'Five' as a typological number in the medieval Arabic grammatical tradition

BEATA SHEYHATOVITCH (Tel Aviv University)

Abstract

In the Arabic grammatical tradition several categories comprising exactly five members can be found, e.g., the types of "meaningful things", of definite nouns, of *tanwīn*, of definite article, of *tawābiʿ* etc. Given the importance of the number 'five' in Islam, it is natural to ask whether these categorizations are affected by the symbolical meaning of that number. This article examines some of these categorizations in order to check the extent to which they are linguistically or theoretically justified, and whether they use 'five' as a typological number. In order to answer these questions, the fivefold divisions are tested for consistency and the surrounding discourse is investigated.

Key words: Medieval Arabic grammatical tradition, typological numbers, definiteness, *bayān*, *tanwīn*, *tawābiʿ*, *ʿaṭf al-bayān*

1. Introduction

Organizing material into short lists may be a powerful mnemonic and pedagogical tool, but in light of the frequent use of the specific number 'five' in Arabic grammatical litera- ture, we ask whether this particular number has a special meaning and what that meaning can be.

Various cultures ascribe symbolic and even magical significance to numbers. Numerical symbolism in monotheistic religions is probably related to the Pythagorean tradition, which holds that the cosmic order can be expressed by numbers. This tradition views odd numbers in general as auspicious (and even numbers as boding ill). In cultures influenced by this tradition, ritual acts and prayers are repeated an odd number of times.[1] Among various meaningful numbers, the number five is related to the pentagonal symmetry, to the five senses, etc. (although, unlike three and seven, five is not considered mysterious).[2]

---

[1] See SCHIMMEL 1993: 12-14.

[2] LAROCHE 1995: 571.

In Islamic tradition (influenced by Greek ideas), the number 'five' seems to have a special significance—particularly well-known are the five pillars of Islam and the five daily prayers. In Islamic jurisprudence there are *al-'aḥkām al-ḥamsa* 'the five qualifications', namely, *al-wājib* 'obligatory', *al-mustaḥibb* 'recommended', *al-mubāḥ* 'indifferent', *al-makrūh* 'reprehensible', and *al-ḥarām* 'forbidden'.[3] In Islamic theology there are *al-muġayyabāt al-ḥams* 'the five mysteries', a technical term denoting the five things known only to God. They are the hour of the Last Judgment; when rain will be sent down; what is in the womb (namely, the sex and number of children); the livelihood one will obtain on the morrow; and when one will die.[4]

'Iḥwān al-Ṣafā' 'The Brethren of Purity" (the authors of the encyclopedic *Rasā'il 'Iḥwān al-Ṣafā';* were active in Baṣra in the 10th century[5]) used numerical symbolism extensively, and seem to have given a special role to the number 'five': in their view, it signifies *ṭabī'a* 'Nature' (that can be divided into celestial nature and the four elemental natures);[6] the five senses correspond to the five types of Nature,[7] and also to the five moving planets.[8] In addition, 'Iḥwān al-Ṣafā' distinguish "five interior faculties".[9] Interestingly, Ibn Sīnā speaks of "five interior senses", in addition to the five "exterior senses".[10]

Given the above-mentioned evidence for the importance of the number 'five' in Islam, to which we add that in the Arabic grammatical tradition several categories comprising exactly five members can be found, it may be assumed that, at least in some cases, grammarians made efforts to organize the linguistic data into fivefold categories, the number 'five' being considered an auspicious number. In this article I will examine several such categorizations (the categorizations of "meaningful things", definite nouns, *tanwīn*s, definite articles and *tawābi'*), and discuss the question of the extent to which the divisions into five types are linguistically or theoretically justified in these cases, or whether the number 'five' is used typologically.[11]

---

3 SCHACHT 1960: 257. See LARCHER 1992: 363-365 for a pragmatic- and logic-oriented discussion of *al-'aḥkām al-ḥamsa.*

4 The editors of *EI²* 1993: 346-347.

5 See MARQUET 1971 for a discussion on *Rasā'il 'Iḥwān al-Ṣafā'.*

6 See NASR 1993: 51-52, 60-61 for a discussion.

7 *Ibid.*: 96.

8 *Ibid.*: 101.

9 See *ibid.*: 102 for a discussion.

10 See *ibid.*: 250 for a discussion.

11 The notion of typological numbers is widely used in Bible research—see, e.g., STONE 2011: 69 ff. CONRAD 1988 applies this notion to Islamic historiographical literature, claiming that some numbers are used there not in their literal sense, but "to express a general idea of magnitude, proliferation, or great extension" (*ibid.*: 45).

2. Five types of meaningful things

Al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 868/869) presents in his *Kitāb al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn* "the five modalities of clarity" (*'adawāt al-bayān al-ḥams*). *Bayān* (translated by Montgomery as "clarity"[12]) is a complex term, whose meaning varies from one source to another.[13] Al-Jāḥiẓ defines it as follows:

> Clarity is a noun which comprises everything which removes for you the headscarf [enveloping] the concept and tears down the veil [covering] the inmost mind, so that the auditor may attain its true reality and seize upon its product whatever that clarity actually is and no matter what type of sign is used[14] (*wa-l-bayānu smun jāmi'un li-kulli šay'in kašafa laka qinā'a l-ma'nā wa-hataka l-ḥijāba dūna l-ḍamīri ḥattā yufḍā l-sāmi'u 'ilā ḥaqīqatihi wa-yahjuma 'alā maḥṣūlihi, kā'inan mā kāna ḏālika l-bayānu wa-min 'ayyi jinsin kāna l-dalīlu*).[15]

From his study of *Kitāb al-Bayān*, Montgomery concludes that "for Jāḥiẓ, *bayān* is a two-way process in which both locutor and auditor participate, and to which they both contribute. […] His notion of *bayān* is not narrowly aesthetic, but is rather the heaven-sent gift of communication".[16] Indeed, "the five modalities of clarity" cover all imaginable types of communication:

> All varieties of signs, verbal and non-verbal, for concepts [amount to] five things, no less, no more: the first is the oral expression, then gesture, then counting, then writing, then the condition which is called location (*niṣba*). 'Location' is the signifying condition, which can take the place of those [other four] varieties and which is no less efficacious than those [other four] signs[17] (*wa-jamī'u 'aṣnāfi l-dalālāti 'alā l-ma'ānī min lafẓin wa-ġayri lafẓin ḥamsatu 'ašyā'a lā tanquṣu wa-lā tazīdu: 'awwaluhā l-lafẓu, ṯumma l-'išāratu, ṯumma l-'aqdu, ṯumma l-ḥaṭṭu, ṯumma l-ḥālu llatī tusammā niṣbatan. wa-l-niṣbatu hiya l-ḥālu l-dāllatu, llatī taqūmu maqāma tilka l-'aṣnāfi wa-lā taqṣuru 'an tilka l-dalālāti*).[18]

These modalities, save for the last one, are clear enough.[19] As for *niṣba*, it is one of the Arabic translations suggested for the Greek *to keisthai* (the other options were *waḍ'* and *mawḍū'*), one of the ten Aristotelian categories, that can be translated into English as "be-

---

[12] MONTGOMERY 2006: 103 ff.

[13] See BERNAND 1995 for a discussion on the term *bayān* in *'uṣūl al-fiqh*; MONTGOMERY (2006: 122-133) explores the concept of *bayān* in the Qur'ān and in al-Jāḥiẓ's view.

[14] This translation is taken from MONTGOMERY 2006: 127-128.

[15] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān* I: 76.

[16] MONTGOMERY 2006: 133.

[17] This translation is taken from *ibid.*: 128, with some slight changes.

[18] Al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān* I: 76. See RON-GILBOA (2017: 147-156), who, based on this fragment from *Kitāb al-Bayān* and discussions from *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān*, concludes that al-Jāḥiẓ views the entire universe as a "semiotic system", in which each phenomenon is a sign that can be deciphered by a careful observer.

[19] See MONTGOMERY 2006: 129-131 for a discussion.

ing-in-a-position".[20] According to al-Ǧāḥiẓ, this modality of clarity refers to phenomena of the natural world that can be interpreted, for instance, as signs of God's presence.[21] Montgomery claims that there was "an intellectual and polemical connection between the legal-theoretical *Risāla* ('Epistle') of Šāfiʿī and the *Bayān* of Ǧāḥiẓ"[22] (note that al-Šāfiʿī's *Risāla* also presents five *wuǧūh* 'modalities' of *bayān*,[23] and so does al-Ǧaṣṣāṣ' *Fuṣūl*[24]).

In the grammatical literature, traces of these ideas can be found in discussions of the definition of 'word' by Ibn Yaʿīš (d. 1245) and al-ʾAstarābāḏī (d. circa 1289).

At the beginning of his *al-Mufaṣṣal*, al-Zamaḫšarī (d. 1144) defines *kalima* 'word' as *al-lafẓatu l-dāllatu ʿalā maʿnan mufradin bi-l-waḍʿi* 'an expression unit that signifies by its coinage[25] a simple meaning'.[26] While explaining components of this definition, Ibn Yaʿīš notes that there are five types of "meaningful things" (*al-ʾašyāʾ al-dālla*): *al-ḫaṭṭ, al-ʿaqd, al-ʾišāra, al-nisba, al-lafẓ*[27] (the same categories mentioned by al-Ǧāḥiẓ).

Ibn al-Ḥāǧib (d. 1249) defines 'word' as *lafẓ wuḍiʿa li-maʿnan mufradin* 'an expression that was coined for a simple meaning'[28] (a definition that is very close to al-Zamaḫšarī's, which is to be expected, given the proven affinity between the latter's *al-Mufaṣṣal* and Ibn al-Ḥāǧib's *al-Muqaddima al-Kāfiya*[29]). Al-ʾAstarābāḏī explains this definition, and says that mentioning *lafẓ* is necessary because it excludes from the definition *al-ḫaṭṭ, al-ʿaqd, al-nisba* and *al-ʾišāra*, which may signify a simple meaning by their coinage, but cannot be considered words.[30]

---

[20] MONTGOMERY 2006: 128-129.

[21] See *ibid.*: 129-130 and RON-GILBOA 2017: 154-156 for a discussion.

[22] MONTGOMERY 2006: 102.

[23] See al-Šāfiʿī, *Risāla*, 14-21; see BERNAND 1995: 149-150 for a discussion. Al-Šāfiʿī's modalities are completely different from the categories mentioned by al-Ǧāḥiẓ; however, MONTGOMERY (2006: 131) links between al-Šāfiʿī's notion of *iǧtihād* and al-Ǧāḥiẓ's notion of *nisba* (the fifth modalities of clarity in their respective systems).

[24] Al-Ǧaṣṣāṣ (*Fuṣūl* II: 14-19) discusses al-Šāfiʿī's classification of *bayān* types. He also mentions (*ibid.*: 31) a classification similar to al-Ǧāḥiẓ's, attributing it to "one ancient scholar". See BERNAND 1995: 152 for a discussion.

[25] Coinage (*waḍʿ*) is an important term in Muslim philosophy, theology and jurisprudence. In the grammatical literature, it is particularly prominent in al-ʾAstarābāḏī's *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya*. Al-ʾAstarābāḏī (*Šarḥ* I: 21) explains the phrase "the coinage of a linguistic expression" (*waḍʿ al-lafẓ*) as "the first assignment of [a linguistic expression] to a meaning, with an intention that it will become conventional between people." An element's coinage determines its form, meaning, categorical identity, syntactic functions, etc. (although in actual use there can be certain deviations from those primary properties of the element). Al-ʾAstarābāḏī's theory of coinage is discussed in SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 84-127.

[26] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* I: 18. See GUILLAUME 2011: 51-53 for a discussion of al-Zamaḫšarī's definition (with a stress on its Aristotelian origin).

[27] Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* I: 19.

[28] Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 19.

[29] See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 1 for a survey of some opinions on this issue. GUILLAUME (2011: 56) views this definition as Ibn al-Ḥāǧib's version of "the standard definition".

[30] Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 22-23. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 84-87 for an additional discussion of al-ʾAstarābāḏī's definition of 'word'. See also GUILLAUME 2011 and LARCHER 2011.

Both Ibn Yaʿīš and al-ʾAstarābāḏī state that the function of the word *lafẓ* 'a [linguistic] expression' in the definition of 'word' is to exclude from it four other types of "meaningful things", including *ḫaṭṭ*. The distinction between *lafẓ* and *ḫaṭṭ*, or, in other words, between spoken and written language, is natural in a book of rhetoric and literary criticism such as al-Jāḥiẓ's (because rhetorical and stylistic devices used in oral speech may be different from those used in writing), but seems artificial in the context of a definition of 'word'. A word is a word no matter whether it is written or spoken, and any book of grammar is abundant with examples of written words that are referred to as words. Ibn Yaʿīš and al-ʾAstarābāḏī's attempts to exclude writing from the definition of *kalima* are therefore very surprising. These attempts may be explained by the influence of al-Jāḥiẓ and/or by the importance of the number 'five'.[31]

3. Five types of definite nouns

Starting with Sībawayhi (d. 796), most Arabic grammarians speak of five categories of definite nouns; however, some of them have difficulty with fitting the relative pronouns into this model.

Sībawayhi's categorization is as follows:

> Definite nouns are five things: nouns that are proper nouns; nouns that are annexed to definite nouns, if you do not have in mind the idea of *tanwīn*, (i.e., if the annexation is real); [nouns prefixed by] the definite article; vague nouns; personal pronouns (*al-maʿrifatu ḫamsatu ʾašyāʾa: al-ʾasmāʾu llatī hiya ʾaʿlāmun ḫāṣṣatun wa-l-muḍāfu ʾilā l-maʿrifati ʾiḏā lam turid maʿnā l-tanwīni, wa-l-ʾalifu wa-l-lāmu wa-l-ʾasmāʾu l-mubhamatu wa-l-ʾiḍmāru*).[32]

Sībawayhi explains that 'vague nouns' are demonstrative pronouns (*ʾasmāʾ al-ʾišāra*), that are definite because they are used to point at a thing to the exclusion of the rest of its kind.[33] Al-Mubarrad (d. 899/900), Ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 929),[34] al-Zajjājī (d. 948/949/950), Ibn Jinnī (d. 1002), and Ibn al-ʾAnbārī (d. 1119) mention the same five categories[35] (although Ibn Jinnī

---

31 Interestingly, a similar fivefold division of meaningful things appears in al-Suhaylī's *Natāʾij al-fikr fī l-naḥw* in a discussion of *ʾan al-mufassira*. Al-Suhaylī refers to them as *kalām al-nafs* 'the speaking of the self'. See SADAN (forthcoming), Section 3.3 for a discussion of the relevant excerpt.

32 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I: 187. See MAROGY 2010: 99-149 for a pragmatics-oriented discussion on the notion of definiteness in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.

33 Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I: 187-188. SAKAEDANI (2019: 236-237) notes that Sībawayhi does not mention relative pronouns in this list, but does include them with demonstratives in the category of *al-ʾasmāʾ al-mubhama* (which she translates as "ambiguous nouns") in *Bāb taḥqīr al-ʾasmāʾ al-mubhama* 'The chapter on the diminutive forms of the vague nouns' (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* II: 141-142). She concludes that he found similarities between demonstratives and relatives, although he did not express them clearly.

34 See SAKAEDANI 2019: 237-240 for a discussion on al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj's categorizations.

35 Al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* IV: 276; Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* I: 143; Ibn Jinnī, *Lumaʿ*, 159-167; al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 27, 192; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 341-342.

in *Kitāb al-Lumaʿ* uses the term *ʾasmāʾ al-ʾišāra* instead of *mubhamāt*[36]). The order of categories (and, correspondingly, the hierarchy of definite nouns) varies from one author to another.[37]

Al-Zamaḫšarī seems to be the first grammarian who explicitly included the relative pronouns in the category of *mubhamāt*, together with demonstratives, in the context of discussing definite nouns. His list of categories is: "proper nouns" (*al-ʿalam al-ḫāṣṣ*), "personal pronouns" (*al-muḍmar*), "vague nouns, that include two things: demonstrative pronouns and relative pronouns" (*al-mubham wa-huwa šayʾāni ʾasmāʾu l-ʾišārati wa-l-mawṣūlātu*), "[nouns] prefixed by the definite article" (*al-dāḫil ʿalayhi ḥarfu l-taʿrīfi*), "nouns annexed in a real annexation to one of these [types of nouns]" (*al-muḍāf ʾilā ʾaḥadi hāʾulāʾi ʾiḍāfatan ḥaqīqiyyatan*).[38] Ibn Yaʿīš explains that the principal difference between *mubham* and *muḍmar*, vague and pronominalized constituents, is that a vague constituent is elucidated by a constituent that follows it, whereas a 3rd person pronoun is elucidated by a constituent that precedes it, i.e., by its antecedent.[39]

Ibn ʿUṣfūr (d. 1271) presents the following five categories of definite nouns: personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, proper nouns, nouns prefixed by the definite article, nouns annexed to definite nouns in a real annexation. He includes relative pronouns in the category of nouns preceded by the definite article, stating: *fa-ʾammā l-mawṣūlātu fa-min qabīli mā ʿurrifa bi-l-ʾalifi wa-l-lāmi*, but mentions a controversy related to the question of whether they are made definite by an overt article or an intended one.[40]

Ibn ʿUṣfūr presents two different opinions: according to ʾAbū ʿAlī l-Fārisī (d. 987), relative pronouns "are definite by the previous knowledge (i.e., by virtue of information that is known equally to the speaker and the addressee), represented by the relative clause" (*taʿarrafat bi-l-ʿahdi llaḏī fī l-ṣilati*). According to ʾAbū l-Ḥasan al-ʾAḫfaš (d. 825-835), relative pronouns are definite due to the definite article. The former opinion is supported by the fact that some relative pronouns come without the definite article (for instance, *mā* and *man*). The latter is supported by the claim that definiteness can exist only with the definite article or annexation, while the case of *mā* and *man* is explained by analogy to *saḥar* 'this dawn': if the latter refers to the dawn of the day on which the utterance is produced, it is considered as definite (and thus is diptote), but comes without the definite article, due to *ʿadl* 'anomaly'.[41] The view that *allaḏī* etc. are definite due to the definite article may be challenged by the claim that some relative pronouns can create annexation structures, but the answer would be that when functioning as an annexed

---

36 Ibn Jinnī, *Lumaʿ,* 159.

37 See GÄTJE 1970, GABUČAN 1972: 40-41, and MAROGY 2010: 117-123 for a discussion of some of such categorizations.

38 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* V: 85.

39 *Ibid.*: 86. This excerpt is discussed in GÄTJE 1970: 234-235 (GÄTJE translates *mubham* as "unbegrenzt"). See also SAKAEDANI 2019: 240-242.

40 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 148.

41 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II: 237; see SHEYHATOVITCH 2016: 316 for an analysis of al-ʾAstarābāḏī's discussion on *saḥar*. See CARTER 1981: 76, 79 for a discussion of 'anomaly' as a factor "preventing full declinability" (as formulated in CARTER 1981: 74).

element, the relative pronoun is definite due to the annexation, and its original definiteness is ignored.[42]

Al-'Astarābāḏī, similarly to Ibn Yaʿīš, regards relative pronouns, together with demonstrative pronouns, as *mubhamāt*,[43] but explains the reason for their definiteness differently: he does not consider them as definite due to the definite article (he says that their definiteness resembles that of nouns preceded by *al-*,[44] implying that it is not the same). Also, he does not accept the view that the relative pronoun is definite due to the relative clause: he argues that if the relative clause could render other constituents definite, it should also have rendered definite the noun *rajul* in the sentence *jāʾanī rajulun ḍarabtuhu* 'A man whom I hit came to me".[45] So what is al-'Astarābāḏī's explanation for the relative pronoun's definiteness?

> The definiteness of the relative pronoun is due to its coinage as a definite noun that is used to refer to a thing known to the speaker and the addressee, [whereas the common knowledge regarding that thing is] the content of the relative clause [that follows that pronoun] (*taʿrīfu l-mawṣūli bi-waḍʿihi maʿrifatan mušāran bihi ʾilā l-maʿhūdi bayna l-mutakallimi wa-l-muḫāṭabi bi-maḍmūni ṣilatihi*).[46]

In other words, the definiteness of *allaḏī* should be explained by the hypothetical coiner's intention rather than by a formal factor.

To sum up, the above-mentioned grammarians accept the fivefold division of definite nouns, although some of them obviously struggle to find a right place for relative pronouns within their categories. Hence it is not surprising that some grammarians challenged the accepted categorization and treated relative pronouns as a separate category.

Ibn Mālik (d. 1274) presents the definite nouns as follows:

> *wa-ġayruhu maʿrifatun ka-hum wa-ḏī / wa-hinda wa-bnī wa-l-ġulāmi wa-llaḏī*

> And the other nouns (i.e., that differ from indefinite nouns mentioned beforehand) are definite, like *hum* 'they', *ḏī* 'this (fem.)', / Hind, *ibnī* 'my son', *al-ġulām* 'the servant', and *allaḏī*[47]

Ibn ʿAqīl (d. 1367) in his commentary of this verse explicitly speaks of six types of definite nouns: *al-muḍmar* 'personal pronouns', *ism al-'išāra* 'demonstrative pronouns', *ʿalam* 'proper nouns', *al-muḥallāt bi-l-'alif wa-l-lām* '[nouns] provided with a definite article', *al-mawṣūl* 'relative pronouns', *mā ʾuḍīfa ʾilā wāḥidin minhā* '[nouns] that are annexed to one of [these types of definite nouns]'.[48]

---

42 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* II: 237-238.

43 See al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* III: 240.

44 See, e.g., *ibid.* II: 312.

45 *Ibid.* III: 8.

46 *Ibid*.

47 Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ* I: 87.

48 *Ibid.* – See also SAKAEDANI 2019: 243-244. – SAKAEDANI (*ibid.*: 245-246) analyzes Ibn Hišām's categorization of definite nouns, which is also sixfold.

4. Five types of *tanwīn*

Some grammarians distinguished between five types of *tanwīn*, perhaps in order to match the five categories of definite nouns.[49] Sībawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj do not treat various functions of *tanwīn* systematically (though they occasionally mention them in their discussions). Al-Zajjājī in *al-ʾĪḍāḥ* speaks of three functions of *tanwīn*:[50]

(1) It may mark the distinction between *mutamakkin* (lit. 'powerful; established', fully declinable)[51] and light constituents, on the one hand, and heavy constituents that are not fully declinable, on the other hand;[52]

(2) It may serve as compensation (*ʿiwaḍ*) for an omitted part of the word—for example, the form *jawārin* 'female slaves' is derived from a supposed original form **jawāriyu* in *rafʿ* or **jawāriyi* in *jarr*; the sequences -*iyu* and -*iyi* are considered "heavy", and therefore *yāʾ* becomes quiescent; then the pattern of the word becomes deficient, and the word is joined by a compensating *tanwīn*, becoming **jawāriyn*, and then the *yāʾ* is omitted, because it is a quiescent letter followed by a vowelless *nūn*. This is the process by which the form *jawārin* is obtained.[53] Al-Zajjājī uses this as a central example in his discussion on "a compensating *tanwīn*", as its *tanwīn* is clearly unrelated to *tamakkun* because the word is diptote by its pattern.

(3) It may make it possible to distinguish between definite and indefinite states in proper nouns and interjections whose ending is usually left unchanged. For instance, the proper noun ʿAmrawayhi retains its ending as long as it is used as semantically definite, but once it becomes semantically indefinite (namely, when it is used to signify a class of objects[54]), the proper noun takes a *tanwīn* to signify that it is used as an indefinite noun. For instance, *hāḏā ʿamrawayhi wa-marartu bi-ʿamrawayhin ʾāḫara* 'This is ʿAmrawayhi and I passed by another [man named] ʿAmrawayhi'.[55]

---

49 See GABUČAN 1972: 55-56 for a discussion of al-ʾUšmūnī's (d. 1464) view of *tanwīn* as an indefinite article, and of modern linguists who adopted this view. AYOUB (1991: 169 ff.) examines this view, and concludes that it is insufficient as an explanation of all appearances of *tanwīn*, given that proper nouns such as Zayd take *tanwīn* despite their semantic definiteness. She offers a more complicated explanation for the *tanwīn* function: it is related to the nominality of the noun in different modules (the module of logical form, the module of cases and the syntactic module). See *ibid.*: 207-209 for a discussion.

50 The following excerpt is translated and discussed also in VERSTEEGH 1995: 168-176.

51 *Mutamakkin* is an active participle derived from the term *tamakkun*, which, in DANECKI's (2009: 431) words, "is used for a general grammatical and semantic category indicating the ability of words to be inflected and perform various grammatical functions". See AYOUB 2018: 33, fn. 44 for a survey of various translations offered by modern scholars for this term. AYOUB (2009: 443), AYOUB (2018: 37), and DANECKI (2009: 431) relate the notion of *tamakkun* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* to the notions of heaviness/lightness. In AYOUB's (2018: 38) words, "the notion of *tamakkun* refers to mobility in syntactic position, semantic mobility, morphological flexibility, and wide referential capability".

52 Al-Zajjājī, *ʾĪḍāḥ*, 97.

53 *Ibid.*: 97-98.

54 See MAROGY 2009: 115 ff. for a discussion of cases when proper nouns "lose their specific character and become applicable to each member of a whole class so named".

55 Al-Zajjājī, *ʾĪḍāḥ*, 98-99. AYOUB (2009: 443) notes that Arab grammarians usually analyze the *tanwīn* of *ʾibrāhīmin* in *marartu bi-ʾibrāhīma wa-ʾibrāhīmin ʾāḫara* as *tanwīn al-tamakkun* (and points out that

Al-Zamaḫšarī is probably the first grammarian to speak of five types of *tanwīn*. They are the following:

(1) *Al-dāll ʿalā l-makāna* 'signifying the status'. According to Ibn Yaʿīš, this type of *tanwīn* signifies that the noun retains its nominal status, becoming neither like a particle (which would render the noun *mabnī*) nor like a verb (which would render the noun diptote).[56] This type of *tanwīn* parallels the first type mentioned by al-Zajjājī.

(2) *Al-fāṣil bayna l-maʿrifa wa-l-nakira* 'distinguishing between the definite and indefinite [noun]'.[57] This parallels the third type mentioned by al-Zajjājī.

(3) *Al-ʿiwaḍ min al-muḍāf ʾilayhi* 'compensation for an [omitted] governed element'. Unlike al-Zajjājī, who concentrates on the morphophonological aspects of the phenomenon and speaks of "compensating *tanwīn*" in relation to words whose third root consonant is *wāw* or *yāʾ*, al-Zamaḫšarī and Ibn Yaʿīš speak here about forms such as *yawmaʾiḏin* 'that day', where, according to Ibn Yaʿīš, the *tanwīn* compensates for an omitted clause (or clauses). For instance, Q 99:1-4: *ʾiḏā zulzilat-i l-ʾarḍu zilzālahā wa-ʾaḫrajat-i l-ʾarḍu ʾaṭqālahā wa-qāla l-ʾinsānu mā lahā yawmaʾiḏin tuḥaddiṯu ʾaḫbārahā* 'When earth is shaken with a mighty shaking and earth brings forth her burdens, and Man says, "What ails her?", upon that day she shall tell her tidings'. The reconstructed original structure is: *…yawmaʾiḏin tuzalzalu l-ʾarḍu zilzālahā wa-tuḫriju l-ʾarḍu ʾaṭqālahā wa-yaqūlu l-ʾinsānu mā lahā…* 'Upon the day when earth is shaken with a mighty shaking and brings forth her burdens, and Man says, "What ails her?", [she shall tell her tidings]'.

The three clauses that should have functioned as a governed element of the first word were omitted, and the *tanwīn* took their place. The form should have been **yawmaʾiḏn*, and a *kasra* was added after the *ḏāl* to prevent a sequence of two vowelless consonants.[58]

(4) *Al-nāʾib manāb ḥarf al-ʾiṭlāq* "[*tanwīn*] that takes the place of the long vowel of a loose rhyme".[59] Traditional Arabic poetic theory recognizes two types of rhyme (*qāfiya*), *muqayyada* 'fettered' and *muṭlaqa* 'loose'. In the former, the rhyme consonant is not followed by a letter of prolongation. In the latter, a letter of prolongation is attached. Various types of rhyme where the rhyme consonant is followed by a short vowel and a vowelled or quiescent *hāʾ* are also called 'loose rhyme'.[60] So al-

---

classifying the *tanwīn*s of *ʿamrawayhin* and of *ʾibrāhīmin* as belonging to two different categories is somewhat problematic—see *ibid.*: 445). It can be concluded that *tanwīn* as a marker of indefinite nouns (widely known as *tanwīn al-tankīr*) is irrelevant for originally diptote proper nouns that receive *tanwīn* due to their semantic indefiniteness. That is because once *ʾibrāhīm* ceases to be semantically definite, it ceases to behave as a diptote proper noun, behaving instead as a regular triptote noun. Consequently, it is appropriate for it to take *tanwīn al-tamakkun*.

56 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* IX: 29. See AYOUB 2009: 443 for a discussion of this excerpt.

57 See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* IX: 29-30 for a discussion.

58 *Ibid.*: 30. See *ibid.*: 31-33 for additional examples.

59 *Ibid.*: 29.

60 See BONEBAKKER 1978: 412.

Zamaḫšarī speaks here of a *tanwīn* used instead of a vowel prolongation at the end of poetry verses, a practice characteristic of Banū Tamīm's recitation.

(5) *Al-tanwīn al-ġālī* 'extravagant *tanwīn*[61]' that joins only a 'fettered' rhyme.[62]

Interestingly, al-Zamaḫšarī presents *tanwīn* as one of the "exclusive attributes" (*ḫaṣāʾiṣ*) of a noun[63] (which does not prevent him from distinguishing five types of *tanwīn*, including those peculiar to poetry, that can also join verbs). Ibn Yaʿīš notices this theoretical difficulty, and resolves it by explaining that when speaking of a *tanwīn* as an exclusive attribute of a noun, al-Zamaḫšarī has in mind *tanwīn al-tamkīn* only (called *al-dāll ʿalā l-makāna* by al-Zamaḫšarī), which indeed is attached only to nouns, in order to distinguish between those that are fully declinable and those that are not. Ibn Yaʿīš says that al-Zamaḫšarī could not have meant "an absolute *tanwīn*" (*muṭlaq al-tanwīn*, i.e., *tanwīn* in general), as this category includes also *tanwīn al-tarannum* that can also join verbs.[64]

After explaining the first three types of *tanwīn* mentioned by al-Zamaḫšarī, Ibn Yaʿīš states that the fourth type is *tanwīn al-tarannum*, which appears only in poetry and is related to rhyme[65] (in Ayoub's words, it is used "so as to produce a musical effect"[66]). *Nūn* can replace letters of prolongation, which it resembles, being a nasal consonant. *Tanwīn al-tarannum* can, in turn, be divided into two types: a *tanwīn* that makes the verse's structure and pattern complete, and a *tanwīn* that is added after all parts of the verse are present. The former is added in a loose rhyme, the latter in a fettered rhyme. The two types of *tanwīn al-tarannum* correspond to al-Zamaḫšarī's fourth and fifth types. Ibn Yaʿīš criticizes al-Zamaḫšarī for classifying those as two separate types of *tanwīn*, and also for omitting another type—*tanwīn al-muqābala* '*tanwīn* of comparison'. This *tanwīn* is added to proper nouns that have the form of the sound feminine plural. For instance, Muslimāt, when functioning as a feminine proper noun, is expected to be diptote (like any feminine proper noun); however, it takes a *tanwīn*, to match the *nūn* of the ending of sound masculine plural forms, such as *muslimūna*.[67]

To sum up, Ibn Yaʿīš recognizes the following five types of *tanwīn*: *li-l-farq bayna mā yanṣarifu wa-mā lā yanṣarifu*, *al-dāll ʿalā l-nakira*, *tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ*, *tanwīn al-tarannum*, *tanwīn al-muqābala*.[68] It seems that he chose to join the two types of rhyme-related *tanwīn*s under the title *tanwīn al-tarannum* in order to maintain the fivefold categorization.

Ibn ʿUṣfūr presents the same five types: *tanwīn li-l-tamakkun*, *tanwīn al-tankīr*, *tanwīn al-muqābala*, *tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ* (unlike al-Zamaḫšarī and Ibn Yaʿīš, he mentions in this context both cases like *yawmaʾiḏin* and cases like *jawārin*), *tanwīn al-tarannum* (he mentions

---

61 CARTER (1981: 20) translates the term in al-Širbīnī's work as "metrical extravagance".

62 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* IX: 29.

63 *Ibid.* I: 24. *Ḫāṣṣa* 'property/exclusive attribute' is one of the five important general terms in logic. See SHEYHATOVITCH, forthcoming, for a discussion of the term's use by al-ʾAstārābāḏī.

64 Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* I: 25.

65 *Ibid.* IX: 33.

66 AYOUB 2009: 443.

67 See Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* IX: 34 for a detailed discussion.

68 See AYOUB 1991: 153-155 for a discussion of four types of *tanwīn* (excluding *tanwīn al-tarannum*).

only the case of loose rhymes, i.e., the first of the two cases mentioned by Ibn Yaʿīš); he stresses that all types except for the last-mentioned one join only nouns.[69]

Al-ʾAstarābāḏī deals with *tanwīn* in a chapter dedicated to "the exclusive attributes of a noun" (*ḫawāṣṣ al-ism*).[70] He mentions the same five types of *tanwīn*, distinguishing from the outset between *tanwīn al-tarannum*, that can join various constituents, and the other four types, that are added to nouns only.[71] Unlike the grammarians we mentioned before, who limit *tanwīn al-tankīr* to certain proper nouns and interjections, al-ʾAstarābāḏī says that the ending of the proper nouns in *rubba ʾaḥmadin wa-ʾibrāhīmin* 'many men named ʾAḥmad and ʾIbrāhīm' is not only the marker of indefiniteness, but also a marker of establishment,[72] which is the case also with the ending of *rajulun* 'a man', since there are particles/morphemes (*ḥarf*) that perform two functions simultaneously. If *rajulun* functions as a proper noun, its *tanwīn* should be construed as a marker of establishment only.[73]

Al-ʾAstarābāḏī's discussion of *tanwīn al-muqābala* is relatively detailed and complicated. He does not limit this type of *tanwīn* to proper nouns, but notes that the fact that it is retained in proper nouns, e.g., in Q 2:198 *min ʿarafātin* 'from ʿArafāt', proves that it is not a marker of establishment (since proper nouns that are feminine by form or meaning should be diptote) nor of indefiniteness (because proper nouns are definite).[74] However, his final conclusion is that it is "[a marker] of full declension and establishment" (*li-l-ṣarf*[75] *wa-l-tamakkun*). At this point he needs to explain why this *tanwīn* is not omitted in *min ʿarafātin*. His explanation is as follows:

> If [the *tanwīn*] was omitted, it would have been followed by the *kasra* in the omission, and the *naṣb* would have followed [the omitted *kasra*]. That would have differed from the usual state of affairs in the sound plural, where the *kasra* is followed by others, instead of following others (*li-ʾannahu law saqaṭa la-tabiʿahu l-kasru fī l-suqūṭi, wa-tabiʿa l-naṣbu, wa-huwa ḫilāfu mā ʿalayhi l-jamʿu l-sālimu ʾiḏ-i l-kasru fīhi matbūʿun lā tābiʿun*).[76]

In other words, if *ʿarafāt* had been a diptote noun, it would not have taken *kasra*, as a consequence of its not receiving a *tanwīn*.[77] Thus, its ending in *jarr* would have become identical to its ending in *naṣb*, which should not happen in the sound plural, in which

---

69 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 36-40.

70 See al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 43-50.

71 *Ibid.*: 45-49.

72 *Ibid.*: 45. In such cases, the Arab grammarians usually view the *tanwīn* as a marker of establishment—see fn. 55 above.

73 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 45.

74 *Ibid.*: 46.

75 See ÅKESSON 2009 for a discussion of the term *ṣarf*; see AYOUB 2018: 34 ff. for a comparison between the terms related to *tamakkun* and *ṣarf*.

76 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 47.

77 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī maintains that the *kasra* in the ending of diptote nouns is omitted as a consequence of the omission of the *tanwīn*. See *ibid.*: 102-103 for a discussion.

naṣb generally behaves analogously to *jarr*, but not *vice versa*.[78] According to al-ʾAstarābāḏī, the *tanwīn* in *min ʿarafātin* resembles a *tanwīn* in a diptote noun that received it "due to poetic license" (*li-l-ḍarūra*), as there was something that prevented the *tanwīn*'s omission.[79]

It should be mentioned that al-ʾAstarābāḏī considers *tanwīn*, regardless of its specific function, a marker of a word's end and an indicator that the word is not an annexed element (*dāllan ʿalā tamāmi l-kalimati wa-ʾannahā ġayru muḍāfatin*). This trait is common to the *tanwīn* and the *nūn* of the suffix of the dual and sound masculine plural, but the above-mentioned five functions pertain to *tanwīn* only.[80]

Despite the problematic status of *tanwīn al-tarannum* (which can join nouns and verbs, and thus seems to contradict the claim that *tanwīn* is an exclusive attribute of a noun), and despite blurring the difference between *tanwīn al-muqābala* and *tanwīn al-tamakkun,* al-ʾAstarābāḏī keeps speaking of five types of *tanwīn*.

Al-Širbīnī (d. 1570) views *tanwīn* as one of the identifying features of a noun. He focuses on the four types of *tanwīn* that are added only to nouns: *tanwīn al-tamakkun* (he mentions that it is called also *tanwīn al-ʾamkaniyya* and *tanwīn al-ṣarf*[81]), *tanwīn al-tankīr* (which, like most grammarians, he limits to *baʿḍ al-ʾasmāʾ al-mabniyyāt* 'certain invariable nouns'),[82] *tanwīn al-muqābala* (which he does not limit to proper nouns), *tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ*. As for the latter type, al-Širbīnī says that it joins nouns such as *ġawāšin* 'covers' and *jawārin* "in compensation for the arbitrarily omitted *yāʾ*" (*ʿiwaḍan min-a l-yāʾi l-maḥḏūfati ʿtibāṭan*), and also *ʾiḏ* in cases such as Q 30:4 *yawmaʾiḏin yafraḥu l-muʾminūna* 'on that day the believers shall rejoice, where the *tanwīn* compensates for the omitted governed element (which should be a clause). Al-Širbīnī cites Ibn Hišām (d. 1360), who argues that the *tanwīn* in *kullun* 'all' and *baʿḍun* 'some' is also *tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ* that compensates for an omitted governed element. Al-Širbīnī rejects this claim, arguing that this is the *tanwīn* of establishment "which disappears in an annexation and remains in the absence [of annexation]" (*yaḏhabu maʿa l-ʾiḍāfati wa-yaṯbutu maʿa ʿadamihā*).[83]

Al-Širbīnī notes that some grammarians add another six types of *tanwīn* to this list. He cites an anonymous verse that includes the entire list of ten. The additional types are: (1) redundant, (2) *tanwīn al-tarannum*, (3) *ḥikāya* 'verbatim quotation', (4) poetic li-

---

78 See, e.g., Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I: 3 for a discussion of this principle. Al-ʾAstarābāḏī uses this principle also to explain why nouns in the dual and the sound masculine plural do not behave as diptote, even if there are two reasons for diptosis—see al-ʾAstarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 103.

79 See *ibid.*: 47.

80 *Ibid.*: 87. AYOUB (1991: 208) notes that in this al-ʾAstarābāḏī differed from other grammarians, who were unable to relate the distinct values of *tanwīn* to each other and to a general property of a category of nouns. She offers a more nuanced analysis: in her view, *tanwīn* is a marker of syntactic completeness when suffixed to a noun that functions as an argument, whereas it is a marker of syntactic incompleteness when suffixed to a noun that functions as a predicate. See AYOUB 1991: 198 ff. for a discussion.

81 CARTER 1981: 16-17 (CARTER translates these three terms, respectively, as "the *tanwīn* of establishment", "the *tanwīn* of stability", and "the *tanwīn* of currency").

82 *Ibid.*: 18-19.

83 See *ibid.*: 18-21.

cense, (5) metrical extravagance, (6) after *hamza*.[84] After that he states that these types "are called *tanwīn* in a non-literal sense, not in a literal one, since they are not peculiar to nouns" (*tasmiyatuhā tanwīnan majāzun lā ḥaqīqatun li-ʿadami ḫtiṣāṣihā bi-l-ismi*).[85] This is how al-Širbīnī reconciles between his view of *tanwīn* as one of the identifying features of a noun and the fact that some sources mention *tanwīn*s that can also join other parts of speech.

5. Five types of definite article

Ibn ʿUṣfūr follows his presentation of *tanwīn* with a categorization of functions of the definite article:

(1) *li-taʿrīfi l-ʿahdi fī šaḫṣin ʾaw fī jinsin* 'for a definiteness [based on the addressee's] previous knowledge, of an individual or a genus' (usually, grammarians view *taʿrīf al-ʿahd* and *taʿrīf al-jins* as different categories,[86] but Ibn ʿUṣfūr probably thinks that speakers may have previous knowledge of genera just like they may have previous knowledge of individuals, and thus these two functions of the definite article are closer to each other than to its other functions). The examples are *jāʾanī l-rajulu llaḏī jāʾaka* 'The man that came to you came to me' (the referent of the noun prefixed by the definite article is an individual known to both the speaker and the addressee), and *al-rajulu ḫayrun min-a l-marʾati* 'Man is better than woman' (this genus is better than that genus).[87]

(2) *li-taʿrīfi l-ḥuḍūri* 'for a definiteness based on presence'. Unlike *taʿrīf al-ʿahd*, which is a definiteness based on previous knowledge, this definiteness is related to the referent's being present at the moment of utterance. This is the definite article that joins the noun that follows a demonstrative pronoun, e.g., *hāḏā l-rajulu* 'this man', or a vocative particle, e.g., *yā ʾayyuhā l-rajulu* 'O the man!', or *ʾiḏā l-fujāʾiyya*,[88] e.g., *ḫarajtu fa-ʾiḏā l-ʾasadu* 'I went out and there was the lion'. This is also the definite article that appears in words such as *al-ʾān, al-sāʿa, al-ḥīn* 'now'.[89]

(3) *li-lamḥi l-ṣifati* 'because of an intimation of the adjective'. This is a definite article that is added to a proper noun that was originally an adjective, such as al-Ḥāriṯ, lit. 'the plowing one' and al-ʿAbbās lit. 'the frowning one'. This *al-* is not an insepara-

---

84 See CARTER 1981: 20-23 for a detailed discussion.

85 *Ibid.*: 20-22.

86 See, e.g., GÄTJE 1970: 245. GÄTJE explains: "Die Aussonderung aus der Gattung setzt eine Verständigung (*ʿahd*) zwischen dem Sprechenden und dem Gesprächspartner voraus. Diese erfolgt dadurch, daß das Gemeinte vorher erwähnt wird".

87 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 40.

88 In WRIGHT's (1967 I: 284; II: 157) words, this is an adverb "indicating something unexpected", "introducing a person or thing that comes suddenly into view".

89 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 40.

ble part of these words, as can be proven by the fact that one may say *rajulun
ḫāriṯun* 'a plowing man' and *rajulun ʿabbāsun* 'a frowning man'. [90]

(4) *li-l-ġalaba* 'for a predominance'. This is a definite article that joins an indefinite
noun in order to render it definite, and then dominates it. The noun consequently be-
comes a proper noun. For instance, al-Najm, lit. 'the star', which denotes the Pleia-
des; if the intended meaning is the Pleiades (and not just any star), the *al-* is obliga-
tory. [91]

(5) *zāʾida* 'redundant'. This type of article is attached to proper nouns that do not origi-
nate in adjectives, and is used only due to poetic license. For instance:

ʾa-mā wa-dimāʾin lā tazālu murāqatan / ʿalā qunnati l-ʿuzzā wa-bi-l-nasri ʿandamā

'I swear by blood that still penetrates / the upper part of al-ʿUzzā [idol] and renders
al-Nasr blood-red' [92]

The poet used al-Nasr instead of Nasr (lit. 'vulture'; the name of an idol worshipped
by the Ḥimyarites[93]).

After mentioning these types of *al-* (of which there were five), Ibn ʿUṣfūr adds: "These four
types are found only in nouns" (*wa-hāḏihi al-ʾaḍrubu l-ʾarbaʿatu lā tūjadu ʾillā fī l-ʾasmāʾi
ḫāṣṣatan*), and then starts a discussion on *al-* with the meaning of *allaḏī*, which joins parti-
ciples, but in poetry can also join verbs and clauses.[94] His mention of "four types" is truly
surprising, because he clearly listed five types just before. Perhaps this is due to an attempt
on his part to create a symmetry between the categorization of *tanwīn*s (five types, of which
one type, *tanwīn al-tarannum*, can join various parts of speech, and the rest can join only
nouns), and the categorization of *al-* (again five types, of which one type can sometimes be
attached to verbs and clauses, and the rest only to nouns). In defense of Ibn ʿUṣfūr's logic, it
can only be said that the types of *al-* that join only nouns could be viewed as four instead of
five if we ignore the "redundant" *al-* (which has no meaning or function besides regulariz-
ing the rhythm of a poetic verse). It is the only type in Ibn ʿUṣfūr's categorization which is
mentioned without the preposition *li-* 'for', and this may mean that the author did not intend
to include it in the total.

Ibn Hišām's classification of *al-* is completely different (which proves that Ibn ʿUṣfūr's
classification is by no means necessary). The former dedicates a chapter of his book to *al-*,
which he divides into three types:

(1) A relative pronoun with the meaning of *allaḏī* and its likes, which usually joins par-
ticiples. It can also join time/place expressions and nominal or verbal clauses (if the
predicate is an imperfect verb). The fact that this type of *al-* can be attached not only

---

90 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 40.

91 *Ibid.*: 41. – See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 148-149 for a discussion of predominant proper nouns accord-
ing to al-ʾAstarābāḏī.

92 See Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 41, fn. 15 for a discussion of the verse's authorship and meaning. See also al-
Baġdādī, *Ḫizāna* VII: 214 ff. for a discussion on this verse and its context.

93 See FAHD 1993.

94 See Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 41-42.

to nouns proves, according to Ibn Hišām, that it is not a definite article (*ḥarf al-taʿrīf*).[95]

(2) A definite article, of which there are two types, (a) *ʿahdiyya* 'based on previous knowledge' and (b) *jinsiyya* 'generic'.[96] Each of these two types is, in its turn, divided into three subtypes:[97]

    (a) *ʿahdiyya*

        (i) "The [referent of] the noun related to it is known because [that noun] was mentioned before" (*yakūnu maṣḥūbuhā maʿhūdan ḏikriyyan*), e.g., Q 73:15-16 *kamā ʾarsalnā ʾilā firʿawna rasūlan fa-ʿaṣā firʿawnu l-rasūla* 'as We sent to Pharaoh a Messenger, but Pharaoh rebelled against the Messenger'.[98] The definite article in *al-rasūl* signifies that the word's referent is the same as of the previously-mentioned *rasūl*. Gabučan notes that this description corresponds to the European notion of "anaphoric article".[99]

        (ii) "[The referent of the noun related to it] is known, because it is present in the [addressee's] mind" (*maʿhūdan ḏihniyyan*), e.g., Q 9:40 *ʾiḏ humā fī l-ġāri* 'when the two were in the Cave'.[100] Interestingly, this is the first time "the cave" is mentioned in the sūrah; Ibn Hišām considers its referent as "present in the [addressee's] mind", because the Muslim tradition links it to a specific event when Muḥammad and ʾAbū Bakr were hiding in a cave near Mecca, and their enemies were not able to find them.[101]

        (iii) "[The referent of the noun related to it] is known, because it is present [in the speech situation]" (*maʿhūdan ḥuḍūriyyan*). Here Ibn Hišām cites Ibn ʿUṣfūr's description of cases that the latter classifies as *li-taʿrīf al-ḥuḍūr* (the second item in Ibn ʿUṣfūr's classification mentioned above). This proves that Ibn Hišām was acquainted with Ibn ʿUṣfūr's work, and supports an assumption that his classification of *al-* is a reformulation of the latter's.

        Ibn Hišām criticizes some points in Ibn ʿUṣfūr's description. First, when the sentence *lā taštum-i l-rajula* 'Do not curse the man!' is produced by a speaker who witnesses someone cursing a third party, the word *al-rajul* is definite because its referent is present in the speech situation (a case which Ibn ʿUṣfūr did not mention). Additionally, *al-* that follows

---

95 See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 60-61.

96 LARCHER (1991: 146) translates *ʿahdiyya* as "thématique", and *jinsiyya* as "générique".

97 See GABUČAN 1972: 46-47 for a discussion of this excerpt.

98 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61.

99 GABUČAN 1972: 46.

100 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61.

101 See, e.g.,; al-Zamaḫšarī, *Kaššāf* II: 259-260; al-Ṭabrisī, *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* V: 41.

’iḏā l-fujā’iyya "does not signify the definiteness of a thing present at the speech situation, nor a definiteness that resembles [a definiteness of a thing] present at the speech situation" (*laysa li-taʿrīfi šay’in ḥāḍirin ḥālata l-takallumi fa-lā tušbihu mā l-kalāmu fīhi*).[102] This criticism is based on the fact that the thing mentioned after *’iḏā l-fujā’iyya* is present at the situation presented in the sentence (which may be different from the speech situation[103]). However, Ibn ʿUṣfūr does not mention the speech situation in his discussion, mentioning only the idea of presence (which is relevant in the case of *’iḏā l-fujā’iyya*)—thus, Ibn Hišām's criticism does not seem justified.

Finally, Ibn Hišām says that the *al-* in *al-’ān* should be viewed as redundant (*zā’ida*) rather than as a definite article. That is because this *al-* is an inseparable part of the word, whereas the definite article is not known to appear as an inseparable part of the word.[104]

(b) *jinsiyya*:[105]

(i) "Signifying [that the word] comprises all the individuals [that can be referred by it]" (*li-stiġrāqi l-’afrādi*). This is the *al-* "that can be replaced by *kull* in its literal sense" (*allatī taḥlufuhā kullun ḥaqīqatan*). For instance, Q 4:28 *wa-ḥuliqa l-’insānu ḍaʿīfan* 'for man was created a weakling'.[106] According to the principle formulated by Ibn Hišām, *al-’insān* is definite in a generic, inclusive definiteness, which can be demonstrated by replacing it by the phrase *kullu ’insānin* in its literal sense.

(ii) "Signifying [that the word's referent] comprises all the exclusive attributes of individuals [that can be referred to by the word]" (*li-stiġrāqi ḥaṣā’iṣi al-’afrādi*). This is the *al-* "that can be replaced by *kull* in its non-literal sense" (*allatī taḥlufuhā kullun majāzan*). For instance, *zaydun-i l-rajulu ʿilman* 'Zayd is the man in terms of knowledge'.[107] This sentence can be paraphrased by *zaydun kullu rajulin ʿilman* 'Zayd equals all men in terms of knowledge', i.e., Zayd's knowledge is perfect.[108]

---

102 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61.

103 *’Iḏā l-fujā’iyya* refers to the same time as the preceding statement. See the examples in WRIGHT 1967 I: 284; II: 157-158.

104 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61.

105 See GABUČAN 1972: 48-50 for a discussion on generic definiteness according to Ibn Hišām and additional grammarians.

106 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61.

107 *Ibid.*

108 These are probably the cases described by GÄTJE (1970: 249-250) as "die generelle Determination, wenn sie beim Individuum steht, um zu zeigen, daß dieses die Merkmale der Gattung in vollem Umfange aufweist".

(iii) "That renders the essence definite" (*li-taʿrīfi l-māhiyyati*). This *al-* cannot be replaced by *kull*, in either its literal or its non-literal sense. For instance, if someone says *wa-llāhi lā ʾatazawwaju l-nisāʾa* 'By God, I will not marry the women', his vow would be violated if he married even a single woman.[109]

(3) *zāʾida* 'redundant':

(a) "[that constitutes] an inseparable part [of the noun]" (*lāzima*). That is the *al-* of relative pronouns, according to the view whereby they are rendered definite by the relative clause,[110] and of proper nouns, "provided that [*al-*] joined them when they were transmitted (from their original meaning to functioning as proper nouns)" (*bi-šarṭi muqāranatihā li-naqlihā*[111]), which is the case with al-Naṣr, al-Naʿmān, al-Lāt, al-ʿUzzā, or "when they were invented" (*li-rtijālihā*), which is the case with al-Samawʾal, or when "the word became dominant [in referring to] one of its original referents" (*li-ġalabatihā ʿalā baʿḍi man hiya lahu fī l-ʾaṣli*), which is the case with al-Bayt, lit. 'The House' (referring to the Kaʿba), al-Madīna, lit. 'The City' (referring to al-Ṭayyiba 'The Good', the city in Saudi Arabia), and al-Najm, lit. 'The Star' (referring to the Pleiades).[112]

This last case of "redundant inseparable *al-*" corresponds to the fourth item in Ibn ʿUṣfūr's classification.[113]

(b) "[that does not constitute] an inseparable part of the word" (*ġayr lāzima*). This category is divided into two types:

(i) A common type, that appears in eloquent speech. This is the *al-* that appears in proper nouns "that were transferred from [common nouns] without [*al-*] that can be prefixed by it, is such a way that [a proper noun includes] an intimation [of the original common noun]" (*manqūl min mujarrad ṣāliḥ lahā malmūḥ ʾaṣluhu*). This is the case, e.g., of al-Ḥāriṯ, lit. 'the plowing one', al-ʿAbbās 'the frowning one', and al-Ḍaḥḥāk 'the one who laughs frequently'.[114]

(ii) An uncommon type of *al-*, which may appear in poetry and in anomalous instances of prose.[115]

---

109 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 61-62.

110 See Section 3 above for a discussion on the status of relative pronouns. Ibn Hišām cites the view rejected by al-ʾAstarābāḏī—see pp. 86-87 above.

111 LARCHER (1992: 358-359) translates *manqūla* (a passive participle derived from the same root as *naql*, that refers to a change in a constituent's function) as "tranférées".

112 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 62.

113 See p. 93-94 above for a discussion.

114 Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* I: 63.

115 See *ibid.*: 63-64 for examples.

6. The five types of *tawābi*

Tawābi (sing. *tābi*) is a category of words "whose case assignment is caused by their 'following' another word". This category created a special problem for the Arab grammarians, as its case assignment cannot be explained by governance.[116]

Sībawayhi does not speak of such a category. Al-Mubarrad in his treatise uses various terms related to this category, without however systematizing them.[117] Ibn al-Sarrāj is probably the first one to speak of *tawābi* as a category, that comprises five types of sentence constituents:

(1) *Tawkīd* 'emphasizer'. This type is divided into two:

    (a) "emphasis by repetition of the noun" (*tawkīd bi-takrīr al-ism*):

        (i) "A type in which a noun is repeated literally" (*ḍarb yuʿādu fīhi l-ismu bi-lafẓihi*). Despite this formulation, Ibn al-Sarrāj demonstrates that constituents that are repeated can be nouns, verbs, particles (together with the nouns that receive *jarr* from them) and even clauses.[118] Perhaps he uses the term *ism* here, although he has in mind various types of constituents, because of the principle that any word can be viewed as a noun, if it is produced with the linguistic expression itself in mind (rather than its meaning/referent).[119]

        (ii) "[A type in which] the meaning is repeated in different words" (*ʾiʿādat al-maʿnā bi-lafẓin ʾāḫara*). For instance, *marartu bi-zaydin nafsihi* 'I passed by Zayd himself'.[120]

    (b) "signifying comprehensiveness and generality" (*li-l-ʾiḥāṭa wa-l-ʿumūm*). Ibn al-Sarrāj has in mind the derivatives of words such as *kull*, *ʾajmaʿ*, *ʾaktaʿ* 'all', and also *kilā/kiltā* 'both (masc./fem.)', *ṯalāṯatuhum* 'the three of them', etc.[121]

---

(2) *Naʿt* 'adjectival qualifier'. Interestingly, Ibn al-Sarrāj distinguishes five types of it (and thus creates a fivefold division inside another fivefold division, proving his interest in this number):

(a) "An attribute [related to the appearance[122]] of the described thing, which may exist in [that thing] or in something related to it logically" (*mā kāna ḥilyatan li-l-mawṣūfi takūnu fīhi ʾaw fī šayʾin min sababihi*).[123] The examples for the first option are: *marartu bi-rajulin ʾazraqa/ʾaḥmara/ṭawīlin/qaṣīrin* 'I passed by a blue/red/tall/short man'; the examples for the second option are: *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasanin ʾabūhu* 'I passed by a man whose father is good' and *maḍaytu ʾilā rajulin ṭawīlin ʾaḫūhu* 'I went to a man whose brother is tall'.[124]

(b) "An action of the described thing, which may be performed by [the latter] or by something related to it logically" (*mā kāna fiʿlan li-l-mawṣūfi yakūnu bihi fāʿilan ʾaw muttaṣilan bi-šayʾin min sababihi*). The examples for the former option are: *marartu bi-rajulin qāʾimin/nāʾimin/ḍāribin* 'I passed by a standing/sleeping/hitting man'; the examples for the latter option are *marartu bi-rajulin ḍāribin ʾabūhu* 'I passed by a man whose father is hitting', *marartu bi-rajulin qāʾimin ʾaḫūhu* 'I passed by a man whose brother is standing', *raʾaytu rajulan ḍāriban ʾaḫūhu ʿamran* "I saw a man whose brother is hitting ʿAmr', etc.[125]

(c) "An attribute [of the described thing], that is neither [its] action nor is related to its appearance" (*mā kāna ṣifatan ġayra ʿamalin wa-taḥliyatin*), e.g., *marartu bi-rajulin ʿālimin/ʿāqilin* 'I passed by a knowledgeable/reasonable man', *marartu bi-rajulin ʿālimin ʾabūhu* 'I passed by a man whose father is knowledgeable', *marartu bi-rajulin ẓarīfatin jāriyatuhu* 'I passed by a man whose female slave is charming'.

(d) "Relation" (*nasab*). These are adjectives that relate a person or thing to a father, a place, a profession, or some category. For instance *marartu bi-rajulin hāšimiyyin/ʿarabiyyin* 'I passed by a Hāšimī/Bedouin man' (with adjectives that relate the man to certain genera), *marartu bi-rajulin bazzāzin/ʿaṭṭārin/najjārin* "I passed by a man who is a seller of cloth/a seller of perfumes/a carpenter' (with adjectives that relate the man to things with which he deals),

---

122 This addition is based on one of the definitions of *ḥilya* given in LANE (1865 II: 635): "the appearance in respect of colour, or complexion, &c., of a man". The addition seems necessary, in order to highlight the difference between this type of qualifier and type (c), that includes attributes which have no external manifestation (see below).

123 See the discussion of the term *sabab* in CARTER 2009.

124 Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* I: 409-410. Such constructions are known as *naʿt sababī*, an adjective that refers to the main noun "in virtue of a following word which is connected with it". See WRIGHT 1967 II: 283-284. DIEM (1998: 12) renders *naʿt sababī* as "adjektivischer Satz" since, on the one hand, it is equivalent to a sentence, and on the other hand it has the same syntactic distribution as adjectives and participles. See DIEM 1998 for a detailed discussion on the uses of *naʿt sababī*.

125 See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* I: 410-411 for additional discussion and examples.

marartu bi-rajulin baṣriyyin/miṣriyyin/kūfiyyin 'I passed by a Baṣran/Egyptian/Kūfan man' (with adjectives that relate the man to places).[126]

(e) "Describing [things] by means of *ḏū* 'possessor'" (*al-waṣf bi-ḏī*). For instance, *marartu bi-rajulin ḏī ʾiblin* 'I passed by a man who possesses camels', *marartu bi-rajulin ḏī ʾadabin* 'I passed by a man who possesses manners', *marartu bi-rajulin ḏī ʿaqlin* 'I passed by a man who possesses reason'.[127]

This classification seems somewhat artificial, especially the distinction between (a) and (c), and may serve as yet another proof of Ibn al-Sarrāj's adherence to the number 'five' (which is also apparent from the examples surveyed by Okazaki).[128]

(3) *ʿAṭf al-bayān* 'the explicative'. Ibn al-Sarrāj explains that the difference between this constituent and an adjectival qualifier is that the former is an underived noun. The grammarians avoid calling it an adjectival qualifier, because it does not signify an attribute of the described thing and does not correspond to any type of qualifier. It is called 'the explicative' because it distinguishes between the referent of its head and other objects with the same name. For instance: *raʾaytu zaydan ʾabā ʿamrin* 'I saw Zayd, ʿAmr's father' and *laqītu ʾaḫāka bakran* 'I met your brother Bakr'.[129]

The difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition is that the former is intended to be similar to an adjectival qualifier of the head, and the latter is intended to be a constituent that can replace the head. Thus, when the speaker uses *ʿaṭf al-bayān*, he says *yā ʾaḫānā zaydan* 'O our brother Zayd!'[130] (*zaydan* takes *naṣb*, according to the basic rule regarding words in vocative[131]), and when he uses apposition, he says *yā ʾaḫānā zaydu* (*zaydu* takes *ḍamma*, as a single noun that follows a vocative particle, as if it followed *yā* directly).[132]

(4) *ʿAṭf al-badal* 'apposition'. Ibn al-Sarrāj recognizes four types of apposition.[133]

---

(5) *Al-ʿaṭf bi-l-ḥarf* 'coordination by means of a particle'. Ibn al-Sarrāj states that there are ten coordinative particles that "make the constituent that follows them to agree [in case] with the noun or verb that precedes them" (*yutbiʿna mā baʿdahunna mā qablahunna min-a l-ʾasmāʾi wa-l-ʾafʿāli*).[134]

Ibn Jinnī mentions the same five types of *tawābiʿ*;[135] Ibn al-ʾAnbārī does not speak explicitly of *tawābiʿ* as a category, but places in a succession the chapters dealing with *tawkīd*, *waṣf* (a term very close to *naʿt*), *ʿaṭf al-bayān*, *badal*, and *ʿaṭf*.[136]

Al-Zajjājī appears to be the first grammarian who speaks about four *tawābiʿ*: *al-naʿt*, *al-ʿaṭf*, *al-tawkīd*, *al-badal* (he omits *ʿaṭf al-bayān*).[137] Ibn ʿUṣfūr does not challenge this categorization, but incorporates *ʿaṭf al-bayān* by distinguishing between two types of *ʿaṭf*: *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and *ʿaṭf al-nasq* 'coordination'.[138] Al-Baṭalyawsī (d. 1127) openly criticizes al-Zajjājī's categorization of *tawābiʿ*: he says that al-Zajjājī did not mention *ʿaṭf al-bayān*, as if it can be included in his four categories, which is not true. Al-Baṭalyawsī notes that it exists only in definite nouns, and shares some positions with the adjectival qualifier, some with apposition, and some are unique to it (which last point proves that al-Zajjājī's categorization is not accurate).[139] He mentions three positions that are unique to *ʿaṭf al-bayān*:

1. In vocative constructions:

    ʾinnī wa-ʾasṭārin suṭirna saṭran / la-qāʾilun yā naṣru naṣrun naṣrā

    'I swear by the lines [of the Qurʾān] that are indeed written, / I say: O Naṣr, Naṣr, Naṣr…'[140]

    Al-Baṭalyawsī explains that those who assign *naṣb* to the second and third *naṣr*, construe them as *ʿaṭf al-bayān* that agrees with the position of the first *naṣr*, which follows a vocative particle[141] (because the position following a vocative particle should in principle be occupied by a noun in *naṣb*; however, a semantically definite noun that is not an annexed element takes a *bināʾ* ending *ḍamma* in this position[142]). Those who

---

134 Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʾUṣūl* I: 442. See *ibid.*: 442-446 for a detailed discussion of all coordinative particles.

135 Ibn Jinnī, *Lumaʿ*, 138.

136 Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, *ʾAsrār*, 283-306. See also Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* III: 38-39 for a similar discussion.

137 Al-Zajjājī, *Jumal*, 26.

138 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* I: 174. See *ibid.*: 268-272 for a detailed discussion of *ʿaṭf al-bayān*. This is also the solution of Ibn ʿAqīl in dealing with Ibn Mālik's fourfold categorization of *tawābiʿ*: he incorporates *ʿaṭf al-bayān* into Ibn Mālik's model (presented in Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ* III: 190) by distinguishing between two types of *ʿaṭf*—see *ibid.*: 218. See *ibid.*: 218-223 for a further discussion of *ʿaṭf al-bayān*. Al-Širbīnī's presentation is the same: he first speaks of four types of *tawābiʿ* (CARTER 1981: 148), and then distinguishes between two types of *ʿaṭf* (see *ibid.*: 274). TALMON (1981: 288) notes that the literal meaning of *ʿaṭf*— "turning s.o. or s.th. (to)"—allows its application to both "conjunctive" and "appositival" categories.

139 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 104.

140 This is a verse by Ruʾba ibn al-ʿAjjāj (d. 762). The Naṣr who is addressed here is Naṣr ibn Sayyār (the last Umayyad governor of Ḫurāsān, d. 748). See HEINRICHS 1995. See also al-Baġdādī, *Ḫizāna* II: 219-224.

141 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 105.

142 See fn. 131 above.

assign *raf'+tanwīn* to the second *naṣr*, construe it as *'aṭf al-bayān* that agrees with the form of the first one (which is possible, because the *ḍamma* in the ending of a noun that follows a vocative particle resembles an *'i'rāb* ending[143]), and construe the third *naṣr* as *'aṭf al-bayān* that agrees with the position of the first one. Those who assign the second *naṣr raf'* without a *tanwīn*, construe it as an apposition of the first.[144] As we shall see below, al-Baṭalyawsī holds that in apposition there is the intention of repeating the governor, whereas there is no such intention in *'aṭf al-bayān*. Thus, one can imagine the second *naṣr* as immediately following a suppressed vocative particle, and consequently assign it *ḍamma*, provided one construes the second *naṣr* as an apposition.

2. With vague constituents (i.e., demonstrative pronouns): e.g., *marartu bi-hāḏā l-rajuli* 'I passed by this man', *laqītu hāḏā l-ġulāma* 'I met this servant'. Al-Baṭalyawsī notes that grammarians refer to nouns following the demonstrative as *na't* 'adjectival qualifier', whereas it is actually *'aṭf bayān*.

3. With active participles: e.g., *hāḏā l-ḍāribu l-rajuli zaydin* 'This is the one hitting the man, Zayd'. *Zayd* can be assigned *jarr* only if it is construed as *'aṭf al-bayān* of *al-rajul*. In order to be construed as an apposition, it should be a word that can occupy the position of its head, whereas one cannot say **hāḏā l-ḍāribu zaydin* 'This is the one hitting Zayd' (instead one should say *hāḏā l-ḍāribu zaydan*, i.e., use a direct object instead of an annexation structure), because a noun prefixed by the definite article cannot be annexed to a noun that is not prefixed by that article, unless the former noun is in dual or masculine sound plural form.[145]

After that, al-Baṭalyawsī takes pains to distinguish between *'aṭf al-bayān* and other *tawābi'* that can be confused with it. He mentions five points of difference between *'aṭf al-bayān* and adjectival qualifiers:

1. The function of a qualifier is usually performed by adjectives, whereas *'aṭf al-bayān* is an underived noun, similarly to apposition.[146]
2. A qualifier may be either definite or indefinite, whereas *'aṭf al-bayān*, according to the Baṣran view, must be definite.[147]

---

143 See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 107-109 for a detailed discussion of this point according to al-'Astarābāḏī.

144 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 105.

145 *Ibid.*: 106. – According to al-Zamaḫšarī (Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II: 122), one can say *humā l-ḍāribā zaydin* 'The two of them are the ones hitting Zayd', and *hum-u l-ḍāribū zaydin* 'They are the ones hitting Zayd', but not **al-ḍāribu zaydin* 'the one hitting Zayd', because in this case the annexation does not achieve 'lightness'. Ibn Ya'īš explains that *al-* that joins an active participle has the meaning of a relative pronoun, thus the participle in this position is equivalent to a verb, and should govern the following word. If the participle is in the dual or sound masculine plural form, this principle may be breached for the sake of lightness (which is achieved by omitting the *nūn* of the dual/ sound masculine plural in an annexation); however, principles should not be breached if that brings no benefit. *Al-ḍāribu l-rajuli* 'the one hitting the man' is acceptable (unlike **al-ḍāribu zaydin*), since this phrase behaves analogously to *al-ḥasanu l-wajhi* 'the one whose face is beautiful'. See Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ* II: 122-123 for a detailed discussion.

146 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 108.

3. "A qualifier may [signify an attribute of the referent] of the head noun or of something related to it logically" (*'anna l-naʿta yakūnu bi-mā huwa min-a l-manʿūti wa-bi-mā huwa min sababihi*), whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is co-referential with its head.
4. A qualifier may be replaced by clauses, time/place expressions and constituents in *jarr*, and this does not occur with *ʿaṭf al-bayān*.
5. A qualifier signifies some part of the head noun's referent, namely, some attribute of it, whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is co-referential with its head.[148]

According to al-Baṭalyawsī, there are four points of difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition:

1. An apposition may be co-referential with its head, and may also signify a part of the head's referent or a thing that accompanies the head's referent and is included in it, e.g., *suliba zaydun ṯawbuhu* 'Zayd was robbed, his garment'.[149] An apposition may signify an action of the referent of its head or an accident related to it, whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān* must be co-referential with its head.
2. The function of apposition may be performed by both definite and indefinite nouns, and by both explicit nouns and pronouns, whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān*, according to the Baṣran view, must be a definite explicit noun.
3. In the case of apposition "there is the intention[150] of repeating the governor" (*yuqaddaru maʿahu ʾiʿādatu l-ʿāmili*), as if a new sentence is started, whereas in the case of *ʿaṭf al-bayān* there is no such intention; the latter resembles in this respect an adjectival qualifier.
4. "There is a type of apposition that is related to mistakes" (*'anna l-badala yajī'u minhu mā jarā majrā l-ġalaṭi*),[151] whereas there is no such thing in *ʿaṭf al-bayān*.[152]

This notwithstanding, al-ʾAstarābāḏī states:

Until now I have not revealed a clear difference between a full substitution and *ʿaṭf al-bayān*. Moreover, I hold that *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is actually an apposition (*wa-ʾanā ʾilā*

---

147 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 109. Al-Baṭalyawsī refers here specifically to the Baṣran view, since the Kūfan grammarians held that *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is indefinite, if it follows an indefinite head. In contrast, the Baṣran grammarians maintained that *ʿaṭf al-bayān* must be a definite noun that follows a definite head, and regarded cases of indefinite nouns following an indefinite head as apposition. See the discussion in ʾAbū Ḥayyān, *Baḥr* III: 10.

148 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 109.

149 Here reference is made to the three main types of apposition distinguished by the Arab grammarians: *badal kull min kull* 'full substitution', *badal baʿḍ min kull* 'permutative apposition', and *badal ištimāl* 'substitution of inclusiveness'. See ESSEESY 2006: 124 for a discussion.

150 See LEVIN 1997: 151-157 for a discussion on *taqdīr* in the sense of 'speaker's intention'.

151 Here al-Baṭalyawsī has in mind *badal al-ġalaṭ* 'permutative of error', where the speaker self-corrects what he or she has stated. For instance, *ra'aytu rajulan ḥimāran* 'I saw a man, [rather,] a donkey'. ES-SEESY 2006: 124.

152 Al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal*, 109. Interestingly, Ibn Hišām mentions eight points of difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition. See Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī*, 525-529.

l-'āna lam yaẓhar lī farqun jaliyyun bayna badali l-kulli min-a l-kulli wa-ʿaṭfi l-bayāni, bal lā 'arā ʿaṭfa l-bayāni 'illā l-badala).[153]

Al-'Astarābāḏī argues that Sībawayhi held the same view when he said, with regard to the sentence *marartu bi-rajulin ʿabdi llāhi* 'I passed by a man, ʿAbdallāh', that there is a substitution of a definite noun for an indefinite one, as if the speaker was asked 'Who did you pass by?', or thought that someone might ask such a question, and thus replaced the indefinite noun with a more definite one.[154]

It should be mentioned that al-'Astarābāḏī equates *ʿaṭf al-bayān* with a full substitution, one of the apposition types—therefore, points (1) and (4) from al-Baṭalyawsī's discussion on the difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition, in which various types of the latter are mentioned, should be irrelevant for him.

Al-'Astarābāḏī says that other grammarians may claim that the difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition is that an apposition (and not its head) is "the one intended in the ascription" (*al-maqṣūd bi-l-nisba*), whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is an explanation, and an explanation is secondary in relation to what is explained. Therefore, in the case of *ʿaṭf al-bayān* the one intended in the ascription is the head.[155] The term *nisba* in *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya* refers to semantic relations between constituents, which may be predicative or not.[156] When al-'Astarābāḏī speaks of "being intended in the ascription", he probably means that the constituent in question is more important than another one or other ones, it is the one that is really meant to create syntactic connections with other parts of the sentence.[157] The grammarians' claim that the apposition is more important than its head (whereas in the case of adjectival qualifier the head is more important) is well known.[158]

Al-'Astarābāḏī does not accept the claim that in the case of an apposition the speaker intends the second constituent only; in his view, this is true only for 'permutative of error', in which "the second constituent (i.e., the apposition) is obviously intended instead of the first (i.e., the head)" (*fa-'inna kawna l-ṯānī fīhi huwa l-maqṣūdu dūna l-'awwali ẓāhirun*).[159] He

---

153 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 379. See SARTORI, forthcoming: Section 1 for an alternative translation of this passage.

154 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 379. Here al-'Astarābāḏī refers to a discussion from Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* I: 192. However, Sībawayhi did use the term *ʿaṭf al-bayān* once—while discussing the above-mentioned verse by Ru'ba (see *Kitāb* I: 263). See TALMON 1981: 282 for a discussion of a relevant excerpt. TALMON (1981) reconstructs the category of "appositival *ʿaṭf*" in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*, considering it an important syntactic innovation that can be attributed without doubt to Sībawayhi and al-Ḫalīl, in contrast to grammarians of Sībawayhi's time and of previous generations. According to Talmon's description, Sībawayhi's "appositival *ʿaṭf*" roughly corresponds to both *tawkīd* and *ʿaṭf bayān* in later grammatical literature.

155 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 380.

156 See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 42-51 for a discussion.

157 See *ibid.*: 142, fn. 66 for a discussion of an excerpt from Ibn al-Ḥājib's *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya*, where the head of an adjectival qualifier is presented as "the one intended in the informative ascription".

158 For instance, al-Jurjānī (*Muqtaṣid* II: 930) says: "The apposition behaves as if the governor was repeated before it, because the head is neglected for the sake of the apposition" (*wa-'innamā kāna l-badalu fī ḥukmi takrīri l-ʿāmili li-'ajli 'anna l-badala yutraku 'ilayhi l-mubdalu minhu*). See SARTORI, forthcoming for a discussion on this and similar excerpts.

159 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 380.

explains his position by recalling that in three types of apposition[160] the head overtly functions as "[a constituent] to which something is ascribed" (*mansūb 'ilayhi*). Thus, its mention should create "an (additional) meaning" (*fā'ida*)[161] that would not have been achieved without it—because the speech of eloquent people (let alone God and his Prophet) should not include useless elements.[162] Given that the head noun is the one to which something else is overtly ascribed, and that it includes a meaning that justifies other constituents being ascribed to it, it would be inconsistent with the overt structure to claim that it is not intended.[163]

After that, al-'Astarābāḏī explains the three possible semantic contributions that may be achieved by the combination of the head noun and full substitution. His conclusion is that *'aṭf al-bayān* is a name for a full substitution in which the second constituent clarifies the head.[164] In other words, he views *'aṭf al-bayān* as a sub-type of apposition (i.e., a type of full substitution, which, in its turn, is a type of apposition).

Al-'Astarābāḏī mentions the claim that apposition (unlike *'aṭf al-bayān*) "[behaves] as if the governor was repeated" (*fī ḥukmi takrīri l-'āmili*; this claim corresponds to item (3) in al-Baṭalyawsī's above-mentioned presentation of points of difference between *'aṭf al-bayān* and apposition).[165] His response is: even if this claim could be accepted in cases where the governor is overtly repeated, how could the addressee know that (i.e., that there is an intention to repeat the governor) in cases where it is not repeated? Moreover, if the claim of repeating the governor is accepted in the case of apposition, it should be accepted in the case of *'aṭf al-bayān* as well.[166] After that al-'Astarābāḏī mentions the claim of some grammarians that *'aṭf al-bayān*, unlike apposition, must agree with the head noun in definiteness.[167] This claim roughly corresponds to item (2) in al-Baṭalyawsī's presentation:[168] given the fact that most grammarians hold that *'aṭf al-bayān* follows only definite nouns, saying that it must agree with its head is equivalent to saying that it must be definite. Al-

---

160 I.e., the types mentioned in fn. 149 above.

161 This use of the term *fā'ida* corresponds to "*fā'ida* as an addition to the message", one of the meanings of the term distinguished in SHEYHATOVITCH 2012.

162 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 380. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2019a: 284 for a discussion of another application of this principle in al-'Astarābāḏī's *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya*.

163 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 380.

164 *Ibid.*: 380-381. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2019b: Section 4 for a discussion of two possible types of *'aṭf bayān* according to al-'Astarābāḏī (interestingly, the number 'five' plays an important role in the presentation of the second type).

165 See p. 103 above. See SARTORI, forthcoming, for a survey of other sources who view "the repetition of the governor" as a distinguishing characteristic of apposition.

166 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 383. Al-'Astarābāḏī believes that the governor should be the same in all *tawābi'* (see *ibid.*: 279-282 for a discussion), whereas other grammarians did not necessarily hold the same view. For instance, Ibn al-'Anbārī maintains that the governor of the adjectival qualifier is the same as the governor of the head (see fn. 116 above), whereas the governor of the apposition "is not the same as the governor of the head, and [the head and the apposition are in] two [sentences]" (*ġayru l-'āmili fī l-mubdali, wa-huwa jumlatāni*). He notes that most grammarians held this view. See Ibn al-'Anbārī, *'Asrār*, 300-301.

167 Al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 383.

168 See p. 103 above.

’Astarābāḏī says in response that "a constituent that is called *ʿaṭf al-bayān*" (*al-musammā ʿaṭfa bayānin*; a formulation that stresses again his disapproval of this term) can also disagree with its head in definiteness.[169]

Sartori, after analyzing various grammarians' remarks on the difference between the *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition, reaches the conclusion that the most essential difference is of a suprasegmental character, namely, apposition is preceded in speech by a pause, whereas *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is pronounced immediately after the main noun, similarly to an adjectival qualifier.[170]

It is unclear whether al-’Astarābāḏī did not grasp this essential difference between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition, or did grasp it but considered it not significant enough to categorize these two as separate types of *tawābiʿ*. He repeats his statement that *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is actually an apposition several times,[171] but, this notwithstanding, constantly speaks of five *tawābiʿ*.[172] That can be explained either by retaining the accepted views and terminology, or by recognizing the importance of the number 'five' (the former possibility seems less convincing, given al-’Astarābāḏī's general non-conformism[173]).

Interestingly enough, the tendency towards a division into four (instead of five) types of *tawābiʿ*, that started with al-Zajjājī and Ibn Mālik, became dominant in modern grammatical literature in Arabic. For instance, Ḥasan in his *al-Naḥw al-Wāfī* dedicates a detailed chapter to "the four *tawābiʿ*", in which *ʿaṭf al-bayān* is subsumed under the category of *ʿaṭf*.[174]

7. Conclusion

This article analyzed several fivefold divisions found in medieval Arabic grammatical literature. It strove to determine to what extent these divisions are theoretically justified and to what extent 'five' appears in them as a typological number (given the special place of this number in Islam).

The first categorization that was discussed was "five types of meaningful things". It was demonstrated that Ibn Yaʿīš and al-’Astarābāḏī adopted al-Jaḥiẓ's fivefold categorization, although the distinction between oral speech and writing (and the resulting exclusion of written words from the definition of 'word') seems unjustified in the context of their respective discussions.

As for the fivefold classification of definite nouns, it was accepted by most grammarians starting with Sībawayhi, despite the fact that in such a scheme it is difficult to find the right place for relative pronouns (that may appear as nouns prefixed by a definite article, but differ from them in some features). This difficulty led Ibn ʿAqīl and Ibn Hišām to place

---

169 Al-’Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* II: 384.

170 See SARTORI, forthcoming: Conclusion, where a parallel is drawn between apposition in Arabic grammar and "non-restrictive modifiers" in French grammar.

171 See, e.g., al-’Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* I: 362, 386; II: 233.

172 See, e.g., *ibid.* I: 360, 364, 438; II: 378; III: 133.

173 See, e.g., SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 31-41 for some examples demonstrating al-’Astarābāḏī's originality and non-conformism.

174 See ḤASAN 1964 III: 355-545.

relative pronouns in a separate category (thus obtaining a sixfold categorization of definite nouns).

The fivefold classification of *tanwīn* seems to have begun with al-Zamaḫšarī. Ibn Yaʿīš criticizes him for not including another type of *tanwīn* (namely *tanwīn al-muqābala*) in this model, but succeeds in retaining a list of five types by combining two types mentioned by al-Zamaḫšarī in a single category. Al-ʾAstarābāḏī demonstrates that *tanwīn al-muqābala* is actually *tanwīn al-tamakkun* (and thus blurs the border between two categories out of the five); he also finds a common denominator for the five types of *tanwīn* and the *nūn* of the ending of the dual and sound masculine plural. This notwithstanding, he keeps speaking about the five types of *tanwīn*. Interestingly enough, al-Zamaḫšarī, al-ʾAstarābāḏī and others view *tanwīn* as an exclusive attribute of nouns, but still include in their classifications rhyme-related *tanwīn*s that can also join verbs. Al-Širbīnī is particularly aware of this problem.

Ibn ʿUṣfūr seems to model his presentation of the definite article after his presentation of *tanwīn* types (i.e., five types of which four are unique to nouns). Retaining the fivefold categorization (and/or retaining the symmetry between two discussions) is so important to him that he makes efforts to present the apparent six types of definite article as five types. This categorization is by no means necessary, as is easily proved by Ibn Hišām's model, which is totally different from Ibn ʿUṣfūr's, including three main types with intricate subdivisions.

The last division examined in this article is that of *tawābiʿ*. Most medieval grammarians speak of five *tawābiʿ*; however, al-Zajjājī seems to start a tendency of speaking about four only. This confusion is apparently caused by *ʿaṭf al-bayān*. Those who divide the *tawābiʿ* into four either do not distinguish between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and apposition, or subsume the former under the title *ʿaṭf* (together with *ʿaṭf al-nasq* 'coordination'). Al-ʾAstarābāḏī says explicitly that he considers the distinction between *ʿaṭf al-bayān* and full substitution unjustified; he refutes the other grammarians' arguments in favor of such a distinction. However, he keeps using the term "five *tawābiʿ*".

All this material demonstrates that in many cases the grammarians took pains to make the linguistic material fit into a fivefold division, while ignoring (or pretending to ignore) existing discrepancies.[175] This can be explained by the grammarians' respect for their predecessors, which may have made them adhere to previously used terms and models even when they were aware of their flaws.[176] Another possible explanation is the importance of

---

[175] Additional cases, similar to those discussed in the article are the cases of *ʾinna* and "its sisters" and of "the five/six nouns". Sībawayhi (*Kitāb* I: 241) calls the former category *al-ḥurūf al-ḫamsa* 'the five particles', and lists in this context *ʾinna*, *lākinna*, *layta*, *laʿalla* and *ka-ʾanna*. Al-Mubarrad (*Muqtaḍab* IV: 107) and Ibn al-Sarrāj (*ʾUṣūl* I: 217) speak about "the five particles", but attempt to integrate both *ʾinna* and *ʾanna* into the list, by stressing their similarity. Sībawayhi did not include *ʾanna* in the list of "the five particles", because he classified it under *ism*. It seems that later grammarians did not adopt Sībawayhi's view of *ʾanna*, but nevertheless kept speaking of "the five particles" (see KASHER 2010-2011 for an analysis of the relevant material). As for "the five/six nouns", SARTORI (2010) argues that *han* 'a thing' was removed from this category because some grammarians found it embarrassing (because it frequently refers to female genitalia), thus leaving the category with five nouns (which fits into the scheme of fivefold categorizations).

[176] This is the main explanation offered by OKAZAKI (2003) for the fivefold divisions of *mafʿūl* and *mafʿūl*-like constituents accepted by many grammarians. However, he notes that this hypothesis is in-

the number 'five'. The fact that even al-'Astarābāḏī, known for his non-conformism and originality, adheres to fivefold categorizations of *tanwīn*s and *tawābiʿ*, despite his own criticism of them, proves that the grammarians' engagement with number 'five' goes beyond mere respect for their predecessors' authority.

Bibliography

Primary sources

'Abū Ḥayyān, *Baḥr* = Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn ʿAlī 'Abū Ḥayyān: *Tafsīr al-Baḥr al-muḥīṭ*, eds. ʿĀ. 'Aḥmad and ʿA. Muʿawwaḍ. Beirut 1993.

al-'Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* = Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Raḍī l-Dīn al-'Astarābāḏī: *Šarḥ al-Raḍī ʿalā l-Kāfiya*, ed. Y. Ḥ. ʿUmar. Benghazi 1996.

al-Baġdādī, *Ḫizāna* = ʿAbd al-Qādir ibn ʿUmar al-Baġdādī: *Ḫizānat al-'adab wa-lubb lubāb lisān al-ʿarab*, ed. ʿA-S. M. Hārūn. Cairo 1989.

al-Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal* = ʿAbdallāh ibn Muḥammad al-Baṭalyawsī: *Kitāb al-Ḥulal fī 'iṣlāḥ al-ḫalal min Kitāb al-Jumal*, ed. S. ʿA-K. Suʿūdī. Iraq 1980.

Ibn al-'Anbārī, *'Asrār* = 'Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-'Anbārī: *Kitāb 'Asrār al-ʿarabiyya*, ed. M. B. al-Bayṭār. Damascus 1957.

Ibn ʿAqīl, *Šarḥ* = ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAqīl: *Šarḥ Ibn ʿAqīl ʿalā 'Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*, ed. M. M.-D. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Cairo 1980.

Ibn Hišām, *Muġnī* = 'Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh Jamāl al-Dīn ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Aḥmad ibn Hišām: *Muġnī l-labīb ʿan kutub al-'aʿārīb*, ed. M. M.-D. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Beirut 1991.

Ibn Jinnī, *Lumaʿ* = 'Abū l-Fatḥ ʿUṯmān ibn Jinnī: *al-Lumaʿ fī l-ʿarabiyya*, ed. Ḥ. al-Mu'min. Beirut 1985.

Ibn al-Sarrāj, *'Uṣūl* = 'Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Sarī ibn Sahl ibn al-Sarrāj: *al-'Uṣūl fī l-naḥw*, ed. M. ʿUṯmān. Cairo 2009.

Ibn ʿUṣfūr, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Mu'min ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿUṣfūr: *Šarḥ Jumal al-Zajjājī*, ed. F. al-Šaʿʿār, Beirut 1998.

Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* = Muwaffaq al-Dīn Yaʿīš ibn ʿAlī ibn Yaʿīš: *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*. Egypt, n.d.

al-Jāḥiẓ, *Bayān* = 'Abū ʿUṯmān ʿAmr ibn Baḥr ibn Maḥbūb al-Jāḥiẓ: *al-Bayān wa-l-tabyīn*, ed. ʿA-S. M. Hārūn. Cairo 1998.

al-Jaṣṣāṣ, *Fuṣūl* = 'Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī 'Abū Bakr al-Rāzī al-Jaṣṣāṣ: *al-Fuṣūl fī l-'uṣūl*, ed. ʿA. J. al-Našmī. Kuwait 1994.

al-Jurjānī, *Muqtaṣid* = ʿAbd al-Qāhir ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jurjānī: *Kitāb al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-'Īḍāḥ*, ed. K. Baḥr al-Marjān. Baghdad 1982.

al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* = 'Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad ibn Yazīd al-Mubarrad: *Kitāb al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. M. ʿA.-Ḥ. ʿUḍayma. Beirut n.d.

---

consistent with the term *mafʿūl minhu* (used by Sībawayhi in reference to the constituent in *naṣb* in the *taḥḏīr* structure) not being included by later grammarians in the *mafʿūl* category. This fact also cannot be explained by the infrequent use of the *taḥḏīr* structure, because another infrequent *mafʿūl maʿahu* is included in the category. See Okazaki 2003: 28-29 for a discussion.

al-Šāfiʿī, *Risāla* = ʾAbū ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn ʾIdrīs al-Šāfiʿī: *al-Risāla*. Egypt 1310 AH.

Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* = ʿAmr ibn ʿUṯmān Sībawayhi: *Le Livre de Sībawaihi*, ed. H. DERENBOURG. Hildesheim 1970.

al-Ṭabrisī, *Majmaʿ al-bayān* = ʾAbū ʿAlī l-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisrī: *Majmaʿ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*, ed. ʾI. ŠAMS AL-DĪN. Beirut 1997.

al-Zajjājī, *ʾĪḍāḥ* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʾIsḥāq al-Zajjājī: *al-ʾĪḍāḥ fī ʿilal al-naḥw*, ed. M. AL-MUBĀRAK. Cairo 1959.

al-Zajjājī, *Jumal* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʾIsḥāq al-Zajjājī: *al-Jumal*, ed. M. IBN ŠANAB. Paris 1957.

al-Zamaḫšarī, *Kaššāf* = ʾAbū l-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn ʿUmar al-Zamaḫšarī: *al-Kaššāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq al-tanzīl wa-ʿuyūn al-ʾaqāwīl fī wujūh al-taʾwīl*, ed. ʿA.-R. AL-MAHDĪ. Beirut 2008.

Secondary Sources

ÅKESSON, Joyce. 2009. "*Ṣarf*." In: *EALL* IV: 118-122.

AYOUB, Georgine. 1991. "La nominalité du nom ou La question du *tanwīn*." *Arabica* 38: 151-213.

— . 2009. "*Tanwīn*." In: *EALL* IV: 442-446.

— . 2018. "Case and Reference: The Theory of *mā yanṣarif wa-mā lā yanṣarif* in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*." In: AYOUB & VERSTEEGH (eds.) 2018: 11-50.

— , and Kees VERSTEEGH (eds.) 2018. *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics III: The Development of a Tradition: Continuity and Change*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

BERNAND, Marie. 1995. "*Bayān* selon les *Uṣūliyyūn*." *Arabica* 42: 145-160.

BINAGHI, F., and M. SARTORI (eds.). [forthcoming]. *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics V*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

BONEBAKKER, Seeger A. 1978. "*Ḳāfiya*." In: *EI²* IV: 411-414.

BRAY, Julia. (ed.). 2006. *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam: Muslim Horizons*. London & New York: Routledge.

CARTER, Michael G. 1981. *Arabic Linguistics: An Introductory Classical Text with Translation and Notes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

— . 2009. "*Sabab*." In: *EALL* IV: 101-102.

CONRAD, Lawrence I. 1988. "Seven and the *tasbīʿ*: On the Implications of Numerical Symbolism for the Study of Medieval Islamic History." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 31: 42-73.

DANECKI, Janusz. 2009. "*Tamakkun*." In: *EALL* IV: 431-433.

DIEM, Werner. 1998. *Fa-waylun li-l-qāsiyati qulūbuhum: Studien zum arabischen adjektivischen Satz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

EALL = Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, edited by K. VERSTEEGH, M. EID, A. ELGIBALI, M. WOIDICH and A. ZABORSKI. Leiden: Brill, 2005-2008.

EI² = Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition, edited by P. BEARMAN, Th. BIANQUIS, C.E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, W.P. HEINRICHS. Leiden: Brill.

ESSEESY, Mohssen. 2006. "Apposition." In: *EALL* I: 123-126.

FAHD, Toufic. 1993. "*Nasr*." In: *EI²* VII: 1012.

GABUČAN, Gračija M. 1972. *Teorija artiklja i problemy arabskogo sintaksisa*. [Theory of the article and problems of Arabic syntax]. Moscow: Nauka. [In Russian].

GÄTJE, Helmut. 1970. "Zum Begriff der Determination und Indetermination im Arabischen." *Arabica* 17: 225-251.

GIOLFO, Manuela, and Kees VERSTEEGH (eds.). 2019. *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics IV: The Evolution of Theory*. Leiden: Brill.

GUILLAUME, Jean-Patrick. 2011. "Defining the Word within Grammatical Tradition." In: LANCIONI & BETTINI (eds.) 2011: 49-68.

ḤASAN, ʿAbbās. 1964. *Al-Naḥw al-wāfī maʿa rabṭihi bi-l-ʾasālīb al-rafīʿa wa-l-ḥayāt al-luġawiyya al-mutajaddida*. First edn. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1960.

HEINRICHS, Wolfhart P. 1995. "Ruʾba b. al-ʿAdjdjādj." In: *EI²* VIII: 577-578.

KASHER, Almog. 2010-2011. "Early Transformations of Theories about *anna* and *an* and the Standardization of Arabic Grammatical Tradition." *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 19: 243-256.

LANCIONI, Giuliano, and Lidia BETTINI (eds.). 2011. *The Word in Arabic*. Leiden & Boston. Brill.

LANE, Edward W. 1863–1893. *Arabic-English Lexicon*. 8 vols. London: Williams and Norgate.

LARCHER, Pierre. 1991. "D'une grammaire l'autre: Catégorie d'adverbe et catégorie de *mafʿūl muṭlaq*." *Bulletin d'études orientales* 43: 139-159.

— . 1992. "Quand, en arabe, on parlait de l'arabe … (III) Grammaire, logique, rhétorique dans l'islam postclassique." *Arabica* 39: 358-384.

— . 2011. "What is a *kalima*?" In: LANCIONI & BETTINI (eds.) 2011: 33-48.

LAROCHE, Roland A. 1995. "Popular Symbolic/Mystical Numbers in Antiquity." *Latomus* 54: 568-576.

LEVIN, Aryeh. 1995. "The Arab Grammarians' Theory of *ʿamal*." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 19: 214–232.

— . 1997. "The Theory of al-*Taqdīr* and Its Terminology." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 21: 142–166.

MAROGY, Amal E. 2010. *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Leiden.

MARQUET, Yves. 1971. "Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ." In: *EI²* III: 1071-1076.

MONTGOMERY, James. E. 2006. "Al-Jāḥiẓ's *Kitāb al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*." In: BRAY (ed.) 2006: 92-152.

NASR, Seyyed Hossein. 1993. *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

OKAZAKI, Hideki. 2003. "The Subcategory of *mafʿūl* in Arabic Grammatical Tradition: Ibn As-Sarrāǧ's Classification and the Later Transition." *Kansai Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 3: 15-32. [In Japanese].

OWENS, Jonathan. 1988. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

RON-GILBOA, Guy. 2017. *The ʿAjāʾib Theme in Four Medieval Works*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Hebrew University of Jerusalem. [In Hebrew].

SADAN, Arik [forthcoming]. "Less familiar types of *ʾan* according to Arabic grammarians." In: SHEYHATOVITCH & KASHER (eds.) (forthcoming).

SAKAEDANI, Haruko. 2019. "What is Definiteness in Arabic? Focusing on Proper Nouns for Genera and *asmā' mubhama* 'Ambiguous Nouns'." In: GIOLFO & VERSTEEGH (eds.) 2019: 233-252.

SARTORI, Manuel. 2010. "Les 'six noms': grammaire arabe et pudibonderie." *Synergies Monde arabe* 7: 35-45.

— . [forthcoming]. "Suprasegmental Criteria in Medieval Arabic Grammar." In: BINAGHI & SARTORI (eds.) [forthcoming].

SCHACHT, Joseph. 1960. "*Aḥkām*." In *EI²* I: 257.

SCHIMMEL, Annemarie. 1993. *The Mystery of Numbers*. New York & Oxford: Oxford UP.

SHEYHATOVITCH, Beata. 2012. *The Notion of* fā'ida *in the Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition*. M.A. thesis. Tel Aviv University. [In Hebrew].

— . 2016. *Raḍī l-Dīn al-Astarābāḏī and His Position in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory: A Study on the Distinctive Terminology and Methodology in* Šarḥ al-Kāfiya. Ph.D. dissertation. Tel Aviv University. [In Hebrew].

— . 2018. *The Distinctive Terminology in* Šarḥ al-Kāfiya *by Raḍī l-Dīn al-'Astarābāḏī*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

— . 2019a. "The Concept of *tawṭi'a* in Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition." In: GIOLFO & VERSTEEGH (eds.) 2019: 274–294.

— . 2019b. "The Distinction between the General and the Specific in *Sharḥ al-Kāfiya* by Raḍī al-Dīn al-Astarābādhī." Forthcoming in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 46.

— . [forthcoming]. "The Theory of Definition in *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya* by Raḍī l-Dīn al-'Astarābāḏī." In: SHEYHATOVITCH & KASHER (eds.) (fortcoming).

— , and A. KASHER (eds.). [fortcoming]. *From Sībawayhi to 'Aḥmad Ḥasan al-Zayyāt: New Angles on the Arabic Linguistic Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.

STONE, Michael E. 2011. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids, MI, & Cambridge (UK): William B. Eerdmans.

TALMON, Rafael. 1981. "Appositival *'aṭf*: An Inquiry into the History of a Syntactic Category." *Arabica* 28: 78-292.

The editors of *EI²*. 1993. "*Al-mughayyabāt al-khams*." In: *EI²* VII: 346-347.

VERSTEEGH, Kees. 1995. *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes: az-Zaǧǧāǧī's Theory of Grammar: Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

— . 2009. "*Ṣifa*." In: *EALL* IV: 219-222.

WRIGHT, William. 1967. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. (First edn London & Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1862.)

© Beata Sheyhatovitch, Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, Lester and Sally Entin Faculty of Humanities, Tel Aviv University, Israel

◄ beatashe@mail.tau.ac.il ►