On the morphology of the word *tawriya* according to al-Ṣafadī

(d. 764/1363):

Between Baṣrans and Kūfans

Luca Rizzo

The starting-point for this article is the statement made by al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) that the Arabic word *tawriya* has the original form *(aṣl)* *wawriya*, corresponding to the pattern *(wazn)* *tafᶜila*, in which the first radical *wāw* has been replaced by the segment /t/. I aim to shed light on this derivation postulated by al-Ṣafadī by investigating the major sources of grammatical, morphological, and etymological studies which were then available to him. I analyse the sources chronologically to arrive at a better understanding of developments in morphology in the period from the first authors to al-Ṣafadī's contemporaries. I show that al-Ṣafadī was influenced by the disquisitions of the two main schools of Arabic thought on grammar: those of Baṣra and Kūfa. He was influenced in particular regarding the question of how to attribute the patterns to some words like *tawrāt*, with the Baṣran grammarians positing that it is *fawᶜala*, and those belonging to the Kūfa school maintaining that it is according to the pattern *tafᶜala.* Moreover, and precisely because some scholars assume that *tawriya* and *tawrāt* have a common etymology, al-Ṣafadī postulates that, besides having the same root, they also share the same original form, meaning that both words underwent the same phonological and morphological mutations.

1. Introduction

My analysis here is part of a broader project that investigates a figure of speech that underwent its greatest development in the Arabic literature of the Ayyubid and Mamluk eras: *tawriya* (double entendre). *Tawriya* consists in the use of a homonymous/polysemic word expressing at least two meanings, only one of which is intended by the speaker. The importance of this figure in pre-modern literature is shown by the many texts on poetics and stylistics that discuss in more or less detail the theoretical principles on which this figure is based, and that collect those loci probantes that illustrate

the various categories and subdivisions of which this rhetorical device is composed. One of the most important such texts is *Faḍḍ al-ḫitām ʿan al-tawriya wa-l-istiḫdām* by Ḫalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), which is a treatise devoted entirely to this figure. A classic example of treatise-cum-anthology,[1] the text consists of an introduction, two premises (*muqaddima*),[2] a supplement (*tatimma*), and a conclusion (*natīǧa*) where al-Ṣafadī gathers together his choice of poems. The treatise has been studied by Bonebakker (1966), who was the first scholar to present the contents of al-Ṣafadī's work, to place the work within the Arabic literary landscape, and to describe how al-Ṣafadī's predecessors introduced the notion of *tawriya*, and how his successors then developed the notion further.

The main interest of scholars in the study of *tawriya* has focused on the one hand on how *tawriya* developed over time to become an integral part of ʿ*ilm al-badīʿ* (figures of speech) and therefore of canonical tripartite Arabic eloquence (ʿ*ilm al-balāġa*),[3] and on the other on how its diffusion in literature mirrors an evolution in literary sentiment, which itself reflects social and political changes. However, I am not concerned with these issues here, and refer to the studies already available, in particular Bonebakker (1966; 2012), and Rizzo (2018; forthcoming). I am mainly concerned instead with the implications of the few lines in al-Ṣafadī's treatise that introduce his first premise (*muqaddima*). Here, al-Ṣafadī approaches the question of the morphology (*taṣrīf*) and derivation (*ištiqāq*) of the word *tawriya*, arguing that its original form was **wawriya*, with *tawriya* being the result of changes at the morphological level. When I first read this, I wondered why al-Ṣafadī had undertaken such an analysis, and could not understand his argument. It is therefore worth spending some effort to understand al-Ṣafadī's view. I will do so by studying the relevant sources on morphology to clarify what may seem to an Arabist a gross error, since the word *tawriya* is nothing but the *nomen verbi* of the augmented form

---

[1] On anthologies in the Mamluk era, their specificity as a genre, the characteristics of the different types of anthologies, and a classification of the main authors and works, see Bauer (2003; 2007a). Obviously, al-Ṣafadī is not the only author who discussed *tawriya* in detail. There are many authors who contributed in different ways to the theoretical standardisation of this figure. For a list and analysis of the sources, see Bonebakker (1966), Rizzo (2018; forthcoming).

[2] *Muqaddima* is not meant here as an introduction to a work. Rather, it should be understood as a premise to a conclusion, as in a logical syllogism. This is explained because the structure of the work is of a treatise-cum-anthology, where the two premises and the supplement are the theoretical background of which the final conclusion, i.e. the anthology of poetry, is the practical result, and through which those poems can be understood and appreciated.

[3] ʿ*Ilm al-balāġa* is often translated as 'rhetoric.' Although not false in principle, this translation can nevertheless lead to a terminological confusion with the Greek-Latin rhetorical art, an art that will not be received within the *balāġa*, but will enter the Arabic tradition by the name of *ḫaṭāba*; see Larcher (2014). It should be emphasised that *balāġa* in its tripartite canonical form is essentially a pragmatic discipline in which the communication needs and the techniques with which to express them are linked to and dependent on the purpose of the speaker and the consequent adaptation to the conditions of the context of enunciation. See Ghersetti (1998), Bauer (2007b), Larcher (2009; 2013).

fa⁽⁽ala—yufa⁽⁽ilu—taf⁽īl applied to the triliteral root *w r y*, and therefore to the doubly weak verb *warrà—yuwarrī—tawriya*, where the *nomen verbi* assumes the pattern *taf⁽ila*, and not *taf⁽īl*, precisely because it is a third-weak-consonant verb, like, for example, *rabbà—yurabbī—tarbiya.* I do not want to see this as a simple oversight on al-Ṣafadī's part, and nor to accuse him of being ignorant of the basic rules of verbal morphology, and therefore propose to give chronological order to and investigate the sources available to al-Ṣafadī. Doing so will demonstrate how he drew his arguments from the two Arabic grammatical traditions, the Kūfan and the Baṣran,[4] and combined them into a whole – albeit one that is not entirely convincing.

2. Al-Ṣafadī and his sources

Al-Ṣafadī (*Faḍḍ* 63) opens the first *muqaddima* by analysing the derivational morphology and the etymology of the word *tawriya*. Bonebakker (1966) does not address the first of these, i.e. the morphology and substitution of segments that al-Ṣafadī argues affects the word *tawriya*. Specifically,

---

[4] When speaking of the grammatical schools of Baṣra and Kūfa, one refers to the two traditions of grammatical studies that characterised the development of Arabic grammatical theory especially after Sībawayhi's *Kitāb.* The source *par excellence* regarding the contrast between the two schools is undoubtedly Ibn al-Anbārī's (d. 577/1181) *al-Inṣāf fī masāʾil al-ḫilāf*, a work that lists 121 grammatical and syntactic issues where the contrast between the two schools is most evident, and that clarifies the arguments made by grammarians in each tradition. If we wanted to summarise the essential traits that differentiate these two schools and their different methodologies, we could resort to the famous dichotomy *qiyās* vs. *samā⁽.* On the one hand, the Baṣran school is seen as deriving general laws from particular cases based on analogical reasoning (*qiyās*), while on the other the Kūfan school is seen as favouring the empirical datum, the datum collected by informants (*samā⁽*), which becomes a rule by virtue of its own attested use, even if it represents an anomalous case (*šāḏḏ*).

To this simplified view of the two schools, Carter (1999) replies that they were distinguished in terms of induction (*istiqrāʾ*), the concept underlying both approaches. This convincing hypothesis is based on the fact that analogical reasoning, the foundation of the Baṣran school, is applied to the linguistic material collected, to the living language of the informants. However, if the act of collecting new data cannot be stopped, with even anomalous cases becoming part of the basis on which to apply the induction, then the very hold of analogical reasoning as a method for deriving general rules from particular cases fails, since special cases can always be admitted, at least according to the Kūfan view. This is why, Carter continues, closing the admissible corpus was the only way to base a grammatical theory on a certain and immutable set of data from which applicable rules could be derived inductively.

On the other hand, Bernards (1997: 93-98) argues that there was a real methodological distinction between the two schools only at the turn of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, and that belonging to a school should be seen more in terms of the social aspect of geographical origin and of academic lineage, above all for the concept of transmitted authority and the weight that it has in justifying certain theoretical constructs.

Numerous scholars have contributed to our knowledge of the developmental phases of Arabic grammar as a science, and in particular of the two schools of Baṣra and Kūfa: for example, Weil's introduction to Ibn al-Anbārī (*Inṣāf* 3-116), Versteegh (1980; 1990; 1993: 9-16, passim), Baalbaki (1981), Owens (1990: 1-3, 203-219, passim), Bernards (1997: 11-18, 93-98, *passim*), Carter (1999), Shah (2003a-b).

al-Ṣafadī maintains that the pattern of the word *tawriya* is *tafʿila*, where we can see a mutation of the first segment of the pattern: the original form is not *tawriya* but *wawriya, a substitution comparable to the words **wawlağ > tawlağ*, **wurāṯ > turāṯ*, and **wawṣiya > tawṣiya*. Al-Ṣafadī does not comment on or explain his argument, which makes us reflect on the morphological change in a word that we would all have classified as a *maṣdar* issued from the second augmented form *faʿʿala*. Let us proceed in order, starting first of all with al-Ṣafadī's statement:

> Know that the original form (*aṣl*) of *tawriya* is *wawriya, since the first *wāw* has been substituted with *tāʾ*. This phenomenon is frequent in the language of the Arabs, e.g. they said *tawlağ*[5] [instead of] *wawlağ, *turāṯ*, whose original form is *wurāṯ, and *tawṣiya*, whose original form is *wawṣiya, for the radical (*mādda*) of the first is *w l ğ*, of the second *w r ṯ*, and of the third *w ṣ y*. Its pattern (*wazn*) is *tafʿila* like *tabṣira*, *takrima*, and *taḏkira*. (al-Ṣafadī, *Faḍḍ* 63)

No other scholar before al-Ṣafadī had argued that *wawriya was the original form of the word *tawriya*. To understand al-Ṣafadī's theory better, we should consider the two pillars on which it is based. First, the segment /t/ is a substitution for the first radical letter of the word: *wāw*; second, the pattern of the word is *tafʿila*. The first is dubious to an Arabist ear, and seems to contradict the second, which, if true, would invalidate the first. To understand better what this morphological change is and how it applies to particular words with a weak letter as first and last radical letter, we should provide a brief overview of the phenomenon of *ibdāl al-ḥurūf* (letter substitution).[6]

Sībawayhi (d. ca. 180/769) was the first grammarian to mention the *ibdāl* or *badal* as a morphological phenomenon involving the substitution of a segment in given words, writing the following in his *Kitāb*:

> Sometimes, they substituted the *wāw* with *tāʾ* when the first is vowelled 'u' in the way I have already described, for the letter *tāʾ* is one of the letters of augmentation (*ḥurūf al-ziyāda*), and the substitution is like that of *hamza*. In this case, the substitution with *tāʾ* is not a general rule (*laysa bi-muṭṭarid*); therefore, they say: *turāṯ*, being derived from *wariṯa*,

---

[5] Since the words that al-Ṣafadī uses to exemplify substitution and mutation are quoted only to show a morphological change and not for their meanings, I do not translate them.

[6] This is the case of *ibdāl* called grammatical *ibdāl*; on this, see El Berkawi (1981: 27-48), Bohas and Guillaume (1984: 223-267), Hämeen-Anttila (2007). Ibn al-Sikkīt (d. 244/858) devoted a whole work to the issues of *qalb* and *ibdāl*, which, however, is less informative for this investigation than the other sources I discuss (*Qalb* 62-63). On the other hand, the lexical *ibdāl* "refers to phonologically and semantically related doublets, triplets, or longer series in the lexicon" (Hämeen-Anttila 2007: 280). See also Hämeen-Anttila (1993).

as well as *anā* is derived from *wanaytu*, for the woman has been made indolent, as well as *aḥad* is derived from *wāḥid*, *aǧam* from *waǧam* whereas they said *aǧam* in that way, for they substituted the initial *wāw* vowelled 'u' or 'i' with *hamza*. Likewise, *al-tuḫama*, for it is derived from *al-waḫāma*; *al-tukaʾa*, for it is derived from *tawakkaʾtu*; *al-tuklān*, for it is derived from *tawakkaltu*; and *al-tuǧāh*, for it is derived from *wāǧahtu*. [...]

Sometimes, when two *wāws* have met, they substituted [one of them] with *tāʾ*, as they did with *tāʾ* in the above-mentioned examples. This substitution is not a general rule and it is not as frequent as when the *wāw* is vowelled 'u', for the *wāw* is vowelled 'a.' It is compared, thus, with the *wāw* in *waḥad*. On the other hand, it is not as frequent, and it could have been substituted anyway despite its rare occurrence as is the case with *tawlaǧ*, about which al-Ḫalīl [d. ca. 160-175/776-791] affirmed that [its pattern] is *fawʿal* and they substituted the *wāw* with *tāʾ*. He stated that *fawʿal* is more suitable than *tafʿal*, since *tafʿal* as a noun hardly ever occurs in the language, while *fawʿal* is frequent. Among them, someone says *dawlaǧ* meaning *tawlaǧ*, which means the place where you enter. [...]

You say *tawʿida* and *yawʿid* in forming the pattern *tafʿila* and *yafʿil* from *waʿadtu*, when they are nouns and not a verb, as you say *mawḍiʿ* and *mawrika*. Both *yāʾ* and *tāʾ* are in the place of this *mīm*, and the *wāw* did not disappear as it did in the verb. It is also not suppressed in *mawʿid* because in it there is no cause [for its suppression] as there is in *yaʿidu*. This is due to the fact that it is a noun, and their saying *tawdiya*, *tawsiʿa*, and *tawṣiya* demonstrates to you that the *wāw* remains unchanged. (Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* 2: 392-394)

In this extract, Sībawayhi is highlighting the fact that substituting the first radical letter *wāw* is not a general rule (*ġayr bi-muṭṭarid*), and it is usually applied when *wāw* is vowelled 'u,' whilst it is less frequent when *wāw* is vowelled 'a,' *hamza* being preferred in this case. Moreover, when the pattern applied to a root with a weak first radical letter is a pattern expressing a noun, the semivowel *wāw* is not suppressed, as it is, in contrast, in the conjugation of the verb *muḍāriʿ*.

Al-Sīrāfī's (d. 368/979) *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi* explains Sībawayhi's comments regarding the fact that morphological changes differ depending on the type of word – be it a noun or a verb:

About what he said on the pattern *tafʿila*: *tawʿida* and *tawʿid*, he meant the difference between *tawʿid* and *tawʿida* as two nouns or two verbs. For, when you conjugate the verb from the root *al-waʿd* according to the patterns *tafʿil* and *yafʿil*, you say *taʿid* and *yaʿid*, as per the case which we have explained about the fall of this *wāw* in the verb and its being restored. There [you see] the whole original form, in the falling of *wāw* in the verb *taʿid*, that the original form of *yaʿid* is **yawʿid*. The *wāw* is between a *yāʾ* and a vowel 'i:' this is heavy (*ṯaqīl*) and the verb is also heavy, making the *wāw* fall. Then, the rest follows the *yāʾ*: *taʿidu*, *yaʿidu*, and *aʿidu*.

When you form a noun, the noun is lighter (*aḫaff*) than the verb, and the presence of a *wāw* in a noun between a *yāʾ* and a vowel 'i' is lighter than its presence between them in a verb.

> Their words *tawsiʿa* and *tawḍiya* witness the difference between the noun and the verb; if
> it were in a verb, you would have said *tasiʿu* and *taḍī*. (al-Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* 5: 225)

Al-Sīrāfī's commentary on Sībawayhi's words explains why the first radical letter *wāw* falls in the *muḍāriʿ* paradigm of verbs, contrasting the conjugation of verbs with that of nouns. The verb is *ṯaqīl* (heavy), as is the consonant *yāʾ* and the vowel 'i' between which the *wāw* is found. This is why the *wāw* falls in the third-person singular, with mutation occurring in the other persons, too: *yawʿid > yaʿid, *tawʿid > taʿid, *awʿid > aʿid (cf. al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* 1:126). This is not applicable if the pattern is applied to express a noun instead of a verb, since the noun is lighter (*aḫaff*) than the verb; and, even if the letter immediately after the *wāw* is vowelled 'i,' it does not entail the fall of the semivowel, e.g. *w s ʿ* > *tawsiʿa* (*tafʿila*). If we apply this reasoning to the word *tawriya*, then the segment /t/ is not a substitution for a first radical *wāw*, which, in the case of a verb, would have fallen; but *tawriya* being a noun, it is spelled out in the word, for /t/ is but a segment of the pattern, added to the radical letters to derive a *nomen verbi*. This seems to contradict openly what al-Ṣafadī maintains, since for him the segment /t/ is a substitution for the first radical *wāw*, while the *wāw* which is spelled out in the word is nothing but an augmentation letter.

How, then, can we explain the fact that al-Ṣafadī states that *tawriya* has as its pattern *tafʿila*, but explains the presence of the segment /t/ at its beginning as a substitution of the letter *wāw*, while Sībawayhi assigns the pattern *fawʿal* instead of *tafʿil/tafʿila* to the most common words undergoing this *ibdāl*? Our first impression is of a misunderstanding on al-Ṣafadī's part, but is this really so? I will now try to answer this question by focusing on some aspects of the substitution (*ibdāl*), the compensation (*ʿiwaḍ*), and the specific nature of the patterns *tafʿila* and *fawʿal*.

We can find some help in interpreting al-Ṣafadī's statement by looking at the words of al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898-9), who states in his *al-Kitāb al-kāmil* that this substitution has fundamentally phonetic motives:

> The *wāw* can be turned into *tāʾ* when there is no *tāʾ* after it, for example *turāṯ* from *wariṯtu*,
> *tuǧāh* from *al-waǧh*, and *tukaʾa*. This has been done because of the aversion to the *wāw* being
> vowelled 'u.' The nearest to the *wāw* of the letters of augmentation and substitution (*ḥurūf
> al-zawāʾid wa-l-badal*) is the *tāʾ*. Thus, it has been turned into it, and it can be turned into it
> as a substitution also when the vowel is not 'u,' for example: 'this is *atqà* than this' and 'I
> hit him until I made him fall' (*atkaʾtu-hu*).[7] When after the *wāw* there is the *tāʾ* of the *iftaʿala*

---

[7] The radical letters of *atqà* are *w q y*, while those of *atkaʾtu* are *w k ʾ*.

pattern, the way is the mutation (*qalb*) to obtain the assimilation (*idġām*). (al-Mubarrad, *Kāmil* 1:100; cf. *Muqtaḍab* 1:102-103; 1:129)

Al-Mubarrad lays down two conditions for substituting *wāw* with *tāʾ*: when it is not followed by another segment /t/, and when the substituted *wāw* is vowelled 'u,' to avoid the segment /wu/. For al-Mubarrad, *tāʾ* is chosen as a substitution for *wāw* because this letter is among the *ḥurūf al-zawāʾid*, which has the point of articulation closer to *wāw*. This example helps us to understand why such a substitution occurs in some words, and where it is considered mandatory or just admissible and actualised only in some variants. The case of *tawriya* does not pertain to the phonetic substitution case of /wu/ > /tu/, but, as al-Mubarrad points out, this change can also occur when the vowel of the *wāw* is 'a.' This seems to be the case with *tawriya* if we believe al-Ṣafadī's words. However, al-Mubarrad adds that in this case the substitution of *wāw* is more common with *hamza*:

> If it were said to you 'build the pattern *fawʿal* from the root *waʿada*,' you would have said *awʿad*, being its original form **wawʿad*, because *wāw* is from the original form, and after it there is the *wāw* of *fawʿal*, then you turn the first into *hamza*, as I have described to you already. (al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* 1:131-32)

In these two passages, we deduce that the substitution /w/ > /t/ is a general rule when the *wāw* is vowelled 'u.' However, when the *wāw* is vowelled 'a,' the general rule suggests a substitution with *hamza*, as we have seen in the previous passage from Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*. In this case, the pattern of the word under examination plays an important role in distinguishing whether the segment at the beginning of the word is part of the root or not. In the word *tawriya*, the augmentation letter is certainly *tāʾ*, which is part of the pattern of the *nomen verbi*, while *wāw* is the first radical letter of the word. Why, then, does al-Ṣafadī claim that /t/ is but a substitution for an original *wāw*? Does he consider it to be an augmentation letter or part of the radical? And if the pattern were not *tafʿila*?

To investigate this topic, I will turn to Ibn Ǧinnī (d. 392/1002), who explains the difference between the use of the letter *tāʾ* as a radical and as an augmentation letter:

> Another thing shows that in the word *tawʾam* the augmentation is the *wāw* and not the *tāʾ*. This is because the pattern *fawʿal* is more frequent in speech than *tafʿal*. Do you not see that the category *kawṯar*, *ǧawhar*, *qarṣawa*, *ḥawqal*, and *kawkab* is more frequent than the category *taʾlab*? What is more frequent is considered the general rule. (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Munṣif* 119)

Ibn Ǧinnī then continues with a more specific account of the use of *tāʾ* as a substitution for a first radical letter *wāw*:

Abū ʿUṯmān[8] said: "With this they substituted the *wāw* with *tāʾ* when after it there is no *tāʾ*. So, they said: *atlaǧa yutliǧu*, *atkaʾa yutkiʾu*, this is *atqà* than this, and *taqiyya*. Their original forms are *awlaǧ* and *awkaʾ* since they are derived from *tawallaǧtu* and *tawakkaʾtu*, *atqà* is derived from *waqaytu* as well as *taqiyya*, whose pattern is *faʿīla*, but they substituted the *wāw* with *tāʾ* since it was lighter to them."

Abū l-Fatḥ said: "He says, if they had substituted the *wāw* with *tāʾ* in these places where there is no *tāʾ* after the *wāw*, it is because it is more suitable for their purpose of lightening. So that they substitute it with *tāʾ* in the category *iftaʿaltu*, assimilating the substituted *tāʾ* to that of the pattern *iftaʿala*, and believing that its change of state better accords with the preceding vowels."

Abū ʿUṯmān said: "al-Ḫalīl maintains that his speech

<div dir="rtl">

مُتَّخِذًا مِن عِضَوَاتٍ تَوْلَجا [9]

</div>

Gaining a hiding place among the thorny trees (?)

it is the pattern *fawʿal* from *walaǧtu* and not from *tafʿal*, for *tafʿal* is rare in nouns, while *fawʿal* is frequent. However, it is known that, if there was a *wāw* in its original form, it must be turned into *hamza* lest two *wāw*s meet at the beginning of the word. Therefore, *wāw* is substituted with *tāʾ* for the frequency of its use instead of *wāw* in the category of *walaǧa*, e.g. when they said *atlaǧa*, *mutliǧ*, and this is *atlaǧ* than this. This use has not been gathered except from the reliable authorities."

Abū l-Fatḥ said: "He says, if they substituted already the *wāw* with *tāʾ* in *atlaǧa*, *mutliǧ*, and *atlaǧ* – that if they had brought for it, then elision (*ḥaḏf*) and not mutation (*qalb*) would be obligatory for them – so [that means that] its substitution with *tāʾ* is more appropriate in each letter corresponding to this category in which the mutation is a general rule, for if they had not substituted it with *tāʾ*, they would have had to substitute it with *hamza*. It is *tawlaǧ*, for if it were not substituted with *tāʾ*, it would have been mandatory to say *awlaǧ* because of the meeting of two *wāw*s." (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Munṣif* 207-208; cf. *Taṣrīf* 34-36)

---

[8] Abū ʿUṯmān Bakr b. Muḥammad al-Māzinī, who probably died between 223-249/847-863, is the author of the *Kitāb al-taṣrīf*. Ibn Ǧinnī's *al-Munṣif* is a commentary on this.

[9] The variant ضعوات في > عضوات من is more convincing. The attribution of this verse is not unanimous. In some sources, such as al-Saḫāwī (*Sifr* 333), *Lisān al-ʿarab* and *Tāǧ al-ʿarūs*, s. v. *w l ǧ*, it is attributed to Ǧarīr as a *hiǧāʾ* against the poet al-Baʿīṯ; others have no attribution, as in al-Sīrāfī (*Šarḥ* 5: 223), Ibn al-Anbārī (*Asrār* 23). The hemistich cannot be found in Ǧarīr (*Dīwān*).

In these examples, we understand that the pattern of the word with its specific vowels influences the morphological changes that occur to the radical letters when assuming a specific pattern. In particular, although the general rule sees the substitution of the first *wāw* vowelled 'a' with *hamza*, the linguistic evidence and different variants (*luġāt*) show a category of words in which *tāʾ* is preferred to *hamza* as a substitute for *wāw*. These words are built according to the pattern *fawʿal*, which is a pattern used for nouns and which is more common than the patterns *tafʿal* and *tafʿil*. But it is also a pattern that is not at first sight connected with the word *tawriya*. Or is it?

To my knowledge, Ibn Ǧinnī was also the first author to quote a word formed from the root *w r y* as an example of substitution of the first *wāw* with *tāʾ*: the word *tawrāt*. And he does so when discussing the word's derivation, which he sees as being Arabic in origin:

> As a substitution instead of *wāw*: it is substituted with *tāʾ* as a proper substitution when *wāw* is the first radical letter, for example: *tuǧāh* according to the pattern *fuʿāl* from *al-waǧh*, *turāṯ* according to the pattern *fuʿāl* from *wariṯa*, and *taqiyya* according to the pattern *faʿīla* from *waqaytu*, and like this *taqwà*, from the same root, according to the pattern *faʿlà*, as well as *tuqāt* according to the pattern *fuʿala*.
>
> *Tawrāt* (توراة – تورٰىة) for us is [built] according to the pattern *fawʿala* from *wariya l-zand* (the fire stick produced fire), its original form being *wawraya. The first *wāw* has been substituted with *tāʾ*. This is due to the fact that, if they had not substituted it with *tāʾ*, it would have been mandatory to substitute it with *hamza* because of the meeting of two *wāw*s at the beginning of the word. The same applies to *tawlaǧ*, according to the pattern *fawʿal* from *walaǧa—yaliǧu*, as it is the rule for these two letters, its original form being *wawlaǧ.
>
> On the other hand, for the school of Baghdad,[10] *tawrāt* and *tawlaǧ* are based on the pattern *tafʿal*, but it is better to refer to them as *fawʿal* because of the frequency of *fawʿal* and the scarcity of *tafʿal* in speech. The same applies to *tuḫama*, whose original form is *wuḫama because it is *fuʿala* from *al-waḫāma*, *tukaʾa* because it is *fuʿala* from *tawakkaʾtu*, *tuklān* being *fuʿlān* from *tawakkaltu*, and *tayqūr* is *fayʿūl* from *al-waqār*. (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Sirr* 1:145-146)

Ibn Ǧinnī mentions *tawrāt* as an example of substitution of *wāw* according to the pattern *fawʿala* applied to the root *w r y*.[11] Some later sources do not bring new perspectives to this discussion. By way of example, I quote al-Zamaḫšarī's (d. 538/1144) *Mufaṣṣal*, in which he does not add any particular

---

[10] Ibn Ǧinnī is the only author who attributes this approach to the school of Baghdad.

[11] On the word *tawrāt*, see Jeffery ([1938] 2007: 95-96), Lazarus-Yafeh (2012), and Adang (2006).

explanation, limiting himself instead to listing the same words that had already appeared in previous sources:

> The letters *wāw*, *yāʾ*, *sīn*, *ṣād*, and *bāʾ* are substituted with *tāʾ*. It substitutes the *wāw* when it is first radical, as in *ittaʿada* and *atlağa-hu*. The Poet said:

> رُبَّ رامٍ مِن بني ثُعَلٍ * مُنْلِجٍ كَفَّيْهِ في قُتَرِهْ[12]

> Such a marksman of the banū Ṯuʿal introduces his hands in the lurking-places

> and *tuğāh, tayqūr, tuklān, tukaʾa, tukala, tuḫama, tuhama, taqiyya, taqwà, tatrà, tawrāt,*[13] *tawlağ, turāṯ, tilād.* (al-Zamaḫšarī, *Mufaṣṣal* 175)[14]

No more explanations are given in Ibn al-Ḥāǧib's (d. 646/1249) *al-Īḍāḥ* (2:415), which takes into account neither the word *tawrāt* nor the word *tawriya*. This is the same in Ibn ʿUṣfūr's (d. 669/1270) *al-Mumtiʿ* (254-256) and *al-Muqarrib* (536), while al-Astarābāḏī (d. 686-688/1287-1289) in *Šarḥ Šāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāǧib* stresses the fact that *wāw* is substituted with *tāʾ* because of their point of articulation:

> I say: Know that *tāʾ* is close to *wāw* on its point of articulation (*maḫrağ*), since *tāʾ* is an alveolar consonant (*min uṣūl al-ṯanāyā*)[15] and *wāw* a labial (*min al-šafatayn*), and they have

---

[12] Imruʾ al-Qays (*Dīwān* 123), also quoted in Åkesson (2001: 351).

[13] In another edition of the *Mufaṣṣal* (ed. Imīl Badīʿ Yaʿqūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1999), the editor reads *tawriya* instead of *tawrāt*. This could be a misinterpretation of the Koranic writing for *tawrāt*: تورٰة.

[14] Ibn Yaʿīš (*Šarḥ* 2: 1381) provides a short explanation in accordance with Ibn Ǧinnī: "They called *tawrāt* one of the revealed books, the *tāʾ* in it is a substitution for the *wāw*, its original form being *wawrāt* [based on the pattern] *fawʿala* derived from *warà l-zand*." Åkesson (2001: 351) comments on a similar passage in Ibn Masʿūd, quoting al-Zamaḫšarī's and Ibn Yaʿīš' commentaries without, however, listing the word *tawrāt*.

[15] Fleisch (1949-1950: 230-231) points out that al-Ḫalīl calls this consonant *niṭʿiyya*, i.e. post-alveolar.

the *hams*[16] in common. The *tā'* is a frequent substitution for *wāw*; however, it is not a general rule unless in the category *iftaʿala*.[17]

It happens [in some words], for example *turāṯ, tuǧāh, tawlaǧ, tatrà* – from *al-muwātara, tulaǧ, tukaʾa, taqwà* – from *waqaytu*, and *tawrāt*, which is considered by the Baṣran school to be formed according to the pattern *fawʿala* derived from *warà l-zand* – like *tawlaǧ* – being God's book light. On the other hand, the Kūfan school considers them *tafʿala* and *tafʿal*.[18] The first is more appropriate, for *fawʿal* is more frequent than *tafʿal*. (al-Astarābāḏī, *Šarḥ* 3: 80-82)

How has this overview helped us understand better al-Ṣafadī's statement that the original form of *tawriya* is *wawriya, and that the segment /t/ is nothing but a substitution (*ibdāl*) for the first /w/? To claim that the statement was only a mistake is misleading.

Starting from the fact that both *tawriya* and *tawrāt* share – at least for certain Arab philologists – the same etymology, I posit that this close connection underlies al-Ṣafadī's view and in a sense justifies it. First, al-Ṣafadī continues in the same chapter his attempt to demonstrate that the original radical letters of *tawriya* are in fact two: *wāw* and *rā'*. Combining them with *alif* and not *yā'*, he claims to have proven that the six possible letter combinations convey a similar meaning: 'the shifting [from a meaning] of hiding and concealment to a meaning of clarity and visibility' (*al-intiqāl min al-satr wa-l-ḫafā' ilà maʿnà l-wuḍūḥ wa-l-ẓuhūr*; al-Ṣafadī, *Faḍḍ* 63-66; Bonebakker 1966: 74-75).[19] In particular, when

---

[16] Arab grammarians distinguish between letters *maǧhūra* and *mahmūsa*, i.e. the manner of articulation. Cantineau (1946: 117-118) maintains that for Arab grammarians "la corrélation *mahmûsa-maǧhûra* correspond à une corrélation de pression, les *maǧhûra* étant des consonnes « pressées », à forte tension des organes au point d'articulation et non soufflées, tandis que les *mahmûsa* sont des consonnes « non pressées », à faible tension des organes et accompagnées d'un souffle." Fleisch (1949-1950: 233-237) replies to this analysis by arguing that "les dénominations *maǧhūra, mahmūsa*, en elles-mêmes se réfèrent à la voix : « éclatantes », « étouffées » et non à une modalité du travail articulatoire" (Fleisch 1949-1950: 233). See also Fleisch (1961: 219-223). We should note, however, that *tā'* is *mahmūsa*, but *wāw* is *maǧhūra*. See Fleisch (1949-1950: 228-229); and, for an in-depth analysis of the issue in Ibn Ǧinnī's thought, see Bakalla (1982: 129-139).

[17] To turn *wāw* into *tā'* when the pattern is *iftaʿala* is a general rule: "When they saw that their outcome is to change it (i.e. *wāw*) according to the change in the conditions of what precedes it, they turned it into *tā'* because it is a strong letter, which does not change with a change in the conditions of what precedes it. Moreover, it is near to the point of articulation of *wāw* and in it there is a *hams* compatible with the being *līn* of *wāw* (i.e. soft letter, *wāw* and *yā'*) to harmonise its pronunciation with the pronunciation after it. Therefore, it is assimilated and pronounced all at once" (Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* 2: 1380-1381). See also Åkesson (2001: 229).

[18] We should note that Ibn al-Anbārī (*Inṣāf*) does not mention this different morphological analysis of the word *tawrāt*.

[19] The principle according to which the meaning of the root expressed by its consonants is still expressed even if its components are transposed, and therefore the conclusion that there is a semantic link that unites all the words with the same consonants, even if in a different order, is a theory developed by Ibn Ǧinnī (*Ḫaṣā'iṣ* 2: 133-139). This theory, called *al-ištiqāq al-akbar* (the greater derivation), is in contrast to *al-ištiqāq al-aṣġar* (the smaller derivation), which is, so to say, the set of morphological forms and derivations that are used and understood by people to convey a meaning from a given root. For a discussion of Ibn Ǧinnī's theories on *ištiqāq*, see Mehiri (1973: 239-267, in particular 252-257).

discussing the combination *w r ā*, he cites the word *tawrāt*, providing the same explanation that we have already seen in Ibn Ǧinnī, Ibn Yaʿīš, and al-Astarābāḏī. Second, if we look at the Koranic commentaries, we find that the word *tawrāt* seems to have undergone a change that modified its original form. The question of its etymology remains open in Koranic commentaries, being located between acceptance of its foreign origin and the desire to see it as being derived from an Arabic root. An enlightening example of this attitude is found in the work of the great grammarian of his time, Abū Ḥayyān al-Ġarnāṭī (d. 745/1344), who outlines all the hypotheses on the etymology of *tawrāt*:

> *Tawrāt* is a Hebraic noun, which the grammarians forced into an Arabic derivation (*ištiqāq*) and pattern. This was done after the grammarians had established that the [rules of Arabic] derivation do not apply to foreign nouns, and nor does the pattern apply, forcing an Arabic derivation.
>
> There are two theories on the derivation of *tawrāt*. The first [sees it as being derived] from *wariya l-zand*, i.e. when [the fire stick] has been struck and the fire appeared from it, as if the *tawrāt* were a light against error. This derivation is the saying of the majority. Abū Fīd Muʾarriǧ al-Sadūsī [d. 195/810] was of the opinion that it is derived from *warrà*, as it has been transmitted that [the Prophet] "When he wanted to go on a journey, he concealed it

---

An interesting study of how modern phonological, morphological, and phonotactic theories can be applied to Ibn Ǧinnī's theory is Grande (2003), who, starting from Ibn Ǧinnī's postulates and comparing them with modern studies on the Matrix and Etymon Model (on this model, see Bohas 2007) showed that it is already possible to identify in the thought of the Arab grammarian the overcoming of the assumed schema of the Arabic triliteral root – already questioned by Larcher (1999). Specifically, he shows that the proto-historical root in the Arabic language is nothing more than a biconsonantal-vowel root whose structure is C_1aC_2, i.e. consonant—vowel 'a'—consonant, and that the shift from this proto-historical to the historical root took place in three stages: 1. Vowel transference, 2. Insertion of *hamza*, and 3. Metathesis, obtaining as a final result the historical root $C_1aC_2 \partial C_3$.

Versteegh (1985) and Carter (1991) point out that, although Ibn Ǧinnī was among the most renowned grammarians of the Arabic tradition, the theory of *al-ištiqāq al-akbar* did not find many adherents. One such adherent, though, was al-Ṣafadī, for whom this way of proceeding is not limited only to (*Faḍḍ* 63-66). As Goldziher (1872: 592-595) explains, he supports the theory of greater derivation and applies it uniformly in his writings. For example, in the work *al-Šuʿūr bi-l-ʿūr* devoted to one-eyed people, al-Ṣafadī explores the different meanings that the root ʿ *w r* expresses in its various transpositions, arguing that the common meaning is that of 'being feared' (*taḥawwuf*; *Šuʿūr* 41-52); similarly, in *Ǧinān al-ǧinās*, he explores the different transpositions of the root *ǧ n s*, arguing that the common meaning of all the transpositions is 'the association of something to what resembles it' (*inḍimām al-šayʾ ilà mā yušākilu-hu*; *Ǧinān* 26-29). In another anthology, devoted to blind people, *Nakt al-himyān fī nukat al-ʿumyān*, he reduces the root signifier to the letters ʿ and *m*, and demonstrates that, with the occasional addition of one or more letters based on the words attested in the lexicon, they all express in their different transpositions a meaning that can be traced back to 'becoming hidden and concealed' (*al-istitār wa-l-iḫtifāʾ*; *Himyān* 6-12). There is a need for an in-depth study of how al-Ṣafadī employs *al-ištiqāq al-akbar* in his works, how he borrowed from Ibn Ǧinnī's theory, how this process is a fundamental part of the treatise-cum-anthology genre in his output, and how he uses this approach to support his thesis.

with something else" (*kāna iḏā arāda safaran warrà bi-ġayri-hi*)[20] because most of the *tawrāt* is an allusion (*talwīḥ*).

As for its pattern, al-Ḫalīl, Sībawayhi, and the other grammarians of the Baṣran school were of the opinion that its pattern is *fawʿala*, in which *tāʾ* is a substitution for *wāw*, as it has been substituted in *tawlaǧ*, whose original form is its pattern **wawlaǧ*, for they are derived from *warà* and *walaǧa*, and they are like *ḥawqala*. On the other hand, al-Farrāʾ [d. 207/822] was of the opinion that its pattern is *tafʿila*, like *tawṣiya*, since the vowel 'i' of the *ʿayn* has been substituted with 'a' and the letter *yāʾ* with *alif*, as they said: *nāṣiya* and *ǧāriya*, becoming *nāṣā* and *ǧārā*. Likewise, *tawṣiya > tawṣā* is permitted but not attested, said al-Zaǧǧāǧ [d. 311/923]. Some of the Kūfan grammarians believed that its pattern is *tafʿala*, the *ʿayn* vowelled 'a,' derived from 'I kindled (*waraytu*) for you my fire sticks;' the *imāla* in the word *tawrāt* is possible [...]

Al-Zamaḫšarī said:[21] "*Tawrāt* and *inǧīl* are two foreign nouns, whose derivation has been forced [to derive from] *al-warī* and *al-naǧl*, while their patterns are *tafʿ(v)l* and *ifʿīl*. This is true only if we consider them Arabic." What he said is true, except that a correction should be made in his speech about *tafʿ(v)l*: he did not mention that for the Baṣran school its pattern is *fawʿala*, and did not indicate whether the *ʿayn* was vowelled 'a' or 'i.'[22] (Abū Ḥayyān, *Tafsīr* 2: 386-387)

These sources shed light on al-Ṣafadī's statement about the etymology and derivational morphology of the word *tawriya*.

3. Conclusions

What conclusions can we draw from this overview of the sources available to al-Ṣafadī? We can posit no definitive answer, but can nonetheless advance the hypothesis that he merged morphological theory with etymological theory, based on the (pseudo-)common root of the words *tawriya* and *tawrāt*. To explain this, I propose the following hypothesis: convinced that the two words *tawriya* and *tawrāt* are connected, al-Ṣafadī gives a similar morphological derivation that binds these words. As we have seen in Abū Ḥayyān's commentary, he argues that *tawrāt* is foreign in origin (al-Ṣafadī, *Faḍḍ* 64). However, he also considers the Arabic derivation, embracing the Baṣran view that *tawrāt* underwent a letter substitution that transformed the original form **wawriya*, according to the pattern *fawʿala*, into

---

[20] Most probably *kāna iḏā arāda ġazwatan warrà bi-ġayri-hā*. See Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (*Bulūġ* no. 1270), Abū Dāwūd al-Siǧistānī (*Sunan* no. 2637). Cf. with variants al-Buḫārī (*Ṣaḥīḥ* no. 2947, 2948) and al-Nasāʾī (*Sunan* no. 8727, 8728). Cf. Bravmann (1971), who does not quote the *ḥadīṯ*, but only the *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* by Ibn Hišām (d. ca. 213-218/828-833). See also Zaġlūl (1996: 6, 31).

[21] See al-Zamaḫšarī (*Kaššāf* 1: 526).

[22] Cf. al-Ṭūsī (*Tibyān* 2: 390-391), Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (*Tafsīr* 7: 171-172), al-Bayḍāwī (*Tafsīr* 1: 243), al-Qūnawī (*Ḥāšiya* 6: 7-8).

tawrāt. This point should be stressed because al-Ṣafadī does not affirm that the original form is *wawrāt. Instead, he says *wawriya (*Faḍḍ* 63, 64). This, in my opinion, is a connection to the tradition of Koranic commentaries, which report not only the Baṣran view, but also the Kūfan view represented by al-Farrāʾ, who argued that *tawrāt* has as its pattern *tafʿila* and that it underwent a mutation of the vowel 'i' of the second radical letter in 'a,' entailing a mutation of the letter *yāʾ* in *alif*: *tawriyat > *tawrayat > *tawrāt*. This is all the more plausible if we look at the examples that al-Ṣafadī gives. He quotes the word *tawṣiya* (*Faḍḍ* 63), saying that its original form is *wawṣiya, which is the same word used in Abū Ḥayyān's commentary in describing al-Farrāʾ's opinion: *wawṣiya > *tawṣiya* > *tawṣaya* > *tawṣā*. It is plausible that al-Ṣafadī mixed these two morphological and etymological views. For, he maintains on the one hand that the original form of *tawriya* is *wawriya, as could be justified if we adopt the Baṣran position, which explains the change as a letter substitution (*ibdāl al-ḥurūf*); and on the other that *tawriya*'s pattern is *tafʿila*, like the words *tabṣira*, etc., thereby adopting the Kūfan position, which entails the change 'i' > 'a', and therefore *yāʾ* > *alif*. It is but a short step to claim that *wawriya > *tawriya > *tawraya > *tawrāt*.

The hypothesis that al-Ṣafadī mixed the two theories – Baṣran and Kūfan – is in my opinion justified if we look at the explanations provided by Arab philologists on the pattern of the verbal noun of the augmented verb *faʿʿala*, to which *tawriya* belongs: *warrà—yuwarrī—tawriya.* In their opinion, the morphological mutation occurring in the word *tawriya* is not a letter substitution (*ibdāl*), but a compensation (*ʿiwaḍ*). According to Ibn Yaʿīš,

> The commentator said: "The substitution is that you place one segment instead of another. It can be necessary or discretionary and approvable. They distinguished between substitution (*badal*) and the compensation (*ʿiwaḍ*). They said: what substitutes is more suitable than what has been substituted, and what compensates [is more suitable] than what has been compensated. This is why it stands in its place, for example the *tāʾ* in *tuḫama* and *tukaʾa*, or the *hāʾ* in *haraqtu*. This and the like are what is called substitution (*badal*) and not compensation (*ʿiwaḍ*), for compensation is when you place one segment instead of another, but in a different position, such as the *tāʾ* (ة) in *ʿida* (عدة) and *zina* (زنة), and the *hamza* in *ibn* (ابن) and *ism* (اسم)."[23] (Ibn Yaʿīš, *Šarḥ* 2: 1356)

According to this analysis, both the segment /t/ at the beginning and /t̄/ at the end of the word *tawriya* are not a substitution but a compensation for another segment which has been elided. This can be explained because the pattern *tafʿīl* is not an original form of the *nomen verbi*, which is *fiʿʿāl*. An example can be found in Ibn Ǧinnī's words:

---

[23] See also Bohas' translation (1984: 223-224). Cf. Ibn Ǧinnī (*Ḫaṣāʾiṣ* 1: 265-266).

Among them, the *tāʾ* in *tafʿīl* is a compensation for the first *ʿayn* in *fiʿʿāl* and it is a letter of augmentation (*zāʾida*). It is a requisite that the compensation is a letter of augmentation, too, because [to change] a letter of augmentation with another letter of augmentation is more similar to the original; therefore, the first *ʿayn* [i.e. second radical] in *qiṭṭāʿ* is the letter of augmentation, for *tāʾ* in *taqṭīʿ* is the compensation thereof. As it is the case with the *hāʾ* (ة /ẗ/) of the *nomen verbi tafʿila*, which is a compensation for the *yāʾ* in *tafʿīl*. The two of them are letters of augmentation. (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Ḥaṣāʾiṣ* 3:69)

In his words, Ibn Ǧinnī posits that the segment /t/ in the pattern *tafʿīl* is a compensation for the first *ʿayn* of the original form *fiʿʿāl*,[24] which is an additional letter to the primary root *f ʿ l*. The same reasoning applies to the final segment /ẗ/, which is a compensation for the long vowel 'ī,' concerning the *nomina verbi* derived from verbs with a weak third consonant.[25]

It follows that, in the view of Arab philologists, the word *tawriya* is neither a case of *ibdāl al-ḥurūf*, and nor is it to do with the (forced) Arabic derivation of the word *tawrāt*, for its original form cannot be *wawriya. Instead, we face a common case of double compensation, which affects the verbal nouns issued from a weak-third-rooted verb. In other words, the first radical letter *wāw* in the word *tawriya* has not been substituted, nor is the *wāw* an augmentation letter according to the pattern of the word. Thus, it is not a case of *ibdāl al-ḥurūf*.[26]

References

Primary Sources

Abū Dāwūd al-Siǧistānī, Sulaymān b. al-Ašʿaṯ al-Azdī. 2009. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, ed. Šaʿīb al-Arnaʾūṭ *et al.* Dimašq: Dār al-risāla l-ʿālamiyya.

Abū Ḥayyān al-Ġarnāṭī, Aṯīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Andalusī. 2001. *Tafsīr al-baḥr al-muḥīṭ*, ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawǧūd *et al.* Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 8 vols.

al-Astarābāḏī, Raḍī l-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan. s.d. *Šarḥ Šāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāǧib*, ed. Muḥammd Nūr al-Ḥasan *et al.* Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 4 vols.

---

[24] "Moreover, you made the *tāʾ* of *tafʿīl* a compensation for the *ʿayn* of *fiʿʿāl*. This is their speech: *qaṭṭaʿtu—taqṭīʿ*, *kassartu—taksīr*. Do you not see that the original form is *qiṭṭāʿ* and *kissār?*" (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Ḥaṣāʾiṣ* 3: 290).

[25] "Likewise, *hāʾ* in the verbal nouns *tafʿila* is a compensation for the *yāʾ* of *tafʿīl* or the *alif* of *fiʿʿāl*. For example: *ṣallaytu—taṣliya* and *rabbaytu—tarbiya*" (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Ḥaṣāʾiṣ* 3: 302).

[26] The only substitution (*ibdāl*) concerns the phonemes *y* and *ā*: "It follows that *yāʾ* of *tafʿīl* is a substitution for the *alif* of *fiʿʿāl*, like *tāʾ* at its beginning is a compensation for one of its *ʿayn*" (Ibn Ǧinnī, *Ḥaṣāʾiṣ* 3: 305).

al-Bayḍāwī, al-Qāḍī Nāṣir al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-Šīrāzī. 2000. *Tafsīr al-Bayḍāwī al-musammà Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-taʾwīl*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣubḥī b. Ḥasan Ḥallāq and Maḥmūd Aḥmad al-Aṭraš. Dimašq, Bayrūt: Dār al-rašīd, 3 vols.

al-Buḫārī, ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl. 2002. *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Dimašq: Dār Ibn Katīr.

Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. al-Ḥusayn. 1981. *Tafsīr al-Faḫr al-Rāzī al-šahīr bi-l-tafsīr al-kabīr wa-mafātīḥ al-ġayb*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr, 32 vols.

Ǧarīr, b. ʿAṭiyya b. al-Ḫaṭafa; Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb, Abū Ǧaʿfar. 1986. *Dīwān Ǧarīr bi-šarḥ Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb*, ed. Nuʿmān Muḥammad Amīn Ṭaha. al-Qāhira: Dār al-maʿārif, 3 vols.

Ibn al-Anbārī, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad. 1957. *Asrār al-ʿarabiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Bahǧa al-Bayṭār. Dimašq: Maṭbaʿat al-taraqqī.

Ibn al-Anbārī, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad. 1913. *Kitāb al-inṣāf fī masāʾil al-ḫilāf bayna l-naḥwiyyīn al-baṣriyyīn wa-l-kūfiyyīn*, ed. Gotthold Weil. Leiden: Brill.

Ibn Ǧinnī, Abū l-Fatḥ ʿUtmān. 1952-1956. *al-Ḫaṣāʾiṣ*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAlī l-Naǧǧār. al-Qāhira: Dār al-kutub al-miṣriyya, 3 vols.

Ibn Ǧinnī, Abū l-Fatḥ ʿUtmān. 1999. *al-Munṣif. Šarḥ al-imām Abī al-Fatḥ ʿUtmān b. Ǧinnī li-Kitāb al-taṣrīf li-l-imām Abī ʿUtmān al-Māzinī l-Baṣrī*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir Aḥmad ʿAṭā. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

Ibn Ǧinnī, Abū l-Fatḥ ʿUtmān. 1993. *Sirr ṣināʿat al-iʿrāb*, ed. Ḥasan Hindāwī. Dimašq: Dār al-qalam, 2 vols.

Ibn Ǧinnī, Abū l-Fatḥ ʿUtmān. 1998. *al-Taṣrīf al-mulūkī*, ed. Dīzīrih Saqqāl. Bayrut: Dār al-fikr al-ʿarabī.

Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī, Šihāb al-Dīn Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Muḥammad. 2014. *Buluġ al-Marām min adillat al-aḥkām*, ed. Māhir Yāsīn al-Faḥl. al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-qabas.

Ibn al-Ḥāǧib, Ǧamāl al-Dīn Abū ʿAmr ʿUtmān b. Abī Bakr. 2005. *al-Īḍāḥ fī Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*, ed. Ibrāhīm Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh. Dimašq: Dār Saʿad al-Dīn, 2 vols.

Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿarab* [online], URL: www.ejtaal.net (visited on 24/05/2021).

Ibn al-Sikkīt, Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb b. Isḥāq. 1905. *Kitāb al-qalb wa-l-ibdāl*, ed. August Haffner. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Ibn ʿUṣfūr al-Ḥaḍramī l-Išbīlī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin. 1996 [1st Ḥalab, 1970]. *al-Mumtiʿ fī l-taṣrīf*, ed. Faḫr al-Dīn Qabāwa. Bayrūt: Maktaba Lubnān Nāširūna.

Ibn ʿUṣfūr al-Ḥaḍramī l-Išbīlī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muʾmin. 1998. *al-Muqarrib*, ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawǧūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

Ibn Yaʿīš, Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abū l-Baqāʾ. 2004 [1st Leipzig: A. Brockhaus: 1886]. *Šarḥ Mufaṣṣal al-Zamaḫšarī*, ed. Gustav Jahn. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2 vols.

Imruʾ al-Qays. 1964 [1st 1958]. *Dīwān Imriʾ al-Qays*, ed. Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. al-Qāhira: Dār al-maʿārif.

al-Mubarrad, Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Akbar al-Tumālī l-Azdī. 1864 (vol. 1), 1892 (vol. 2). *al- Kitāb al-kāmil*, ed. William Wright. Leipzig: G. Kreysing (vol. 1); Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus (vol. 2).

al-Mubarrad, Abū l-ʿAbbās Muḥammad b. Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Akbar al-Ṯumālī l-Azdī. 1999. *al-Muqtaḍab*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥamad and Imīl Yaʿqūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 5 vols.

al-Nasāʾī, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Šuʿayb b. Baḥr b. Sinān. 2001. *Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrà*, ed. Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Munʿim Šalabī. Bayrūt: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 12 vols.

al-Qūnawī, ʿIṣām al-Dīn Ismāʿīl b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī. 2001. *Ḥāšiyat al-Qūnawī ʿalà Tafsīr al-Imām al-Bayḍāwī wa-maʿa-hu Ḥāšiyat ibn al-Tamǧīd*, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Maḥmūd Muḥammad ʿUmar. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 20 vols.

al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak. 2013. *Faḍḍ al-ḫitām ʿan al-tawriya wa-l-istiḫdām*, ed. ʿAbbās Hānī al-Čarrāḫ. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya.

al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak. 2009. *Ǧinān al-ǧinās fī ʿilm al-badīʿ*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Hawwārī. Bayrūt: al-Maktaba l-ʿAṣariyya.

al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak. 1911. *Nakt al-himyān fī nukat al-ʿumyān*, ed. Aḥmad Zakī Bik. Miṣr: al-Maṭbaʿa l-ǧamāliyya.

al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḫalīl b. Aybak. 1988. *al-Šuʿūr bi-l-ʿūr*, ed. ʿAbd al-Razzāq Ḥusayn. ʿAmmān: Dār ʿammār.

al-Saḫāwī, ʿAlam al-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī Muḥammad. 1983. *Sifr al-saʿāda wa-safir al-ifāda*, ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad al-Dālī. Dimašq: Maṭbūʿāt maǧmaʿ al-luġa l-ʿarabiyya bi-Dimašq.

Sībawayhi, Abū Bišr ʿAmr b. ʿUṯmān b. Qanbar. 1881-1889. *Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. Hartwig Derenbourg. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 2 vols.

al-Sīrāfī, Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Marzubān. 2008. *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, ed. Aḥmad Ḥasan Muhdalī and ʿAlī Sayyid ʿAlī. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 5 vols.

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ǧaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī. s.d. [1ˢᵗ al-Naǧaf, 1957-1962]. *al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān*, ed. Aḥmad Šawqī l-Amīn and Aḥmad Ḥabīb Quṣayr al-ʿĀmilī. Bayrūt: Dār iḥyāʾ al-turāṯ al-ʿarabī, 10 vols.

al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā l-Ḥusaynī. 1965-2001. *Tāǧ al-ʿarūs min ǧawāhir al-qāmūs*, ed. ʿAbd al-Sattār Aḥmad Farrāǧ *et al.* Madīnat al-Kuwayt: Maṭbaʿat ḥukūmat al-kuwayt, 40 vols.

al-Zamaḫšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Ǧār Allāh Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar. 1998. *Kaššāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq ġawāmiḍ al-tanzīl wa-ʿuyūn al-aqāwīl*, ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawǧūd *et al.* al-Riyāḍ: Maktabat al-ʿabīkān, 6 vols.

al-Zamaḫšarī, Abū l-Qāsim Ǧār Allāh Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar. 1859. *al-Mufaṣṣal. Opus de re grammatica arabicum*, ed. Jens Peter Broch. Christianiae: Sumtibus Universitatis Regiae Fridericianae.

Studies

Adang, Camilla P. 2006. "Torah." In: *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān, vol. 5*, edited by Jane Dammen McAuliffe, 300-311. Leiden: Brill.

Åkesson, Joyce. 2001. *Arabic Morphology and Phonology. Based on the Marāḥ al-arwāḥ by Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Masʿūd. Presented with an Introduction, Arabic Edition, English Translation and Commentary.* Leiden: Brill.

Baalbaki, Ramzi. 1981. "Arab Grammatical Controversies and the Extant Sources of the Second and Third Centuries A.H." In: *Studia Arabica et Islamica. Festschrift for Iḥsān ʿAbbās on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Wadād al-Qāḍī, 1-26. Beirut: American University of Beirut Press.

Bakalla, Muhammad Hasan. 1982. *Ibn Jinnī: An Early Arab Muslim Phonetician. An interpretative study of his life and contribution to linguistics*. London, Taipei: European Language Publications.

Bauer, Thomas. 2003. "Literarische Anthologien der Mamlūkenzeit." In: *Die Mamlūken: Studien zu ihrer Geschichte und Kultur*, edited by Stephan Conermann und Anja Pistor-Hatam, 71-122. Schenefeld: EB-Verlag.

Bauer, Thomas. 2007a. "Anthologies, Arabic literature (post-Mongol period)" [online]. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam,* THREE, edited by Kate Fleet *et al.*, URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_33127 (visited on 24/05/2021)

Bauer, Thomas. 2007b. "Arabische Kultur." In: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, vol. 8*, edited by Gert Ueding, 111-137. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Bernards, Monique. 1997. *Changing Traditions. Al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb*. Leiden: Brill.

Bohas, Georges. 2007. "Lexicon: Matrix and Etymon Model." In: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics, vol. 3*, edited by Kees Versteegh *et al.*, 45-52. Leiden: Brill.

Bohas, Georges and Guillaume, Jean-Patrick. 1984. *Étude des théories des grammairiens arabes. I. Morphologie et phonologie*. Damas: Institut Français de Damas.

Bonebakker, Seeger Adrianus. 1966. *Some early definitions of the tawriya and al-Ṣafadī's Faḍḍ al-xitām ʿan at-tawriya wa-ʾl-istixdām*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Bonebakker, Seeger Adrianus. 2012. "Tawriya" [online]. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, edited by Peri J. Bearman *et al.*, URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_7460 (visited on 24/05/2021).

Bravmann, Max Meier. 1971. "The Non-Technical Origin of the Arabic Rhetorical Term Tawriya." *Arabica* 18/3: 321-322.

Cantineau, Jean. 1946. "Esquisse d'une phonologie de l'arabe classique." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 43: 93-140.

Carter, Michael G. 1991. "Ibn Jinnī's Axiom 'The Adventitious Determines the Rule.'" In: *Semitic Studies in honor of Wolf Leslau on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday*, edited by Alan S. Kaye, 199-208. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Carter, Michael G. 1999. "The Struggle for Authority: A Re-examination of the Baṣran and Kūfan Debate." In: *Tradition and innovation: norm and deviation in Arabic and Semitic linguistics*, edited by Lutz Edzard and Mohammed Nekroumi, 55-70. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

El Berkawy, Abdel Fatah. 1981. *Die arabischen Ibdāl-Monographien insbesondere Das Kitāb al-Ibdāl des Abū ṭ-Ṭayyib al-Luġawī*. Ph.D. thesis Friederich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.

Fleisch, Henri. 1949-1950. "Études de phonétique arabe." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 28: 227-285.

Fleisch, Henri. 1961. *Traité de philologie arabe. Vol. 1 préliminaires, phonétique, morphologie nominale.* Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique.

Ghersetti, Antonella. 1998. "Quelques notes sur la définition canonique de Balāġa." In: *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta. Philosophy and arts in the islamic world*, edited by Daniel de Smet and Urbain Vermeulen, 57-72. Leuven: Peeters.

Goldziher, Ignaz. 1872. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachgelehrsamkeit bei den Arabern.* Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.

Grande, Francesco. 2003. "La struttura originaria della radice araba nel pensiero di ʾIbn Ǧinnī," *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie Orientale* 42/3: 57-82.

Hämeen-Anttila, Jaakko. 1993. *Lexical Ibdāl. Part I: Introduction. Source studies with a reconstruction of Abū Turāb's K. al-Iʿtiqāb.* Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society.

Hämeen-Anttila, Jaakko. 2007. "ʾIbdāl." In: *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, *vol. 2*, edited by Kees Versteegh *et al.*, 280-281. Leiden: Brill.

Jeffery, Arthur. [1938] 2007. *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurʾān.* Leiden: Brill.

Larcher, Pierre. 1999. "Vues "nouvelles" sur la dérivation lexicale en arabe classique." In: *Tradition and innovation: norm and deviation in Arabic and Semitic linguistics*, edited by Lutz Edzard and Mohammed Nekroumi, 103-123. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Larcher, Pierre. 2009. "Mais qu'est-ce donc que la balāġa?" In: *Literary and philosophical rhetoric in the Greek, Roman, Syriac and Arabic worlds*, edited by Frédérique Woerther, 197-213. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Larcher, Pierre. 2013. "Arabic Linguistic Tradition II: Pragmatics." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*, edited by Jonathan Owens, 185-212. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larcher, Pierre. 2014. "Rhétorique « grecque » et « hellénisante » vue par Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Ibn al-ʾAṯīr (VIIe/XIIIe siècle)." *Quaderni di Studi Arabi, Nuova Serie* 9: 115-130.

Lazarus-Yafeh, Hava. 2012. "Tawrāt" [online]. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, edited by Peri J. Bearman *et al.*, URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1203 (visited on 24/05/2021).

Mehiri, Abdelkader. 1973. *Les théories grammaticales d'Ibn Ǧinnī.* Tunis: Publications de l'Université de Tunis.

Owens, Jonathan. 1990. *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory. Heterogeneity and Standardization.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rizzo, Luca. 2018. "The Narrative Structure of Ambiguity. A Semiotic Analysis of a *Tawriya*-Epigram by Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār (d. 794/1392)." *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie Orientale* 54, *supplemento*: 537-574.

Rizzo, Luca. Forthcoming. *New Perspectives on Tawriya. Theory and Practice of Ambiguity.* Baden-Baden: Ergon.

Shah, Mustafa. 2003a. "Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought: Qur'anic Readers and Grammarians of the Kūfan Tradition (Part I)." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5/1: 47-78.

Shah, Mustafa. 2003b. "Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought: Qur'anic Readers and Grammarians of the Baṣran Tradition (Part II)." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5/2: 1-47.

Versteegh, Kees. 1980. "The Origin of the Term qiyās in Arabic Grammar." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 4: 7-30.

Versteegh, Kees. 1985. "La « grande étymologie » d'Ibn Ǧinnī." In: *La linguistique fantastique*, edited by Sylvain Auroux *et al.*, 44-50. Paris: Joseph Clims, Denoël.

Versteegh, Kees. 1990. "Grammar and Exegesis: The Origins of Kufan Grammar and the Tafsīr Muqātil." *Der Islam* 67/2: 206-242.

Versteegh, Kees. 1993. *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾānic Exegesis in Early Islam.* Leiden: Brill.

Zaġlūl, Abū Hāǧar Muḥammad al-Saʿīd b. Basyūnī. 1996. *Mawsūʿa aṭrāf al-ḥadīṯ al-nabawī l-šarīf.* Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 11 vols.

Luca Rizzo holds a joint research PhD in Asian and African Studies from the University Ca' Foscari of Venice and in Arabistik und Islamwissenschaft from the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster. He is currently research fellow at the University of Münster in the Sonderforschungsbereich 1385 "Recht und Literatur." His main research interests are pre-modern Arabic literature, literary aesthetics and hermeneutics, and the Arabic rhetorical and linguistic tradition.
He can be reached at: luca.rizzo@uni-muenster.de