is necessary for disambiguation.

There is also an interesting “mourning” (*nudbah*) form<sup>49</sup> of *ʾiṣriy-ya: yā ʾiṣriy-yāh!* “alas, my twenty!” (*M.* IV, 273.5).

<sup>46</sup>The position of az-Zamaxšari is that it is possible to annex compound cardinals to their possessor, except for “twelve”, because of its declension (*Mufaṣṣal*, 94.10–11).

<sup>47</sup>The text reads *tamāniya-‘ašara-hunna*, which is impossible and inconsistent with its masculine counterpart.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 257; §323, rem b).

<sup>49</sup>See above, footnote 8, p. 81, for more details on this form.

### Annexation of conjoined numerals

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention that in conjoined numerals such as *ṭalāṭatun wa-ṭalāṭūna* the *muḍāf ʿilayh* should be added to both parts, as in *ṭalāṭatu-ka wa-ṭalāṭū-ka* “your thirty-three”. It is the case for any noun conjoined (*maʿtūf*) to another one, as in the expression *gūlāmu-ka wa-jāriyatu-ka* “your lad and your maid” (M. II, 178.6–7).

In other words, each part of these numerals behaves according to its own rule before the conjunction, which implies that their annexation cannot express their counted object but only possession.

Al-Mubarrad is also the only author to mention that as a proper name, *Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna* does not follow the regular rule of conjoined nouns and that the *muḍāf ʿilayh* is added only to the second term as in *Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭū-ka* “your Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūn” (M. II, 178.6).

### Annexation of “one hundred” and “one thousand”

As for *miʾah* and *ʾalf*, they can be annexed to their counted object, as in *miʾatu dirhamin* “a hundred dirhams” (K. I, 87.4; M. II, 167.11; ʾU. I, 304.7) and *ʾalfu dirhamin* “a thousand dirham” (K. I, 87.6; M. II, 164.7; III, 38.3; 65.6; ʾU. I, 312.11).<sup>50</sup>

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention the annexation of *miʾah* and *ʾalf* to their possessor as in *miʾatu-ka* “your hundred” and *ʾalfu-ka* “your thousand” (M. II, 178.5).

### Annexation of ordinals

Annexation of ordinals is dealt with in expressions of the type *xāmisu xamsatin* “one of five” and *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* “the one that completed [a group of] four and made it five”, which all three authors deal with in a chapter devoted to the rule that stipulates that the masculine supersedes the feminine. See below, p. 170, more details on this issue.

These two types of expression are clearly distinguished by Arabic grammarians.<sup>51</sup> In the type of *xāmisu xamsatin* the ordinal is annexed to its corresponding cardinal and in the type of *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* it is annexed to

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 514–515; §106v–w).

<sup>51</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 521, note 1).

the preceding cardinal in the series. See above, p. 88, the Qur'ānic quotations linked with these expressions.

The first expression means “one of two”, “one of three”, “one of four”, and so on, and not “the second of two”, “the third of three” (M. II, 181.4; 'U. II, 426.5–6). In this case, the annexation means the partitive.

The second type of expression, *xāmisu 'arba'atin*, has a verbal meaning. The annexation expresses the link between the verb and its object, just like in *sāriqu l-bayti* “the robber the house” (M. II, 181.6–8; 'U. II, 426.8–9).

There are cases, however, where our authors use the ordinals annexed to their counted objects in their metalanguage, but they never comment on this use. See for example the following expressions where the counted object is either a substantive or a pronoun: *kasarta tāniya l-ḥarfi ḥina qulta fa'ila* “you put a *kasrah* on the second consonant when you say ‘fa'ila’” (K. II, 275.13–14); *kāna tāliṭu-hu ḥarfa l-layyini* “its third [consonant] is a glide” (K. II, 105.7); *wamā kāna min-hā tāni ḥurūfi-hi kasratan* “and that whose second consonant carries a *kasrah*” (M. I, 255.3); *fa-ṣāra rābi'u-hu ḥarfa maddin* “so its fourth [consonant] becomes a glide” ('U. III, 11.10).

### Annexation of compound ordinals

Sībawayh does not mention an issue that seems to have kept al-Mubarrad very occupied, namely the verbal value of compound ordinals. He simply says that above “ten”, in the expressions of the type *xāmisu 'arba'atin* the second part of the first numeral (-'ašara) is deleted, as in *xāmisu 'arba'ata-'ašara* “the one that made [the group of] fourteen to be fifteen”, instead of \**xāmisā-'ašara 'arba'ata-'ašara* (K. II, 179.2). In this case, the compound ordinal *xāmisā-'ašara* “fifteenth”, abridged in *xāmisu*, has a verbal strength and meaning.

Al-Mubarrad says that he follows al-'Axfāš al-'Awsaṭ (d. 215/830) and al-Māzinī (d. 248/862) who believe that it is not possible to build a verbal *fā'il* on a compound cardinal. Al-Mubarrad says that in expressions like *xāmisu 'arba'atin*, *xāmis* is “treated like an active participle” (*tujrī-hi majrā ḍārib*; M. IV, 183.4), but this is impossible with a compound numeral. This forbids expressions like *xāmisu 'arba'ata-'ašara*. He also says that “recent grammarians” have accepted it (*an-naḥwiyyūna al-mutaqaddimūna*; M. II, 182.12–183.1–7).

For him, the only possible expressions are of the type *rābi'u 'arba'atin*, as in *xāmisu xamsata-'ašara* “one of fifteen”, literally “the fif[teen]th of fifteen”. The complete expression should have been \**xāmisā-'ašara xamsata-'ašara*,

but the first –‘*ašara* has been elided for lightness’ sake, and *xāmis* was made declinable to avoid the three-term compound \**xāmisā-xamsata-‘ašara* (M. II, 182.7–10).

This position of al-Mubarrad is one of the debated issues in his *Radd ‘alā Kitāb Sibawayh*, where he expresses the same rejection of this construction, for the same reasons (Issue #113; *Radd*, 165–166).

There is no reference in the ‘*Uṣūl* to the verbal strength of compound ordinals and Ibn as-Sarrāj seems to ignore the debate about the possibility of saying *xāmisu ‘arba‘ata-‘ašara*.

However, Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions annexation of compound ordinals to their counted object, as in *al-ḥādiya-‘ašara-hum ‘anā* “the one who is one of the eleven is me” and *at-tāniya-‘ašara-hum ‘anā* “the one who is one of the twelve is me” (‘U. II, 331.12; 332.1). However, since these examples are the result of the predication test applied to the expressions *‘anā ḥādī ‘aḥada-‘ašara* and *‘anā tānī ṭnay-‘ašara* (see above p. 82), it does not mean that they are actually used in the language and they should be treated cautiously.

### 4.5.3 The addition of the definite article to numerals

Except for compound cardinals, the addition of the definite article to numerals has not received much attention from our grammarians and it seems to be a self-understood issue for them. All numerals, cardinals and ordinals, are found in our corpus with or without the definite article.

The case of compound cardinals is different.<sup>52</sup> In K. II, 47.17–19, Sibawayh says that Arabs very often annex *xamsata-‘ašara* or add the article to it without any change, just like they say *idrib ‘ayyu-hum ‘afḍalu!* “hit the one who is the best!” or *ka-l-‘āna* “like now”. What is at stake here is the independent form of *‘ayyu-hum* and the dependent form of *al-‘āna* in a position where one expects the dependent form *‘ayya-hum* and the oblique form *al-‘āni*. However, Sibawayh considers that the very frequent use of *‘ayyu-hum* and *al-‘āna* in these forms justifies the fact that they are not modified when put in another syntactic position. They are practically treated as indeclinable.

In exactly the same manner, when Arabs annex *xamsata-‘ašara* or add the article to it, they do not change it. Probably what Sibawayh intends is that the second part of the compound, which occupies the slot of a *tanwīn*, should

<sup>52</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 261; §329, rem.), and Howell (1883/2003, II, 813).



be deleted in annexation or after the addition of the definite article but that Arabs keep it as it is, just like they keep *ʿayyu-hum* and *al-ʿāna* in these forms.

Al-Mubarrad sees no difficulty in adding the definite article to compound cardinals (*M. II*, 180.5–7) or to annex them. He simply says that in this case their “intention of *tanwīn*” is deleted (*M. II*, 178.10–11). In other words, *-ʿāšara* occupies the slot of a *tanwīn*, which is incompatible with annexation and with the definite article. However, this intention of *tanwīn* can be deleted.

The difference between Sibawayh’s and al-Mubarrad’s interpretation is that for Sibawayh actual use is a justification in itself while al-Mubarrad tries to find an explanation to actual use.

As for Ibn as-Sarrāj, it is not clear what his position is. He says that the Baṣrans accept *al-xamsata-ʿāšara dirhaman* (*ʿU. II*, 14.12–16), without explicitly endorsing this expression himself. He also mentions that Arabs add the definite article to compound cardinals as in *al-xamsata-ʿāšara* without making any change to it (*ʿU. II*, 140.6–7), and, lastly, he also quotes al-ʿAxfāš who says that some Arabs say *al-xamsata l-ʿāšara* instead of *al-xamsata-ʿāšara* (*ʿU. II*, 312.4–5).

Another issue, linked with this one, is the possibility to express a definite counted object. We will consider it below, p. 174.

At the end of this presentation of numerals in isolation where we have dealt with morphological and morphosyntactical issues, we will take a look at some semantic issues linked with numerals.

## 4.6 Semantic considerations

At first glance, the strongest link between all numerals is not their morphology, nor their syntax, but their semantics, and indeed these words can behave extremely differently but in the end their meaning is quite simple and obviously consistent.

### 4.6.1 The meaning of the patterns

We have seen that numerical roots surface in many different patterns. There seems to be a loose link between these patterns and the meanings they convey.

There are a few patterns whose meaning is stable when applied to numerals, such as the ordinal *fā'il* (except for *wāḥid*), the diminutive *fu'ayl*, the fraction *fu'ul* and its plural *'af'āl*, the fraction *fa'il* and its plural *'af'ilā'* (or *fu'ul*), the distributive *fu'āl* and *maf'al*. These meanings were discussed above, under each pattern.

However, for basic patterns that express the cardinal value of the root, there is no link between the pattern and its meaning. All of *fa'l*, *fa'al*, *fi'l*, *fa'āl*, *fa'ālī* and *fi'lā* can express the cardinal value of specific numerical roots, and only linguistic use can decide which form is accepted by the speakers.

Our grammarians treat these meanings very differently. None of them comments on the exception of *wāḥid*, which has a cardinal meaning and an ordinal pattern, and, in the same manner, they do not comment on the fact that the patterns expressing the cardinal numerals are almost all different. In the following paragraphs, we will consider some issues related to the meanings of the different patterns in which numerals surface.

### Do decades have a plural meaning?

The meaning of the morphological shape of decades was discussed as follows. Is the suffix *-ūna* a plural suffix? As we have seen above p. 111, this question was triggered by morphological considerations. In order to build the diminutive forms of decades, grammarians had to decide whether *-ūna* was part of the pattern of the word or if it was a plural suffix.

Apparently quoting Yūnus, Sibawayh says that the final *nūn* in *ṭalātūna* compares to the final *nūn* in *'isrūna* inasmuch as it cannot be separated from the word it modifies. In other words, *ṭalātūna* is not the plural of *ṭalāt* “three”, just like *'isrūna* is not the plural of *\*'isr* (K. II, 119.7–9).

Another interesting evidence for Sibawayh that *ṭalātūna* is not the plural of *ṭalāt* is that it would then mean “nine” (K. II, 119.9–10). To understand this argument, one has to consider that the plural begins with three and that “nine” is “three times three”.

For al-Mubarrad, the decades are not plurals, although they behave in surface like the external masculine plurals (M. III, 331.11–332.2).

Ibn as-Sarrāj does not deal with this issue independently from the diminutive of *ṭalātūna* where he simply quotes Sibawayh's quotation of Yūnus saying that the diminutive is not built on *ṭalāt* to which the suffix *-ūna* would then

be added but on *ṭalātūna* as a whole, i.e., the suffix *-ūna* does not behave here as a plural suffix (<sup>3</sup>*U.* III, 49.5–7).

### Should not *‘iṣrūna* mean “one hundred”?

The particular shape of *‘iṣrūna* also triggers some question.<sup>53</sup> Its meaning is clearly the dual of “ten” but its pattern could also have meant “one hundred”, since the morphology of *‘iṣrūna* is exactly parallel to the other decades, *ṭalātūna*, *‘arba‘ūna*, and so on, which clearly mean “three decades”, “four decades”, and so on. The problem is that *‘iṣrūna* does not mean “*‘iṣr* decades”, which could mean “one hundred”, if anything.<sup>54</sup>

It is as if it was too confusing to have both the dual \**‘ašrāni* (dependent and oblique *‘ašrayni*) for “twenty” and the plural *‘ašrūna* (*‘ašrīna*) for “one hundred” coexist in the same series.

Al-Mubarrad is the only author to quote a discussion about the morphological form of *‘iṣrūna*, and the *kasrah* under the *‘ayn* in particular. Some say that this *kasrah* comes from the initial *kasrah* in *iṭnayni*, because *‘iṣrūna* means the dual of “ten”, not its plural (*M.* II, 165.15–17), so that there is some trace of this “dual” origin. However, al-Mubarrad rejects this interpretation.

Instead he simply says that *‘iṣrūna* is neither built like other decades (i.e., the feminine form of the unit followed by *-ūna*, as in *ṭalāt-ūna*: \**iṭnat-ūna*? or \**iṭn-ūna*?), nor is it built like the dual of “ten” (*‘ašaratāni*) (*M.* II, 165.15–166.11). According to him, once the declension was removed, the word would appear in a singular form that does not exist (\**iṭn*), and “the meaning [of the word] would have disappeared” (*la-baṭala ma‘nā-hu*; *M.* II, 166.14). Indeed, if *-āni* is a dual marker in *iṭn-āni*, what is a single *iṭn*?

Instead, he says that *‘iṣrūna* has a pattern of its own, just like “ten”, whose masculine and feminine forms (*‘ašaratun* and *‘ašrun*) are not analogical either

<sup>53</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 512–513; §106r).

<sup>54</sup>It seems that Semitic languages surface in two competing systems. In some languages (Akkadian, Ethiopian, South Arabic), all the decades are built in the dual just like “twenty”: e.g., Akkadian *ešrā* “twenty”, *šalāš-ā* “thirty”, *erb-ā* “forty”, \**hamš-ā* > *hanš-ā* “fifty”, whereas in others (Hebrew, Arabic) decades are built in a plural form and “twenty” was integrated into the system: e.g., Hebrew *‘eśr-īm*, *šēlōš-īm*, *‘arbā‘-īm*, *hāmīš-īm*, *šišš-īm*, *šib‘-īm*, *šēmon-īm*, and *tiš‘-īm* (Szemerényi 1960, 145–146).

(*M.* II, 166.1–4).<sup>55</sup> In the same way, the initial *kasrah* in *ʿiṣrūna* is an indication that its morphology and meaning is different from other decades (*M.* II, 166.7).

Ibn as-Sarrāj does not enter in this kind of consideration. He only says that “twenty” is derived from the same root as “ten” (*ʿU.* I, 312.3–4).

### Why is “one hundred” not derived from “ten”?

Once again, al-Mubarrad is the only one to deal with the link between the meaning of *miʿah* and its morphological shape. Morphologically, it is not derived from “ten” (as in hypothetical \**ʿaṣr-ūna* “ten decades”, like *tisʿ-ūna* “nine decades”) but it is a completely different root, which is “its right” (*ḥaqqu-hu*) inasmuch as it begins a new series (*M.* II, 167.9–10).

### The meaning of compound cardinals

Sibawayh states that compound cardinals are originally *ʿatf* constructions, like *xamsata-ʿašara* “fifteen”, whose base form (*ʿaṣl*) is *xamsatun wa-ʿašaratun* (“five and ten”; *K.* II, 47.8–9).

While al-Mubarrad does not tackle this specific issue, Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the same opinion as Sibawayh, adding that the *wāw* between *xamsatun* and *ʿašaratun* has been elided “for brevity” (*ixtiṣāran*; *ʿU.* II, 140.5).

### The meaning of ordinal numerals

The issue at stake in the meaning of ordinal numerals is their link with the corresponding verbs, because it has syntactic implications.

We have seen above p. 104 that all authors agree on the fact that the *fāʿil* pattern of these numerals is linked with the corresponding verbs not only morphologically, but also semantically and syntactically.

Al-Mubarrad teaches that this *fāʿil* form has a verbal strength (and a verbal meaning), which explains that it can also be vocalised *rābiʿun ṭalāṭatan*

<sup>55</sup>The text would not be intelligible without a correction from as-Sirāfi (d. 368/979), which the modern editor ʿUḍaymah has integrated in the text: *fa-min-hā ʿanna-ka taqūla fī l-muḍakkari ʿašaratun wa-li-l-muʿannaṭi ʿaṣrun bi-l-ʿiskāni*. Thanks to this correction, it becomes clear that al-Mubarrad draws a parallel between *ʿiṣrūna* and *ʿašaratun*. The latter does not follow the regular patterns for masculine and feminine, since the masculine *ʿašaratun* carries the feminine *hāʾ*, while the feminine *ʿaṣrun* is deprived of it.

(“making the three to be four”; *M. II*, 181.7). In this case, *rābiʿ* has clearly the status of the *ism al-fāʿil* of the verb *rabaʿa*. This is not true in *rābiʿu ʿarbaʿatin* “one of the four” because the meaning of *rābiʿ* here is not verbal (*M. II*, 181.1).

Later in the *Muqtaḍab* he also says that the forms *xāmis* and *xāmisah* are “derived from the numeral” (*mā štuqqa la-hu min al-ʿadadi smun*; *M. II*, 426.1), “built like an *ism al-fāʿil*” (*banayta-hu bināʾa smi l-fāʿili*; *M. II*, 426.7), which explains the feminine form where a “*hā*” is added just like in *ḍāribah*” (*M. II*, 426.6).

Ibn as-Sarrāj describes these ordinals in exactly the same terms as al-Mubarrad. The forms *xāmis* is “built like an *ism al-fāʿil*” (*banayta-hu bināʾa smi l-fāʿili*; *ʿU. II*, 426.3–8). However, earlier in the *ʿUṣūl* he labels expressions of the type *xāmisu ʿarbaʿatin* as “weak” because the corresponding verbs do not really exist (*ʿU. II*, 332.11–13).

### The meaning of compound ordinals

According to Sībawayh alone, compound ordinals have a different origin (*ʿaṣl*) than compound cardinals. While cardinals have a conjoined origin (*ʿatf* constructions), ordinal compounds are originally *ʿiḍāfah* constructions, like *xāmisah-ʿašara* originating in *xāmisu xamsata-ʿašara* (*K. II*, 47.9–10). He also adds that this has no implication for their treatment as compounds and he interprets both cardinal and ordinal compounds in the same syntactic frame, “the two things that are made one noun”, justifying his choice by saying that both should be treated alike (*K. II*, 47.8–11).

As was made clear above p. 133, al-Mubarrad is the only one to discuss whether compound ordinals have the same verbal strength as ordinals.

### The meaning of fractions

Needless to say, the meaning of the fraction pattern *fuʿul* is not discussed in our texts, where this pattern is not even mentioned. The same goes for *faʿil*, which is found in morphological lists but without comments.

### The meaning of diminutives

As for the meaning of the diminutive pattern *fuʿayl* applied to numerals, our grammarians do not discuss it and it is not really clear what they mean by the

diminutive of “eight” or “thirty”. It cannot be ruled out that they only intend numerals as proper names, although nothing forbids to build the diminutive of a substantive (*kulaḡb* is a “small dog”).

An interesting parallel can be found in the diminutive of the names of the day, which Sībawayh forbids for semantic reasons. He explains that it is impossible to form the diminutive of the days of the week (K. II, 138.7–15) by drawing a distinction between nouns that refer to something present (*al-yawm* “the day”, *aš-šahr* “the month”, *as-sanah* “the year”) and those that refer to a non-present time (ʿ*ams* “yesterday”, *ḡad* “tomorrow”, *aṭ-Talāṭā*<sup>56</sup> “Tuesday”, *al-ʿArbiʿā* “Wednesday”, *al-bāriḡah* “yesterday”) He compares nouns referring to the present time to the proper names *Zayd* and ʿ*Amr* in the expressions *hādā Zaydun* “this is Zayd” and *hādā l-yawmu* “this is the day”, as evidence that their diminutive form is permissible, as opposed to nouns that do not refer to something present and whose diminutive form is not acceptable. Maybe what is at stake is that a “small Zayd” can be put next to a “normal Zayd” and compared, but a “small yesterday” or a “small Monday” have no meaning because they are not “present”, so that they cannot be compared. Sībawayh adds that Arabs prefer to use the diminutive of nouns that are “more stable” (ʿ*ašaddu tamakkunan*) such as *al-yawm* “the day”, *al-laylah* “the night” and *as-sāʿah* “the hour” (K. II, 138.12–13).

Another reason that forbids the formation of the diminutive of the days of the week is that, unlike proper names like *Zayd*, they do not refer to a whole “category” (ʿ*ummah*) but to one specific thing (K. II, 138.14–15). This argument is perhaps a bit weak because one could consider that Monday belongs and refers to the category of Mondays in the year, just like Zayd belongs and refers to the category of all men called Zayd.

Ibn as-Sarrāj, who mentions the argument of *tamakkun* to forbid the formation of the diminutive of the days of the week (ʿ*U*. III, 62.10–11), does not help us any further to understand what the meaning of the diminutive numerals could be.

The position of al-Mubarrad is not useful either in this respect since he does not forbid the diminutive forms of the days of the week, whose meaning he takes for granted. He lists them as follows: *Subayt*, ʿ*Uḡayd*, *Ṭunayyān*, *Ṭulayyitā*, *al-ʿUraybiʿā*, *al-Xumayyis* and *ḡumayʿah* (M. II, 276.1–277.4).

In the end, there is no reason to believe that the diminutive of “eight” and “thirty” could mean anything else than “a small eight” or a “small thirty”,

<sup>56</sup>See above, p. 118, on this vocalisation.

just like “a small dog”,<sup>57</sup> and this because—as can be extrapolated from Sībawayh—they refer to something present, unlike the days of the week.

### The meaning of “deflected” numerals

The “deflected” forms of numerals *ʾuḥād* (or *mawḥad*), *ṭunāʾ* (or *maṭnā*), *ṭulāt* and *rubāʿ* are consistently said to have the distributive meaning *wāḥidan* *wāḥidan* “one by one”, *iṭnayni ṭnayni* “two by two”, and so on (*K.* II, 15.2; *M.* III, 381.7; *ʾU.* II, 88.11–13).

Al-Mubarrad adds that the *ʿadl* “deflection” of these numerals precisely consists in their change in meaning, which also conveys an idea of “multiplication” (*takṭīr*; *M.* III, 381.7–8).

#### 4.6.2 A *maṣḍar*-like meaning of numerals?

In the expression *waḥda-hu* “him alone”, al-Xalīl is said by Sībawayh to “claim” that *waḥd-* is treated as a *maṣḍar*, as if it were the complement of an underlying verb of the same root (*K.* I, 157.10–12), a construction later called *maḥḥul muṭlaq*.<sup>58</sup> And in the Ḥijāz, Arabs are also reported to use the expressions *ṭalātata-hum* “the three of them”, *ʿarbaʿata-hum* “the four of them”, until “ten”; what was said of al-Xalīl’s interpretation for *waḥda-hu* applies to these as well (*K.* I, 157.5–11). However, Sībawayh does not explicitly say what the underlying verb of the same root as *waḥd-* is. This example is discussed by Ayoub (1990, 9) as a case of underlying representation (*tamṭīl*) in grammar.

According to al-Mubarrad, the expression *marartu bi-Zaydin waḥda-hu* “I passed by Zayd alone” is equivalent to (*taʾwīlu-hu*) *ʾawḥadtu-hu bi-murūri ʾiḥādan* “I have isolated him completely by my passing by” and this shows that *waḥd-* has the meaning of *ʾiḥād*, the *maṣḍar* of the verb *ʾawḥada*, which in turn explains its dependent form (*M.* III, 239.6–7). Later in the same chapter, al-Mubarrad also comments on a possible oblique form for the expression *marartu bi-him ṭalātati-him*.

In the same manner, he adds that *marartu bi-l-qawmi xamsata-hum* “I passed by five people of the tribe” actually means *bi-hāʾulāʾi taxmīsan* “by

<sup>57</sup>In a personal communication during the second Foundations of Arabic Linguistics conference held in Cambridge, September 13 & 14, 2012, Michael Carter mentioned that these diminutive forms also carry an affective meaning, as in “dear little eight” or “dear little thirty”.

<sup>58</sup>See above footnote 14, p. 83, for more details.

them, making them five" (M. III, 239.10), i.e., the *maṣḍar* of the verb *xammasa*. This Form II *maṣḍar* corresponds to the Form IV *ʾihādan*, which is according to him the meaning of *waḥd-* in these expressions.

The position of Ibn as-Sarrāj is quite different. In expressions of the type *marartu bi-hi waḥda-hu* "I passed by him alone", *waḥd-* is treated like the *maṣḍar* in *ʾawḥadta-hu ʾihādan* "I have singularised him completely" (ʾU. II, 22.14–15), which is itself treated like a *ḥāl* (*ʾuqīma maqāma maṣḍarin yaqūmu maqāma ḥālin*; ʾU. I, 165.3–4), not a *maḥʾūl muṭlaq*.

As for other numerals, it is possible to use them in the same type of expressions, as in *marartu bi-him ṭalāṭata-hum* and *ṭalāṭati-him* "I passed by the three of them". In the dependent form, *ṭalāṭata-hum* is interpreted like *waḥda-hu* but no verb is mentioned, and *ṭalāṭati-him* agrees with the noun that it qualifies, just like *kullu-hum*, which is an appositive complement (*tābiʿ*) used for "emphasis" (*tawkīd*) (ʾU. II, 22.9–10).

Interestingly, in a section devoted to the fourth possible meaning for the appositive complement (ʾU. II, 46–55), namely "replacement" (*ʾibdāl*), Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes the expression *laqītu qawma-ka ṭalāṭata-hum* "I found your tribe, three of them", where *ṭalāṭata-hum* agrees with *qawma-ka* as an appositive complement meaning the "replacement of a part of the first term" (*mā ʾubdila min al-ʾawwali wa-huwa baʿdu-hu*; ʾU. II, 47.6–8). Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions that Sibawayh proposed this interpretation along with an other one: *ṭalāṭata-hum* can also be an "utterance" (*wa-l-wajhu l-ʾāxaru ʾan yutakallama*; ʾU. II, 47.10), i.e., it is uttered independently, as after a pause.

Lastly, there seems to be some hesitation concerning the gender agreement in these expressions. As for *waḥd-*, it is clear from the actual use of our grammarians that it is perfectly correct to say *waḥda-hā*. However, there are only two cases where the pronoun is in the feminine with other numerals, and in one of these cases Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj do not agree. When referring to the three words *laʿalla* "maybe", *ka-ʾanna* "as if" and *layta* "if only", Sibawayh uses *ṭalāṭu-hunna* (K. I, 168.17) whereas Ibn as-Sarrāj uses *ṭalāṭatu-hunna* (ʾU. I, 240.18).

The second case where the pronoun is in the feminine is an expression of al-ʾAxfāš as quoted by Ibn as-Sarrāj: *ʾatayna-nī ṭamāniya-ʿaš(i)rata-hunna* "the eighteen of them [fem.] came to me" (ʾU. II, 22.13; see above, p. 130).

In the absence of any other occurrence of these expressions in the feminine, it is impossible to decide what the opinion of our authors is and whether it is possible for the numeral to agree in gender when it is annexed



to a pronoun expressing its counted object, or whether in this *maṣḍar*-like use the numeral is invariable.

### 4.6.3 The absolute meaning of the cardinals

In expressions such as *xamsatu-ka* “your five” or *ʿišriy-ya* “my twenty”, what is intended is not the absolute meaning of numerals, i.e., a meaning devoid of reference to any counted object, but it is actually an understood quantity of something that is known to the listener.<sup>59</sup>

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to mention the absolute meaning of numerals as in *mā fī yadi-ka ʿillā ṭalāṭatu* (“you only have three in your hand”; *ʿU. II*, 98.17) and in *ṭalāṭatu ʿaḫṭaru min iṭnayni wa-ʿaḳallu min ʿarbaʿata* (“three is more than two and less than four”; *ʿU. II*, 98.19–20) where *ṭalāṭah* is diptotic if the absolute meaning is intended, as discussed above p. 123.

In a section devoted to the sixth kind of indeclinable nouns (*ʿU. II*, 139.1–15), namely onomatopoeia (*aṣ-ṣawt al-mahkī*), Ibn as-Sarrāj includes in this category letters of the alphabet when used to spell a noun, and numerals when merely listed, as in *wāḥid iṭnāni* “one, two” (*ʿU. II*, 139.7).

The point at stake here is that if numerals are merely listed, they become invariable and no (syntactic) ending vowel should be uttered, as at the pause. Ibn as-Sarrāj (following Sībawayh) calls *ʿidrāj* “listing”<sup>60</sup> the utterance of a group of words not connected by any syntactic link and *ʿiṣmām*<sup>61</sup> the type of non-vocalised pause that applies to them (*ʿU. II*, 139.6–8).

Ibn as-Sarrāj says that *ʿiṣmām* applies to listed numerals because they are not (true) onomatopoeia (*ʿU. II*, 139.7–8). In other words, they are fully declinable nouns, which are treated like onomatopoeia when listed for their absolute meaning.

Finally, Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes another issue also mentioned in the *Kitāb* and which relates to the absolute meaning of numerals. Some Arabs are said to elide the initial *hamzah* in *ʿarbaʿah* “four” when listing numerals, in which

<sup>59</sup>Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1428) says that numerals serve here to express “unrestricted numbers”. More details are found in Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1471–1474; VI, 998–1002).

<sup>60</sup>Troupeau (1976, 90) translates this term in the *Kitāb* by “assemblage” and adds that it applies to morphology, which is not the case here.

<sup>61</sup>See *ʿU. II*, 371–374 for a detailed account of the four different types of pause, *ʿiskān*, *ʿiṣmām*, *taṣḍid* and *rawm at-tahrik*, which are not always interchangeable. Troupeau (1976, 120) translates *ʿiṣmām* by “action de faire sentir” and says that it applies in the field of phonetics. See al-Nassir (1993, 32) for an account of these four types of pause in Sībawayh’s *Kitāb*.

case they vocalise the ending *hā'* in *ṭalāṭah* with a *fathah* as in *ṭalāṭaha rba'ah* “three, four” (K. II, 32.6–8; 'U. II, 139.8–9).

#### 4.6.4 Expression of numerals in the dual and the plural

We have seen above pp. 125ff. that some numerals follow the dual declension and that others can be put in the plural. In this case, it is noteworthy that what is intended is their absolute meaning, not the calculation of a new numeral. In other words, *xamsatāni* means “two fives” not “ten”, and *ṭalātu xamasātin* means “three fives” not “fifteen”.

The case of *mi'ah* and *'alf* is different since they can be used to express a new quantity, as in *ṭalātu mi'atin* “three hundreds” and *ṭalāṭatu 'ālāfin* “three thousands”. The proof that they build new numerals is that they can in turn have a counted object, as in *ṭalātu mi'ati waladin* “three hundred boys” and *ṭalāṭatu 'ālāfi waladin* “three thousand boys”, while it is not possible to say *\*ṭalātu xamasāti 'awlādin* “three five boys”.

What is the case of other numerals, compounds and decades? How can one say “two twenties” or “three forties”? Sibawayh is the only one to discuss—and reject—the possibility to put the decades in the dual and the plural because otherwise there would be two declension markers in the same word, as in *\*iṣrūnāni* “two twenties”. He also quotes the following erroneous forms: *\*mi'atānāni* “two two hundreds”, *\*'alfānāni* “two two thousands” and *\*Itṇānāni* “two Mondays” (K. II, 93.14–20).<sup>62</sup>

Moreover, Sibawayh says that there is no need to say “two twenties” because the word *'arba'ūna* “forty” exists instead (K. II, 93.19). As for “two Mondays”, it is impossible to say because the word *al-Itṇāni* “Monday” actually replaces (*'alā hadd* “its definition”) the expression *al-yawmu yawmāni min aṣ-ṣahri* “today is [the completion of] two days of the month” (K. II, 93.21).

There is no trace of this discussion in the two other grammar treatises.

<sup>62</sup>Interestingly, Egyptian colloquial expresses the plural of numerals that have an external masculine plural form with an external feminine plural: *iṣrīn-āt* “twenties”, *xamsīn-āt* “fifties”. These are especially used when referring to the corresponding banknotes. The recent apparition of a two hundred banknote has even launched the audacious *metēn-āt* “two hundreds”. As made clear by Sibawayh in K. II, 93.14–20 mentioned above, these forms are not possible in Classical Arabic.

### 4.6.5 Numerals having both a cardinal and an ordinal meaning

As we have seen above, the *fā'il* pattern is used to express the ordinal meaning of numerals between “two” and “ten” and, with some adaptation, of numeral compounds between “eleven” and “nineteen”.

However, the fact that for other numerals the same forms are used for both cardinals and ordinals is not mentioned by our authors: *al-bābu l-išrūna* “the twentieth chapter”, *al-kitābu l-mi'atu* “the hundredth book”, *al-yawmu l-'alfu* “the thousandth day”, and it is only the adjectival construction of these numerals that makes their meaning ordinal.<sup>63</sup>

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention that decades have no corresponding *ism al-fā'il* because there would be confusion (*yaltabisu*) with the *fā'il* of numerals from “three” to “ten” from the root of which the decades' forms are also built (*M. II*, 184.1–3). In other words, one cannot build two different *fā'il* forms on the root *tlṭ*, on which both *ṭalāṭah* “three” and *ṭalāṭūna* “thirty” are built.

But just like Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj, he does not observe explicitly that the semantic implication of this is that the names of decades have both meanings, cardinal and ordinal, and no example of decades (nor *mi'ah*, nor *'alf*) used as ordinals is found in our texts.

Is it possible that this use was not attested in the first four centuries? In any case, it is noteworthy that our authors did not raise the issue.

The case of *'awwal* may also be mentioned again here. However clearly related semantically to ordinals, it is not considered as such by our grammarians and *wāhid* is left alone in the series without an ordinal counterpart built on the same root. This fact is not questioned in our texts.

### 4.6.6 Are cardinals “unspecified nouns”?

Our three grammarians deal with a specific category, which they call *al-'asmā' al-mubhamah*, which can be translated as “unspecified nouns”.<sup>64</sup> Since none of them presents us with a theory of these unspecified nouns, we are left with

<sup>63</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 522; §107e–f) and Wright (1967, I, 261–262; §330).

<sup>64</sup>Baalbaki (2008, 229) translates *mubham* by “undefined”, Troupeau (1976, 42) translates it by “imprécisé”, Versteegh (1993a, 158) by “unspecified”, and Marogy (2010, 104) by “vague”. We prefer “unspecified” because in most cases these nouns are in need of another noun that “specifies” (*yumayyizu*) them or that “explains” them (*yufassiru*); they do not need to be “defined”.

only examples to deal with. This category is of great interest for our study because compound cardinals and decades are said by our grammarians to be “unspecified nouns”.

According to Sībawayh, an “unspecified noun” is a noun that “applies to everything” (*taqa‘u ‘alā kulli šay’in*; K. II, 38.17). These nouns can replace a whole class of nouns, just like the demonstrative *hādā* or the relative pronoun *alladī*. See Versteegh (1993a, 158) for a historical account of this category.

Sībawayh says explicitly that compound cardinals and ordinals are “unspecified” (*mubham*; K. II, 47.11), just like *kam* and *ka-dā*, in a way that corresponds exactly to his own definition of “unspecified substantives” (K. II, 38.17). However, he never says explicitly that decades are unspecified, which would have made them even more similar to compound numerals, and he does not follow this track in his interpretation. This issue remains unclear in the *Kitāb*.

It is not certain that “unspecified nouns” are another “substantial” subcategory of *‘asmā’*, different from *‘asmā’ al-‘adad* and *‘asmā’ al-fā‘il*, as Mosel (1975, 71) asserts. Rather, it seems that being “unspecified” is a semantic qualification of some nouns that are in need of a specifier. As al-Mubarrad puts it: *lammā qulta ‘iṣrūna ‘abhamta* (“when you say *‘iṣrūna* you are vague”; M. II, 144.6), so that the listener does not know what the speaker is talking about until they specify it.

In the expression *‘iṣrūna rajulan*, the word *rajulan* is a commentary on the “unspecified” numeral *‘iṣrūna*. It “throws light on its species” (*li-tubayyina naw‘a hādā l-‘adadi*; M. II, 144.7).

In exactly the same meaning, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that “any unspecified [noun], from the numerals or not, is explained by a [noun in the] indefinite dependent form” (*kullu mubhamin min al-‘a‘dādi wa-ḡayri-hā ‘innamā tufassiruhu n-nakiratu l-manṣūbatu*; ‘U. I, 114.16). Since not all numerals are specified by a *tamyīz* construction, this means that not all numerals are *mubhamah* but only the non-annexable ones.

Although being “unspecified” seems to be a semantic qualification (nouns whose meaning is defective and which can apply to everything), there are evident syntactic implications (these nouns are in need of a specifier) which could give the impression that they form a distinct substantial category of nouns.

This point will also be presented in more detail in the next part of this study, within the frame of each grammarian, p. 211 for Sībawayh’s opinion, p. 235 for al-Mubarrad’s opinion, and p. 255 for Ibn as-Sarrāj’s opinion.

#### 4.6.7 Is *kam* is a numeral?

Our authors all draw a parallel between *kam* and numerals (K. I, 250–256; M. III, 55–67; U. I, 315–320): *kam* is a noun (*ism*) that replaces semantically any numeral, and just like them its “complement” can take two different shapes, in the dependent form (interrogative meaning) and in the oblique form (assertive or exclamatory meaning). The comparison stops here since there are actual differences, but the similitudes are enough to justify the parallel treatment between *kam* and numerals.

Sibawayh says that “*kam* operates on anything that ‘*isrūna* operates on, and if it is not suitable for ‘*isrūna*, it is not suitable for *kam* either” (*kam ta‘malu fī kulli šay’in ḥasuna li-l-‘isrūna ‘an ta‘mala fī-hi fa-‘idā qabuḥa li-l-‘isrūna ‘an ta‘malu fī šay’in qabuḥa dālīka fī kam*; K. I, 251.1–2. However, there are cases where ‘*isrūna* and *kam* are not interchangeable. In K. I, 251.11–12, Sibawayh rejects the expression \**al-‘isrūna la-ka dirhaman* but he says that it is perfectly acceptable for *kam* (*wa-lākinna-hā jāzat fī kam jawāzan ḥasanan*) because “it is as if it [*kam*] replaces the *mutamakkīn*<sup>65</sup> in the language” (*li-‘anna-hu ka-‘anna-hu šāra ‘iwaḍan min al-mutamakkīni fī l-kalāmī*; K. I, 251.12).<sup>66</sup> Sibawayh does not seem to see any contradiction between this difference of treatment between *kam* and ‘*isrūna* and his assertion that they are interchangeable.

Sibawayh (K. I, 256.10) is the only one to include the expression *ka-dā* in this comparison, as in *ka-dā dirhaman*, which is also said to be similar to *kam* when it refers to a numeral (*bi-manzilati kam wa-huwa kināyatun li-l-‘adadi*) and to *fulān* when it refers to a noun (*bi-manzilati fulānin ‘idā kanayta bi-hi fī l-‘asmā’i*). According to Sibawayh, ‘*isrū-na dirhaman* and *ka-dā dirhaman* are syntactically parallel inasmuch as *-dā* has the status of the *tanwīn*, which prevents annexation (K. I, 256.11–12).

Al-Mubarrad says that in the interrogative position, *kam* behaves like a “numeral carrying a *nūn*” (*‘adad munawwan*; M. III, 55.4), i.e., a numeral that cannot be in the position of *muḍāf* because of its final *nūn*, like ‘*isrūna*, or because of its intention of *tanwīn*, like *xamsata-‘ašara* (M. III, 55.5; 10–11). This impossibility explains that the complement surfaces in the indefinite dependent form, as in *kam rajulan ‘inda-ka?* “how many men are at your place?” (M. III, 55.4–5). This complement is called a *tamyīz* by al-Mubarrad,

<sup>65</sup>The account of *tamakkun* “full declinability” and *‘adam tamakkun* “partial declinability” in Baalbaki (2008, 118–119) is maybe not as clear as that of Chairret (2000, 216–217) who insists more on its gradient nature in the *Kitāb*.

<sup>66</sup>Manuscripts B, C and H have *at-tamakkun* instead of *al-mutamakkīn*.

just like after numerals (M. III, 56.3). See below, p. 229, for a detailed presentation of the *tamyīz* in the *Muqtaḍab*.

At this point, the only difference between *kam* and *ʿiṣrūna* is that *kam* can be separated from its *tamyīz*, so that it is possible to say *kam la-ka jāriyatan?* “how many maids do you have?” (M. III, 55.8) whereas it is not possible to say \**ʿiṣrūna la-ka jāriyatan* (M. III, 55.10). The reason given by al-Mubarrad for this difference is that it is a compensation granted to *kam* for not being *mutamakkin* (M. III, 55.9). In other terms, instead of being fully declinable, *kam* has the strength to operate on its *tamyīz* even it is separated from it.

The *tamyīz* surfaces in the dependent form, yet it is possible to say *kam ġilmānu-ka?* “how many are your lads?” in the independent form, because in this case the *tamyīz* itself is not expressed overtly and the underlying expression is *kam ġulāman ġilmānu-ka?* just like the expression *ʿa-ʿiṣrūna ġilmānu-ka?* “are your lads twenty?” corresponds to an underlying *ʿa-ʿiṣrūna ġulāman ġilmānu-ka?* (M. III, 56.4–8).

The most straightforward expression of a parallel between *kam* and numerals is found in the *ʿUṣūl* where Ibn as-Sarrāj calls *kam* an “unspecified numeral” (*ism ʿadad mubham*; ʿU. I, 314.1).

Like Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad he says that “*kam* is a noun that replaces all numerals” (*kam ismun yantaḍimu l-ʿadada kulla-hu*; ʿU. I, 315.6) and that it is “like the rest of numerals at an underlying level” (*kamā yakūnu sāʾiru l-ʿaḍādi fī t-taqdīr*; ʿU. I, 316.4–5).

What is more, he adds that:

(٥) فكم عدد والعدد حكمه حكم المعداد الذي عدته به فإن كان المعداد زمانا فهو زمان وإن كان حيوانا فهو حيوان وإن كان غير ذلك فحكمه حكمه.

(5) *kam* is a numeral and its status is that of the object that is counted. If the counted object is time, it is time, and if it is an animal, it is an animal, and if it is something else, its status is the same. (ʿU. I, 317.4–6)

This assertion is repeated later in the text: *kam* is “the name of an unspecified numeral” (*ismun li-ʿadadin mubhamin*; ʿU. II, 135.4–5), so that the interrogative expression *kam mālu-ka?* “how much is your sum?” replaces the expression *ʿa-ʿiṣrūna mālu-ka?* “is your sum twenty?” and any other numeral (ʿU. II, 135.5–7). He further explains that “numerals are infinite so they [Arabs] came up with a noun that replaces them all” (*wa-l-ʿadadu bil-lā nihāyatin fa-ʾataw bi-smin yantaḍimu l-ʿadada kulla-hu*; ʿU. II, 135.7). See below, pp. 255ff., the treatment of *kam* by Ibn as-Sarrāj.

### 4.6.8 Is *biḏ'ah* a numeral?

The case of *biḏ'* (fem. *biḏ'ah*) is also interesting since it replaces semantically and syntactically any numeral between “three” and “nine” in compound numerals: *biḏ'ata-ʿašara rajulan* “ten-odd men” and *biḏ'a-ʿaš(i)rata mraʿatan* “ten-odd women”.<sup>67</sup> This semantic and syntactic information about *biḏ'(-ah)* is mentioned by Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj (K. II, 179.2–3; ʿU. II, 427.6–7), but not by al-Mubarrad, who does not use this word in his *Muqtaḍab*.

Interestingly, *biḏ'* and *biḏ'ah* follow the same gender polarity rules as numerals between “three” and “ten”. However, neither Sibawayh nor Ibn as-Sarrāj comment on this polarity nor do they mention the use of *biḏ'ah* and *biḏ'* when used alone before a counted object as in *biḏ'atu ʿawlādin* “a few boys” (and *biḏ'u banātin* “a few girls”).

Another noun that is usually associated with numerals is *nayyif*, which means “some” in expressions like *nayyifun wa-ʿiṣrūna rajulan* “twenty and some men”.<sup>68</sup> This word applies to both masculine and feminine counted objects, it is not found in our texts.

### 4.6.9 Numerals as proper names

In our texts, numerals are tested as proper names<sup>69</sup> in the following cases: their relative adjective (*ʿArbaʿata-ʿAšar* in K. I, 298.4–9; *Xamsata-ʿAšar* in K. II, 84.3; *Itnā-ʿAšar* in K. II, 84.13; *Itnā-ʿAšar* and *Xamsata-ʿAšar* in ʿU. III, 69.9–12); their mourning form (*Itnā-ʿAšar* in K. I, 281.12–13; *Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna* in K. I, 282.9); their vocative form (*Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna* in K. I, 282.9–12; 16–17; *Itnā-ʿAšar* in M. II, 162.9–10; *Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna* in ʿU. I, 344.16–17); their apocopated form (*tarxīm*) (*Itnā-ʿAšar* in K. I, 298.22; *Xamsata-ʿAšar* in K. I, 298.19–20; *Xamsata-ʿAšar* in ʿU. I, 363.4–6; 364.1–3); their diminutive form (*ʿUḥād* and *Ṭunā* in K. II, 15.9–10); their use in the opposite gender (*Ṭalāt* in M. II, 157.13; *Xams* or *Sitt* in ʿU. II, 100.11–12; *Sabʿah* in ʿU. II, 111.6–7); their annexed form (*Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna* in M. II, 178.6; compound numerals in ʿU. III, 69.11–12); their declension (*ʿArbaʿūna* in M. III, 332.7; *ʿIṣrūna* in M. IV, 37.4; compound numerals in ʿU. II, 80.1–5; 92.12–13; the diminutive of the ‘deflected’ forms *ʿUḥayyid* and *Ṭunayy* in ʿU. II, 83.9–10).

There are even cases where grammarians test the same numeral simultaneously in its numerical value and as a proper name in order to compare

<sup>67</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 255; §319, rem. b) and Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1470–1471).

<sup>68</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 258; §324, rem).

<sup>69</sup>See above p. 80 on the proper name test.

more precisely what is modified by this semantic change. See for example the difference between the vocative form of *ṭalāṭatun wa-ṭalāṭūna* as a proper name in *yā Ṭalāṭatan-Wa-Ṭalāṭīna!* “O Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna!” (ʿU. I, 344.15–16) and as a numeral in *yā ṭalāṭatu wa-ṭalāṭūna!* “O [the] thirty-three [of you]!” (ʿU. I, 344.17) where the regular rule for the conjoined nouns applies, as in *yā Zaydu wa-ʿAmru!* (ʿU. I, 332.10).

Another part of this test is to put proper names in the dual and in the plural but none of our authors applies this test to numerals as proper names. In the same manner, none of our grammarians tests ordinals as proper names. Maybe is it obvious that the same problems would find the same answers and that they did not need to treat them explicitly.

The last case of a numeral used as a proper name is the curious *Xamsata-ʿAšaru-Zaydin* which is discussed by Sibawayh alone (K. II, 61.23–24). His point here is that *xamsata-ʿašara* becomes declinable, as in *hāḏā Xamsata-ʿAšaru-Zaydin* “this is *Xamsata-ʿAšaru-Zaydin*” (K. II, 61.24), because nothing forbids it, unlike in names that originate in complete utterances (*ḥikāyah*, as in *Taʿabbaṭa-Šarran*) and that have to remain as they were before being used as proper names.

#### 4.6.10 The meaning of the days of the week

For all three authors, the names of the days of the week, *al-ʿAḥad* “Sunday” to *al-Xamīs* “Thursday”, have a clear semantic link with numerals. Not only are they built on the numerical roots from *wḥd* to *xms*, but they also mean the corresponding ordinals from *al-ʿawwal* “first” to *al-xāmīs* “the fifth”, which are treated as adjectives in the expressions *al-yawmu l-ʿAḥadu*, *al-yawmu l-Ṭnāni*, *al-yawmu t-Ṭalāṭāʿu*, and so on (K. I, 176.22–24; M. II, 92.18–93.1; ʿU. I, 158.1–2). They are the days’ proper names (K. I, 228.20–23; M. II, 276.1; ʿU. I, 158.1–2). Moreover, as mentioned above p. 140, Sibawayh says that the names of the days of the week do not refer to a whole “category” (ʿummah) but to one specific thing, and that they do not refer to something present (K. II, 138.7–15).

The case of *al-ḡumʿah* “Friday” and *as-Sabt* “Saturday” is different since they mean *al-ijtimāʿ* “the gathering” and *ar-rāḥah* “the rest” (Sibawayh)—or *al-inqitāʿ* “the interruption” (Ibn as-Sarrāj)—which are *mašādir*, hence their construction in annexation in *yawmu l-ḡumʿati* and *yawmu s-Sabti* (K. I, 176.17–177.3; ʿU. I, 194.16–19).



Our grammarians also mention that some Arabs say *al-yawmu l-Itnu* and *al-yawmu t-Tunayy* for “Monday” (K. II, 93.22–23; M. II, 92.17).<sup>70</sup> Al-Mubarrad disapproves of this expression because the name of the day should have a “dual” meaning (*at-tatniyah*), just like the other days of the week, which were built on the corresponding numerals (M. II, 92.18–93.1).

For al-Mubarrad, the name of the days of the week can be compared to the expression *al-yawmu yawmāni min aš-šahri* “today is two days of the month”, which he paraphrases as *al-yawmu tamāmu yawmayni min aš-šahri* “today is the completeness of two days of the month” (M. II, 93.1–2). He also adds that they should always carry the article because they are definite (M. III, 382.4–5).

## 4.7 Conclusion

As a conclusion to this chapter, one can say that numerals are words built on a very limited set of roots and a large number of patterns in order to express a potentially unlimited number of meanings (quantities, ranks, lexicalised meanings, idiomatic expressions, and their absolute meaning).

Morphosyntactically speaking, numerals and their cognates are not very flexible. In other words, they do not have a full *tamakkun* “freedom of behaviour”. This is maybe not completely true of cardinals and ordinals from “three” to “ten”, as well as “one hundred” and “one thousand”, but it is certainly true of the other numerals (compounds, decades and conjoined numerals), and this, because they are built on the same roots as the units and because any change in these greater numerals may potentially end up into an already existing form.

On the other hand, numerals between “three” to “ten” present less morphosyntactic difficulties, once their root and pattern are taken for granted. These roots and patterns surely point toward old words that are not transparent anymore to the morphological system but that have been integrated into the trilateral root system.

At this point, it is also clear that “one” and “two” do not easily fit into the system, because of the existence in the language of a singular and a dual, which already express quantity. This explains the morphosyntactic peculiarities that the following numerals display: “eleven”, “twelve”, “twenty-one”, “thirty-one”, and so on.

---

<sup>70</sup>The text reads *al-yawmu t-Tinyu* but this vocalisation is somewhat strange and the diminutive *Tunayyu* is more consistent here in the context.



## Chapter 5

# Numerals in the sentence

### 5.1 The numerals' morphological class

The syntactic positions numerals can occupy in the sentence are clearly linked with the morphological class to which they belong, their “substantial category” (Mosel 1975). This fact is well-known to Arabic grammarians although they do not present things as systematically as a modern reader would expect. For this reason, it is only through some extrapolation that one can systematise their teaching. The following observations are not found verbatim in our texts.

Numerals are called *'asmā' al-ʿadad* “numerical substantives”, a subcategory of *'asmā'* “nouns”, as opposed to *'aʿlām* “proper names”, *maṣādir* “verbal nouns”, *'asmā' al-fāʿil* “active participle”, *'asmā' al-fiʿl* “proper names of the verbs”, *ṣifāt* “adjectives”, *ṣifāt muṣabbahah bi-l-fāʿil* “adjectives resembling the active participle”.

Although they belong to the category of *'asmā' al-ʿadad*, numerals can occupy slots preferred for proper names, active participles, verbal nouns or adjectives.

It is not clear whether *wāḥid* “one” and *iṭnāni* “two” are considered by our three authors to be adjectives occupying slots preferred for numerals or numerals occupying slots preferred for adjectives.

As adjectives, “one” and “two” offer less possibilities than other numerals. As we have seen above pp. 103, 109 and 129, *ʾaḥad* (fem. *ʾiḥdā*) is derived

from the same root as the adjective *wāḥid* and it is used instead of it in syntactic slots preferred for substantives (with the notable exception of Q. 112.1 presented above p. 87, which is not commented on by our authors). The case of *ʾaḥad* will be dealt with in greater detail below (pp. 158ff) because it has a specific syntax. It seems to belong to the substantives, and not to the adjectives anymore. In the same manner, the word *waḥd-* (no feminine form) replaces *wāḥid* and *wāḥidah* in their *maṣḍar*-like use (see above p. 141), as in *marartu bi-hā waḥda-hā* “I passed by her alone”. It is always used as construct (*muḍāf*). What the category of *waḥd-* is, is not clear. If we follow our authors, it seems to be a “substantive” (*ism*) that is used in a slot preferred for “verbal nouns” (*maṣādir*).

As for the adjective *iṭnāni*, it has no corresponding substantive and except for its use in *ṭintā ḥanḍalin* “two colocinths” which is a poetic license (see above pp. 92 and 130), there is no example in our corpus of its use in a syntactic slot preferred for substantives. The word *kilā-* (fem. *kiltā-*) “both” is used instead.

The case of ordinal numerals is also different. As mentioned above pp. 132 and 138, ordinal numerals are systematically linked by our authors to the corresponding verbs, as their *ʾasmāʾ al-fāʿil* “active participles” in expressions of the type *xāmisu xamsatin* “one of five” and *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* “the one that completed [a group of] four and made it five”. This points at a substantival nature of ordinals, although they are commonly used in adjectival slots. Just like our authors say that *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* has the same meaning as *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata*, one could consider that *al-bābu al-xāmisu* “the fifth chapter” actually stands for *al-bābu llaḍi xamasa l-ʾabwāba l-ʾarbaʿata* “the chapter that made the four chapters to be five”. However, this is an extrapolation and it is not found in our texts. Mosel (1975, 138) concludes that ordinals “nicht nur die Struktur fāCil haben, sondern auch zur Kategorie ism al-fāCil gehören”, and not to the category of *ʾasmāʾ al-ʿadad*. Indeed, al-Mubarrad mentions that the expression *rābiʿu ṭalāṭatin* can also be vocalised *rābiʿu ṭalāṭatan*. In this case, *ṭalāṭah* is the *maḍʿūl bi-hi* of the active participle *rābiʿ* (M. II, 181.7). This last assertion confirms the idea that ordinals are active participles (*ʾasmāʾ al-fāʿil*) rather than numerals (*ʾasmāʾ al-ʿadad*).

Another issue—which is not discussed by our grammarians—is the ordinal use of decades, hundreds and thousands (see above p. 145). How should the following numerals be interpreted in *al-bābu l-ʿiṣrūna* “the twentieth chapter”, *al-bābu l-miʾatu* “the hundredth chapter”, *al-bābu l-ʿalfu* “the thousandth chapter”? None of our authors comments on whether these numerals are here in a slot preferred for adjectives or for active participles.

## 5.2 Syntactic slots occupied by numerals

Just like other substantives, numerals (except for “one” and “two”) can occupy different syntactic slots, with which the category of *ʾasmāʾ* is usually linked: *mubtadaʾ* “topic of the nominal sentence”, *fāʾil* “agent of the verbal sentence”, *nāʾib al-fāʾil* “formal agent of a passive verbal sentence”, *ism kāna* “topic of a *kāna* sentence”, *mafʾūl* “object of the verbal sentence”, *badal* “appositive complement”, *ḍarf* “adverb”, *muḍāf* “construct”, *muḍāf ʾilayh* “that to which the construct is annexed”, *majrūr bi-ḥarf* “put in the oblique form by a particle”, and so on, with limitations due to their specific morphosyntactic nature. For example, the compensatory *nūn*<sup>1</sup> in *ʾisrūna* “twenty” cannot be deleted before its counted object, which makes the expression *ʾisrūna dirhaman* “twenty dirhams” indefinite. As a consequence, the sentence \**ʾisrūna dirhaman la-ka* is incorrect, because it is incorrect to begin a sentence with an indefinite expression. It should be formulated *la-ka ʾisrūna dirhaman* “you have twenty dirhams”. There is nothing irregular about this behaviour and it is not mentioned by our authors.

Although cardinal numerals are substantives, they can also—with some degree of “flexibility”—occupy syntactic positions preferred for other categories, in which case our authors mention the category according to which they are treated: Numerals can be treated like *ṣifāt* “adjectives” and be in the function of *naʿt* “qualifier” as in *rijālun xamsatun* “five men”, they can be treated like *maṣādir* and be in the function of *mafʾūl muṭlaq* as in *marartu bi-him talātata-hum* “I passed by the three of them”, they can be treated like *ʾaʿlām* and have a relative adjective built on them as in *Xamsiyyun*, they can be treated like adjectives and be in the slot of *xabar* “predicate of a nominal sentence” and *xabar ʾinna* “predicate of an *ʾinna* sentence”.

<sup>1</sup>In chapter 2, (K. I, 3.17–18; 22–23) Sibawayh defines this *nūn*, which he calls *nūn al-iṭnayni wa-l-jamīʿ*: “the [ending] *nūn* in the dual and the plural”: *wa-takūnu z-zāʾidatu t-tāniyatu nūnan ka-ʾanna-hā ʾiwaḍun li-mā muniʾa min al-ḥarakati wa-t-tanwīni* “the second appendix is a *nūn*, as if it were a compensation for what has been forbidden [to carry] a vowel or a *tanwīn*.” See Wright (1967, I, 235) and Ayoub (2009, 443–444) for an account of the four types of *tanwīn*: (i) *tanwīn at-tamakkun*, which is a marker of full declension, (ii) *tanwīn at-tankīr*, which is added to diptotic nouns to make them indefinite, as in *marartu bi-ʾAmrawayhi wa-ʾAmrawayhin ʾāxara* “I passed by ʾAmrawayh [whom you and I know] and by another ʾAmrawayh”, (iii) *tanwīn al-ʾiwaḍ* “*tanwīn* of compensation”, which is found in weak root nouns such as *qāḍin* and in adverbial expressions like *ḥina-ʾidin*, and (iv) *tanwīn al-muqābalah* “*tanwīn* of correspondence”, which is found in external feminine plurals, as in *muslimātun*, and which corresponds to the *nūn* in external masculine plural *muslimūna*. What Sibawayh calls *nūn al-iṭnayni wa-l-jamīʿ* is not one of these four *tanwīn*. See Howell (1883/2003, II, 842–846; III, 862–864); Fleisch (1990, I, 284; §59b). We call this *nūn* the compensatory *nūn*, based on Sibawayh’s definition. This compensatory *nūn* has the same distribution as the *tanwīn* in some contexts but it also differs from it in some respects, as will be made clear in this study.

Our grammarians do not devote the same attention to the different syntactic slots numerals can occupy in the sentence. Generally, they prefer to focus on irregular or minority uses (slots preferred for adjectives, verbal nouns, and so on), rather than comment on majority uses (slots preferred for substantives).

### 5.2.1 A numeral as *ḍarf* in the independent form

Sibawayh clearly choses to comment on a minority use in the expression *wulida la-hu sittūna ʿāman*<sup>2</sup> “[a child] was born to him [while he was] sixty years [old]” which he compares to the expression *sīra ʿalay-hi marratāni* “he was passed by twice” (K. I, 97.15–16).

In *sīra ʿalay-hi marratāni*, *marratāni* “twice” is an *ism*, treated like a *maṣḍar* in the syntactic position of formal agent<sup>3</sup> of the passive verb *sīra* in the independent form.<sup>4</sup> Sibawayh says that the meaning of this *maṣḍar* is “two occurrences of the verb” (*al-marratāni min al-fīl*; K. I, 11.10). It replaces the *maṣḍar* of the same root as the verb (*sayratāni*), so that the original underlying expression is *sīra ʿalayhi sayratāni* “he was passed by twice.”

The expression *wulida la-hu sittūna ʿāman* appears already in K. I, 75.5 and is interpreted as a case where the *ḍarf* replaces the formal agent (*mafʿūl*, or later *nāʾib al-fāʾil*), as a consequence of flexibility of the language (*li-saʿati l-kalām*). In other words, the *ḍarf* (*sittūna*) is an *ism* in the independent form because the slot of the formal agent is unoccupied.

The meaning of the two expressions (*al-marratāni min al-fīl* and *ḍarf*) is very similar if not equivalent, but the analysis of the underlying structures is very different. Sibawayh’s comments are a good example of the type of commentary he proffers on minority cases where numerals are used in slots preferred for other parts of speech.

<sup>2</sup>See also in M. III, 105.4 and ʾU. I, 194.3; II, 255.10–11.

<sup>3</sup>Sibawayh calls *mafʿūl* what later grammarians call *nāʾib al-fāʾil* “formal agent”.

<sup>4</sup>In this type of construction, the passive verb is thus said by Sibawayh to have two *mafāʾil* “complements”: The first one is in the independent form and if there is a second one it is in the dependent form as in *ḍuriba ʿAmrun ḍarban ṣadīdan* “Amr was heavily beaten” and *ḍuriba bi-hi ḍarbun ḍaʾīfun* “because of him, he was lightly beaten” (K. I, 97.1–3). What is at stake here is that in both cases the first *mafʿūl* is in the independent form, be it the formal agent (*ʿAmrun* in the first sentence) or the *maṣḍar* (*ḍarbun* in the second sentence).

### 5.2.2 Numerals in adjectival slots

A case of a numeral in an adjectival slot in the *Kitāb* is found in the poetic hemistich *xawwá ‘alā mustawayātin xamsin* “it [the camel] laid down on five [equal] levels” (*K. I*, 183.2) presented above p. 92. Another case of an adjectival use of a cardinal numeral is found in chapter 430 (*K. II*, 211–214) devoted to *ṣifāt* that have a “broken” form in the plural, where Sibawayh gives the following example of a masculine noun to which a feminine *ṣifah* applies, *rijālun xamsatun* “five men”, adding that *xamsatun ismun mu’annaṭun wuṣifa bi-hi l-muḍakkaru* (“*xamsah* is a feminine substantive by which the masculine has been described”; *K. II*, 212.10–11). This is exactly what he alludes to briefly earlier in *K. I*, 285.14–15, when commenting on the following poetic line:

*Naḥnu banū ‘ummi l-banīna l-‘arba’atu*

We are the four boys of the mother of the boys. (*K. I*, 285.13)

In this hemistich, “four” is used in an adjectival slot, or in Sibawayh’s words, *ja‘ala l-‘arba’ata waṣṣan* (“he made ‘four’ a description”; *K. I*, 285.14–15).

In the same manner, al-Mubarrad comments on the expression *hā’ulā’i niswatun ‘arba’un* “these are four women” (*M. III*, 341.4) where the numeral occupies a slot usually preferred for *ṣifāt* “adjectives”. Al-Mubarrad says that in this slot *‘arba’* is not diptotic although it is in an adjectival slot and it has an *‘aḥḥal* pattern, and this because it keeps its numerical value (as opposed to an adjectival value). When in the position of qualifier, *‘arba’* stands for the passive participle *ma’dūdāt* and is not diptotic. This shows that its position of qualifier does not make it a qualifier, otherwise it would be diptotic. The same interpretation is made by al-Mubarrad in the expression *jawārī-ka ‘arba’un* “your female slaves are four” where there is a “underlying verbal value in the qualification” *taqdīr al-fi’l fi n-na’t* (*M. III*, 342.6).

Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on the expression *‘axaḍa Banū Fulānin min Banī Fulānin ‘iblan mi’atan* “the So-and-so took a hundred camels from the So-and-so” (*‘U. II*, 27.19–20). This quotation is found in a section devoted to “adjectives that are not proper adjectives” *aṣ-ṣifāt allatī laysat bi-ṣifāt maḥḍah* (*‘U. II*, 27–31). Sibawayh also comments this expression in *K. I*, 197.16.<sup>5</sup>

Another adjectival slot where numerals are commonly found is the *xabar*. It is dealt with above p. 99.

<sup>5</sup>Only manuscript A explicitly reads that *mi’ah* has been made a *ṣifah*.

### 5.2.3 Numerals in slots preferred for *maṣādir*

The major discussions about numerals used in slots preferred for *maṣādir* deal with expressions of the type *maratu bi-hi waḥda-hu* “I passed by him alone” and *bi-him ṭalātata-hum* “by the three of them”, see above p. 141.

Another case is found in the commentary of al-Mubarrad on the expressions *ḍarabtu Zaydan mi'ata sawṭin* “I gave Zayd a hundred lashes” (M. IV, 51.9) or *ḍuriba bi-Zaydin 'iṣrūna sawṭan* “because of Zayd, he was given twenty lashes”<sup>6</sup> (M. IV, 51.15). In these cases, he says that numerals occupy the “slot of the *maṣdar*” (understand: *maḥ'ul muṭlaq*).<sup>7</sup> Numerals here express ‘*adad al-maṣdar*’ “number of the *maṣdar*”, and they occupy a slot called *nā'ib al-maḥ'ul al-muṭlaq* by the later grammatical tradition.<sup>8</sup> In the second expression, ‘*iṣrūna*’ is in the independent form because this slot is left empty by the passive construction of the verb.

The only case where Ibn as-Sarrāj discusses this point is in the expression *ḍuriba min 'ajli Zaydin 'iṣrūna sawṭan* “because of Zayd, he was beaten twenty lashes” (‘U. I, 79.12) where ‘*iṣrūna sawṭan*’ occupies the empty slot of the formal agent of the passive verb, whereas its natural slot here would have been to be *nā'ib al-maḥ'ul al-muṭlaq*, expressing its quantity.

## 5.3 The special case of ‘*aḥad*’

As was made clear above, “one” needs a special treatment. Let us sum up what has been said already about it. Its root is *whd* (see above p. 103); its cardinal meaning is expressed by the *fā'il* pattern which usually expresses ordinals (see p. 104) and, unlike other cardinals, it is an adjective (see p. 153); its ordinal meaning is expressed by ‘*awwal*’ (fem. ‘*ūlá*’) whose pattern differs completely from other ordinals (see p. 102); its root is modified into ‘*hd*’ in the word ‘*aḥad*’ (fem. ‘*iḥdá*’) which is used as its construct form (*muḍāf*) and in conjoined numerals (see pp. 109, 129 and 121); the word *waḥd-* (no feminine form) is always annexed to a pronoun and occupies the slot of a *maṣdar* (see p. 141). As mentioned above p. 87, the only occurrence of ‘*aḥad*’ in its numerical value of “one” where it is not annexed nor conjoined with a numeral is Q. 112.1 ﴿*Qul huwa l-Lāhu 'aḥadun*﴾.

<sup>6</sup>Al-Mubarrad paraphrases the expression by adding *al-ma'ná bi-sababi Zaydin* “the meaning is: because of Zayd”.

<sup>7</sup>See above footnote 14, p. 83, for more details.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, I, 143).



Finally, the word 'aḥad (no feminine form) is used in negative sentences and means “nobody”.<sup>9</sup> All three grammarians insist that it cannot receive a predicate in affirmative sentences in the meaning of “somebody”. We will quickly present here the discussion about the negative 'aḥad, which seems to belong to the substantives, just like the numerical 'aḥad.

### 'Aḥad in a negative context

In chapter 18 (K. I, 20.10–21.19), Sibawayh explains that in some cases it is possible to predicate an indefinite noun of another indefinite noun, as is the case with the word 'aḥad in the expression *laysa*<sup>10</sup> 'aḥadun xayran min-ka “nobody is better than you” (K. I, 20.10–1). Otherwise, it would bring no new information to do so, as in \**kāna rajulun dāhiban* “a man was leaving” (K. I, 20.13).

In a negative context, 'aḥad is a general negation (*nafyun* 'āmmun), as in the expression *mā 'atā-ka 'aḥadun* “nobody came to me” (K. I, 20.21). Sibawayh says that it negates all possible alternatives (“a woman came to me”, “a strong man came to me”, “two people came to me”, and so on), hence its designation of “general negation”, and the fact that it does not have a feminine form.

Since 'aḥad negates all other possibilities, Sibawayh says that it is possible to predicate an indefinite (*xayran min-ka*) of another indefinite ('aḥadun) as in *laysa 'aḥadun xayran min-ka*, because the listener does not need additional information to understand the utterance, unlike in \**kāna rajulun dāhiban*, where no new information is provided for the listener.

In a chapter devoted to verbs that operate on an object (M. III, 91–92), al-Mubarrad says that it is not possible to comment on “'aḥad and its sisters” (*wa-lā yuxbaru 'an 'aḥadin wa-'axawāti-hi*; M. III, 92.7). This assertion comes at the very end of this short chapter. Among other words—or categories of words—that al-Mubarrad says cannot receive a predicate are the *ḥāl*, the *naʿt*, the *tamyīz*, adverbs (*ḍurūf*) that are not used as nouns, verbs, particles (*al-ḥurūf allatī taqaʿu li-maʿānin*), *kayfa*, 'ayna, and other interrogative words (M. III, 91.16–92.6).

Curiously, nowhere else in the *Muqtaḍab* does al-Mubarrad talk about “the sisters of 'aḥad”.<sup>11</sup> In a footnote Uḍaymah mentions a passage in al-

<sup>9</sup>In Post-Classical and Neo-Arabic, *wāḥid* can be found instead of 'aḥad in negative sentences, as in *lam yaḍkur-hu wāḥidun min-hum* “neither of the two mentioned it” (Blau 2002, 48, §99).

<sup>10</sup>*Mā kāna* instead of *laysa* in mss. B, C, and H.

<sup>11</sup>Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1478–1483) mentions as many as twenty-one words used in negative contexts to denote totality.

ʿAstarābādī's (d. 686/1287) *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah* where the following can be read: *wa-ka-dā kullu smin yalzimu-hu n-nafyu naḥwa lā ʾaḥada wa-lā ʾarība wa-lā katīʿa* ("and the same goes for all the nouns that are inseparable from the negative, like *lā ʾaḥada*, *lā ʾarība*, and *lā katīʿa*"; *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah* (2000), III, 271.4).<sup>12</sup> The three expressions mentioned mean "nobody". However, *katīʿ* is not found in the *Muqtaḍab* and *ʾarīb* is found only once, in a poetic line (*M. III*, 98.14), and al-Mubarrad does not comment on *katīʿ* in it.

*M. IV*, 86–97 deals with verbs like *kāna*, *šāra* and *ʾašbaḥa*, where the topic and the predicate refer to the same thing.<sup>13</sup> With these verbs, it is possible to predicate of an indefinite noun as in *mā kāna ʾaḥadun miṭla-ka* "nobody was like you" or *mā kāna ʾaḥadun mujtariʿan ʾalay-ka* "nobody was bold with you" (*M. IV*, 90.4).

The origin of these sentences is a nominal sentence made up of a *mubtadaʾ* and a *xabar* (*M. IV*, 86.15). However in the case of *ʾaḥad* it is not possible to suppress the verb and go back to the incorrect \**ʾaḥadun miṭlu-ka*, i.e., it is not possible to comment the indefinite *ʾaḥadun* by a *xabar* and this is why *mā kāna ʾaḥadun miṭla-ka* is a special case. The explanation given by al-Mubarrad for this special case is that here the indefinite *ʾaḥadun* refers to the definite *an-nāsu* ("the people"; *M. IV*, 90.6) in the negative.

In a section devoted to the addition of the interrogative *hamzah* before *laysa* (*ʿU. I*, 90–91), Ibn as-Sarrāj expresses the rule that stipulates that *wa-ʾaḥadun lā yustaʿmalu fī l-wājibi* ("and *ʾaḥad* is not used in the affirmative"; *ʿU. I*, 90.6).

Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with this negative *ʾaḥad* in the two following issues: The expression of the type *mā ʾaḥadun fī d-dāri* "there is no one in the house" (*ʿU. I*, 59.11; 66.18) is one of the few cases where it is possible to have an indefinite noun in the position of *ibtidāʾ*; and expressions of the type *mā kāna ʾaḥadun miṭla-ka* "no one was like you" or *laysa ʾaḥadun xayran min-ka* "no one is better than you" (*ʿU. I*, 84.2) where it is exceptionally possible to comment on an indefinite noun by another indefinite noun.

In both issues, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that the expressions are correct although they break general rules, and this, because they convey a "useful meaning" (*fāʾidah*; *ʿU. I*, 59.10; 66.18; 84.2).

Lastly, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that it is also possible to use *ʾaḥad* after *kullu*, as in the following affirmative utterance: *yaʿlamu ḥadā kullu ʾaḥadin* "everybody

<sup>12</sup>Page II, 46.12–13, in the edition dated 1858.

<sup>13</sup>Curiously, the chapter in *M. III*, 97–101 has the same title as the chapter in *M. IV*, 86–97 and deals with closely related issues.

knows this” (ʿU. I, 84.11–12). This case is the only one mentioned in the *ʿUṣūl* where *ʾaḥad* means “someone” in an affirmative context, and there is no similar example in the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab*.

Interestingly, al-Mubarrad is reported to have taught in his *Radd ʿalā Sībawayh* that in an affirmative context *ʾaḥad* can mean “someone” when it could be replaced by a plural, as in the following examples, which correspond exactly to Ibn as-Sarrāj’s example *yaʿlamu hādā kullu ʾaḥadin: jāʾa-nī l-yawma kullu ʾaḥadin* “everybody has come to me today” (*Radd*, 11.9) and *ʾawwalu ʾaḥadin laqītu Zaydan* “the first person I met is Zayd” (*Radd*, 11.9–10).

However in the *Muqtaḍab*, he explains that in its non-numerical meaning of “someone”, *ʾaḥad* cannot be predicated of (i.e., it cannot be commented by a *xabar*, in the affirmative) which falsifies his two examples in his *Radd*.

## 5.4 Conclusion

Just as for the morphosyntactic issues, our authors do not comment systematically on all syntactic problems posed by numerals. It is only through extrapolation that one can infer that, except for “one” and “two”, cardinals are “numerical substantives” (*ʾasmāʾ al-ʿadad*), a sub-category of the part-of-speech called *ʾasmāʾ* “nouns”. Just like other substantives, they can potentially occupy all the slots preferred for the other sub-categories of “nouns” (*ṣifāt*, *maṣādir*, *ʾaʿlām*, and so on). In all this, numerals follow the rules that are valid for other nouns, according to their specific morphosyntactic characteristics.

It is not clear whether our authors consider that ordinals belong to the subcategory of *ʾasmāʾ al-ʿadad* or to the subcategory of *ʾasmāʾ al-fāʿil*. The same goes for “one” and “two”. It is not clear whether they consider that they belong to *ʾasmāʾ al-ʿadad* or to *ṣifāt* “adjectives”. Their approach is not as systematic as ours, and they content themselves with the broad part-of-speech of “nouns”, to which all numerals belong. Any attempt to systematise this view takes the risk to go beyond their own views.

Finally, at the end of this enquiry we reach the core of what has kept our grammarians occupied, as far as numerals are concerned, namely, the expression of the counted object along with the cardinal expressing its quantity. In the following pages, we will only mention the issues at stake, in order to be able to understand where our authors stand and how they tackle these issues within the larger frame of their grammatical theory.



## Chapter 6

# The expression of the counted object

For “one” and “two”, al-Mubarrad is the only one to note that the noun itself expresses both the number (*‘adad*) and the species (*naw‘*), as in *rajulun* “[one] man” and *rajulāni* “two men”. In these cases, number and counted object are expressed together by one single word (*M. II*, 155.10–13). For all other quantities, the numeral has to be expressed overtly with the counted object.<sup>1</sup> It is however possible to say *waladun wāḥidun* “one boy” and *waladāni ṭnāni* “two boys”, in an appositional construction.

Arabic knows two basic syntactic constructions between two substantives, namely annexation (*‘idāfah*, which can express various meanings presented above p. 128) and the appositional construction (*tābi‘*). Between two substantives, the appositional construction expresses “substitution” (*badal*) or “emphasis” (*tawkid*), and between a substantive and an adjective it expresses “qualification” (*na‘t*).<sup>2</sup>

The actual shape displayed by the counted objects after non-annexable numerals does not correspond to an annexational nor to an appositional

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1425–1426).

<sup>2</sup>This account of *badal*, *tawkid* and *na‘t* as possible sub-cases of the same construction is dependent on Ibn as-Sarrāj (*‘U. II*, 19–79). We will adopt it here for its clarity. He adds a fourth possible case, namely *‘atfal-bayān* “explicative apposition” which is not used by our grammarians to describe the link between numerals and their counted object. See Talmon (1982, 30) for an account of the difference between *tawkid* and *‘atfal-bayān*, which are one and the same category in the *Kitāb*.

construction but to a verbal complement in the singular indefinite. The reason why we will call this construction the specifying construction will appear below.

In addition to these three constructions (annexational, appositional, and specifying), it is also possible to express the relationship between numerals and their counted object by a predicative construction, as in *al-ʿawlādu xamsatun* “the boys are five”, where the numeral is the predicate (*xabar*). The preferred category for the predicate is adjectival but it is very common to find substantives in this slot, as in *al-waladu ṭālibun* “the boy is a student”.

## 6.1 The appositional construction

It seems that all numerals can be in an appositional construction with their counted object.<sup>3</sup> This construction is natural for *wāḥid* and *iṭnāni* because they are adjectives (*ṣifāt*). As for other numerals, they are treated as *ṣifāt* in this slot, unless they are regarded as *badal* or *tawkīd*. For example, Sibawayh interprets *xamsah* in *rijālun xamsatun* “five men” as being treated like an adjective (*K. II*, 212.10–11), just like al-Mubarrad interprets *ʿarbaʿ* in *niswatun ʿarbaʿun* “four women” (*M. III*, 341.4). It is also the frame in which Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj interpret *ʿiblan miʿatan* mentioned above p. 157.

Since numerals are primarily substantives, the appositional construction involving numerals and their counted object can also express *badal* and *tawkīd*. For example, it seems that Sibawayh believes that *mustawayātīn xamsin* “five levels” expresses *badal* (*K. I*, 183.2). See above, p. 92.

As for ordinal numerals, our authors remain silent about their syntax and their category. One can only suppose that whatever their original category (*ʿasmāʾ al-fāʿil* or *ʿasmāʾ al-ʿadad*), they can be in an appositional construction with their counted objects, as in *al-bābu l-xāmisu* “the fifth chapter”. This is also true of cardinals used in an ordinal meaning, as in *al-bābu l-ʿišrūna* “the twentieth chapter”. As for the syntactic meaning of this construction, one could consider it to be *naʿt* “qualification”, *badal* “substitution” or *tawkīd* “emphasis”. Finally, it could also be the case that semantically the counted object is the agent of the *ism al-fāʿil*, as in *al-bābu l-xāmisu* understood as *al-bābu llaḏī xamasa l-ʿabwāba*, but this is clearly extrapolation since our authors are silent on this issue.

---

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 255; §321).

Whatever the meaning of this appositional construction (*naʿt*, *badal*, or *tawkid*), the syntactic consequences are the same. The numeral and the counted object agree in case and in definiteness. For example, Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on *ʿindī [...] ʿaṭwābun xamsatun* “I have [...] five garments” (ʿU. I, 308.21–22) saying that the numeral has the meaning of *badal*. In the end, it is probably up to the speaker to tell what meaning he intends (Anghelescu 1975, 11).

## 6.2 The predicative construction

The predicative construction involves a substantive and an adjective, as in *al-waladu ḡakiyyun* “the boy is smart”. By extension, it can also involve two substantives, as in *al-waladu ṭālibun* “the boy is a student”. This construction can be embedded in larger constructions, such as *ʿinna*, *ʿanna* or *kāna* sentences, or be itself in an adjectival slot.

In the *Kitāb* there are a few commented cases where the syntactic relation between the cardinal numeral and the counted object is a predicative construction, as in *marartu bi-ṭawbin sabʿun ṭūlu-hu* “I passed by a garment whose length is seven” and *marartu bi-rajulin miʿatun ʿiblu-hu* “I passed by a man whose camels are a hundred” (K. I, 197.14–15). In these cases, the numeral is treated as a *ṣifāh* in the slot of *mabnī ʿalā l-mubtadaʾ* in the embedded nominal sentences *sabʿun ṭūlu-hu* and *miʿatun ʿiblu-hu*—which are themselves in the slot of *naʿt*—and the counted object is the *mubtadaʾ* of the same embedded nominal sentences.

The predicative construction can be found in a nominal sentence that is not embedded, as in *jawārī-ka ʿarbaʿun* “your maids are four” (M. III, 342.6), but this is the only explicit example found in our texts. Otherwise, our authors use such expressions in their metalanguage, as *al-maʿnā wāḥidun* “the meaning is the same” (K. I, 7.1); *ḡurūbu l-ʿafʿālī ʿarbaʿatun* “the types of verbs are four” (K. II, 239.16); *wa-ḡurūfu l-ḡalqī sittatun* “and the guttural consonants are six” (M. II, 140.9); *ʿadawātu l-qasami wa-l-muqṣami bi-hi xamsun* “the [syntactic] tools [expressing] the oath and that by which it is sworn are five” (ʿU. I, 430.2).

Occurrences of embedded nominal sentences include the following: *li-ʿanna l-maʿnā wāḥidun* “because the meaning is the same” (K. I, 57.7); *lā taṣīru ʿiddata l-ḡurūfī ʿarbaʿatan* “the number of the consonants does not become four” (K. II, 351.17); *qad ʿalima ʿanna-hum xamsatun* “he knew indeed that they were five” (M. III, 239.13); *li-ʿanna ʿaqalla l-ʿuṣūlī ṭalātātun* “because the least roots are three [consonants]” (ʿU. I, 365.7). None of these expressions is commented on.

In all these cases, the cardinal numeral would probably be treated as a *ṣifāh*, as is explicitly the case in the examples that are commented on.

As for ordinal numerals, none of our authors comments on their use in a predicative construction, yet, a few occurrences can be found in their treatises: *hiya fī l-ʿašli tāliḡatun* “in origin, it comes third” (K. II, 141.21); *wa-n-nūnu tāliḡatun sākinatun* “and the *nūn* comes third and silent” (K. II, 387.22); *fa-ʿin kānat al-ʿalifu xāmisatan maqṣūratan* “and if the *ʿalif* comes fifth and *maqṣūrah*” (M. III, 148.5); *li-ʿanna l-hāʿa lā takūnu ʿillā rābiʿatan* “because the *hāʿ* always comes fourth” (ʿU. II, 84.21). In these phrases, ordinal numerals are in a predicative construction with their counted object, they are treated like *ṣifāt* in the slot of *xabar*.

### 6.3 The annexational construction

The annexational construction (*ʿidāfah* construction) has been dealt with in detail above pp. 128ff., its possible meanings as well as the morphosyntactic limitations of some numerals, which prevent their annexation in some cases, especially if this construction expresses the counted object.

In a nutshell, only the following numerals can be annexed to their counted object: cardinals between “three” and “ten”, ordinals between “third” and “tenth”, “one hundred”, and “one thousand”.

### 6.4 The specifying construction

After compound numerals and decades, the counted object surfaces in the singular indefinite dependent form, as in *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* “twenty dirhams” and *xamsa-ʿaṣ(i)rata jāriyatan* “fifteen maids”.<sup>4</sup> Sibawayh does not name this construction, he simply describes it (Carter 1972b, 485 calls this construction *tanwīn-naṣb*). Al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj do not use a single term to name it, but they seem to use the words *tabyīn* “explanation”, *tamyīz* “specification” and *tafsīr* “commentary” indifferently, while the word *tamyīz* seems to have prevailed in later tradition.

In some cases, annexable numerals are also found in a specifying construction with their counted object: Sibawayh mentions the expression *ʿalay-hi*

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 510–514; §106*n*–*u*) and Howell (1883/2003, I, 286).



*mi'atun baydan*<sup>5</sup> “he owes a hundred helmets” (K. I, 262.3); he also says that under poetic license it is possible to say *talāṭatun 'aṭwāban* “three [in terms] of clothes” (K. I, 253.3), as in the poetic line *'idā 'āša l-fatā mi'atayni āman* “if the boy lived two hundred years” which is commented on by all three authors (K. I, 87.8; 253.4; M. II, 169.1; 'U. I, 312.14). Al-Mubarrad repeats the same opinion as Sibawayh about this poetic license (M. II, 168.13–169.3); he also discusses the case of Q. 18, 25 mentioned above p. 87. Ibn as-Sarrāj disapproves of the expression *'indī xamsatun 'aṭwāban* “I have five [in terms of] dresses”, which he attributes to al-Farrā' ('U. I, 324.5); he also quotes Bagdadian grammarians who say that both *'indī xamsatun waznan* and *'indī xamsatun waznun* “I have five measures” are valid possibilities ('U. I, 326.1–2).

## 6.5 Summary

There are thus four possible constructions between numerals and their counted objects, appositional, annexational, predicative, and specifying. Both cardinals and ordinals can be found in these constructions, except for the last type where only cardinals are found. As for ordinals above “tenth”, the only possible construction is the appositional one. The reason for this is that compound ordinals are not flexible, and there is no separate forms for the decade ordinals. The following table summarises the different possibilities to express numerals and their counted objects.

It appears from this table that the annexational and specifying constructions are in a complementary distribution for cardinals between “three” and “one thousand”.

	Cardinals	Ordinals
Appositional (definite)	<i>al-waladu l-wāḥidu</i> <i>al-'awlādu ṭ-ṭalāṭatu</i> (p. 174) <i>al-'awlādu ṭ-ṭalāṭata-'ašara</i> (p. 134) <i>al-'awlādu l-'iṣrūna</i> (p. 134) <i>al-'awlādu l-mi'atu</i> (p. 134) <i>al-'awlādu ṭalāṭu l-mi'ati</i> (p. 182) <i>al-'awlādu l-'alfu</i> (p. 134)	<i>al-waladu l-'awwalu</i> <i>al-waladu ṭ-ṭālīṭu</i> <i>al-waladu ṭ-ṭālīṭa-'ašara</i> <i>al-waladu l-'iṣrūna</i> (p. 145) <i>al-waladu l-mi'atu</i> (p. 145) <i>al-waladu ṭālīṭu l-mi'ati</i> (p. 183) <i>al-waladu l-'alfu</i> (p. 145)
Appositional (indef., p. 164)	<i>waladun wāḥidun</i> (p. 163) <i>'awlādun ṭalāṭatun</i> <i>'awlādun ṭalāṭata-'ašara</i> <i>'awlādun 'iṣrūna</i> <i>'awlādun mi'atun</i>	<i>waladun 'awwalu</i> <i>waladun ṭālīṭun</i> <i>waladun ṭālīṭa-'ašara</i> <i>waladun 'iṣrūna</i> (p. 145) <i>waladun mi'atun</i> (p. 145)

<sup>5</sup>See above footnote 32, p. 95, for the vocalisation of *baydan*.

	<i>ʿawlādun ṭalātu miʿatin</i> (p. 182) <i>ʿawlādun ʿalfun</i>	<i>waladun ṭālīṭu miʿatin</i> (p. 183) <i>waladun ʿalfun</i> (p. 145)
Annexational (definite)	(p. 129) <i>ṭalāṭatu l-ʿawlādi</i> (p. 130) (p. 130) (p. 131) <i>miʿatu l-waladi</i> (p. 174) <i>ṭalātu miʿati l-waladi</i> (p. 182) <i>ʿalfu l-waladi</i> (p. 174)	( <i>ʿawwalu l-ʿawlādi</i> , p. 198) <i>ṭālīṭu l-waladi</i> (p. 132)  <i>ṭālīṭu miʿati l-waladi</i> (p. 183)
Annexational (indefinite)	<i>ṭalāṭatu ʿawlādin</i> (p. 130)  <i>miʿatu waladin</i> (p. 132) <i>ṭalātu miʿati waladin</i> (p. 182) <i>ʿalfu waladin</i> (p. 132)	<i>ʿawwalu waladin</i> (p. 198) <i>ṭālīṭu waladin</i> (p. 132) ( <i>ṭālīṭu ṭalāṭata-ʿašara</i> , p. 133)  <i>ṭālīṭu miʿati waladin</i> (p. 183)
Specifying (definite)	<i>aṭ-ṭalāṭata-ʿašara waladan</i> (p. 174) <i>al-ʿiṣrūna waladan</i> (p. 174)	
Specifying (indefinite, p. 166)	<i>ṭalāṭata-ʿašara waladan</i> <i>ʿiṣrūna waladan</i>	
Predicative (p. 165)	<i>al-waladu wāḥidun</i> <i>al-ʿawlādu ṭalāṭatun</i> <i>al-ʿawlādu ṭalāṭata-ʿašara</i> <i>al-ʿawlādu ʿiṣrūna</i> <i>al-ʿawlādu miʿatun</i> <i>al-ʿawlādu ṭalātu miʿatin</i> (p. 182) <i>al-ʿawlādu ʿalfun</i>	<i>al-waladu ʿawwalu</i> <i>al-waladu ṭālīṭun</i> <i>al-waladu ṭālīṭa-ʿašara</i> <i>al-waladu ʿiṣrūna</i> <i>al-waladu miʿatun</i> <i>al-waladu ṭālīṭu miʿatin</i> (p. 183) <i>al-waladu ʿalfun</i>

Table 6.1: *Expression of the counted object*

In the next part of this study, we will consider in more detail the opinion of Sibawayh (chapter 8), al-Mubarrad (chapter 9), and Ibn as-Sarrāj (chapter

10) about the expression of the counted object in a specifying construction with numerals, which they interpret in very different theoretical frames.

But before that, there are a few other issues linked with the expression of the counted object that should be mentioned: gender issues, expression of definiteness, expression of the counted object by an adjective, a collective noun, a pronoun, the number of the counted object, the different plural forms of the counted object, “one hundred” and “one thousand” as counted object themselves.

## 6.6 Issues related to the counted object

### 6.6.1 Gender agreement and disagreement

All numerals between “one” and “nineteen”, both cardinals and ordinals, have a masculine and a feminine form, or, rather, a form that applies to feminine counted objects and a form that applies to masculine counted objects.<sup>6</sup> See above, p. 96, the issue of the gender of numerals. The case of compound cardinals, which was presented above p. 120, is interesting because of the gender discrepancy between their two parts.

To put it in a nutshell, cardinals from “three” to “ten” and from “thirteen” to “nineteen” disagree in gender with their counted object, whereas “one”, “two”, “eleven” and “twelve” agree in gender.<sup>7</sup> This intriguing though very well known phenomenon has received little attention from our three authors, who simply describe it without comment (*K.* II, 176.13–177.19; *M.* II, 157.8–16; 163.1–15; *ʾU.* II, 424.10–11; 425.1–3). In the same manner, our authors do not mention the fact that it applies to all the possible constructions between the numeral and the counted object: appositional (*al-ʾawlādu t-talāṭatu*), predicative (*al-ʾawlādu talāṭatun*), annexational (*talāṭatu ʾawlādin*), and specifying (*talāṭata-ʿašara waladan*).

The case of “one”, “two”, “eleven” and “twelve” is also intriguing. This phenomenon probably finds an explanation in the fact that “one” and “two” are adjectives, not substantives, and that this must have some influence on “eleven” and “twelve”.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Wright (1967, I, 254; §319) and Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1426–1434).

<sup>7</sup>These rules are not always followed in Post-Classical and Neo-Arabic (Blau 2002, 48, §98).

As for ordinals, their *fā'il* pattern is clearly gender marked, hence their agreement with their counted objects in all types of constructions. These issues are not discussed either by our authors.

Sibawayh does not explicitly say that decades, *mi'ah*, and *'alf* apply both to masculine and feminine counted objects but his own use shows that he would agree on this. Unlike Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad explicitly notes it (*M.* II, 165.13; 168.10–12; 170.8). He explains it by saying that they belong to the greater numerals. Although they also belong to the greater numerals, compound numerals do have different forms for the masculine and the feminine. Al-Mubarrad justifies this by saying that they are the compound of two lesser numerals (see above p. 120). Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with numerals that have a different form in the masculine and the feminine in *'U.* II, 424–425. Just like Sibawayh, he remains silent on those that have the same form in both genders.

### 6.6.2 Elements of different genders counted together

As far as the syntax of numerals is concerned, there are two types of gender conflicts that can happen. The first type<sup>8</sup> happens when masculine and feminine nouns are counted together as in “three men and women” and the second type<sup>9</sup> happens when the grammatical gender of the counted object differs from its biological sex as in French “trois tortues mâles”, because “tortue” is feminine, but “tortues mâles” are males.

We have already mentioned above p. 132 the fact that all three authors choose the chapter devoted to expressions of the type *xāmisu xamsatin* and *xāmisu 'arba'atin* to mention and illustrate the rule that stipulates that masculine supersedes feminine in case of elements of different genders counted together.

Sibawayh quotes the expressions *xamsa-‘aš(i)rata min bayni yawmin wa-laylatin* “fifteen [masc.] days [masc.] and nights [fem.]” or *xamsata-‘ašara min bayni ‘abdin wa-jāriyat* “fifteen [fem.] slaves [masc.] and maids [fem.]”. In the first case, he says that *laylah* has superseded *yawm* because if one talks of “fifteen nights” it is understood that they include the “days” (*K.* II, 180.4–6).<sup>10</sup> He concedes that one could also have put the numeral in the feminine *xamsata-‘ašara* (*K.* II, 180.14). In the second case,

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1435–1436).

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1437–1439; 1466–1471).

<sup>10</sup>Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1466–1467) reports that there are two exceptions where the feminine supersedes the masculine. The first one is the dual *ḍabu'āni* “two hyenas [a male and a female]”, which is built on the feminine singular *ḍabu'un* instead of the masculine *ḍib'anun*, in order to

there is no other option because if one of the two terms *‘abd* or *jāriyah* is not mentioned, the meaning changes (K. II, 180.11–14), and since we already know that the masculine generally supersedes the feminine (K. II, 178.22–23), it is understood from the text here that the numeral has to agree with the masculine (i.e., be put in the feminine) for this reason.

Apparently, al-Mubarrad does not deal with this issue except in the expressions *xāmisu xamsatin* and *xāmisu ‘arba‘atin* mentioned above (M. II, 182.3).

Ibn as-Sarrāj briefly mentions this issue in a section that is so dependent on the *Kitāb* that it is difficult not to read it with Sibawayh’s teaching in mind. He quotes the same examples as Sibawayh, *xamsa-‘aš(i)rata min bayna yawmin wa-laylatin* and *xamsata-‘ašara min bayna ‘abdin wa-jāriyatīn*, and gives the same commentary (ʿU. II, 428.15–429.4).

### 6.6.3 Grammatical gender vs. biological sex

Sibawayh deals with the conflict between gender and sex in the counted objects in chapter 414 (K. II, 179.4–181.7). The general rule that can be inferred from his examples is that grammatical gender supersedes biological sex, as in *ṭalāṭu šiyāhin dukūrun*<sup>11</sup> “three [masc.] male [masc.] sheep [fem.]”, *ṭalāṭun min al-baṭṭi* “three [masc.] ducks [masc.]” or *ṭalāṭu ‘a‘yunin* “three [masc.] [male] notables [fem.]” because *šā’*, *baṭṭah* and *‘ayn* (K. II, 179.6; 14; 17) are feminine in the singular, even if they refer to males like *‘ayn*. In the same way, for words whose singular is masculine, the numeral is put in the feminine as in: *ṭalāṭatu ‘ašxušin* “three [fem.] persons [masc.]” (K. II, 179.17) even if *šaḫs* refers to a female.

Sibawayh does not mention here the masculine nouns ending with a *tā’ marbūṭah* like *xalīfah* “caliph”. It must have been obvious to him that the presence of the *tā’ marbūṭah* does not affect the gender of the numeral used to count them, so that we can probably say *ṭalāṭatu xulafā’a* “three [fem.] caliphs [masc.]”

A problem arises for words whose gender is not fixed, as is the case for *naḥs* “soul [fem.]”, which is treated as a masculine if it means “man [masc.]” (K. II, 179.18–19), or *faras* “horse [fem.]”, which is more commonly used as

---

avoid the form *ḏib‘ānāni*. The second case is the expression of days and nights, because, he says, Arabs date by nights, which are feminine, not by days.

<sup>11</sup>Derenbourg vocalises *dukūr* in the independent form, interpreting it as a *badal* of *ṭalātu*, but it could as well be vocalised in the oblique form as a *badal* of *šiyāhin*. Sibawayh gives no clue on this issue.

a feminine, referring to both a stallion and a mare (K. II, 180.1–2). In these issues, Sibawayh mentions actual use and says which one is more common.

The teaching of al-Mubarrad is slightly different. These gender issues are solved by separating the words in conflict as in *‘indī ṭalātun min al-ḡanami dukūr*<sup>12</sup> *wa-ṭalātun min aš-šā’i dukūr* “I have three [masc.] [heads] of male [masc.] livestock [fem.] and three [masc.] male [masc.] sheep [fem.]” (M. II, 186.7). Another way of expressing the same idea is *‘indī ṭalātatu dukūrin min aš-šā’i wa-ṭalātatu dukūrin min al-’ibli* (M. II, 186.9). The point made by al-Mubarrad here is that the gender conflict is solved by the agreement of the numeral to the closest word.

Except for these differences, al-Mubarrad’s interpretation of these conflicts is similar to that of Sibawayh. Although some words are feminine *‘alā l-lafḍ* “on the surface level”,<sup>13</sup> like *nafs* “soul” (and the evidence for this is that its diminutive is feminine: *nufaysah*; M. II, 187.2), they can refer to males, as in *ṭalātatu ’anfusin* “three [fem.] souls” and *ṭalātu ’anfusin* “three [masc.] souls” (M. II, 186.12) which are both correct. Al-Mubarrad quotes here four passages from the Qur’ān where *nafs* is used in the feminine, as if the question was disputed among grammarians and needed stronger evidence.

As for Ibn as-Sarrāj, his teaching is similar to that of Sibawayh. The grammatical gender always prevails on the biological sex in case of a conflict as in *ṭalātu šiyāhin dukūrun* “three [masc.] male [masc.] sheep [fem.]”, *ṭalātatu ašxāšin* “three [fem.] persons [masc.]” even if women are intended, *ṭalātu ’afrāsin* “three [masc.] horses [fem.]” even for stallions (ʿU. II, 428.2–429.4).

#### 6.6.4 Adjectives as counted objects

Sibawayh says that it is “ugly” (*qabīḥ*) to annex numerals to adjectives<sup>14</sup> and say *ṭalātatu nassābātin* “three genealogists” or *ṭalātatu dawābba*<sup>15</sup> “three riding animals”. It would thus be better to say *ṭalātatu rijālin nassābātin* “three genealogist men” (K. II, 179.21). As for *ṭalātatu dawābba* he contents himself with actual use (K. II, 179.21–23).

<sup>12</sup>Just like in the *Kitāb*, the syntactic position of *dukūr* is not stated by al-Mubarrad. See the preceding footnote.

<sup>13</sup>Al-Mubarrad apparently uses the expressions *‘alā l-lafḍ* (20 occurrences) and *fi l-lafḍ* (25 occurrences) in the same meaning, “on the surface level”. He also uses the expression *li-l-lafḍ* three times, meaning “because of the surface level” (M. III, 33.8; 348.11; IV, 396.6).

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1454).

<sup>15</sup>*Dābbah*, plural *dawābb*. The plural is diptotic, hence its final *fathah* in the position of an indefinite *muḍāf* ‘ilayh.

Later in chapter 415 he also mentions relative adjectives (like *quraṣiyyun* “Qurayshite”) and participles (like *muslim* “Muslim” and *ṣāliḥ* “virtuous”) to which numerals should not be annexed. One should rather say *hā’ulā’i ṭalāṭatun quraṣiyyūna wa-ṭalāṭatun muslimūna wa-ṭalāṭatun ṣāliḥūna* “these are three Qurayshites, three Muslims and three virtuous [men]” (K. II, 181.8–10). The reason given by Sibawayh is that it is “disliked” (*karāhiyah*) to treat adjectives like nouns (K. II, 181.10). This is interesting, since the opposite is not true and it is possible to treat a noun like an adjective, probably because nouns have more “strength” than adjectives.

Al-Mubarrad also says that it is “ugly” to annex a numeral to an adjective. Instead, he recommends to say *ṭalāṭatu rijālin quraṣiyyūna wa-ṭalāṭatu rijālin kirāmin* (“three qurayshite men and three generous men”; M. II, 185.6–7). This impossibility is lifted if this qualifier “resembles the noun and comes at its place” (*muḍāri’un li-l-ismi wāqi’un mawqi’a-hu*; M. II, 185.5), as in *jā’a-nī ṭalāṭatu ’amṭāli-ka wa-’arba’atu ’aṣbāhi Zaydin* (“three like you came to me and four resembling Zayd”; M. II, 185.7–8) or in Qur’anic *fa-la-hu ’aṣru ’amṭāli-hā*.<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, al-Mubarrad does not mention the solution which consists in saying *ṭalāṭatun quraṣiyyūna* and *ṭalāṭatun kirāmun*. If it is not correct to use adjectives in substantival slots then in *ṭalāṭatu rijālin quraṣiyyūna*, the adjective cannot be in the slot of *badal* but of *na’t*.

What are these qualifiers that “resemble a noun” is not clear and only two of them are quoted here: *’amṭāl* and *’aṣbāh* (M. II, 185.7–8). The expression “qualifiers that resemble a noun” probably refers to the semantic use of these words since no information is found in the *Muqtaḍab* about such a category of nouns.

Ibn as-Sarrāj also qualifies of *qabiḥ* “ugly” the expression *ṭalāṭatu nassābātin* “three genealogists” because *nassābah* is an adjective (*ṣifah*) in the slot of a substantive, but “this does not give the adjective the strength of the substantive” (*fa-lam yaj’al aṣ-ṣifata taqwā quwwata l-ismi*; ʿU. II, 428.11–13). In another section, he deals with masculine nouns that are treated like feminine nouns as in *’indī ṭalāṭatun nassābātun* “I have three genealogists” and *’allāmātun* “scholars”, which he qualifies of “extremely correct” and “right language” when in the slot of the qualifier (*fī n-nu’ūt*; ʿU. III, 477.2–5), i.e., in an appositional rather than annexational construction.

In the same manner, Ibn as-Sarrāj adds that one should say *hā’ulā’i ṭalāṭatun quraṣiyyūna* “those are three Qurayshites” and *ṭalāṭatun muslimūna* “three Muslims” with the counted objects treated as an appositive complements instead of *muḍāf ’ilayh* because *quraṣiyyūna* and *muslimūna* are

<sup>16</sup>See above, p. 88, for more details.

adjectives and they should not be treated like substantives, except in poetry, “out of dislike that the adjective be treated like the noun” (*karāhiyatan ‘an yuj‘ala l-ismu ka-ṣ-ṣifati*; <sup>7</sup>U. II, 429.12).

In all these cases, grammarians only deal with the annexational construction between numerals and their counted objects. There would be no problem in both the appositional and predicative constructions (*al-muslimūna l-‘iṣrūna* “the twenty Muslims” and *al-muslimūna ‘iṣrūna* “the Muslims are twenty”) but one may ask oneself how they would say, *‘iṣrūna muslimīna* or, more probably, *‘iṣrūna muslimūna* “twenty Muslims”?

### 6.6.5 Expression of definiteness and indefiniteness

Theoretically, it is possible to express definiteness and indefiniteness when a counted object is expressed with a numeral,<sup>17</sup> in appositional construction (*al-‘awlādu t-talāṭatu* vs. *‘awlādun talāṭatun*), as well as in annexational construction (*talāṭatu l-‘awlādi* vs. *talāṭatu ‘awlādin*)<sup>18</sup> and specifying construction (*al-‘iṣrūna waladan* vs. *‘iṣrūna waladan*), according to the regular rules of definiteness and indefiniteness. As for the predicative construction, there is no choice but to say *al-‘awlādu talāṭatun*.

The issue of definiteness and indefiniteness in the expression of the counted object is not tackled systematically by our authors. The only cases they comment are the annexational and specifying constructions. All three authors say that it is correct to say *talāṭatu l-‘awlādi*, according to the general rule of annexation (*K. I, 86.9–10; 87.2–5; M. II, 175.12–14; 178.3–4; IV, 144.3; ‘U. I, 311.8–11; 312.10–11*).

In the case of “one hundred” and “one thousand”, Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad also mention the possible addition of the definite article to the counted object, as in *mi‘atu d-dirhami* “the hundred dirhams” (*K. I, 87.4; M. II, 167.11–12*). Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the conflicting positions of the Baṣrans and the Kūfans on this issue. The Baṣrans prefer *‘alfu d-dirhami* whereas the Kūfans accept *al-‘alfu d-dirhami* (<sup>7</sup>U. II, 14.11–13). Ibn as-Sarrāj does not express his opinion explicitly but there is no reason to believe he would not follow Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad.

As for the specifying construction, things are far from clear. In *K. II, 47.17–19*, Sibawayh compares *al-xamsata-‘ašara* to *ka-l-‘āna* “like now” (see

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1483–1484; V, 675).

<sup>18</sup>In Post-Classical Arabic, Blau (2002, 49, §102) mentions cases where, in annexational construction, both the numeral and the counted object carry the article, as in *as-sab‘atu l-‘ayyāmi* “the seven days”, or only the numeral, as in *at-talāṭatu ma‘āni* “the three kinds”.



above p. 134), saying that Arabs leave it as it is after the addition of the definite article or after annexation, although it is indefinite. Yet, it is not clear what his position is concerning the definiteness status of *al-xamsata-‘ašara dirhaman*, which he does not discuss as such. Interestingly, he himself uses this expression in K. II, 467.1: *al-‘aḥada-‘ašara ḥarfan* “the eleven letters”. And in the same manner, he does not discuss expressions of the type *al-‘iṣrūna dirhaman*.

As for al-Mubarrad, expressions like *\*aṭ-ṭalāṭatu d-darāhima*, *\*al-xamsata-‘ašara d-dirhama* (or *\*al-xamsata l-‘ašara d-dirhama*) and *\*al-‘iṣrūna d-dirhama* are labelled “abominable errors” by him (*xaṭa’ fāḥiṣ*; M. II, 175.5); he adds that “those who say this argue that it is used in speech” (*wa-‘illatu man yaqūlu hāḍā l-i-ṭilālu bi-r-riwāyati*; II, 175.6).<sup>19</sup>

Interestingly, the answer of al-Mubarrad is that in such cases analogy (not actual use) should prevail:

(6) *wa-mimmā yubṭilu hāḍā l-qawla ‘anna r-riwāyata ‘an al-‘Arabi l-fuṣaḥā’i xilāfu-hu fa-riwāyatun bi-riwāyatin wa-l-qiyāsu ḥākimun.*

And among things that invalidate this [the argument that it is used in speech] is the fact that the speech of literate Arabs differs from it, so that it is word against word [actual use against the use of literate Arabs] and analogy prevails. (M. II, 175.7)

For decades, it is not permitted to say *\*al-‘iṣrūna d-dirhama* because the definiteness of the numeral has already been properly expressed (*‘uḥkima wa-buyyina*; M. II, 176.10). The correct expression is thus *al-‘iṣrūna dirhaman* (M. II, 176.12).

Al-Mubarrad says that one has “to go back to the truth of analogy, and not to follow tradition” (*‘an yarji‘a min qablu ‘ilā ḥaqīqati l-qiyāsi wa-lā yamḍiya ‘alā t-taqlīdi*; M. III, 177.4–5), making it clear that these expressions were found in the language of people.

The position of Ibn as-Sarrāj is not clear, as he quotes many opinions without mentioning his own (ʿU. I, 321.14–17; 325.3–7; 14–15). In a section devoted to annexation, he is the only author to quote the position of the Kūfans who accept expressions such as *al-‘iṣrūna d-dirhama*, *al-xamsatu d-darāhimi* and *al-mi‘atu d-dirhami* (ʿU. II, 14.11–12), while the Baṣrans reject them and prefer to say *xamsatu d-dirhami* and *mi‘atu d-dirhami* as well as *al-‘iṣrūna dirhaman* and *al-xamsata-‘ašara dirhaman* (ʿU. II, 14.12–16). It is not clear whether it should be understood that Ibn as-Sarrāj follows the Baṣrans.

<sup>19</sup>See Baalbaki (1981, 6–7; 20) for an account of this issue between the Kūfan and the Baṣran grammarians, according to Ibn as-Sikkit’s (d. 244/858) *ʿIṣlāḥ al-manṭiq*.

There is one last possible case, which is not mentioned by Sībawayh, namely the possibility for the counted object to be defined by annexation as in *ṭalāṭatu aṭwābi-ka* “your three dresses”, *mi’atu dirhami-ka* “your hundred dirhams”, *’alfu dīnāri-ka* “your thousand dinars”, which al-Mubarrad accepts (*M. II*, 178.3–5; 8–10).

Bagdadian grammarians are reported by Ibn as-Sarrāj to have accepted expressions such as *xamsatu darāhimi-ka* and *dirhami-ka* “your five dirhams” in an *’idāfah* construction (*’U. I*, 325.15–16). Ibn as-Sarrāj says that this is acceptable as a poetic licence (*’U. I*, 325.16–17). This passage is very elliptical and one may wonder why he invokes here poetic licence. We will come back to this issue in the larger frame of Ibn as-Sarrāj’s theory (see below, p. 260).

### 6.6.6 Expression of the counted object by a pronoun

The expression of the counted object by a pronoun poses no problem in an appositional construction (in the definite only, as in *hum at-talāṭatu* “the three of them [masc.]” and *naḥnu t-ṭalātu* “the three of us [fem.]”), nor in a predicative construction (as in *hum ṭalāṭatun* “they [masc.] are three” and *’antunna ṭalāṭun* “you [fem.] are three”). These cases are not discussed by our authors.

In a specifying construction, expression of the counted object by a pronoun is impossible since in these constructions the counted object has to be indefinite (*K. I*, 85.6–7; *M. II*, 180.8–11; *’U. I*, 312.5–6) and pronouns are definite by nature.

As for the annexational construction, our authors discuss it in expressions of the type *marartu bi-him xamsata-hum* “I passed by the five of them” which we have presented above, p. 141. They mention only numerals between “one” and “ten”. Since compounds and decades cannot be annexed to their counted object (see above p. 130) expressions like *\*marartu bi-l-qawmi xamsata-’ašara-hum* “I passed by the tribe, the fifteen of them”, or *\*’axaḍtu ’iṣrīna dirhaman wa-ṭalāṭi-him* “I took twenty dirhams and thirty of them” (*M. II*, 180.8; 11) are rejected. As for *mi’ah* and *’alf* which are annexed to singular counted objects, it is probable that *mi’atu-hum* “one hundred of them” and *’alfu-hum* “one thousand of them” are impossible, because the pronouns are considered plural. Our authors are silent on this point.

In a section devoted to the use of the definite article in lieu of the relative pronoun (*’U. II*, 330–361), Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with these expressions from the perspective of the predication of their second part (see above, p. 82, more details about the predication test). Compare for example *hāḍā ṭālīṭu ṭalāṭatin*

“this one is one of three”<sup>20</sup> and *allaḍīna ḥāḍā tāliṭu-hum ṭalātātun* “those of which this one is the third are three” (ʿU. II, 331.2–3). This section is the last one in a called *bāb al-ittisāʿ* where Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with cases that are correct although they cannot be considered to be analogical.<sup>21</sup>

He says that the expression *al-ḥāḍiya-ʿašara-hum ʿanā* “I am one of the eleven”, where the relative pronoun is replaced by the definite article, is not analogical although it is actually used in the language; the reason given by Ibn as-Sarrāj is that *ḥāḍiya-ʿašara* cannot behave like a verb in this position because it is a compound (ʿU. II, 331.12–332.3). He quotes al-ʿAxfas as saying that this construction is acceptable below “ten” because numerals can be built like verbs, although it is clear that these verbs do not actually exist (ʿU. II, 332.5–9).

Later in the same section, Ibn as-Sarrāj gives more insight into these cleft expressions, introducing a semantic criterion. It is not correct to say *\*at-tānī-himā ʿanā ṭnāni* “those of which I am the second [masc.] are two [masc.]” because it is redundant if a man says it. In the opposite, a woman could say *at-tāniyatu-humā ʿanā ṭnatāni* if she is the second of a group of two women, as opposed to *at-tāniyatu-humā ʿanā ṭnāni* if she is the second of a group of a man and a woman (herself); and in the same manner it is redundant for a woman to say *\*at-tālītatu-hunna ʿanā ṭalātun* “those of which I am the third [fem.] are three [masc.]” (ʿU. II, 334.18–20). Thus, ultimately, the issue is related to the rules that stipulate that the masculine supersedes the feminine, and to the communicative purpose (*fāʿidah*) that lies in the utterance.

### 6.6.7 The number of the counted object

The case of “one” is as follows. Quantity can be expressed overtly in the appositional construction, as in *waladun wāḥidun* “one boy”, and in the predicative construction, as in *al-waladu wāḥidun* “the boy is one”. In the annexational construction the only possibility is to say *ʾaḥadu l-ʾawlādi* “one of the boys”, but in this case the meaning of the construction is not the counted object, but a partitive.

As for “two”, the following two forms are possible: *waladāni ṭnāni* “two boys” and *al-waladāni ṭnāni* “ther boys are two”, the only case of an annexational construction being found in poetic *ṭintā ḥanḍalin* “two colocinths” (see above p. 92).

<sup>20</sup>See above, p. 132, on the translation of this expression.

<sup>21</sup>See Versteegh (1990b) for an account of the history of the concept of *ittisāʿ* in the Arabic grammatical tradition.

The counted object of numerals between “three” and “ten” is in the plural. This is true of cardinals in appositional, annexational and predicative constructions with their counted object, with or without the definite article, as in *al-ʾawlādu t-ṭalāṭatu* “the three boys”, *ṭalāṭatu ʾawlādin* “three boys” and *al-ʾawlādu ṭalāṭatun* “the boys are three” (K. I, 86.8–11; M. II, 164.4–5; ʾU. I, 311.5–8).

Above “ten”, the situation is not as simple as it seems. In the appositional and predicative constructions, the counted object is in the plural, as in *al-ʾawlādu l-ʾiṣrūna* “the twenty boys”, *ʾawlādun miʾatun* “a hundred boys”, *al-ʾawlādun ʾiṣrūna* “the boys are twenty” and *al-ʾawlādu ʾalfun* “the boys are a thousand”. These expressions are not commented on by our authors.

In the annexational and specifying constructions, the counted object is in the singular above “ten”, as in *miʾatu waladin* “a hundred boys”, *ʾalfu waladin* “a thousand boys”, *ṭalāṭata-ʿašara waladan* “thirteen boys” and *ʾiṣrūna waladan* (K. I, 86.13; 15–18; M. II, 164.5–6; III, 32.7–8; 58.8; ʾU. I, 312.8–10).

The case of ordinals is different. Their “counted” object is always in the singular whatever the numeral, as in *al-waladu t-ṭālīṭu*, *al-waladu t-ṭālīṭa-ʿašara* and *al-waladu l-ʾiṣrūna*. This fact is not mentioned by our authors.

The only issue linked with the number of the counted object that is discussed by our authors can be reformulated as follows: Why should the counted object be in the singular above “ten” in the annexational and specifying constructions? The answer they give to this question depends on the general frame in which they interpret numerals at large and will be presented in more detail in the next part of this study. See below, p. 207 for Sibawayh’s theory, p. 216 for al-Mubarrad’s, and p. 248 for Ibn as-Sarrāj’s.

### 6.6.8 Different plural forms of the counted object

We will not enter into the morphological study of the plural because it would take us too far from the grammar of numerals. All we need to recall here is that Arabic knows three different plural forms that can be built through inner morphological changes (“broken plurals”): lesser plural, greater plural, and plural of plural. Here is an example of these morphological changes for the word *kalb* “dog”. Its lesser plural form is *ʾaklub* (K. II, 181.15); its greater plural form is *kilāb* (K. II, 181.17); and its plural of plural is *kilābāt* (K. II, 208.1).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup>See Ratcliffe (1998) and Ferrando (2002) for a survey of these three plural forms in Classical Arabic grammars and other Semitic languages.

Next to these forms, plurals can also be formed “externally” by the addition of the suffixes *-ūna* and *-āt*. These plural forms are considered by Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad<sup>23</sup> to be lesser plural forms because they share common features with the dual (K. II, 144.11–12; M. II, 156.10–12). The position of Ibn as-Sarrāj seems to be different. While he mentions many times the plural form in *-āt* as a lesser plural form (ʿU. II, 439.9–10; 14–15; III, 9.17–10.2; 4–6; 10–11; 11.14–15) he never associates the plural form in *-ūna* to lesser numbers but to “humans” (*man yaʿqilu*; ʿU. I, 47.7).

The general rule that all three authors mention is that the counted object of cardinals between “three” and “ten” should be in the lesser plural form (K. II, 181.15–16; M. II, 156.4–9; ʿU. I, 311.5–8).<sup>24</sup>

Sibawayh says that in some cases it is permissible to use the greater plural form instead of the lesser plural form, as in *xamsatu kilābin* “five dogs” (instead of *xamsatu ʾaklubin*), which stands for *xamsatun min al-kilābi* (K. II, 182.16). He compares this use to other cases where the *muḍāf ʾilayh* is a greater plural or a collective noun as in *hāḍā ṣawtu kilābin* “this is the sound of dogs” (K. II, 182.16) and *ḥabbu rummānin* “a seed of [the species of the] pomegranate” (K. II, 182.17).

Both expressions are semantic equivalents of the partitive particle *min* followed by the noun in the oblique form: *min al-kilābi* or *min ar-rummāni*.

Later in the same chapter, Sibawayh gives other examples of greater plural forms that are used instead of lesser plural forms as *qiradah* “monkeys” which is used instead of \*ʾaqrād; *šusūx* “sandal thongs” instead of \*ʾaššāx; *qurūʾ* “menstruations” instead of \*ʾaqrūʾ (K. II, 185.12–13). This is apparently only a matter of linguistic use for Sibawayh, who adds that in the dialect of Tamīm, greater plural forms are generally used instead of lesser plural forms (K. II, 198.10–12).

He says that he asked al-Xalil about the expression *ṭalāṭatu kilābin*, and his answer is that it is a poetic license (K. II, 210.10–11). Sibawayh then

<sup>23</sup>In his commentary of the *Kitāb*, ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994), a disciple of Ibn as-Sarrāj, gives a different account of the position of al-Mubarrad concerning feminine external plurals. According to ar-Rummānī, al-Mubarrad considers that plurals in *-āt* are equally correctly used for lesser and greater plural forms (*Šarḥ* ar-Rummānī, 84.4–6). Other grammarians say that these external plural forms primarily express a lesser plural form, and that they can be used to express greater plurals, just like *šusūʿ* can express a lesser plural (*Šarḥ* ar-Rummānī, 6–7). Ar-Rummānī says that the best position is that of al-Mubarrad because plurals in *-āt* are equivalent to plurals in *-ūna* (*Šarḥ* ar-Rummānī, 7–9). The problem is that the teaching of al-Mubarrad in his *Muqtaḍab* does not correspond to ar-Rummānī’s account. The position of az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) is that masculine external plurals apply both to lesser and greater plurals (*ʾIdāḥ*, 122.6–9), but external feminine plurals are lesser plural forms that can be used for greater plurals (*ʾIdāḥ*, 122.16–18).

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1454–1457).

adds (always quoting al-Xalīl?) that another possibility is to say *ṭalāṭatun kilābun*, in an appositional construction, *ka-ʾanna-ka qulta ṭalāṭatun tumma qulta kilābun* (“as if you said *ṭalāṭatun* and then *kilābun*”; K. II, 210.12).

In his *Radd*, al-Mubarrad says that it is not a poetic license but a valid option to use the greater plural forms after numerals between “three” to “ten”, as in Qurʾānic *ṭalāṭatu qurūʾin* (Q. 2, 228; *Radd*, 169.11–12). His point is probably here to clearly distinguish Qurʾānic use from poetry, by refuting the occurrence of any kind of poetic license in the Qurʾān.

In the *Muqtaḍab*, his teaching is slightly different since he says that only if the lesser plural form does not exist it is possible to replace it by the greater plural form (M. II, 158.4–160.2). The opposite is also true (M. II, 160.4). The lesser plural forms *ʾaydin* “hands” and *ʾarjul* “feet” can be used to express greater numbers, because the greater plural form of *yad* and *rijl* do not exist.<sup>25</sup> As for the lesser plural form of proper names like *ṭalāṭatu Muḥammadina* “three Muḥammads” and *xamsatu Jaʿfarina* “five Jaʿfars”, it is also correct to say *ṭalāṭatun min al-Maḥāmidi* and *xamsatun min al-Jaʿāfiri*, using the greater plural forms instead of the lesser plural forms *Muḥammadūna* and *Jaʿfarūna* (M. II, 161.1–3).

In a nutshell, what he called a valid option in the *Radd* is said to be only possible if the regular form is not available. Yet, Sibawayh is wrong to say that it is a poetic license (which anyway is not his position but al-Xalīl’s).

It seems that this issue debated in the *Radd* and the *Muqtaḍab* has lost its interest for Ibn as-Sarrāj who says, in the introduction to a section devoted to the broken plurals (ʿU. II, 429–III, 35), that it is not rare for a greater plural form to be used instead of a lesser plural form, as in *ṭalāṭatu šusūʾin* “three sandal thongs” and *ṭalāṭatu qurūʾin* “three menstruations” (ʿU. II, 430.3–9). He adds, later in the *Uṣūl*, that if one says *xamsatu kilābin* instead of the expected *xamsatu ʾaklubin*, what is intended is the species (*jins*) as in *xamsatun min al-kilābi* (ʿU. II, 434.1–2).

### 6.6.9 Collective nouns as counted object

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention that if a noun refers to a “nonhuman genus” (*jins min ġayr al-ʾādamiyyina*; M. II, 185.10), numerals cannot be annexed to it, but the “annexation particle” should link them (M. II, 185.10), as in *ʿindī ṭalāṭun min al-ʾibli wa-ṭalāṭun min al-ġanami* (“I have three camels

<sup>25</sup>It seems that al-Mubarrad does not know the greater plural form *ʾayādin*.

and three [heads] of livestock”; *M.* II, 186.6–7). In other words, according to al-Mubarrad, numerals cannot be annexed to collective nouns.<sup>26</sup>

Would al-Mubarrad also forbid the expression of the counted object by a collective noun in the other possible constructions? How would he judge *‘iṣrūna ḡanaman*, *al-ḡanamu ṭ-ṭalāṭu* and *al-ḡanamu ṭalāṭun*? We have no clue about the answer in the *Muqtaḍab*.

### 6.6.10 Counted objects and conjoined numerals

The counted object that is expressed with conjoined numerals follows the syntactic rules of the decades, i.e., of the closest numeral in the sentence, as in *xamsatun wa-‘iṣrūna waladan* “twenty-five boys”. In this case *xamsatun* is in the feminine because *walad* is masculine, and *walad* is in a specifying construction with *‘iṣrūna* because it is the closest to it in the sentence.

Just like decades, conjoined numerals can be in different types of construction with their counted objects: appositional, either definite as in *al-‘awlādu l-xamsatu wa-l-‘iṣrūna* “the twenty-five boys” or indefinite as in *‘awlādun xamsatun wa-‘iṣrūna* “twenty-five boys”; predicative, as in *al-‘awlādu xamsatun wa-‘iṣrūna* “the boys are twenty-five”; and specifying, either in definite as in *xamsatun wa-‘iṣrūna waladan* “twenty-five boys” or definite as in *al-xamsatu wa-l-‘iṣrūna waladan* “the twenty-five boys”.

None of our authors mentions the expression of the counted object with conjoined numerals. We can however safely extrapolate that all their remarks that apply to the syntax of decades apply to conjoined numerals as well.

Al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention annexation of conjoined numerals to their possessor, as in *ṭalāṭatu-ka wa-ṭalāṭu-ka* “your thirty-three”. See above, p. 132.

### 6.6.11 “One hundred” and “one thousand” as counted objects

All grammarians comment on the fact that, against the general rule, *mi’ah* remains in the singular after numerals between “three” and “nine”,<sup>27</sup> as in *ṭalāṭu mi’atin*<sup>28</sup> “three hundreds”, instead of the expected plural *mi’ūna* or *mi’āt* (*K.* I, 87.11; *M.* II, 169.4–5;<sup>29</sup> *U.* I, 313.1–2).

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1439–1441).

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1444–1447).

<sup>28</sup>See above, note 22, p. 87, about this transliteration.

<sup>29</sup>See above footnote 17, p. 109.

For al-Mubarrad, this behaviour of *mi'ah* does not contradict the way numerals behave (*dālīka qiyāsun* “it is analogical”) because what is true of “basic” numerals, i.e., “one” to “ten”, is not true of “subsidiary” numerals, i.e., all other numerals (*M. II*, 169.4–5). This assertion will need further inquiry (see below, p. 223). As for his commentary on the expression *ṭalāṭa mi'atin sinīna* in *Q.* 18, 25 where *mi'ah* is not annexed to its counted object *sinīna*, see above p. 87.

Sibawayh explains the singular of *mi'ah* after numerals from “three” to “nine” by comparing it to the singular of the counted noun after decades and numerals between “eleven” and “nineteen” (*K. I*, 87.11–12).<sup>30</sup> He adds that it is not rare in Arabic for a singular to refer to a plural, especially in the field of numerals (*K. I*, 87.13).

Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes Sibawayh’s opinion that *mi'ah* should have been put in the plural after “three” to “nine” but it was treated like “eleven” and “twenty”. This explanation is difficult to understand without going back to the *Kitāb*, otherwise the text of the *ʿUṣūl* remains unclear. Compare both quotations:

(٧) وأما ثلاث مائة إلى تسع مائة فكان ينبغي أن يكون مئين أو مئات ولكنهم شبهوه بعشرين وأحد عشر حيث جعلوا ما يبين به العدد واحدا لأنه اسم لعدد كما أن عشرين اسم لعدد وليس بمستنكر في كلامهم أن يكون اللفظ واحدا والمعنى جميع. (في الكتاب ٢، ٨٧. ١١–١٣)

(٨) قال سيبويه وثلاث [هكذا] وأما تسع مائة وثلاث مائة فكان حقّه مئين أو مئات ولكنهم شبهوه بعشرين وأحد عشر. (في الأصول ١، ٣١٣. ٢–١)

(7) [...] and concerning *ṭalāṭu mi'ah* and *tis'u mi'ah*, it ought to have been *mi'ina* or *mi'āt*, but they treated it like *'isrūna* and *'aḥada-ʿašara* inasmuch as they put the specifier of the numeral in the singular since it is a numeral, just like *'isrūna* is a numeral and it is not odd in their language for the surface form to be in the singular whereas the meaning is a plural (*K. II*, 87.11–13).

(8) Sibawayh said: And *ṭalāṭ* [sic] and concerning *tis'u mi'ah* and *ṭalāṭu mi'ah*, it ought to have been *mi'ina* or *mi'āt*, but they treated it like *'isrūna* and *'aḥada-ʿašara* (*ʿU. I*, 313.1–2).

The new numerals formed with *mi'ah* present little flexibility when used to count objects, because of their shape of *muḍāf* and *muḍāf ʿilayh* and the definiteness issues linked with annexation. The annexational and predicative constructions are the only one to be straightforward, as in *ṭalāṭatu mi'ati waladin* “three hundred boys”, in a double annexation, and *al-ʿawlādu ṭalāṭu mi'atin* “the boys are three hundred”, where the *muḍāf (ṭalāṭatu)* remains

<sup>30</sup>As-Sirāfi gives a clearer explanation of this obscure passage in the *Kitāb (Šarḥ IV*, 175.8–9).



indefinite after its annexation to an indefinite term (*mi'atin*). Theoretically, it should also be possible to say “the three hundred boys”, by making the second annexation definite, as in *ṭalāṭu mi'ati l-waladi*, but no author mentions it. However, it seems unusual to say, in an appositional construction, “the three hundred boys” (\**al-'awlādu ṭalāṭu l-mi'ati?*), although it is structurally correct. None of these issues is mentioned in our treatises.

The case of *'alf* is different from that of *mi'ah* since it follows the general rule for the counted object after any numeral, as in *ṭalāṭatu 'ālāfin* “three thousands”, *'aḥada-‘ašara 'alfan* “eleven thousands”, *'išrūna 'alfan* “twenty thousands” or *xamsu mi'ati 'alfin* “five hundred thousands”.<sup>31</sup>

These new numerals formed with *'alf* can also apply to counted objects, as in *xamsu mi'ati 'alfi waladin* “five hundred thousand boys”. The only author to mention these expressions is al-Mubarrad (*M.* II, 169.9–10). He clearly compares *'alf* to the counted object *ṭawb* “garment” in the following expressions: *'ašaratu 'ālāfin* and *'ašaratu 'aṭwābin*, *'aḥada-‘ašara 'alfan* and *'aḥada-‘ašara ṭawban* (*M.* II, 169.10–170.1). For him, it seems to be normal for *'alf* and *mi'ah* to behave differently, just because they are different series of numerals (*M.* II, 169.9). Ibn as-Sarrāj does not comment on the behaviour of *'alf* as a counted object after any numeral, however, he quotes the line *sab'ūna 'alfa mudajjaḡin* “seventy thousand armored [soldiers]”, in which such a case is found (*K.* I, 258.3).

It seems that only the annexational construction is possible between these greater numerals and their counted object, as in *al-'awlādu xamsu mi'ati l-'alfi* “the five hundred thousand boys” or *al-'awlādu xamsu mi'ati 'alfin* “the boys are five hundred thousands”. However, our authors do not mention these expressions.<sup>32</sup>

As for *'alf* used alone, all types of constructions are possible: *al-'awlādu l-'alfu* “the thousand boys”, *'awlādun 'alfun* “a thousand boys”, *al-'awlādu 'alfun* “the boys are a thousand”, *'alfu waladin* “a thousand boys”, *'alfu l-waladi* “the thousand boys”. These possibilities are not mentioned by our authors.

The case of ordinals is not dealt with by our authors. They do not mention the forms *ṭānī mi'atin* “two hundredth”, *ṭālīṭu mi'atin* “three hundredth”, and so on. The corresponding definite forms should be also possible: *ṭānī l-mi'ati* “the two hundredth”, *ṭālīṭu l-mi'ati* “the three hundredth”, as well as

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Howell (1883/2003, IV, 1447).

<sup>32</sup>Baalbaki (1981, 6) mentions that in his *Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq* Ibn as-Sikkīt (d. 244/858) quotes al-Kisā'ī's (d. 189/805) following example: *mā fa'alat al-'aḥada l-'ašara l-'alfa d-dirham* “what have the eleven thousand dirhams yielded?” Ibn as-Sikkīt adds that Baṣrans add the definite article only to the first part of the compound as in *mā fa'alat al-'aḥada-‘ašara 'alfa dirhamin* (*Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq*, 302.15–18).

the annexation to a counted object, as in “the three hundredth chapter” (*al-bābu tālītu l-mi’ati?*) or the “fifteen thousandth year” (*as-sanatu l-xāmisā-‘ašara ‘alfan?*) The orientalist grammar we consulted do not mention these issues.

### 6.6.12 The expression of complex numerals

Lastly, our authors do not deal with the expression of complex numerals, as in “three thousand five hundred and thirty-nine”.<sup>33</sup> The only occurrence of such a numeral is found in the colophon of Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *’Uṣūl: furigā min intisāxihi tālīta-‘ašara šahri Ramaḍāni sanati ’iḥdā wa-xamsīna wa-sitti mi’atin* “its copy was finished on the thirteenth of the month of Ramaḍān of the year six hundred and fifty-one”, in an annexational construction (*’U. III, 481*).

<sup>33</sup>Cf. Fleisch (1990, I, 515–516; §106y) and Wright (1967, I, 259; §327).

## Chapter 7

# Conclusion

The number of issues that are related to numerals is quite amazing. It is now clear that numerals are not a straightforward category, at least syntactically and morphologically. As is the case for nouns in general, one finds all types of words in this category, in terms of declension, syntactic “strength”, flexibility. Some numerals actually behave like active participles (*xāmisun*) and may operate on a *mafʿūl bi-hi* in certain occasions, while others are indeclinable and have very limited syntactic possibilities (*xamsata-ʿašara*). Some numerals are fully declinable, in both genders, they can be put in the dual and the plural, and can be annexed (*xamsatun*), while others are indeclinable (*xamsata-ʿašara*) or have limited declinability, have no dual nor plural form, have a common form for both genders and are not annexable (*ʿišrūna*). Lastly, some numerals stand alone and behave like no other one (*iṭnā-ʿašara*).

Moreover, all types of numerals should operate on—or be in a syntactic construction with—any type of countable substantive. This implies that, despite their differences, numerals should be interchangeable so that one can express any quantity of any counted object. This point is the source of an illimited number of grammatical issues. And in the same manner, the nominal groups constituted of a numeral and its counted object should also theoretically be found in all types of constructions where these counted objects can be found. The result is that the number of possible distinct cases is potentially infinite.

It is clear that, given all these constraints, the morphology and morphosyntax of numerals is linked with the wider grammatical system of each

author. We will now see how numerals are inserted in each of the three treatises we focus on in this study.

## **Part III**

# **Three different frames to tackle numerals**



## Introduction

In the previous part, we have come across a great number of issues linked with numerals in Classical Arabic morphology, syntax, and semantics. We have also pointed out the issues that are dealt with by our authors, and those that are not. In some cases, we have mentioned divergent opinions between them. However, this factual overview is not enough to understand the grammar of numerals that each grammarian has developed. Indeed, what we have presented in the previous part is cut off from the wider frame in which each grammarian interprets numerals. Thus, we were able to gather information on numerals, and on our grammarians' opinion about specific grammatical rules, but we were not able to understand how these issues connect together, if they do.

If we want to have a deeper view of numerals as a unified grammatical phenomenon, it is necessary to read anew the chapters linked with numerals in each treatise, not trying to answer specific questions that we would have—many of them remaining unanswered—but entering into each grammarian's logic.

In the three grammatical treatises we focus on in this study, we will first recall the general outline of each treatise and the chapters where grammatical information on numerals is found. Then, we will analyse in detail the chapters that are devoted to numerals in order to understand each grammarian's logic.

In order to avoid forcing our questions on the texts, we have followed a linear reading path, from the beginning to the end of each of the three treatises. Although we tried to present the issues synthetically in the following pages, this flat, linear reading is surely still preceivable.





## Chapter 8

# Sībawayh's approach to numerals

### 8.1 Introduction

As Baalbaki puts it,<sup>1</sup>

Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* is roughly divided into two parts, *naḥw* (in this sense, syntax, rather than the general meaning of "grammar"), which deals with the relations between the different parts of the structure and with the declensional endings which are associated with these relations, and *ṣarf* (morphology), which examines words in isolation of structure and includes derivational morphology as well as morphophonology. Phonological issues are treated under morphology—hence, phonology does not represent an independent level—whereas phonetics are briefly discussed toward the end of the book (Baalbaki 2007b, xxxi).

If one had to clearly delimit these two parts, one should probably say that they correspond to Derenbourg's two volumes, chapters 1–284 (*K. I*, 1–441) have a more syntactic approach whereas chapters 285–571 (*K. II*, 1–481) deal with morphosyntactic issues as well as derivational and morphophonetic issues.

There are two main chapters in the *Kitāb* that deal with the syntax of numerals, chapter 41 (*K. I*, 81.19–88.8) and chapter 412 (*K. II*, 176–177). In chapter 41, devoted to the *ṣifāh al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fā'il*, Sībawayh presents the general semantic and syntactic frame in which he interprets both an-

---

<sup>1</sup>See Baalbaki (2008, 31) for a different formulation of the same idea.

nexational and specifying constructions for all numerals and their counted object. Chapter 412 deals with the syntax of numerals and their counted object between “three” and “nineteen” at a lower level (compound morphology, gender agreement, number, and so on).

Other issues related to numerals are dispersed in the *Kitāb*, according to the chapter they belong to. This is especially true of morphological issues but also of syntactic issues where numerals are tested for their peculiar behaviour. We will briefly recall them here, in a tabular form, in order to see how they are organised in the *Kitāb*.

<i>Kitāb</i>	Issues	Pages
<b>In syntactic chapters</b>		
Ch. 18, <i>K. I.</i> , 20–21	In some cases it is possible to predicate an indefinite noun of another indefinite noun, as is the case with the word <i>ʾaḥad</i> .	p. 159
Ch. 41, <i>K. I.</i> , 81–88	On <i>ṣifāt muṣabbahah bi-smi l-fāʿil</i> . Will be analysed below.	pp. 194ff.
Ch. 85, <i>K. I.</i> , 157	The issue at stake is the grammatical interpretation of the expression <i>waḥda-hu</i> , and of the final <i>fathah</i> on <i>waḥda</i> - in particular.	p. 141
Ch. 87, <i>K. I.</i> , 158–159	It explores constructions like <i>marartu bi-him jamīʿan</i> where <i>jamīʿan</i> —which is morphologically an <i>ism</i> —is considered a <i>ḥāl</i> applying to the <i>xabar</i> (-him) and to distinguish them from constructions like <i>marartu bi-him xamsata-hum</i> that were dealt with in chapter 85 and where <i>xamsata-hum</i> is treated like a <i>maṣḍar</i> , although it is morphologically an <i>ism</i> .	p. 176
Ch. 99, <i>K. I.</i> , 174–177	Sibawayh deals briefly with the syntactic pattern of the names of the days, annexational vs. appositional ( <i>K. I.</i> , 176.22–24).	p. 150
Ch. 101, <i>K. I.</i> , 178–185	Sibawayh comments on the poetic line <i>xawwá ʿalá mustawayātin xamsin kirkiratin wa-ṭafinātin mulsin</i> (“It [the camel] laid down on five [equal] levels, the chest and [the four other] bald callosities”; I, 183.2).	pp. 92 and 157
Ch. 110, <i>K. I.</i> , 197–200	This chapter is devoted to constructions of the type <i>marartu bi-ḥayyatin dirʾun ṭūlu-hā</i> , <i>marartu bi-ṭawbin sabʾun ṭūlu-hu</i> and <i>marartu bi-rajulīn miʾatun ʾiblu-hu</i> ( <i>K. I.</i> , 197.14–15).	pp. 93, 99, 157 and 165
Ch. 123, <i>K. I.</i> , 227–229	On common nouns that have been used as proper names, as is the case for the days of the week.	p. 150
Ch. 141, <i>K. I.</i> , 250–256	On the analogy between <i>kam</i> and the numerals.	p. 147
Ch. 157, <i>K. I.</i> , 281	Sibawayh mentions <i>wā Ṭnā-ʿAṣarāh!</i> , the “mourning form” of the proper name <i>Ṭnā-ʿAṣara</i> ( <i>K. I.</i> , 281.12–13).	p. 149

Ch. 159, K. I, 282–283	Sibawayh mentions <i>wā Ṭalāṭatan-Wa-Ṭalāṭīnāh!</i> , the “mourning form” of the proper name <i>Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna</i> , and <i>yā Ṭalāṭatan-Wa-Ṭalāṭīna!</i> , its vocative form (K. I, 282.9).	p. 149
Ch. 173, K. I, 298–299	Sibawayh mentions <i>yā Xamsata!</i> , the apocopated form of the proper name <i>Xamsata-‘Ašara</i> in the vocative (K. I, 298.20).	p. 149
Ch. 222, K. I, 350–352	This chapter deals with <i>ʿayy</i> and compares its behaviour to the behaviour of <i>xamsata-‘ašara</i> .	p. 78
<b>In morphosyntactic chapters</b>		
Ch. 297, K. II, 14–15	Sibawayh presents the <i>maʿdūl</i> forms of numerals.	p. 117
Ch. 336, K. II, 84; ch. 368, 115–119; ch. 386, 123–125; ch. 389, 137–138	He presents the formation of relative adjectives. Numerals are dealt with in these chapters according to their morphology.	p. 113
Ch. 412, K. II, 176–177	On the expression of the counted object for numerals between “three” and “nineteen”. Will be analysed below.	pp. 203ff.
Ch. 413, K. II, 177–179	This chapter deals with expressions of the type <i>xāmisu xamsatin</i> , <i>xāmisu ʿarbaʿatin</i> , and ordinals in general. In this chapter, Sibawayh also deals with elements of different gender counted together.	pp. 132 and 170
Ch. 414, K. II, 179–181	Chapter 414 deals with the cases when there is a discrepancy between the grammatical gender and the biological sex.	p. 171
Ch. 415, K. II, 181	Chapter 415 forbids annexation of adjectives to numerals between “three” and “ten” like <i>ṭalāṭatun qurašīyyūna</i> “three Qurayshites” (and not <i>*ṭalāṭatu qurašīyyīna</i> ), because adjectives should not be treated like nouns.	p. 172
Ch. 416–431, K. II, 181–224	These chapters are devoted to “broken plurals”, which Sibawayh tackles almost exclusively from a morphological perspective. In chapter 430 (K. II, 211.17–214.6), devoted to <i>šifāt</i> that have a “broken” form in the plural, Sibawayh gives the following example of a masculine noun to which a feminine <i>šifāh</i> applies: <i>rijālun xamsatun</i> (K. II, 212.10–11).	pp. 157, 164 and 177

Table 8.1: *Numerals in the Kitāb*

In the following pages, we will analyse chapters 41 and 412 in more detail.

## 8.2 The link with the counted object

Chapter 41 (K. I, 81.19–88.8) is devoted to the *ṣifah muṣabbahah bi-l-fā'il* “adjectives that resembles the active participle”, its syntax and the meaning of its relationship with the noun to which it applies. After general explanations where syntactic rules are explained in detail (K. I, 81.19–84.14), Sibawayh intends to explain apparently inconsistent constructions, such as *xayrun min-ka 'aban* “better than you [in terms of] father” (K. I, 84.16), *'iṣrūna dirhaman* “twenty dirhams” (K. I, 85.5), *imtala'tu mā'an* “I got filled of water” (K. I, 85.18) and the syntactic link between other numerals and their counted object (K. I, 86.6–88.8), which he decides to gather under this heading, despite some difficulties that we will consider here.

In chapter 27, Sibawayh gives a first clue of what will become a prime example in his grammatical theory, i.e., the expression of the counted object after *'iṣrūna* “twenty”:<sup>2</sup>

(١) وَإِنَّمَا هُوَ [إِنَّ] بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْفَعْلِ كَمَا أَنَّ عَشْرِينَ رَجُلًا وَثَلَاثِينَ رَجُلًا بِمَنْزِلَةِ ضَارِبِينَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ  
وَلَيْسَ بِفَعْلٍ وَلَا فَاعِلٍ.

(1) It [*'inna*] has the status of the verb, just like *'iṣrūna rajulan* and *ṭalāṭūna rajulan* have the status of *ḍāribūna 'Abda l-Lāhi*, although it is not a verb nor an active participle (K. I, 38.18–19).

This is what chapter 41 is about: the broad analogy between *'iṣrūna* and the active participle, but with much more details as in (1) and many intermediate steps. As Carter (1972b) puts it, *'iṣrūna dirhaman* is a *locus probans* in the *Kitāb*, which Sibawayh uses in order to describe various grammatical cases where a non-verbal noun has a verb-like action on a noun and puts it in the dependent form.

Carter (1972b, 486) believes that Sibawayh attempts to fill the gap of the specifying construction,<sup>3</sup> left empty because of the impossibility of the expression *ḥasanun wajhan*, to which *'iṣrūna dirhaman* supposedly corresponds analogically. Carter builds his whole interpretation of this chapter on the fact that *ḥasanun wajhan* does not exist in Arabic and that Sibawayh endeavours to prove that *'iṣrūna dirhaman* fills the empty space left by the non-existing *ḥasanun wajhan*. This interpretation is powerful, yet, it unduly systematises Sibawayh's thought. Moreover, when one knows how elliptic the *Kitāb* can be, the mere absence of an expression has very little convincing power. And as

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 78, other cases of prime examples.

<sup>3</sup>Carter calls the specifying construction *tanwīn-naṣb*. See above, p. 166.

Carter (1972b, 486, note 3) mentions himself, *ḥasanun wajhan* is found indeed in later grammarians. See for example in Ibn Wallād's *Intiṣār* (25.7).

The way Sibawayh presents things is slightly different. He proceeds by successive analogies, considering the “strength” (*quwwah*) that each word has. To put it simply, the verb (*fiʿl*) has the maximum strength, then comes the active participle (*ism al-fāʿil*), then the “adjective that resembles the active participle” (*aṣ-ṣifah al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fāʿil*). After this, come the following problematic expressions: *xayrun min-ka ʿaban*, *ʾišrūna dirhaman*, *imtalaʿtu māʿan* and numerals, where “something” of the initial verbal strength remains.

“To have more strength” can mean different things: to have the meaning of the unaccomplished verb (K. I, 81.20); to put the following noun into the dependent form instead of the oblique form (K. I, 82.7); to have an effect on definite words (K. I, 82.17; 85.19); to agree in gender and number (K. I, 85.7–8);<sup>4</sup> to have more than one possible construction (K. I, 84.21; 85.18; 86.20–21); to perform two syntactic roles at the same time (K. I, 85.10–11); to have a retroactive syntactic effect (K. I, 85.20).<sup>5</sup> In the description of *quwwah* given by Baalbaki (1979, 15–19) it is clear that this “anthropomorphic metaphor” (Carter 1972b, 487, in note) is primarily linked with the theory of *ʿamal* “operation, government, regimen”, which is clearly the case here. See also Ayoub (1991, 51).

Sibawayh is always extremely careful in assigning a relative strength to the words (and sometimes to morphemes within words). Depending on their nature, morphology, syntax, and meaning in the sentence, words are assigned a specific relative strength, which is compared to the neighbouring words. Each word can either have more or less or the same strength as any other word. At the top end of the scale are transitive verbs and at the lower end are isolated consonants and vowels. Between these two extremes is an infinity of possibilities and what is important is the relative strength that each element has in a word or in a sentence. Analogy is the tool used by Sibawayh to compare the relative strength of words and morphemes.

To understand this chapter, it is very important to distinguish between two levels of interpretation: the semantic level and the syntactic level. At the semantic level, the link between the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* and its complement is called *sabab* or, as Sibawayh puts it, the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* “has a syntactic

<sup>4</sup>Manuscript A has a different reading that has the opposite meaning, and Derenbourg relies on C here, probably because of the context, which pleads for a mistake in A, not in C.

<sup>5</sup>In the same manner as above, manuscript C has a reading with an opposite meaning but Derenbourg has chosen the reading in A with is more consistent with the context.

effect on what has a semantic link to it" (*ta'malu fī-mā kāna min sababi-hā*; K. I, 82.1).<sup>6</sup>

Carter (1985, 60) proposes to translate *sabab* as "semantic link", and shows that this term is used to describe the link between two words in more than one syntactic relation. He distinguishes three levels of possible semantic link according to Sībawayh: "a. semantically linked with the antecedent (*min sababihi*); b. involved with the antecedent (*iltabasa bihi*); c. involved with something semantically linked with the antecedent (*iltabasa bi-šay'in min sababihi*)" (Carter 1985, 57).

There are five different types of semantic relations that are called *sabab* by Sībawayh, the fifth type being the one under discussion in our present chapter of the *Kitāb*. This type involves either a *šifah mušabbahah* or an active participle or a comparative.

In this fifth type, the *šifah mušabbahah* (or the active participle or the comparative) can occupy different slots. In the type Va, it is a predicate: *huwa xayrun min-ka 'aban* "he is better than you [in terms of] father", *'Abdu l-Lāhi fārihu l-'abdi* "Abd Allāh is gifted [in terms of] slave"; in the type Vb, it is an attribute:<sup>7</sup> *marartu bi-rajulin dāribin 'abū-hu rajulan* "I passed by a man whose father was beating a man", *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasanin 'abū-hu* "I passed by a man whose father is handsome"; in type Vc, it is a *ḥāl*: *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasanan 'abū-hu* "I passed by a man whose father is handsome"; in type Ve, it is a vocative: *yā dā d-ḍāmīru l-'ansi* "you, who put the strong she-camel on diet!"<sup>8</sup>

At the syntactic level, the *šifah mušabbahah* can be in more than one construction with the word with which it is linked semantically. The preferred construction is an *'idāfah* (K. I, 82.2) whose second term carries the article (K. I, 82.17) as in *ḥasanu l-wajhi* (fem. *ḥasanatu l-wajhi*). In the expression *huwa*

<sup>6</sup>Manuscript A has *šababi-hā* instead of *sababi-hā* but Derenbourg has corrected this obvious misspelling.

<sup>7</sup>Later grammarians reserved the term *sabab* to this type (Carter 1985, 55). The slot of the *šifah mušabbahah* (or the active participle or the comparative) is called *na't sababī* (Carter 2009, 101).

<sup>8</sup>Other types of *sabab* are I, *mā Zaydun 'āqilan 'abū-hu* "Zayd, his father is not rational", where there is a semantic link between *'āqilan* and *Zaydun* through *'abū-hu*; type II, *'anta fa-nḍur!* "you, look!", where there is a semantic link between the pronoun *'anta* and the implicit pronoun in the imperative verb; type III, *Zaydan laqitu 'axā-hu* "Zayd, I found his brother", where the preposed object optionally agrees with the word with which it is semantically linked; type IV, *ra'aytu Zaydan 'abū-hu 'afḍalu min-hu* "I saw Zayd, whose father is better than him", where the word which is semantically linked with Zayd is in an adjectival sentence. The last type, Vd, *marartu bi-rajulin ma'a-hu mra'atun dāribu-hā 'abū-hu* "I passed by a man who was with a woman whom his father beats", can be optionally interpreted as type IV (*dāribu-hā*), Vb (*dāribi-hā*) or Vc (*dāriba-hā*).

*ḥasanu l-wajhi* “he is handsome [in terms of] face”, *ḥasan* is semantically linked with *al-wajh* (it is the face that is handsome), and it is syntactically linked with the pronoun *huwa*, as its *xabar*. In Sibawayh terms, *ḥasan* operates on *al-wajh*, to which it is semantically linked (cf. K. I, 82.1 quoted above). In his commentary, as-Sīrāfi says that the expression *ḥasanu l-wajhi* is a sub-case of *ḥasanun wajhu-hu*. The role of the definite article in *al-wajhi* is to replace the definiteness of the suffix pronoun *-hu* in *wajhu-hu* (Šarḥ IV, 100.16–18).

It is correct to add the definite article to the *muḍāf* (K. I, 83.15) as in *al-ḥasanu l-wajhi* (K. I, 83.16). The reason given by Sibawayh is that in the *sabab* complement the second term does not make the first one definite (K. I, 83.17). In order to make the expression definite one adds the definite article to the first term.<sup>9</sup>

Syntactically, it is also possible to express the *sabab* by an indefinite noun. In this case, one should add the article to the first term, as in *al-ḥasanu wajhan* “the beautiful of face” (K. I, 83.18) and, by extension, *al-ḥasanu l-wajha* (K. I, 84.4).<sup>10</sup> In *al-ḥasanu wajhan*, the construction is not named by Sibawayh.

It is also possible to elide the article from the second term if the meaning is clear, as in *ḥadiṭu ‘ahdin* “inexperienced” and *karimu ‘abin* where *al-‘ahd* and *al-‘ab* are intended. In Sibawayh’s words, “you have not disturbed the first term at all” (*lam tuxlil bi-l-‘awwali fī šay’in*; K. I, 83.19–20).<sup>11</sup> Since the first term does not acquire the definiteness of the second term in this type of annexation, modifying the definiteness of the second term does not disturb the definiteness of the first term.<sup>12</sup>

The reason why the second term should be put in the dependent form is that the *šifah mušabbahah* resembles the active participle, which can be constructed as *aḍ-ḍāribu Zaydan* “the one who hit Zayd” (K. I, 84.3). If the *šifah mušabbahah* is put in the dual or in the plural, then the second term is either in the dependent form as in *al-ḥasanāni l-wujūha* “the two beautiful ones [in terms of] faces” and *al-‘axsarūna ‘a-mālan* “the losers [in terms of] deeds” (K. I, 84.9–10) or in the oblique form, as in *aṭ-ṭayyibū ‘axbārin* “the good ones [in terms of] news” (K. I, 84.14).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Aoun (1978) shows that the *‘alif lām* cliticised to the *šifah mušabbahah* does not mean the definite article but the reduced definite specifier of a reduced relative clause. Its full counterparts are *allaḍī*, *allatī*, and so on.

<sup>10</sup>Manuscript A reads *al-ḥasanu l-wajhi* which is inconsistent with the context.

<sup>11</sup>The reading of C is as follows: فلم تُخلل بالآخر في شيء which could be ambiguous since الآخر could be read either *al-‘āxar* “the other one” or *al-‘āxir* “the last one”. The context suggests to read “the other one” or, as interpreted by A: “the first one”.

<sup>12</sup>See as-Sīrāfi’s commentary, Šarḥ IV, 111.4–8.

<sup>13</sup>Manuscript C reads *aṭ-ṭayyibū al-‘axbāri*.

Another evidence that the active participle has more strength than the *ṣifah mušabbahah* is that it has more freedom of behaviour, as in the peculiar *al-ḥāfiḍū 'awrata l-'aširati* “the ones who protect the modesty of their relatives”, where the first term (*al-ḥāfiḍū*) has lost its *nūn*—just like a *muḍāf*—and where the second term (*'awrata*) is in the dependent form, unlike a *muḍāf 'ilayh* (K. I, 84.13–14).

In an expression like *xayrun min-ka 'aban* “better that you [in terms of] father”, where *min* separates the two terms which are linked, the annexational construction is not an option because the particle *min* cannot be elided, and there is no choice but to use the specifying construction (K. I, 84.16). In the same manner, in the expression *'iṣrūna dirhaman* (K. I, 85.5), there is no other choice but to put the complement in the singular indefinite dependent form. The reason given by Sībawayh is that the singular is “lighter” than the plural, and the indefinite is “lighter” than the definite (K. I, 85.6–7), so it is “lighter” to say *'iṣrūna dirhaman* than *'iṣrūna min ad-darāhimi* (K. I, 85.5–6).

Sībawayh draws a parallel between the expression *'awwalu rajulin* “the first man”—which has the same meaning as *'awwalu r-rijālī*—and the expression *'iṣrūna dirhaman* (K. I, 85.1–7). Arabs have “lightened” the expression *'awwalu r-rijālī* by suppressing the article and the plural. He then says that in the same manner in the expression *'iṣrūna min ad-darāhimi* “the addition of the definite article does not change the indefiniteness of *'iṣrūna*, therefore they lightened it by dropping what was unnecessary” (*wa-lam yakun duxūlu l-'alifi wa-l-lāmi yuḡayyiru l-'iṣrīna 'an nakirati-hi fa-staxaffū bi-tarki mā lam yuḥtaj 'ilay-hi*; K. I, 85.6–7), so that they simply say *'iṣrūna dirhaman*.

Sībawayh gives two pieces of evidence that *'iṣrūna* and *xayrun min* have less strength than the *ṣifah mušabbahah* (K. I, 85.7–8).<sup>14</sup> The first one is that they are invariable in number, gender and form (K. I, 85.8). In the following expression, the *ṣifah mušabbahah* agrees in form with the *mawṣūf*: *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasani l-wajhi 'abū-hu* “I passed by a man whose father is beautiful of face” (K. I, 85.8–9). This is not possible with *'iṣrūna* and *xayrun*, because they remain in the independent form (K. I, 85.10). In his commentary on the *Kitāb*, as-Sirāfi gives examples of this use of *'iṣrūna* that remains in the independent form: *marartu bi-rajulin 'iṣrūna dirhaman mālu-hu* “I passed by a man whose money is twenty dirhams”, *marartu bi-rajulin xayrun min-ka 'abū-hu* “I passed by a man whose father is better than you” (*Šarḥ* IV, 132).

To put it another way, *'iṣrūna* and *xayrun min* cannot perform two roles at the same time, but only one. In *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasani l-wajhi 'abū-hu*, the word *ḥasani* has two different roles. It is syntactically the attribute

<sup>14</sup>See footnote 4, p. 195.



of *rajulin* and semantically the *xabar muqaddam* of *'abū-hu*. In *marartu bi-rajulin* *'iṣrūna dirhaman mālu-hu*, on the other hand, the word *'iṣrūna* is only the fronted predicate (*xabar muqaddam*) of *mālu-hu* in the nominal sentence *'iṣrūna dirhaman mālu-hu*, which is itself the qualifier of *rajulin*.

The second piece of evidence that *'iṣrūna* and *xayrun min* have less strength than the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* is that they must keep their compensatory *nūn*<sup>15</sup> (K. I, 85.13–14), and the specifier cannot be made definite (K. I, 85.6–7), as in the following possible constructions: *xayrun min-ka 'aban* (K. I, 84.16), *xayrun 'amalan (min-ka)* “better (than you) [in terms of] work” (K. I, 84.17), *xayrun min-ka 'a'mālan* (K. I, 85.1), *'iṣrūna dirhaman* (K. I, 85.5). In other words, it is both possible to say *al-ḥasanu wajhan* and *ḥasanu l-wajhi*, whereas the specifier of *'iṣrūna* has to surface in the indefinite dependent form *dirhaman* because it is not possible to annex *'iṣrūna* to its counted object.

Sibawayh does not deal explicitly with the possibility to add the definite article to *'iṣrūna*, as in *al-'iṣrūna dirhaman* “the twenty dirhams”, but nothing seems to forbid it.

Lastly, there is one more case where the verb is weak and has limited action: intransitive verbs like *imtala'tu* in the expression *imtala'tu mā'an* “I got filled of water” (K. I, 85.18). This verb, as is the case for a *ṣifah muṣabbahah* (K. I, 85.20), has limited verbal power and only one possible construction. *Mā'* cannot be replaced by a pronoun, as in *\*imtala'tu-hu* (K. I, 85.19); the operation of the verb is not retroactive for there is no such thing as *\*mā'an imtala'tu* (K. I, 85.20); and one could add as well that its action is limited to indefinite nouns since *\*imtala'tu l-mā'a* is incorrect. The “origin” (*'aṣl*)<sup>16</sup> of the construction *imtala'tu mā'an* is *imtala'tu min al-mā'i* (K. I, 86.1). This verb has the “status of reflexivity” (*bi-manzilat al-infi'āl*; K. I, 85.21), hence its limited strength.

Can we still talk of a semantic *sabab* relationship between *'iṣrūna* and *dirhaman*, or between *imtala'tu* and *mā'an*? Carter (1985, 55) mentions *xayrun min-ka 'aban* as one possible case of *sabab* complement, but does not mention *'iṣrūna dirhaman* nor *imtala'tu mā'an*. Is it evident for Carter that these are *sabab* complements? Sibawayh is not very clear either on this point. It seems obvious for him that *'aban* in *xayrun min-ka 'aban* expresses the *sabab* (K. I, 84.16–17), but this is the last occurrence of the term *sabab* in this chapter, and it is not used in any of the other chapters concerned with

<sup>15</sup>See above, note 1, p. 155.

<sup>16</sup>See Baalbaki (1988/2004, 166–167) for the five main meanings of *'aṣl* in Sibawayh's *Kitāb*: 1) the form that agrees with analogy, 2) the origin from which a certain usage has developed, 3) the reconstructed origin of a certain usage, 4) the form that is characteristic of a certain function, and 5) the supposed root of a word. Here, the *'aṣl* refers to the reconstructed origin of the expression *imtala'tu mā'an*.

numerals. The expressions *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *imtala'tu mā'an* are treated here along with clear *sabab* complements, as if they were the same. However, there are differences in the syntactic possibilities of each construction, which surely point to semantic differences. This way of presenting things is very typical of Sībawayh and he leaves us without further explanation.

In this chapter, nothing is said either about *iltibās* as a weaker *sabab*. However, we are probably not far from the truth if we say that the *sabab* relationship in *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *imtala'tu mā'an* is not as strong as in the clear examples (*ḥasanu l-wajhi*, and so on) but that there is “something” of the *sabab* expressed by *dirhaman* and *mā'an* in *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *imtala'tu mā'an* which explains both the similarities and the differences in syntactic construction. We can probably not go any further if we do not want to systematise Sībawayh's theory more than he did himself.

The *sabab* relationship can be expressed through a much larger range of syntactic links than the specifying construction. In optimum conditions, the *sabab* complement can be masculine or feminine, definite or indefinite,<sup>17</sup> singular or plural, in the oblique or dependent form.

The fact that, unlike the full-fledged *ṣifah muṣabbahah*, *ʿiṣrūna* can only surface in one shape with its counted object clearly shows that it shares only very little of its strength.

The rest of chapter 41 deals with all other numerals. From “three” to “ten”, the counted object has to be put in the plural and the numeral is connected to it by *ʿidāfah* (K. I, 86.8). This counted object can be definite or indefinite, as in *ṭalāṭatu ʿabwābin* (“three garments”; K. I, 86.9) and *xamsatu l-ʿaṭwābi* (“the five dresses”; K. I, 86.10) and for Sībawayh there is no other possible construction when the numeral is *muḍāf* (K. I, 86.10–11).

From “eleven” to “nineteen”, the numeral is considered a compound and is “in the position of an indefinite noun” (*fī mawḍiʿi smin munawwanin*). There is only one possible construction for its complement. It has to be indefinite, singular and in the dependent form as in *ʿaḥada-ʿašara dirhaman* and *iṭnā-ʿašara dirhaman* (K. I, 86.13).

There is also only one possible construction for decades from “twenty” to “ninety”, as has been explained above for “twenty”. The numeral itself behaves like an indefinite plural<sup>18</sup> with its long declension vowel and compensatory

<sup>17</sup>See above, p. 194, on the expression *ḥasanun wajhan*.

<sup>18</sup>In chapter 368, Sībawayh has a more precise description of the morphology of decades. See above, p. 136, the discussion on the plural meaning of decades.

*nūn* (K. I, 86.15–16) and the counted object has to be singular, indefinite and in the dependent form as in *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *ṭalāṭūna ʿabdan* (K. I, 86.16–18).

For hundreds, the only possible syntactic link between the numeral and its complement is the *ʾidāfah* (K. I, 87.2). The complement can be indefinite or definite, as in *miʾatu dirhamin* and *miʾatu d-dirhami* (K. I, 87.4), *miʾatā dirhamin* and *miʾatā d-dīnāri* (K. I, 87.5). The same rules apply to thousands: *ʾalfu dirhamin* and *ʾalfā dirhamin* (K. I, 87.6).

Nouns referring to hundreds, from “three hundred” to “nine hundred”, have a specific behaviour since the word “one hundred” itself remains in the singular, and the rules mentioned above (see p. 200) for counted nouns between “three” and “nine” do not apply. So, instead of the plural forms *miʾīna* and *miʾātin*, the singular *miʾatin* is used (K. I, 87.11). Sibawayh explains this singular by comparing it to the singular of the counted noun after decades and numerals between “eleven” and “nineteen” (K. I, 87.11–12).<sup>19</sup> He adds that it is not rare in Arabic for a singular to refer to a plural, especially in the field of numerals (K. I, 87.13).

### Open issues on *ṣifāt muṣabbahah*

Among the issues that are not dealt with by Sibawayh in this chapter is the morphology of *ṣifāt muṣabbahah* and their morphological link to the verbs, whose *ism al-fāʿil* they resemble. For example, is *xayr* a *ṣifah muṣabbahah* morphologically derived from the verb *xāra* “to choose”, or is it only in the same semantic *sabab* relationship with its complement as the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* is with its complement? The same is valid for numerals: They could easily be morphologically related to verbs, which could reinforce their comparison with *ṣifāt muṣabbahah* (see above, p. 105). Yet, Sibawayh does not follow this path.

Chapter 111 (K. I, 201–206) also deals with issues in the syntax of *ṣifāt muṣabbahah bi-l-fāʿil*. In its title, Sibawayh mentions *al-ʾasmāʾ allatī min al-ʾafʿāl* “nouns that are from verbs” (like *munṭaliq* “leaving”) and *mā ʾaṣbaha-hā min aṣ-ṣifāt allatī laysat bi-ʿamal naḥwa l-ḥasan wa-l-karīm* “what resemble them among adjectives that are not an action like *al-ḥasan* and *al-karīm*” (K. I, 201.1–2). No other theoretical definition of *ṣifāt muṣabbahah bi-l-fāʿil* is found in the *Kitāb*, which, on the other hand, multiplies the linguistic examples. This is typical of Sibawayh’s empirical method.

<sup>19</sup>As-Sirāfi (*Ṣarḥ* IV, 175.8–9) gives a clearer explanation of this obscure passage in the *Kitāb*.

In the same manner, the fact that ordinals are not morphologically linked with *ṣifāt mušabbahah bi-l-fā'il* makes it all the more striking since they do have a *fā'il* pattern. Sibawayh quotes the expression *hādā 'awwalu rajulin*, but apparently for the only purpose of giving an example where a singular (*rajul*) can stand for a "lighter" version of a plural (*rijāl* in *hādā 'awwalu r-rijāli*), as in the singular *'iṣrūna dirhaman*, which stands for the plural *'iṣrūna min ad-darāhimi*. Could it be that through this single example Sibawayh draws a parallel with ordinal numerals in general, and not only with the syntax of *'awwal*? This would be quite far-fetched since *'awwal* itself is a particular case among ordinal numerals.

In chapter 41, Sibawayh only deals with annexational (*ḥasanu l-wajhi* "handsome of face") and specifying constructions (*ḥasanun wajhan* "handsome [in terms of] face"),<sup>20</sup> which he gathers under the wider semantic umbrella of *sabab* relationship. He does not mention predicative and appositional constructions, which are otherwise only briefly mentioned in the *Kitāb*.<sup>21</sup> The reason for this is probably that both predicative and appositional constructions are straightforward and do not need much explanation.

Interestingly, these two constructions are also very natural for *ṣifāt mušabbahah*, as in *al-wajhu l-ḥasanu* "the handsome face" et *wajhu-hu ḥasanun* "his face is handsome". So if numerals can be linked with *ṣifāt mušabbahah* for annexational and specifying constructions, they can *a fortiori* be linked with them for appositional and predicative constructions. This is maybe the reason why Sibawayh does not consider them separately in the *Kitāb*.

In this chapter, Sibawayh links the dependent form of *dirhaman* in *'iṣrūna dirhaman* to the strength of the *ṣifah mušabbahah bi-l-fā'il*, which is a verbal strength. He is clear that *'iṣrūna* has no verbal value itself, but it is difficult to say, as does Owens (1990b, 255), that the dependent form of *dirhaman* has absolutely nothing to see with transitivity.

Owens (1990a, 109) calls SNIP, separation and non-identity principle, the reason why some complements surface in the indefinite dependent form, as in *'iṣrūna dirhaman*. *Dirhaman* is separated from *'iṣrūna* by the compensatory *nūn* which prevents annexation, and the two terms are in a non-identity relationship, i.e., one is not semantically included in the other. This SNIP accounts for the dependent form of certain complements that are not subjected to verbal transitivity. We have seen above the separation role of the *tanwīn* (the *nūn* in the case of *'iṣrūna*). As for the non-identity principle, it is expressed by Sibawayh in chapter 128, entitled "concerning that which takes dependent

<sup>20</sup>See p. 194, about this construction which is not found literally in the *Kitāb*.

<sup>21</sup>See above pp. 164ff. for more details about these constructions in the *Kitāb*.

form because it is not part of the noun preceding it nor identical with it”<sup>22</sup> (*bāb mā yantaṣibu li-’anna-hu laysa min ismi mā qabla-hu wa-lā huwa huwa*; K. I, 235–236).

This presentation of Owens has been criticised by Ayoub (1991, 55–59). She refutes the idea that there are two different types of operation that assign the direct form, namely transitivity and SNIP. The separation principle is rather the regular idea that if elements occupy a syntactic position they prevent others to do so (the compensatory *nūn* prevents ‘*īsrūna* to be annexed to *dirham*, just like in *fī-hā ‘Abdu l-Lāhi qā’iman*, the expression *fī-hā* prevents the independent form *qā’imun*) and the non-identity principle is “tellement un primitif de l’analyse qu’elle n’est jamais énoncée comme telle” (Ayoub 1991, 57). It is however necessary to establish what the referential relation between the two words is, because if it is identity, a qualifying construction would surface.

Rather than saying with Owens that the dependent form of *dirhaman* in ‘*īsrūna dirhaman* has nothing to do with verbal transitivity, we prefer to consider that there is a syntactic operation (‘*amal*) of ‘*īsrūna* on *dirhaman*, which is analogous to the operation of the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* on its complement in the dependent form, which is itself analogous to verbal transitivity.

Lastly, it is clear that the alternation of annexational and specifying constructions in *ṭalāṭatu ’awlādīn*, *xamsata-’ašara waladan*, ‘*īsrūna waladan*, *mi’atu waladīn* and ‘*alfu waladīn* is a striking feature. Here in chapter 41, Sibawayh presents a unified semantic frame that gathers them both, thanks to their syntactic similarities with the *ṣifah al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fā’il*.

A closer look at this series shows that the other problematic issues are the invariability of compound numerals, and the final *nūn* in decades, which cannot be elided in a specifying annexation. The first point is dealt with by Sibawayh in chapter 412 (K. II, 176–177), which be analysed now. The second issue is dealt with in chapter 141 (K. I, 250–256; see above, p. 147).

### 8.3 Between “three” and “nineteen”

Chapter 412 (K. II, 176–177) is entirely devoted to numerals, and is immediately followed by three other chapters also explicitly concerned with numerals. In chapter 412, Sibawayh considers the series from “three” to “nineteen”. Strikingly, he does not quote any other grammarian nor any poet,

<sup>22</sup>Carter’s translation (Carter 1972b, 492).

unlike in many other chapters. He clearly speaks here on his own authority, and the imperative *i'lam 'anna* ... "know that ..." is probably the best marker for this.

### 8.3.1 From "three" and "ten"

Sibawayh begins this chapter by mentioning the counted object expressed after cardinals from "three" to "ten". These numerals are feminine, with or without the final *tā' marbūṭah*, see above, p. 96.

### 8.3.2 Contradictory teaching in chapters 314, 336 and 412

The morphology of compound numerals is a tricky issue in the *Kitāb*, because it is dealt with in different chapters, but it is only here in chapter 412 that Sibawayh explicitly gives his opinion. In chapters 314 and 336, where this issue is discussed, Sibawayh quotes other grammarians, and does not express his own view. It is only in chapter 412 that he clearly gives his own opinion about the morphology of compound numerals.

To put it in a nutshell,<sup>23</sup> Sibawayh chooses not to follow al-Xalil on the syntactic status of the second part of compound numerals. According to al-Xalil, as quoted by Sibawayh, *-ʿAšar* is interpreted as a compensatory *nūn* in the proper name *Iṭnā-ʿAšar* and as a *tā' marbūṭah* in the proper name *Xamsata-ʿAšar* (K. II, 84.14–15). Not only was Sibawayh evasive about this issue in earlier chapters, but he even quotes al-Xalil without discussing him in chapter 336. In chapter 412, Sibawayh is very clear on this point. The second part in *all* compound numerals is similar to the compensatory *nūn* in *muslimūna*, not to the *tā' marbūṭah* in *Talḥah* (K. II, 177.13–18). This decision is explicitly made for the sake of consistency among numerals.

The difference between Sibawayh's and al-Xalil's interpretation of the lexical category (*ḥāl*) of the second part of compound numerals lies in the fact that al-Xalil considers *-ʿašara* and *-ʿaš(i)rata* to have the status of a *tā' marbūṭah* in all compound numerals except in *iṭnā-ʿašara* and *iṭnatā-ʿaš(i)rata*, where they have the status of the compensatory *nūn*; whereas Sibawayh considers that this last frame applies to all compound numerals.

As for the second part of compound numerals, (*-ʿašara*, *-ʿaš(i)rata*), Sibawayh says that its pattern (*bināʾ*) has changed because its lexical category (*ḥāl*) has changed (K. II, 177.3–5), and that it is not rare in the language that a

<sup>23</sup>See Druel (forthcoming) for a detailed account of these chapters.

noun changes its *bināʾ* when its *ḥāl* changes. To make his point understood, Sibawayh quotes other examples where a change in lexical category (*ḥāl*) goes along with a change in pattern (*bināʾ*).

For example, *ʾufuq* “horizon” is an *ism* and its pattern is *fuʿul*. Its relative adjective is *ʾafaqiyyun* “horizontal”, pattern *faʿaliyyun*. In the same manner, the proper name *Zabīnah* is an *ism ʿalam*. Its pattern *faʿīlah* is changed into *faʿaliyyun* in the relative adjective *Zabāniyyun* (K. II, 177.11–13). In these two cases, a change in *ḥāl* (from *ism* to *nisbah*) goes along with a change in *bināʾ* (from *fuʿul* and *faʿīlah* to *faʿaliyyun*).

What is at stake with compound numerals is that the second part of the compound does not have the status of a substantive (*ism*) anymore, as was the case when it meant “ten” (pattern *faʿalatun* and *faʿlun*), but to the compensatory *nūn* in *iṭn-ā-ni* (pattern *-faʿala* and *-faʿ(i)lata*).

Like all compounds “that are made one noun”, compound numerals are not fully declinable (*ġayr mutamakkinah*), they do not take the *tanwīn at-tamkīn*. Since the second term of the compound is already added (*zāʾidah*) to the first term, a *tanwīn* cannot be added to it (K. II, 47.7–12).

### 8.3.3 “Eleven”

For “eleven”, the numeral applying to masculine nouns is *ʾaḥada-ʾašara*.<sup>24</sup> It is a “one noun” compound (*ḥarfāni juʿilā sman wāḥidan ḍammū ʾaḥada ʾilā ʾašara*; K. II, 176.20–21). In this construction, *ʾaḥada-* is said to have the same pattern (*bināʾ*) as in the expression *ʾaḥadun wa-ʾiṣrūna ʾāman* (K. II, 176.22), whereas *-ʾašara* does not have the same *bināʾ* as when it was referring to “ten” (K. II, 176.22–23). Its *bināʾ* has changed from *faʿalah* (in *ʾašarah*, “ten”) to *faʿal* (in *-ʾašara*, “-teen”).

If “eleven” applies to a feminine noun, the numeral has the form *ʾiḥdā-ʾašrata* in the dialect (*luġah*) of Ḥijāz, or *ʾiḥdā-ʾaširata* in the dialect of Tamīm<sup>25</sup> (K. II, 176.23–177.2).<sup>26</sup> The analysis for the two parts of this feminine

<sup>24</sup>Sibawayh says a bit obscurely that there is no *ʾalif* in *ʾašara* (*laysat fi ʾašara ʾalifun*). This *ʾalif* most probably refers to the pausal form *-ā*, meaning that the pausal form of *ʾaḥada-ʾašara* is *ʾaḥada-ʾašar*, not *\*ʾaḥada-ʾašarā*.

<sup>25</sup>The Ḥijāzī form is sometimes considered to be more correct. On this point, see Rabin (1951, 98, § e).

<sup>26</sup>The expression *\*ʾaḥada jamala*, *\*ʾiḥdā nabiqata* and *\*ʾiḥdā tamrata* are clearly incorrect. The expected vocalisation is rather *ʾaḥada jamalin*, *ʾiḥdā nabiqatin* and *ʾiḥdā tamratin*. Why would Sibawayh compare the expression *ʾaḥada-ʾašara* (which is correct) to the expression *\*ʾaḥada jamala* (which is not correct)? The answer is probably that he did not mean the comparison for the final forms but only for the inner pattern (*bināʾ*). The editor should have dropped the

compound noun, *ʾiḥdā-* and *-ʿaš(i)rata*, is the same as for the masculine *ʾaḥada-* and *-ʿašara*: *ʾiḥdā-* has not changed its lexical category (*ḥāl*) if compared to the expression *ʾiḥdā wa-ʿiṣrūna sanatan*, whereas *-ʿaš(i)rata* has (K. II, 177.2–3).

### 8.3.4 “Twelve”

For “twelve”, the numeral applying to masculine nouns is *itnā-ʿašara* in the independent form and *itnay-ʿašara* in the dependent and oblique forms (K. II, 177.4).<sup>27</sup> As was the case for *ʾaḥada-ʿašara* and *ʾiḥdā-ʿaš(i)rata*, the first part of the compound has not changed its *ḥāl* if compared to its situation when alone, except that its *nūn* has been deleted. This, because *-ʿašara* has the status of this compensatory *nūn* (K. II, 177.5). As for the first part of the compound, *itnā-*, it carries the declension, which is not the case in *xamsata-* in the compound *xamsata-ʿašara* (K. II, 177.5–6).

The fact that, unlike all other compound numerals, “twelve” is declinable is explained as follows by Sībawayh: Since *-ʿašara* has the status of the compensatory *nūn* in *itnāni*, the letter that is before *-ʿašara* is a *ḥarf ʾiʾrāb* “letter carrying the declension”, just like the letter that is before the compensatory *nūn* in *itnāni* (K. II, 177.5–6).

This explanation refers to the fact that unlike other numerals, “two” is the only one to carry a *ḥarf ʾiʾrāb*, i.e., a glide that carries declension. In other compounds, the *tanwīn* of the first term is also elided, as in *xamsat-u-n* which becomes *xamsat-a-* in compound *xamsat-a-ʿašara*. The invariable *-a-* replaces the declensional *-u-*. If the same applies to “two” *itn-ā-ni*, the declensional glide *-ā-* is not replaced by an invariable one before the addition of *-ʿašara*. In other words, the fact that in “two” the declension is carried by a *ḥarf* and not a *ḥarakah* forbids its invariability, but not the replacement of the *nūn* by *-ʿašara*.<sup>28</sup> This answers to an issue left open above, see p. 125.

Sībawayh refers here to his chapter entitled “the declinable and the non-declinable” (*mā yaṣarifu wa-lā yaṣarifu*, chap. 285–315; K. II, 1–56). In this chapter—or rather group of chapters—he deals only once with the elision of the compensatory *nūn* (K. II, 18.11), saying that in the case of the dependent and oblique plural *muslimātin*, the *tāʾ* resembles (*ʿašbahat*) the *yāʾ* in the

final vowels and vocalised *ʾaḥada-ʿašar* like *ʾaḥada jamal*, *ʾiḥdā-ʿaširah* like *ʾiḥdā nabiḡah*, and *ʾiḥdā-ʿašrah* like *ʾiḥdā tamrah*.

<sup>27</sup>Manuscript A mistakingly reads: *wa-ʾinna la-hu tñā-ʿašara*.

<sup>28</sup>See Versteegh (1985, 159) on the issue of the glide as being *ḥarf al-ʾiʾrāb* in the *Kitāb*, and its problematic reception in later tradition.



plural *muslimīna* and in the dual *rajulayni*, whereas the *tanwīn* in *muslimātin* has the status of the (compensatory) *nūn* in *muslimīna*. Thus, *muslimā-t-in* is to be analysed like *muslim-ī-na* and *rajula-y-ni*. The consequence of this for the numeral “twelve” is that *itnā-‘ašara* should be analysed *itn-ā-‘ašara* like *itn-ā-ni*. The same goes for *itnay-‘ašara* which is to be analysed *itna-y-‘ašara*, like *itna-y-ni*.

The same analysis is given for the feminine forms of “twelve”, *itnat-ā-‘aš(i)rata* and *itnata-y-‘aš(i)rata*. The following alternative forms are also mentioned: *tint-ā-‘aš(i)rata* and *tinta-y-‘aš(i)rata*, so that “twelve” can take eight different forms altogether (K. II, 177.7–8). The same analysis for the status of both parts of the compound and the final *nūn* is also mentioned here (K. II, 177.8–9).

### 8.3.5 “Thirteen” to “nineteen”

Sibawayh explains that the analysis for compound numerals “eleven” and “twelve” is also true of all compound numerals, from “thirteen” to “nineteen”, both in the masculine and the feminine (K. II, 177.13–18). This answers a question that was left open above, see p. 119. He also notes here that all numerals from “three” to “nineteen” have different forms in the masculine and the feminine (K. II, 177.18–19).

### 8.3.6 Open issues in the grammar of numerals in the *Kitāb*

Are all numerals feminine or only numerals from “three” to “ten”? According to the analysis of numerals, where the second part of the compound is similar to the *tanwīn*, and the first part does not change its lexical category (*ḥāl*), compound numerals should logically be feminine as well. But this is not stated clearly by Sibawayh.

Lastly, since in chapter 314 Sibawayh explicitly treats ordinal compound numerals like the corresponding cardinals (K. II, 47.8–11), we can most probably infer that he interprets *-‘ašara* and *-‘aš(i)rata* in *xāmisā-‘ašara* and *xāmisata-‘aš(i)rata* as analogous to a compensatory *nūn* in *muslimūna*.

Another issue that remains unclear is the following. Why should the counted object be in the singular above “ten” in the annexational and specifying constructions? See above, p. 177, for a presentation of this issue. Sibawayh describes this phenomenon, and he draws a parallel with other expressions where a singular has a plural meaning, but he does not address the question as

such. He says that the singular is “lighter” than the plural, and the indefinite is “lighter” than the definite, so it is “lighter” to say *‘iṣrūna dirhaman* than *‘iṣrūna min ad-darāhimi* (K. I, 85.5–7). But why should this be true only above ten?

Another possible way to consider this question is that while the complement of the *ṣifah muṣabbahah* can be put in the dual or in the plural, as in *al-ḥasanāni l-wujūha* and *al-‘axsarūna ‘a‘mālan* (K. I, 84.9–10), it is normal for numerals to have less possibilities. But this is not said explicitly by Sībawayh.

## 8.4 The logic at stake in the *Kitāb*

As Baalbaki (2008, 81) puts it, one of Sībawayh's far-reaching aims is “to demonstrate that linguistic phenomena are not haphazard and that they conceal an underlying harmony which grammatical analysis can disclose.”

Sībawayh may have considered the case of *‘iṣrūna* first because it is the most difficult one. Unlike *muslimūna*, *‘iṣrūna* keeps its compensatory ending *nūn*, and the second term (*dirhaman*) is put in the dependent form just like a verbal complement, although *‘iṣrūna* has no verbal origin. Indeed, the problematic point at stake in the syntax of numerals is not their slot in the sentence, since they comply with regular rules for substantives (according to their morphosyntactic limitations). It is not their relationship with their counted object when in appositional, predicative or annexational constructions either. As substantives, numerals can be found in these constructions. The most problematic issue is thus the specifying construction *‘iṣrūna dirhaman*. For Sībawayh the problem is apparently twofold: In what frame to interpret *‘iṣrūna dirhaman* and why do not all numerals behave the same?

Sībawayh chooses the *ṣifah muṣabbahah bi-l-fā‘il* as a starting point for his reflexion and proceeds then by successive analogies. Interestingly, the *ṣifah muṣabbahah bi-l-fā‘il* and its complement can be found in all the same constructions as numerals with their counted object, appositional, predicative, annexational and specifying. However, numerals are not considered *ṣifāt muṣabbahah*, but they resemble them semantically and syntactically, just like the *ṣifāt muṣabbahah* resemble active participles to some extent (K. I, 86.20–21).

At this point, it is important to understand that the syntactic strength is not something “present or not present” but a graded phenomenon. Carter (1985, 54) shows that the *sabab* relationship can be stronger or weaker, depending on the degree of “involvement” (*iltibās*) between the words. In

other words, the semantic relationship between numerals and their counted object is a *sabab* relationship, just like with *ṣifāt mušabbahah*, but it is quite weak, hence all the limitations on the possible syntactic constructions. The same goes for other numerals (K. I, 86.6–7).

*Ṣifāt mušabbahah* share “something” of the twofold strength of active participles (verbal and nominal), which explains that they can be found in similar constructions with their complement. However, not everything that is possible with active participles is possible with *ṣifāt mušabbahah*. Passive verbs like *imtalaʿa*, and expressions like *xayrun min* share “something” of the strength of the *ṣifah mušabbahah*, but with less power. At the end of the analogical chain are *ka-dā*, *ʾišrūna* and compound numerals, which seem to have lost all verbal strength of the active participle, except for the “surface strength” to put their counted object in the dependent form. As for annexable numerals, they do not even have this strength.

At a syntactic level, Sibawayh aims to prove that the annexational and specifying constructions are structurally equivalent (Carter 1972b, 489). This enables him to harmonise numerals’ behaviour, which is clearly his aim, along with the mere explanation of the linguistic phenomena (Versteegh 1997b, 246).

At the semantic level, it is not clear what remains from the *sabab* relationship between *ṣifāt al-mušabbahah* and their complement. There must be “something” of the *sabab* in the semantic link between numerals and their counted object, but Sibawayh does not mention it explicitly. Is it really possible to go beyond this without forcing his thought?

He describes this process of comparison where “something” gets lost *en route* and attributes this phenomenon to native speakers themselves:

(٢) وقد يشبهون الشيء بالشيء وليس مثله في جميع أحواله وسترى ذلك في كلامهم كثيرا.

(2) They may compare something to something else even if it is not the same in everything; you will see this a lot in their language (K. I, 77.12–13).

Sibawayh does not know the grammatical category of *tamyīz*, a construction involving a singular indefinite noun in the dependent form used to “specify” the meaning of an “unspecified” term. Such a construction would have been a practical category to analyse *dirhaman*, although there would still have been a consistency issue: Why should certain numerals be in an annexational construction with their complements, and others in need of a specifier?

Sibawayh’s logic may be puzzling because he tries to do two opposite things at the same time. On the one hand, he proceeds through successive

analogies, where “something” of the initial “syntactic strength”<sup>29</sup> is lost in the process, but on the other hand he aims at a global consistency of grammatical phenomena. These two logics are incompatible because an analogy is not an equality, and since something is lost in the analogy, the resulting grammatical rule does not apply fully and loses part of its consistency. Since an analogy is not an equivalence, all the rules that apply to the first element in the analogy do not apply to the second element, and what is lost is not always obvious. The reader can only deduce from the many examples quoted what is lost and what remains.

Baalbaki (2008, 113) lists a series of factors that are compared in order to assign a relative status to words in comparison with one another: *xiffah* “lightness” vs. *tiqal* “heaviness”; being *’awwal* “first” or not, i.e., whether they have been modified by affixation or not; being *’aṣl* “basic forms” vs. *far’* “subsidiary forms”; being *mutamakkin* “fully declinable” or not. In the chapters devoted to numerals, which we have examined here in detail, *quwwah* “syntactic strength” is central in the evaluation of the behaviour of numerals.

A simple example of the trade-off between analogy and consistency lies in the problem of the addition of the article to compound numerals and decades, which does not make them definite in a specifying construction. Sibawayh draws an analogy between compound numerals and duals, treating syntactically –*’aṣara* in *itnā–’aṣara* like the compensatory *nūn* in *itnāni* (K. II, 177.3–6). This solution accounts for the declension of *itnā–* in the middle of the compound. But when it comes to the addition of the definite article, it does not work anymore. It is correct to say *al-itnāni* but the expression *al-xamsata–’aṣara* is doubtful (K. II, 47.17–18), although it is widespread in the language. What was gained through analogy is lost in terms of consistency. In other words, –*’aṣara* is comparable to the compensatory *nūn*, but it also differs from it in some aspects.

Most interestingly, Sibawayh does with compound numerals the same thing as he did for decades. He chooses to explain first the most difficult case (declinable “twelve”) before considering other, easier cases, to which he applies his solution for the difficult case.

A more difficult example of the trade-off between analogy and consistency lies in the question of the invariability of both parts of all compound numerals, except “twelve”. Normally, the addition of the compensatory *nūn* does not prevent the noun from receiving declension, which is added before the *nūn*. Analogically, this works perfectly with “twelve”, interpreted in the

<sup>29</sup>See above, p. 195, what it means to have more or less “strength”.

compensatory *nūn*-like frame. Compare *itn-ā-‘ašara* (independent form) and *itn-ay-‘ašara* (dependent and oblique forms). But regarding other compound numerals, this analogy does not work anymore because the first part of the compound is always *mabnī* on a *fathḥah*, as in *xamsat-a-‘ašara*. Here, consistency is lost, and al-Xalīl has a point when he “claims” that “twelve” does not behave like other compound numerals (K. II, 51.4–6). However, Sibawayh does his best to interpret all compound numerals in the same frame (K. II, 177.13–18), instead of following al-Xalīl, who chooses two different frames (K. II, 84.14–15). In the end, both solutions are interesting, but none is completely consistent.

To sum the whole process up, *-‘ašara* is “like” *nūn al-itnayni wa-l-jamī‘* “the [ending] *nūn* in the dual and the plural”<sup>30</sup> but not everything that applies to *nūn al-itnayni wa-l-jamī‘* applies to *-‘ašara*, and *nūn al-itnayni wa-l-jamī‘* itself is “like” the *tanwīn*, but not everything that applies to the *tanwīn* applies to it, and what is lost at each step can only be deduced by the reader.

Similar examples are very numerous. See for example all the limitations on the specifying construction when it comes to *‘iṣrūna* and other numerals (K. I, 86.6–7); see also the questions posed by the partial analogy between *kam* and *‘iṣrūna* (see above, p. 147.) One should remember that Sibawayh is not aiming at a system where each element would have a fixed status, but, as Ayoub (1990, 6) puts it, he explores the relative position words occupy in relation with one another.

## 8.5 Beyond Sibawayh ...

Although Sibawayh says that some words are “unspecified” (*mubhamah*), see above p. 145, he does not follow this possible track of interpretation for numerals. He could have considered that all numerals are *‘asmā’ mubhamah* “unspecified substantives”. All substantives should refer to something precise, and this comes from the classification of the different parts of speech according to Sibawayh himself (Mosel 1975, 11): verbs (*‘af‘āl*), substantives (*‘asmā’*) and particles (*hurūf*). The problem is that numerals hardly fit this classification and, as many other *‘asmā’*, they refer to something “unspecified”, as was pointed out only once by Sibawayh (K. II, 47.10–11). Among other “unspecified nouns” are *‘awwalu*, *kam*, *‘ayyun*, *ba‘da*, *ba‘du*, *bayna*, *tijāha*, *jamī‘u*, *‘inda*, *kullu*, *ladun*, *ladā*, *la-‘amru*, *miṭla*, *ma‘a*, *naḥwa*, and many more, which are grammatically substantives but behave like *hurūf* in many aspects. Their meaning as nouns is far from clear, hence their specific problems. All

<sup>30</sup>See above, note 1, p. 155.

these nouns are in need of a specifier, be it a *muḏāf* 'īlayh, a *tamyīz* or the particle *min* followed by a *majrūr*.

Sibawayh often mentions these 'asmā' *mubhamah* in his interpretation, yet, he does not link them all into a wider theory of semantically deficient substantives, in need of a semantic complement. The solution proposed by Sibawayh is a semantic complement, which is analogous to the *sabab* complement of the *ṣifah muṣabbahah*. This again is a good example of a negotiation between consistency and analogy. It is the definition of what a noun is that causes later inconsistencies, because some nouns are analogically treated as if they belonged to this category without sharing all the characteristics of the category.

Among these three categories of words, 'af'āl, 'asmā' and *hurūf*, the second one is certainly the wider one. In this category, one finds almost everything in terms of "strength". Some 'asmā' have only a little less strength than verbs, such as 'asmā' *al-fi'l* or 'asmā' *al-fā'il*, whereas other 'asmā' have barely more strength than particles, such as 'inda and *ma'a*.

Most of the problems are found in the syntactic and semantic relations between two nouns, especially if one wants to maintain some global consistency to the system. Ultimately, the issue here is that of nominal government: Can nouns operate on other nouns directly or should an elided particle be supposed at an underlying level? Numerals and their counted object are found in the three possible constructions that involve a possible operation of a noun on another noun, predicative (*al-'awlādu ṭalāṭatun*), annexational (*ṭalāṭatu 'awlādin*) and specifying (*'iṣrūna waladan*). The first case is not explicitly dealt by Sibawayh. For the two other constructions, the underlying structure / meaning is *ṭalāṭatun min al-'awlādi* and *'iṣrūna min al-'awlādi*.

However, Sibawayh is not clear whether he is considering the possibility that numerals "operate" on their counted objects. His presentation of numerals as a subcase of *ṣifah muṣabbahah* gives the impression that he is following this track and, in terms of syntactic "strength", numerals are somewhere between *aṣ-ṣifāt al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fā'il* and *ka-dā*. But it is not possible to go beyond this without forcing Sibawayh's views.

## Chapter 9

# Al-Mubarrad's approach to numerals

### 9.1 Introduction

It is already clear from chapters 4 to 6 that al-Mubarrad is much more specific than Sibawayh in his grammar and that he deals with a great number of issues on which Sibawayh remains silent. In many cases indeed, al-Mubarrad is the only one to mention particular issues. At first glance, his approach seems to be more factual than that of Sibawayh.

The most striking innovation in the grammar of numerals in the *Muq-taḍab*, is that, unlike Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad does not try to reconcile the specific behaviour of all numerals into one comprehensive frame. Instead, he draws a clear separation between basic and subsidiary numerals (*M. II*, 165.13–14); he does not consider “twelve” to be a compound noun, unlike other compound cardinals (*M. II*, 167.3–4); he considers the second part of other compound cardinals to have the status of a *tā' marbūṭah*, not of a compensatory *nūn* (*M. IV*, 29.4–5); he justifies the different behaviour of “one hundred”, as compared to compounds and decades, by the fact that it begins a new series (*M. II*, 167.9–10).

Al-Mubarrad uses the same tools and the same linguistic corpus as Sibawayh but he differs from him in that he does not seem to be interested into a general consistency, as far as numerals are concerned. This point is a good illustration of what Baalbaki (2008, 235) writes of al-Mubarrad's approach to

grammar who “differed from that of his predecessor’s in many aspects but did not introduce any significant change to his overall grammatical theory”.

When one considers these two observations together, a more factual approach than Sibawayh and no quest for a general consistency but a differentiated approach, one gets the impression that al-Mubarrad’s grammar is “atomistic”.

The second most striking innovation is the category of *tamyīz*. Al-Mubarrad does not use a single terminology to name this complement and he seems to use the words *tabyīn* “explanation”, *tamyīz* “specification” and *tafsīr* “commentary” indiscriminately. Since the *tamyīz* surfaces in different shapes (dependent form or *mudāf ʿilayh*), it is clear that this terminology does not apply to the construction as such, but to the meaning of the complement that expresses the species.

In the following pages, we will analyse the chapters in his *Muqtaḍab* that deal with numerals. As we did for Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*, we will first browse the *Muqtaḍab* in order to see where the factual issues that we presented in chapters 4 to 6 are treated and how they relate to one another.

<i>Muqtaḍab</i>	Issues	Pages
M. II, 92–94	This chapter deals with the morphology of nouns that begin with an <i>hamzat al-waṣl</i> like <i>ibn</i> “son”, <i>ism</i> “noun”, and the numeral <i>itnāni</i> “two” (M. II, 92.7–9). Al-Mubarrad applies different morphological tests to these words. He also comments on the meaning of the names of the days of the week.	pp. 112 and 150
M. II, 140–152	In this chapter al-Mubarrad draw a comparison between <i>ʾisrūna rajulan</i> (M. II, 144.6) and expressions like <i>niʿma r-rajulu Zaydun!</i> “what an excellent man Zayd is!” and <i>biʿsa r-rajulu ʿAbdu l-Lāhi!</i> “what an evil man ʿAbd Allāh is!” (M. II, 141.5). In the expression <i>ʾindī min ad-darāhimi ʾisrūna dirhaman</i> , the word <i>dirhaman</i> is a “confirmation” ( <i>tawkid</i> ; M. II, 150.5–6).	p. 145
M. II, 154–187	Four chapters entirely devoted to the morphology and syntax of numerals. The first two of them (M. II, 154–180) will be analysed below.	pp. 216
M. II, 181–184	This chapter is the third of the previous series. It is devoted to the <i>ism al-fāʾil</i> built on numerals, and used in expressions of the type <i>rābiʿu ʿarbaʿatin</i> “one of four” and <i>rābiʿu talāṭatin</i> “the fourth of three”. Decades have no proper <i>ism al-fāʾil</i> . The verb <i>ʾamʿa</i> (Form IV) means “to make something a hundred”; <i>ʾallafa</i> (Form II) or <i>ʾālafa</i> (Form IV) mean “to make something a thousand”.	pp. 88, 91, 107, 138 and 145



M. II, 185–187	This chapter is the last one of the series devoted to numerals. It deals with the annexation of lesser numerals to “nonhuman genus”, to “qualifiers that resemble the nouns”, as well as with issues related to gender discrepancies. These issues seem to have been gathered here only for the sake of exhaustivity.	pp. 170, 172 and 180
M. II, 255–256	In this chapter, which is part of a series devoted to the diminutive ( <i>taḥqīr</i> ), al-Mubarrad deals with the case of <i>ṭamānin</i> “eight” (M. II, 255.5–6; 8–9).	pp. 108 and 112
M. II, 275–278	This chapter is devoted to the diminutive forms of adverbs of time ( <i>taḥqīr aḍ-ḍurūf min al-ʿazminah</i> ; M. II, 275.2). The names of the days of the week are “proper names” (M. II, 276.1).	pp. 113, 118, 140 and 150
M. III, 32–38	This chapter is entitled <i>bāb at-tabyīn wa-t-tamyīz</i> “chapter of the explaining and specifying [constructions]”. We will analyse this chapter below.	pp. 229ff.
M. III, 55–63; 64–67	Two chapters dealing with the comparison between <i>kam</i> and the numerals. <i>ʿIṣrūna dirhaman</i> means ‘ <i>ṣrūna min ad-darāhimi</i> , and this “because ‘twenty’, and what is like it, is a numeral” ( <i>li-ʿanna ʿiṣrūna wa-mā ʿašbaha-hu smu ʿadadin</i> ; M. III, 66.9–10).	p. 147
M. III, 91–92	At the end of this chapter devoted to transitive verbs, al-Mubarrad says that it is not possible to predicate of “ʾaḥad and its sisters” ( <i>wa-lā yuxbaru ʿan ʾaḥadin wa-ʾaxawāti-hi</i> ; M. III, 92.7).	p. 159
M. III, 239–247	In the first part of this chapter (M. III, 239.1–242.7), al-Mubarrad deals with expressions of the type <i>marartu bi-Zaydin waḥda-hu</i> “I passed by Zayd alone”.	p. 141
M. III, 319–312	In this chapter devoted to the triptote and diptotic declensions, al-Mubarrad comments on the <i>maʿdūl</i> “deflected” numerals <i>maṭnā</i> , <i>ṭulāt</i> and <i>rubāʿ</i> (M. III, 319.13).	pp. 117 and 124
M. III, 339–343	This chapter is devoted to the declinability of words of the pattern <i>ʾaḥal</i> that can be in the position of <i>naʿt</i> “qualifier”. Al-Mubarrad analyses here the numeral <i>ʾarbaʿ</i> in the expression <i>hāʾulāʾi niswatun ʾarbaʿun</i> (“these are four women”; M. III, 341.4).	p. 95
M. III, 368–382	In this chapter devoted to the meaning and declinability of <i>maʿdūl</i> nouns, al-Mubarrad comments on the names of the days of the week, their meaning and their patterns, which he says are not <i>maʿdūlah</i> (M. III, 382.1).	p. 150
M. IV, 29–31	This chapter is devoted to the morphology of compound numerals and its implication on their inflection. We will analyse this chapter below.	p. 218
M. IV, 36–39	Chapter devoted to masculine proper names that have a dual or an external plural surface form, like <i>Rajulāni</i> , <i>Muslimāt</i> or <i>ʿIṣrūna</i> .	p. 149

M. IV, 50–71	Numerals can occupy the slot of the <i>maṣḍar</i> as in <i>ḍarabtu Zaydan miʾata sawṭin</i> “I gave Zayd a hundred lashes” (M. IV, 51.9) and in <i>ḍuriba bi-Zaydin ʾiṣrūna sawṭan</i> “he was given twenty lashes because of Zayd” (M. IV, 51.15).	p. 158
M. IV, 86–97	With verbs like <i>kāna</i> , <i>ṣāra</i> , or <i>ʾaṣbaḥa</i> , it is possible to make an indefinite noun a <i>mubtadaʾ</i> , as in <i>mā kāna ʾaḥadun miṭla-ka</i> “nobody was like you” or <i>mā kāna ʾaḥadun mujtariʾan ʾalay-ka</i> “nobody was bold with you” (M. IV, 90.4).	p. 159

Table 9.1: Numerals in the Muqtaḍab

Most of the information on numerals is thus found in the four chapters in M. II, 154–187, the first two of which we will comment now. In addition to these chapters, we will also focus on the two following chapters, M. III, 32–38 dealing with the *tamyīz*, and M. IV, 29–31 dealing with morphosyntactic issues linked with compound nouns.

## 9.2 Morphology and syntax of numerals

The first chapter to be entirely devoted to numerals is entitled *hādā bābu l-ʾadadi wa-tafsīri wujūhi-hi wa-l-ʾillati fī-mā waqaʿa min-hu muxtalifan* (“chapter on numerals, the commentary of their forms and the cause behind that, which has a different shape”; M. II, 153–174). Al-Mubarrad deals here with many issues, morphological as well as syntactic. The only grammarians quoted by name are Sībawayh (d. 180/796), ʾAbū l-Ḥasan al-ʾAḫfaṣ al-ʾAwsaṭ (d. 215/830) and ʾAbū ʾUmar al-Jarmī (d. 225/839). Other grammarians are mentioned anonymously.

### 9.2.1 Differences between the singular, the dual and the plural

After a discussion on the morphology of the dual (M. II, 153.4–155.9), al-Mubarrad says that singular and dual forms have in common that they express at the same time the species (*an-nawʿ*) and the numeral (“one” or “two”), as in *rajulun* “[one] man” and *rajulāni* “two men”; in order to express other quantities, one has to express the number separately as in *ṭalāṭatu ʾafrāsin* “three horses” (M. II, 155.10–13).

Interestingly, al-Mubarrad considers that the overt expression of the number is the base form (*al-ʿaṣl*) and that analogically one should say *\*wāḥidu rijālīn* and *\*tintā rijālīn* (M. II, 155.14), which are possible forms in poetry (M. II, 156.1–2).

As for the dual, another reason to justify expressions like *\*tintā rijālīn* is that for al-Mubarrad the dual is a plural, since the definition of the plural is simply *ʿanna-hu ḍammu šayʿan ʿilā šayʿin* (“it is adding something to something”; M. II, 156.2), which makes *rajuḷāni* a subcase of *\*tintā rijālīn* and *talātatu ʿafrāsīn*.

### 9.2.2 The lesser plural, from “three” to “ten”

The lesser plural is expressed by three different patterns:<sup>1</sup> 1. If the noun is made up of three consonants (*min dawāt at-talāṭah*), it takes one of the specific patterns (*ʿabniyah*) that refer to the lesser plural (*ʿaqall al-ʿadad*), like *ʿaful*, *ʿafʿāl*, *ʿafīlah* or *fiʿlah* (M. II, 157.4–9). 2. Masculine plurals in *-ūna* also refer to lesser numbers, because their pattern “has taken the way of the dual” (*ʿalā minhāji t-taṭniyah*; M. II, 156.10–11); 3. their equivalent in the feminine are the plurals in *-āt* (M. II, 156.12).

In order to express the (lesser) plural of a masculine noun, the numeral is annexed to the counted object. The feminine ending (*ʿalāmat at-taʿnīt*) is added to the numeral (M. II, 157.8–9). This *ʿalāmah* is not added to a masculine word, as in the feminine *ḍāribah* or *qāʿimah*, but it is part of the pattern, as in *ʿallāmah* “most erudite”, *nassābah* “genealogists”, *rabʿah* “medium-sized” or *yafaʿah* “pubescent”, which are masculine (*fa-daxalat hāḍihi l-hāʿu ʿalā ḡayri mā daxalat ʿalay-hi fi ḍāribatun wa-qāʿimatun wa-lākin ka-duḡūli-hā fi ʿallāmatun wa-nassābatun wa-rajuḷun rabʿatun wa-ḡulāmun yafaʿatun*; M. II, 157.9–10). See above, p. 96, on the gender of numerals.

Al-Mubarrad inserts here a paragraph about the use of numerals as proper names, saying that when *Talāt* is used as a masculine proper name (*ʿin sammayta rajulan bi-Talāt*; M. II, 157.13), it is diptotic if it comes from *talāt* and not if it comes from *talāṭah*. This distinction is surprising, because once used as a proper name, the gender of *talāt* or *talāṭah* should not have an effect on *Talāt* any more. We would rather expect that if *Talāt* is a feminine proper name (coming from *talāt*) it is diptotic, but not if it is a masculine proper name (coming from *talāṭah*). But this interpretation would be possible only if the

<sup>1</sup>There are many chapters in the *Muqtaḍab* that deal with the morphology of the plural (two chapters in M. I, 256–261; three chapters in M. I, 266–270 only to mention those that precede the chapter we consider here, M. II, 153–174), but this is not the focus of this study.

expression *'in sammayta rajulan bi-Ṭalāt* (M. II, 157.13) referred to both “men” and “women”, which is quite unlikely.

All these rules apply to numerals between “three” and “ten” (M. II, 157.15–16).

Then, al-Mubarrad says that it is possible to use greater number plurals after “three” to “ten”. This point has been presented above, p. 178.

### 9.2.3 Compound numerals from “eleven” to “nineteen”

Above “ten”, the numeral is a compound noun (*ja'alta-humā sman wāḥidan*; M. II, 161.6) made up from the unit and the noun “ten”. The *lafḍ* “surface form” of both terms of this compound has been modified for the sake of the new pattern (*li-l-binā'*) as in *'aḥada-‘ašara*; the underlying forms (*al-‘ašl*) of these compounds are of the type *'aḥadun wa-‘ašaratun* (M. II, 161.4–6). Both terms of the compound carry an invariable *fathāh* because “it is the lightest of the vowels” (*li-‘anna-hu [al-fath]* *'axaffu l-ḥarakāti*; M. II, 161.8).

Should not compound numerals be declined, just like *Ḥaḍra-Mawtu* and *Ba'la-Bakku*? (M. II, 162.1) The answer of al-Mubarrad is that in these compounds, the second part is regarded as a *hā' at-ta'nīṭ* (*ju'ilā sman wāḥidan ka-mā fa'alū bi-mā fi-hi hā'u t-ta'nīṭi*; M. II, 162.2), and they are proper names, so that they do not “deviate from [their] normal state” (*lam yakun la-hu ḥaddun šurifa 'an-hu*; M. II, 162.3). As for compound numerals, the reason not to decline them is that they have been “deviated” (*'udila*) from their surface form (*al-‘adadu allaḍi ḍakartu kāna la-hu ḥaddun šurifa 'an-hu ka-mā ḍakartu la-ka fa-lammā 'udila 'an wajhi-hi 'udila 'an al-'i'rāb*; M. II, 162.3–4).

In a chapter that bears no title, al-Mubarrad deals with the morphology of compound numerals and its implication for their inflection (M. IV, 29–31). The last paragraph sums up the possible cases for compound nouns. There are two possible coalescence frames, either an *'idāfah* or a one-word compound, and three possible declensional patterns, either fully declinable (*triptotic*), partially declinable (*diptotic*), or indeclinable.

Compound numerals like *xamsata-‘ašara* are indeclinable nouns, with a *fathāh* at the end of both terms. The first *fathāh* indicates that it is not the end of the noun (*'anna-hu laysa muntahā l-ismi*; M. IV, 29.4) but that it is like the *dāl* in *Ḥamdah* or the *hā'* in *Ṭalḥah* (M. IV, 29.4–5). This comparison suggests that the second term of the masculine compound *xamsata-‘ašara* has the status of the *tā' marbūṭah* in the male proper names *Ḥamdah* and *Ṭalḥah*, which was already mentioned in M. II, 162.2.

The final *fathah* on the second term is because of its indeclinability (*li-l-bināʾ*; *M. IV*, 29.6). It was chosen over the other vowels for two reasons. In the first place, it is “lighter” (*li-ʾanna-hu [al-fathu] ʾaxaffu l-ḥarakāti*; *M. IV*, 29.6). This was already stated in *M. II*, 161.8 and *M. III*, 182.2. The second reason why the *fathah* was chosen is that both parts of the compound are Arabic words (*ʿarabiyyun ḍammamta-hu ʾalā ʿarabiyyin*; *M. IV*, 29.6–7). Al-Mubarrad says that in compounds like *ʿAmra-Wayhi*, which are of foreign origin, the final vowel is an indeclinable *kasrah* (*M. IV*, 31.7).

When compound numerals are used as proper names, it is possible to interpret them either in the “integrated” frame or in the *ʾidāfah* frame (*M. IV*, 30.11). Yet, one has to remember that what is said by al-Mubarrad to be indeclinable in the “integrated” frame is only the first term. Its second term could be indeclinable or declinable, fully or partially, but al-Mubarrad does not mention it here.

Al-Mubarrad then quotes the opinion of al-ʾAxfāš, who is said to have accepted the interpretation of compound numerals—when used as numerals—in the *ʾidāfah* frame and considered them to be declinable (*wa-kāna l-ʾAxfāš yujīzu fī-hi [sc. xamsata-ʾašara] l-ʾidāfata wa-huwa ʿadadun wa-yuʿribu-hu*; *M. IV*, 30.12). Al-Mubarrad comments on this opinion by saying that is it correct to interpret compound numerals in the *ʾidāfah* frame (*fa-ʾammā l-ʾidāfatu fa-jayyidatun*; *M. IV*, 30.13),<sup>2</sup> but the declension is erroneous (*wa-ʾammā l-ʾiʾrābu fī-hi fa-radīʾun*; *M. IV*, 30.13). According to him, it is not correct to decline a noun in *ʾidāfah* if it is not declined in the indefinite (*M. IV*, 30.13–14).

The following paragraph (*M. IV*, 30.15–19) is a bit puzzling since it seems to repeat what al-Mubarrad already expresses earlier in the *Muqtaḍab* (*M. II*, 164.3–4 and *M. II*, 178.10–11), namely, that compound numerals contain a “meaning of *tanwīn*” (*maʿnā t-tanwīn*; *M. IV*, 30.16), which can be deleted when the compound is in the position of *muḍāf* as in *hāḍihi xamsata-ʾašara-kum* “these are your fifteen”.

However, the formulation in *M. IV*, 30.15–19 is slightly different from the two previous occurrences of the same idea:

(٣) فَإِذَا قُلْتَ هَذَا خَمْسَةَ عَشْرَ كُمْ ذَهَبَ مِنْهُ مَعْنَى التَّنْوِينِ وَصَارَ فِي الْوَجْهِينَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ هَذِهِ عَشْرُونَ دِرْهَمًا وَهَذِهِ عَشْرُوكَ وَعَشْرُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ فَهُوَ بِالْيَتَةِ هَكَذَا.

<sup>2</sup>See above, footnote 8, p. 227, for a discussion of this issue between Kūfans and Baṣrans, as quoted by Baalbaki (1981, 20).

(3) So if you say *hādā xamsata-‘ašara-kum* “these are your fifteen”, the meaning of *tanwīn* is gone and in both forms it has the status of the expression *hādihi ‘iṣrūna dirhaman* “these are twenty dirhams”, and *hādihi ‘iṣrū-ka* “these are your twenty”, and *‘iṣrū ‘Abdi l-Lāhi* “‘Abdallāh’s twenty”. This is how it is, in intention (*M. IV*, 30.16–17).

A clue to the interpretation of this passage probably lies in the expression *fī l-wajhayni* (“in both forms”; *M. IV*, 30.16), which could either refer to the two constructions (*xamsata-‘ašara dirhaman* and *xamsata-‘ašara-kum*, which behave like *‘iṣrūna dirhaman* and *‘iṣrū-ka*), or to the two interpretations (the “integrated” frame and the *‘iḍāfah* frame). In the former case, this paragraph does not add anything to *M. II*, 164.3–4 and *M. II*, 178.10–11. In the latter case, it means that whatever the frame in which compound numerals are interpreted (*fī l-wajhayni*), they lose their “meaning of *tanwīn*” when in the position of *muḍāf*.

### 9.2.4 “Twelve”

“Twelve” behaves differently from all the other compound numerals, because it carries an “indication of *‘iṣrāb*” which prevents it from forming one word with another noun (*li-‘anna-hu mim-mā fī-hi dalīlu l-‘iṣrābi [...] lam yajuz ‘an yuj‘ala ma‘a ḡayri-hi sman wāḥidan*; *M. II*, 162.5–6). This behaviour is different from the behaviour of *Ḥaḍra-Mawtu* (where the second part is regarded as a *hā’ at-ta’nīṭ*) and from the behaviour of *kaffata-kaffata* (where both parts are indeclinable and which seems to be the pattern chosen for compound numerals except “twelve”).

In *itnā-‘ašara* the second part (*-‘ašara*) has the status (*manzilah*) of the final *nūn* in *itnā-ni*, “except that it has the meaning from which it is distinguished among numerals” (*‘illā ‘anna la-hā l-ma‘nā llaḍī ‘abānat ‘an-hu min al-‘adadi*; *M. II*, 162.8). In the vocative, the proper name *Itnā-‘Ašara* loses its second part as in *yā Tna ‘aqbil!* which shows that *-‘Ašara* is treated exactly like the final *nūn* in *itnā-ni* (*M. II*, 162.9–10). It also shows that its numerical meaning (“teen”) is not important anymore and it can be erased without a risk of confusion.

In this frame, the declinability of “twelve” is not problematic, as it was in Sibawayh’s theory. Al-Mubarrad poses the question the other way round: Since *itnāni* carries a *ḥarf ‘iṣrāb*, it cannot coalesce like other compounds, hence the form *itnā-‘ašara* which also carries a *ḥarf ‘iṣrāb*. This clarifies a point that was left unanswered above, p. 125.

Then, al-Mubarrad discusses the case of compound cardinals between “thirteen” and “nineteen”, which can only carry one *hā’ at-ta’nīṭ*, either on

the first term or on the second one. This point has been presented above, p. 120.

The difference between Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad is thus twofold. Firstly, unlike Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad does not consider that *itnā-‘ašara* is a compound noun although he agrees with him on the status of *-‘ašara* as that of a compensatory *nūn*, and secondly, he suggests a parallel between the second part of other compound numerals and the *tā’ marbūṭah* in the male proper names *Ḥamdah* and *Ṭalḥah*. This interpretation is that attributed to al-Xalil by Sibawayh (see above, p. 204). It is consistent with what we know about al-Mubarrad theory that he interprets “twelve” and the other compound cardinals differently since they behave differently.

### 9.2.5 “One hundred” and “two hundred”

*Mi’ah* begins a new series. It is morphologically different from decades, and this for two reasons. “Because—according to what precedes concerning numerals—a series has the right to be different from the noun before it” (*wali-‘anna l-‘iqda’ haqqu-hu ‘an yakūna fī-mā faraṭa’ min al-‘aḍādi xārijan min ismin qabla-hu*; M. II, 167.10). In other terms, a new series is entitled to have a different behaviour. The other reason is that, in the first place, it could not be derived from *‘ašarah* (forming a hypothetical \**‘ašarūna* “ten decades”, just like *ṭalāṭūna* “three decades” and *‘arba‘ūna* “four decades”), and this, in order to avoid any confusion with *‘iṣrūna* “twenty” (M. II, 167.9–10; see above pp. 137f.)

“One hundred” is annexed to its counted object, with or without the article, as in *mi’atu dirhamin* or *mi’atu d-dirhami*, just like after numerals from “three” to “ten” (M. II, 167.10–12) as in *ṭalāṭatu ‘awlādin* and *ṭalāṭatu l-‘awlādi*. This construction differs from the construction of *‘iṣrūna* because its *tamyiz* “specifier” is separated from it (M. II, 168.1–2). It is clear that al-Mubarrad means the compensatory *nūn*,<sup>5</sup> which he calls a *tanwīn*. This *nūn* separates between the numeral and its complement and thus prevents annexation.

<sup>3</sup>This vocalisation is unexpected. Obviously the word *عقد* here does not mean “decade” (*‘aqd*) in the narrow sense, but “series”. Ibn Manḍūr (d. 711/1311) does not mention the meaning of “decade” for *‘aqd* but he mentions the meaning of “necklace” for *‘iqd*, pl. *‘uqūd* (*Lisān*, III, 296). The meaning of “decade” for *‘aqd*, pl. *‘uqūd* is found in ‘Abū Ḥayyān’s (d. 745/1344) *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ* (III, 1437). The verb *‘aqada / ya‘qidu* is well attested in the meaning of “counting on one fingers” (Kazimirski 1860, II, 311; Lane 1863–1893/1955–1956, V, 2105–2106). As for the singular of *‘uqūd* in the sense of “decades”, Lane adds that he found “no satisfactory authority for the orthography of the word in this sense”, adding that the vocalisation *‘iqd* is found only in one manuscript of az-Zamaxšārī’s (d. 538/1144) *Muqaddimat al-‘adab*.

<sup>4</sup>Sic.

<sup>5</sup>See above, p. 155, more details on the compensatory *nūn*.

Since it is not possible to put the “species” complement (*nawʿ* or “specifier” *tamyīz*) in the definite when it comes in the dependent form, al-Mubarrad says that one can express quantity in the definite by adding the article to the numeral, as in *al-ʿiṣrūna rajulan* (M. II, 168.3–4). This construction is parallel to the expression *aḍ-ḍāribūna Zaydan* because the *tanwīn* (understand, the compensatory *nūn*) acts as a separator (*li-ʾanna mā baʿda t-tanwīni munfaṣilun mim-mā qabla-hu*; M. II, 168.4). This separator prevents annexation, leaving no other option than to put the article to the numeral in order to make it definite as in *al-ʿiṣrūna rajulan* (M. II, 168.3).

The syntactic differences between *miʾah* and *ʿiṣrūna* can be explained by the difference between the *tanwīn* in *miʾah* and the *nūn* in *ʿiṣrūna* (M. II, 168.5). At the pause, the *tanwīn* is elided whereas the *nūn* is not; in the same way, if the article is added to the noun, the *tanwīn* is elided but not the *nūn* (M. II, 168.5–6), as in *al-miʾatu* and *al-ʿiṣrūna*.

As for the difference between *ṭalāṭah* and *miʾah*—which are both annexable—it lies in the number of their *muḍāf ʾilayh*: a lesser plural form after *ṭalāṭah*, a singular after *miʾah* (M. II, 168.7–8).<sup>6</sup> In all this, al-Mubarrad is keen to point out the differences between numerals. There are syntactic and morphological common points between numerals but in the end each series behaves differently.

*Miʾah* is used for both the masculine and the feminine (M. II, 168.10–11), as was the case for decades. Al-Mubarrad notes that compound numerals have a masculine and a feminine form although they are not lesser numerals. However, they are made up of two numerals that both apply to lesser plural forms (*kāna wāqīʿan li-ʾadnā l-ʾadadi*; M. II, 168.10–12) and this is the reason why they have a masculine and a feminine form. See above, p. 120.

Under poetic licence, it is possible to put the counted object after *miʾah*—as well as after numerals from “three” to “ten”—in the dependent form, indefinite and singular, as in *ṭalāṭatun ʾaṭwāban* and *miʾatāni ʿāman* in which case the counted object behaves exactly as after *ʿiṣrūna*, “because it is a *tamyīz*” (*li-anna-hu tamyīz*; M. II, 168.13–169.3). It is understood from this passage that the dual *miʾatāni* is the regular dual form of *miʾah* and is normally in the position of *muḍāf* with the counted object, although in poetry it may operate on a *tamyīz*.

<sup>6</sup>Here again, it is thanks to a correction by as-Sirāfi that the text is understandable.



### 9.2.6 From “three hundred” to “nine hundred”

The singular of *mi'ah* in the forms *ṭalātu mi'atin*, *'arba'u mi'atin*, and so on, needs an explanation. Al-Mubarrad says that the Arabs prefer it to the plural *mi'ūna'* or *mi'āt* and that this does not contradict the way numerals behave (*dālika qiyāsun*; M. II, 169.4).

The explanation given by al-Mubarrad would be difficult to understand without the clear distinction he draws between “base form numerals” (*al-ʿaṣl*), i.e., “one” to “ten”, and “subsidiary numerals” (*al-farʿ*), i.e., all other numerals. The singular form of *mi'ah* after numerals between “three” and “nine” is, in al-Mubarrad’s own words, “analogous to what was presented before concerning numerals, because it was the base form and what is after this is subsidiary” (*fa-ʿinnamā dālika qiyāsun ʿalā mā maḍā li-ʿanna l-māḍī min al-ʿadadi huwa l-ʿaṣlu wa-mā baʿda-hu farʿun*; M. II, 169.4–5). In other words, it is normal that hundreds behave differently from other numerals because they belong to a different series. This distinction between “base form” and “subsidiary” numerals is not found in the *Kitāb*. Al-Mubarrad uses it to justify the difference of behaviour between the numerals.

According to him, *ṭalātu* in *ṭalātu mi'atin* behaves exactly like *ʿiṣrūna*, inasmuch as its complement *mi'ah* is in the singular (M. II, 169.5–8). This is the *qiyās* for “subsidiary” *farʿ* numerals because they are in need of a “species” complement (*nawʿ*), be it a *tamyīz* or a *muḍāf ʿilayh*. This interpretation is valid up till *tisʿu mi'atin* “nine hundred” (M. II, 169.8).

### 9.2.7 “Thousands”

The next series is built with the word *ʿalf* “one thousand”: *ʿalfun*, *ṭalāṭatu ʿālāfin*, *ʿaṣaratu ʿālāfin*, *ʿahada-ʿaṣara ʿalfan* (M. II, 169.9–10) and nothing forbids expressions like *ʿiṣrūna ʿalfan*, *miʿatu ʿalfin*, *xamsatu miʿati ʿalfin*. Here the word *ʿalf* behaves like any counted object and not like *mi'ah*. Indeed, al-Mubarrad clearly compares *ʿaṣaratu ʿālāfin* to *ʿaṣaratu ʿatwābin* and *ʿahada-ʿaṣara ʿalfan* to *ʿahada-ʿaṣara ṭawban* (M. II, 169.10–170.1).

Once more, the explanation given by al-Mubarrad points out the differences of treatment: *ṭumma taqūlu ṭalāṭatu ʿālāfin li-ʿanna l-ʿadada llaḍi baʿda-hu ḡayru xārijin min-hu* (“then you say *ṭalāṭatu ʿālāfin* [and not \**ṭalāṭatu ʿalfin*, like *ṭalātu mi'atin*] because the numeral [*ʿalf*] that is after it [*mi'ah*] is not derived from it [*mi'ah*]”; M. II, 169.9). For al-Mubarrad, it seems to be normal

<sup>7</sup>See above, footnote 17, p. 109.

that *ʿalf* and *miʿah* behave differently, just because they are different series of numerals.

### 9.2.8 More issues about “one hundred” and “one thousand”

If *ʿalf* is put in the plural after “three” to “ten”, why should not this be applied to *miʿah*, which remains in the singular? Al-Mubarrad says that it is actually correct (*jāza*) to annex *miʿah* in the plural to numerals between “three” and “ten” as in *ṭalātu miʿina* or *ṭalātu miʿātin* (M. II, 170.3–4) but this possibility would become compulsory if expressions like \**ʿašru miʿina* and \**ʾiḥdā-ʿaš(i)-rata miʿatan* were used (M. II, 170.1–2). Here, al-Mubarrad probably refers to the fact that *miʿah* cannot be treated as a counted object, unlike *ʿalf* which can be used after any other numeral.

This type of reasoning is somewhat strange. It seems in the end that the point of al-Mubarrad is only to say that whereas *ṭalātu miʿina* or *ṭalātu miʿātin* are possible variants (especially in poetry), \**ʿašru miʿina* and \**ʾiḥdā-ʿaš(i)-rata miʿatan* are not. But why should the annexation of “ten” to the plural form of *miʿah*, or its use as a *tamyīz* after “eleven”, make it compulsory to annex “three” to “ten” to its plural form, and why should the opposite not be true? The answer to this question probably lies in the fact that \**ʿašru miʿina* and \**ʾiḥdā-ʿaš(i)-rata miʿatan* are redundant with *ʿalfun* and *ʿalfun wa-miʿatun* and if these expressions were correct, they would indeed make *miʿah* a mere counted object and not a numeral, just like *ʿalf*, thus making it compulsory to say *ṭalātu miʿina* or *ṭalātu miʿātin*, just like *ṭalātatu ʿālāfin*.

Another issue discussed by al-Mubarrad is the fact that both *ʿalf* and *miʿah* apply indifferently to masculine and feminine nouns, as in *miʿatu dirhamin*, *miʿatu jāriyatin*, *ʿalfu ġulamīn* and *ʿalfu jāriyatin* (M. II, 170.8). Al-Mubarrad says that *ʿalf* and *miʿah* do not behave like numerals from “three” to “ten” and the reason he gives is that “*ṭalāt* and *ṭalāṭah*, when applied to *ʿalf* or *miʿah* or other [nouns], indicate lesser quantities of what they count” (*li-ʿanna ṭ-ṭalāṭa wa-ṭ-ṭalāṭata ʿalā miʿina waqaʿa ʿaw ʿalā ʿulūfin ʿaw ġayri ḍālika fa-fi-hinna ʿaḡallu l-ʿadadi mim-mā waqaʿna ʿalay-hi*; M. II, 171.1–2). The second part of the reason given here is the same as for decades: Greater numerals apply to both masculine and feminine counted objects. Al-Mubarrad repeats here the justification for the fact that compounds have both a masculine and a feminine form although they belong to greater numerals: They are made of two lesser numerals (M. II, 171.3).

## 9.3 Expression of definiteness

The chapter entitled *hādā bābu 'idāfati l-'adadi wa-xtilāfi n-naḥwiyyīna fī-hi* (“this is the chapter on the annexation of numerals and the disagreement of grammarians about them”; *M. II*, 175–177) is devoted to the addition of the article to either the numeral or the counted object, which is only possible in a few cases. We have seen above, pp. 174f., that al-Mubarrad is very critical of the actual language of Arabs who use expressions such as \**aṭ-ṭalāṭatu d-darāhim*, \**al-xamsata-‘ašara d-dirham* (or \**al-xamsata l-‘ašara d-dirham*) and \**al-‘iṣrūna d-dirham*, which he labels “abominable errors” (*xaṭa’ fāhiṣ*; *M. II*, 175.5). His comment is that analogy, not actual use, should prevail (*M. II*, 175.7).

Al-Mubarrad first recalls that only a noun derived from a verb can carry the definite article in the position of *muḍāf*. He gives no example here, but in a chapter devoted to the *'idāfah* (*M. IV*, 136–147), he explains in much detail expressions such as *hum aḍ-ḍāribū Zaydin* “they are the ones who hit Zayd” (*M. IV*, 145.4). The analogy that forbids the addition of an article to numerals differs in the case of lesser numerals, compound numerals, and decades.

For lesser numerals, al-Mubarrad compares *ṭalāṭatu 'aṭwābin* to *ṣāhibu 'aṭwābin* “owner of clothes” saying that the only possible way to make this expression definite is *hāḍihi ṭalāṭatu l-'aṭwābi* just like *hādā ṣāhibu l-'aṭwābi*, and that \**hāḍihi ṭ-ṭalāṭatu l-'aṭwābi* is incorrect (*M. II*, 175.12–14). The expressions *hāḍihi ṭalāṭatu l-'aṭwābi* and *xamsatu d-darāhimi* are also mentioned in *M. IV*, 144.3.

For compound numerals, he says that *xamsata-‘ašara* has the status of *Ḥaḍra-Mawtu*, *Ba‘la-Bakku*, *Qālī-Qālā*, *'Ayādī-Sabā* and “all other comparable nouns that have been made one noun” (*wa-mā 'aṣbaha ḍālika min al-ismayni llaḍayni yuj'alāni sman wāḥidan*; *M. II*, 176.7). The explanation given by al-Mubarrad is that “if one of these [compounds] is indefinite and has to be put in the definite, the article is added to the first term because the second term has become integrated in the first one, but this [to add the article to the first term] is even uglier and more disgraceful” (*fa-'idā kāna šay'un min ḍālika nakiratan fa-'inna ta'rifā-hu 'an taj'ala l-'alifa wa-l-lāma fī 'awwali-hi li-'anna ṭ-ṭāniya qad šāra fī darajī l-kalāmi al-'awwali fa-hādā 'aqbaḥu wa-'ašna'u*; *M. II*, 176.8–9). If the compound nouns listed above are definite—because they are proper names—then the question of adding the definite article is purely theoretical; but if they were not—which is the case of *xamsata-‘ašara*—then it is possible to add the definite article to the first term. It would be “uglier and more disgraceful” to add the article to both terms and to the counted object.

For decades, it is not permitted to say \**al-ʿiṣrūna d-dirham* because the definiteness of the numeral has already been properly expressed (*ʾuḥkima wa-buyyina*; *M. II*, 176.10) and it is simply in need of a “species” (*nawʿ*), i.e., *dirhaman*, not a specific definite *ad-dirham*. The correct expression is thus *al-ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* (*M. II*, 176.12), just like *aḍ-ḍāribūna Zaydan* (*M. II*, 168.4) mentioned above.

## 9.4 Numerals in annexation

The chapter entitled *hādā bābu mā yuḍāfu min al-ʾaḍādi l-munawwanati* (“this is the chapter on numerals that carry a *tanwīn* [or a compensatory *nūn*] and that are annexable”; *M. II*, 178–180) deals with numerals in the position of *muḍāf* as in *ṭalāṭatu-ka* and *ṭalāṭu-ka* “your three” (both genders), *ʿiṣrū-ka* “your twenty”, *miʾatu-ka* “your hundred”, *ʾalfu-ka* “your thousand”. In some cases (which correspond to cases where the counted object can be definite), it is also possible to express a counted object as in *ṭalāṭatu ʾaṭwābi-ka* “your three dresses”, *miʾatu dirhami-ka* “your hundred dirhams”, *ʾalfu dīnāri-ka* “your thousand dinars” (*M. II*, 178.3–5; 8–10).

There is no difficulty in all these expressions, where the numeral is treated exactly like any other declinable non-diptotic noun in the position of *muḍāf*. As al-Mubarrad puts it, the ending *tanwīn* (or compensatory *nūn* in *ʿiṣrūna* and other decades) is simply deleted (*M. II*, 178.3). The declension rules of these numerals do not change, as in *raʾaytu ṭalāṭi-ka* (*M. II*, 178.4). In the same manner, for conjoined numerals, each part follows its own rules. See above, p. 132. In all these cases, however, numerals are not annexed to their counted object but to their possessor.

### 9.4.1 Annexation of compound numerals

In order to annex a noun to another one, the first noun should be deprived of both the definite article and the *tanwīn*. The issue at stake with the annexation of compound numerals is that it is not possible to annex compound numerals without removing this second part. However, when the second part is removed, nothing distinguishes between the compound numeral and its corresponding unit, and the original meaning is lost.

The innovation of al-Mubarrad, if compared to Sībawayh, lies in the fact that he considers that compound numerals between “eleven” and “nineteen” carry an “intention of *tanwīn*” (*niyyatu t-tanwīn*; *M. II*, 164.3–4) and that this

intention that prevents annexation can be deleted: *tuqaddiru ḥaḍfa mā fī-hi min at-tanwīni fī n-nīyyati* (“you imply the elision of the intention of *tanwīn*”; *M. II*, 178.10–11). In other words, an expression like *xamsata-‘ašara-ka* is possible because the intention of *tanwīn* that is in *xamsata-‘ašara* is deleted in order to annex the numeral to the pronoun.

This interpretation of al-Mubarrad differs from that of Sibawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj who both qualify the expression *xamsata-‘ašara-ka* of “bad language” (*luḡah radī‘ah*; *K. II*, 47.19; *‘U. II*, 140.8). See above, p. 130.

Al-Mubarrad justifies this deletion by comparing it to the following two expressions:

(4) *hunna ḥawājjū bayta l-Lāhi*.

They [fem. pl.] are pilgrimaging to the house of God (*M. II*, 178.11).

and

(5) *hunna ḥawājjū bayti l-Lāhi*.

They [fem. pl.] are pilgrims of the house of God (*M. II*, 178.11).

The word *ḥawājj* is the feminine plural form of *ḥājj* and it is diptotic. In (4), al-Mubarrad says that it carries an “intention of *tanwīn*” as in *ḥādā ḍāribun Zaydan* (*M. II*, 178.12–13), whereas in (5) this intention is deleted, as in *ḥādā ḍāribu Zaydin* (*M. II*, 178.13). In the same way, *xamsata-‘ašara* carries an “intention of *tanwīn*” which is deleted in *xamsata-‘ašara-ka* (*M. II*, 178.10–11).

In the rest of this chapter (*M. II*, 178.10–180.12), al-Mubarrad discusses the possibility for compound numerals to be declinable in the position of *muḍāf* as in *xamsata-‘ašaru-ka*, *xamsata-‘ašara-ka* and *xamsata-‘ašari-ka*, which is the case in the language of some Arabs (*M. II*, 179.6).<sup>8</sup> Al-Mubarrad acknowledges that in some way there are elements that could justify this declension (*la-hu wujayhun min al-qiyāsi*; *M. II*, 179.6–7). For example, *‘amsi* “yesterday” and *min qablu* “before” are indeclinable, however they become declinable when in the position of *muḍāf*, as in *‘amsu-ka* and *min qabli-ka* (*M. II*, 179.8); as well as after the addition of the definite article (*M. II*, 180.2); and also when put in the indefinite, as in some readings of Qur’ānic ﴿li-l-Lāhi l-‘amru min qablin wa-min ba‘din﴾ (*Q. 30, 4*; *M. II*, 180.3).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>The discussion here is not about the possibility of *-‘ašar* to be the *muḍāf* ‘ilayh of *xamsata-* as apparently understood by Baalbaki (1981, 20) but of *xamsata-‘ašara* to become declinable when in the position of *muḍāf*. For the issue presented by Baalbaki see *M. IV*, 30.12–13.

<sup>9</sup>Instead of the canonical *min qablu wa-min ba‘du*. In the footnote (*M. II*, 180) ‘Uḍaymah says that the reading *min qablin wa-min ba‘din* is “irregular” (*min aš-šawāḍḍ*). He refers to ‘Abū Ḥayyān’s *al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ* (VII, 162; VII, 210 in our edition).

In the same manner, al-Mubarrad explains that the *munādā* (which carries an indeclinable *ḍammah* when alone, as in *Yā Zaydu!* "O Zayd!") finds its declension again when in the position of *muḍāf* or when put in the indefinite, as in *Yā 'Abda l-Lāhi!* "O 'Abd Allāh!" and *Yā rajulan!* "O man!" (M. II, 180.4–5). In this case, the *idāfah* (in *'Abd al-Lāh*) and the *tankīr* (in *rajulan*) have caused the otherwise indeclinable *munādā* to be declinable.

The behaviour of *'ams*, *qabl* and the *munādā* could be an argument for those who justify the declension of *xamsata-ʿašara* when in the position of *muḍāf*, however al-Mubarrad sees some differences between them.

Unlike *'ams* and *qabl* which are *maʿārif*, *xamsata-ʿašara* is *nakirah* (M. II, 180.1). What is meant exactly by al-Mubarrad is not very clear. It seems to be another level than the mere syntactic "definiteness" and "indefiniteness". It could refer to the meaning of these words, and the difference with what classical grammarians call *maqṣūd* "deliberate" and *ḡayr maqṣūd* "undeliberate" words, or with the opposition between "specified" (*maxṣūṣ*)<sup>10</sup> and "unspecified" (*mubham*) which seems to be merely semantic. The implication of this, for al-Mubarrad, is that the behaviour of *'ams* (and *qabl*) and *xamsata-ʿašara* is not analogical. For example, the addition of the definite article to *'ams* and *qabl* turns their declinability on (M. II, 180.1–2), whereas for *xamsata-ʿašara* it does not, as in *jāʿani l-xamsata-ʿašara rajulan* (M. II, 180.5–6). The other difference between *'ams*, *qabl* and *xamsata-ʿašara* is that being a *nakirah* ("by essence", as opposed to syntactic indefiniteness), *xamsata-ʿašara* cannot be put in the indefinite, unlike *'ams* or *qabl* (M. II, 180.3).

As for the difference between the *munādā* and *xamsata-ʿašara*, it also lies in the fact that the *munādā* can be turned into an indefinite (M. II, 180.4–5) whereas *xamsata-ʿašara* cannot, because it is already an indefinite. Although al-Mubarrad does not express it here, this is due to the fact that the *munādā* is definite "by essence", although it can be turned into an indefinite. Compare for example *Yā rajulu!* "O [you,] man!" to *Yā rajulan!* "O man [in general]!" This *tankīr* is impossible with *xamsata-ʿašara*, whose "intention of *tanwīn*" can only be deleted but not superadded.

This discussion is very typical of al-Mubarrad's method. Different things must behave differently. In other words, there must be a difference between *'ams*, the *munādā* and *xamsata-ʿašara* that justifies their different behaviour. Why do *'ams* becomes fully declinable after the addition of the definite article and not *xamsata-ʿašara*? He answers by introducing a semantic distinction between *'ams*, which is definite by essence and *xamsata-ʿašara*, which is indefinite by essence. In the same manner, why does the *munādā* becomes

<sup>10</sup>See Versteegh (1993a, 158).

fully declinable when the indefinite is intended and not *xamsata-‘ašara*? He also answers with the same semantic distinction between the *munādā* which is essentially definite and *xamsata-‘ašara* which is essentially indefinite.

In the end, we have three different cases: *‘ams* is essentially definite, and can carry the definite article, which turns its full declinability on; the *munādā* is also essentially definite, but indefiniteness can be intended, which turns its full declinability on; compound numerals are essentially indefinite, and neither the addition of the definite article nor the deletion of their intention of *tanwīn* make them fully declinable.

Al-Mubarrad claims here that Sibawayh permits the declension of *xamsata-‘ašara* after the addition of the article as in *jā‘ani l-xamsata-‘ašaru rajulan* or in the position of *muḍāf* (M. II, 180.7).<sup>11</sup> See above, p. 130.

## 9.5 The specifier complement *tamyīz*

In a chapter entitled *bāb at-tabyīn wa-t-tamyīz* “chapter of the explaining and specifying [constructions]” (M. III, 32–38), al-Mubarrad teaches that the *tamyīz* is operated on by a verb, or what resembles the verb on an underlying level (*i‘lam ‘anna t-tamyīza ya‘malu fī-hi l-fi‘lu wa-mā yušbihu-hu fī taqdīri-hi*; M. III, 32.3). The meaning of the dependent form (*intiṣāb*) of the *tamyīz* is the same, whatever its “operator” (*‘āmil*). It sheds light on the “species” (*naw‘*) of the operator (*wa-ma‘nā-hu fī l-intiṣābi wāḥidun wa-‘in ixtalafat ‘awāmilu-hu fa-ma‘nā-hu ‘an ya’tiya mubayyinān ‘an naw‘i-hi*; M. III, 32.3–5).

The first example of *tamyīz* given by al-Mubarrad is extremely interesting: *‘indī ‘iṣrūna dirhaman* “I have twenty dirhams” (M. III, 32.5) because there is clearly no verbal operator, and it must be supposed that for al-Mubarrad *‘iṣrūna* resembles the verb *fī taqdīri-hi* “on an underlying level”.

There are many words indeed that resemble the verb on an underlying level (*taqdīr*). Al-Mubarrad gives three types of such words, depending on whether they resemble the verb *li-l-lafḍ* “because of [their] surface level”; or *li-t-taṣarruf* “because of [their] behaviour”; or *li-l-ma‘nā* “because of [their]

<sup>11</sup>However, in the expression used by al-Mubarrad *wa-‘innamā ‘ajāza Sibawayhi ḍ-ḍamma ‘alā bu‘dīn* the meaning of *‘alā bu‘dīn* is not very clear. This expression is found eleven times in the *Muqtaḍab* (and not in the *Kitāb*) and the most frequent constructions are *hādā jā‘izun ‘alā bu‘dīn* (M. I, 228.16; II, 148.4), *huwa ‘ajāza-hu ‘alā bu‘dīn* (M. II, 180.7; III, 57.2; IV, 185.11), *hādā yajūzu ‘alā bu‘dīn* (M. II, 351.3–4; III, 44.2; III, 221.7; IV, 341.4). It most probably refers to expressions that are “accepted although they are far-fetched”. Compare to the expression *hādā min al-bu‘dī bi-makānin* “this is improbable, or extraordinary, or strange” (Lane 1863–1893/1955–1956, I, 225). The equivalent expression in the *Kitāb* could be *‘alā ḡayri qiyāsīn*.

meaning" (M. III, 33.8). Owens (1990b, 256) says that al-Mubarrad has not understood the separation and non-identity principle (SNIP) in Sibawayh's grammar. See above, p. 202, for a presentation of this theory.

Here are examples of all three categories quoted by al-Mubarrad: *'inna* "indeed", *la'alla* "perhaps" and *'iṣrūna* "twenty" resemble the verb "because of [their] surface level" (*li-l-lafḍ*) inasmuch as their complement is in the dependent form, as in *'inna Zaydan munṭaliqun* "Zayd is leaving indeed", *la'alla Zaydan 'axūka* "perhaps is Zayd your brother" and *'iṣrūna rajulan* "twenty men" (M. III, 33.2-4).

*Kāna* resembles the verb "because of [its] behaviour" (*li-t-taṣarruf*), inasmuch as it has a verbal pattern (*wazn*) and behaviour (*taṣarruf*), but it is not a real verb (*wa-laysat fi'lan 'alā l-ḥaqīqati*; M. III, 33.4-5). A real verb "tells that an action of Zayd has reached 'Amr" (*fa-tuxbiru bi-'anna fi'lan waṣala min Zaydin 'ilā 'Amrin*) as in *ḍaraba Zaydun 'Amran* "Zayd has hit 'Amr" (M. III, 33.5-7).

Lastly, the negative particule *mā* resembles the verb *li-l-ma'nā* because it has the same meaning as *laysa*, which is a verb (M. III, 33.9).

By comparison with the other categories, one can say that *'iṣrūna* has no verbal "meaning" (*ma'nā*) nor "behaviour" (*taṣarruf*), but that its verbal underlying level (*taqdīr*) is due to its surface level (*li-l-lafḍ*), just like *'inna* and *la'alla*, not to its meaning nor to its behaviour.

In the rest of the chapter, al-Mubarrad gives more examples of expressions with a *tamyīz* operated on by words that resemble the verb *li-l-lafḍ*: *hādā 'afḍalu-hu rajulan* "he is the best of them [in terms of] man" (M. III, 33.17), *lī miṭlu-hu rajulan* "I have the same [in terms of] man" (M. III, 34.1), *wayha-hu rajulan!* "woe unto him!" (M. III, 35.1), *li-l-Lāhi darru-hu fārisan!* "what a fine rider he is!" (M. III, 35.1).

In all these expressions, the *tamyīz* is operated on by a *'āmil* "operator" of which it expresses the *naw'* "species" (M. III, 32.3-5).

The terminology, however, is not fixed clearly and in this chapter al-Mubarrad uses indifferently the words *tamyīz* (7 times, plus once in the title of the chapter), *tabyīn* (3 times, plus once in the title) and *tafsīr* (once). It seems that what al-Mubarrad refers to here is the complement itself, not the construction, which he does not name.



### 9.5.1 The case of *‘iṣrūna dirhaman*

Normally, the *tamyīz* is indefinite, in the singular and in the dependent form (M. III, 32.6–11), just like in *‘iṣrūna dirhaman*, which thus serves as a good example of *tamyīz*. As we will see below however, there are other possibilities.

At the semantic level, al-Mubarrad explains that *‘iṣrūna* is in need of a *tamyīz* because it is an “unspecified numeral”:

(٦) لَمَّا قُلْتُ عِنْدِي عِشْرُونَ وَثَلَاثُونَ ذَكَرْتُ عِدْدًا مِثْمَا يَقَعُ عَلَى كُلِّ مَعْدُودٍ فَلَمَّا قُلْتُ دِرْهَمًا عَرَّفْتُ الشَّيْءَ الَّذِي قَصَدْتُ بِأَنْ ذَكَرْتُ وَاحِدًا مِنْهُ يَدُلُّ عَلَى سَائِرِهِ.

(6) When you say: *‘indī ‘iṣrūna* and *ṭalāṭūna* you mention an unspecified numeral that applies to any counted [object] so when you add *dirhaman* you define the thing that you intend by mentioning one of it, which refers to all the rest (M. III, 32.6–7).

What is somewhat confusing in the beginning of this chapter devoted to the *tamyīz* is that al-Mubarrad compares *‘indī ‘iṣrūna dirhaman* “I have twenty dirhams” to *hā’ulā’i ḍāribūna Zaydan* “those are the hitters of Zayd” (M. III, 32. 11–12), as if there were a semantic parallel between both expressions. However, one understands from the rest of the chapter that the only common point between these two expressions is that the ending *nūn* in *‘iṣrūna* and *ḍāribūna* forbids the annexation to *dirham* and *Zayd*. About the effect of the *nūn* as a separator between the *mumayyaz* (what is specified) and the *tamyīz* (specifier), al-Mubarrad says that “this is the behaviour of each *tabyīn*, in which a *nūn* is involved” (*fa-hāḍa sabīlu kulli mā kānat an-nūnu fī-hi ‘āmilatan min at-tabyīni*; M. III, 33.10).

According to al-Mubarrad, *‘iṣrūna* resembles the verb because of its surface level inasmuch as it operates on a noun in the dependent form (*dirhaman*, just like *Zaydan*), but he is very clear that for *‘iṣrūna*, *‘inna* and *la‘alla*, the comparison stops here:

(٧) [...] وَلَا يَكُونُ مِنْهُ [أَيُّ عِشْرُونَ رَجُلًا وَإِنَّ زَيْدًا مُنْطَلِقًا وَلَعَلَّ زَيْدًا أَخُوكَ] فَعَلَّ وَلَا يَفْعَلُ وَلَا شَيْءٌ مِنْ أَمْثَلَةِ الْفِعْلِ.

(7) [...] and to this [sc. *‘iṣrūna rajulan*, *‘inna Zaydan munṭaliqan* and *la‘alla Zaydan ‘axū-ka*] belongs no *fa‘ala* nor *yaf‘alu* nor any other pattern of the verb (M. III, 33.4).

In the rest of the chapter, al-Mubarrad discusses different topics related to the *tamyīz*: its number, its use with the particle *min*, its fronting, its construction as a *muḍāf ‘ilayh* and, lastly, expressions of the type *al-ḥasanu wajhan* which seem to surface like the *tamyīz*.

### 9.5.2 The number of the *tamyīz*

In general, the *tamyīz* surfaces in the singular, because it expresses the whole species and not specific items. This is particularly true after numerals, like *ʿiṣrūna* (M. III, 32.7; 34.12–13) where no other possibility is given.<sup>12</sup>

### 9.5.3 The particle *min* and the *tamyīz*

If the first term contains a reference—such as a pronoun—to the noun that expresses the *tamyīz*, it is preferable to use the particle *min* as an “emphasis” (*tawkīd*), as in *wayḥa-hu min rajulin!* instead of *wayḥa-hu rajulan!* and in *li-l-Lāhi darru-hu min fārisin!* instead of *li-l-Lāhi darru-hu fārisan!* (M. III, 35.2–3). However, it is not possible to say \**ʿiṣrūna min dirhamin* because *min dirhamin* does not refer to something mentioned in the first part of the expression, which it would “confirm” (M. III, 35.3–4).

Curiously, al-Mubarrad does not mention in this chapter the semantic equivalence between *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *ʿiṣrūna min ad-darāhimi*. His point here is simply to say that on the one hand there is no embedded pronoun in *ʿiṣrūna* and that on the other hand it is better to replace the *tamyīz* by the particle *min* and its *majrūr* if the “operator” is constructed with a pronoun as in *wayḥa-hu min rajulin!*

Later in the *Muqtaḍab*, in a chapter where he compares *kam* and the numerals, al-Mubarrad states that *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* means *ʿiṣrūna min ad-darāhimi*, and this “because ‘twenty’, and what is like it, is a numeral” (*li-ʿanna ʿiṣrūna wa-mā ʿaṣbaha-hu smu ʿadadin*; M. III, 66.9–10). Al-Mubarrad infers here that the *tamyīz* has this specific meaning after numerals.

### 9.5.4 Fronting the *tamyīz*

If the “operator” (*ʿāmil*) of the *tamyīz* is a verb (and not a word resembling the verb), it is possible to front *tamyīz*, as in *ṣaḥman tafaqqaʿtu* “I exploded [in terms of] grease” and *ʿaraqan taṣabbabtu* “I broke into a sweat” (M. III, 36.2). This fronting is possible only with verbs, because of their freedom of behaviour (*li-taṣarrufi l-fiʿli*; M. III, 36.1). Al-Mubarrad notes that Sibawayh did not accept the fronting of the *tamyīz*, even when its “operator” was a verb

<sup>12</sup>In some cases, and only if the first term does not refer to a numeral, it is possible to express the *tamyīz* by a plural as in *huwa ʿafrahu n-nāsi ʿabdan* or *ʿabīdan* “he is the most gifted of men [in terms of] slave” or “[in terms of] slaves” (M. III, 34.13–14); and the Qurʾān contains examples of plural *tamyīz* (M. III, 34.14–15).

(M. III, 36.3), because—according to al-Mubarrad—Sībawayh sees no difference between these verbal constructions and *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* or *hāḍā ʿafrahu-hum ʿabdan* (M. III, 36.3).

In a chapter dealing with “issues of the agent” *masāʿil al-fāʿil*, and with expressions of the type *marartu bi-rajulin qāʿimin ʿabū-hu* (M. IV, 155–157), al-Mubarrad makes it clear that *ʿiṣrūna* cannot be separated from *dirhaman* as in the uncorrect *\*ʿindī ʿiṣrūna l-yawma dirhaman*:

(٨) [...] يكون العامل غير متصرف فلا يجري مجرى الفعل نحو عندي عشرون اليوم درهمًا وإن منطلق زيداً وزيداً إن منطلق فهذا الذي لا يجوز.

(8) [...] the operator is not fully declinable so that it does not behave like the verb as in: *\*ʿindī ʿiṣrūna l-yawma dirhaman*, *\*inna munṭaliquṇ Zaydan* or *\*Zaydan ʿinna munṭaliquṇ*; this is not correct (M. IV, 156.15–16).

Al-Mubarrad links here full declinability with verbal strength.

In the chapter devoted to the *tamyīz*, he adds that it is possible to say *rākiban jāʿa Zaydun* because the operator of *rākiban* is a verb (*jāʿa*), whereas it is not possible to say *qāʿiman hāḍā Zaydun* because here the operator of *qāʿiman* (namely *hāḍā*) is not a verb (M. III, 36.5–6). He adds that this is also al-Māzinī’s opinion (M. III, 36.7).

The comparison used by al-Mubarrad is somewhat puzzling because *rākiban* and *qāʿiman* are not *tamyīz* but *ḥāl*. His point here is only to show that in general the verb is a “stronger” operator than the noun.

### 9.5.5 The construction of the *tamyīz* as a *muḍāf ʿilayh*

Al-Mubarrad says that in some cases the *tamyīz* can surface in the oblique form and not in the dependent form (M. III, 37.3). In this construction, the noun is specified by a *tamyīz* to which it is annexed (*ʿaḍaḥṭa ʿilā l-mumayyazi*; M. III, 38.4).

This is the case of the expression *kullu rajulin jāʿa-nī fa-la-hu dirhamun* “let each man who came to me receive a dirham” (M. III, 38.1). This expression means *kullu r-rijālī ʿidā kānū rajulan rajulan* “all the men if they are one by one” (M. III, 38.1). In this case, al-Mubarrad says that *rajulin* is the *tamyīz* of *kull* and, in the same manner, *dirhamin* is the *tamyīz* of *miʿah* and *ʿalf*, and that its meaning is the same as in *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman*. The only difference between *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* and *miʿatu dirhamin* is that in *ʿiṣrūna* the ending *nūn* cannot be deleted so that the oblique form is forbidden, or in al-Mubar-

rad's words, "because the *tanwīn* is not compulsory, whereas the *nūn* in 'iṣrūna is" (*li-'anna t-tanwīn ġayr lāzim wa-n-nūn fī 'iṣrūna lāzimah*; *M. III*, 38.3–5).<sup>13</sup>

However, this is not completely true since it is possible to say *hāḍihi 'iṣrū Zaydin* "these are Zayd's twenty" (*M. III*, 32.12). This was already stated for the annexation of a numeral to a pronoun (*M. II*, 178.4–5; 10–11). But in this case, the 'iḍāfah expresses the possession ('alā jihat al-milk; *M. III*, 33.12) and not the *tamyīz*. Because of the possible confusion between the two, it is not possible for the *tamyīz* to surface as a *muḍāf 'ilayh* after decades (*M. III*, 33.15–16).

In a chapter devoted to annexation (*M. IV*, 136–147), al-Mubarrad distinguishes two types of annexation, either with a particle (*min*, 'ilā, *rubba*, *fī*, *ka-*, *bi-*, *li-*, and *mund*), or without a particle. He then comments on the different meanings these particle convey, and he says that the annexation without a particle has the meaning of the particle *li-* (*ma'nā l-lām*; *M. IV*, 143.4). He does not mention other possible meanings for the annexation without particle.

There are other expressions where the *tamyīz* surfaces as a *muḍāf 'ilayh*. After a comparative, as in 'anta 'afrahu 'abdin fī n-nāsi "you are the most gifted slave among people" which al-Mubarrad says means 'anta 'aḥadu hā'ulā'i llaḍina faḍḍaltu-hum ("you are one of those I preferred"; *M. III*, 38.10).

In order to be correct, the comparative has to be semantically included in the *tamyīz* to which it is annexed, so that it is correct to say *al-xalīfatu 'afḍalu Banī Hāšima* "the caliph is the best of the Banī Hāšim" but not \**al-xalīfatu 'afḍalu Banī Tamīma* "the caliph is the best of the Banī Tamīm" (*M. III*, 38.11–12) because the caliph does not belong to the Banī Tamīm. In this last case, the only correct utterance is *al-xalīfatu 'afḍalu min Banī Tamīma* "the caliph is better than the Banī Tamīm" (*M. III*, 38.14), but it is not a *tamyīz* meaning any more, i.e., *Banī Tamīm* does not express the *naw'* "species" of *xalīfah*.

Lastly, the fact that the *tamyīz* can surface as a *muḍāf 'ilayh* changes its syntactic definition into a semantic definition because it is not defined by a syntactic structure anymore but by its meaning. What remains as its specific syntactic properties is its being singular and indefinite. This shift in definition does not seem to bother al-Mubarrad.

<sup>13</sup>See above, footnote 1, p. 155, on the difference between the *tanwīn* and the compensatory *nūn*.

### 9.5.6 Is *wajhan* a *tamyīz* in the expression *al-ḥasanu wajhan*?

Al-Mubarrad clearly says that expressions of the type *Zaydun al-ḥasanu wajhan* “Zayd the beautiful of face” and *al-karīmu ‘aban* “the generous of father” (M. III, 38.6) belong to another chapter, namely *min bābi d-dāribi Zaydan* (M. III, 38.6), i.e., the syntax of ‘asmā’ *al-fā’il*. For al-Mubarrad, this appears clearly in the following expressions: *huwa l-ḥasanu l-wajha* and *huwa ḥasanun al-wajha* (M. III, 38.7). He most probably means that in these expressions the word *wajh* is determined by the article, which clearly shows that it is not a *tamyīz*. All the details about these constructions are found in a chapter devoted to the *ṣifah al-mušabbahah bi-l-fā’il* (M. IV, 158–165), which is thus not connected to the syntax of numerals, unlike in the *Kitāb*.

### 9.5.7 Unsolved issues linked with the *tamyīz*

*Munawwanah* numerals (carrying an “intention of *tanwīn*”, just like compound numerals and decades; M. II, 164.3–4) also correspond to the *mubhamah* “unspecified” numerals, which are thus in need of a *tamyīz* (see M. II, 165.2 for compound numerals; M. II, 144.7 and M. III, 32.6–7 for decades).

If there is a link between being *munawwan*, being *mubham* and being in need of a *tamyīz*, how come *mi’ah* and ‘*alf*’ operate on a *tamyīz* (M. III, 37.3–38.5) although they are apparently not *munawwanah*? Are they also *mubhamah*?

The case of hundreds and thousands is not clear. It would be consistent with other annexable cardinals for them to be “specified”, but it would be consistent with other greater cardinals for them to be “unspecified”. Al-Mubarrad is silent on this issue. He says that all numerals above “ten” need a complement that expresses their species (M. II, 164.5–6). Does this mean that hundreds and thousands are “unspecified”? Probably yes, but this is an extrapolation. See above, p. 145, for a general view on this issue in our three treatises.

Another question that is not addressed by al-Mubarrad is the following. It is clear that in *mi’atu dirhamin* and ‘*alfu dirhamin*’, the word *dirham* is a *tamyīz* that surfaces as a *mudāf ‘ilayh*, but what is it in *mi’atu d-dirhami* and ‘*alfu d-dirhami*? We only know that al-Mubarrad would probably not call it a *tamyīz* because it is definite (M. III, 32.9–10).

## 9.6 The logic at stake in the *Muqtaḍab*

Throughout the chapters that deal with numerals al-Mubarrad draws a clear line between “basic numerals” (*al-ʾaṣl*) from “one” to “ten”, and “subsidiary numerals” (*al-farʿ*), above “ten”, which he says are all “derived” *muštaqqah* from basic numerals, either in “surface” (*lafẓ*) or in “meaning” (*maʿnā*) (M. II, 165.13–14).

Numerals between “twenty-one” and “ninety-nine” are simply conjoined by a *waw al-ʿatf* (M. II, 166.16–17) and they behave separately according to their respective rules, so that one might say that they neither belong to lesser nor to greater numerals but that the unit behaves like basic numerals and the decade behaves like subsidiary numerals.

Above “two”, number and species have to be expressed separately. Al-Mubarrad says that this is the *ʾaṣl* “origin”, hence “one” and “two” must be regarded as a subcase of the other small numerals. Incidentally, this is also why the dual is considered by al-Mubarrad to be a subcase of the plural (M. II, 156.2).

Among the different possible ways to express the counted object, al-Mubarrad focuses on the annexational and specifying constructions. The first one characterises “basic” numerals (M. II, 164.4–5) and the second one characterises “subsidiary” numerals. For al-Mubarrad, a distinctive feature of subsidiary numerals is that their counted object is in the singular in the annexational and specifying constructions because it expresses a whole species (M. II, 164.5–6). With this definition, what seemed to be a problem in Sibawayh’s theory simply disappears as an issue. See above, p. 177, for a presentation of this issue in our three treatises. Base form numerals are not in need of a “species” complement whereas “derived” numerals are. What is somewhat puzzling is that al-Mubarrad calls *tamyiz* the counted object after hundreds and thousands, which surfaces as a *muḍāf ʾilayh*.

Subsidiary numerals all have in common that they are “unspecified” *mubhamah* and as such in need of a complement that expresses their *nawʿ* “species”, as in *xamsata-ʿašara ṭawban* (M. II, 164.5–6) and *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* (M. II, 144.7; 165.2; 13; III, 32.6–7).

Al-Mubarrad explicitly says that *iṭnā-ʿašara* is not a compound (a word that has been made “one word”) and that *-ʿašara* has the status of a compensatory *nūn* (M. II, 162.5–8). Other compound cardinals have been made “one word” and he draws a parallel between their second part and the *tāʾ marbūṭah* in the male proper names *Ḥamdah* and *Ṭalḥah* (M. IV, 29.4–5).

Al-Mubarrad explains that decades resemble the verb *li-l-lafḍ* “because of the surface level”, inasmuch as their complement is put in the dependent form (M. III, 33.2–4). However, he makes it clear that decades have no verbal value so that for example it is not possible to front the *tamyīz* and say \**dirhaman ‘iṣrūna* whereas this is possible in *ṣaḥman tafaqqā’tu*, because the “operator” *‘āmil* of the *tamyīz* is a verb (M. III, 36.1–2). In the same way, *‘iṣrūna* cannot be separated from its *tamyīz* as in \**‘iṣrūna la-ka dirhaman* (M. III, 55.8).

“One hundred” and “one thousand” are not *munawwanah* so that their *tamyīz* can surface as a *muḍāf ‘ilayh*, in the indefinite as in *mi’atu dirhamin*, *ṭalātu mi’ati dirhamin*, *‘alfu dirhamin*, *ṭalātu ‘ālāfi dirhamin*, or in the definite as in *mi’atu d-dirhami*, *ṭalātu mi’ati d-dirhami*, *‘alfu d-dirhami*, *ṭalātu ‘ālāfi d-dirhami* (M. II, 167.10–12; III, 38.3–5). In all these expressions, the semantic link between numerals and their counted object is a specifying relationship although it surfaces syntactically as an annexational construction. The only limitation to regular *‘iḍāfah* rules is that the *tamyīz* has to be in the singular, and this because the quantity is already expressed by the numeral.

Finally, according to al-Mubarrad, the only common point between all numerals is that their counted object has a semantic link with the meaning of the partitive *min*, at least in the annexational and specifying constructions. More precisely, this semantic link is [m. 13], the underlying structure.

Al-Mubarrad’s grammatical method has been studied less intensively than that of Sibawayh and it is difficult to extrapolate it from his grammar of numerals. In the introduction to his edition of the *Muqtaḍab*, ‘Uḍaymah has a section devoted to al-Mubarrad’s use of *qiyās* in balance with attested data (‘Uḍaymah 1966–79, I, 113–117), based on the *Muqtaḍab* and the *Kāmil*, another work by al-Mubarrad. Unfortunately, he does not comment on the occurrences he quotes where al-Mubarrad has a specific use of *qiyās*, which he either rejects, or bases on minority usage and exceptions.

Two severe accusations were levelled at al-Mubarrad, one by Ibn Wallād (d. 332/944) and the other by al-Baṣrī (d. 375/985). Al-Mubarrad is accused by Ibn Wallād to be *رجل يجعل كلامه في النحو أصلا وكلام العرب فرعاً فاستجاز أن يخطئها إذا* (“a man who makes his own language in grammar the base form and the language of the Arabs subsidiary, allowing himself to falsify them when they utter forms that contradict his base form”; *Intiṣār*, 71.)<sup>14</sup>

The other accusation is formulated by al-Baṣrī in his *Kitāb at-tanbīhāt*: *ولو تشاغل أبو العباس بملح الأشعار وتنف الأخبار وما يعرفه من النحو كان خيراً له من القطع على كلام العرب*

<sup>14</sup>Abū Janāḥ (1980, 60) quotes this sentence from ‘Uḍaymah (1966–79, I, 117 and not 109 as indicated in note). ‘Uḍaymah does not mention the reference in the *Intiṣār*, which was not yet edited at the time.

(“had ‘Abū l-‘Abbās been attentive to the poets’ anecdotes, the biographies’ valuable information, and his own knowledge in grammar, it would have been better for him than to interrupt the Arabs when they talk”; *Tanbihāt*, 124).<sup>15</sup>

According to ‘Abū Janāḥ (1980, 60–61), al-Mubarrad relies more on “intellectual criteria” *maqāyīs dihniyyah* than on attested data in poetry and in Qur’ānic readings, which he does not hesitate to refute at times (*radd ar-riwāyāt* “refutation of attested data”; ‘Abū Janāḥ 1980, 53). These two points are presented in more detail—although without analysis—by ‘Uḍaymah (1966–79, I, 117–123). The grammatical tradition reports of al-Mubarrad that he defended his method against his Kūfan accusators:

[...] al-Mubarrad scornfully accuses Ta‘lab of abandoning Qur’ānic and majority usage in favour of the word of “some stupid old bedouin woman”! Even if inauthentic, the anecdotal evidence gives a good picture of what it was the Baṣrans found so objectionable about Kūfan attitudes (Carter 2000, 266 quoting az-Zajjāji’s *Majālis*, 121).

Indeed, we have seen above in the grammar of numerals, p. 225, that al-Mubarrad does not hesitate to reject actual use in order to go back to the “truth of analogy”, even if it contradicts actual use. This attitude of al-Mubarrad towards *qiyās* is pointed out by Baalbaki (1995, 130), who mentions four main shifts in al-Mubarrad’s grammatical method. The first of these shifts is that he changes the subtle equilibrium that Sibawayh had achieved between *qiyās* and *samā‘* by granting more weight to the former, in a way that makes it “a purely intellectual process”. The result of this use of *qiyās* is that it leads al-Mubarrad to reject attested forms when they contradict his theory. The three other shifts mentioned by Baalbaki are the autonomisation of the concept of ‘amal “operation”, which is considered for itself; the subdivision of categories that were held together by Sibawayh; and the introduction of new types of logical reasoning.

## 9.7 Beyond al-Mubarrad ...

It seems that for al-Mubarrad the only “true” numerals are the “masculine” numerals between “three” and “ten”, i.e., the forms carrying a *tā’ marbūtah*: *ṭalāṭatun*, *‘arba‘atun*, until *‘aṣaratun*. All other numerals are explained by comparison to these basic numerals.

The category of the *tamyīz*, which originates in a syntactic construction, enables al-Mubarrad to describe very easily the counted object after compound numerals and decades. They are in the position of *tamyīz* and they

<sup>15</sup>‘Uḍaymah (1966–79, I, 117) does not give the reference of this quotation.



express the “species” of “unspecified” numerals. As for “one hundred” and “one thousand”, al-Mubarrad expands the syntactic category of *tamyīz* and says that in *mi’atu ṭawbin* and *’alfu ṭawbin* the counted object also expresses the “species” of the numerals. However this *tamyīz* surfaces as a *muḏāf’ilayh*. What remains of the characteristics of the syntactic *tamyīz* is its meaning and its singular.

As for the expression *mi’atu ṭ-ṭawbi*, it is not clear whether al-Mubarrad would call it a *tamyīz* since he dislikes the expression of the *tamyīz* with a definite noun (*M. III*, 32.9–10).

In the end, the *tamyīz* is practically reduced to a semantic category that can be expressed by two different constructions, annexational and specifying.

What is unclear as well is the nature of the *’idāfah* relationship between basic numerals and their counted object. Al-Mubarrad says that it also expresses the “species” *naw’* of the basic numerals although he does not say that they are “unspecified” numerals nor that their complement is a *tamyīz*.

In a nutshell, basic numerals are neither *mubhamah* nor *munawwanah* so that they do not need a *tamyīz* but a complement that has the same meaning (the *naw’*, i.e., partitive *min*); compound numerals and decades are both *mubhamah* and *munawwanah* so that they need a *tamyīz* in the dependent form; “one hundred” and “one thousand” are not *munawwanah* and are in need of a *tamyīz* in the oblique form which most probably makes them *mubhamah* in the eyes of al-Mubarrad.

Al-Mubarrad does not address the issue of consistency among numerals. Each series of numerals has a different morphological shape and a different syntactic behaviour. There are common points to all the numerals, but he prefers to focus on the differences between them. It even seems to be part of his theory that each series is due to behave differently, which is another type of consistency than Sibawayh’s. If one adds to this picture the fact that he studies many more issues than Sibawayh, we get an overall impression of an “atomistic grammar”. A great variety of issues are dealt with and no global consistency is aimed at, except that different behaviours are due to be interpreted differently, as is clearly the case with numerals.



## Chapter 10

# Ibn as-Sarrāj's approach to numerals

### 10.1 Introduction

The most striking characteristic of the *ʿUṣūl* is its outline itself and the mere position of any grammatical issue in the general organisation of the treatise tells a lot about the author's opinion. This way of dividing the grammatical matter is known as *taqṣīm* "dichotomous classification" (Carter 2000, 270). This systematic presentation is probably found for the first time in Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl* (Dayf 1968, 'Ayd 1973, Owens 1990b, and Ṭāhā 1995, 5). This is certainly not the case of the *Kitāb* where similar issues are spread all over the book. The outline of the *Muqtaḍab* is not as hectic as in the *Kitāb*, but in no way is it as systematic as in the *ʿUṣūl*.

Ibn as-Sarrāj first presents the "principles" (*ʿuṣūl*) of grammar in a very organised way, and then quotes many "applied issues" (*masā'il*), somehow related to the principles exposed. As he says himself:

(٩) قد فرغنا من ذكر المرفوعات والمنصوبات وذكرنا في كلّ باب من مسائل مقدارا كافيا فيه درية للمتعلم ودرس للعالم بحسب ما يصلح في هذا الكتاب لأنّه كتاب أصول ونحن نفرّد كتابا لتفريغ الأصول ومزج بعضها ببعض ونسمّيه كتاب الفروع ليكون فروع هذه الأصول.

(9) We have explored all possible branches of [nouns in] the independent and dependent forms and mentioned in each chapter a sufficient number of issues where the learner will find a path and the learned a lesson, according to what befits this book, because it is a book of principles; we will dedicate a separate book to branches of the principles and their mingling with one another, and we will call it the *Book of the branches* in order for them to be branches of these principles. (ʿU. I, 328.3–6)

Unfortunately, this *Book of branches* has not reached us. It would have helped us to understand Ibn as-Sarrāj's grammatical judgments.

As Baalbaki puts it:

The clear-cut distinction which Ibn al-Sarrāj establishes between *uṣūl* and *furūʿ* is probably the main reason for the famous saying that Ibn al-Sarrāj, by his *uṣūl* (or perhaps *Uṣūl*, i.e., the work itself), has rationalized grammar; *mā zāla ʿl-naḥw majnūnan ḥattā ʿaqqalahu Ibn al-Sarrāj [bi-ʿuṣūli-hi]* (Baalbaki 1988/2004, 173 quoting as-Suyūṭī's *Buḡyat al-wuʿāh*, I, 109 and Yāqūt's *Muʿjam al-ʿudabāʾ*, XVIII, 198).

Baalbaki (1988/2004, 173) adds that the distinction between *ʿuṣūl* “principles”, *furūʿ* “subsidiary issues” and *masāʾil* “applied issues” is not absent in the *Muqtaḍab*, but it does not determine the organisation of the treatise itself. In a more precise way, it is also possible to say with Baalbaki (2008, 248–249) that *masāʾil* and *furūʿ*—both terms are almost synonymous in the *Muqtaḍab*—receive a technical meaning in the *ʿUṣūl*. In later grammatical tradition, *ʿuṣūl an-naḥw* will receive another technical meaning, namely the “types of grammatical argumentation” (Bohas and Guillaume 1984, viii–ix).

Undoubtedly, this organisation of the *ʿUṣūl* is the most obvious piece of evidence that Greek logic and rational methodology have made their way into Arabic grammar by the late III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> centuries. This point has been well studied. See above, pp. 49ff.

Numerals are dealt with in many different places in Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw*, and this from different perspectives: morphology, syntax, semantics and phonetics. Some chapters are explicitly devoted to numerals as such, but these chapters do not gather all the information about numerals in the *ʿUṣūl*. We will focus here on Ibn as-Sarrāj's methodology more than on basic facts concerning numerals.

Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl* are divided in chapters of unequal length, which can be separated into syntactic issues (ʿU. I, 36–II, 406), morphosyntactic issues (ʿU. II, 407–III, 159) and morphological (derivational and morphophonetic) issues (ʿU. III, 160–480).<sup>1</sup> Each chapter is systematically subdivided into sections and subsections, which are very often followed by a long section of additional “applied issues” (*masāʾil*). See above, p. 57 on these “exhaustive divisions”.

<sup>1</sup>Baalbaki (2007b, xxxi) states that this division derives from the *Kitāb*, which later grammarians have imitated.

The phonetic chapter *bāb al-ʿimālah* (“chapter on fronting the *fathah*”; ʿU. III, 160–171) is not inserted with other phonetic and phonological issues, such as assimilation and metathesis, which are all integrated into a chapter entitled *ḍikr at-taṣrīf* (“morphology”; ʿU. III, 231–480). *Bāb al-ʿimālah* is inserted between morphological chapters dealing with word patterns: *bābu l-maṣādira wa-ʿasmāʾi l-fāʿilina* (“chapter on verbal nouns and active participles”; ʿU. III, 85–159) and *ḍikru ʿiddati mā yakūnu ʿalay-hi al-kalimu* (“mention of the number [of root consonants] on which words are built”; ʿU. III, 171–179).

Interestingly, in the *Kitāb*, the chapter on *ʿimālah* is also situated among other morphological issues (K. II, 279–294), showing that it is not seen as a purely phonetic phenomenon. Here in the *ʿUṣūl* it clearly marks the separation between morphosyntax (ʿU. II, 407–III, 159) and morphophonology (ʿU. III, 171–480).

Syntactic issues are divided as follows: parts of speech (ʿU. I, 36–44); declension and indeclinability (ʿU. I, 45–II, 221); word order (ʿU. II, 222–247); ellipsis (ʿU. II, 247–254); “flexibility” (*ittisāʿ*; ʿU. II, 255–361); declension in pausa (ʿU. II, 361–406).

The following chapters are devoted to morphosyntactic issues: masculine and feminine (ʿU. II, 407–415); *al-maqṣūr wa-l-mamdūd* (ʿU. II, 415–417); dual and external plurals (ʿU. II, 417–419); other plurals (ʿU. II, 420–III, 35); diminutives (ʿU. III, 36–63); relative adjectives (ʿU. III, 63–85); *maṣādir* and *ʿasmāʾ al-fāʿil* (ʿU. III, 85–159).

Then comes *bāb al-ʿimālah* (ʿU. III, 160–171).

The last three chapters deal with the following morphophonological issues: root system (ʿU. III, 171–179); patterns (ʿU. III, 179–231); word formation and morphophonetic changes (*bāb at-taṣrīf*; ʿU. III, 231–480).

The grammar of numerals is dispatched in the *ʿUṣūl* according to this outline. Here is a quick overview of the issues linked with numerals. All these issues have been presented in chapters 4 to 6. They will only be recalled here, in order to see where they are located in the *ʿUṣūl*. Sections relevant for the grammatical method of Ibn as-Sarrāj will be analysed in detail after this quick presentation.

ʿUṣūl	Issues	Pages
In syntactic chapters		
ʿU. I, 76–81	Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on the expression <i>ḍuriba min ʿajli Zaydin ʿiṣrūna sawṭan</i> “because of Zayd, twenty lashes were given” (ʿU. I, 79.12).	p. 158

ʿU. I, 90–91	“ʿAḥad is not used in the affirmative” ( <i>wa-ʿaḥadun lā yustaʿmalu fi l-wājibi</i> ; ʿU. I, 90.6).	p. 159
ʿU. I, 150–158	Issues related to definite and indefinite nouns. The name of the days are proper names, like the names of the stars ( <i>ad-Dabarān</i> “Aldebaran” and <i>as-Simāk</i> “Spica”). They are derived from ordinal numerals (ʿU. I, 158.1–2).	pp. 118 and 150
ʿU. I, 159–169	In this section devoted to <i>al-mafʿūl al-muṭlaq</i> , Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with <i>waḥd-</i> in expressions of the type <i>marartu bi-hi waḥda-hu</i> “I passed by him alone”.	p. 141
ʿU. I, 190–197	“Applied issues” linked with the <i>mafʿūl fihi</i> that expresses time. Unlike the other days of the week, “Friday” and “Saturday” do not have a numerical (ordinal) meaning (ʿU. I, 194.16–19).	p. 150
ʿU. I, 307–310	<i>Bāb tamyīz al-maqādir</i> “chapter of specifying the measures”. Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the construction <i>ʿindī [...] ʿaṭwābun xamsatun</i> “I have [...] five garments” (ʿU. I, 308.21–22) where the numeral has the meaning of the <i>badal</i> “appositional substantive”.	pp. 164 and 250
ʿU. I, 311–314	<i>Bāb tamyīz al-ʿaḍād</i> “chapter of specifying the numerals”. It is the first section entirely devoted to numerals in the ʿUṣūl. We will analyse this section below.	pp. 246ff.
ʿU. I, 315–320	In <i>bāb kam</i> “chapter on <i>kam</i> ”, Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on his affirmation in the previous section that <i>kam</i> is an “unspecified numeral” ( <i>ism ʿadad muḥam</i> ; ʿU. I, 314.1). This section will be analysed below.	pp. 255ff.
ʿU. I, 321–328	This section gathers various “applied issues” ( <i>masāʾil</i> ) related to the measure and numerical specifiers as well as to <i>kam</i> . This section will be analysed below.	p. 257
ʿU. I, 344–346	There is little information in the ʿUṣūl about the use of numerals as proper names. In a section devoted to the vocative form of nouns that “resemble the <i>muḍāf</i> because of [their] length” ( <i>al-muḍāriʿ li-l-muḍāf li-ṭūli-hi</i> ), Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the vocative form <i>yā Talātatan-Wa-Talātina!</i> (ʿU. I, 344.16–17).	p. 149
ʿU. I, 359–366	In a section devoted to the “apocopation of nouns in the vocative” ( <i>tarxīm</i> ), Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions the form <i>yā Xamsata!</i> built on the proper name <i>Xamsata-Aṣar</i> (ʿU. I, 363.4–6; 364.1–3).	p. 149
ʿU. II, 13–19	This section consists in a series of “applied issues” linked with annexation. In an affirmative context, <i>ʿaḥad</i> (ʿiḥḍā in the feminine) is always in the position of <i>muḍāf</i> ; it cannot be put in the dual nor in the plural (ʿU. II, 17.2–4).	p. 129

ʿU. II, 19–23	Numerals other than “one” can be found in expressions of the type <i>marartu bi-hi waḥda-hu</i> . Unlike for <i>waḥd-</i> , which is a <i>mafʿūl muṭlaq</i> , the choice is left to the speaker either to treat them like <i>waḥda-hu</i> , or like an appositive complement ( <i>tābiʿ</i> ) meaning <i>tawkid</i> (“emphasis”).	p. 141
ʿU. II, 27–31	Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on adjectival slots where numerals are found, as in <i>ʿaxaḍa Banū Fulānin min Banī Fulānin ʿiblan miʿatan</i> (“the So-and-so took a hundred camels from the So-and-so”; ʿU. II, 27.19–20); <i>marartu bi-ṭawbin sabʿin</i> (“I passed by a seven [measure long] garment”; ʿU. II, 27.19); and the poetic line <i>fī jubbin ṭamānina qāmatan</i> (“in an eighty fathom [deep] well”; ʿU. II, 27.21).	p. 157
ʿU. II, 46–55	Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on the expression <i>laqītu qawma-ka ṭalātata-hum</i> “I found your tribe, three of them” (ʿU. II, 47.7–8) and on the use of compound numerals in the same slot.	p. 141
ʿU. II, 80–93	The numerals’ “deflected” ( <i>maʿdūl</i> ) forms are diptotic: <i>ʿuḥād, ṭunāʿ</i> or <i>maṭnā, ṭulāṭ</i> and <i>rubāʿ</i> (ʿU. II, 83.8–9; 88.11–13).	p. 124
ʿU. II, 90–91	The pattern of <i>ṭamānin</i> “eight” could be assimilated to a diptotic plural, like <i>madāʿin</i> or <i>darāhim</i> (ʿU. II, 91.11–15).	p. 108
ʿU. II, 93–103	There are two cases when numerals are diptotic: compound numerals other than “twelve” used as proper names, and numerals between “three” and “ten” used in an absolute meaning.	p. 123
ʿU. II, 139	Short section on onomatopoeia. Letters of the alphabet used to spell a noun and numerals when merely listed, as in <i>wāḥid itnāni</i> (ʿU. II, 139.7), are diptotic.	p. 143
ʿU. II, 139–144	This section is devoted to compound nouns such as <i>xamsata-ʿašara</i> . We will analyse this section below.	p. 262
ʿU. II, 330–361	Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with the cleft form of expressions of the type <i>xāmisu xamsatin</i> and <i>xāmisu ʿarbaʿatin</i> , as in <i>allaḍina ḥaḍā ṭālīṭu-hum ṭalāṭatun</i> “those which this one is one of them are three” (ʿU. II, 331.2–3).	p. 176
<b>In morphosyntactic chapters</b>		
ʿU. II, 424–429	Three short sections on numerals that have different masculine and feminine forms, expressions of the type <i>xāmisu xamsatin</i> and cases where the grammatical gender of the counted object differs from its biological sex. These sections paraphrase chapters 412–415 in the <i>Kitāb</i> (K. II, 176–181)	p. 169
ʿU. III, 36–63	Chapter devoted to the diminutive forms: <i>ṭamāniyah</i> “eight” and <i>ṭalātūna</i> “thirty” (ʿU. III, 46–49); compound cardinals (ʿU. III, 60). As for the names of the days, they have no diminutive (ʿU. III, 62.10–11).	pp. 110 and 140

ʿU. III, 63–85	Chapter devoted to the morphology of the relative adjective ( <i>nisbah</i> ): <i>Xamsiyyun</i> , built on the proper name <i>Xamsata-ʿAšar</i> (ʿU. III, 69.9); <i>Tanawiyyun</i> or <i>Iṭniyyun</i> , built on the proper name <i>Iṭnā-ʿAšar</i> (ʿU. III, 69.10–11); <i>ṭamāniyyun</i> , built on the numeral <i>ṭamānin</i> “eight” (ʿU. III, 74.8); <i>ṭanawiyyun</i> and <i>iṭniyyun</i> , built on the numeral <i>iṭnāni</i> “two” (ʿU. III, 77.9–10).	p. 113
ʿU. III, 146–147	Section on the pattern <i>mafʿal</i> applied to assimilated roots. Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions <i>mawḥad</i> as another <i>maʿdūl</i> form of <i>wāḥid</i> (ʿU. III, 147.1–2).	p. 116
<b>In morphophonological chapters</b>		
ʿU. III, 270	The base form of <i>sitt</i> “six” is <i>sids</i> . The diminutive form of <i>sittah</i> is <i>sudaysah</i> .	p. 112
ʿU. III, 307–311	ʿAḥad derives from <i>waḥad</i> after the ʾibdāl “replacement” of its <i>wāw</i> by a <i>hamzah</i> (ʿU. III, 307.5–10).	p. 103
ʿU. III, 316–351	In this long section devoted to non analogical word formation, Ibn as-Sarrāj discusses the plural form of <i>mīʾah</i> (ʿU. III, 328.5–329.8).	p. 109

Table 10.1: *Numerals in the ʿUṣūl*

We will now analyse in detail the following sections: *bāb tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād* (“chapter of specifying the numerals”; ʿU. I, 311–314); *bāb kam* (“chapter on *kam*”; ʿU. I, 315–320); and “applied issues” related to non verbal *tamyīz* (ʿU. I, 321–328). In these sections, Ibn as-Sarrāj presents his theory on the numerical specifier. We will also analyse the section dealing with the syntax of compound nouns (ʿU. II, 139–144). All these sections are subsections of a long chapter dealing with all types of ʾirāb, declension and indeclinability (ʿU. I, 45–II, 221).

## 10.2 Specifying the numerals

The first section devoted to numerals in Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw* is called *bāb tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād* “chapter of specifying the numerals” (ʿU. I, 311–314) and it comes just after a section called *bāb tamyīz al-maqādir* “chapter of specifying the measures” (ʿU. I, 307–310). At this point, Ibn as-Sarrāj calls *tamyīz* “specifying” the construction that involves a noun in the indefinite dependent form, e.g., *ʾiṣrūna dirhaman*, and *mufasssir* “commentator” or *al-ism al-mumayyiz* “specifier” this noun in the dependent form, e.g., *dirhaman*.

These sections are subsections of a section entitled “mention of the nouns in the dependent form” (*ḍikr al-ʾasmāʾ al-manṣūbah*), which is it-



self subdivided into two subsections, verbal and non-verbal complements. Verbal complements include *al-maʿfūl* and *al-muṣabbah bi-l-maʿfūl*. Non-verbal complements include measure specifiers, numerical specifiers and the specifier of *kam*. Unlike in the *Muqtaḍab*, the difference between verbal and nominal *tamyīz* is thus very clear.

We will first consider the general form of the *tamyīz* construction, which is a subcase of *al-muṣabbah bi-l-maʿfūl*, i.e., a complement in the dependent form whose operator is a verb but which is not a real *maʿfūl*, just like the *ḥāl*.

### 10.2.1 The general form of the *tamyīz* construction

In <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222-228, Ibn as-Sarrāj presents the *tamyīz*, which is—along with the *ḥāl*—a construction that involves an operator (*ʿāmil*). This operator is either a “real verb” (*fiʿl ḥaqīqī*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 213.5) or a word that has a verbal meaning (<sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.2).<sup>2</sup> In this construction, the complement is said to be “resembling the *maʿfūl*” (*muṣabbah bi-l-maʿfūl*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 212.17) because it is in the dependent form and it has a verbal operator.

In expressions like *qad tafaqqaʿa Zaydun ṣaḥmatan* “Zayd exploded [in terms of] grease” and *imtalaʿa l-ʾināʾu māʾan* “the container is full of water”, Ibn as-Sarrāj makes it clear that *ṣaḥmatan* and *māʾan* are “operated on by a verb” (*al-ʿāmil fī-hā fiʿl*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.2); they are put in the dependent form, and although they surface in the shape of a complement they are the agent of the verb “in meaning” (*fī l-maʿnā*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.2–3). The term *maʿnā* refers here to [m. 13], the underlying structure of the sentence. In other words, “its surface form is the complement but its “meaning” is the agent” (*fa-lafḍu-hu lafḍu l-maʿfūl wa-huwa fī l-maʿnā fāʿil*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.5–6).

The operator can also be “in the meaning of a verb” (*fī maʿnā l-fiʿl*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.2) and not a “real verb” (*fiʿl ḥaqīqī*) as in *huwa ʾaḥsanu-hum wajhan* (“he is the most handsome [in terms of] face”; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.7). Again in this type of expression, the complement is in the dependent form although, in “meaning”, it is the agent: “what is the most handsome is the face” (*wa-l-ḥasanu huwa l-wajhu*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 222.8).

The specifier “has to be indefinite, referring to genera” (*lā takūnu ʾillā nakirātin tadullu ʿalā ʾajnāsi*; <sup>ʾ</sup>U. I, 223.1–2). Whether the specifier is in the

<sup>2</sup>See Tāhā (2009, 412) for an account of *ḥaqīqī* “real” and *ḡayr ḥaqīqī* “non-real” verbs in Ibn as-Sarrāj’s *ʾUṣūl*, and, more generally, for the introduction of a semantic criterion to verbal transitivity. Al-Mubarrad is probably the one who introduced this distinction among verbs. See Tāhā (1995, 90, 100–101) and Tāhā (2010, 111).

singular or in the plural is the choice of the speaker (*kunta bi-l-xiyāri fī l-ismi l-mumayyizi 'in šī'ta jamma'ta-hu wa-'in šī'ta waḥḥadta-hu*; 'U. I, 223.3).

Concerning the number of the specifier after numerals, Ibn as-Sarrāj simply quotes al-Mubarrad's position that it is not allowed to say *'iṣrūna darāhima*, putting *darāhima* in the plural, for the reason that the number is already expressed in the numeral ('U. I, 223.7–10 quoting M. III, 34.11–14).

Ibn as-Sarrāj then mentions the possibility to express the specifier before its operator as in *šahman tafaqqa'tu* or *'araqan taṣabbabtū*. He quotes the position of al-Māzinī and al-Mubarrad who accept this possibility if the operator is a verb but reject it otherwise, as in *'iṣrūna dirhaman*, which cannot be uttered *\*dirhaman 'iṣrūna*. According to Ibn as-Sarrāj, Sībawayh and the Kūfans reject it in all cases ('U. I, 223.10–224.7). In this matter, Ibn as-Sarrāj seems to follow al-Mubarrad and al-Māzinī, but the text is not explicit.

The chapter entitled *bāb at-taqdīm wa-t-ta'xīr* ("chapter on fronting and postponing"; 'U. II, 222–247) is entirely devoted to the possibility of changing the order of the words and in 'U. II, 229–230 Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with the *tamyīz* construction. He repeats here the impossibility to put the specifier before its nominal agent as in incorrect *\*dirhaman 'iṣrūna* ('U. II, 229.9–10). If the agent is a verb, he also repeats that there are different opinions among grammarians but that "analogically to its chapter" (*qiyāsu bābi-hi*) the *mufasssīr* should also be postponed because it is the "real agent" (*li-anna-hu fā'ilun fī l-ḥaḳīqati*) and it cannot follow the rules of the other *maf'ūlāt* ("complements"; 'U. II, 229.12–17).

### 10.2.2 Specifying the numerals

In the section devoted to the numerical specifier ('U. I, 311–314), Ibn as-Sarrāj uses four different terms to describe the role of the counted object. It is a noun that "specifies" (*yumayyizu*; 'U. I, 311.2; 312.10) the numeral, it is a "need" (*ḥājah*; 'U. I, 311.2) of the numeral, the numeral is "made clear" by it (*yubayyanu bi-hi*; 'U. I, 312.5), it "comments" (*yufassiru*; 'U. I, 314.1) on the numeral.

In the introduction to these subsections devoted to the nominal *tamyīz*, Ibn as-Sarrāj discusses the difference between the two types of *tamyīz* construction, the first one, which applies to verbal sentences, and the second one, which applies to numerals and measures:

(١٠) والفرق بين هذا الضرب من التمييز وبين التمييز الذي قبله أنّ المنصوب هنا ينتصب عند تمام الاسم وذلك ينتصب عند تمام الكلام.

(10) The difference between this kind of *tamyīz* [for numerals] and the previous one [for verbal sentences] is that the complement in the dependent form here takes the dependent form after the completion of a noun whereas the other [complement] takes the dependent form after the completion of a sentence ('U. I, 306.7–10).

These two types of *tamyīz* construction, verbal and nominal, have very different meanings.<sup>3</sup> In *tafaqqā'a Zaydun šahmatan, imtala'a l-'inā'u mā'an* or *huwa 'ahsanu-hum wajhan*, the verbal specifier has the meaning of the agent (*fā'il*) of its operator (*tafaqqā'a*, *imtala'a*, and *'ahsan*) although it surfaces in the shape of its complement; whereas the numerical specifier simply specifies the numeral. Its meaning is not the agent of the operator.

Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions two possibilities for the nominal *tamyīz*: It comes either after a *muḍāf* and a *muḍāf 'ilayh* or after a noun carrying an ending *nūn* (understand, a compensatory *nūn*).<sup>4</sup>

(١١) هذا الضرب كلّ اسم نذكره لفائدة بعد اسم مضاف أو فيه نون ظاهرة أو مضمرة قد تمّا بالإضافة والنون وحالت النون بينهما أو الإضافة ولولاها لصلح أن يضاف إليه.

(11) This type is any noun that we mention for a [communicative] purpose after an annexed noun or after a noun that carries an overt or an implied *nūn*. Both [nouns] are completed by the annexation and by the *nūn*, and this *nūn* or the annexation separates between them; otherwise it would have been correct to annex [the first term] to it ('U. I, 306.6–9).

Examples of both types of nominal *tamyīz* are found later in the text. In *mā fi s-samā'i qadru rāḥati saḥāban* “there is not in the sky a handful of clouds” ('U. I, 307.3), the *muḍāf 'ilayh* prevents the annexation of *qadr* to *saḥāb*. In *'indī qafizāni burran* “I have two cafizes of wheat” ('U. I, 307.5–6), the dual *nūn* prevents the annexation of *qafiz* to *burr*. In *'ahada-'ašara dirhaman* “eleven dirhams” ('U. I, 311–15–312.1), the numeral is the same position (*mawḍi'*) as a numeral carrying a (compensatory) *nūn* and annexation to *dirham* is not possible.

Ibn as-Sarrāj says that numerals are “in need of a specifier” (*taḥtāju 'ilā mā yumayyizu-hā*), just like measures:

(١٢) اعلم أنّ الأعداد كالمقادير تحتاج إلى ما يميّزها كحاجتها وهي تجيء على ضربين منها ما حقه الإضافة إلى المعدود وذلك ما كان منه يلحقه التنوين ومنها ما لا يضاف وهو ما كان فيه نون أو بني اسم منه مع اسم فجعلنا بمنزلة اسم واحد.

<sup>3</sup>Talmon (2009, 208 note 36) writes that “Ibn Sarrāj’s statement *wal-mafʿūl huwa fāʿil fi l-maʿnā* indicates that he fell short of perceiving the dynamic dimension of the early SNIP principle”. It would be more accurate to say that Ibn as-Sarrāj describes the *tamyīz* on two separate levels, syntactic, where the SNIP principle applies, and semantic, where it has different meanings depending on its operator. See above, p. 202, a presentation of Owens’ SNIP.

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 155, for more details on the compensatory *nūn*.

(12) Know that numerals, just like measures, need something that specifies them “as their need”; they [the numerals] come in two types: The first type has the right to be annexed, as is the case for those carrying a *tanwīn*, the other type cannot be annexed, as is the case for those carrying a *nūn* or those that have been built with another noun and have the status of one noun (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 311.2–5).

In the section devoted to the measure *tamyīz* (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 307–310), Ibn as-Sarrāj explains that:

(١٣) ولولا المضاف والنون لأضفته إليه لأنّ كلّ اسم يلي اسما ليس يخبر له ولا صفة ولا بدل منه فحقّه الإضافة.

(13) if it were not for the *muḍāf* or the *nūn* you would have annexed it to it because for any noun that follows a noun which is not its *xabar* nor a qualifier nor its *badal*, the *ʿiḍāfah* is the rule (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 308.2–4).

From this quotation it seems that the specifying construction is only applied where annexation is not possible. This shows that there is a shift in this section devoted to “specifying the numerals”. Although the category of *tamyīz* clearly has a syntactic origin, linked with the dependent form, the numerical specification is described in a semantic category that can be expressed in two different syntactic constructions, annexational and specifying. In the end, the link of the numerical *tamyīz* to dependent form objects (*manṣūbāt*) is secondary.

Ibn as-Sarrāj does not discuss the dependent form *per se*. It seems to be self-understood that since annexation is not possible, the specifier has no other possibility but to surface in the dependent form. In the outline of the *ʿUṣūl*, the numerical and measure specifiers are inserted as a subcase of nouns in the dependent form, without any other justification, and with no link with any verbal “strength”, even at a surface level, as is the case in the *Kitāb* and the *Muqtaḍab*.

What does *ka-ḥājati-hā* exactly mean in the expression *taḥtāju ʿilā mā yumayyizu-hā ka-ḥājati-hā* (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 311.2)? It seems to be redundant here. What is it exactly that makes the numerals “need” a specifier? Similar expressions in the *ʿUṣūl* include a comment on the following two sentences, *ḍarabtu wa-ḍaraba-nī Zaydun* “I hit and Zayd hit me” (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. II, 315.5), which are semantically connected by the fact that the object of the first verb is elided and expressed only as the agent of the second verb. Ibn as-Sarrāj discusses and rejects the possibility to topicalise the agent of the two verbs.<sup>5</sup> He says that the first sentence “needs” the second sentence as its mandatory comment: *min ʿajli ʿanna hātayni l-jumlatayni ka-jumlatin wāḥidatin li-ḥājati l-ʿulā ʿilā mā*

<sup>5</sup>The topicalised form is *aḍ-ḍāribu ʿanā wa-ḍ-ḍārib-ī Zaydun* “I am the one who hits and Zayd is he one who hits me” (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. II, 315.22).

*yufassiru-hā min at-tāniyati* “because these two sentences are like one single sentence, due to the need that the first one has of what comments it in the second one” (ʿU. II, 316.15–17). The argument given by Ibn as-Sarrāj is that transitive verbs need their object just like a *muḩtadaʿ* needs its *xabar*.

Another occurrence of this *ḩājah* is found in *fa-ḩālu-hu ka-ḩāli llāḩi ḩakartu la-ka min al-muḩtadaʿi wa-l-xabari wa-ḩājati kulli wāḩidin min-humā ʿilā mā yutimmu-hu* “its case is like the case of what I mentioned about the *muḩtadaʿ* and the *xabar* and the need that each has of what completes it” (ʿU. II, 318.12–13). Here again, Ibn as-Sarrāj implies that numerals are in the same “need” of a specifier as the *muḩtadaʿ* is in need of a *xabar*.

The end of the section devoted to the numerical *tamyīz* deals with the different shapes it can take. We will consider them now.

### 10.2.3 The annexation of the numeral to the counted object

The first case of numerical specifier that Ibn as-Sarrāj mentions is not in the dependent form but in the oblique form.

Between “three” and “ten”, the numeral is annexed to the counted object in a lesser plural form, as in *ṭalāṭatu ʿaṭwābin* “three dresses” or in *xamsatu ʿaklubin* “five dogs” (ʿU. I, 311.5–8). In the introduction to a section devoted to broken plurals (ʿU. II, 429–III, 35), Ibn as-Sarrāj says that it is not rare for a greater plural form to be used instead of a lesser plural form, as in *ṭalāṭatu šusūʿin* “three sandal thongs” and Qurʾānic *ṭalāṭatu qurūʿin* “three menstruations” (ʿU. II, 430.3–9) and he adds later that if one says *xamsatu kilābin* instead of the expected *xamsatu ʿaklubin*, what is intended is the “genus” (*jins*) as in *xamsatun min al-kilābi* (ʿU. II, 434.1–2).

It is possible to add the definite article to the *muḩḩaf ʿilayh*, just like in a regular *ʿiḩāfah*, which in turn makes the first term definite: *ṭalāṭatu l-ʿaṭwābi* “the three dresses” (ʿU. I, 311.8–10).

The same goes for “one hundred” and “one thousand” because “one hundred” is similar (*naḩīr*) to “ten”, which can be in the position of *muḩḩaf*, and “one thousand” is equivalent to “one hundred”:

(١٤) ومن ذلك مائة وألف لأنّ المائة نظير عشرة لأنها عشر عشرات والألف نظير المائة لأنه عشر مئات .

(14) and in the same way “one hundred” and “one thousand”, because “one hundred” is equivalent to “ten” since it is “ten tens”, and “one thousand” is equivalent to “one hundred” since it is “ten hundreds” (ʿU. I, 311.10–11).

At the end of this paragraph, Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes al-Mubarrad's observation that the *tanwīn* in *mi'ah* and *'alf* is attached like a suffix ("not necessary" *ġayr lāzim*) whereas the *nūn* in *'isrūna* is attached at a lower level ("necessary" *lāzimah*) and cannot be deleted in pausa, nor after the addition of the definite article ('U. I, 311.12–14 quoting *M. III*, 38.3–5). See above, p. 233, for this issue in the *Muqtaḍab*, and footnote 1, p. 155, on the difference between the *tanwīn* and the dual and plural *nūn*.

However, it is not completely true that the *nūn* in *'isrūna* cannot be deleted. When the annexation expresses possession (and not the genus) it is possible to annex *'isrūna* after the elision of the *nūn*. Compare to *'isrū Zaydīn* "Zayd's twenty", which cannot mean "twenty Zayds", unlike *'isrūna Zaydan*. In a section dealing with the transformation of the *wāw* into a *yā'* he mentions the expression *hāḍihi 'isrū-ka* "these are your twenty", where the *wāw* in *'isrūna* becomes a *yā'* in *'isriy-ya* "my twenty" ('U. III, 263.6–7).

Another case when the final *nūn* in *'isrūna* can be deleted is found in a section that deals with nouns carrying a final *nūn*, which remains after the generic negation *lā*<sup>6</sup>, as in *lā ġulāmayni ḍarīfayni la-ka* "you do not have two good lads". Ibn as-Sarrāj says that it is correct to say *lā 'isrīna dirhaman la-ka* "you do not have twenty dirhams" ('U. I, 387.7; 391.4) but if one does not mention the dirhams, it is correct to say *lā 'isrī la-ka*<sup>7</sup> "you have no twenty" ('U. I, 391.4–5).

In exactly the same manner, in a section devoted to "applied issues" linked with the generic negation *lā* ('U. I, 402–408), Ibn as-Sarrāj comments on the expression *lā ġulāmayni wa-lā jāriyatay la-ka*<sup>8</sup> "you do not have two lads nor two maids", where *jāriyatay* is annexed to *la-ka*, as if one was saying *wa-lā jāriyatay-ka* ('U. I, 402.6).

These examples (*hāḍihi 'isrū-ka*, *'isriyya* and *lā 'isrī la-ka*) show that the final *nūn* in *'isrūna* can be elided but only if the annexation means the possession, and not if the following noun is a numerical specifier.

Ibn as-Sarrāj does not introduce here a distinction between two types of annexation, possessive and generic. However, in a section devoted to the annexation ('U. II, 5–19), he makes a distinction between *'idāfah maḥḍah* "proper annexation" and *'idāfah ġayr maḥḍah* "improper annexation" ('U. II, 5.4). The proper annexation can have two meanings: possession (*bi-ma'nā l-*

<sup>6</sup>See above, footnote 5, p. 78, a brief presentation of the generic negation *lā*.

<sup>7</sup>This is the reading of Bohas (1993, 96) according to the manuscript of Rabat, instead of al-Fatli's *lā 'isrīna la-ka*.

<sup>8</sup>The edition of al-Fatli reads *jāriyata-ka* and is again corrected by Bohas (1993, 97). The impression that one gets while reading this section is that its text is far from clear and its very poor edition is not exactly helpful.

*lām*; *ʿU. I.* 53.8) and specification (*bi-maʿnā min*; *ʿU. I.* 53.8), because the particle *min* expresses the “genus” (*jins*; *ʿU. I.* 53.17). The improper annexation consists in four different types that do not concern us here (the *muḍāf* is an *ism al-fāʿil*; or it is a qualifier that applies to what precedes it; or a comparative of the form *ʿafʿal*; or the *muḍāf ʿilayh* is a qualifier that applies to the *muḍāf*).

As for the two meanings that the proper annexation can have, does Ibn as-Sarrāj intend here the meaning as a reformulation (*tafsīr*, *taʿwīl*, [m. 3]) or as the syntactic underlying level (*ʿaṣl*, *taqdīr*, [m. 13])?<sup>9</sup> Since the underlying structure is the same in both cases, i.e., the *muḍāf ʿilayh* is equivalent to a particle and its *majrūr*, the only difference between these expressions is their reformulation [m. 3].

#### 10.2.4 Cases where annexation is impossible

Above “ten”, cardinal numerals are compound nouns made up of two nouns that both carry an invariable *fathah* as in *ʾaḥada-ʿašara* or *xamsata-ʿašara*. The compound itself occupies the position of a numeral carrying an ending *nūn* (*fī mawḍiʿi ʿadadin fī-hi nūnun*; *ʿU. I.* 311.15). More precisely, Ibn as-Sarrāj explains that the second part (*-ʿašara*) takes the slot of a *tanwīn* (*-ʿašara qad qāmat maqāma at-tanwīni*; *ʿU. I.* 312.1). For him, the evidence for this assumption is found in the expression *itnā-ʿašara dirhaman* where *-ʿašara* has replaced the *nūn* (*-ʿašara qad ʿaqabat an-nūna*; *ʿU. I.* 312.2). Ibn as-Sarrāj follows Sibawayh’s interpretation of all compounds in one and the same frame, namely, that of the compensatory *nūn*. It is remarkable that the case of *itnā-ʿašara* serves as an evidence for the analysis of the other compounds, whereas for al-Mubarrad the difference between them encourages him to analyse them differently.

He adds that both terms (the numeral and the counted object) did not “meet” (*lam tajtamiʿā*; *ʿU. I.* 312.2). This means that they are separated by *-ʿašara* and that annexation of the numeral is impossible. This is true of cardinals until “nineteen” (*ʿU. I.* 312.3). In this case, the specifier is expressed by a noun in the singular dependent form.

In the same manner, the specifier (*allaḍi yubayyanu bi-hi*) can only surface as an indefinite singular after decades, as in *ʿiṣrūna ṭawban* “twenty dresses” and *tisʿūna ḡulāman* “ninety lads” (*ʿU. I.* 312.5–6).

Morphologically, “twenty” is derived from “ten”, as Ibn as-Sarrāj puts it “if you double the lowest decade, which is ‘ten’, it has a name derived from

<sup>9</sup>See above, p. 27, the different types of meanings.

its root" (*fa-ʿidā dāʿafta ʿadnā l-ʿuqūdi wa-huwa ʿašarah kana la-hu smun min lafḍi-hi*; ʿU. I, 312.3–4).

### 10.2.5 The counted object after “one hundred” and “one thousand”

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only one to point out what seems to be a contradiction in the expression of the counted object after “one hundred” and “one thousand”. Why should it surface in the singular, since annexation is possible? In other words, nothing forbids the *muḍāf ʿilayh* to be in the plural, just like after “three” to “ten”, so why should the counted object be in the singular, just as it does after decades? His answer is that “one hundred” is both comparable to *ʿašarah* and *ʿiṣrūna*, which behave differently.

Since “one hundred” is “ten tens”, it must be annexable just like “ten” (*fa-wajaba la-hā min hāḍihi l-jihati al-ʿidāfata*; ʿU. I, 312.8). But since “one hundred” immediately follows “ninety”, it must have a specifier in the singular just like the decades (*fa-wajaba ʿan yakūna mumayyizu-hā wāḥidan*; ʿU. I, 312.9–10). The result is that “one hundred” is annexed to a noun in the singular. This noun can carry the definite article, as in a regular *ʿidāfah* (ʿU. I, 312.10–11).

“One thousand” behaves exactly like “one hundred” (*wa-kaḍālika ʿalfun ḥukmu-hu ḥukmu miʿatin*; ʿU. I, 312.11).

In the dual, the ending *nūn* is elided as in *miʿatā dirhamin* “two hundred dirhams” and *ʿalfā dirhamin* “two thousand dirhams” (ʿU. I, 312.11–12).

After this explanation, Ibn as-Sarrāj writes that in poetry one may find a noun in the indefinite dependent form after “one hundred” as in *ʿidā ʿāša l-fatā miʿatayni ʿāman* (“if the boy lived two hundred years”; ʿU. I, 312.14). The author does not mention Q. 18, 25 *ṭalāṭa miʿatin sinīna* “three hundred years” which is a traditional *crux* for grammarians (see above, p. 87).

Then he quotes Sibawayh’s opinion that *miʿah* should have been put in the plural after “three” to “nine” but that it was treated like “eleven” and “twenty”. This explanation is difficult to understand without going back to the *Kitāb* where Sibawayh explains that just as the counted object after “eleven” and “twenty” is in the singular, *miʿah* remains in the singular and that it is not rare for a singular to express a plural (ʿU. I, 313.1–2 quoting K. I, 87.11–13). See above, p. 181, for Ibn as-Sarrāj’s quotation of the *Kitāb*, and p. 201, for the commentary of this passage in the *Kitāb*.



Then follow other quotations from the *Kitāb* where Sibawayh gives examples of elision of the *tanwīn* and use of a singular to express a plural (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 313.2–8 quoting *K. II*, 87.19; 88.2–5). The link between this passage of the *Kitāb* and the syntax of *miʾah* is quite unclear (see above, footnote 19, p. 201), but here in the *ʿUṣūl* it is even more elliptic and it would be impossible to understand without the text of the *Kitāb*.

The last assertion of Ibn as-Sarrāj in this section is very strange. We will investigate it below.

(١٥) واعلم أن كم اسم عدد مبهم فما يفسرها بمنزلة ما يفسر العدد وقد أفردت لها بابا يلي هذا الباب.

(15) Know that *kam* is an unspecified numeral so that its specifier has the same status as the specifier of the numeral and I have devoted a separate chapter to it that follows this chapter (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 314.1–2).

### 10.3 *Kam* is an unspecified numeral

*Kam* has two “positions” (*mawḍiʿ*; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.2): interrogative and predicative (or exclamatory). The interrogative *kam* behaves like *ʿiṣrūna* as in *kam dirhaman la-ka?* (“how many dirhams do you have?”; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.3–4) and the predicative *kam* behaves like *miʾah* as in *kam ġulāmin la-ka qad ḏahaba!* (“how many of your lads have gone!”; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 317.17–318.1). Both functions are treated differently in order to avoid confusion (*xuṣṣa l-istifhām bi-n-naṣb li-yakūna farqan bayna-hu wa-bayna l-xabari*; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.6).

In these expressions, *dirhaman* is said to “comment” on *kam* (*yufassiru*; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.4). The same verb is used three more times in the same section, at the exclusion of other verbs used in the previous section to describe the link between the numeral and its counted object (*bayyana*, *mawayyaza*). In an even more specific way, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that *kam dirhaman la-ka?* means *kam la-ka min ad-darāhimi?*, just as *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman* means *ʿiṣrūna min ad-darāhimi* and that *min* was elided out of lightness (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.11–13). The only difference between *kam* and *ʿiṣrūna* in this matter being—according to al-Xalil—that it is possible to separate between *kam* and its “commentary” and say *kam la-ka dirhaman?* but not between *ʿiṣrūna* and *dirhaman* (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.15–316.1).

In this section, Ibn as-Sarrāj explains that “*kam* is a noun that subsumes all numerals” (*kam ismun yantaḏimu l-ʿadada kulla-hu*; <sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.6) and that, just like numerals that behave in two different ways, in annexational and specifying constructions, *kam* behaves in two different ways, in its interrogative and predicative function (<sup>ʿ</sup>U. I, 315.7–8).

In these two functions, *kam* has to be in the syntactic position of the *mubtada'* but in meaning (*fī l-ma'nā*, i.e., the underlying structure [m. 13]) it can be the agent (*fā'il*), as in *kam rajulan 'atā-nī?* ("how many men came to me?"; 'U. I, 316.6); or the object (*maf'ūl*), as in *kam rajulan ḍarabta?* ("how many men did you hit?"; 'U. I, 316.7); or the topic of a nominal sentence (*mubtada'*), as in *kam dāniqan dirhamu-ka?* ("how many *dāniq* is your dirham?"; 'U. I, 316.7–8);<sup>10</sup> or a circumstantial complement (*ḍarf*), as in *kam laylatan sirta?* ("how many nights did you walk?"; 'U. I, 317.3). In all this, *kam* is "like the rest of the numerals at an underlying level" (*kamā yakūnu sār'u l-'a'dādi fī t-taqdīr*; 'U. I, 316.4–5).

Then comes a clue to the assertion that *kam* is an "unspecified numeral" (*ism 'adad mubham*; 'U. I, 314.1):

(١٦) فكم عدد والعدد حكمه حكم المعدود الذي عدّته به فإن كان المعدود زمانا فهو زمان وإن كان حيوانا فهو حيوان وإن كان غير ذلك فحكمه حكمه.

(16) *Kam* is a numeral and the status of numerals is the same as that of the counted object; if the counted object is time, it is time, and if it is an animal, it is an animal, and if it is something else, its status is the same ('U. I, 317.4–6).

Although it is not stated explicitly here, this statement is an explication of what Ibn as-Sarrāj says at the end of the previous section: *i'lam 'anna kam ismu 'adadin mubhamun fa-mā yufassiru-hā bi-manzilati mā yufassiru l-'adadi* ("know that *kam* is an unspecified numeral and what comments it has the status of what comments the numeral"; 'U. I, 314.1). In other words, saying that *kam* is an *ism 'adad mubham* means that *kam* "subsumes all numerals" (*yantaḍimu l-'adada kulla-hu*; 'U. I, 315.6) and is treated like a numeral (*hukmu-hu ḥukmu-hu*; 'U. I, 317.6).

In Sibawayh's words, as quoted loosely by Ibn as-Sarrāj, *kam* stands for a numeral: *huwa kināyatun li-l-'adadi bi-manzilati fulānin fī l-ḥayawāni wa-huwa mubham* ("it [*kam*] stands for a numeral, in the same way as *fulān* [stands] for an animal, being unspecified"; 'U. I, 320.7–8 quoting K. I, 256.10). The teaching of Ibn as-Sarrāj pushes Sibawayh's opinion towards an even tighter analogy between *kam* and the numerals.

<sup>10</sup>This assertion of Ibn as-Sarrāj is strange since the indefiniteness of *kam dāniqan* and the definiteness of *dirhamu-ka* plead for the opposite, namely, that *kam dāniqan* is in the slot of the *xabar*, and *dirhamu-ka* in the slot of the postponed *mubtada'*.

## 10.4 Issues on the numerical specifier and *kam*

<sup>U. I.</sup> 321–328 is devoted to “applied issues” (*masā’il*) related to the measure and numerical specifiers as well as to *kam*. In this section, Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes a few grammarians, whose opinion he discusses: al-Xalīl (d. 170/786), Yūnus (d. 182/798), al-Kisā’ī (d. 189/805), al-Farrā’ (d. 207/822), al-ʿAxfāš (d. 215/830), ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās (al-Mubarrad, d. 285/898) and ʿAḥmad b. Yaḥyā (Ṭaʿlab, d. 291/904). Other grammarians are referred to collectively, like *al-Baṣriyyūna* and *al-Baḡdādiyyūna*. In three places, Ibn as-Sarrāj himself is referred to as ʿAbū Bakr. This happens after other grammarians have been quoted, in order to indicate that the author goes back to expressing his own opinion. It is also a marker of the transmission history of the text, whose final form was not composed by Ibn as-Sarrāj.

The topics dealt with in this section that are related to numerals and their specifier (*mufasssir*) are the following: the expression of definiteness; the possibility to express the specifier in a specifying construction instead of an annexational construction, as in *xamsatun ʿaṭwāban*; the expression of appositive complements (*tawābiʿ*); the possibility of expressing the specifier by something identifiable.

There are other issues dealt with in this section. They are related to the differences between *kam* and (other) numerals, such as the elision of its specifier, as well as the interference between the *istiṭnaʿ* construction and the specifier after *kam*. These other issues will not be commented on here because they would take us too far from numerals.

Before taking a look at the issues linked with numerals, it is interesting to note that Ibn as-Sarrāj begins this section by telling the difference between the three possible following constructions for measures: *raṭlun zaytan*, *raṭlu zaytin* and *raṭlun zaytun* “a rotl of oil”.

(١٧) تقول عندي رطل زيتا ورطل زيت فمن نصب فعلى التمييز ومن خفض أضاف ومن رفع أتبع وكلّ هذا جائز في المقادير.

(17) You say ‘*indī raṭlun zaytan* and *raṭlu zaytin* [which can also be read *raṭlun zaytun*]. If it is in the dependent form, it is a specifying [construction]; if it is in the oblique form, it is an annexational [construction]; and if it is in the independent form, it is an appositional [construction]. All of this is correct with measures (<sup>U. I.</sup> 321.2–3).

These three expressions are built with the three constructions: *tamyīz* “specifying”, *ʿidāfah* “annexational” and *ʿitbāʿ* “appositional”, respectively.

As for the *tamyīz*, its meaning here is the expression of the measure: *raṭlun zaytan* means *miqdāru raṭlin zaytan* “the amount of a rotl in terms of oil” (see other comparable examples in *ʿU. I*, 321.4–6).

As for the *ʾiḏāfah*, its meaning here is specification (it refers to a “genus” *jins*) as in *raṭlun min zaytin*, which is, along with possession, one of the two possible meanings of this construction (*ʿU. I*, 53–54).

As for the *ʾitbāʿ*, Ibn as-Sarrāj does not mention which meaning is concerned: *badal*, *tawkid*,<sup>11</sup> *naʿt* or *ʿatfal-bayān*. See *ʿU. II*, 19–79 for a detailed presentation of the *tawābiʿ*. This point will be dealt with below (pp. 259f).

### 10.4.1 The expression of definiteness

The first issue related to numerals in these *masāʾil* related to the numerical specifier is the addition of the definite article to the numeral and to the specifier. According to Ibn as-Sarrāj, al-Kisāʾī (d. 189/805) allows the addition of the definite article to both the numeral and its specifier of the two types (annexational and specifying constructions), as in *al-xamsatu l-ʾaṭwābi* and *al-xamsatu l-ʾaṭwāba* (*ʿU. I*, 321.14). Later in the same section he even quotes al-Kisāʾī's opinion that the following expression is valid: *ʿindī l-xamsatu l-ʾalfi*<sup>12</sup> *d-dirhami* (“I have the five thousand dirhams”; *ʿU. I*, 325.4). But Ibn as-Sarrāj disapproves of this use, just as he disapproves of *ʿindī l-xamsata l-ʾašara l-ʾalfa d-dirhami* (“I have the fifteen thousand dirhams”; *ʿU. I*, 325.5–7).

Başrans are said to have rejected the addition of the article in all cases (*ʿU. I*, 321.16) and al-Farrāʾ is reported to have accepted it only for active participles and adjectives that resemble them, as in *aḏ-ḏāribu r-rajula* and *al-ḥasanu l-wajhi* (*ʿU. I*, 321.17).

### 10.4.2 Is *xamsatun ʾaṭwāban* a valid possibility?

Ibn as-Sarrāj reports that al-Farrāʾ teaches that the expression *ʿindī xamsatun ʾaṭwāban* “I have five [in terms of] dresses” shares “something” with the expression *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasanin wajhan* “I passed by a handsome man [in terms of] face” (*ʿU. I*, 324.5–6). From the rest of the text, it appears that the underlying question is the following. Is there in numerals something of the verbal strength of a corresponding *maṣḍar* that would justify the specifying construction, even if the numeral is annexable? In other words, if there is a

<sup>11</sup>Both terms, *tawkid* and *taʾkid*, are found in the *ʿUṣūl*, almost 70 times each.

<sup>12</sup>This singular is unexpected here.

verb-like strength in annexable numerals like *xamsah*, it would be possible to say ‘*indī xamsatun ’aṭwāban*’.

ʿAbū Bakr (Ibn as-Sarrāj) disapproves of this use because, unlike *ḥasan*, numerals do not resemble the active participle; however, he admits it could be found as a poetic licence (ʿU. I, 324.7–9).

The position of Taʿlab is quite different since, according to Ibn as-Sarrāj, he considers that “all specifiers in the dependent form confer a verbal interpretation on what precedes them” (*kullu maṣṣūbin ʿalā t-tafsīri fa-qad juʿila mā qabla-hu fī taʿwili al-fiʿli*; ʿU. I, 324.10–11) as in ‘*indī mā yuʿaddu bi-hi d-dirhamu xamsatan*’ (“I have that in which the dirhams are counted to be five”; ʿU. I, 324.12). It is as if *xamsah* “had been made a *maṣḍar*” (*fa-juʿilat la-hā maṣḍaran*; ʿU. I, 324.12). In other words, if *ʿaṭwāban* surfaces in the dependent form it confers a verbal (*maṣḍar*) interpretation to *xamsah*. The meaning of such a *maṣḍar* is thus “counting something to be five” as in ‘*indī mā yuʿaddu bi-hi d-dirhamu xamsatan*’ mentioned above.

At the end of the section, Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes Bagdadian grammarians who say that both ‘*indī xamsatun waznan*’ and ‘*indī xamsatun waznun*’ “I have five measures” are valid possibilities (ʿU. I, 326.1–2). In the first one, *xamsah* is treated like a *maṣḍar* (ʿU. I, 326.2) and in the second one, *waznun* is treated like a qualifier (*naʿt*) and the expression means *xamsatun mawzūnatun* “five measured” (ʿU. I, 326.2–3).

### 10.4.3 Appositive complements

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only author to deal with the issue of the expression of appositive complements (*tawābiʿ*) of the counted object, such as the qualifier (*ṣifah* in this section; *naʿt* is also found) and the appositional substantive (*badal*). What is at stake is the “number” of the numeral. If the appositive complement agrees with the numeral, it agrees in the plural.

For example, it is both possible to say ‘*indī ʿiṣrūna rajulan ṣāliḥan*’ (“I have twenty righteous men”; ʿU. I, 325.7–8) with the qualifier applying to the specifier and agreeing with it, and ‘*indī ʿiṣrūna rajulan ṣāliḥūna*’ (“I have twenty righteous men”; ʿU. I, 325.7–8) where the qualifier applies to the numeral itself, hence its independent form. All authors agree on the fact that *ʿiṣrūna* is not a plural, it is however clear here that its qualifier is put in a plural form.

And if the qualifier is “a plural that has a singular surface form” (‘*in kāna jamʿan ʿalā laḥḍi l-wāḥidi*; ʿU. I, 325.9), it can either be put in the independent

form or in the dependent form, as in *‘indī ‘iṣrūna dirhaman jiyādan* and *jiyādun* (“I have twenty excellent dirhams”; *ʿU. I.*, 325.10). In other words, the singular surface pattern of *jiyād* (*fi‘āl*) makes it possible to treat it as a qualifier of *dirhaman*, instead of the singular *jayyid* which is expected, as in *‘indī ‘iṣrūna dirhaman jayyidan*.

In the same way, the *badal* can agree either with the numeral as in *‘indī talātu niswatin ‘ajūzāni wa-šābbatun*<sup>13</sup> or with the specifier as in *‘indī talātu niswatin ‘ajūzayni wa-šābbatin* “I have three women, two old ones and one young one” (*ʿU. I.*, 325.13–14).

#### 10.4.4 The specifier as an identifiable thing

In expressions like *xamsatu-ka* “your five” and *xamsatu ‘aṭwābi-ka* “your five dresses”, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that no specifier is expressed, or in his words, “you have not extracted any specifier out of it” (*lam tuxrij min-hu mufasssiran*; *ʿU. I.*, 325.15).<sup>14</sup> This is because the numeral was “annexed and defined” (*‘udīfa wa-‘ullima*; *ʿU. I.*, 325.14–15). This means that the specifier has to refer to a whole indefinite species, not to something identifiable by the listener. However, the specifier can carry the definite article (*ʿU. I.*, 311.8–10), as in *xamsatu l-‘aṭwābi* “the five dresses”, but in this case *‘aṭwāb* still refers to the whole species, not to particular items. The difference between *xamsatu ‘aṭwābi-ka* and *xamsatu l-‘aṭwābi* is that in the former what is expressed is not a specifier but a regular *muḍāf ‘ilayh*.

For Ibn as-Sarrāj there is thus a difference between *xamsatu l-‘aṭwābi*, which he says is a valid way of specifying the numeral (*ʿU. I.*, 311.8–10), and *xamsatu ‘aṭwābi-ka* where *‘aṭwābi-ka* cannot be called a specifier because it refers to something identifiable<sup>15</sup> (*ʿU. I.*, 325.14–15).

The point here is that a specifier has to be a generic term that refers to the whole species, even with the definite article, and not to a particular item. This distinction between a definite species and an identifiable item enables Ibn as-Sarrāj to consider *ad-dirhami* as a *tamyīz* in the expression *mi‘atu d-dirhami*, which was a problem in al-Mubarrad’s theory, because of his definition of the *tamyīz* as an indefinite noun (see above, p. 235).

<sup>13</sup>The text reads *‘indī talātu niswatin wa-‘ajūzāni wa-šābbatun* but the first *wāw* makes no sense. Nevertheless, it was not corrected by Bohas (1993). We propose to suppress it.

<sup>14</sup>See Talmon (2009, 206) on the expression *xaraja mufasssiran*, as used by al-Farrā’.

<sup>15</sup>Marogy (2010, 95) borrows this pragmatic category from Lambrecht (1994, 92) and Lyons (1999, 282) and shows that it is more efficient than definiteness and indefiniteness to understand the *Kitāb*. Here also in the *ʿUṣūl*, it enables us to distinguish between a definite species and an identifiable item. The latter cannot be used in a *tamyīz* relationship whereas the former can.

However, Ibn as-Sarrāj does not mention here the difference in meaning between these expressions. What is the exact nuance in meaning between *xamsatu ʾaṭwābin* and *xamsatu l-ʾaṭwābi* and how different is it from *xamsatu ʾaṭwābi-ka* in terms of definiteness? According to his own definition of *ʾidāfah*, these three expressions should be equivalent to *xamsatun min ʾaṭwābin*, *xamsatun min al-ʾaṭwābi* and *xamsatun min ʾaṭwābi-ka* respectively.

In the section devoted to *ʾidāfah* (ʾU. I, 53–54), Ibn as-Sarrāj is very keen on explaining the fact that, unlike in the possessive *ʾidāfah* and the use of the particle *li-*, there is no difference between the “generic” *ʾidāfah* and the use of the particle *min*. Indeed, whereas *baytu Zaydin* “the house of Zayd” and *baytun li-Zaydin* “a house belonging to Zayd” do not convey the same meaning in terms of definiteness, the two expressions *ṭawbu xazzin* “a silk dress” and *ṭawbun min xazzin* “a dress [made of] silk” have exactly the same meaning (ʾU. I, 53.8–54.6). In other words, the “generic” *ʾidāfah* does not modify the definiteness of the *mudāf*, unlike the possessive *ʾidāfah*, because what is expressed is the genus (*al-xazz* “silk”).

In the possessive annexation, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that the definiteness of the *mudāf ʾilayh* applies to the *mudāf* or, in his words, *alladī yudāf bi-ḡayri lām yaktasī<sup>16</sup> mim-mā yudāf ʾilayh taʾrifa-hu wa-tankīra-hu fa-yakūnu maʾrifatan ʾin kāna maʾrifatan wa-nakiratan ʾin kāna nakiratan* (“that which is annexed without *lām* takes from that to which it is annexed its definiteness and indefiniteness, so that it is definite if it is definite and indefinite if it is indefinite”; ʾU. I, 53.11–12).

Ibn as-Sarrāj refers here to the annexation “without *lām*”, i.e., the possessive annexation. Although it is not explicit in the text, one must understand that this principle does not apply in the “generic” annexation and that the addition of the definite article to the *mudāf ʾilayh* does not make the *mudāf* definite.

The difficulty in this matter is that Ibn as-Sarrāj compares *ṭawbu xazzin* to *dāru l-xalīfati* “the caliph’s house”, and not with an indefinite *mudāf ʾilayh*, as in *baytu qāḍin* “a judge’s house” and *baytun li-qāḍin* “a house of a judge”. He says that *dāru l-xalīfati* “the house of the caliph” and *dārun li-l-xalīfati* “a house of the caliph” do not convey the same definiteness (ʾU. I, 53.13–15), but how do *ṭawbu xazzin* and *ṭawbu l-xazzi* compare in terms of definiteness? Logically, both are most probably indefinite because *al-xazzi* refers to the whole genus, not to something definite.

<sup>16</sup>Literally “is dressed, clothed”. The ms. of the British Library reads *yaktasibu* “acquires, takes on”.

This does not apply to *xamsatu 'aṭwābin* “five dresses” and *xamsatu l-'aṭwābi* “the five dresses”, since the second expression is clearly labelled as definite by Ibn as-Sarrāj (*'U. I*, 311.8–10). If this is true, we are in front of a semantic difference between the measure and the numerical specifier, which can both surface in the same “generic” annexation but with different syntactic implications in terms of definiteness. This is probably the reason why Ibn as-Sarrāj treats them separately.

We have then the following differences: *ṭawbu xazzin* and *ṭawbu l-xazzi* both mean “a silk dress” and are both indefinite. These constructions express a “measure” *tamyīz*. The expressions *xamsatu 'aṭwābin* “five dresses” and *xamsatu l-'aṭwābi* “the five dresses” express a “numerical” *tamyīz*. The first one is indefinite and the second one is definite. As for the definite expression *xamsatu 'aṭwābi-ka* “your five dresses”, it is not a numerical *tamyīz* but a regular *'idāfah* in the meaning of the particle *min*.

## 10.5 Compound morphosyntax

The section entitled *ḍikr aḍ-ḍarb aṭ-ṭānī min al-mabniyyāt wa-huwa l-kalim al-murakkab* (“mention of the second type of undeclinable nouns, namely the compounds”; *'U. II*, 139–144) is devoted to compound nouns such as *xamsata-‘ašara*. It is a subsection of a section devoted to “indeclinable nouns that resemble declinable ones” (*ḍikr al-‘asmā’ al-mabniyyah allatī tuḍāri‘u l-mu‘rab*; *'U. II*, 111–144). There are six types of one-word indeclinable nouns and two types of compound indeclinable nouns: those that have been made one noun (like *xamsata-‘ašara*) and those whose *muḍāf ‘ilayh* has been deleted but that are compound in their intention (*fī n-niyyah*, like *qablu*, *‘amsi* and *ḥayṭu*).

Although it is only in this section that Ibn as-Sarrāj presents his theory about compound nouns, *xamsata-‘ašara* serves as a prime example in a few places earlier in the *‘Uṣūl*: The undeclinable verbal noun *ḥay-hala* “come by here!” is compared to *xamsata-‘ašara* (*'U. I*, 144.18–19); according to ‘Abū ‘Uṭmān (al-Māzinī) *miṭla mā* has been made “one noun” in Qur’ānic ﴿inna-hu la-ḥaqqun miṭla mā ‘anna-kum taṭīqūna﴾ (Q. 51, 23), just like *xamsata-‘ašara* (*'U. I*, 275.4–5); ‘Abū ‘Uṭmān says that it is possible to interpret the expression *ibn ‘umm* “son of mother” in the expression *yā bna ‘umma!* “O son of [my] mother!” as an indeclinable compound noun, just like *xamsata-‘ašara* (*'U. I*, 341.13–14); Ibn as-Sarrāj compares the expression *lā rajula* “no man” to *xamsata-‘ašara*, saying that *lā* and the following indefinite noun have been



made “one noun” and have the same “status” *manzilah* as *xamsata-‘ašara* (ʿU. I, 380.1–2; 385.5–7; 403.7–9; II, 66.6–7).<sup>17</sup>

There are two kinds of compound nouns, partially declinable (diptotic) and indeclinable (*mabnī*), although Ibn as-Sarrāj does not present things this way. Rather, he deals with the two types in different places: diptotic compounds are treated in a section dedicated to the nine “reasons that make a noun diptotic” (*al-‘asbāb allatī tamna‘ aš-šarf*; ʿU. II, 80–93), while undeclinable compounds are presented here, in a section devoted to compound morphosyntax.

Typical examples of diptotic compounds are *Ḥaḍra-Mawt*, *Ba‘la-Bakk*, *Rāma-Hurmuz*, *Māra-Sarjis* and *Ma‘dī-Karib* (ʿU. II, 92.15–16).

As for indeclinable compounds, there are different types. The first type includes compounds that are made up of two words; this type is subdivided into six categories depending on the nature of the words (two nouns, a noun and a verb, a noun and a particle, a noun and an onomatopoeia, a particle and a verb, two onomatopoeia). The second type is made up of nouns whose *muḍāf ‘ilayh* has been deleted: *qabl*, *ḡayr*, *ḥasb*, *‘ams*, *‘awān*, or replaced by a sentence: *ḥaytu*, *‘id*, *‘idā* and *ladun* (ʿU. II, 142.66–144.18).

Compound numerals belong to the first category of the first type of indeclinable compounds. They are made up of two nouns, which both carry an invariable *fathah*, as in the cardinal *xamsata-‘ašara* “fifteen” and the ordinal *ḥādiya-‘ašara* “eleventh” (ʿU. II, 140.3–6). The base form (*al-‘ašl*) of these compounds is the coordination with a *wāw* as in *xamsatun wa-‘ašaratun* where the *wāw* has been elided “for brevity” (*ixtišāran*; ʿU. II, 140.5).

There are other compounds that are said to belong to the same category as *xamsata-‘ašara*, such as *ḥayša-bayša* “confusion”, *šāgara-baḡara* “in all directions”, *‘Ayādi-Sabā*, *Qālī-Qalā* (ʿU. II, 140.8–10).

Lastly, there are compounds for which there are different interpretations (*xāza-bāza*, *bayta-bayta*, *bayna-bayna*, *šabāḥa-masā’a*, *yawma-yawma*, *kaffata-kaffata*), which are either treated like *xamsata-‘ašara*, or like diptotic *Ḥaḍra-Mawt*, or like a *muḍāf* and a *muḍāf ‘ilayh* (ʿU. II, 140.11–21). However, Ibn as-Sarrāj reports no variant interpretation for numerals.

Compound cardinals and ordinals belong thus, for Ibn as-Sarrāj, to a simple category of compounds that poses no special difficulty.

The only two issues mentioned in this section by him are the following: the addition of the definite article and the annexation to a pronoun. He says that Arabs “leave *xamsata-‘ašara* unchanged after the annexation and (the

<sup>17</sup>The negation is missing in al-Fatli’s edition. See Bohas (1993, 97) for the correction.

addition of) the article" (*wa-l-ʿArabu tadaʿu xamsata-ʿašara fī l-ʾiḏāfati wa-l-ʾalifi wa-l-lāmi ʿalā ḥāli-hā*; *ʿU. II*, 140.6–7). He also qualifies the expression *xamsata-ʿašara-ka* as "bad" (*radīʾah*; *ʿU. II*, 140.8). However, it is not clear what his judgment is concerning the addition of the article. Is actual use a sufficient justification? In *ʿU. II*, 305–312, which is part of *bāb al-ittisāʿ* "chapter on flexibility",<sup>18</sup> Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes al-ʾAxfāš who says that some Arabs say *al-xamsata l-ʿašara* instead of *al-xamsata-ʿašara* (*ʿU. II*, 312.4–5).

In the same manner, it is not very clear what he means by annexation. Does he only mean the annexation to a pronoun, as in *xamsata-ʿašara-ka*, or to other nouns as well?

The fact that "twelve" is declinable (see above, p. 125) is not dealt with by Ibn as-Sarrāj in the sections analysed here. It is only in the first of the three short sections devoted to numerals (*ʿU. II*, 424–429) that he mentions the fact that "twelve" is declinable, unlike other compound numerals. The explanation he gives is exactly the same as Sibawayh in the *Kitāb*, although he does not quote him explicitly. "Twelve" is declinable because the declension is carried by a letter (the *ʾalif* or the *yāʾ*) that remains after the replacement of the final *nūn* in *iṭnā-ni* by *-ʿašara* (*ʿU. II*, 424.15–16 repeating *K. II*, 177.5–6 word for word without explicit quotation). Ibn as-Sarrāj does not provide an original opinion in this matter.

## 10.6 The logic at stake in the *ʿUṣūl*

The grammar of numerals in the *ʿUṣūl* is rather simple, partly due to the fact that some very specific issues are not dealt with, unlike in the *Kitāb* and even more in the *Muqtaḍab*. Ibn as-Sarrāj focuses almost exclusively on the counted object when it is expressed after the numeral (i.e., when the counted object specifies the numeral) and not on the other possible constructions, except allusively. This is hardly surprising, since he focuses on what is specific to numerals, not on constructions that are common to other substantives. Numerals found in these common constructions (appositional and predicative) are dealt with in the relevant sections of the *ʿUṣūl*.

The specific way Ibn as-Sarrāj deals with the expression of the counted object as a specifier is as follows. Numerals are "unspecified" *mubham* nouns and as such are in need of a specifier (*ʿU. I*, 311.2). This specifier can be easily expressed by one of the two meanings of the proper *ʾiḏāfah* construction, namely its "generic" meaning, as opposed to its "possessive" meaning (*ʿU.*

<sup>18</sup>See Versteegh (1990b).

I, 53.7–8; 17). However, due to the difference in morphological shape, not all numerals can be annexed to their counted objects, compound numerals and decades for instance (*ʿU. I, 312.2–6*). For these numerals, the specifier is expressed by a specifying construction. Ibn as-Sarrāj distinguishes three different meanings for the specifying construction, depending on the nature of the word to which it applies, its operator.

Thus, Ibn as-Sarrāj distinguishes between the syntactic level and the semantic level, which he both needs in his grammatical analysis. The specifying construction can have different meanings, depending on its operator. In the verbal specifying construction, the specifier expresses the agent of the verb in the dependent form (as in *imtalaʿa l-ʿināʿu māʿan*; see above, p. 247); whereas the nominal specifying construction either means *miqdār* “the amount of” if the operator is a measure (as in *raṭlun zaytan, miqdār raṭlin zaytan* “a rotl of oil”); and if the operator is a numeral, the counted object “specifies” (*yumayyizu, yubayyinu, yufassiru*) the numeral, which needs it (*ʿU. I, 311.2*); Ibn as-Sarrāj also says that the relationship means *min* (*ʿiṣrūna dirhaman, ʿiṣrūna min ad-darāhimi* “twenty dirhams”; *ʿU. I, 315.11–13*).

As for the *ʿiḍāfah* construction, it either expresses possession (*baytu Zaydin, baytun li-Zaydin* “Zayd’s house”) or specification (*xātamun dahabin, xātamun min dahabin* “a gold ring”). If the *muḍāf* is a numeral, the *muḍāf ʿilayh* expresses the specifier (*mufassir*) and the construction is a “generic” (*jins*) *ʿiḍāfah* (*xamsatu ʿaṭwābin, xamsatun min ʿaṭwābin* “five dresses”).

In other words, the grammatical definition of the numerical specifying construction can be summed up as follows. It has the same syntax as the verbal *tamyīz* construction and the same meaning as the “generic” *ʿiḍāfah*. What is noticeable is that this definition includes a semantic dimension. It expresses the counted object, not the agent. Seen from the perspective of the numerical specifier (a semantic category), it is expressed in an annexational construction, if the numeral is annexable, and in a specifying construction otherwise.

This way of presenting things is typical of Ibn as-Sarrāj’s “exhaustive divisions” (*taqāsim*, see above, p. 57).

This means that although these sections are entitled *tamyīz al-maqādir* and *tamyīz al-ʿaḍād*, and although they are located in a section devoted to nouns in the dependent form, the oblique form is the base form. It is only when annexation is not possible that the nominal specifier surfaces in the dependent form (*ʿU. I, 306.6–9*). The reason given by Ibn as-Sarrāj for the preference of the annexational construction over the specifying one is that numerals do not resemble the active participle (*ʿU. I, 324.7–9*). Unlike

*ḥasanun*, they have no verbal meaning and it is only because they cannot be annexed that they have a complement (specifier) in the dependent form. Ṭāhā (1995, 163) notes that “the verb is central in [Ibn as-Sarrāj’s] analysis of verbal constructions and of the relationship between every verb and the different Noun Phrases that occur with it.” It is true that here both measure and numerical *tamyīz* are explained in a section that is linked with verbal transitivity, although they share very little with it, if anything. The only link these two constructions have with transitivity is that if annexation is impossible, the *mufassir* takes the dependent form.

A striking difference between Ibn as-Sarrāj and Sibawayh or al-Mubarrad is the fact that he explicitly includes a semantic criterion in his grammatical interpretation (the two meanings of the annexational construction, the three meanings of the specifying construction, the five meanings of the appositional construction) and it enables him to solve the tricky problem of the apparent inconsistency between the expression of the counted object in different constructions. Instead of aiming at a one-to-one correspondence between constructions and meanings, he believes that some constructions have the same meaning, namely the “generic” meaning of the annexational construction the “specifying” meaning of the specifying construction.

Another difference with Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad is the distinction Ibn as-Sarrāj makes between *xamsatu l-’aṭwābi* and *xamsatu ’aṭwābi-ka*: In the latter case no specifier is expressed, because it refers to something identifiable. Ibn as-Sarrāj says that in *xamsatu ’aṭwābi-ka* the numeral was “annexed and defined” (*’uḍifa wa-’ullima*; *’U. I.* 325.14–15). The implication of this difference is that, unlike Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad, Ibn as-Sarrāj has no difficulty with a definite specifier, as long as it refers to the whole species.

## 10.7 Beyond Ibn as-Sarrāj ...

Ibn as-Sarrāj solves a difficulty that was undermining both Sibawayh’s and al-Mubarrad’s theory of numerals by creating a specific category of *tamyīz al-’a’dād*. Although this category has a clear syntactic origin, namely, a construction involving a verb and a substantive in the indefinite dependent form, it evolves towards a semantic relationship that can be expressed by two different syntactic constructions, namely, annexational and specifying.

Moreover, the assertion that the annexational construction is the base form widens the gap between the verbal and the numerical *tamyīz*. But it is only at this price that some consistency in the syntax of numerals can be safeguarded.

Ibn as-Sarrāj clearly addresses the grammatical issues from a syntactic perspective, however, the introduction of a semantic dimension enables him to reconcile apparently inconsistent phenomena in the language, such as the problematic series *ṭalāṭatu ʿawlādin*, *xamsata-ʿašara waladan*, *ʿiṣrūna waladan*, *miʿatu waladin* and *ʿalfu waladin*. In each case, the relationship between the numeral and its counted object is a *tamyiz*, however, it surfaces in two different shapes because, for morphological reasons, some numerals are not annexable.

In other words, Ibn as-Sarrāj has no problem with the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between syntactic construction and semantic relationship. The same meaning is conveyed by different constructions and one construction conveys different meanings. For example, the (proper) annexational construction expresses both possession (*li-*) and species (*min*), and in turn, species can be expressed by both the annexational and specifying constructions. Another example is the specifying construction that can both express the agent of the verb and specify measures or numerals.

In the same manner, Ibn as-Sarrāj is not aiming at a one-to-one correspondence between morphological shape and syntactic behaviour. This is clear from the way he deals with compound nouns. In a section devoted to syntax he compares the second part of compound cardinals to a compensatory *nūn*, but in a section devoted to compound morphology this comparison is completely absent. In other words, nothing prevents a compound noun from behaving syntactically like a word carrying a *nūn* in some cases and like a word carrying a *tāʾ marbūṭah* in other cases. And inversely, a noun carrying a compensatory *nūn* may behave differently in different syntactico-semantic constructions, like *ʿiṣrūna* in a possessive and a generic annexation. Unlike Sibawayh, Ibn as-Sarrāj does not seem to have been concerned about these issues.

Among the questions that kept Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad busy but are not dealt with in the *ʿUṣūl* are the following: the gender of numerals, the (surface) gender disagreement between cardinals and their counted object, the singular of the counted object after compound ordinals and decades, the verbal value of ordinals, the fact that compound cardinals between “thirteen” and “nineteen” are made up of two words of opposite (surface) gender.

In some cases, it is clear that Ibn as-Sarrāj adopts Sibawayh’s or al-Mubarrad’s views, which he either quotes verbatim or alludes to. In these cases, what is important is probably not the opinion expressed as much as its position in the outline of the *ʿUṣūl*.

Also striking is the little importance given to criteria such as *xiffah* “lightness”, *ṭiqal* “heavyness” or *quwwah* “strength”, which words and morphemes can have in comparison with one another, as noted by Chairet (2000, 218). It seems that his classification relieves him of the use of these analytical tools. In other words, his criteria are more formal than linked with any inner qualities words might possess.

## **Part IV**

# **Results of the study**





## Chapter 11

# A comparison of the three grammarians

We can now compare the three treatises that we focused on in this study. We will first compare factual grammar, which was the object of chapters 3 to 7. Then we will compare grammatical methods, which was the object of chapters 8 to 10. Lastly, we will compare our grammarians' stand towards semantics, based on the theoretical frame presented in the literature review (chapter 2).

This detailed comparison of the three treatises will enable us to check the validity of our research hypothesis, namely that the search for consistency in the grammar of numerals moves from a functional to a formal dimension of grammar.

### 11.1 Formal differences between the three treatises

In this chapter, we will not consider the issues that are discussed by all three grammarians, and on which they may agree or disagree. This is the aim of chapters 4 to 6, which list all the issues linked with numerals at large and gives the opinion of Sībawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj.

What we would like to focus on in this chapter is the content of the three treatises we have studied, i.e., the presence or the absence of the issues as

such. We wish to consider the appearance and disappearance of some issues linked with numerals in these treatises and to have a comparative overview at their content.

Counting the issues dealt with is not a straightforward thing to do since there are many ways of separating them. The principle we have adopted here is to consider issues as separate if different rules apply. For example, it is not pertinent to consider the diminutive form of *xamsah* to be a separate issue, since regular rules apply to its formation. No author deals with it explicitly and we will not consider it to be a separate issue from the diminutive as such. However, we considered the diminutive form of *mi'ah* to be a separate issue, since its formation requires the restitution of a missing consonant and no author has dealt with it.

Theoretically, there are eight possible categories: 1. issues discussed by all three grammarians; issues discussed in the *Kitāb* and that later disappeared, either 2. from the *Muqtaḍab* alone, or 3. from the *ʿUṣūl* alone, or 4. from both later treatises; issues that are not discussed in the *Kitāb* but that appear in 5. the *Muqtaḍab* alone, 6. the *ʿUṣūl* alone, or 7. in both treatises; lastly, 8. there are issues that are not found in any of the three treatises.

There are approximately one hundred issues linked with numerals at large that are dealt with in the *Kitāb*. Only a handful of these issues are not found in the *Muqtaḍab* (four issues) or in the *ʿUṣūl* (three issues). On the other hand, we could find in these two treatises 23 issues that are not found in the *Kitāb* but that appear in later treatises, fifteen in the *Muqtaḍab*, six in the *ʿUṣūl*, and two in both treatises. These figures are approximations but they give an idea of the content of these treatises at large. They also confirm the idea that almost the entirety of Sibawayh's *Kitāb* was subsumed in later tradition, in terms of discrete issues. As we will see in the next chapter, the picture is very different for Sibawayh's grammatical methods.

Interestingly, if one also takes into account the fact that the *Kitāb* is approximately 60% longer than the *Muqtaḍab* and 25% longer than the *ʿUṣūl* in terms of number of words,<sup>1</sup> it means that the *Muqtaḍab* deals with almost 20% more issues linked with numerals than the *Kitāb*, in a book that is 40% shorter. This first information confirms the impression that the *Muqtaḍab* has a more factual and detailed approach to grammar than the *Kitāb*. As for a comparison between the *Kitāb* and the *ʿUṣūl*, the figures are less explicit. The *ʿUṣūl* deals with 5% more numerical issues than the *Kitāb*, in 20% less words.

<sup>1</sup>There are 277.017 words in the *Kitāb*, 171.175 in the *Muqtaḍab* and 219.843 in the *ʿUṣūl*. These statistics are made according to electronic versions of these texts that we were able to compile according to the edition of Derenbourg for the *Kitāb*, of ʿUḍaymah for the *Muqtaḍab* and of al-Fatli for the *ʿUṣūl*.

### 11.1.1 The legacy of the *Kitāb*

What happened to the numerical issues discussed in the *Kitāb*? Categories 1. to 4. represent the four possible evolutions. One can say that almost all the issues linked with numerals in the *Kitāb* are discussed in the later treatises. We could only find two issues that completely disappeared (category 4.), in addition to two other issues that disappeared only from the *Muqtaḍab* (category 2.), and one that disappeared only from the *ʿUṣūl* (category 3.) All other issues have made their way in the later treatises (category 1. not repeated here) We will briefly recall the issues of categories 2., 3. and 4.

Cat.	Issues	Found in	Above
1.	More than a hundred issues found in the <i>Kitāb</i> are treated in the <i>Muqtaḍab</i> and in the <i>ʿUṣūl</i> .	<i>K.</i> , <i>M.</i> , <i>ʿU.</i>	pp. 101–163
2.	The phonetic assimilation of the root <i>sds</i> (referring to “six”).	<i>K.</i> , <i>ʿU.</i>	p. 103
2.	The <i>nisbah</i> of numerals. While Sibawayh has only discussed the case of compound numerals, Ibn as-Sarrāj has a whole chapter devoted to the <i>nisbah</i> where he discusses the case of “two”, “eight”, and compound numerals.	<i>K.</i> , <i>ʿU.</i>	p. 113
3.	The case of <i>itnāni</i> in the position of <i>muḍāf</i> , in the expression <i>ṭintā ḥanḍalin</i> “two colocynths” and in the incorrect annexation <i>*itnay-himā</i> “the two of them”.	<i>K.</i> , <i>M.</i>	p. 130
4.	The case of <i>waḥd-</i> , which is found only in annexation. Mentioned explicitly only in the <i>Kitāb</i> .	<i>K.</i>	p. 103
4.	The dual and the plural forms of compound numerals and decades <i>*iṣrūnāni</i> “two twenties”, <i>*miʾatānāni</i> “two two hundreds” or <i>*ʿalfānāni</i> “two two thousands”.	<i>K.</i>	p. 144

Table 11.1: *What happened to the issues treated in the Kitāb?*

### 11.1.2 Apparition of new issues

Altogether, twenty-three new issues appear in the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl*. There are three possibilities for new issues to appear in these two treatises. They are either found in the *Muqtaḍab* alone (category 5., fifteen issues), or in the *ʿUṣūl* alone (category 6., six issues), or they are found in both treatises (category 7., two issues).

Cat.	Issues	Found in	Above
5.	The morphology of the feminine form <i>ʾiḥdā</i> , which does not correspond to a masculine.	<i>M.</i>	p. 109
5.	For “one” and “two” the noun expresses both the quantity and the species in one word, as in <i>raġulun</i> “[one] man” and <i>raġulāni</i> “two men” but for other quantities, the number has to be expressed separately from the species.	<i>M.</i>	p. 163
5.	It would be confusing to build a <i>fāʿil</i> form on decades have the same root as numerals from “three” to “nine”.	<i>M.</i>	p. 145
5.	Since <i>miʾah</i> begins a new series, its form is different from that of decades.	<i>M.</i>	p. 138
5.	The verb <i>ʾamʾā</i> (Form IV) means “to make something a hundred”, and the verbs <i>ʾallafa</i> and <i>ʾālaḥa</i> mean “to make something a thousand”.	<i>M.</i>	pp. 107 and 109
5.	“Twenty-one” can be expressed by both <i>ʾaḥadun wa-ʾiṣrūna</i> and <i>wāḥidun wa-ʾiṣrūna</i> .	<i>M.</i>	p. 121
5.	The morphology of decades prevents coalescence of conjoined numerals.	<i>M.</i>	p. 121
5.	Analogically, one should say <i>*wāḥidu riġālin</i> “one men”, however, <i>wāḥid</i> cannot be annexed in its numerical meaning.	<i>M.</i>	p. 129
5.	Conjoined numerals can be annexed to their possessor, as in <i>ṭalātatu-ka wa-ṭalātū-ka</i> “your thirty-three”.	<i>M.</i>	p. 132
5.	Conjoined proper name can also be annexed to their possessor, as in <i>Ṭalātātun-Wa-Ṭalātū-ka</i> “your Ṭalātātun-Wa-Ṭalātūn”.	<i>M.</i>	p. 132
5.	The numerals <i>miʾah</i> and <i>ʾalf</i> can be annexed to their possessor, as in <i>miʾatu-ka</i> “your hundred” and <i>ʾalfu-ka</i> “your thousand”.	<i>M.</i>	p. 132
5.	Al-Mubarrad is the only author to discuss—and deny—a possible verbal value to compound ordinals, in the expressions of the type of <i>xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin</i> .	<i>M.</i>	p. 133
5.	The morphology of <i>ʾiṣrūna</i> and the origin of its <i>kas-rah</i> .	<i>M.</i>	p. 137
5.	The impossibility to annex cardinals to a collective noun.	<i>M.</i>	p. 180
5.	The numeral <i>ʾalf</i> behaves like any other counted object when it is found after a numeral.	<i>M.</i>	p. 183
6.	The root of <i>ʾawwal</i> “first”, which Ibn as-Sarrāj says is <i>wwl</i> .	<i>ʾU.</i>	p. 102
6.	The diminutive form of <i>sittah</i> “six” is <i>sudaysah</i> .	<i>ʾU.</i>	p. 112
6.	Numerals are diptotic when used in their absolute meaning.	<i>ʾU.</i>	pp. 123 and 143

6.	Although it has a plural-like pattern, <i>ṭamānin</i> “eight” is not diptotic.	ʿU.	p. 109
6.	ʾAḥad (fem. ʾiḥdā) is always in the position of <i>muḍāf</i> , as in ʾaḥadu l-ʾawlādi “one of the boys”. Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad use this construction but never comment on it.	ʿU.	p. 129
6.	Ibn as-Sarrāj discusses—and rejects—the possibility of putting ʾaḥad and ʾiḥdā in the dual and in the plural, as in * <i>marartu bi-rajulayni maqtūʾay ʾiḥdā l-ʾaḍāni</i> “I passed by two men one of whose ears was cut off”, because their meaning supposes a parallel with another item.	ʿU.	p. 129
7.	Decades can be annexed to their possessor, as in ʾiṣrū Zaydin “Zayd’s twenty”, ʾiṣriy-ya “my twenty”, and ʾiṣrū-ka “your twenty”.	M., ʿU.	p. 131
7.	It is possible to express the counted object by a noun defined by ʾiḍāfah, as in <i>ṭalāṭatu ʾaṭwābi-ka</i> “your three dresses”. While al-Mubarrad has no reservation, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that this is a poetic licence.	M., ʿU.	p. 176

Table 11.2: *Apparition of issues not treated in the Kitāb*

### 11.1.3 Issues discussed by none of the three grammarians

Lastly, there are issues that do not seem to have triggered the curiosity of our grammarians.

Cat.	Issues	Above
<b>In morphology</b>		
8.	A possible quadriliteral origin of <i>ṭalāṭah</i> and <i>ʾarbaʿah</i> .	p. 104
8.	The biliteral nature of the root of <i>miʾah</i> is not tested with any morphological test, diminutive, vocative, relative adjective, proper name, and so on.	p. 109
8.	The presence of an ʾalif in the spelling of <i>miʾah</i> (مائة or مئة).	p. 109
8.	The irregularities of the pattern <i>fāʾil</i> , which does not apply to <i>miʾah</i> nor to ʾalf, which applies to the root <i>ṭn</i> after the restoration of a third radical, and which generates the very irregular form <i>ḥādin</i> .	p. 104
8.	The diminutive form of <i>wāḥid</i> ( <i>wuwayḥid?</i> ), <i>ʾarbaʿah</i> ( <i>ʾurbayʿah?</i> ) or <i>miʾah</i> ( <i>muʾayyah?</i> )	pp. 98, 109, 113
8.	The external masculine plural form of decades, a pattern that is preferred for human males (our grammarians content themselves with the fact that decades do not have a plural meaning).	p. 126
8.	The partitive patterns <i>fuʾul</i> and <i>fāʾil</i> , although the first one is well attested in the Qurʾān.	pp. 115 and 115

8.	The relative adjective forms ( <i>nisbah</i> ) of “deflected” ( <i>ma’dūl</i> ) numerals, <i>ṭunā’iyyun</i> , <i>ṭulāṭiyyun</i> , and so on. (These are regularly used in the <i>ʿUṣūl</i> to describe the roots.)	p. 117
<b>In semantics</b>		
8.	The fact that decades, “one hundred” and “one thousand” have both a cardinal and an ordinal meaning.	pp. 98 and 145
<b>In morphosyntax</b>		
8.	The gender of compound cardinals: Should they be treated like their first part or does the coalescence modify their gender?	p. 96
8.	The fact that “eleven” and “twelve” agree with their counted object, unlike other compound cardinals.	p. 169
8.	The adjectival nature of <i>wāḥid</i> and <i>iṭnāni</i> .	p. 153
8.	The possibility to annex <i>waḥd-</i> to a feminine pronoun, as in <i>waḥda-hā</i> .	p. 142
8.	All numerals are found in all three texts with and without the definite article, however, it is not easy to extract the opinion of the three grammarians on this issue, which is not tackled <i>per se</i> .	p. 134
<b>In syntax</b>		
8.	The counted object above “ten” is in the plural in the appositional and predicative constructions, as in <i>al-ʿawlādu l-ʿiṣrūna</i> “the twenty boys”, <i>ʿawlādun miʿatun</i> “a hundred boys”, <i>al-ʿawlādu ʿiṣrūna</i> “the boys are twenty” and <i>al-ʿawlādu ʿalfun</i> “the boys are a thousand”.	p. 177
8.	The expression of the counted object after conjoined numerals.	p. 181

Table 11.3: *Issues not treated by our three authors*

## 11.2 Example of treatment of specific issues

Before comparing the three authors’ methodology, we would like to present three problematic issues, as an illustration of the three different frames in which our authors work.

### 11.2.1 What is the status of the second part of compound numerals?

The status of the second part of compound numerals has triggered a lot of discussion among grammarians (see above, p. 119).

Sibawayh seems to be the only author to study compound morphology in detail. He studies every possible case and subcase of coalescence in a way

that is not found in the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl*. What is at stake for Sībawayh is clearly not important for al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj, namely, to find a single frame to interpret all compound numerals. If “twelve” were not declinable, it would be simple to analyse all compounds in the same manner, but the fact that “twelve” is declinable forces our grammarians to deal with this issue.

Sībawayh is clearly aiming at consistency among numerals. He first considers *itnā-ʿašara*, finds the compensatory *nūn* solution according to which *-ʿašara* has the status of the final *nūn* in *itnāni* (as opposed to the substantival status it had before coalescence) and then applies this solution to all compounds, cardinals and ordinals (see p. 206).

The solution proposed by al-Mubarrad is very different. He says that the declensional long vowel in the first term in *itnā-ʿašara* forbids coalescence. Thus, he adopts the same position as Sībawayh on the status of *-ʿašara* but only for “twelve” (see p. 220). Other compound cardinals are real compounds and do not need this interpretation. They are interpreted like any other compound in the language where both parts carry an indeclinable *fathah*. Their second part has the status of the *tāʾ marbūṭah* in the male proper names *Hamdah* and *Talhah* (see p. 218). Al-Mubarrad treats the problems separately. There is an issue with “twelve”, so he proposes a solution (Sībawayh’s solution). There is no issue with other compounds, so he treats them like other compounds.

In *bāb tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād*, Ibn as-Sarrāj gives a detailed account of the status of the second part of compound cardinals and ordinals. It occupies the slot of a *tanwīn* and this is the reason why these numerals, just like decades, are not annexable (see p. 253). It is remarkable that the evidence of this assertion for *xamsata-ʿašara* lies in the expression *itnā-ʿašara dirhaman* where *-ʿašara* has replaced the final *nūn* of *itnāni* (*ʿU*. I, 311.15–312.3). It is almost as if Ibn as-Sarrāj had not seen that there is a consistency issue among compound cardinals.

Strangely, this interpretation of the second part of compound numerals is completely absent in the section devoted to indeclinable compounds, where he simply says that compound numerals are made up of two nouns, both carrying an invariable *fathah* as in *xamsata-ʿašara* “fifteen” and *ḥādiya-ʿašara* “eleventh” (*ʿU*. II, 140.3–6). This description is a mere morphological account of these compounds (see p. 262).

In a section devoted to apocopation (*tarxīm*), *-ʿašar* in compound numerals used as proper names is treated like a final *hāʾ* (i.e., *tāʾ marbūṭah*) and is thus deleted in order to build the apocopated form, as in *yā Xamsata*

ʿaqbil!, the apocopated form of the proper name *Xamsata-ʿAšar* (ʿU. I, 363.4–6; 364.1–3).

Ibn as-Sarrāj does not comment on the difference in the treatment of –ʿa-*sara* in proper names and numeral compounds.

The question is whether the interpretation of the second part of compound numerals given in *bāb tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād* (the compensatory *nūn* frame) is an *ad hoc* explanation, which is valid only in this section in order to justify the specifying construction—exactly like it is compared to a *tāʾ marbūṭah* in the section devoted to *tarxīm*—or whether it has some validity outside this section, and especially in the section devoted to indeclinable compounds. In other words, is the compensatory *nūn* explanation a morphological interpretation that is valid for other indeclinable compounds such as *ḥayṣa-bayṣa* and *šağara-bağara* or simply a syntactic comparison valid only in the section dealing with the numerical *tamyīz*?

Since syntactic issues and morphological issues are so clearly separated in the *ʿUṣūl*, one might think that the compensatory *nūn* explanation is only a syntactic comparison without a morphological basis, except maybe in the case of “twelve”, as suggested by Ibn as-Sarrāj in the expression *itnā-ʿašara dirḥaman* where –ʿašara has replaced the final *nūn* of *itnāni* (ʿU. I, 311.15–312.3).

In conclusion, we can say that the three solutions are quite different. Sibawayh endeavours to find a single consistent frame, al-Mubarrad simply ignores the consistency issue and Ibn as-Sarrāj seems to have an *ad hoc* approach to the phenomenon, depending on the section where he deals with the issues.

### 11.2.2 Are numerals “unspecified” substantives?

“Unspecified” substantives are not clearly defined by our authors (see above, p. 145). It is only through cross-examination that we can try to figure out what they mean and why they apply it to numerals. “Unspecified” substantives can either replace a whole category (like *hādā* or *alladī*) or they need to be specified (like *ʿiṣrūna* and *kam*). See above, p. 145. In both cases, these substantives can be said to be semantically deficient, unlike “regular” substantives, which are supposed to refer to something in themselves, according to the very definition of what a substantive is for our grammarians.

According to Sibawayh, compound cardinals and ordinals are “unspecified” (K. II, 47.11). Al-Mubarrad teaches the same about cardinal compounds



(*M.* II, 165.2) and decades (*M.* II, 144.6; 165.13). As for Ibn as-Sarrāj, it is not clear whether he means that all numerals are “unspecified” or only those whose specifier is expressed by an indefinite dependent form (*ʿU.* I, 114.16).

What is at stake is the definition of the numerical specifier. Both al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj primarily link the definition of *tamyīz* to the dependent form, but they both say that it can surface as a *muḍāf ʿilayh* if the numeral is annexable, as is the case with hundreds and thousands. However, they both expand the definition of *tamyīz* in order to apply it to hundreds and thousands, though for different reasons. Al-Mubarrad draws a clear distinction between basic and subsidiary numerals and says that only the latter need a *tamyīz* (either in the dependent or in the oblique form), while Ibn as-Sarrāj creates an *ad hoc* category numerical *tamyīz* that surfaces in the oblique form with annexable numerals and in the dependent form with non annexable numerals.

The consequence is the same, hundreds and thousands need a specifier. Does this make them *mubhamah*? Neither al-Mubarrad nor Ibn as-Sarrāj give a clear answer to this question.

Sibawayh does not define a category of *tamyīz* in the first place and he only qualifies compound numerals as *mubhamah*. He does not explore this path further and the reader is left with more questions than answers on this matter.

Ibn as-Sarrāj states that *kam* is an “unspecified numeral” (*ism ʿadad mubham*; *ʿU.* I, 314.1), and later in the *ʿUṣūl* he says that it is a “noun for an unspecified numeral” (*ismun li-ʿadadin mubhamin*; *ʿU.* II, 135.4–5). What is meant by this expression is that *kam mālu-ka*? “how much is your sum?” replaces the expression *ʿa-ʿiṣrūna mālu-ka*? “is your sum twenty?” and any other numeral (*ʿU.* II, 135.5–7). He further explains that “numerals are infinite so they came up with a noun that subsumes them all” (*wa-l-ʿadadu bi-lā nihāyatin fa-ʿataw bi-smin yantaḍimu l-ʿadada kulla-hu*; *ʿU.* II, 135.7).

The other nouns that Ibn as-Sarrāj explicitly quotes as being *mubhamah* are demonstratives like *hādā, tilka, ʿulāʾika* (*ʿU.* I, 149.7), adverbs like *quddām, ʿamām, warāʾ, xalf* (*ʿU.* I, 197.11–13), and pronouns like *mā, man, alladī* (*ʿU.* II, 68.5–7).

As for numerals, it is not clear whether they are all *mubhamah* or not. Ibn as-Sarrāj says that *kullu mubhamin min al-ʿaḍādi wa-ḡayri-hā ʿinnamā tufassiru-hu n-nakiratu l-manṣūbatu* (“any unspecified numeral or any other [word] is made explicit by a [noun in the] indefinite dependent form”; *ʿU.* I, 114.16).

On the one hand, since not all numerals are specified by a specifying construction, does this mean that only non-annexable numerals are “unspecified”? And on the other hand, since all numerals are in need of a specifier (*ʿU. I, 311.2*), does this mean that they are all unspecified?

The last question linked with unspecified nouns in the *ʿUṣūl* is whether *mubhamah* nouns are definite by nature or not, as could be inferred from the following quotation: *wa-l-maʿrifatu xamsatu ʿašyāʾa: al-ismu l-makniyyu wa-l-mubhamu wa-l-ʿalamu wa-mā fī-hi l-ʿalifu wa-l-lāmu wa-mā ʿuḍifa ʿilayhinna* (“the definite [noun] is five things: the pronoun; the unspecified [noun]; the proper name; what carries the definite article; and what has been annexed to these”; *ʿU. I, 149.2–3*). Since this obviously does not apply to numerals, because they are not definite, one is forced to admit that *mubham* refers to at least two different things: a particular category of definite nouns that share common features (such as *hādā, mā, allādī*) and a broader semantic “unspecifiedness” that describes numerals, measures, and some adverbs like *quddām, xalf, warāʾ*, and so on.

### 11.2.3 Why should the counted object be in the singular above “ten” in the annexational and specifying constructions?

We have seen above, p. 177, that the counted object above “ten” in predicative and appositional constructions is in the plural, as in *al-ʿawlādu ʿiṣrūna* “the boys are twenty” and *al-ʿawlādu l-ʿiṣrūna* “the twenty boys”, but this is not pointed out by our grammarians.

However, in annexational and specifying constructions, the counted object remains in the singular above “ten”, as in *ʿiṣrūna waladan* and *miʾatu waladin*. The positions of Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj are quite different and reflect their theory at large.

Sibawayh explains the phenomenon by saying that it is not rare for a plural to be expressed by a singular, which is “lighter” (*K. I, 85.5–7*). But he does not say why this should be true only above “ten”.

The logic of al-Mubarrad is different. He simply says that the counted object of greater numerals is expressed in the singular (*M. II, 164.5–6*) because it expresses a whole species. He does not address the issue of the predicative and appositional constructions, but as far as the annexational and specifying constructions are concerned, his solution is simple and consistent with the

necessity for greater numerals to be specified, i.e., to have a complement that expresses their species, which the singular can do perfectly.

Ibn as-Sarrāj is not very explicit about the reason why the counted object has to be in the singular above “ten” in the annexational and specifying constructions. He simply notes that it is in the plural after “three” to “ten” (ʿU. I, 311.5–8) and in the singular after decades because the number is already expressed in the numeral (ʿU. I, 223.7–10 quoting *M. III*, 34.11–14), but he does not comment on the singular counted object after compound numerals.

As for hundreds, Ibn as-Sarrāj explains the singular of the counted object by the fact that “one hundred” was due to behave partly like “ten” because it is “ten tens” and partly like “ninety” because it comes just after it (ʿU. I, 312.8–10). Like “ten”, “one hundred” is annexed to its specifier, and like “ninety”, its specifier is in the singular. He gives exactly the same analysis for “one thousand”, which is “ten hundreds” (ʿU. I, 312.11). This interesting “two-sided consistency” is not found in the *Kitāb* or in the *Muqtaḍab*.

The absence of commentary on this issue is all the more strange since the verbal specifier can surface either in the singular or in the plural, depending on the intended meaning (ʿU. I, 223.3). In the case of the numerical specifier, there is no choice.

The solution of Ibn as-Sarrāj is not as simple as that of al-Mubarrad. His argument that after decades the plural is not needed because the quantity is already expressed, does not account for the plural after numerals between “three” and “ten”. He does not mention compound numerals and in the case of “hundreds” and “thousands” his “two-sided consistency” looks like a middle way between Sibawayh’s consistency at all price and al-Mubarrad’s interpretation of different series in different frames.

### 11.3 Differences in methodology

In chapter 2, we have seen how modern scholars have qualified the grammatical methodology of Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj, especially focusing on Sibawayh and often qualifying the two other grammarians by comparison with him. In part three, we have tried to understand the theoretical frame in which these grammarians deal with numerals, not only as discrete issues but as a whole. At this point, we are able to cast a new light on the grammatical methodology of our three grammarians and not only on their factual approach to grammatical issues.

Obviously, numerals are not separable from the grammatical systems developed by these grammarians and most of the traits that scholars have discerned in these grammar treatises are confirmed at the level of numerals.

In the case of Sībawayh, what is described in the literature as a search for a simple consistency across the grammatical rules, even at the cost of a non-intuitive and highly sophisticated theory (see p. 32), is surely at work in his presentation of numerals. In the same manner, the description made by Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli (1990/2006, 5) of al-Mubarrad's method as a "heterogeneous" approach (see p. 52) is not only confirmed but well documented by our study. Lastly, we also have a confirmation of Ibn as-Sarrāj's use of what can be labelled as "formal semantic subcategories", as described by Owens and Ṭāhā (see p. 65), which enables him to present the grammar of numerals in a simpler way than Sībawayh, without renouncing some consistency but, sometimes, at the cost of a "double-sided consistency", as we will see below.

In the following pages, we present the results of our inquiry on numerals and we link them to what has been presented in the literature review in part one. However, before we turn to these issues, we will compare the way Sībawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj deal with the linguistic corpus they analyse.

### 11.3.1 The recourse to the testimony of canonised tradition

We have seen above (p. 85) that there are in the *Muqtaḍab* almost twice as many Qur'ānic quotations containing numerals than in the *Kitāb*. One half of these Qur'ānic verses is identical with those in the *Kitāb*, the other half is found exclusively in the *Muqtaḍab*. This picture is quite different from what we find in the *ʿUṣūl*, since Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes the Qur'ān twice less than Sībawayh, i.e., four times less than al-Mubarrad.

If one considers all the Qur'ānic quotations, and not only those containing numerals, we obtain a more precise picture of how our authors quote the sacred text. There are 70% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Muqtaḍab* than in the *Kitāb* (832 and 488 respectively), 34% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Kitāb* than in the *ʿUṣūl* (488 and 364 respectively) and 128% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Muqtaḍab* than in the *ʿUṣūl* (832 and 364 respectively).

Lastly, if one relates these figures to the size of the three treatises, i.e., with the fact that the *Kitāb* is 60% longer than the *Muqtaḍab* and 25% longer than the *ʿUṣūl*, we find even more significant differences between them: The 70% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Muqtaḍab* than in the *Kitāb* become 175%

more, and the 34% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Kitāb* than in the *ʿUṣūl* are reduced to only 6% more. The comparison between the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl* is even more dramatic: The 128% more quotations in the *Muqtaḍab* jumps to 193% more Qur'ānic quotations in the *Muqtaḍab* than in the *ʿUṣūl*.

These first estimations are only an indication of the importance our authors assign to the Qur'ān as a source of linguistic data. Of course, more investigation should be done in this field.

Our three authors have a less different stand towards quotations from the Prophetic traditions (*ʾaḥādīṭ*), see above p. 89. There is no explicit *ḥadīṭ* quotation in the *Kitāb*, only one in the *Muqtaḍab* (not mentioned in ʿUḍaymah's tables) and one in the *ʿUṣūl*.

However, Hārūn mentions seven implicit *ḥadīṭ* quotations in the *Kitāb* and some scholars have extracted as many as 46 implicit *ḥadīṭ* quotations. As for the *ʿUṣūl*, aṭ-Ṭanāḥī's tables mention three *ʾaḥādīṭ*, of which only the third one is explicitly quoted as such by Ibn as-Sarrāj.

As for poetry and quotations from the "language of the Arabs", their volume and their variation make it difficult to compare them accurately. If we focus only on poetic lines and expressions that contain numerals, we get the impression that the *Kitāb* quotes more poetry than the *Muqtaḍab*, which in turn quotes more poetry than the *ʿUṣūl*: There are 25 poetic passages in the *Kitāb* that contain numerals, 22 in the *Muqtaḍab*, and only 14 in the *ʿUṣūl*. If one takes their repetition into consideration, the figures are 29, 25 and 17 passages, respectively (see p. 92).

Out of these 22 different poetic passages found in the *Muqtaḍab*, 13 are already found in the *Kitāb*, al-Mubarrad providing the nine other ones. As for the *ʿUṣūl*, 10 of its 14 different passages are already found in the *Kitāb*, the last four ones being unique to Ibn as-Sarrāj.

We have identified approximately 70 different quotations from the "canonised language of the Arabs" that contain numerals (see p. 93). Out of these 70 different quotations, 40 are found in the *Kitāb*, 30 in the *Muqtaḍab* and 50 in the *ʿUṣūl*. Interestingly, it seems that Ibn as-Sarrāj tends to rely either on the *Kitāb* or on independent sources for his linguistic quotations, but not on the *Muqtaḍab*, which was also the case for Qur'ānic and poetic quotations.

Roughly speaking, if quotations containing numerals are representative of all quotations, one can say that the *Muqtaḍab* relies on the *Kitāb* for half of its quotations (Qur'ānic, poetic, or canonised language); and if compared to the *Kitāb*, it quotes more Qur'ān, the same amount of poetry, and less canonised

language. As for the *ʿUṣūl*, it relies more on the *Kitāb* for its quotations than on the *Muqtaḍab*, and its quotations are taken from the canonised language more than from the Qurʾān and poetry, if compared to the two other treatises.

### 11.3.2 A focus on rare forms rather than on regular ones

It is a basic observation that our grammarians focus on rare forms rather than on regular ones. This common feature to the three treatises reminds us to be prudent when speaking of a “pedagogical turn” in post-Sibawayh grammar (see p. 48). Surely, a pedagogical book would focus on regular cases and majority use rather than on difficult and irregular cases.

In part two, we have come across a number of issues that are not dealt with by our grammarians and are thus left to our interpretation (see, p. 275, a list of issues not discussed). The reason why grammarians did not treat some of these issues is probably that they consider them as too evident.

However, this is not the whole picture, since even difficult cases are not tackled in our grammar treatises: the diminutive of *wāḥid*, the root of *miʾah*, to name only two of them. Why did grammarians not tackle these issues although they present interesting morphological challenges? This absence could be explained by the fact that since these issues are not dealt with in the *Kitāb*, they do not belong to the corpus of issues that grammarians have to comment. It seems difficult to believe that they have deliberately ignored a difficult point in grammar.

### 11.3.3 Formalisation of Sibawayh’s methods by al-Mubarrad

Another view that is widely shared by scholars is that post-Sibawayh grammar is more formal than that of Sibawayh (see p. 62). What these scholars intend by formalism is different from prescriptiveness and pedagogy. It is rather the diffuse feeling that Sibawayh’s dynamic view of the relationship between words, in terms of strength and power, is reduced to formal rules. For other scholars, it also includes the idea that post-Sibawayh grammar focuses on syntactic rules rather than on the communicative act that lies behind the utterance. This formalism can be opposed to Sibawayh’s empirical non-systematic method.

In our study, we have come across a few clear cases where al-Mubarrad takes for granted what was probably simply an analytical tool in the *Kitāb*. For example, while dealing with expressions like *xāmisu xamsatin* and *xāmisu*

*ʿarbaʿatin*, Sibawayh explains their form and meaning with the help of the verb *xamasa*. This semantic comparison is apparently taken seriously by al-Mubarrad who provides a full list of numerical verbs that contrasts with the clear affirmation of Ibn as-Sarrāj that these verbs do not actually exist (see p. 105).

In exactly the same manner, Sibawayh postulates an underlying verb that explains the dependent form of *waḥda-hu* in the expression *marartu bi-hi waḥda-hu* but he does not say what verb it is. Not only does al-Mubarrad quote the full expression, *ʿawḥadtu-hu bi-murūri ʾiḥādan*, but he extends it to other numerals, as in *marartu bi-l-qawmi xamsata-hum*, which he paraphrases as *bi-hāʾulāʾi taxmīsan* (see above, p. 141). In other words, here again al-Mubarrad interprets literally what was only suggested by Sibawayh.

Lastly, this increased formalism is much more apparent in criteria such as *quwwah*, *xiffah* or *tiqal*, which are used by Sibawayh to establish local and relative hierarchies between linguistic elements. In the *Muqtaḍab*, these criteria are treated as if they could only take an on/off value, and in the *ʾUṣūl* they are mentioned only briefly. However, our focus on numerals is certainly too narrow to account for this phenomenon and wider research is needed to prove it.

#### 11.3.4 Differentiation as an interpretative tool

A new criterion appears in the *Muqtaḍab* that is not used by Sibawayh, and that can be described as a “differentiation tool”. In many places, al-Mubarrad draws a distinction between series of words and explains their different behaviour by the mere fact that they belong to different series. In other words, he contents himself with the fact that words belong to different categories as a justification for their different behaviour. Curiously, by doing so, al-Mubarrad succeeds in giving the impression that here lies a certain consistency (it is consistent that different categories behave differently). This method is as far as one can imagine from Sibawayh’s quest for consistency, whose aim is to find a limited number of reasons that explain different surface phenomena.

As far as numerals are concerned, al-Mubarrad draws a first distinction between lesser and greater numerals (see p. 216). This distinction accounts for the fact that some numerals have a counted object in the plural and others a singular one (which is only true in the annexational and specifying constructions). It also accounts for the fact that some numerals have a unique form in the masculine and in the feminine, while others have two different

forms (with the exception of compound numerals, which al-Mubarrad treats as lesser numerals because they are made up of two lesser numerals).

Moreover, each series is due to behave differently from the previous series. Al-Mubarrad explains thereby the difference between decades and hundreds, between units and hundreds, between hundreds and thousands and the differences in the issue of the definite article (see pp. 221ff. and 225).

A different meaning can also justify a different behaviour, as is the case with the number of the *tamyīz*. In the expression *Zaydun 'afrahu n-nāsi 'abdan*, a plural *tamyīz* (*'abīdan*) conveys a different meaning. Both constructions are thus possible, whereas after numerals, there would be no difference in meaning since plural is already expressed by the numeral. Thus, numerical *tamyīz* cannot surface in the plural (see p. 232).

This differentiated approach, added to the fact that al-Mubarrad deals with a significantly larger number of issues, definitely confirms the impression that al-Mubarrad's grammar is a "discrete" one, i.e., a grammar that treats issues separately with a minimal theoretical frame. See above, p. 52, the description of al-Mubarrad's method as a "heterogeneous" approach by Bohas, Guillaume, and Kouloughli (1990/2006, 5).

Interestingly, although it is far from our main concern, we find the same differentiated approach in al-Mubarrad's treatment of the Qur'ān and poetry. He spends quite some time to draw a clear difference between them. *M. II*, 171.4–174.10 is devoted to a discussion about the Qur'ān and poetry.<sup>2</sup> His argument is that the justification of a specific use in poetry cannot apply to the Qur'ān because the language of the Qur'ān is different from that of poetry.

### 11.3.5 Local vs. global consistency

Sibawayh aims at a global consistency throughout his *Kitāb* (see p. 44). Not only does the expression *'išrūna dirhaman* serve as a prime example for specifying constructions inside the chapter on numerals, but also outside this chapter. Indeed, the fact that *ṣifāt muṣabbahah* are found in all four constructions, appositional, predicative, annexational, and specifying, as in *wajhun ḥasanun*, *al-wajhu ḥasanun*, *ḥasanu l-wajhi* and *ḥasanun wajhan*<sup>3</sup> is probably the main incentive for Sibawayh to gather the syntax of all numerals under this chapter.

<sup>2</sup>It is here that he comments on *Q. 18*, 25 mentioned above, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 194, for this last expression.



Although not all numerals are found in all four constructions, they are, when considered together: *ʿawlādun xamsatun*, *al-ʿawlādu xamsatun*, *xamsatu ʿawlādin* and *ʿiṣrūna dirhaman*. As is clear from this series, the difficult case is the last one. Sibawayh considers it first and once the validity of its position as a subcase of *ṣifāt muṣabbahah* is proven, all other numerals are added to the picture, to which they fit easily.

This non-intuitive approach is aiming at a global consistency for all numerals. It does not mean that numerals resemble the active participle, but that they resemble adjectives that resemble active participles. This “second degree” resemblance justifies the lesser freedom of behaviour that numerals show, in comparison to actual *ṣifāt muṣabbahah*.

Al-Mubarrad is confronted with the same consistency issue as Sibawayh, but he solves it in a radical way: the consistency lies in the fact that each series behaves differently.

As for Ibn as-Sarrāj, his methodology of “exhaustive divisions” (*taqāsīm*) is very clear in the case of the grammar of numerals, as it is in general (see p. 57). He treats the syntax of the counted object in a subsection called *tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād*, which is itself a subsection of complements in the dependent form, namely, those that are not operated on by a verb (see above, p. 246). The annexational construction is presented at the same place in the *ʿUṣūl*, in what at first sight looks like a subcase of numerical *tamyīz* for annexable numerals. However, the presentation of Ibn as-Sarrāj leaves little doubt that it is the other way round: the specifying construction is a subcase of the annexational one, and it is only if numerals are not annexable that their counted object is expressed by a noun in the indefinite dependent form.

The conclusion we draw from Ibn as-Sarrāj’s presentation is that the numerical *tamyīz* is actually considered first for its meaning (to express the species), and that it surfaces in a specifying construction only if annexation is not possible. We see here the limit of Ibn as-Sarrāj’s rigid *taqāsīm* based on the four basic forms that substantives can take (independent, dependent, oblique and indeclinable). Since his outline is organised according to these forms, he is compelled to choose one of these four forms to insert the numerical *tamyīz* in his treatise. He adopts the dependent form as the entry point for the expression of the counted object, but then widens its definition in order to include the annexational construction (oblique form). By doing this, Ibn as-Sarrāj maintains some consistency in the system, which is ultimately not based on the syntactic forms that the counted object can take but on the meaning it expresses (it specifies the numeral).

There are two other cases where Ibn as-Sarrāj finds new solutions in order to maintain some consistency within his theory. The first case can be labelled a “double-sided consistency”. It is the case of “one hundred” that behaves partly like annexable “ten” (“one hundred” means “ten tens”) and partly like “ninety” which “one hundred” immediately follows and whose counted object is in the singular (see p. 254).

The second case can be labelled a “local consistency”. In the interpretation of compound numerals, Ibn as-Sarrāj does not try to reconcile two different approaches, syntactic and morphological (see above, p. 276). Syntactically, the second part of compound numerals occupies the slot of a *tanwīn*, which forbids their annexation. This interpretation is completely absent from the discussion on their morphology. Since Ibn as-Sarrāj clearly separates issues in his treatise, he discusses syntactic issues in syntactic sections and morphological issues in morphological sections. Consequently, unlike Sibawayh, Ibn as-Sarrāj has no place to discuss transversal issues. Most of the discussions linked with compound substantives in the *Kitāb* simply disappear in the *ʿUṣūl* because only a local consistency is aimed rather than a global one.

### 11.3.6 Appearance of formal semantic categories

Owens (1990b), Ṭāhā (1995) and al-Māḍī (2009) mention semantic constraints in the description of syntactic categories in the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl* (see p. 65), which correspond exactly to what we have observed above in the definition of *tamyīz* in the *ʿUṣūl*. In this case, a broad syntactic category (complements in the dependent form) is refined and subdivided into categories that apply only to a limited number of cases (*maʿfūl bi-hi*, verbal *tamyīz*, *tamyīz al-maqādir*, *tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād*, and so on). Ibn as-Sarrāj’s “exhaustive divisions” enable him to present subcategories that are exclusive of one another. All substantives in the dependent form are either operated on by a verb or by a noun; those operated on by a noun are either operated on by a measure or a numeral or *kam* (see p. 246). Verbal *tamyīz* and nominal *tamyīz* are clearly separated from the beginning in the *ʿUṣūl*.

A first semantic criterion is already operating in these divisions, since the only difference between measures and numerals is their meaning. The case of *kam* is different, since it can replace any numeral. A second semantic criterion appears in what constitutes the semantic shift of the whole category of *tamyīz al-ʿaʿdād* that was described above: Although it is treated as a subsection of substantives in the dependent form, the annexational construction is actually the base form of this *tamyīz*. What is left in the definition of the numerical *tamyīz* is not its dependent form, nor its singular, nor its indefiniteness but

its meaning: it specifies the numeral. This definitely cuts off the numerical *tamyīz* from its verbal counterpart.

Actually, this obvious shift in the *ʿUṣūl* is also present in the *Muqtaḍab*. There, it is less striking, because of the differentiated approach of al-Mubarrad which makes general categories less compelling. Unlike Ibn as-Sarrāj, al-Mubarrad does not separate verbal *tamyīz* and nominal *tamyīz* (see p. 229). According to him, *tamyīz* complements are operated on either by a verb or by a word that behaves like a verb, either because of its meaning (*li-l-maʿnā*), or of its behaviour (*li-t-taṣarruf*), or because of its surface level (*li-l-laḫḫ*).

This definition is based on formal criteria, namely, the dependent form in which the *tamyīz* surfaces. However, al-Mubarrad quickly shifts to a semantic definition of the *tamyīz* as the expression of the species and he adds that it can surface in the oblique form, as in *kullu rajulin*, *miʿatu dirhamin* and *ʿanta ʿafrahu ʿabdin fī n-nāsi* (see p. 233). What is left from the first definition of *tamyīz* is the specification meaning, as well as the singular and the indefiniteness.

With this new definition, there is a consistency issue with numerals between “three” and “ten”, which al-Mubarrad solves by saying that, as base form numerals, they do not need a *tamyīz*. There is another difficulty with “hundreds” and “thousands” whose counted object can take the definite article, although al-Mubarrad explicitly says that *tamyīz* should be indefinite. This case is not elucidated by him and we cannot predict whether or not he would call a *tamyīz* the definite expression *ad-dirham* in *miʿatu d-dirhami*.

Ibn as-Sarrāj solves this difficulty by introducing a distinction between two types of definite nouns: those referring to the whole genus and those referring to one specific item (see above, p. 260). It is thus possible for the specifier to carry the definite article, since this does not prevent it from referring to the whole genus, as in *miʿatu d-dirhami* “the hundred dirhams”. This distinction is only semantic, since *ad-dirham* could also refer to “this very dirham that you and I know”, depending on what is intended by the speaker.

It is remarkable that neither al-Mubarrad nor Ibn as-Sarrāj is disturbed by the fact that their definition of *tamyīz* changes radically from a clear dependent form analysis to a semantic category, which can surface in two different constructions. The reason why they see no contradiction is probably due to the fact that meaning is primary. Their grammar is subordinated to the meanings expressed. If syntactic constructions were al-Mubarrad’s and Ibn as-Sarrāj’s primary concern, this shift would not have passed unnoticed. In the case of Ibn as-Sarrāj, it is less evident, since the whole section on substantives is organised according to case endings, but he does not hesitate

to subsume the annexational and the specifying constructions under the subsection of *tamyiz al-ʿaḏād*.

This is a drastic case. There are more cases in the *ʿUṣūl* where Ibn as-Sarrāj simply introduces a semantic constraint in order to distinguish one subcategory from another and explain different syntactic behaviours. In these cases, there is no syntactic conflict within the category, but semantic subcategories are set up to correspond better to syntactic ones. This is the case of the *ʿiḏāfah* construction that can express different meanings. The case of the expression *ʿiṣrū Zaydin* exemplifies the idea that different meanings can justify different syntactic behaviours. If annexation means possession, it is licit to say *ʿiṣrū Zaydin*, whereas if it expresses the counted object it is not licit to annex *ʿiṣrūna*. Typically, this discussion is found in both the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʿUṣūl*, but not in the *Kitāb* (see p. 131).

### 11.3.7 No question about the semantic unity of numerals

We have mentioned at the beginning of this study that numerals show a strong and self-evident semantic unity (see p. 135). It is the only plausible reason why Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj treat them together in their grammar. This is particularly true of the link between numerals and counted objects, not of their morphology and position in the sentence, which are dealt with along with other similar issues. They endeavour to find some consistency, each one of them in his own way. It is striking that all three grammarians consider the annexational and the specifying constructions together. In other words, for them there is a clear link between *ṭalāṭatu ʿawlādīn* and *ʿiṣrūna waladan* and they have to account for it in a way or another. The nature of this link can only be semantic. More precisely, it corresponds to what Versteegh names “conceptual correlate” of the words expressing numerals [m. 9] (see above, p. 27, the sixteen types of meanings).

There are two other nouns that are also treated together with numerals, *kam* and *biḏʿah* (see pp. 147 and 149). Not only do they have a numerical meaning, but they also share a strong syntactic resemblance with numerals. In the case of *biḏʿah* there is no special difficulty, since it behaves exactly like numerals between “three” and “ten”. However, in the case of the interrogative *kam*, there are differences and it is too simple to say, as Sibawayh does, that “*kam* operates on anything that *ʿiṣrūna* operates on, and if it is not suitable for *ʿiṣrūna*, it is not suitable for *kam* either” (*kam taʿmalu fī kulli šayʿin ḥasuna li-l-ʿiṣrīna ʿan taʿmala fī-hi fa-ʿiḏā qabuḥa li-l-ʿiṣrīna ʿan taʿmalu fī šayʿin qabuḥa ḏālīka fī kam*; K. I, 251.1–2). In the end, we are left with these inconsistencies in the comparison, which we can only resolve by guessing that there is a

difference in strength between *kam* and numerals that justifies, for Sibawayh, the difference in behaviour.

This difference between the interrogative *kam* and *‘iṣrūna* is also pointed out by al-Mubarrad and solved by the theory that the additional freedom of behaviour granted to *kam* is a compensation for its not being *mutamakkin*. This is why, instead of being fully declinable, *kam*, which is a substantive, has the strength to operate on its *tamyīz* even if it is separated from it (see p. 147).

In the *‘Uṣūl*, *kam* is also considered to have a strong link with numerals. What is more, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that *kam* is a numeral (see p. 255). However, the differences mentioned above between *kam* and *‘iṣrūna* simply disappear as issues by the mere fact that the *tamyīz* of *kam* is a different subcategory of *tamyīz*. For Ibn as-Sarrāj there are three subcategories of nominal *tamyīz*: after measures, numerals and *kam*.

The case of *kam* is interesting since it shows both semantic and syntactic similitudes with numerals, which together justify their combined treatment. It is, however, difficult to decide whether the semantic similitudes justify the syntactic ones, or if it is the other way round in the eyes of our grammarians. Lastly, we cannot rule out that al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj inherited the comparison between *kam* and numerals from Sibawayh and integrate it into their system with some adaptation.

### 11.3.8 A more precise view on semantics

#### Intentional semantics [m. 1]

We have seen in the literature review that some scholars believe that a distinctive feature of Sibawayh's *Kitāb* is its focus on the intention of the speaker (see p. 35). According to this “enunciative theory”, Sibawayh is said to focus on the unconscious decisions that the native speaker has to perform in order to express his intended meaning. Later grammarians, beginning right after Sibawayh, are viewed as having a much more formal approach (see p. 62), until the confrontation with Greek logic forced grammarians to consider seriously the role of meaning in the linguistic process.

This picture is not supported by our limited data. In the passages related to numerals, there are three cases altogether in our three treatises where grammarians do take into account the intention of the speaker. Two are found in the *Muqtaḍab*, one in the *‘Uṣūl* and none in the *Kitāb*. We do not pretend

at all that this is representative of the situation on a wider scale, but it surely encourages us to refine our views.

In the *Muqtaḍab*, al-Mubarrad comments on a line of poetry in which it is licit to put the complement of *kam* in all three independent, dependent and oblique form, depending on the intended meaning (see p. 147). In the same manner, he says that it is possible for the verbal *tamyīz* to surface in the singular or in the plural, according to the meaning the speaker wants to express (see p. 247).

In the same manner, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that triptotic numerals may become diptotic if the speaker intends their absolute meaning (see p. 123).

### Communicative semantics [m. 3.5.6]

The “enunciative theory” quickly evolved into a communicational appreciation of Sibawayh’s grammar, i.e., a grammar that focuses on the efficiency of the communicative act (see p. 37). According to Versteegh’s classification of meanings (see p. 27), communicative semantics gathers five different types of meaning, all linked with the message. We could find only three of these five meanings in the passages related to numerals in our texts: the paraphrase of the message [m. 3], the mood of the sentence [m. 5] and the communicative purpose of speech [m. 6].

**The paraphrase of the message [m. 3]** Explanatory paraphrase [m. 3] should not be confused with the underlying structure of the sentence [m. 13], which is much more frequent in our grammar treatises. In the passages related to numerals we can mention the following occurrences of explanatory paraphrase. All of Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad, and Ibn as-Sarrāj say that the “deflected” forms of numerals *ʾuḥād*, *ṭunāʾ*, and so on, mean *wāḥidan wāḥidan* “one by one”, *itnayni ṭnayni* “two by two” (see p. 141). The expressions used by the three grammarians to describe this semantic equivalence are: *ḥadd* “definition” (K. II, 15.2); *taʾwīl* “reformulation” (M. III, 381.7); and *maʿnā* “meaning” (ʿU. II, 88.12).

In the same manner, all three authors paraphrase the meaning of the names of the day of the week between *al-ʾAḥad* and *al-Xamīs*, which correspond to the ordinals *al-ʾawwal* “the first”, *at-tānī* “the second”, and so on. The actual names are the days’ proper names (see p. 150). Here, the expressions they use are: *yurīdu* “he wants” (K. I, 228.23); *maʿnā* “meaning” (M. II, 92.18); and *yaʿnī* “it means” (ʿU. I, 158.1).

Al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj also paraphrase expressions of the type *tānī ṭnayni* and *ṭālīṭu ṭalāṭatin* as *ʾaḥadu ṭnayni* and *ʾaḥadu ṭalāṭatin* “one of two” and “one of three” (see p. 132), instead of “the second of two” and “the third of three”. In this case, the meaning they mention (*maʿnā*, in both *M. II*, 181.4 and *ʾU. II*, 426.5) is an explanatory paraphrase [m. 3]. Sibawayh does not paraphrase these expressions.

The case of expressions of the type *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* is less clear. All grammarians relate them to expressions like *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata* (see p. 132). However, al-Mubarrad is the only author to say that these numerical verbs actually exist, and that the “meaning” (*maʿnā*; *M. II*, 181.6) of this expression is *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata*. It is thus a semantic paraphrase [m. 3], because the verb *xamasa* actually exists. Ibn as-Sarrāj explicitly says that these verbs do not really exist. He adds that when you say *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin* you “mean” (*turīd* “you want”; *ʾU. II*, 426.8) *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata*. However, since the verb *xamasa* does not actually exist, the expression *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata* is a reconstructed underlying structure [m. 13], not a paraphrase [m. 3]. Sibawayh is silent on the actual existence of these verbs. In all three cases they do not address the question of the meaning of ordinals *per se* [m. 9], i.e., the rank they refer to. As for the morphological meaning of their pattern [m. 14], only al-Mubarrad seems interested in the discussion on whether or not they have a verbal meaning that would derive from their *fāʿil* pattern (see p. 133). He only deals explicitly with compound ordinals, but it is clear that for him non-compound ordinals do have a verbal strength (*tujrī-hi majrā ḍārib* “you treat it like [the active participle] *ḍārib*; *M. IV*, 183.4) in expressions of the type *xāmisu ʾarbaʿatin*.

The semantic tests are clearer cases of paraphrase [m. 3]. Numerals are found in semantic tests in the *Muqtaḍab* and the *ʾUṣūl*, but not in the *Kitāb* (see p. 83). For example, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that if someone says *allaḍi la-hu ʾindī miʾatu dirhamin ʾillā dirhamayn* “what I owe him is a hundred dirham less two”, what he means (*ʾaqarra bi-* “he confirms, he asserts”; *ʾU. I*, 304.7–8) is “98 dirhams”. In the same manner, Ibn as-Sarrāj says that *la-ka ʾalayya ʾaṣaratun ʾillā xamsatan mā xalā dirhaman* “I owe you ten [i.e., dirhams] less five but one dirham” means “six dirhams” (*fa-llaḍi la-hu sittatun* “so what he has is six”; *ʾU. I*, 304.20).

**The mood of the sentence [m. 5]** The only discussion about the mood of the sentence in the chapters devoted to numerals is found in the passages dedicated to *kam*, which behaves differently, depending on its “meaning” [m. 5] (*mawḍiʿ*; *K. I*, 250.12; *M. III*, 55.3; *ʾU. I*, 315.2), interrogative or predicative. All three grammarians deal with this issue in detail (see p. 147).

**The communicative purpose of the message [m. 6]** Another dimension of communicative semantics is the communicative purpose (*fā'idah*) of the utterance [m. 6]. In the chapters devoted to numerals in our grammars, it is only mentioned by Ibn as-Sarrāj, in three different places. The first case is the expression *\*at-tānī-himā 'anā tnāni* (see p. 177) which is redundant unless it is uttered by a woman (*kāna radī'an li-'anna-hu 'ulima* "it is bad because it is already known"; 'U. II, 334.19). The second case is the use of compound numerals in sentences of the form *alladīna hādā tāliṭu-hum talāṭatun* (see p. 82). The only possibility would be to say *\*alladīna hādā ḥādī-him 'aḥada-ʿašara* but this is not correct because the expected semantic outcome is impaired. The compulsory elision of *-ʿašara* leads to "confusion" (*yulabbasu bi-;*<sup>4</sup> 'U. II, 331.11). The last case is the use of indefinite nouns in the position of *mubtada'* (see p. 160). It is by way of exception possible to say *mā 'aḥadun fī d-dāri, mā kāna 'aḥadun miṭla-ka* or *laysa 'aḥadun xayran min-ka* because these sentences convey a "useful meaning" (*fā'idah*; 'U. I, 59.10; 66.18; 84.2).

It is thus not possible to say that post-Sibawayh grammar has lost its communicative dimension. Our limited data could even give the opposite impression, namely that a communicative dimension appears in post-Sibawayh grammar.

### Extra-linguistic semantics [m. 7] and cognitive semantics [m. 9]

It is a common view among historians of Arabic grammar that grammarians excluded extra-linguistic semantics from their inquiry and reserved it to others branches of scholarship such as lexicography and rhetorics (see p. 62). We can only confirm this statement. For example, nowhere do we find any reference to the meaning [m. 7] of the diminutive form of numerals (see p. 139). Rather, grammarians deal with the morphological meaning [m. 14] of specific patterns, which is the case with diminutives. But what "a little three" and "a little eight" refer to is far from clear; it could be the case that grammarians only regard them as proper names.

The case of *mubham* "unspecified" substantives is also doubtful. We have seen above that our grammarians do not provide us with a theory of *mubham* substantives (see p. 145). These substantives are semantically deficient, since they do not refer to anything in particular. This is the reason why they need a specifier. We have also seen that it is not clear in our three grammar treatises whether all numerals are *mubhamah* (which seems to be Ibn as-Sarrāj's position, see p. 278), or only non-annexable ones

<sup>4</sup>Sic. The Form VIII, *yaltabisu*, would be more common in this sense.



(probably Sibawayh's position, see p. 145) or all greater numerals (probably al-Mubarrad's position, see p. 235).

Yet, the question remains: What dimension of meaning do they lack? Since grammarians explicitly say that they apply to everything, and not to something in particular, they probably intend the extra-linguistic meaning [m. 7]. (To be sure, not all words that do not have an extra-linguistic referent are said to be *mubhamah*.) On the other hand, as we have mentioned above, the conceptual correlate [m. 9] of numerals is extremely clear and distinctive: they represent discrete quantities that apply to counted objects.

Ibn as-Sarrāj is the only author to mention cases where numerals are used for their own meaning (*'idā 'aradta l-ma'rifata wa-l-'adada fa-qat* "if you want the definite and the numeral alone"; 'U. II, 98.17), which we called their "absolute meaning" (pp. 123 and 143). According to Ibn as-Sarrāj, it is possible to consider numerals by themselves, as in *talātatu 'akṭaru min iṭnayni wa-'aqallu min 'arba'ata* ("three is more than two and less than four"; 'U. II, 98.19–20).

In this case, it seems obvious that numerals are not *mubhamah* any more, i.e., they do not need a specifier any more. This means that they refer to the quantity in itself [m. 9], in a way that is not deficient semantically. However, as we have said above, the category of "unspecified" (*mubham*) substantives is not systematically explored by our grammarians.

As far as the conceptual correlate [m. 9] is concerned, a few other issues are worth mentioning. For example, none of the authors mentions the fact that decades have both a cardinal and an ordinal meaning [m. 9] (see p. 145). Only al-Mubarrad discusses the morphological impossibility to build a *fā'il* form, which conveys the ordinal meaning [m. 9], from roots that are used both for units and decades, otherwise it would be "confusing" (*yaltabisu*; M. II, 184.1).

In a few cases it is not easy to decide whether grammarians deal with the conceptual correlate [m. 9] of numerals or with the meaning of their morphological form [m. 14], for example, in their discussion of the plural form of decades (see p. 136). When Sibawayh says that the final *nūn* in the decades is not a plural marker, otherwise *talātūna* would "mean nine" (*ta'nī tis'ata*; K. II, 119.10), i.e., the plural of "three", this involves both the morphological meaning [m. 14] of this *nūn* (its *mawḍi'*) and its implication in terms of conceptual correlate [m. 9]. In the *Muqtaḍab* and in the 'Uṣūl it seems that only the morphological meaning is intended [m. 14]. The discussion is primarily triggered by the diminutive form of *talātūna*, and the question is whether *nūn* is a plural marker or not.

The same comment can be said about Sibawayh's remark that there is no need to say "two twenties" because the word *'arba'ūna* "forty" exists instead (K. II, 93.19; see above, p. 144). He clearly refers to the conceptual correlate [m. 9] of "twenty", "forty" and the dual, but also to the morphological meaning [m. 14] of the dual.

Al-Mubarrad is the only author to mention a discussion about the dual meaning of *'iṣrūna* (see p. 137). This origin is still visible in the *kasrah*, "because it [*'iṣrūna*] is the dual of 'ten' and not a plural" (*li-'anna-hā taṭniyatu 'aṣaratin wa-laysat bi-jam'in*; M. II, 165.16). However, he rejects this interpretation and says that *'iṣrūna* has a pattern of its own. In this case he probably regards the dual meaning of *'iṣrūna* as a conceptual correlate [m. 9], not as a morphological meaning [m. 14].

In other words, it seems that the only motive for grammarians to tackle an issue related to extra-linguistic semantics [m. 7] is to mention a deficiency (*mubham* substantives). As for the conceptual correlate of words [m. 9], i.e., the concepts that numerals refer to, it is usually taken for granted in our texts.

### Formal semantics [m. 12–14]

Formal semantics is by far the most frequent type of meaning dealt with in our three treatises, at least in the chapters devoted to numerals. This includes, among other meanings, the semantic content of the root [m. 12], the underlying structure of the sentence [m. 13], the morphosyntactic meaning of a pattern or of a sentence, its *mawḍi'* [m. 14]. These dimensions of semantics are labelled as "formal" because they are linked with the linguistic sign (see above, pp. 27f.)

**The root's semantic content [m. 12]** The semantic content of numerical roots [m. 12] is implicitly dealt with in the regular morphological derivations such as the formation of the pattern *fā'il* (see p. 104), and the "deflected" forms *'uḥād*, *tunā'*, *tulāt*, and so on (see p. 116). In the case of the corresponding verbal forms (see p. 105) and the names of the days of the week (see p. 150), it is understood that what is at stake is the semantic content of the root itself, but the grammarians do not comment on it.

The case of the root *tn* is interesting since the semantic content of the root [m. 12] seems to be very weak. In a discussion on the morphology of *'iṣrūna* al-Mubarrad says that it should have been built like other decades (see p. 137). What he means here is that if it were parallel to *talātūna* and *'arba'ūna* it would be *\*iṭnūna*. Al-Mubarrad does not quote this form, he

simply says that the meaning of the word would disappear after the elision of the dual suffix (*la-baṭala ma'nā-hu* “its meaning [of *itnāni*] would have disappeared”; *M. II*, 166.14). This means that for al-Mubarrad once the dual suffix has been removed from *itn-āni*, the semantic content [m. 12] of the root *tn* is neutralised.

The issue behind this discussion is that al-Mubarrad notices that the root 'šr is treated irregularly with respect to its semantic content, which is “ten” [m. 12]. The form *'išruna* means the “dual of ten” [m. 9] but it surfaces in what could be morphologically interpreted as a “ten tens” [m. 14], just like *ṭalāṭūna* is morphologically “three tens” [m. 14], but it means “thirty” [m. 9] without discrepancy. Al-Mubarrad tackles this issue by discussing why the form *\*itnūna* is impossible because it would not mean [m. 9] anything.

Lastly, what is at stake in proper names tests is that the semantic content of the root [m. 12] is neutralised, the word acquiring a clear extra-linguistic referent, the person who is referred to [m. 7]. The grammarian checks whether anything remains of its morphological meaning [m. 14], such as the suffixes (see p. 80).

**The sentence's underlying structure [m. 13]** We have seen above, p. 293, an application of the sentences's underlying structure as a semantic explanation in the grammarians' commentary of expressions of the type *xāmisu 'arba'atin*. For al-Mubarrad, it “means” [m. 3; reformulation] *allaḍi xamasa l-'arba'ata*, while for Sībawayh, it “means” [m. 13; underlying structure] *allaḍi xamasa l-'arba'ata*. The difference between both interpretations depends on whether the verb *xamasa* actually exists.

Al-Mubarrad also comments on the expression *kam ṭalāṭatan sittatun 'illā ṭalāṭatāni?* “how many threes is six, if not two?” saying that at an “underlying level” (*taqdīr*) is the expression *'ayyu šay'in min al-'adadi sittatun 'illā ṭalāṭatāni?* “what numeral is six if not two threes?” (*M. III*, 64.3–5).

Another application of the underlying structure is found in the commentary on the meaning of compound cardinals and ordinals (see p. 138). For Sībawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj, the base form (*'ašl*, [m. 13]) of compound cardinals is a *'atf* construction, e.g., the *'ašl* of *xamsata-'ašara* is *xamsatun wa-'ašaratun* (*K. II*, 47.8 and *U. II*, 140.5). Al-Mubarrad does not mention this discussion. Sībawayh alone adds that the base form (*'ašl*, [m. 13]; *K. II*, 47.9) of compound ordinals is an annexational construction (see p. 139).

All three authors assert that the expression *'išrūna dirhaman* “means” ([m. 13]; *'arādū* “they want”, in *K. I*, 85.5; *ma'ná* “meaning”, in *M. III*, 66.9; *'aradta*

“you want”, in *ʿU. I*, 315.12) *ʿišrūna min ad-darāhimi* (see p. 198, for Sībawayh’s opinion; p. 232, for al-Mubarrad’s opinion; and p. 255, for Ibn as-Sarrāj’s opinion). This reveals its underlying structure. However, just like they take for granted the semantic [m. 9] unity of numerals, they also take for granted the semantic [m. 9] unity of the expression of the counted object. What they explore (each in his own way) is the underlying structural unity [m. 13] of this expression.

Lastly, all three authors spend a lot of time discussing the meaning [m. 14] of the *maṣḍar*, which numerals can take in expressions of the type *marartu bi-hi waḥda-hu* and *marartu bi-him ṭalāṭata-hum*. The grammarians relate this to the expressions *ʾafradtu-hu ʾifrādan* and *ʾawḥadtu-hu ʾihādan* (see p. 141). What is at stake here is twofold. While implicitly interpreting the numerals’ position [m. 14] as that of a *maṣḍar*, Sībawayh and Ibn as-Sarrāj reveal the underlying structure of the sentence [m. 13] (*tamṭīl* “representation”, in *K. I*, 157.11; *ka-ʾanna-ka qulta* “as if you said”, in *ʿU. II*, 22.14–15).

The position of al-Mubarrad is different. As was the case with the *fāʿil* forms, it seems that he takes for granted the existence of the underlying verbal *maṣādir* (*ʾihādan*, *taxmīsan*, and so on), because he mentions them explicitly. Since for al-Mubarrad the corresponding Form II and IV *maṣādir* really exist in the language, it implies that *ʾawḥadtu-hu ʾihādan* and *marartu bi-him taxmīsan* are not underlying structures [m. 13] but “reformulations” [m. 3] (*taʾwīl*, in *M. III*, 239.6). It is exactly the same case as for the expression *allaḍi xamasa l-ʾarbaʿata*, which is, for al-Mubarrad, a reformulation [m. 3], not an underlying structure [m. 13].

**The morphosyntactic meanings [m. 14]** This last dimension of meaning is by far the one represented most frequently in our texts. We have already come across a few cases where it mingles with other dimensions of meaning: the meaning of the *fāʿil* pattern in ordinals and its verbal strength; the meaning of the final *nūn* in decades; the proper names where morphosyntactic meanings are tested; the diminutive pattern; the “deflected pattern”; the *maṣḍar* meaning of numerals in certain expressions, and so on. In almost all these cases, only the morphosyntactic dimension of these forms is treated [m. 14], sometimes with a paraphrase [m. 3], as for the “deflected” pattern, or with an emphasis on underlying structures [m. 13], as for the *maṣḍar* slot. Yet, their conceptual correlate is always taken for granted [m. 9].

There are other cases that are simpler to deal with. For example, both al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj say that, depending on the meaning [m. 14] of annexation, it is either possible to annex decades or not (see p. 131, for the

annexation of decades; p. 234, for al-Mubarrad's position; and p. 252, for Ibn as-Sarrāj's opinion).

We have mentioned above (p. 272) that al-Mubarrad mentions more issues linked with numerals than other grammarians. Some of these issues deal with morphosyntactic meanings [m. 14]. For example, al-Mubarrad is the only author to discuss whether a *fā'il* form having an active participle meaning [m. 14] can be built on compound ordinals (see p. 133). He also discusses the absence of a link between the morphological meaning [m. 14] of *mi'ah* "one hundred" and its lexical meaning "ten tens" [m. 9] (see p. 138). He is also the only author to say that the intention of *tanwīn* [m. 14] in *-ʿašara* can be deleted from compound numerals in order to enable their annexation (see p. 226). Lastly, he clearly says that decades have no verbal meaning "at an underlying level" (*taqdīr*) [m. 14] and that the dependent form of their *tamyīz* is justified at the surface level only (see p. 229).

Formal semantics, i.e., linked with the linguistic sign, are dealt with in our texts in two main components, the underlying structure of the sentence [m. 13] and the morphosyntactic meanings of words and sentences [m. 14]. As was the case with the extra-linguistic referent [m. 7] and the conceptual correlates [m. 9], the semantic content of roots [m. 12] is taken for granted and only rarely mentioned explicitly.

The only clear difference between our three authors, as far as formal semantics are concerned, is that the *Muqtaḍab* contains more issues where formal semantics is involved. However, this observation is of little significance because the *Muqtaḍab* contains more issues linked with numerals in the first place. It is thus not a surprise that this dimension of semantics is more visible in the *Muqtaḍab*.



## Chapter 12

# Summary

In this study, I have compared three Arabic grammatical treatises from the first four centuries AH, Sibawayh's (d. 180/796) *Kitāb*, al-Mubarrad's (d. 285/898) *Muqtaḍab* and Ibn as-Sarrāj's (d. 316/928) *ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw*, in order to contribute to the study of the evolution of the place of semantics in their grammatical methods.

Based on a classification of the different meanings of the word *maʿnā* ("meaning") in the Arabic grammatical tradition (Versteegh 1997b), I have isolated five main dimensions of semantics: intentional, communicative, extra-linguistic, cognitive, and formal. The purpose of this distinction was to show that it is too simplistic to consider that a semantic concern is or is not found in these grammatical treatises: semantics has many dimensions, which may or may not surface, together or separately.

In order to reach this aim, I have focused on the grammar of numerals, because they present an obvious semantic unity and a great syntactic diversity. This led me to believe that the way grammarians treat numerals gives a relevant insight into the way they link semantics and syntax. My research hypothesis was that the search for consistency in the grammar of numerals moved from a functional to a formal dimension of semantics. This corresponds to shift from a psychological understanding of the concepts of *lafẓ* vs. *maʿnā*, roughly equivalent to 'signifier/signified', to a linguistic understanding (Kouloughli 1985).

After a review of the literature focused on the place of semantics in the Arabic grammatical tradition (chapter 2), all the issues linked with numerals

in Arabic, in morphology, morphosyntax, and semantics are dealt with in chapters 3 to 7. Then, I have studied how each grammarian deals with numerals within his grammatical system (chapters 8 to 10). Lastly, I have compared the three treatises on three points (chapter 11): their formal level (extent, content, language described); the grammatical methodology each grammarian uses; and the recourse of each grammarian to the five main dimensions of semantics.

## Comparison at a formal level

These three treatises are comparable in terms of volume, content and focus. They represent three attempts to gather, organise, and explain the language of the Arabs. There are differences between them at the formal level, but this does not impair their resemblance. The *Kitāb* is by far the most extensive work of the three, but it does not contain as many issues as the two other treatises, as far as numerals are concerned. Paradoxically, it is in the *Muqtaḍab* that one finds the most extensive list of issues. This is paradoxical because it is the shortest of the three treatises (the *Kitāb* is 60% longer than the *Muqtaḍab* and 25% longer than the *ʿUṣūl* in terms of number of words).

A striking difference between them is their link with the linguistic corpora, especially the Qurʾān, poetry, and the canonised language of the Arabs. Al-Mubarrad quotes many more Qurʾānic verses than the two other grammarians, while Ibn as-Sarrāj quotes significantly more utterances from the language of the Arabs than Sībawayh and al-Mubarrad. This conclusion is based only on quotations containing numerals.

As far as the grammar of numerals is concerned, the three grammarians describe exactly the same phenomena. This means that the way in which numerals and quantities are expressed in Arabic seems to be stable through time, since no major variation is mentioned. The differences the grammarians mention are minor (the possibility to add an article to numerals, the possibility to annex them) and can easily be accounted for by the methodological frames they adopt rather than by actual linguistic variation.



## Comparison of grammatical methodologies

This picture contrasts with the differences between their methodology. Indeed, the methodological framework in which Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj interpret linguistic phenomena differs considerably.

Sibawayh's methodology has been studied extensively in the last forty years, and my study confirms the main findings of these scholarly works. The most striking feature of Sibawayh's grammar is that it aims at a profound and wide consistency between linguistic phenomena. In order to discover this consistency, and to limit the number of rules and categories, Sibawayh does not hesitate to assimilate phenomena that could intuitively be seen as separate. The frame in which he works is that of a potentially unlimited gradation of rights and powers that words have vis-à-vis other words. Sibawayh considers the most difficult case first (the fact that for some numerals the annexational construction is impossible and replaced by a specifying construction). He inserts numerals in a scale somewhere between *aṣ-ṣifāt al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fā'il* (adjectives with a verbal valency) and *ka-dā* (constructions with the particle *ka-*), and refines their relative position vis-à-vis other words by comparing them in different contexts. The result of this highly speculative method is simple and unified: all numerals behave the same, but at a deeply underlying level.

The methodology of al-Mubarrad is probably the least studied of the three. He presents more issues than the two other grammarians, in a way that clearly does not aim at a wide-scale consistency. The development between the *Muqtaḍab* and the *Kitāb* is certainly not one of rationalisation, nor of pedagogical organisation, but rather an attempt to continue Sibawayh's description of the language. However, unlike Sibawayh, whose aim was to uncover the underlying consistency of the language, al-Mubarrad's treatise shows a clear emphasis on exhaustivity. For him, applying distinctions is tantamount to offering an explanation. He divides numerals into basic and subsidiary ones, and refines these divisions in order to explain each series. The result of this much less speculative method is, at the same time, more complicated and shallower than that of Sibawayh: each series behaves differently, according to rules that apply only to a given set of numerals and that can be explained easily.

Ibn as-Sarrāj's method has received some attention although not as much as it would deserve. He presents grammatical issues in a systematic way, using syntactic, semantic and morphological tools to refine his classification. His system clearly aims to organise grammatical issues rather than finding a wide-scale consistency between them. His "exhaustive classification"

(*taqāsīm*) makes him blind to transversal issues that occupied Sibawayh in his *Kitāb*. This gives the impression that he contents himself with local consistencies. Thanks to a subcategory specific to numerals, *tamyīz al-ʿaḍād*, Ibn as-Sarrāj addresses the same question as Sibawayh and al-Mubarrad (the semantic equivalence of the annexational and specifying constructions and their complementary distribution for the expression of the counted object). What is probably new is that Ibn as-Sarrāj does not reject the use of semantic criteria to distinguish between these subcategories, if needed. The result of this systematic method is a strong consistency, which is however only local, i.e., it applies only to numerals, and this at a much lower speculative cost than Sibawayh.

The consequence of these different methods on the grammar of numerals is far-reaching, not in terms of the linguistic facts themselves, since all three grammarians describe the same linguistic facts, but in terms of justification and organisation. In the *Kitāb*, the syntactic and semantic link between numerals and their counted objects could be called a fossilised subcase of the *ṣifah mušabbahah bi-l-fāʿil*. For al-Mubarrad numerals behave differently according to the series they belong to. And Ibn as-Sarrāj's ready-to-wear category of numerical *tamyīz* enables him to find a strong consistency among numerals, which is, by definition, not valid for other words.

## Comparison of the place of semantics

The issue of semantics was at the core of the debate about the grammatical methods of Arabic grammarians. However, my inquiry did not bring clear-cut evidence that any radical shift happened between Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj, as far as the recourse to semantics is concerned. One might say that this is due to the limited volume of data dealt with, but this does not seem to be a major obstacle to understand the evolution of grammar, at least not in the first centuries. All three grammarians deal with semantic issues. They have in common that they take extra-linguistic [m. 7] and cognitive [m. 9] semantics for granted, they all rely on communicative semantics (reformulation [m. 3], mood of the sentence [m. 5] and communicative purpose [m. 6]). Lastly, they all rely in their analysis on formal semantics (underlying structures [m. 13] and morphosyntactic meanings [m. 14]).

It is not the case that Sibawayh focuses on the intention of the speaker [m. 1] more than al-Mubarrad and Ibn as-Sarrāj do, nor is his grammar more communicative [m. 2,3,5,6], or al-Mubarrad's and Ibn as-Sarrāj's grammar more formal [m. 12–14]. Rather, my conclusion is that their grammatical

methods are much more discriminating than their views about meaning. The three treatises deal with the same semantic dimensions, but they serve different methodological approaches. Qualifying a methodological approach thus means that one has to find out in which way a grammarian integrates the different semantic dimensions of language, in function of his view of consistency of the grammatical rules.

Tentatively, one might say that when al-Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab* or Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl* does not feature the same "lively" approach to grammar as Sibawayh's *Kitāb*, this is not primarily due to a lack of focus on intentional or communicative semantics, but to a radical reshaping of the issues dealt with, in a "discrete" way in the *Muqtaḍab* and in a systematic way in the *ʿUṣūl*, whereas in the *Kitāb* issues are presented in a more "narrative" way.

At the beginning of this study I formulated the hypothesis that the search for consistency in the chapter of numerals shifted from a functional to a formal dimension of grammar. This hypothesis could not be validated because my data do not support the idea that Sibawayh's search for consistency relies more on communicative semantics than that of later grammarians and because al-Mubarrad's differentiated approach cannot be called a search for consistency in the proper sense. My study does support, however, the view that Ibn as-Sarrāj's subdivision of syntactic categories was based on formal semantic criteria.



## **Part V**

# **Bibliographical references**



## Primary sources

- ʿAsrār                      ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-Barakāt Kamāl ad-Dīn) Ibn al-ʿAnbārī (d. 577/1181) (1886). *Kitāb ʿasrār al-ʿarabiyyah*. Ed. by Christian F. Seybold. Leiden.
- ʿAxbār an-naḥwiyyīn      al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (ʿAbū Saʿīd) as-Sīrāfī (d. 368/979) (1936). *Kitāb ʿaxbār an-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn*. Ed. by Fritz Krenkow. Bayrūt: al-Maṭbaʿah al-Kāṭūlikiyyah.
- al-Baḥr al-muḥiṭ        Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (ʿAṭīr ad-Dīn) al-Ġarnāṭī l-ʿAndalusī ʿAbū Ḥayyān (d. 745/1344) (2002). *Tafsīr al-baḥr al-muḥiṭ*. Ed. by ʿAbd ar-Razzāq al-Mahdī. 8 vols. Bayrūt: Dār ʾIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʿArabī.
- Buġyat al-wuʿāh        ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʿAbī Bakr (Jalāl ad-Dīn ʿAbū al-Faḍl) as-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) (1964–1965). *Buġyat al-wuʿāh fī ṭabaqāt al-luġawiyyīn wa-n-nuḥāh*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAbū l-Faḍl ʾIbrāhīm. 2 vols. al-Qāhirah: ʾĪsā l-Bābī l-Ḥalabī.
- ʾĪdāḥ (in English)      ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʾIshāq (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) al-Baġdādī az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) (1995). *Kitāb al-ʾīdāḥ fī ʿilal an-naḥw. The explanation of linguistic causes*. Trans. by Kees Versteegh. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 22–246.
- ʾĪdāḥ                      ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʾIshāq (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) al-Baġdādī az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) (1959). *al-ʾīdāḥ fī ʿilal an-naḥw*. Ed. by Māzin al-Mubārak. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-ʿUrūbah.
- ʾĪdāḥ al-Fārisī        al-Ḥasan b. ʾAḥmad (ʿAbū ʿAlī) al-Fārisī (d. 377/987) (2008). *Kitāb al-ʾīdāḥ*. Ed. by Kāḍim Baḥr al-Murjān. Bayrūt: Dār ʿĀlam al-Kutub.
- ʾInṣāf                      ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-Barakāt Kamāl ad-Dīn) Ibn al-ʿAnbārī (d. 577/1181) (1913). *Kitāb al-ʾinṣāf fī masāʾil al-xilāf bayn an-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa-l-Kūfiyyīn. Die grammatischen Streitfragen der Basrer und Kufer*. Ed. by Gotthold Weil. Leiden: Brill. 1–355 in Arabic.
- Intiṣār                      ʾAḥmad b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) at-Tamīmī l-Miṣrī Ibn Wallād (d. 332/944) (1997). *Kitāb al-intiṣār ʾaw Kitāb an-naqd ʿalā l-Mubarrad fī raddi-hi ʿalā Sībawayh. Changing traditions*. Ed. by Monique Bernards. Leiden, New York & Köln: Brill. 1–192 in Arabic.

- ʿIṣlāḥ al-mantiq* Yaʿqūb b. ʿIshāq (ʿAbū Yūsuf) Ibn as-Sikkīt (d. 244/858) (1956). *ʿIṣlāḥ al-mantiq*. Ed. by ʿAḥmad Šākir and ʿAbd as-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Maʿārif bi-Miṣr.
- K. I ʿAmr b. ʿUṭmān (ʿAbū Biṣr) Sibawayh (d. 180/796) (1881/1970). *Le livre de Sibawaihi*. Ed. by Hartwig Derenbourg. Vol. 1. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. Reprint, Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms. (1970).
- K. II ʿAmr b. ʿUṭmān (ʿAbū Biṣr) Sibawayh (d. 180/796) (1889/1970). *Le livre de Sibawaihi*. Ed. by Hartwig Derenbourg. Vol. 2. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. Reprint, Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms. (1970).
- Lisān* Muḥammad b. Mukarram (ʿAbū l-Faḍl) al-Xazrajī Ibn Maḍḍūr (d. 711/1311) (1955–1956). *Lisān al-ʿArab*. 15 vols. Bayrūt: Dār Šādīr & Dār Bayrūt.
- M. I Muḥammad b. Yazīd (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-ʿAz-dī al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) (1979b). *Kitāb al-muq-taḍab*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Xāliq ʿUḍaymah. Vol. 1. al-Qāhirah: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf: Lajnat ʿIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʿIslāmī.
- M. II Muḥammad b. Yazīd (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-ʿAz-dī al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) (1966a). *Kitāb al-muq-taḍab*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Xāliq ʿUḍaymah. Vol. 2. al-Qāhirah: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf: Lajnat ʿIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʿIslāmī.
- M. III Muḥammad b. Yazīd (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-ʿAz-dī al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) (1966b). *Kitāb al-muq-taḍab*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Xāliq ʿUḍaymah. Vol. 3. al-Qāhirah: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf: Lajnat ʿIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʿIslāmī.
- M. IV Muḥammad b. Yazīd (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-ʿAz-dī al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) (1979a). *Kitāb al-muq-taḍab*. Ed. by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Xāliq ʿUḍaymah. Vol. 4. al-Qāhirah: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf: Lajnat ʿIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʿIslāmī.
- Majālis* ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʿIshāq (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) al-Baġdādī az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949) (1984). *Majālis al-ʿulāmāʾ*. Ed. by ʿAbd as-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Anastatic reprint. al-Kuwayt: Wizārat al-ʿIlām.



- Miftāḥ al-‘ulūm* Yūsuf b. ‘Abī Bakr (‘Abū Ya‘qūb Sirāj ad-Dīn) al-Xawārizmī as-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) (1899). *Kitāb miftāḥ al-‘ulūm*. Bayrūt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-‘Adabiyyah.
- Mufaṣṣal* Maḥmūd b. ‘Umar (‘Abū l-Qāsim) az-Zamaxšarī (d. 538/1144) (1879). *Kitāb al-mufaṣṣal fī n-naḥw. al-Mufaṣṣal, opus de re grammatica arabicum*. Ed. by Jens Peter Broch. 2nd edition. Christiana: Mallingii. 1–197 in Arabic.
- Mu‘jam al-‘udabā’* Yāqūt b. ‘Abd al-Lāh (‘Abū ‘Abd al-Lāh Šihāb ad-Dīn) Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 626/1229) (1940). *Mu‘jam al-‘udabā’*. Ed. by ‘Aḥmad Farīd ar-Rifā‘ī. 2nd edition. 20 vols. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Ma‘mūn.
- Muqtaṣad* ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān (‘Abū Bakr) al-Jur-jānī (d. 471/1078) (1982). *Kitāb al-muqtaṣad fī šarḥ al-‘Idāḥ*. Ed. by Kāḍim Baḥr al-Murjān. 2 vols. Baḡdād: Manšūrāt Wizārat aṭ-Ṭaqaḥ wa-l-‘Tlām.
- Muṣannaf VIII* ‘Abd al-Lāh b. Muḥammad (‘Abū Bakr) Ibn ‘Abī Šaybah (d. 235/849) (1989). *Muṣannaf Ibn ‘Abī Šaybah fī l-‘aḥādīṭ wa-l-‘āṭār*. Ed. by Sa‘īd Muḥammad al-Laḥām. Vol. 8. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr.
- Nūr al-qabas* Muḥammad b. ‘Imrān (‘Abū ‘Abd al-Lāh or ‘Ubayd al-Lāh) al-Marzubānī (d. 384/994) (1964). *Kitāb nūr al-qabas al-muxtaṣar min al-Muqtabas fī ‘axbār an-nuḥāḥ wa-l-‘udabā’ wa-š-šu‘arā’ wa-l-‘ulamā’*. Ed. by Rudolf Sellheim. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Q. Radd* (1999). *al-Qur‘ān al-karīm*. Dimašq: Dār al-Ma‘rifah. Muḥammad b. Yazīd (‘Abū l-‘Abbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-‘Azdi al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898) (1997). *Radd ‘alā kitāb Sibawayh. Changing traditions*. Ed. by Monique Bernards. Leiden, New York & Köln: Brill. 1–192 in Arabic.
- Šarḥ IV* al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Lāh (‘Abū Sa‘īd) as-Sirāfī (d. 368/979) (1998). *Šarḥ kitāb Sibawayh, al-juz’ ar-rābi’*. Ed. by Muḥammad Ḥāšim ‘Abd ad-Dāyim. Vol. 4. al-Qā-hirah: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā‘iq al-Qawmiyyah.
- Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah* Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (Raḍī ad-Dīn) al-‘Astarābāḍī (d. 686/1287) (1858). *Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah*. 2 vols. [Istan-bul]: Maṭba‘at aš-Širkah aš-Šaḥafiyyah al-‘Uṡmāniyyah.
- Šarḥ al-Kāfiyah (2000)* Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (Raḍī ad-Dīn) al-‘Astarābāḍī (d. 686/1287) (2000). *Šarḥ ar-Raḍī ‘alā Kāfiyat Ibn al-*

- Ṣarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal* *Hājib*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-‘Āl Sālīm Makram. 7 vols. al-Qāhirah: ‘Ālam al-Kutub.
- Ṣarḥ ar-Rummānī* Ya‘īš b. ‘Alī (‘Abū l-Baqā’ Muwaffaq ad-Dīn) al-‘Asadī Ibn Ya‘īš (d. 643/1245) (1900?). *Ṣarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*. 10 vols. al-Qāhirah: Idārat at-Ṭibā‘ah al-Muniriyyah.
- Ṭabaqāt an-naḥwiyyīn* ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā (‘Abū l-Ḥasan) ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994) (1979). *Ṣarḥ kitāb Sibawayh. Sieben Kapitel des Ṣarḥ Kitāb Sibawayhi von ar-Rummānī*. Ed. by Edith Ambros. Wien: Verlag des Verbandes der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs. 37–91.
- Tanbihāt* Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (‘Abū Bakr) al-Isbīlī az-Zubaydī (d. 379/989) (1954). *Ṭabaqāt an-naḥwiyyīn wa-l-luġawiyyīn*. Ed. by Muḥammad ‘Abū l-Faḍl ‘Ibrāhīm. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-Xānji.
- Tārīx Baġdād* ‘Alī b. Ḥamzah (‘Abū l-Qāsim) at-Tamīmī al-Baṣrī (d. 375/985) (1967). *Kitāb at-tanbihāt ‘alā ‘aġaliṭ ar-ruwāh fī kutub al-luġah al-muṣannafāt. al-Manqūṣ wa-l-mamdūd li-l-Farrā’ wa-t-Tanbihāt li-‘Alī b. Ḥamzah*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Maymanī ar-Rājakūti. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Ma‘ārif. 78–354.
- ‘U. I* ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī (‘Abū Bakr) al-Xaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071) (1931). *Tārīx Baġdād ‘aw Madīnat as-Salām*. 16 vols. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-Xānji; Baġdād: al-Maktabah al-‘Arabiyyah.
- ‘U. II* Muḥammad b. as-Sarī (‘Abū Bakr) al-Baġdādī Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928) (1996a). *al-‘Uṣūl fī n-naḥw*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatli. Third edition. Vol. 1. Bayrūt: Mu‘assasat ar-Risālah.
- ‘U. III* Muḥammad b. as-Sarī (‘Abū Bakr) al-Baġdādī Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928) (1996b). *al-‘Uṣūl fī n-naḥw*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatli. Third edition. Vol. 2. Bayrūt: Mu‘assasat ar-Risālah.
- Xaṣā’iṣ* Muḥammad b. as-Sarī (‘Abū Bakr) al-Baġdādī Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928) (1996c). *al-‘Uṣūl fī n-naḥw*. Ed. by ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Fatli. Third edition. Vol. 3. Bayrūt: Mu‘assasat ar-Risālah.
- Xaṣā’iṣ* ‘Uṭmān b. Jinnī (‘Abū l-Faṭḥ) al-Mawṣūlī Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002) (1952–1956). *al-Xaṣā’iṣ*. Ed. by Muḥammad ‘Alī an-Najjār. 3 vols. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Kitāb al-Miṣriyyah.

## Secondary sources

- ʿAbū Janāḥ, Ṣāḥib (1980). al-Qiyās fī manhaj al-Mubarrad. *al-Mawrid* 9/3. 51–62.
- Anghelescu, Nadia (1975). Sur le sens de la flexion désinentielle dans la grammaire arabe traditionnelle. *Folia orientalia* 16. 7–12.
- (1985). La relation normatif-théorique dans les diverses périodes de la grammaire arabe classique. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15. 1–10.
- al-ʿAnṣārī, ʿAḥmad Makki (1972). *Sibawayh wa-l-qirāʾat: Dirāsah taḥlīliyyah miʿyāriyyah*. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Maʿārif.
- Aoun, Youssef (1978). Structure interne du groupe nominal en arabe. *Analyses théorie : études arabes* 1. 1–40. 2. 1–25.
- ʿAyd, Muḥammad (1973). *ʿUṣūl an-naḥw al-ʿarabī*. al-Qāhirah: ʿĀlam al-Kutub.
- Ayoub, Georgine (1990). De ce qui “ne se dit pas” dans le Livre de Sibawayhi : la notion de *tamṭil*. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–15.
- (1991). La forme du sens : le cas du nom et le mode du verbe. *The Arabist: Budapest studies in Arabic* 3–4 (= *Proceedings of the colloquium on Arabic grammar, Budapest, 1-7 September 1991*. Ed. by Kinga Dévényi and Tamás Iványi). 37–87.
- (2009). Tanwīn. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 4: Q–Z. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 442–446.
- (2011). *Mustaqīm, muḥāl, ḥasan, qabīḥ*: Les critères de recevabilité dans le *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi. *In the shadow of Arabic: The centrality of language to Arabic culture. Studies presented to Ramzi Baalbaki on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Ed. by Bilal Orfali. Leiden: Brill. 119–175.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi (1979). Some aspects of harmony and hierarchy in Sibawayhi’s grammatical analysis. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 2. 7–22.
- (1981). Arab grammatical controversies and the extant sources of the second and third centuries A.H. *Studia arabica et islamica: Festschrift for ʾIḥsān ʿAbbās on his sixtieth birthday*. Ed. by Wadād al-Qaḍī. Beirut: American University of Beirut. 1–26.
- (1983). The relation between *naḥw* and *balāga*. A comparative study of the methods of Sibawayhi and Ġurġānī. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 11. 7–23.
- (1985). The treatment of *qirāʾat* by the second and third century grammarians. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (= *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar. Proceedings of the first symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, held at Nijmegen, 16–19th April 1984*. Ed. by Hartmut Bobzin and Kees Versteegh). 11–32.

- Baalbaki, Ramzi (1988/2004). A contribution to the study of technical terms in early Arabic grammar: The term *aṣl* in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*. *A miscellany of Middle Eastern articles in memoriam Thomas Muir Johnstone*. Ed. by A. K. Irvine, R. B. Serjeant, and G. Rex Smith. Harlow: Longman. 163–177. Reprint, *Grammarians and grammatical theory in the medieval Arabic tradition*. Aldershot: Ashgate. (2004). Chap. IV.
- (1990). 'Ṭ'rāb and binā' from linguistic reality to grammatical theory. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17–33.
  - (1991). A *balāḡī* approach to some grammatical *ṣawāhid*. *The Arabist: Budapest studies in Arabic* 3–4 (= *Proceedings of the colloquium on Arabic grammar, Budapest, 1–7 September 1991*). Ed. by Kinga Dévényi and Tamás Iványi. 89–100.
  - (1995). The book in the grammatical tradition: Development in content and method. *The book in the Islamic world*. Ed. by George N. Atiyeh. State University of New York. Chap. 7. 123–139.
  - (2001). *Bāb al-fā'* [fā' + subjunctive] in Arabic grammatical sources. *Arabica* 48. 186–209.
  - (2003). Coalescence as a grammatical tool in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*. *Arabic grammar and linguistics*. Ed. by Yasir Suleiman. London & New York: Routledge. Chap. 4. 86–106.
  - (2005). Theoretical coherency versus pedagogical attainability. The conscious bias of Arab grammarians. *Alltagsleben und materielle Kultur in der arabischen Sprache und Literatur. Festschrift für Heinz Grotzfeld zum 70. Geburtstag Mitwirkung*. Ed. by Thomas Bauer and Ulrike Stehli-Werbeck. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 39–68.
  - (2006). Analogy on a broader scale. The case of vocative and generic *lā* constructions. *Der Islam* 83. 233–257.
  - (2007a). Inside the speaker's mind: Speaker's awareness as arbitrator of usage in Arab grammatical theory. *Approaches to Arabic linguistics presented to Kees Versteegh on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Ed. by Everhard Ditters and Harald Motzki. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 3–23.
  - (2007b). Introduction. *The early Islamic grammatical tradition*. Ed. by Ramzi Baalbaki. Aldershot: Ashgate. xiii–l.
  - (2008). *The legacy of the Kitāb*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beck, Edmund (1946). Die Partikel 'īdan bei al-Farrā' und Sibawaih. *Orientalia* 15. 432–438.
- Belguedj, Mohammed S. (1973). La démarche des premiers grammairiens arabes dans le domaine de la syntaxe. *Arabica* 20. 168–185.

- Bernards, Monique (1997). *Changing traditions: al-Mubarrad's refutation of Sibawayh and the subsequent reception of the Kitāb*. Leiden, New York & Köln: Brill.
- Blau, Joshua (2002). *A handbook of early middle Arabic*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Bohas, Georges (1981). Quelques aspects de l'argumentation et de l'explication chez les grammairiens arabes. *Arabica* 28. 204–221.
- (1984). Contribution à l'étude de la méthode des grammairiens arabes en morphologie et en phonologie d'après les grammairiens arabes « tardifs ». *Étude des théories des grammairiens arabes*. Ed. by Georges Bohas and Jean-Patrick Guillaume. Vol. I. Morphologie et phonologie. Damas: Institut français de Damas. xi–333.
- (1991). À propos de l'édition du *Kitāb al-ʿuṣūl*: l'accès aux textes. *The Arabist: Budapest studies in Arabic* 3–4 (= *Proceedings of the colloquium on Arabic grammar, Budapest, 1–7 September 1991*. Ed. by Kinga Dévényi and Tamás Iványi). 107–113.
- (1993). Relecture du *Kitāb al-ʿuṣūl* (II). *Langues orientales et anciennes: philologie et linguistique* 4. 73–102. See Barakāt and Bohas 1991 for part I.
- Bohas, Georges and Jean-Patrick Guillaume (1984). *Étude des théories des grammairiens arabes*. Vol. I: Morphologie et phonologie. Damas: Institut français de Damas.
- Bohas, Georges, Jean-Patrick Guillaume, and Djamel Eddine Kouloughli (1989). L'analyse linguistique dans la tradition arabe. *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux. Vol. 1: La naissance des métalangages en Orient et en Occident. Liège & Bruxelles: Pierre Mardaga. 260–282.
- (1990/2006). *The Arabic linguistic tradition*. London & New York: Routledge. Reprint, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. (2006).
- Broch, Jens Peter, ed. (1879). *al-Mufaṣṣal, opus de re grammatica arabicum*. 2nd edition. Christiana: Mallinxi.
- Buburuzan, Rodica (1993). Exclamation et actes de langage chez Sibawayhi. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 38. 421–437.
- Carter, Michael G. (1968). A study of Sibawayhi's principles of grammatical analysis. PhD thesis. Oxford University.
- (1972a). Les origines de la grammaire arabe. *Revue des études islamiques* 40. 69–97.
- (1972b). 'Twenty dirhams' in the *Kitāb* of Sibawayhi. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35. 485–496.
- (1973a). An Arab grammarian of the eighth century A.D. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93. 146–157.
- (1973b). *Ṣarf* et *ḥilāf*, contribution à l'étude de la grammaire arabe. *Arabica* 20. 292–304.

- Carter, Michael G. (1981/83). The use of proper names as a testing device in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*. *The history of linguistics in the Near East*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh, Konrad Koerner, and Hans-Josef Niederehe. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 109–120. First published in *Historiographia linguistica* 8 (1981). 345–356.
- (1983). Language control as people control in medieval Islam: The aims of the grammarians in their cultural context. *al-Abhath* 31. 65–84 in English.
  - (1984). Linguistic science and orthodoxy in conflict: The case of al-Rum-mānī. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften* 1. 212–232.
  - (1985). The term *sabab* in Arabic grammar. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (= *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar. Proceedings of the first symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, held at Nijmegen, 16–19th April 1984*. Ed. by Hartmut Bobzin and Kees Versteegh). 53–66.
  - (1987–1988). Arab linguistics and Arabic linguistics. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften* 4. 205–218.
  - (1991). The ethical basis of Arabic grammar. *al-Karmil* 12. 9–23 in English.
  - (1994a). [Review of the book *Early Arabic grammatical theory: Heterogeneity and standardization* by J. Owens (1990)]. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114. 472–475.
  - (1994b). Writing the history of Arabic grammar. *Historiographia linguistica* 21. 385–414.
  - (1995). Predication tests, copula, and a possible link with Aṣṣarism. *Proceedings of the 14th Congress of the Union européenne des arabisants et islamisants*. Ed. by Alexander Fodor. Vol. 1. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University & Csoma de Kőrös Society (= *The Arabist: Budapest studies in Arabic* 13–14). 23–36.
  - (1997). Analogical and syllogistic reasoning in grammar and law. *Islam: Essays on scripture, thought and society*. Ed. by Peter G. Riddell and Tony Street. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 104–112.
  - (1999). The struggle for authority: A re-examination of the Baṣran and Kūfan debate. *Tradition and innovation*. Ed. by Lutz Edzard and Mohammed Nekroumi. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 55–70.
  - (2000). The development of Arabic linguistics after Sībawayhi: Baṣra, Kūfa and Baghdad. *History of the language sciences*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux et al. Vol. 1. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 263–272.
  - (2001). A missing link between law and grammar, the *Intiṣār* of Ibn Wallād. *Arabica* 48. 51–65.
  - (2004). *Sībawayhi*. London & New York: Oxford University Press India & I. B. Tauris.
  - (2009). *Sabab*. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 4: Q–Z. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 101–102.

- Chairet, Mohamed (2000). *Ḥiffa, ṭiqal et tamakkun: régime d'incidence et classes de mots. Langues et littératures du Monde arabe 1* (= *Linguistique arabe et sémitique I*). 213–226.
- Ḍayf, Ṣawqī (1968). *al-Madāris an-naḥwīyyah*. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Maʿārif.
- Derenbourg, Hartwig, ed. (1881–89/1970). *Le livre de Sibawaihi*. 2 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. Reprint, Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms. (1970).
- Druel, Jean N. (forthcoming). How to deal with contradictory chapters in Sibawayh's *Kitāb*? *Les cahiers du Midéo 6* (= *Islam, Christianity and citizenship. Festschrift offerts à Emilio Platti*).
- Dévényi, Kinga (1987–88). *Muḡāwara: A crack in the building of 'i'rāb. Quaderni di studi arabi 5-6* (= *Atti del XIII congresso dell'Unione europea d'arabisti et d'islamisti, Venezia, 29 settembre - 4 ottobre 1986*). 196–207.
- (1990a). On Farrā' 's linguistic methods in his work *Maʿānī l-Qurʿān*. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 101–110.
- (1990b). *Sibawayhi and al-Farrā': Uniformity and diversity in the history of Arabic grammar-writing*. PhD thesis. University of Budapest.
- Elamrani-Jamal, Abdelali (1983). *Logique aristotélicienne et grammaire arabe*. Paris: Vrin.
- Endreß, Gerhard (1977). al-Munāḍarah bayn al-mantiq al-falsafī wa-n-naḥw al-ʿArabī fī ʿaṣr al-xulafāʾ. *Majallat tāriḫ al-ʿulūm al-ʿArabiyyah 1/2*. 106–118 in Arabic.
- (1986). Grammatik und Logik: Arabische Philologie und griechische Philosophie im Widerstreit. *Sprachphilosophie in Antike und Mittelalter*. Ed. by Burkhard Mojsisch. 163–299.
- al-Fatli, ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn, ed. (1973/85/96). *al-ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw*. 3 vols. Baḡdād: Maṭbaʿat an-Nuʿmān. Reprint, Bayrūt: Muʿassasat ar-Risālah. (1985 & 1996).
- Ferrando, Ignacio (2002). The plural of paucity in Arabic and its actual scope: On two claims by Sibawayhi and al-Farraʾ. *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics XVI*. Ed. by Sami Boudelaa. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 39–61.
- Fleisch, Henri (1957). Esquisse d'un historique de la grammaire arabe. *Arabica 4*. 1–22.
- (1990). *Traité de philologie arabe*. 2nd edition. 2 vols. Beyrouth: Dar el-Machreq.
- Frank, Richard M. (1981). Meanings are spoken of in many ways: The earlier Arab grammarians. *Le Muséon 94*. 259–319.

- Gilliot, Claude (1997). *Shawāhid. The encyclopaedia of Islam (new edition)*. Ed. by C. E. Bosworth et al. Vol. 9: San-Sze. Leiden: Brill. 370–372.
- Goldziher, Ignaz (1871/1967). Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachgelehrsamkeit bei den Arabern. Mit Mitteilungen aus der Refāiija. *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 67. 207–251. Reprint, *Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. by Joseph Desomogyi. Vol. 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms. (1967). 7–51.
- Gouttenoire, Marie-Andrée (2010). Représentations et écritures du voyage au désert des lexicographes et grammairiens en langue arabe de l'espace iraqien des II/VIIIe et III/IXe siècles. PhD thesis. Université de Provence.
- Guillaume, Jean-Patrick (1985). Fragments d'une grammaire oubliée. *Bulletin d'études orientales* 35 (année 1983). 19–35.
- (1986). La 'cause' des grammairiens: Étude sur la notion de 'illa dans la tradition grammaticale (fin IIIe/IXe - milieu du IVe/Xe s.) PhD thesis. Université de Paris-III.
  - (2000). La nouvelle approche de la grammaire au IV<sup>e</sup>–V<sup>e</sup> siècle: Ibn Ġinnī (320/932 – 392/1002). *History of the language sciences*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux et al. Vol. 1. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 273–280.
- Haarmann, Ulrich (1974). Religiöses Recht und Grammatik im klassischen Islam. XVIII. *deutscher Orientalistentag 1972 = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supp. II*. Ed. by W. Voigt. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 149–169.
- al-Ḥadiṭī, Xadijah 'Abd ar-Razzāq (1975). *Sibawayh: Ḥayātu-hu wa-kitābu-hu*. Baġdād: Manšūrāt Wizārat al-'I'lām.
- (1980). *Dirāsāt fī Kitāb Sibawayh*. 2 vols. Kuwayt: Wikālat al-Maṭbū'āt.
  - (1981). *Mawqif an-nuḥāh min al-iḥtijāj bi-l-ḥadiṭ aš-šarīf*. Baġdād: Dār ar-Rašid.
- Hārūn, 'Abd as-Salām Muḥammad, ed. (1966–1977). *Kitāb Sibawayh*. 5 vols. al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Qalam (vol. 1); Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī (vol. 2); al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Ammah li-l-Kitāb (vol. 3–5).
- Howell, Mortimer S. (1883/2003). *A grammar of the Classical Arabic language*. Anastatic reprint. 7 vols. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House. [Part I covers vols. 1–4 and Part II covers vols. 5–7.]
- Humbert, Geneviève (1995). *Les voies de la transmission du Kitāb de Sibawayhi*. Leiden: Brill.
- (1997). Le *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi et l'autonomie de l'écrit. *Arabica* 44. 553–567.
- ʿIbādah, Muḥammad ʾIbrāhīm (2002). *aš-Šawāhid al-qurʾāniyyah fī Kitāb Sibawayh*. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-'Ādāb.
- Itkonen, Esa (1991). *Universal history of linguistics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.



- Iványi, Tamás (1991). *Qad yağūz fī š-šī'r*: On the linguistic background of the so called poetic licenses in Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*. *The Arabist: Budapest studies in Arabic* 3–4 (= *Proceedings of the colloquium on Arabic grammar, Budapest, 1–7 September 1991*. Ed. by Kinga Dévényi and Tamás Iványi). 201–216.
- Jum'ah, Xālid 'Abd al-Karīm (1980). *Šawāhid aš-šī'r fī Kitāb Sibawayh*. Madīnat al-Kuwayt: Dār al-'Urūbah.
- Kapeliuk, Olga (2003). A note on the role of linguistic informants in Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb*. *Jerusalem studies in Arabic and Islam* 28. 289–296.
- Kouloughli, Djamel Eddine (1985). À propos de *lafz* et *ma'nā*. *Bulletin d'études orientales* 35 (année 1983). 43–63.
- Košut, Jaromi, ed. (1878). *Fünf Streitfragen der Baṣṣenser und Kūfenser über die Abwandlung des Nomen aus Ibn el-Anbārī's Kitāb al-'inṣāf fī masā'il al-xilāf bayn an-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣṣiyyīn wa-l-Kūfiyyīn*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn & Adolf Holzhausen.
- Krenkow, Fritz, ed. (1936). *Biographies des grammairiens de l'École de Basra*. Beyrouth: Imprimerie catholique.
- Lambrech, Knud (1994). *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larcher, Pierre (2011). [Review of the book *The legacy of the Kitāb* by R. Baalbaki (2008)]. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 106. 121–123.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levin, Aryeh (1991). What is meant by *al-maf'ūl al-muṭlaq*? *Semitic studies in honor of Wolf Leslau on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday, November 14th, 1991*. Ed. by Alan S. Kaye. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 917–926.
- (1994). Sibawayhi's attitude to the spoken language. *Jerusalem studies in Arabic and Islam* 17. 204–243.
- (2000). Sibawayhi. *History of the language sciences*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux et al. Vol. 1. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 252–263.
- Loucel, Henri (1963–64). L'origine du langage d'après les grammairiens arabes. *Arabica* 10. 188–208, 253–281; 11. 57–72, 151–187.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Machuel, Louis (1908). *Vocabulaire des principaux termes techniques de la grammaire arabe*. Tunis: Société anonyme de l'imprimerie rapide.
- al-Māḍī, Sāmī (2009). *ad-Dalālah an-naḥwiyyah fī kitāb al-Muqtaḍib li-l-Mubarrad Muḥammad b. Zayd*. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat at-Taḳāfah ad-Dīniyyah.
- Marogy, Amal E. (2010). *Kitāb Sibawayhi*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Massignon, Louis (1954). Réflexions sur la structure primitive de l'analyse grammaticale en arabe. *Arabica* 1. 3–16.

- al-Maxzūmī, Mahdī (1955). *Madrasat al-Kūfah wa-manhajū-hā fī dirāsāt al-luġah wa-n-naḥw*. Bagdād: Maṭbaʿat Dār al-Maʿrifah.
- Mosel, Ulrike (1975). Die syntaktische Terminologie bei Sibawaih. PhD thesis. Philosophische Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Muṣṭafā, ʾIbrāhīm (1948). ʾAwwal man waḍaʿa n-naḥw. *Majallat Kulliyyat al-ʾādāb, Jāmiʿat Fuʾād al-ʾawwal* 10/2. 69–74 in Arabic.
- Nakamura, Kōjirō (1974). Ibn Maḍā's criticism of Arabic grammarians. *Orient* 10. 89–113.
- al-Nassir, A. A. (1993). *Sibawayh the phonologist*. London & New York: Kegan Paul.
- Owens, Jonathan (1990a). *Early Arabic grammatical theory: Heterogeneity and standardization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- (1990b). Themes in the development of Arabic grammatical theory. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 253–263.
- (1991). Models for interpreting the development of medieval Arabic grammatical theory. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111. 225–238.
- (1995). The comparative study of medieval Arabic grammatical theory. *Historiographia linguistica* 22. 425–440.
- Peters, Jan (1976). *God's created speech: A study in the speculative theology of the Mu'tazilī Qāḍī l-Quḍāt Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Jabbār bn Aḥmad al-Hamadānī*. Leiden: Brill.
- Peterson, David (1972). Some explanatory methods of the Arab grammarians. *Papers from the eighth regional meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*. Ed. by Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi, and Gloria C. Phares. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 504–515.
- Rabin, Chaim (1951). *Ancient West-Arabian*. London: Taylor's Foreign Press.
- Ratcliffe, Robert R. (1998). *The "broken" plural problem in Arabic and comparative Semitic*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Reuschel, Wolfgang (1959). *Al-Ḥalīl ibn-Aḥmad, der Lehrer Sibawaihs, als Grammatiker*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Sara, Solomon I. (2007). *Sibawayh on ʾimālāh (inclination)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schoeler, Gregor (1985). Die Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im frühen Islam. *Der Islam* 62. 201–230.
- (1989). Weiteres zur Frage der schriftlichen oder mündlichen Überlieferung der Wissenschaften im Islam. *Der Islam* 66. 38–67.
- Seybold, Christian F., ed. (1886). *Kitāb ʾasrār al-ʿarabiyyah*. Leiden.
- Shakir, Mahomedali H. (1983). *Holy Qur'an*. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an.

- Silvestre de Sacy, Antoine-Isaac (1829). *Anthologie grammaticale arabe ou morceaux choisis de divers grammairiens et scholiastes arabes*. Paris: Imprimerie royale.
- Suleiman, Yasir (2003). Autonomy versus non-autonomy in the Arabic grammatical tradition. *Arabic grammar and linguistics*. Ed. by Yasir Suleiman. London & New York: Routledge. Chap. 2. 30–49.
- Szemerényi, Oswald (1960). *Studies in the Indo-European system of numerals*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter & Universitätsverlag.
- Ṭāhā, Zaynab Ḥamad (1995). Issues of syntax and semantics: A comparative study of Sibawayhi, al-Mubarrad, and Ibn as-Sarraaj. PhD thesis. Georgetown University.
- (2009). Taʿaddīn. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 4: Q–Z. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 410–416.
  - (2010). *Taṭawwūr al-fikr an-naḥwī min Sibawayh ʾilā Ibn as-Sarrāj*. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-ʿĀdāb.
- Talmon, Rafael (1982). *Naḥwiyyūn in Sibawayhi's Kitāb*. *Zeitschrift für arabisches Linguistik* 8. 12–38.
- (1990). The philosophizing Farrāʾ: An interpretation of an obscure saying attributed to the grammarian Ṭaʿlab. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 265–279.
  - (2009). Two studies in Arabic *tamyīz*. *Egyptian, Semitic and general grammar. Studies in memory of H. J. Polotsky*. Ed. by Gideon Goldenberg and Ariel Shisha-Halevy. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. 197–219.
- aṭ-Ṭanāḥī, Maḥmūd Muḥammad (1986). *Fahāris kitāb al-ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw li-ʿAbī Bakr b. as-Sarrāj*. al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-Xānjī.
- Troupeau, Gérard (1962). La grammaire à Baḡdād du IX<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Baḡdād. Tirage à part d'Arabica* 9/3. Leiden: Brill. 397–405.
- (1976). *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sibawayhi*. Paris: Klincksieck.
  - (1994). La rationalité en grammaire. *Horizons maghrébins: le droit à la mémoire* 25-26. 13–21.
- ʿUḍaymah, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Xāliq, ed. (1966–79). *Kitāb al-muqtaḍab*. 4 vols. al-Qāhirah: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf: Lajnat ʾIḥyāʾ at-Turāṭ al-ʾIslāmī.
- Vernier, Donat (1891–92). *Grammaire arabe composée d'après les sources primitives*. 2 vols. Beyrouth: Imprimerie catholique.
- Versteegh, Kees (1978). The Arabic terminology of syntactic position. *Arabica* 25. 261–281.
- (1980). Logique et grammaire au dixième siècle. *Histoire, épistémologie, langage* 2/1: *Éléments d'histoire de la tradition linguistique arabe*. 39–52.

- Versteegh, Kees (1981). La conception des “temps” du verbe chez les grammairiens arabes. *Analyses théorie : études arabes* 3. 47–68.
- (1983). Arabic grammar and the corruption of speech. *al-Abhath* 31 = *Arab language and culture*. Ed. by Ramzi Baalbaki. Beirut: American University of Beirut. 139–160.
  - (1985). The development of argumentation in Arabic grammar: the declension of the dual and the plural. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (= *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar. Proceedings of the first symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, held at Nijmegen, 16–19th April 1984*. Ed. by Hartmut Bobzin and Kees Versteegh). 152–173.
  - (1989a). A sociological view of the Arab grammatical tradition: Grammarians and their professions. *Studia linguistica et orientalia memoriae Haim Blanc dedicata*. Ed. by Paul Wexler, Alexander Borg, and Sasson Somekh. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 289–302.
  - (1989b). Le langage, la religion et la raison. *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux. Vol. 1: La naissance des métalangages en Orient et en Occident. Liège & Bruxelles: Pierre Mardaga. 243–259.
  - (1990a). Borrowing and influence: Greek grammar as a model. *Le langage dans l'antiquité*. Ed. by Pierre Swiggers and Alfons Wouters. Louvain: Leuven University Press & Peeters. 197–212.
  - (1990b). Freedom of the speaker? The term *ittisāʿ* and related notions in Arabic grammar. *Studies in the history of Arabic grammar II: Proceedings of the 2nd symposium on the history of Arabic grammar, Nijmegen, 27 April - 1 May 1987*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh and Michael G. Carter. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 281–293.
  - (1990c). Grammar and exegesis. The origins of Kufan grammar and the *Tafsīr Muqātil*. *Der Islam* 67. 206–242.
  - (1991). Two conceptions of irrealis in Arabic grammar: Ibn Hišām and Ibn al-Ḥāǧib on the particle *law*. *Bulletin d'études orientales* 43. 77–92.
  - (1993a). *Arabic grammar and Qurʾānic exegesis in early Islam*. Leiden: Brill.
  - (1993b). Three is a crowd: Lawyers and linguists on Qurʾān 4/11. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 25. 302–315.
  - (1994). The notion of ‘underlying levels’ in the Arabic grammatical tradition. *Historiographia linguistica* 21. 271–296.
  - (1995). *The explanation of linguistic causes. Az-Zaǧǧāǧī's theory of grammar*. John Benjamins.
  - (1996). The linguistic introduction to Rāzī's *Tafsīr*. *Studies in Near Eastern languages and literature: Memorial volume of Karel Petrůček*. Ed. by Petr Zemánek. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic: Oriental Institute. 589–603.
  - (1997a). *Landmarks in linguistic thought III: The Arabic linguistic tradition*. London & New York: Routledge.

- (1997b). The Arabic tradition. *The emergence of semantics in four linguistic traditions*. Ed. by Wout van Bekkum et al. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Chap. 4. 225–284.
- (2000). Grammar and logic in the Arabic grammatical tradition. *History of the language sciences*. Ed. by Sylvain Auroux et al. Vol. 1. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 300–306.
- (2004). Meanings of speech: The category of sentential mood in Arabic grammar. *Le voyage et la langue: Mélanges en l'honneur d'Anouar Louca et d'André Roman*. Ed. by Joseph Dichy and Hassan Hamzé. Damas: Institut français du Proche-Orient. 269–287.
- (2006a). A new treatise about the <sup>ʿ</sup>ilal an-naḥw: Ibn al-Warrāq on <sup>ʿ</sup>inna wa-<sup>ʿ</sup>axawātuḥā. *Grammar as a window onto Arabic humanism. A collection of articles in honour of Michael G. Carter*. Ed. by Lutz Edzard and Janet Watson. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 51–65.
- (2009). Taqdīr. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 4: Q–Z. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 446–449.
- Weil, Gotthold (1913a). *Die grammatischen Schulen von Kufa und Basra. Zugleich Einleitung zu der Ausgabe des Kitāb al-inṣāf von Ibn al-Anbārī*. Leiden: Brill.
- ed. (1913b). *Die grammatischen Streitfragen der Basrer und Kufer* = Ibn al-ʿAnbārī (577/1181). *Kitāb al-ʿinṣāf fī masāʿil al-xilāf bayn an-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa-l-Kūfiyyīn*. Leiden: Brill.
- (1915). Zum Verständnis der Methode der moslemischen Grammatiker. *Festschrift Eduard Sachau zum siebzigsten Geburtstage*. Ed. by Gotthold Weil. Berlin: Reimer. 380–392.
- Weiß, Josef (1910). Die arabische Nationalgrammatik und die Lateiner. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 64. 349–390.
- Wright, William (1967). *A grammar of the Arabic language*. Third edition. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press.
- Yāqūt, Maḥmūd Sulaymān (1992). *Šarḥ jumal Sibawayh*. 4 vols. al-ʿIskandariyyah: Dār al-Maʿrifah al-Jāmiʿiyyah.

## Dictionaries & encyclopedias

- Brockelmann, Carl (1943–1949/1996). *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*. 2+3 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Kaḥḥālāh, ʿUmar Riḍā (1957). *Muʿjam al-muʿallifīn*. 15 vols. Bayrūt: Dār ʿIḥyāʾ at-Turāṯ al-ʿArabī.
- Kazimirski, A. de Biberstein (1860). *Dictionnaire arabe-français*.... 2 vols. Paris: Maisonneuve. Reprint, Beyrouth: Librairie du Liban. (n.d.)

- Lane, Edward William (1863–1893/1955–1956). *An Arabic-English lexicon derived from the best and the most copious eastern sources*. 8 vols. Cambridge: Williams and Norgate. Reprint, New York: Frederick Ungar. (1955–1956).
- Sezgin, Fuat (1967–2010). *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. 15 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Versteegh, Kees, ed. (2006b). *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Vol. 1: A–Ed. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

## **Part VI**

# **Annexes**





# Index of Qur'ānic verses

Here are the Qur'ānic verses quoted in the grammatical texts studied here and which contain numerals. They are sorted according to their numbering in the Qur'ān.

١. ﴿وَمَا يُعْلِمَانِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ حَتَّى يَقُولَا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ ۖ فَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ﴾ (البقرة، ١٠٢)
1. Q. 2, 102 (M. II, 20.10).
٢. ﴿فَصَبِّامٌ تَلْفِئَةً أَيَّامٍ فِي الْحَجِّ وَسَبْعَةً إِذَا رَجَعْتُمْ ۚ تِلْكَ عَشْرَةٌ كَامِلَةٌ﴾ (البقرة، ١٩٦)
2. Q. 2, 196 (M. II, 158.2-3).
٣. ﴿يَتَرَبَّصْنَ بِأَنْفُسِهِنَّ ثَلَاثَةَ قُرُوءٍ﴾ (البقرة، ٢٢٨)
3. Q. 2, 228 (K. II, 185.13; M. II, 159.1; 'U. II, 430.9). See pp. 86, 180 & 251.
٤. ﴿أَنْ تَضِلَّ إِحْدَاهُمَا فَتُذَكِّرَ إِحْدَاهُمَا الْأُخْرَى﴾ (البقرة، ٢٨٢)
4. Q. 2, 282 (K. I, 383.2-3; 425.5-6; M. III, 214.8-9).
٥. ﴿فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنَى وَثُلَاثَ وَرُبُعَ﴾ (النساء، ٣)
5. Q. 4, 3 (M. III, 381.2). See p. 116.
٦. ﴿لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ ثَالِثُ ثَلَاثَةٍ﴾ (المائدة، ٧٣)
6. Q. 5, 73 (K. II, 177.22-12; M. II, 181.4-5). See p. 88.
٧. ﴿مَنْ جَاءَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ فَلَهُ عَشْرُ أَمْثَالِهَا﴾ (الأنعام، ١٦٠)
7. Q. 6, 160 (K. II, 181.13; M. II, 149.1; 185.8; 9; 'U. III, 477.5-6). See pp. 86, 86, 88 & 173.

٨. ﴿وَأَخْتَارَ مُوسَىٰ قَوْمَهُ سَبْعِينَ رَجُلًا لِّمِيقَاتِنَا﴾ (الأعراف، ١٥٥)
8. *Q.* 7, 155 (*K.* I, 12.15; *M.* II, 321.5; 342.10; <sup>3</sup>*U.* I, 178.1-2). See p. 86.
٩. ﴿وَإِذْ يَعِدُكُمُ اللَّهُ إِحْدَى الطَّائِفَتَيْنِ أَنَّهَا لَكُمْ﴾ (الأنفال، ٧)
9. *Q.* 8, 7 (*K.* I, 415.12-13; <sup>3</sup>*U.* I, 270.11).
١٠. ﴿إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ﴾ (التوبة، ٤٠)
10. *Q.* 9, 40 (*K.* II, 177.22; *M.* II, 181.4-5). See p. 88.
١١. ﴿وَلَا يَلْتَفِتْ مِنْكُمْ أَحَدٌ إِلَّا أَمْرَاتُكَ﴾ (هود، ٨١)
11. *Q.* 11, 81 (*M.* IV, 395.10). See p. 86.
١٢. ﴿إِنِّي رَأَيْتُ أَحَدَ عَشَرَ كَوْكَبًا وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ رَأَيْتُهُمْ لِي سَاجِدِينَ﴾ (يوسف، ٤)
12. *Q.* 12, 4 (*M.* II, 225.8-9).
١٣. ﴿يَسْتَبِيحُ لَا تَدْخُلُوا مِنْ بَابٍ وَاحِدٍ﴾ (يوسف، ٦٧)
13. *Q.* 12, 67 (*M.* IV, 249.1).
١٤. ﴿سَيَقُولُونَ ثَلَاثَةٌ رَأَيْتُهُمْ كَلْبُهُمْ﴾ (الكهف، ٢٢)
14. *Q.* 18, 22 (*M.* II, 181.9). See p. 88.
١٥. ﴿وَلَبِثُوا فِي كَهْفِهِمْ ثَلَاثَ مِائَةٍ سِنِينَ وَازْدَادُوا تِسْعًا﴾ (الكهف، ٢٥)
15. *Q.* 18, 25 (*M.* II, 170.4). See pp. 87, 167, 182, 286 & 254.
١٦. ﴿قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ أَنَّمَا إِلَهُكُمُ إِلَهٌ وَاحِدٌ﴾ (الكهف، ١١٠؛ فصلت، ٦)
16. *Q.* 18, 110; 41, 6 (*K.* I, 414.7-8; <sup>3</sup>*U.* I, 269.11-270.1<sup>1</sup>).
١٧. ﴿فَإِمَّا تَرَيَنَّ مِنَ الْبَشَرِ أَحَدًا﴾ (مريم، ٢٦)
17. *Q.* 19, 26 (*K.* II, 155.3; *M.* III, 14.1; *M.* IV, 34.6).
١٨. ﴿وَإِنَّ هَذِهِ أُمَّتُكُمْ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً وَأَنَا رَبُّكُمْ فَاتَّقُون﴾ (المؤمنون، ٥٢)
18. *Q.* 23, 52 (*K.* I, 247.10-11; *M.* II, 347.6-7; <sup>3</sup>*U.* I, 267.3-4; 271.14-15). See pp. 86 & 86.
١٩. ﴿الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِّنْهُمَا مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ﴾ (النور، ٢)

<sup>1</sup>After the correction of Bohas (1993, 82).

19. Q. 24, 2 (K. I, 60.9).

٢٠. ﴿فَشَهِدُوا أَحَدِهِمْ أَرْبَعَ شَهَدَاتٍ بِاللَّهِ إِنَّهُ لَمِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ﴾ (النور، ٦)

20. Q. 24, 6 (K. I, 422.6-7).

٢١. ﴿وَالْخَمِيسَةَ أَنَّ غَضَبَ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهَا﴾ (النور، ٩)

21. Q. 24, 9 (K. I, 429.2).

٢٢. ﴿وَمِنْهُمْ مَّنْ يَمْشِي عَلَىٰ أَرْبَعٍ﴾ (النور، ٤٥)

22. Q. 24, 45 (M. II, 50.18).

٢٣. ﴿عَلَىٰ أَنْ تَأْجُرَنِي ثَمْنِي حَبَّحٍ طَّ فَإِنْ أَتَمَمْتَ عَشْرًا فَمِنْ عِنْدِكَ﴾ (القصاص، ٢٧)

23. Q. 28, 27 (M. II, 158.1-2).

٢٤. ﴿أُولَٰئِكَ أَجْنَحَهُ مِثْنَىٰ وَثُلُثٌ وَرُبْعٌ﴾ (فاطر، ١)

24. Q. 35, 1 (K. II, 15.4; M. III, 381.1-2). See p. 116.

٢٥. ﴿وَلَوْ أَنَّمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ مِنْ شَجَرَةٍ أَقْلَمٌ وَالْبَحْرُ يَمُدُّهُ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ سَبْعَةُ أَبْحُرٍ﴾ (لقمان، ٢٧)

25. Q. 31, 27 (K. I, 246.4-5; U. I, 249.12-13). See p. 86.

٢٦. ﴿وَلَيْسَ زَالَتَا إِنْ أَمْسَكَهُمَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ مِّنْ بَعْدِهِ﴾ (فاطر، ٤١)

26. Q. 35, 41 (K. I, 405.10-11; U. II, 190.8).

٢٧. ﴿وَأَرْسَلْنَاهُ إِلَىٰ مِائَةِ أَلْفٍ أَوْ يَزِيدُونَ﴾ (الصافات، ١٤٧)

27. Q. 37, 147 (M. III, 304.3).

Q. 41, 6 see Q. 18, 110.

٢٨. ﴿فِي أَرْبَعَةِ أَيَّامٍ سَوَاءً لِّلنَّاسِ لَيْلٍ﴾ (فصلت، ١٠)

28. Q. 41, 10 (K. I, 232.3; 4; M. II, 158.1; M. III, 232.4; M. IV, 304.12; 305.1). See pp. 83 & 86.

٢٩. ﴿أَبَشِّرْنَا مِنَّا وَاحِدًا نَّتَّبِعُهُ﴾ (القمر، ٢٤)

29. Q. 54, 24 (M. II, 76.4-5).

٣٠. ﴿وَمَا أَمْرُنَا إِلَّا وَاحِدَةٌ كَلَمْحٍ﴾ (القمر، ٥٠)

30. Q. 54, 50 (M. IV, 190.17).

٣١. ﴿مَا يَكُونُ مِنْ نَجْوَى ثَلَاثَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ رَابِعُهُمْ وَلَا خَمْسَةٍ إِلَّا هُوَ سَادِسُهُمْ﴾ (المجادلة، ٧)

31. Q. 58, 7 (M. II, 181.8-9). See p. 88.

٣٢. ﴿سَخَّرَهَا عَلَيْهِمْ سَبْعَ لَيَالٍ وَتَمَنِيَةً أَيَّامٍ﴾ (الحاقة، ٧)

32. Q. 69, 7 (M. II, 157.16).

٣٣. ﴿فَإِذَا نُفِخَ فِي الصُّورِ نَفْخَةٌ وَاحِدَةٌ﴾ (الحاقة، ١٣)

33. Q. 69, 13 (M. III, 104.6; <sup>U</sup>U. II, 297.20). See p. 82.

٣٤. ﴿فَمَا مِنْكُمْ مِّنْ أَحَدٍ عَنْهُ حَاجِزِينَ﴾ (الحاقة، ٤٧)

34. Q. 69, 47 (M. III, 252.7).

٣٥. ﴿وَأَنَّ الْمَسَاجِدَ لِلَّهِ فَلَا تَدْعُوا مَعَ اللَّهِ أَحَدًا﴾ (الجن، ١٨)

35. Q. 72, 18 (K. I, 413.10; M. II, 347.8; <sup>U</sup>U. I, 269.5-6). See p. 86.

٣٦. ﴿وَمَا لِأَحَدٍ عِنْدَهُ مِنْ نِّعْمَةٍ تُجْزَى إِلَّا أَتْبَعَاءَ وَجْهِ رَبِّهِ الْأَعْلَى﴾ (الليل، ١٩-٢٠)

36. Q. 92, 19-20 (M. IV, 412.6-7).

٣٧. ﴿قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ﴾ (الإخلاص، ٢-١)

37. Q. 112, 1-2 (K. II, 298.16; M. II, 314.2; 315.11-12; <sup>U</sup>U. II, 369.14). See pp. 86, 86, 87, 154 & 158.

٣٨. ﴿وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ﴾ (الإخلاص، ٤)

38. Q. 112, 4 (K. I, 21.15-16; M. IV, 90.8; <sup>U</sup>U. I, 85.15). See p. 86.

## Other Qur'ānic verses containing numerals, mentioned in this research, but not quoted in the grammatical texts studied here.

١. ﴿فَإِنْ كُنَّ نِسَاءً فَوْقَ اثْنَتَيْنِ فَلَهُنَّ ثُلُثَا مَا تَرَكَ وَإِنْ كَانَتْ وَاحِدَةً فَلَهَا النِّصْفُ وَلِأَبَوَيْهِ لِكُلِّ وَاحِدٍ مِّنْهُمَا السُّدُسُ مِمَّا تَرَكَ إِنْ كَانَ لَهُ وَلَدٌ فَإِنْ لَّمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ وَلَدٌ وَوَرِثَهُ أَبَوَاهُ فَلِأُمِّهِ الثُّلُثُ فَإِنْ كَانَ لَهُ إِخْوَةٌ فَلِأُمِّهِ السُّدُسُ﴾ (النساء، ١١)

1. Q. 4, 11. (See p. 115.)

٢. ﴿فَإِنْ كَانَ لَهُنَّ وَلَدٌ فَلَكُمْ الرُّبْعُ مِمَّا تَرَكَنَّ مِنْ بَعْدِ وَصِيَّةٍ يُوصِيَنَّ بِهَا أَوْ دَيْنٍ وَلَهُنَّ الرُّبْعُ مِمَّا تَرَكَنَّ إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ لَكُمْ وَلَدٌ فَإِنْ كَانَ لَكُمْ وَلَدٌ فَلَهُنَّ الثُّمُنُ مِمَّا تَرَكَنَّ﴾ (النساء، ١٢)

2. Q. 4, 12. (See p. 115.)

٣. ﴿فَإِنْ كَانَتَا اثْنَتَيْنِ فَلَهُمَا الثُّلُثَانِ مِمَّا تَرَكَ﴾ (النساء، ١٧٦)

3. Q. 4, 176. (See p. 115.)

٤. ﴿وَقَطَّعْنَاهُمْ اثْنَتَى عَشْرَةَ أَسْبَاطًا أُمَمًا﴾ (الأعراف، ١٦٠)

4. Q. 7, 160. (See p. 89.)

٥. ﴿وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَإِنَّ لِلَّهِ خُمُسَهُ﴾ (الأنفال، ٤١)

5. Q. 8, 41. (See p. 115.)

٦. ﴿إِنْ تَقُومُوا لِلَّهِ مِئَتَى وَفُرَادَى ثُمَّ تَتَفَكَّرُوا﴾ (سبا، ٤٦)

6. Q. 34, 46. (See p. 116.)

٧. ﴿إِنَّ رَبَّكَ يَعْلَمُ أَنَّكَ تَقُومُ أَدْنَى مِنْ ثُلُثِي اللَّيْلِ وَنِصْفَهُ وَثُلُثَهُ وَطَائِفَةٌ مِنَ الَّذِينَ مَعَكَ﴾ (المزمل، ٢٠)

7. Q. 73, 20. (See p. 115.)

### Qur'ānic verses mentioned in this research, but that do not contain numerals.

١. ﴿لِلَّهِ الْأَمْرُ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَمِنْ بَعْدُ﴾ (الروم، ٤)

1. Q. 30, 4. (See p. 227.)

٢. ﴿إِنَّهُ لَحَقُّ مِثْلٍ مَّا أَنْتُمْ تَنطِقُونَ﴾ (ق، ٢٣)

2. Q. 51, 23. (See p. 262.)



# Index of poetic lines

Here are the poetic verses quoted in the grammatical texts studied here and which contain numerals. They are listed in strict alphabetic order of the the first words.

١. أَصْبَحْتُ لَا أَحْمِلُ السَّلَاحَ وَلَا أُرْدُ رَأْسَ الْبَعِيرِ إِنْ نَفَرَا

وَالذُّئْبُ أَخْشَاهُ إِنْ مَرَرْتُ بِهِ وَحَدِي وَأَخْشَى الرِّيحَ وَالْمَطَرَ

1. K. I, 35.17-18.

٢. أَلَا فَاسْلَمِي ثُمَّ اسْلَمِي ثُمَّ اسْلَمِي ثَلَاثَ تَحِيَّاتٍ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَكَلَّمِي

2. <sup>٢</sup>U. II, 19.17.

٣. أَمْنَرِلَيَّ مَيِّ سَلَامٍ عَلَيْكُمَا هَلْ الْأَرْضُ مِنَ اللَّائِي مَضَيْنَ رَوَاجِعُ

وَهَلْ يَرْجِعُ التَّسْلِيمُ أَوْ يَدْفَعُ الْبُكَاءُ ثَلَاثُ الْأَنَافِي وَالرُّسُومُ الْبَلَاغِعُ

3. K. II, 183.15: only the first verse; M. II, 176.1-2; 200.6: only the first verse; IV, 144.4: only the second verse, وَالْدِّيَارُ.

٤. أَنْعْتُ عَيْرًا مِنْ حَمِيرٍ خَنْزَرَهُ فِي كُلِّ عَيْرٍ مَائَتَانِ كَمَرَهُ

4. K. I, 87.10; 253.6.

٥. إِذَا عَاشَ الْفَتَى مَائَتَيْنِ عَامًا فَقَدْ أُوْدَى الْمَسْرَةُ وَالْفَتَاءُ

5. K. I, 87.8; 253.4: ذَهَبَ الْمَسْرَةُ; M. II, 169.1: اللَّدَاذَةُ; <sup>٢</sup>U. I, 312.14: ذَهَبَ الْبَشَاشَةُ; (See pp. 88 & 167.)

(إِلَّا أَوَارِيَّ لَايَا مَا أُبَيِّنُهَا وَالتُّؤْيُ كَالْحَوْضِ بِالْمَظْلُومَةِ الْجَلْدِ

(See 38.

٦. الواهِبُ المائَةِ الهِجَانِ وَعَبْدُهَا عَوْدًا تُرْجَى بَيْنَهَا أَطْفَالُهَا

6. K. I, 77.20; M. IV, 163.1; خَلَفَهَا: <sup>U</sup> II, 308.8.

٧. تَحْدُو ثَمَانِي مَوْلَعًا بِلِقَاحِهَا حَتَّى هَمَمَنْ بِرِيعَةِ الإِرْنَاجِ

7. K. II, 17.15; <sup>U</sup> II, only the first hemistich in 91.15: يَحْدُو.

٨. ثَلَاثُ مِئْنِينَ قَدْ مَرَزْنَ كَوَامِلًا وَهَا أَنْذَا أَرْتَجِي مَرَّ أَرْبَعِ

8. M. II, 170.7.

٩. ثَلَاثُ مِئْنِينَ لِلْمُلُوكِ وَفِي بِهَا رِدَائِي وَجَلَّتْ عَنْ وُجُوهِ الْأَهَاتِمِ

9. M. II, 170.5.

١٠. ثَلَاثَةُ أَنْفُسٍ وَثَلَاثُ ذُودٍ لَقَدْ جَارَ الثُّمَانُ عَلَى عِيَالِي

10. K. II, 181.4.

١١. ثَمَانِي حَجَجٍ حَجَجْتُهُنَّ بَيْتَ اللَّهِ

11. K. I, 75.22.

١٢. جَزَيْتُكَ ضِعْفَ الْوُدِّ لَمَّا اسْتَنْتَبَيْتِهِ وَمَا إِنْ جَزَاكَ الضُّعْفَ مِنْ أَحَدٍ قَبْلِي

12. M. IV, 137.10.

١٣. جَمَعْتَ وَبُخْلًا غَيْبَةً وَنَمِيمَةً ثَلَاثَ خِصَالٍ لَسْتُ عَنْهَا بِمُرْعَوِي

13. <sup>U</sup> I, 354.11.

١٤. حَيْدَةُ خَالِي وَلَقِيطٌ وَعَلِيٌّ وَحَاتِمُ الطَّائِي وَهَابُ الْمِثْيِ

14. <sup>U</sup> III, 329.1; 332.9.

١٥. خَوَى عَلَى مُسْتَوِيَاتٍ خَمْسٍ كَبْرَكِرَةٍ وَثَفَنَاتٍ مُلْسٍ

15. K. I, 183.2. (See pp. 92 & 157.)

١٦. سَمَاءُ الْإِلَهِ فَوْقَ سَبْعِ سَمَائِيَا

16. K. II, 54.13; M. I, 282.5; <sup>U</sup> III, 341.1; 445.3.

١٧. صَبَحْنَاهُمْ بِالْفِ مِنْ سُلَيْمٍ وَسَبَّحَ مِنْ بَنِي عُثْمَانَ وَافِي



17. *M.* II, 184.8. (See p. 108.)

١٨. عَلَى أَنَّنِي بَعْدَ مَا قَدْ مَضَى ثَلَاثُونَ لِلْهَجْرِ حَوْلًا كَمِيلًا

يُذَكِّرُنِيكَ حَتَّى الْعَجُولِ وَنَوَاحِ الْحَمَامَةِ تَدْعُو هَدِيلاً

18. *K.* I, 251.16–17; *M.* III, 55.12: only the first verse; *U.* I, 316.2: only the first verse.

(فَإِنْ كِلَابًا هَلْدِهِ عَشْرُ أَبْطُنٍ وَأَنْتَ بَرِيءٌ مِنْ قَبَائِلِهَا الْعَشْرِ

(See 35.

١٩. فَطَافَتْ ثَلَاثًا بَيْنَ يَوْمٍ وَلَيْلَةٍ يَكُونُ التَّكْيِيرُ أَنْ تُضَيَّفَ وَتَجَارَا

19. *K.* II, 180.10.

٢٠. فَكَانَ نَصِيرِي دُونَ مَنْ كُنْتُ أَتَقِي ثَلَاثَ شُخُوصٍ كَاعِبَانِ وَمُعْصِرُ

20. *K.* II, 181.6; *M.* II, 148.11: *مِجَنِّي*; *U.* III, 476.5: *مِجَنِّي*.

٢١. فِي خَمْسِ عَشْرَةٍ مِنْ جُمَادَى لَيْلَةً لَا أَسْتَطِيعُ عَلَى الْفِرَاشِ رُقَادِي

21. *M.* III, 56.2.

٢٢. فِيهَا اثْنَتَانِ وَأَرْبَعُونَ حَلُوبَةً سَوْدًا كَخَافِيَةِ الْغُرَابِ الْأَسْحَمِ

22. *U.* I, 325.12.

٢٣. قَبَائِلُنَا سَبْعٌ وَأَنْتُمْ ثَلَاثَةٌ وَلَلْسَبْعُ خَيْرٌ مِنْ ثَلَاثٍ وَأَكْثَرُ

23. *K.* II, 181.2.

٢٤. قَدْ جَعَلْتُ مَيِّ عَلَى الظَّرَارِ خَمْسَ بَنَانٍ قَانِي الْأَظْفَارِ

24. *K.* II, 182.20; 210.16: *الظَّرَارِ*; *M.* II, 159.2.

٢٥. قَوْلٍ مَعْرُوفٍ وَقَعَالِهِ عَقَّارٍ مَشْنَى أُمِّهَاتِ الرَّبَاعِ

25. *M.* III, 170.2.

٢٦. كَأَنَّ خُصْيِيهِ مِنَ التَّدْدُلِ طَرْفُ عَجُوزٍ فِيهِ ثِنْتَا حَنْظَلٍ

26. *K.* II, 182.18; 210.14: *جِرَابٍ*; *M.* II, 156.3: *جِرَابٍ*. (See pp. 92, 130, 154, 177 & 273.)

٢٧. لَيْنُ كُنْتُ فِي جُبِّ ثَمَانِينَ قَامَةً      وَرُقِيتُ أَسْبَابَ السَّمَاءِ بِسَلَمٍ

27. K. I, 197.18; <sup>U</sup> II, 27.21. (See p. 93.)

٢٨. لَعَمْرُكَ مَا أَذْرِي وَإِنْ كُنْتُ دَارِيًّا      بِسَيْعِ رَمِينَ الْجَمْرِ أَمْ بِثَمَانٍ

28. K. I, 434.14; M. III, 294.5.

٢٩. لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ عَجَبًا مِثْلَ أَمْسَا      عَجَائِزًا مِثْلَ السَّعَالِي خَمْسَا

29. K. II, 40.15.

٣٠. لَنَا مِرْفَدٌ سَبْعُونَ أَلْفَ مُدَجِّجٍ      فَهَلْ فِي مَعَدٍّ قَوْقَ ذَلِكَ مِرْفَدًا

30. K. I, 258.3. (See p. 183.)

٣١. مَا بِالْمَدِينَةِ دَارٌ غَيْرُ وَاحِدَةٍ      دَارُ الْخَلِيفَةِ إِلَّا دَارُ مَرْوَانَ

31. K. I, 325.22; M. IV, 425.2; <sup>U</sup> I, 303.14.

٣٢. مَا زَالَ مُدٌّ عَقَدَتْ يَدَاهُ إِزَارَهُ      وَدَنَا فَاذْرَكَ خَمْسَةَ الْأَشْبَارِ

32. M. II, 176.4.

٣٣. مَنَنْتَ لَكَ أَنْ تُتْلِقَنِي الْمَنَايَا      أَحَادَ أَحَادٍ فِي شَهْرِ خِلَالِ

33. M. III, 381.4. (See p. 117.)

٣٤. نَحْنُ بَنُو أُمِّ الْبَنِينَ الْأَرْبَعَةِ      وَنَحْنُ خَيْرُ عَامِرٍ بْنِ صَعْصَعَةَ

34. K. I, 285.13. (See p. 157.)

٣٥. وَإِنْ كِلَابًا هَلِيزِهِ عَشْرُ أَبْطُنٍ      وَأَنْتَ بَرِيءٌ مِنْ قِبَائِلِهَا الْعَشْرِ

35. K. II, 180.22; M. II, 148.11; <sup>U</sup> III, 477.1.

(وَالذَّبُّ أَحْشَاهُ إِنْ مَرَزْتُ بِهِ      وَخُدِي وَأَخْشَى الرِّيَّاحَ وَالْمَطْرَا

(See 1.

(وَقَفْتُ فِيهَا أَصِيلًا أَسَائِلُهَا      عَيَّتْ جَوَابًا وَمَا بِالرَّيْعِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ

(See 38.

٣٦. وَلَكِنَّمَا أَهْلِي بِوَادِ أُنَيْسُهُ      ذُنَابُ تَبَعَى النَّاسَ مِثْنَى وَمَوْحَدُ

36. K. II, 15.8; M. III, 381.6. (See p. 117.)

٣٧. وَمَاذَا يَدْرِي الشُّعْرَاءُ مِنِّي وَقَدْ جَاوَزْتُ حَدَّ الْأَرْبَعِينَ

37. M. III, 332.7; IV, 37.6.

(وَقَفْتُ فِيهَا أَصِيلًا نَأَسْأَلُهَا عَيَّتْ جَوَابًا وَمَا بِالرَّبْعِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ

(See 3.

٣٨. يَا دَارَ مَيَّةَ بِالْعَلْيَاءِ فَالْسَّنْدِ أَقَوْتُ وَطَالَ عَلَيْهَا سَالِفُ الْأَبَدِ

وَقَفْتُ فِيهَا أَصِيلًا نَأَسْأَلُهَا عَيَّتْ جَوَابًا وَمَا بِالرَّبْعِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ

إِلَّا أَوَارِي لَأَيَّا مَا أُبَيِّنُهَا وَالنُّؤْيُ كَالْحَوْضِ بِالْمَظْلُومَةِ الْجَلَدِ

38. K. I, 319.14–16; M. IV, 414.4–5: only the first and the second verses, أَصِيلًا, وَمَا بِالرَّبْعِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ; U. III, 275.10: only the second verse, أُعَيَّتْ, أَصِيلًا; and only the second verse, لَأَيَّا, in 292.4.

(يَخْدُو ثَمَانِي مَوْلَعًا بِلِقَاحِهَا حَتَّى هَمَمَنْ يَرْزُقُهُ الْإِزْتَاكِ

(See 7.

(يُذَكِّرُنِيكَ حَنِينُ الْعَجُولِ وَنُوحَ الْحَمَامَةِ تَدْعُو هَدِيلاً

(See 18.



# Index of Classical authors

Here is a list of the authors of the Classical period quoted in this study, sorted according to their date of death. The dates of death are quoted from Kaḥḥālāh (1957), Sezgin (1967–2010), and Brockelmann (1943–1949/1996). For simplicity's sake, only the most widely acknowledged date of death is mentioned when these authors are quoted in the text.

See below in the index of proper names, p. 344, the pages where these authors are quoted in the text.

## Authors of the I<sup>st</sup>/VII<sup>th</sup> century

al-ʿAṣṣā, Maymūn b. Qays (ʿAbū Baṣīr) (d. ca. 7/629)

al-ʿAjjāj, ʿAbd al-Lāh b. Ruʿbah (ʿAbū š-Šaʿtā) (d. between 86/705 and 96/715)

## Authors of the II<sup>nd</sup>/VIII<sup>th</sup> century

ʿAbū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlāʾ, Zabbān (or Zayyān or al-ʿUryān) b. ʿAmmār (d. 154/771 or 157/774)

al-Xalīl b. ʿAḥmad (ʿAbū ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān) al-Farāhīdī (d. 160/776 or 170/786 or 175/791 or 177/793)

Sibawayh, ʿAmr b. ʿUṭmān (ʿAbū Biṣr) (d. 180/796)

Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (ʿAbū ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān) (d. 182/798)

al-Kisāʾī, ʿAlī b. Ḥamzah (ʿAbū l-Ḥasan) (d. 189/805)

## Authors of the III<sup>rd</sup>/IX<sup>th</sup> century

aš-Šāfi‘ī, Muḥammad b. ‘Iḍrīs (‘Abū ‘Abd al-Lāh) (d. 204/820)

Qutrub, Muḥammad b. al-Mustanīr (‘Abū ‘Alī) (d. 206/821)

al-Farrā’, Yaḥyá b. Ziyād (‘Abū Zakariyyā’) al-‘Aslamī d-Daylamī (d. 207/822)

al-‘Axfāš al-‘Awsaṭ, Sa‘īd b. Mas‘adah (‘Abū l-Ḥasan) al-Mujāšī‘ī (d. 210/825 or 215/830 or 221/835)

al-Jarmī, Šālīḥ b. ‘Ishāq (‘Abū ‘Umar) (d. 225/839)

Ibn ‘Abī Šaybah, ‘Abd al-Lāh b. Muḥammad (‘Abū Bakr) (d. 235/849)

Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (‘Abū ‘Abd al-Lāh) aš-Šaybānī (d. 241/855)

Ibn as-Sikkīt, Ya‘qūb b. ‘Ishāq (‘Abū Yūsuf) (d. 243/857 or 244/858 or 246/860)

al-Mutawakkil ‘alā l-Lāh, Ja‘far b. al-Mu‘tašim (‘Abū l-Faḍl) (d. 247/861)

al-Māzinī, Bakr b. Muḥammad (‘Abū ‘Utmān) (d. 248/862 or 249/863)

al-Jāḥiḍ, ‘Amr b. Baḥr (‘Abū ‘Utmān) (d. 255/869)

Ibn Qutaybah, ‘Abd al-Lāh b. Muslim (‘Abū Muḥammad) ad-Dīnawarī (d. 270/883 or 271/884 or 276/889)

al-‘Azdī, ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ishāq (‘Abū ‘Ishāq) al-Qāḍī l-Baġdādī (d. 282/896)

al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd (‘Abū l-‘Abbās) aṭ-Ṭumālī l-‘Azdī (d. 285/898 or 286/899)

Ṭa‘lab, ‘Aḥmad b. Yaḥyá (‘Abū l-‘Abbās) aš-Šaybānī (d. 291/904)

Ibn Kaysān, Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad (or ‘Ibrāhīm) (‘Abū l-Ḥasan) (d. 299/912 or 320/932)

## Authors of the IV<sup>th</sup>/X<sup>th</sup> century

az-Zajjāj, ‘Ibrāhīm b. as-Sarī (‘Abū ‘Ishāq) (d. 311/923)

Ibn as-Sarrāj, Muḥammad b. as-Sarī (‘Abū Bakr) al-Baġdādī (d. 316/928)

al-Xayyāṭ, Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad (‘Abū Bakr) (d. 320/932)

- Ibn Mujāhid, ʿAḥmad b. Mūsā (ʿAbū Bakr) at-Tamīmī l-Baġdādī (d. 324/936)
- Ibn Wallād, ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) at-Tamīmī l-Miṣrī (d. 332/944)
- az-Zajjājī, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʾIṣḥāq (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) al-Baġdādī (d. 337/949 or 339/950 or 340/952)
- al-Fārābī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū Naṣr) (d. 339/950)
- al-Qālī, ʾIsmāʿīl b. al-Qāsim (ʿAbū ʿAlī) al-Baġdādī al-Qālī (d. 356/967)
- as-Sirāfī, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (ʿAbū Saʿīd) (d. 368/979)
- al-Baṣrī, ʿAlī b. Ḥamzah (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) at-Tamīmī (d. 375/985)
- al-Fārisī, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAḥmad (ʿAbū ʿAlī) l-Baġdādī (d. 377/987)
- az-Zubaydī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (ʿAbū Bakr) al-ʾIṣbīlī (d. 379/989)
- Ibn al-Warrāq, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (ʿAbū l-Ḥasan) al-Baġdādī (d. 381/991)
- al-Marzubānī, Muḥammad b. ʾImrān (ʿAbū ʿAbd al-Lāh or ʾUbayd al-Lāh) (d. 378/988 or 384/994)
- ar-Rummānī, ʿAlī b. ʾĪsā (ʿAbū l-Ḥasan) (d. 384/994)
- Ibn Jinnī, ʾUṭmān b. Jinnī (ʿAbū l-Faṭḥ) al-Mawṣūlī (d. 392/1002)

### **Authors of the v<sup>th</sup>/xI<sup>th</sup> century**

- ʿAbū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (d. c. 400/1010)
- Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. ʿAḥmad al-Fārisī l-ʾAndalusī (d. 456/1064)
- al-Xaṭīb al-Baġdādī, ʿAḥmad b. ʿAlī (ʿAbū Bakr) (d. 463/1071)
- al-Jurjānī, ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān (ʿAbū Bakr) (d. 471/1078)

### **Authors of the vI<sup>th</sup>/xII<sup>th</sup> century**

- az-Zamaxšarī, Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar (ʿAbū l-Qāsim) (d. 538/1144)

Ibn al-ʿAnbārī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-Barakāt Kamāl ad-Dīn) (d. 577/1181)

al-Suhaylī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (Abū al-Qāsim/Abū Zayd/Abū al-Ḥasan) l-Andalusī l-Ḍarīr (d. 581/1185)

Ibn Maḍāʿ, ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān (ʿAbū Jaʿfar/ʿAbū l-Qāsim/ʿAbū l-ʿAbbās) al-Qurṭubī (d. 592/1196)

### **Authors of the vii<sup>th</sup>/xiii<sup>th</sup> century**

Ibn Xarūf, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-Ḥasan) al-ʿIṣbīlī l-ʿAndalusī (d. 603/1206 or 605/1208 or 609/1212 or 610/1213)

Yāqūt b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (ʿAbū ʿAbd al-Lāh Šihāb ad-Dīn) al-Ḥamawī (d. 626/1229)

as-Sakkākī, Yūsuf b. ʿAbī Bakr (ʿAbū Yaʿqūb Sirāj ad-Dīn) al-Xawārizmī (d. 626/1229)

Ibn Yaʿīš, Yaʿīš b. ʿAlī (ʿAbū l-Baqāʾ Muwaffaq ad-Dīn) al-ʿAsadī (d. 643/1245)

Ibn Mālik, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Lāh (ʿAbū ʿAbd al-Lāh Jamāl ad-Dīn) al-Jayyānī (d. 672/1274)

Ibn aḍ-Ḍaʿī, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad (ʿAbū l-Ḥasan) al-ʿIṣbīlī (d. 680/1281)

al-ʿAstarābādī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (Raḍī ad-Dīn) (d. 684/1285 or 686/1287 or 688/1289)

### **Authors of the viii<sup>th</sup>/xiv<sup>th</sup> century**

Ibn Maḥdūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram (ʿAbū l-Faḍl Jamāl ad-Dīn) al-Xazrajī (d. 711/1311)

ʿAbū Ḥayyān, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (ʿAṭīr ad-Dīn) al-Ġarnāṭī l-ʿAndalusī (d. 745/1344)

al-ʿĪjī, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. ʿAḥmad aš-Širāzī (ʿAḍud ad-Dīn) (d. 756/1355 or 753/1352)

Ibn ʿAqīl, ʿAbd al-Lāh b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān (ʿAbū Muḥammad Bahāʾ ad-Dīn) (d. 769/1367)



---

**Authors of the IX<sup>th</sup>/XV<sup>th</sup> century**

Ibn Xaldūn, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad (‘Abū Zayd) (d. 808/1406)

**Authors of the X<sup>th</sup>/XVI<sup>th</sup> century**

as-Suyūṭī, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. ‘Abī Bakr (Jalāl ad-Dīn ‘Abū al-Faḍl) (d. 911/1505)



# Index of proper names

- ʾAbū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlāʾ (d. 154/771),  
 108, 109, 112, 339  
 ʾAbū Ḥayyān (d. 745/1344), 221,  
 227, 342  
 ʾAbū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d.  
 400/1010), 24, 341  
 ʾAbū Janāḥ, Š., 47, 237, 238  
 al-ʿAjjāj (d. 90/708), 92, 339  
 Anghelescu, N., 36, 47, 165  
 al-ʾAnṣārī, ʾA., 70  
 Aoun, Y., 197  
 al-ʾAʿšā (d. 7/629), 93, 339  
 al-Assyouti, N., 11  
 al-ʾAstarābādī (Raḍī ad-Dīn) (d.  
 686/1287), 22, 55, 63, 65,  
 99, 102, 122, 160, 342  
 al-ʾAxfāš al-ʾAwsaṭ (d. 215/830),  
 45, 48, 52, 65, 110, 131,  
 133, 135, 142, 177, 216,  
 219, 257, 264, 340  
 ʿAyd, M., 241  
 Ayoub, G., 26, 27, 39–41, 45, 71,  
 93, 106, 141, 155, 195,  
 203, 211  
 al-ʾAzdī (d. 282/896), 57, 340  
  
 Baalbaki, R., 12, 19, 23, 30, 31, 33,  
 34, 37, 38, 41–47, 49, 50,  
 52, 55, 60–64, 69–71, 78,  
 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88,  
 119, 145, 147, 175, 183,  
 191, 195, 199, 208, 210,  
 213, 219, 227, 238, 242  
 Badawi, el-S., 12  
 al-Baġdādī (ʾAbū ʿAlī), *see* al-Qālī  
 (d. 356/967)  
 al-Baġdādī (ʾAbū Bakr), *see*  
 al-Xaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d.  
 463/1071)  
 al-Baṣrī (d. 375/985), 237, 341  
 Beck, E., 22  
 Belguedj, M., 36, 62  
 Bernards, M., 56, 57, 60, 75  
 Bin ʿĀšūr, ʾA. Ḥ., 90, 91  
 Bjørnsnøs, A., 82  
 Blau, J., 102–104, 159, 169, 174  
 Bohas, G., 19, 21–23, 29, 32,  
 35–37, 48, 52, 57, 70, 71,  
 106, 242, 252, 260, 263,  
 282, 286  
 Broch, J. P., 22  
 Brockelmann, C., 339  
  
 Cannuyer, C., 11  
 Carter, M., 19, 21, 23, 30–36, 39,  
 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54,  
 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 70, 71,  
 78–80, 82, 89, 99, 141,  
 166, 194–196, 199, 203,  
 208, 209, 238, 241  
 Chairret, M., 147, 268  
  
 Ḍayf, Š., 22, 70, 241

- Derenbourg, H., 22, 95, 171, 191, 195, 196, 272  
 Dévényi, K., 21, 40–42, 66  
 Druel, J., 204
- Elamrani-Jamal, A., 50, 51  
 Elgibali, A., 12  
 Endreß, G., 50
- Fahmi, Kh., 12  
 al-Fārābī (d. 339/950), 57, 341  
 al-Fārisī (d. 377/987), 50, 56, 68, 341  
 al-Farrā' (d. 207/822), 40–42, 48, 50, 52, 66, 167, 257, 258, 260, 340  
 al-Fatli, 'A. H., 70, 102, 252, 263, 272  
 Ferrando, I., 178  
 Fleisch, H., 17, 30, 52, 99, 102–105, 110, 115, 116, 119, 122, 126, 129, 130, 132, 137, 145, 155, 166, 184  
 Frank, R., 26, 27, 54
- Gilliot, C., 62, 84  
 Goldziher, I., 22, 62  
 Gouttenoire, M.-A., 59  
 Guillaume, J.-P., 19, 21–23, 32, 35–37, 48, 49, 52, 57, 63, 70, 71, 242, 282, 286
- Haarmann, U., 62  
 al-Ḥadīṭī, X., 70, 89–91  
 Hārūn, 'A. S., 85, 86, 89, 283  
 Holzer, V., 11  
 Hopkins, S., 12  
 Howell, M., 17, 78, 87, 89, 101, 103, 114, 116, 119, 126, 127, 130, 134, 143, 149, 155, 158, 159, 163, 166, 169, 170, 172, 174, 179, 181, 183
- Humbert, G., 45
- ʿIbādah, M., 70, 87  
 Ibn ʿAbī Ṣaybah (d. 235/849), 340  
 Ibn al-ʿAnbārī (d. 577/1181), 22, 54, 60, 342  
 Ibn ʿAqīl (d. 769/1367), 52, 342  
 Ibn aḍ-Ḍāʿī (d. 680/1281), 89, 342  
 Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), 57, 340  
 Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), 55, 341  
 Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002), 32, 50, 54, 56, 57, 61, 69, 341  
 Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912), 50, 340  
 Ibn Maḍā' (d. 592/1196), 55, 342  
 Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274), 342  
 Ibn Maḍḍūr (d. 711/1311), 118, 221, 342  
 Ibn Mujāhid (d. 324/936), 57, 341  
 Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889), 62, 340  
 Ibn as-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), 241–268, 340  
 Ibn as-Sikkīt (d. 244/858), 175, 183, 340  
 Ibn Wallād (d. 332/944), 60, 75, 195, 237, 341  
 Ibn al-Warrāq (d. 381/991), 58, 341  
 Ibn Xaldūn (d. 808/1406), 63, 343  
 Ibn Xarūf (d. 609/1212), 89, 342  
 Ibn al-Xayyāt, *see* al-Xayyāt (d. 320/932)  
 Ibn Yaʿīś (d. 643/1245), 22, 99, 122, 342
- Ibrahim, Z., 12  
 al-ʿĪjī (d. 756/1355), 68, 342  
 Itkonen, E., 32  
 Iványi, T., 75
- al-Jāhid (d. 255/869), 57, 69, 340  
 Jahn, G., 122  
 al-Jarmī (d. 225/839), 45, 216, 340  
 Jumʿah, X., 70, 88  
 al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078), 23–25, 47, 68, 69, 341

- Kaḥḥālah, 'U., 50, 339  
 Kapeliuk, O., 59  
 Kazimirski, A., 115, 118, 221  
 al-Kisā'ī (d. 189/805), 183, 257, 258, 339  
 Košut, J., 22  
 Kouloughli, J. E., 19, 21–29, 32, 35–38, 43, 48, 52, 57, 70, 71, 282, 286, 301, 359  
 Krenkow, F., 22  
  
 Lambrecht, K., 260  
 Lane, E., 221, 229  
 Larcher, P., 38, 40, 64, 65, 69, 71, 85  
 Leech, G., 39  
 Levin, A., 32, 59, 83  
 Loucel, H., 54  
 Lyons, C., 260  
  
 Machuel, L., 22  
 al-Māḍī, S., 67, 288  
 Marogy, A., 38, 39, 47, 64, 71, 85, 145, 260  
 al-Marzubānī (d. 384/994), 34, 53, 341  
 Massignon, L., 47  
 al-Maxzūmī, M., 70  
 al-Māzinī (d. 248/862), 45, 53, 55, 56, 133, 233, 248, 262, 340  
 Moreh, Sh., 12  
 Mosel, U., 146, 153, 154  
 al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898), 213–239, 340  
 Muṣṭafā, 'I., 22  
 al-Mutawakkil 'alā l-Lāh (d. 247/861), 57, 340  
  
 Nakamura, K., 55  
 al-Nassir, A., 143  
  
 Owens, J., 19, 21, 23, 43, 52, 53, 59, 65, 66, 70, 71, 78, 202, 203, 230, 241, 249, 282, 288  
  
 Peled, Y., 12  
 Peters, J., 54  
 Peterson, D., 29, 30  
  
 al-Qāḍī, *see* al-'Azdī (d. 282/896)  
 al-Qālī (d. 356/967), 89, 341  
 Quṭrub (d. 206/821), 53, 55, 56, 340  
  
 Rabin, C., 205  
 Ratcliffe, R., 178  
 Reuschel, W., 22  
 ar-Rummānī (d. 384/994), 50, 55–57, 179, 341  
  
 as-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229), 69, 342  
 Sara, S., 85  
 Schoeler, G., 45  
 Seybold, C., 22  
 Sezgin, F., 339  
 aš-Šāfi'ī (d. 204/820), 62, 89, 340  
 Shakir, M., 82  
 Sibawayh (d. 180/796), 191–212, 339  
 Silvestre de Sacy, A.-I., 22  
 as-Sirāfi (d. 368/979), 22, 50, 51, 56, 138, 182, 197, 198, 201, 222, 341  
 al-Suhayli (d. 581/1185), 69, 342  
 Suleiman, Y., 49, 58  
 as-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), 53, 55, 242, 343  
 Szemerényi, O., 137  
  
 Ṭāhā, Z., 12, 19, 23, 66, 67, 71, 241, 247, 266, 282, 288  
 Ṭa'lab (d. 291/904), 238, 257, 259, 340  
 Talmon, R., 33, 163, 249, 260  
 aṭ-Ṭanāḥī, M., 86, 89, 91, 283

Troupeau, G., 52–55, 117, 143, 145

ʿUḍaymah, M., 70, 86, 89, 90, 138,  
159, 227, 237, 238, 272,  
283

Vernier, D., 22

Versteegh, K., 21, 23, 27–29, 31,  
32, 35–37, 41–44, 46,  
50–52, 56, 58, 59, 63, 66,  
68–71, 76, 106, 107, 145,  
146, 177, 206, 209, 228,  
264, 290, 292, 301, 359

Wallād, *see* Ibn Wallād (d.  
332/944)

Weil, G., 22

Weiß, J., 22

Wright, W., 17, 78, 87, 102, 109,  
115–117, 120, 131, 134,  
145, 149, 155, 164, 169,  
184

al-Xalīl b. ʿAḥmad (d. 170/786),  
22, 34, 54, 80, 108, 109,  
112, 114, 124, 141, 179,  
180, 204, 211, 221, 255,  
257, 339  
al-Xaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071),  
89, 341  
al-Xayyāṭ (d. 320/932), 50, 340

Yāqūt (d. 626/1229), 242, 342

Yāqūt, M., 70, 85

Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. 182/798), 96,  
136, 257, 339

az-Zajjāj (d. 311/923), 50, 340

az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949), 50, 52,

54–57, 179, 238, 341

az-Zamaxšarī (d. 538/1144), 22,  
51, 99, 122, 128, 131,

221, 341

az-Zubaydī (d. 379/989), 89, 341



# General index

Analogy (*qiyās*), 32, 43, 47, 55, 60,  
78, 93, 110, 129, 137, 175,  
177, 182, 192, 194, 195,  
199, 203, 207–212, 217,  
223, 225, 227–229, 237,  
238, 246, 248, 256, 274  
Annexational construction, 17, 18,  
119, 163, **166**, 168, 169,  
174, 176–178, 182–184,  
192, 198, 202, 203,  
207–209, 212, 233–234,  
236, 237, 239, 249, 250,  
254, 255, 257, 258, 260,  
265–267, 279, 280,  
285–288, 290, 297, 303,  
304, 361, 362  
Appositional construction, 18,  
163, **164–165**, 167, 169,  
173, 174, 176–178, 180,  
181, 183, 202, 208, 257,  
264, 266, 276, 280, 286  
ʿAṣl, pl. ʿuṣūl, 28, 44, 50, 60, 129,  
138, 139, 165, 166, 199,  
210, 217, 218, 223, 236,  
241, 242, 253, 263, 297  
*Bağdād*, 30, 52–54, 167, 176, 257,  
259  
*Banū Tamīm*, 179, 205, 234  
*Başrah* vs. *Kūfah*, 30, 32, 52, 54,  
60, 135, 174, 175, 183,  
219, 238, 248, 257, 258  
*Biḍʿah*, **149**, 290

Cardinal numerals  
‘Zero’, 102  
‘One’, 17, 79, 82, 87, 95, 96,  
102, 104, 116, 117, 128,  
129, 141, 143, 151, 153,  
155, 158, 160, 161, 163,  
169, 176, 177, 182, 216,  
223, 234, 236, 245, 274,  
275, 292, 293  
  ʾaḥad, 87, 95, 104, 109, 113,  
121, 122, 128, 129, 153,  
154, **158–161**, 177, 192,  
205, 206, 215, 216, 218,  
234, 244, 246, 275, 293,  
294  
  iḥdā, 96, 104, 109, 121,  
129, 153, 158, 205, 206,  
244, 274, 275  
  wāḥid, 17, 87, 102, 104,  
105, 113, 122, 129, 136,  
141, 143, 145, 153, 154,  
159, 163–165, 177, 217,  
245, 246, 274–276, 284,  
292  
  wāḥidah, 82, 104, 105, 122  
‘Two’, 17, 18, 77, 79, 88, 92,  
95, 97, 104, 107, 114,  
116, 124–126, 129, 130,  
133, 141, 143–145, 151,  
153–155, 161, 163, 169,  
177, 206, 214, 216, 236,



246, 273, 274, 292, 293,  
295, 297

*iṭnāni*, 17, 77, 81, 95, 112,  
114, 121, 124–126, 130,  
137, 141, 143, 153, 154,  
163, 164, 177, 205–207,  
210, 214, 220, 245, 246,  
264, 273, 276–278,  
292–295, 297

*iṭnatāni*, 17, 77, 114, 121,  
125, 177

*tintāni*, 92, 93, 114, 125,  
129, 130, 154, 177, 217,  
273

From ‘three’ to ‘ten’, 17, 18,  
79, 96, 98, 109, 126, 127,  
130, 141, 145, 149, 151,  
166, 169, 176–182, 192,  
193, 200, 201, 203, 204,  
207, 217, 218, 221–224,  
238, 245, 251, 254, 274,  
281, 289, 290

‘Three’, 17, 18, 79, 81–84,  
88, 95–98, 104, 107, 111,  
122, 124, 126–128, 130,  
133, 136, 139, 141–145,  
154, 155, 158, 165, 167,  
169–182, 193, 200, 203,  
214, 216, 217, 221–226,  
238, 245, 251, 260, 267,  
275, 290, 293–295, 297,  
298

‘Four’, 19, 81, 83, 84, 88,  
95, 98, 99, 101, 105, 111,  
112, 122, 124, 126, 127,  
132, 133, 139, 141, 143,  
154, 157, 164, 165, 170,  
171, 173, 193, 214, 215,  
238, 245, 274, 275, 285,  
293, 295, 297, 298

‘Five’, 79, 81, 84, 88, 92, 95,  
98, 99, 103, 105, 114,

122, 126, 129, 130, 132,  
141, 143, 144, 154, 155,  
157, 164, 165, 167, 170,  
171, 175, 176, 179–181,  
185, 192, 193, 200, 206,  
225, 244, 245, 251,  
257–262, 265, 266, 272,  
284, 285, 287, 293

‘Six’, 81, 83, 84, 99, 103,  
112, 117, 122, 165, 246,  
273, 274, 293, 297

‘Seven’, 99, 103, 108, 122,  
165, 174, 192, 245

‘Eight’, 81, 98, 101, 105,  
108, 109, 112, 114, 122,  
123, 140, 215, 245, 246,  
273, 275, 294

‘Nine’, 87, 103, 122, 136,  
295

‘Ten’, 88, 89, 103, 122, 127,  
133, 137, 138, 144, 173,  
178, 205, 207, 218, 221,  
223, 224, 235, 236, 238,  
251, 253, 254, 276, 280,  
281, 288, 293, 296, 297

Compound cardinals, 18, 19,  
43, 77–79, 81, 82, 89, 98,  
99, 103, 104, 113, 114,  
**119–121**, 126–128, 130,  
131, 133–135, 138, 139,  
142, 144–146, 149, 151,  
166, 167, 169, 170, 176,  
178, 182, 183, 192, 193,  
200, 201, 203–205, 207,  
209–211, 213, 215, 216,  
218–220, 222, 224–227,  
229, 235, 238, 239, 245,  
246, 253, 262–265, 267,  
273, 276–279, 281, 286,  
288, 294, 297, 299

‘Eleven’, 18, 81, 82, 103,  
120, 134, 151, 169, 175,

177, 182, 205, 207, 224,  
249, 254, 276

‘Twelve’, 18, 81, 89, 112,  
120, 126, 127, 131, 134,  
151, 169, 185, 200, 204,  
206, 207, 210, 211, 213,  
220, 221, 245, 253, 264,  
276–278

‘Eighteen’, 127, 131, 142

Decades, 18, 19, 79, 98, 99,  
111, 122, 126, 128, 131,  
136–138, 144–146, 151,  
154, 166, 170, 175, 176,  
181, 182, 200, 201, 203,  
210, 213, 214, 221, 222,  
224–226, 234–239, 253,  
254, 265, 267, 273–277,  
279, 281, 286, 295, 296,  
298, 299

‘Twenty’, 18, 44, 79, 84, 95,  
98, 99, 103, 111, 121,  
131, 136–138, 143–148,  
155, 158, 166, 174–176,  
178, 181, 182, 185, 194,  
195, 198–203, 208, 209,  
211, 212, 214–216,  
220–223, 225, 226,  
229–234, 236, 237, 243,  
246, 248, 252–255, 259,  
260, 265, 267, 273–275,  
278–280, 286, 287, 290,  
291, 296, 297

‘Thirty’, 81, 98, 104, 111,  
126, 131, 136, 137, 140,  
145, 176, 194, 201, 221,  
226, 231, 245, 295–297  
‘Forty’, 112, 137, 144, 221,  
296

‘Fifty’, 103, 137, 144

‘Sixty’, 95, 103, 113, 156

‘Seventy’, 86, 103

‘Eighty’, 93, 245

‘Ninety’, 103, 138, 253

From ‘twenty-one’ to

‘ninety-nine’, 79, 81, 87,  
107, 121–122, 132,  
149–151, 158, 181, 205,  
206, 226, 236, 274, 276

Hundreds, 18, 84, 87, 88, 95,

98, 99, 107, 109, 110, 113,  
117, 122, 126, 127, 132,  
137, 138, 144, 145, 151,  
154, 157, 158, 164–167,  
169, 170, 174–176, 178,  
181–184, 201, 203, 213,  
216, 221–224, 226, 233,  
235–237, 239, 245, 246,  
251, 252, 254, 255, 267,  
272–276, 279–281, 284,  
286, 288, 289, 293, 299

Complex numerals

‘Six hundred and  
fifty-one’, 184

Thousands, 18, 19, 91, 98,

102, 103, 108, 111, 115,  
122, 126, 132, 144, 145,  
151, 154, 166, 169, 170,  
174, 176, 178, 181–184,  
201, 203, 223, 224, 226,  
233, 235–237, 239, 251,  
252, 254, 258, 267,  
273–276, 279, 281, 286,  
289

‘One million’, 102

‘One milliard’, 102

Compensatory *nūn*, 98, 155, 199,  
200, 202–208, 210, 211,  
221, 222, 226, 234, 249,  
252, 267, 277, 278

Days of the week, 111, 113, 118,  
140, 141, 150–151, 192,  
214, 215, 244, 245, 292,  
296

*al-ʿAḥad*, 113, 118, 150, 292

- al-ʿArbiʿā*, 118, 140  
*al-It̤nāni*, 118, 140, 144, 150  
*al-It̤nu*, 151  
*aṭ-Ṭunayy*, 151  
*aṭ-Ṭalātā*, 118, 140  
*al-Xamīs*, 118, 150  
 Diminutive forms, 80, 81, 98, 108, 109, **110–113**, 121, 126, 136, 139–141, 149, 151, 172, 215, 243, 245, 246, 272, 274, 275, 284, 294, 295, 298  
 Diminutive forms built on ‘deflected’ numerals, *see* Numerals’ ‘deflected’ forms  
 Distributives, *see* Numerals’ ‘deflected’ forms  
 Fractions, **115**, 136, 139  
*al-Ḥijāz*, 85, 141, 205  
*Kam*, 83–84, 146, **147–148**, 192, 211, 215, 232, 244, 247, 255–258, 278, 279, 288, 290–293, 297  
*Kūfah*, *see* *Başrah* vs. *Kūfah*  
*Lafḍ*, pl. *ʿalfāḍ*, *see* Surface form  
*Maʿdul* numerals, *see* Numerals’ ‘deflected’ forms  
*Maʿnā*, pl. *maʿānī*, 23–29, 35, 37–43, 50, 52, 64, 65, 68, 69, 137, 158, 182, 219, 220, 229, 230, 234, 236, 247, 253, 256, 289, 292, 293, 297, 301, 359  
*Mubham* nouns, *see* ‘Unspecified’ nouns  
*Nayyif*, 149  
*Nisbah* forms, *see* Relative adjective forms  
 Numerals as proper names, 80, 109, 114, 121, 123, 140, **149–150**, 217, 219, 245, 275, 277, 294, 297, 298  
     *ʿArbaʿata*–*ʿAšar*, 149  
     *ʿArbaʿūna*, 149  
     *Ṭšrūna*, 149  
     *It̤nā*–*ʿAšar*, 80, 114, 149, 192, 204, 220, 246  
     *Miʿatu*, 123  
     *Sabʿah*, 149  
     *Sitt*, 149  
     *Ṭalāt*, 149, 217  
     *Ṭalāṭatu*, 123  
     *Ṭalāṭatun-Wa-Ṭalāṭūna*, 81, 132, 149, 150, 193, 274  
     *Wāḥidatu*, 123  
     *Xams*, 114, 149  
     *Xamsa*–*ʿAš(i)rah*, 114  
     *Xamsah*, 114  
     *Xamsata*–*ʿAšar*, 114, 149, 193, 204, 244, 246, 278  
     *Xamsata*–*ʿAšaru*–*Zaydin*, 150  
 Numerals’ ‘absolute’ meaning, 124, 126, **143–144**, 144, 151, 245, 274, 292, 295  
 Numerals’ ‘deflected’ forms, **116–118**, 124, 125, 141, 193, 215, 245, 246, 292, 296, 298  
     Their diminutive forms, 117, 118, 124–125, 149  
     Their relative adjective forms, 76, 117, 118, 276  
 Numerical verbs, 104, **105–108**, 138, 141–143, 154, 177, 201, 259, 267, 274, 293, 296  
     *wahḥada* (Form II), 106, 108

ʿawḥada (Form IV), 141, 285,  
 298  
   ṭannā (Form II), 106, 107  
   ṭalaṭa (Form I), 105  
   ṭallaṭa (Form II), 106–108  
   rabaʿa (Form I), 105, 139  
   rabbaʿa (Form II), 108  
   xamasa (Form I), 105, 106,  
 285, 293, 297, 298  
   xammasa (Form II), 142, 285,  
 298  
   sadasa (Form I), 105  
   tassaʿa (Form II), 107  
   ʿaššara (Form II), 107  
   ʿamʿā (Form IV), 102, 107,  
 214, 274  
   ʿallafa (Form II), 91, 107, 108,  
 214, 274  
   ʿālaḥa (Form IV), 90, 107, 214,  
 274  
*Nūn al-iṭnayni wa-l-jamīʿ*, see  
 Compensatory *nūn*  
  
 Ordinal numerals, 19, 101, 102,  
 106, 132, 134, 145, 150,  
 164, 167, 178, 183, 267,  
 274, 293  
   Units, 81, 82, 88, 102,  
 104–105, 106, 123, 132,  
 133, 136, 138, 139, 145,  
 150, 151, 154, 158, 161,  
 166, 169, 170, 177, 193,  
 198, 202, 210, 244, 274,  
 292, 293, 298  
   Compounds, 105, 119–121,  
 127, 133, 134, 139, 146,  
 167, 169, 207, 263, 267,  
 274, 277, 278, 293, 297,  
 299  
   Decades, 98, 99, 145, 154,  
 164, 295  
   Conjoined, 105, 121  
   Hundreds, 145, 276

Thousands, 145, 276

Predicative construction, 17, 18,  
 164, 165–166, 168, 169,  
 174, 176–178, 181, 182,  
 202, 208, 212, 264, 276,  
 280, 286

Relative adjective forms, 80, 81,  
 108, 113–114, 121, 149,  
 155, 173, 193, 205, 243,  
 246, 273, 275  
 Relative adjectives built on  
 ‘deflected’ numerals, see  
 Numerals’ ‘deflected’  
 forms

*Samāʿ*, 35, 47, 85, 238  
 Specifying construction, 18, 65,  
 77, 83, 128, 146–148,  
 164, 166–167, 168, 169,  
 174, 176, 178, 181, 192,  
 194, 198, 200, 202, 203,  
 207–212, 214, 221–224,  
 229–233, 235–239,  
 246–250, 255, 257, 258,  
 265–267, 277–280,  
 285–287, 289, 290, 292,  
 299, 303, 304, 361, 362  
 Surface form, 24–29, 35, 38–40,  
 43, 50, 56, 63–65, 68, 69,  
 172, 182, 218, 229, 230,  
 236, 237, 247, 254, 259,  
 289, 301, 359

*Tamīm*, see *Banū Tamīm*

*Tamīl*, 40, 41, 75, 106, 141, 298

*Tamyīz* in the dependent form,  
 see Specifying  
 construction

*Tamyīz* in the oblique form, see  
 Annexational  
 construction

---

*Taqdīr*, 28, 34, 41, 44, 45, 49, 55,  
148, 157, 229, 230, 253,  
256, 297, 299

‘Unspecified’ nouns, 145–146,  
148, 209, 211, 228, 231,  
235, 236, 239, 244,  
255–256, 264, 278–280,  
294–296



# List of tables

1	<i>Transliteration system</i> . . . . .	13
6.1	<i>Expression of the counted object</i> . . . . .	168
8.1	<i>Numerals in the Kitāb</i> . . . . .	193
9.1	<i>Numerals in the Muqtaḍab</i> . . . . .	216
10.1	<i>Numerals in the 'Uṣūl</i> . . . . .	246
11.1	<i>What happened to the issues treated in the Kitāb?</i> . . . . .	273
11.2	<i>Apparition of issues not treated in the Kitāb</i> . . . . .	275
11.3	<i>Issues not treated by our three authors</i> . . . . .	276





# Samenvatting

In deze studie heb ik drie Arabische grammaticale traktaten uit de eerste vier eeuwen A.H., Sībawayhs (st. 180/796) *Kitāb*, al-Mubarrads (st. 285/898) *Muqtaḍab* en Ibn as-Sarrājs (st. 316/928) *ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw*, vergeleken als bijdrage aan de studie van de plaats van de semantiek in hun grammaticale methode.

Uitgaande van een indeling van de verschillende betekenissen van het woord *maʿnā* 'betekenis' in de Arabische grammaticale traditie (Versteegh 1997b), heb ik vijf belangrijke domeinen van semantiek onderscheiden: intentioneel, communicatief, extra-linguistisch, cognitief, en formeel. Het doel van dit onderscheid was aan te tonen dat het te eenvoudig is te denken dat een semantische aanzet al of niet gevonden kan worden in deze grammaticale traktaten. Semantiek heeft veel dimensies, die, tezamen of apart, al of niet op kunnen treden.

Om dit doel te bereiken, heb ik mij gericht op de grammatica van de telwoorden, omdat deze een evidente semantische groep vormen en zich tegelijkertijd syntactisch zeer verschillend gedragen. Ik ging er daarbij van uit dat de manier waarop grammatici de telwoorden behandelen inzicht kan geven in de wijze waarop zij grammatica en syntaxis verbinden. De werkhypothese was dat de zoektocht naar consistentie in de grammatica van de telwoorden in de loop van de tijd verschoof van een functionele naar een formele benadering van de semantiek. Dit kwam overeen met een geleidelijke verschuiving van een psychologische naar een taalkundige benadering van het begrippenpaar *lafḍ/maʿnā* dat min of meer equivalent is aan het begrippenpaar 'signifier/signified' (Kouloughli 1985).

Na een bespreking van de literatuur met de nadruk op de rol van de semantiek in de Arabische grammaticale traditie (hoofdstuk 2), worden in hoofdstuk 3 tot 7 alle problemen met telwoorden in het Arabisch opgesomd, in de morfologie, de morfosyntaxis en de semantiek. Daarna heb ik bestudeerd

hoe elke grammaticus met telwoorden omgaat in zijn grammaticale systeem (hoofdstuk 8 tot 10). Tenslotte heb ik in hoofdstuk 11 de drie traktaten vergeleken op drie punten: het formele niveau (extent, inhoud, taalbeschrijving); de grammaticale methodologie; en het gebruik van elk van de vijf hoofddomeinen van de semantiek.

## Vergelijking op formeel niveau

Deze drie traktaten zijn vergelijkbaar wat betreft hun omvang, inhoud en focus. Zij vertegenwoordigen drie verschillende pogingen de taal van de Arabieren te verzamelen, te organiseren en te verklaren. Op formeel niveau zijn er verschillen tussen hen, maar dit doet geen afbreuk aan de gelijkenis. De *Kitāb* is veruit het grootste traktaat van de drie, maar het bevat niet zoveel onderwerpen gerelateerd aan de telwoorden als de twee andere. Paradoxaal zijn in de *Muqtaḍab* de meeste onderwerpen te vinden. Dit is paradoxaal omdat het de kortste van de drie traktaten in aantal woorden (de *Kitāb* is 60% langer dan de *Muqtaḍab* en 25% langer dan de *ʿUṣūl*).

Een opvallend verschil tussen de drie traktaten is hun gebruik van de linguïstische corpora, in het bijzonder de Qurʾān, poëzie en de gecanoniseerde taal van de Arabieren. Al-Mubarrad citeert veel meer Qurʾānverzen dan de andere twee grammatici, terwijl Ibn as-Sarrāj significant meer uitdrukkingen van de Arabieren citeert dan Sibawayh of al-Mubarrad. Deze constatering is overigens alleen gebaseerd op de citaten met betrekking tot telwoorden.

Voor wat betreft de grammatica van de telwoorden beschrijven de drie traktaten precies dezelfde fenomenen. Dit betekent dat de manier waarop het Arabisch telwoorden en hoeveelheden uitdrukt stabiel lijkt te zijn door de tijd heen. De verschillen die zij vermelden zijn betrekkelijk gering (bijvoorbeeld de mogelijkheid het telwoord met een lidwoord te verbinden of te gebruiken in een genitiefverbinding). Deze verschillen kunnen verklaard worden uit het verschillende theoretisch kader dat de grammatici gebruiken en houden waarschijnlijk geen verband met feitelijke taalvariatie.

## Vergelijking van de grammaticale methodes

Dit beeld contrasteert met de verschillen in methodologie. Het theoretisch kader waarbinnen Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad en Ibn as-Sarrāj de taalkundige fenomenen interpreteren verschilt aanzienlijk.

Gedurende de laatste veertig jaar is Sībawayh's methode uitvoerig bestudeerd. Mijn onderzoek bevestigt de belangrijkste conclusies van dit wetenschappelijk werk. Het meest opvallende kenmerk van Sībawayh's grammatica is dat hij streeft naar een diepgaande samenhang tussen de taalkundige fenomenen. Sībawayh aarzelt niet fenomenen met elkaar in verband te brengen die intuïtief als verschillend gezien worden, teneinde een samenhang te ontdekken en het aantal regels en categorieën te beperken. Het raamwerk waarin hij de taal onderzoekt bestaat uit een potentieel onbeperkte gradatie van rechten en krachten die woorden ten opzichte van andere woorden hebben. Sībawayh bekijkt eerst het moeilijkste geval (het feit dat sommige telwoorden niet gebruikt kunnen worden in een genitiefverbinding, zodat deze vervangen moet worden door een constructie als specifiek). Hij plaatst telwoorden op een schaal tussen *aṣ-ṣifāt al-muṣabbahah bi-l-fā'il* (de adjectieven met een syntactische valentie) en *ka-dā* (de constructie met het partikel *ka-*) en verfijnt hun relatieve positie ten opzichte van andere woorden door ze in verschillende contexten te vergelijken. Het resultaat van deze hoogst speculatieve methode is eenvoudig en homogeen: alle telwoorden gedragen zich op dezelfde wijze, maar dan wel op een dieper niveau.

Van de drie grammatici is de methode van al-Mubarrad waarschijnlijk het minst bestudeerd. Hij bespreekt meer problemen dan de andere twee grammatici, kennelijk zonder daarbij te streven naar volledige consistentie. De ontwikkeling van de *Kitāb* tot de *Muqtaḍab* is zeker geen kwestie van rationalisering of van pedagogische organisatie, maar meer een poging Sībawayh's beschrijving van de taal voort te zetten. In tegenstelling tot Sībawayh, die ernaar streefde de onderliggende consistentie van de taal te laten zien, ligt bij al-Mubarrad veel meer de nadruk op een uitputtende beschrijving. Voor hem staat het aanbrengen van een onderscheid gelijk aan het geven van een verklaring. Hij verdeelt telwoorden in elementaire en secundaire, en verfijnt dit onderscheid teneinde elke serie te verklaren. Het resultaat van deze veel minder speculatieve methode is enerzijds gecompliceerder en anderzijds oppervlakkiger dan dat van Sībawayh. Elke serie gedraagt zich verschillend en gehoorzaamt aan regels die alleen van toepassing zijn op een bepaalde set telwoorden en die daardoor gemakkelijker verklaard kunnen worden.

Ibn as-Sarrājs methode heeft meer aandacht gekregen, maar wellicht nog niet zoveel als zij verdient. Hij presenteert grammaticale zaken op systematische wijze, met gebruikmaking van syntactische, semantische en morfologische begrippen voor de verfijning van zijn indeling. Het doel van zijn systeem is kennelijk meer het organiseren van grammaticale problemen dan het vinden van grootschalige consistentie. Zijn 'uitputtende classificatie' (*taqāsim*) houdt in dat hij geen oog heeft voor zaken die dwars door de indeling

heen spelen. Hierdoor kan de indruk ontstaan dat hij genoeg neemt met het vinden van locale consistentie. Via een subcategorie die speciaal is ingericht voor telwoorden (*tamyīz al-'adad*) houdt Ibn as-Sarrāj zich met dezelfde vraag als Sibawayh en al-Mubarrad bezig (de semantische gelijkwaardigheid van annexerende en specificerende constructies en de complementaire distributie daarvan bij het uitdrukken van de getelde objecten). Wat waarschijnlijk nieuw is in Ibn as-Sarrājs aanpak is dat hij waar nodig het gebruik van semantische criteria om deze subcategorieën te onderscheiden niet afwijst. Het resultaat van deze systematische aanpak is een hoge graad van consistentie, maar alleen op lokaal niveau, d.w.z. alleen van toepassing op de telwoorden, waarbij het speculatieve aspect veel kleiner is dan bij Sibawayh.

De consequentie van deze verschillende methoden voor de grammatica van de telwoorden is aanzienlijk, niet zozeer wat betreft de taalkundige feiten zelf - immers, alle drie grammatici beschrijven dezelfde feiten -, maar wat betreft de verklaring en de organisatie van die feiten. Men zou kunnen zeggen dat in de *Kitāb* de syntactische en semantische relatie tussen de telwoorden en de getelde objecten functioneert als een gefossiliseerde subcategorie van *aš-šifāh al-mušabbahah bi-l-fā'il*. Al-Mubarrad is van mening dat telwoorden zich verschillend gedragen al naargelang de serie waar zij toe behoren. Ibn as-Sarrājs *ad hoc* categorie van numerieke *tamyīz* stelt hem in staat een hoge graad van consistentie tussen telwoorden te vinden, die per definitie niet geldt voor andere woorden.

## Vergelijking van de plaats van de semantiek

De plaats van de semantiek vormt de kern van het debat over de grammaticale methoden van de Arabische grammatici. Mijn studie heeft geen duidelijke aanwijzingen gevonden voor enige radicale omslag tussen Sibawayh, al-Mubarrad en Ibn as-Sarrāj, voorzover het de inbreng van de semantiek betreft. Men zou kunnen zeggen dat dit het gevolg is van de kleinere reikwijdte van het bestudeerde probleem, maar dit lijkt geen obstakel te zijn voor het begrijpen van de ontwikkeling van de grammatica, althans niet in de eerste eeuwen. Alle drie de grammatici moesten zich met semantische zaken bezighouden. Zij hebben gemeen dat zij extra-linguïstische [m. 7] en cognitieve [m. 9] semantiek als vanzelfsprekend beschouwen, zij vertrouwen alle drie op communicatieve semantiek (herformulering [m. 3], zinsmodaliteit [m. 5] en communicatief doel [m. 6]). Tenslotte maken zij alle drie in hun analyse gebruik van formele semantiek (onderliggende structuur [m. 13] en morfosyntactische betekenis [m. 14]).

Het is niet juist dat Sibawayh meer gericht is op de intentie van de spreker [m. 1] dan al-Mubarrad of Ibn as-Sarrāj, en het is evenmin juist dat zijn grammatica communicatiever zou zijn [m. 2.3.5.6], of dat al-Mubarrads en Ibn as-Sarrājs grammatica's formeler [m. 12–14] zouden zijn. Mijn conclusie is veeleer dat hun grammaticale methoden meer verschillen dan hun opvattingen over betekenis. De drie traktaten behandelen dezelfde semantische dimensies, maar zij dienen verschillende methodologische doeleinden. Het kwalificeren van een methodologische aanpak staat dus gelijk aan het ontdekken van de wijze waarop iedere grammaticus de verschillende semantische dimensies van taal integreert, als functie van zijn opvatting over de consistentie van de grammaticale regels.

Zo kan bijvoorbeeld niet gezegd worden dat de afwezigheid van de 'levende' aanpak van de grammatica in Sibawayhs *Kitāb* in al-Mubarrads *Muqtaḍab* en Ibn as-Sarrājs *ʿUṣūl* primair toegeschreven moet worden aan een gebrek aan aandacht voor de intentionele of communicatieve semantiek. Het heeft meer te maken met een radicale herschrijving van de problemen die zij behandelen, op een 'discrete' wijze in de *Muqtaḍab* en op een systematische wijze in de *ʿUṣūl*, terwijl in de *Kitāb* de zaken op een meer 'narratieve' wijze gepresenteerd worden.

Aan het begin van deze studie heb ik de hypothese geformuleerd dat de zoektocht naar consistentie in het hoofdstuk van de telwoorden in de loop van de tijd evolueerde van een functionele naar een formele benadering van de grammatica. Deze hypothese kon niet bevestigd worden omdat mijn data geen ondersteuning leveren voor het idee dat Sibawayhs zoektocht naar consistentie meer op communicatieve semantiek steunde dan die van latere grammatici, en omdat al-Mubarrads alternatieve aanpak niet een zoektocht naar consistentie in eigenlijke zin genoemd kan worden. Wel bevestigt mijn studie de stelling dat Ibn as-Sarrājs onderverdeling van syntactische categorieën gebaseerd was op formele semantische criteria.



## Jean N. DRUEL's résumé

jean@druel.com • +20 (0)12 27 33 55 40

Maṣnaʿ aṭ-Ṭarābiṣ Street, 1 • al-ʿAbbāsiyyah PO Box 18 • 11381 Cairo (Egypt)

Male • Single • Born Jan. 21, 1971 • French passport

### Education

Present	PhD student in Arabic linguistics. Radboud University, Nijmegen. Thesis: Numerals in Arabic grammatical theory: An impossible quest for consistency? Supervisor: Prof. Kees Versteegh.
2006	MA in teaching Arabic as a foreign language. American University, Cairo. Thesis: Emphatic sounds in educated Cairene Arabic: What to teach to AFL students. Supervisor: Prof. Zeinab Ibrahim.
2002	MA in Catholic theology and in Philology of the ancient Near East (Coptic section). Catholic University, Paris.
1993	École supérieure des sciences économiques et commerciales, Paris.

### Teaching experience

2010	Arabic teacher. Critical Language Scholarship (CLS) Summer Program, Cairo. Classes taught: MSA.
2006–2009	Arabic teacher. Département d'enseignement de l'arabe contemporain (DEAC), Cairo. Classes taught: Grammar (MSA). Aural media (MSA).
2007	Arabic teacher. Zuyd Hogeschool, Maastricht. (Fall Term). Classes taught: Grammar (MSA). Aural media (MSA). Translation (MSA).
2003–2006	Arabic teaching assistant. American University, Cairo. Classes taught: Grammatical drills (MSA).

### Academic publications

(Forthcoming)	The proper name <i>Aḥmar</i> : A morphological discussion in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> –4 <sup>th</sup> centuries AH. <i>Midéo</i> 29.
(Forthcoming)	How to deal with contradictory chapters in the <i>Kitāb</i> of Sibawayh? <i>Les Cahiers du Midéo</i> 6 (= <i>Islam, Christianity and citizenship. Festschrift offerts à Emilio Platti</i> ).
2007	Nisba. <i>Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics</i> . Ed. by Kees Versteegh. Vol. 3. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 377–381. Co-authored with René-Vincent du Grandlaunay.

Achevé d'imprimer en septembre 2012  
sur les presses de MG imprimerie  
Pernes-les-Fontaines, France  
Dépôt légal 3<sup>e</sup> trimestre 2012

ISBN 2-913593-46-1





In this study, we have compared three Arabic grammatical treatises from the first four centuries AH, Sībawayh's (180/796) *Kitāb*, al-Mubarrad's (285/898) *Muqtaḍab* and Ibn as-Sarrāj's (316/928) *ʿUṣūl fī n-naḥw*, in order to contribute to the study of the evolution of the place of semantics (intentional, communicative, extra-linguistic, cognitive, and formal) in their grammatical methods.

In order to reach this aim, we have focused on the grammar of numerals, because they present an obvious semantic unity and a great syntactic diversity.

The conclusion of our research is that their grammatical methods are much more discriminating than their stand towards the different dimensions of meaning. The three treatises deal with the same semantic dimensions, but they serve completely different methodological approaches, and different stands towards consistency of the grammatical rules.

If al-Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab* or Ibn as-Sarrāj's *ʿUṣūl* do not feature the same "lively" approach to grammar as Sībawayh's *Kitāb*, this is not primarily due to a lack of focus on intentional or communicative semantics, but to a radical reshaping of the issues dealt with, in a "discrete" way in the *Muqtaḍab* or in a systematic way in the *ʿUṣūl*, whereas in the *Kitāb* issues are presented in a more "narrative" way.

*Jean N. Druel is a researcher at the IDEO (Dominican Institute for Oriental Studies) in Cairo, Egypt.*