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PREFACE

This volume is a collection of twelve papers presented at the Colloquium on Logos, Ethos and Mythos in the Middle East and North Africa (LEM), held in Budapest between 18-22 September 1995, and organized by the Chair for Arabic Studies, Eötvös Loránd University and the Department of Modern Arabic Studies, Leeds University. After the more specialized conferences that were organized regularly since 1991, the organizers decided on a broader topic, with the aim of attracting scholars who deal with different aspects of Middle Eastern and North African culture.

The papers included here were all presented in Section A of the Colloquium that dealt with linguistics and literature. The second volume of the proceedings will appear as volume 18 of The Arabist (Budapest Studies in Arabic) and will contain papers presented in Section B of the Colloquium that covered popular religion, popular culture and history of the above mentioned region.

The divisions are somewhat arbitrary since there are many overlapping areas. A good example for this is the article by Madiha Doss which on the basis of its title and topic could have been included in volume two, but since its main emphasis is on the text and its analysis as a piece of folk literature, it was placed in the Literature section of this volume.

Since 1988 Professor A. F. L. Beeston had regularly participated in the conferences organized by the Chair for Arabic Studies in Budapest for our great pleasure and the benefit of all the participants. The Colloquium on Arabic Lexicology and Lexicography held in 1993 provided an excellent opportunity to celebrate his having been elected an honorary member of the Kőrösi Csoma Society, the society of Hungarian orientalists (the photo in the present volume was taken at this occasion). During these years exceptionally strong ties had been formed between Freddie Beeston, Hungary and Hungarian Arabists. What he appreciated most in Hungary was its long tradition of using Latin as the language of administration and culture. During our regular meetings in Budapest, Oxford and other conference venues he always entertained us with his knowledge of Hungarian words and expressions. He had originally planned to come to Budapest for the LEM Colloquium, too, and only the treatment after his operation hindered him in this. With his sudden death we have lost a great scholar and true friend.
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I. LINGUISTICS
CHANGES IN THE PHONOLOGICAL PERCEPTION OF CLASSICAL ARABIC

Solomon I. Sara, S.J.

Georgetown University

0 Summary

There are two intimately related dictionaries of Arabic, *Kitāb al-'ayn* by al-Halil (101-175/719-793), and *Kitāb Ğamharat al-lūga* by Ibn Durayd (223-321/837-933). In addition, the two books also include treatises on the phonologies of Arabic of their day. The treatise in *Kitāb al-'ayn* is, presumably, the first Arabic phonological treatise that has come down to us. It gives an overall schema of the phonological inventory of Arabic of the eighth century Başra. The treatise in *Kitāb Ğamharat al-lūga* provides an overall schema of the phonological inventory of Arabic of the ninth/tenth century Başra. This is a unique situation in two aspects. Firstly, the lexicographer, Ibn Durayd, took the eighth century dictionary of al-Halil, re-arranged it according to patterns of Arabic words in a new fashion. Secondly, he included his own phonological introduction at the beginning to give his users an explanation of the letters and their use in the dictionary.

This presentation will not dwell on the lexicological aspects, but it will discuss the phonological treatises that both authors pre-pended to their dictionaries, in order to point out some of the similarities and differences between the two. Each author offered his own system of the basic divisions of the vocal tract and the classification of the sounds of Arabic into subgroups that shared phonetic properties. The authors offer sufficient detail to provide a reasonable conjecture on how Arabic was pronounced, and what some of the divergences were among speakers from different linguistic periods. In the process one can observe what was preserved of the eighth century tradition, its theoretical framework, its terminological apparatus, and what had been changed, or so perceived, by Ibn Durayd.

1 Introduction

The symbiosis that exists between al-Halil and Ibn Durayd is their cultural heritage. They are about a century apart, and the debt of the second to the first is admitted right up front. Ibn Durayd embarked on re-doing and re-writing al-Halil’s dictionary from his own perspective. *Kitāb al-'ayn* of al-Halil is the first comprehensive dictionary of Arabic as we define dictionaries now; so is Ğamharat al-lūga a comprehensive dictionary by our definition. They both account for the lexical items of Arabic as comprehensively as was possible within the expanse of each author’s
knowledge of the language and culture of their respective generations. There were aspects of Kitāb al-'ayn that Ibn Durayd was not satisfied with, so he decided to rectify the deficiency by rewriting the whole dictionary.

The above episode is reminiscent of the story told about Händel’s Messiah. Händel (1685-1759), composed the Messiah 1741. Mozart (1756-1791) re-arranged the Messiah for a performance in 1789 (Mackerras 1974:3-4). By musical and artistic criteria this is considered a new musical creation. Young Mozart was asked by Baron Gottfried van Swieten (1733-1803), who had come to appreciate Händel when he was a diplomat in England, for a performance of Händel’s Messiah. It was performed March 6th, 1789. Mozart liked and admired the composition, but being a person of his generation, he found certain aspects of the Baroque composition not to his liking. So to bring the piece into greater harmony with the more contemporary taste and style, he re-arranged and re-worked many of its parts. Sections were interchanged, transposed, lengthened or shortened, the score was adapted in many of its parts, the instruments were interchanged, and solo parts shifted. The point of all that was to make it more acceptable to the intended audience. The outcome of this effort was that now we have two unique masterpieces of music. Mozart’s Messiah is Händel’s Messiah without the trumpets, to put it simply.

Though the above appears like a digression, it has its parallel to the case at hand. So, a very brief summary of the structure of the two dictionaries may not be out of place. al-Halil composed his dictionary on the basis of definite linguistic principles that he found relevant to the structure of Arabic. His guiding principles were: the number of Arabic letters, the restrictions on their combinations, the resultant small set of possible basic patterns, and the phonological matrix that defined the whole enterprise. This, in effect, stated that the inventory of native lexical items in Arabic was limited to four patterns of letters: bi-radical, tri-radical, quadri-radical and quinque-radical. To these patterns, affixes were added to specify the many forms and meanings of the derivations and inflections of the language. The number of patterns, however, was limited and finite. The permutations within these patterns, eventually, accounted for all the lexical items in the language. The governing matrix for the arrangement of the dictionary was phonological. For this purpose al-Halil pre-pended a phonological treatise to his dictionary. In this treatise he described each Arabic letter articulatorily, beginning with the pharyngeals and ending with the labials (Sara 1993). The significance of the phonological treatise for the lexicon was that it guided the user on how the dictionary was organized, how the lexical items were created, and how they were entered into the dictionary. Consequently, the phonological analysis of Arabic had a profound influence on the creation of the lexicon. There was a harmonious integration of the phonological inventory and phonological restrictions with the structure of the lexicon.

Ibn Durayd, on his part, paid great tribute to al-Halil and his contribution to Arabic lexicography, but he thought that the structure of the dictionary could be simplified, and its use made even easier for the contemporary user, if it were redone in a more accessible manner, and closer to the more traditional frame of reference. Ibn Durayd accepted the abstract formalisms of al-Halil with reference to the number of radicals in the stems of Arabic words. His arrangement, however, departed from al-Halil’s in that he grouped together all the tri-radical stems, all the quadri-radical stems and all the quinque-radical stems. al-Halil, for his part, had been more respectful of the autonomy of each letter, under which he listed all the occurring forms. In al-Halil, each letter included all the patterns and their various permutations that began with that letter, e.g. ktb, kbt, tkb, tjb, bkt, btk. A second major departure was that Ibn Durayd did not follow the phonological schema of the phonological structure of Arabic that he had discussed in the beginning of his dictionary. He effectively ignored it, and it had no practical bearing on the composition of the dictionary. The dictionary is not based on the phonetic organization of the letters nor their sequencing. Unlike al-Halil, the letters of Arabic do not have their individual chapters dedicated to them where pertinent forms are included. Rather, it is the number of radicals in the stem that is the dominant organisational principle. Consequently, all the tri-radicals are listed together, all the quadri-radicals, etc. It is a fact, that Ibn Durayd provides a phonetically/phonologically oriented organization of the letters of Arabic in the beginning of the dictionary, but what use was that mode of arrangement of letters, when he completely ignored it, and followed the traditional order of the letters of the alphabet which is alif, ba’, ta’, etc. That was a bold departure from the linguistically motivated organization of al-Halil’s dictionary. From a historical perspective, the importance of the phonetic/phonological preface is its existence, and the information it provides about the sounds of Arabic of its time.

2 The Phonology of al-Halil

Though necessary and interesting as the discussion of the these two dictionaries is as a context for Arabic phonology, the focus of this presentation is on the phonologies of these two authors. It is fortuitous and gratifying that Ibn Durayd considered it important to include information on the phonology of Arabic of his day. In this way, he kept the tradition alive by pre-pending his own phonological analysis. We should say “almost his own”, for he says that he is synthesizing the analyses of other phonologists. In the process both authors give us a glimpse of how Arabic was spoken at their respective times. In addition, they provide us with the theoretical perspective of the linguists of their time, their terminological innovations, their organizational schemes, and, in this case, the subtle changes in the perception of how they viewed the sound system of Arabic.
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Ibn Durayd, on his part, paid great tribute to al-Halil and his contribution to Arabic lexicography, but he thought that the structure of the dictionary could be simplified, and its use made even easier for the contemporary user, if it were redone in a more accessible manner, and closer to the more traditional frame of reference. Ibn Durayd accepted the abstract formalisms of al-Halil with reference to the number of radicals in the stems of Arabic words. His arrangement, however, departed from al-Halil's in that he grouped together all the tri-radical stems, all the quadri-radical stems and all the quinque-radical stems. al-Halil, for his part, had been more respectful of the autonomy of each letter, under which he listed all the occurring forms. In al-Halil, each letter included all the patterns and their various permutations that began with that letter, e.g. kth, kkt, tkt, tkt, bkt, bkt. A second major departure was that Ibn Durayd did not follow the phonological schema of the phonological structure of Arabic that he had discussed in the beginning of his dictionary. He effectively ignored it, and it had no practical bearing on the composition of the dictionary. The dictionary is not based on the phonetic organization of the letters nor their sequencing. Unlike al-Halil, the letters of Arabic do not have their individual chapters dedicated to them where pertinent forms are included. Rather, it is the number of radicals in the stem that is the dominant organisational principle. Consequently, all the tri-radicals are listed together, all the quadri-radicals, etc. It is a fact, that Ibn Durayd provides a phonetically/phonologically oriented organization of the letters of Arabic in the beginning of the dictionary, but what use was that mode of arrangement of letters, when he completely ignored it, and followed the traditional order of the letters of the alphabet which is alif, ba', ta', etc. That was a bold departure from the linguistically motivated organization of al-Halil's dictionary. From a historical perspective, the importance of the phonetic/phonological preface is its existence, and the information it provides about the sounds of Arabic of its time.

2 The Phonology of al-Halil

Though necessary and interesting as the discussion of the these two dictionaries is as a context for Arabic phonology, the focus of this presentation is on the phonologies of these two authors. It is fortuitous and gratifying that Ibn Durayd considered it important to include information on the phonology of Arabic of his day. In this way, he kept the tradition alive by pre-pending his own phonological analysis. We should say "almost his own", for he says that he is synthesizing the analyses of other phonologists. In the process both authors give us a glimpse of how Arabic was spoken at their respective times. In addition, they provide us with the theoretical perspective of the linguists of their time, their terminological innovations, their organizational schemes, and, in this case, the subtle changes in the perception of how they viewed the sound system of Arabic.
2.1 al-Halil’s Inventory of Letters

al-Halil arranged the letters of Arabic in a manner that followed the stream of speech, i.e. it began with the throat proceeded gradually up the vocal tract and ended with the lips (al-Halil, K. al-syn I, 48). al-Halil’s inventory of letters is schematized in Chart I that provides added organization, and al-Halil’s terminological specifications of the vocal tract.

2.1.1 Chart I. al-Halil’s Letters: Locales and Exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>letter /harfl/</th>
<th>locale /hayyiz/</th>
<th>exit /mahrag/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>1. throat /halq/</td>
<td>'h, h, h, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2. uvula /lahab/</td>
<td>q, k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>3. soft-palate /laqr/</td>
<td>ง, ñ, đ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>4. apex /asala/</td>
<td>ñ, s, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>5. alveolum /nit/</td>
<td>ñ, d, t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>6. gingiva /liita/</td>
<td>ژ, ژ, ژ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sabih/</td>
<td>7. laminae /dalaq/</td>
<td>r, l, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak /mu'tall/</td>
<td>8. lips /safa/</td>
<td>f, b, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak /sahib/</td>
<td>cavity /air /hsaa'</td>
<td>w, alif, y '</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As more features are included in the inventory, and more of the organisational aspects of al-Halil’s analysis become apparent, one notices that he was aware of more than a mere listing of the discrete elements of the Arabic writing system. He was aware of the systematic relationships that obtained among the sounds of the language in grouping themselves into natural classes that share unique features. When more of the systematic specifications discussed by al-Halil are accounted for, a sophisticated appreciation of the complexity of his system is revealed. Chart II below provides a complementary list of features to the above outlined system as al-Halil described it.

---

[Editorial note: For technical reasons the usual transcription system of The Arabist was used in this article as well instead of a phonologically more correct notation.]
2.1 al-Halil's Inventory of Letters

al-Halil arranged the letters of Arabic in a manner that followed the stream of speech, i.e. it began with the throat proceeded gradually up the vocal tract and ended with the lips (al-Halil, *K. al-'ayn* I, 48). al-Halil's inventory of letters is schematized in Chart I that provides added organization, and al-Halil's terminological specifications of the vocal tract.

2.1.1 Chart I. al-Halil's Letters: Locales and Exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>letter /harf/</th>
<th>locale /hayyiz/</th>
<th>exit /mahrag/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>1. throat /halq/</td>
<td>'b, h, b, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2. uvula /lahab/</td>
<td>q, k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>3. soft-palate /laqr/</td>
<td>g, š, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>4. apex /asala/</td>
<td>š, s, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>5. alveolum /nit/</td>
<td>t, d, t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>6. gingiva /litta/</td>
<td>z, š, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sabih/</td>
<td>7. laminae /dalq/</td>
<td>r, l, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak /mu'tall/</td>
<td>cavity/air /basal/</td>
<td>w, alif, y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As more features are included in the inventory, and more of the organisational aspects of al-Halil's analysis become apparent, one notices that he was aware of more than a mere listing of the discrete elements of the Arabic writing system. He was aware of the systematic relationships that obtained among the sounds of the language in grouping themselves into natural classes that share unique features. When more of the systematic specifications discussed by al-Halil are accounted for, a sophisticated appreciation of the complexity of his system is revealed. Chart II below provides a complementary list of features to the above outlined system as al-Halil described it.

2.1.2 Feature Matrix

```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Mu'tall</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Nasal</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Voiceless</th>
<th>Voiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/sabih/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mu'tall/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/weak/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nasal/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/vowel/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

[Editorial note: For technical reasons the usual transcription system of *The Arabist* was used in this article as well instead of a phonologically more correct notation.]
2.1.3 Summary of al-Halil’s Phonology

In summary, then, al-Halil’s analysis is a detailed description of the sounds of Arabic. The vocal tract is divided into locales within which a number of exits are specified. The process began with the throat and proceeded, in steps, towards the lips. It accounted for all the sounds of Arabic. The descriptive terminology is intuitive and original, and the list of selected features grouped the sounds into their natural classes. The phonetic/phonological schema of al-Halil, for the most part, is in use today among Arab linguists.

3 Ibn Durayd’s Phonology

Ibn Durayd discussed the phonology of Arabic in the introduction to his dictionary. In the same manner as al-Halil, he gave an articulatory description of the letters of Arabic, and gave several classificatory descriptions of these letters, as he says, synthesizing what other phonologists had done. Its practical purpose was to aid the user of the dictionary, but in the process, he not only accounted for the phonological tradition, but he added his own observations as well. Since some of the details of this analysis are given in Sara & Zawawi (1995), the following will be a summary treatment of his analysis in several of its aspects, to highlight the similarities and differences with al-Halil and his student Sibawayhi.

3.1 First Binary Division: musmata & mudlaqa

The first classificatory division that Ibn Durayd employed is to group the seven classes of sounds under two major headings: musmata and mudlaqa as in Chart III.

3.1.1 Ibn Durayd’s Inventory of Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/laqab/ class</th>
<th>/gins/ type</th>
<th>/harf/ letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/muskara/ 1. 1. /halq/ throat</td>
<td>'h, h', g, h, s, j, t, f, s, j'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'silent' 2. /aqa l-fam/ end of mouth &amp; lowest part of the tongue</td>
<td>q, k, g, q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /asat al-lisan/ middle of the tongue</td>
<td>s, z, s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. /adna l-fam/ nearest in the mouth</td>
<td>t, t, d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. /abs/ til l-gar al-dal/ nearest upper concavity</td>
<td>, d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| /mudlaqa/ 6. 1. /al-ifa/ labial | f, b, m | |
| 'edge' 7. /asalat al-lisan/ tip of tongue | r, n, l | |

The above classification parallels, to a great extent, the classification of al-Halil. There are also obvious differences. Ibn Durayd is precise in his analysis of the throat letters. He specifically says that the /hamza/ [''] is the farthest sound followed by /ha/ [h] which is the locus of the /nasal/ ‘breath’. This is followed by /ha/ [h], and here he goes into the discussion of the confusions in speech due to the interchangeability of these two letters (Ibn Durayd, p. 43). There are obvious differences between the sequencing of the exits in the two authors. /ayn/ [''] is not the first letter, as found in al-Halil. A second difference, which is of great significance, is that the /dad/ [d] is not listed as a soft-palatal sound as found in al-Halil, but is considered more like an alveolar sound grouped with the sounds [z, t, d]. This sound is a problematic one, since its current articulation does not correspond to what was observed by al-Halil and Sibawayhi in the eighth century. A third difference is that the labials are not listed as the last group of sounds, but are listed before the tip of the tongue sounds [r, n, l]. Finally it needs to be pointed out that Ibn Durayd has not made use of the elegant terminology devised by al-Halil in his articulatory schema of the divisions of the vocal tract into eight locales and twenty five exits as in #2.1.1 above. Those are some of the significant differences between the two authors as they perceived the pronunciation of Arabic of their time.

3.1.2 Exits of the Letters

/mahrag/ ‘exit’ is a descriptive term that denotes the narrowing of the vocal tract in the production of a letter/sound. Depending on the author, each letter or group of letters were characterized by their appropriate ‘exit’. Even though Ibn Durayd was following al-Halil in writing his dictionary, and accounting for the sound system of Arabic in the manner of al-Halil, he included, in addition, another analysis that was not similar to al-Halil’s analysis. Ibn Durayd listed sixteen exits for the production of the letters which corresponded more closely to the listing of Sibawayhi than that of al-Halil, and which are included here in chart IV below:
2.1.3 Summary of al-Halil's Phonology

In summary, then, al-Halil's analysis is a detailed description of the sounds of Arabic. The vocal tract is divided into locales within which a number of exits are specified. The process began with the throat and proceeded, in steps, towards the lips. It accounted for all the sounds of Arabic. The descriptive terminology is intuitive and original, and the list of selected features grouped the sounds into their natural classes. The phonetic/phonological schema of al-Halil, for the most part, is in use today among Arab linguists.

3 Ibn Durayd's Phonology

Ibn Durayd discussed the phonology of Arabic in the introduction to his dictionary. In the same manner as al-Halil, he gave an articulatory description of the letters of Arabic, and gave several classificatory descriptions of these letters, as he says, synthesizing what other phonologists had done. Its practical purpose was to aid the user of the dictionary, but in the process, he not only accounted for the phonological tradition, but he added his own observations as well. Since some of the details of this analysis are given in Sara & Zawawi (1995), the following will be a summary treatment of his analysis in several of its aspects, to highlight the similarities and differences with al-Halil and his student Sibawayhi.

3.1 First Binary Division: musmata & mudlaqa

The first classificatory division that Ibn Durayd employed is to group the seven classes of sounds under two major headings: musmata and mudlaqa as in Chart III.

3.1.1 Ibn Durayd's Inventory of Letters

Chart III. Binary division of the Arabic letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/laqab/ class</th>
<th>/gins/ type</th>
<th>/harf/ letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/musmata/ 1. /halq/ throat</td>
<td>/h, h' /g, h' /g, h /k, g, k /q, k, g, q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'silent' 2. /aqā / /fam/ end of mouth &amp; lowest part of the tongue</td>
<td>/s, z, s /c, s /t, t /d, d /d, t /j, j /th, th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /wasat al-lisān/ middle of the tongue</td>
<td>/s, z, s /c, s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. /adnā / /fam/ nearest in the mouth</td>
<td>/t, t /d, d /th, th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. /šāš / /l-gār al-dā/ nearest upper concavity</td>
<td>/t, t /d, d /th, th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mudlaqa/ 6. /al-ṣifa/ labial</td>
<td>/f, b, m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'edge' 7. /asalat al-lisān/ tip of tongue</td>
<td>/r, n, l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart IV. Sibawayhi's classification according to exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Articulator</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Lower Articulator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>throat: farthest</td>
<td>1. 'h, alif</td>
<td>throat: farthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>2. ١</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closest</td>
<td>3. ١٥</td>
<td>closest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: farthest</td>
<td>4. q</td>
<td>tongue: farthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-farthest</td>
<td>5. k</td>
<td>lower than /q/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above molars</td>
<td>6. d</td>
<td>Tongue: beginning of edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: middle</td>
<td>7. ١٥</td>
<td>tongue: middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above premolars</td>
<td>8. ل</td>
<td>tongue closest edge to tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>9. ئ</td>
<td>Tongue: edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>10. ئ</td>
<td>tongue: surface inner to /ئ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: base of incisors</td>
<td>11. ئ, ئ</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>12. ئ, ئ</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: tip of incisors</td>
<td>13. ئ, ئ</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongue: tip of incisors</td>
<td>14. ئ</td>
<td>Lip: inner lower lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lip: upper</td>
<td>15. ئ, ئ, ئ</td>
<td>lip: lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>16. ئ (light)</td>
<td>nose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second classification of the letters of Arabic by Ibn Durayd is included as Chart V below. Even though it was not as detailed as that of Sibawayhi, it followed Sibawayhi's model and shows a great similarity to it:

Chart V. Ibn Durayd's classification of exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cavity</th>
<th>Exit</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>throat</td>
<td>lower part</td>
<td>١٥, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>middle part</td>
<td>١٥, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper part</td>
<td>١٥, ئ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>farthest</td>
<td>ئ, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>middle of tongue</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>side of tongue/upper incisors</td>
<td>ئ, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>right edge of tongue</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>close to /ئ/ but inner</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>edge of tongue, base of incisors</td>
<td>ئ, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>inner lower lip</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>between the lips</td>
<td>ئ, ئ, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>light /ئ/</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>edge of tongue/edge of incisors</td>
<td>ئ, ئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>middle of the tongue/ right edge</td>
<td>ئ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above classification, the letters are listed according to their exits. Ibn Durayd claimed that he was giving the opinion of other linguists (Ibn Durayd, 61, 45). The above chart reflects the classification of Sibawayhi (Kitab II, 405). Needless to say there are some differences between the two linguists. As he did with the classification of al-Halil, Ibn Durayd was not meticulous about maintaining the original classification of Sibawayhi, according to the expected articulatory progression, from the throat to the lips, in the production of these sounds. Firstly, the [q] and [k] are two separate exits in Sibawayhi, here they are grouped as one exit. Secondly, he considers /ğ, ș/ uvular sounds which can easily lead to confusion if one considers that /q, k/ are the farthest sounds and the uvula is the farthest section of the upper perimeter of the oral cavity. Thirdly, he places /d/ 16th in his listing, i.e. in the final position, while in Sibawayhi it is the 6th in the list just after /k/. This despite the fact that he calls it a middle of the tongue letter. This may be an organizational slip more than an articulatory misapprehension. This strict organizational slip creeps up again towards the end of the listing where labial letters are listed before the lingual and dental letters. It is stated in the dictionary that Ibn Durayd dictated his dictionary from memory, so one can imagine the burden placed on memory with all the details. This may be an explanation for the variations in representing the accounts.
Chart IV. Sibawayhi's classification according to exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Articulator</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Lower Articulator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>throat: farthest</td>
<td>1. ', h, alif</td>
<td>throat: farthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>2. ș, h</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closest</td>
<td>2. ș, h</td>
<td>closest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: farthest</td>
<td>4. q</td>
<td>tongue: farthest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-farthest</td>
<td>5. k</td>
<td>lower than /q/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above molars</td>
<td>6. d</td>
<td>Tongue: beginning of edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: middle</td>
<td>7. ș, š, y</td>
<td>tongue: middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above premolars canines and incisors</td>
<td>8. l</td>
<td>tongue closest edge to tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>9. n</td>
<td>Tongue: edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>10. r</td>
<td>tongue: surface inner to /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: base of incisors</td>
<td>11. ț, d, t</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>12. z, s, š</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: tip of incisors</td>
<td>13. z, š, ș</td>
<td>tongue: tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongue: tip of incisors</td>
<td>14. f</td>
<td>Lip: inner lower lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lip: upper</td>
<td>15. b, m, w</td>
<td>lip: lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>16. n (light)</td>
<td>nose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second classification of the letters of Arabic by Ibn Durayd is included as Chart V below. Even though it was not as detailed as that of Sibawayhi, it followed Sibawayhi's model and shows a great similarity to it:

Chart V. Ibn Durayd's classification of exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cavity</th>
<th>Exit</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>throat</td>
<td>lower part</td>
<td>١، ٠، ١، ٠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. middle part</td>
<td>٢، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. upper part</td>
<td>٣، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>4. farthest</td>
<td>٤، ٠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. uvula</td>
<td>٥، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>6. middle of tongue</td>
<td>٦، ٠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>٧، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>٨، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>٩، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٠، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١١، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٢، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٣، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٤، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٥، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palate: above incisors</td>
<td>١٦، ٠</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above classification, the letters are listed according to their exits. Ibn Durayd claimed that he was giving the opinion of other linguists (Ibn Durayd, *Gambara* I, 45). The above chart reflects the classification of Sibawayhi (*Kitab* II, 405). Needless to say there are some differences between the two linguists. As he did with the classification of al-Halil, Ibn Durayd was not meticulous about maintaining the original classification of Sibawayhi, according to the expected articulatory progression, from the throat to the lips, in the production of these sounds. Firstly, the [q] and [k] are two separate exits in Sibawayhi, here they are grouped as one exit. Secondly, he considers /ğ/ uvular sounds which can easily lead to confusion if one considers that /q, k/ are the farthest sounds and the uvula is the farthest section of the upper perimeter of the oral cavity. Thirdly, he places /d/ 16th in his listing, i.e. in the final position, while in Sibawayhi it is the 6th in the list just after /k/. This despite the fact that he calls it a middle of the tongue letter. This may be an organizational slip more than an articulatory misapprehension. This strict organizational slip creeps up again towards the end of the listing where labial letters are listed before the lingual and dental letters. It is stated in the dictionary that Ibn Durayd dictated his dictionary from memory, so one can imagine the burden placed on memory with all the details. This may be an explanation for the variations in representing the accounts.
by other linguists, as he called them. The other aspect is to consider Ibn Durayd as a faithful observer of the passing scene. He is a witness to some of the sounds of the language that are beginning to shift their articulations. A clear example of this shift is the /d/ sound. He described it in two different ways. When he represents what appears to be al-Hallī’s position, he clearly lists it with the apicals/dentals /z, l, d/ without any qualification. While here, in representing what appears to be Sibawayhi’s position, even though he states that the articulation is produced by the middle of the tongue, he still lists it immediately after the /z, l, d/ cf. Chart V. This letter /d/ did change its position in time, and he may have been the first witness to record the shift in its articulation. In its current realizations, for example, it has maintained its fricative nature in the standard Arabic spoken in Iraq, but it has become an apical letter. On the other hand, it has changed its fricative nature into a stop, and it has become apical in articulation in the standard Arabic spoken in Egypt. An overall perception one obtains in reading Ibn Durayd is that in his articulatory descriptions he emphasized the active articulators more than the passive articulators, and thus many of his descriptions are at variance with his sources.

4 Features

Like his predecessors, Ibn Durayd, finds other classificatory criteria for grouping the letters together. In addition to the articulatory descriptions, groupings according to locales or grouping according to exits, the letters of Arabic with different locales and exits can still have features in common, and can be grouped together into smaller or larger natural class. Since Ibn Durayd appears to be following Sibawayhi in this respect, Charts VI and Chart VII of the commonly treated classificatory features by both authors is included for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahmūs ‘muted’</td>
<td>h, b, k, l, s, s, l, s, b, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mağhūr ‘loud’</td>
<td>’, alif, ’, g, q, g, y, d, l, n, r, t, d, z, d, l, b, w, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rihwa ‘soft’</td>
<td>h, b, s, s, ’, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madd &amp; layn ‘long &amp; soft’</td>
<td>w, y, alif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutbaqa ‘covered’</td>
<td>s, t, d, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣādīda ‘tight’</td>
<td>t, s, g, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to fully appreciate how Ibn Durayd treated these features his classificatory features are listed in Chart VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahmūs ‘muted’</td>
<td>h, b, k, l, s, s, l, s, b, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mağhūr ‘loud’</td>
<td>’, alif, ’, g, q, g, y, d, l, n, r, t, d, z, d, l, b, w, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rihwa ‘soft’</td>
<td>h, b, s, s, ’, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madd &amp; layn ‘long &amp; soft’</td>
<td>w, y, alif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutbaqa ‘covered’</td>
<td>s, t, d, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣādīda ‘tight’</td>
<td>t, s, g, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Durayd’s treatment of these features and their exemplifications do not seem to be a literal listing of his sources. It is rather a gesture towards accountability, but no systemic procedure is evident in the organization of the sequence of segments. The sequential listing of the letters is not what one finds in the other two sources. He did not seem to be interested in giving an exhaustive listing of either all the features or all the relevant letters as in the example of “ṣādīda”. There are differences that call for comment. Firstly, the inclusion of [k] with the “rihwa” is out of character with the rest of the included letters. The “rihwa” letters are all of the fricative or continuant type, [k] is not of that type, and there does not seem to be any clear explanation for this inclusion. Similarly, the letter [s] is included in the unfinished listing of “ṣādīda”. The “ṣādīda” feature in Sibawayhi includes only the non-continuant type of letters, and the inclusion of [s] among them is not easily understood or explainable.

5 Final Observations

It appears from the discussion of Ibn Durayd and his bold attempt to rewrite what was a unique and original composition that he would have been memorialized in the annals of lexicography. In addition, his phonetic/phonological discussions witness to a continuing dynamic tradition that was not slavish to an immutable doctrine of phonetics and phonology. It is quite clear that discussions took place espousing different orientations. In the report of Ibn Durayd, there is no clear favoritism towards al-Hallī or Sibawayhi’s approach. He gives them both equal treatment, albeit, neither complete nor exhaustive. In the process of discussing the theories of other linguists, he provides a description of Arabic that is not an exact replica of his predecessors.
by other linguists, as he called them. The other aspect is to consider Ibn Durayd as a faithful observer of the passing scene. He is a witness to some of the sounds of the language that are beginning to shift their articulations. A clear example of this shift is the /d/ sound. He described it in two different ways. When he represents what appears to be al-Halll's position, he clearly lists it with the apicals/dentals /z, l, d/ without any qualification. While here, in representing what appears to be Sibawayhi's position, even though he states that the articulation is produced by the middle of the tongue, he still lists it immediately after the /z, l, d/ cf. Chart V. This letter /d/ did change its position in time, and he may have been the first witness to record the shift in its articulation. In its current realizations, for example, it has maintained its fricative nature in the standard Arabic spoken in Iraq, but it has become an apical letter. On the other hand, it has changed its fricative nature into a stop, and it has become apical in articulation in the standard Arabic spoken in Egypt. An overall perception one obtains in reading Ibn Durayd is that in his articulatory descriptions he emphasized the active articulators more than the passive articulators, and thus many of his descriptions are at variance with his sources.

4 Features

Like his predecessors, Ibn Durayd, finds other classificatory criteria for grouping the letters together. In addition to the articulatory descriptions, groupings according to locales or grouping according to exits, the letters of Arabic with different locales and exits can still have features in common, and can be grouped together into smaller or larger natural class. Since Ibn Durayd appears to be following Sibawayhi in this respect, Charts VI and Chart VII of the commonly treated classificatory features by both authors is included for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahmus 'muted'</td>
<td>h, h, k, s, t, l, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mağhur 'loud'</td>
<td>' , alif, ' , q, g, y, d, l, n, r, t, d, z, b, w, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rihwa 'soft'</td>
<td>h, h, g, l, s, t, z, l, b, w, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madd &amp; layn 'long &amp; soft'</td>
<td>w, y, alif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutbaqa 'covered'</td>
<td>s, d, t, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadida 'tight'</td>
<td>t, l, b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Durayd's treatment of these features and their exemplifications do not seem to be a literal listing of his sources. It is rather a gesture towards accountability, but no systemic procedure is evident in the organization of the sequence of segments. The sequential listing of the letters is not what one finds in the other two sources. He did not seem to be interested in giving an exhaustive listing of either all the features or all the relevant letters as in the example of "sadida". There are differences that call for comment. Firstly, the inclusion of [k] with the "rihwa" is out of character with the rest of the included letters. The "rihwa" letters are all of the fricative or continuant type, [k] is not of that type, and there does not seem to be any clear explanation for this inclusion. Similarly, the letter [s] is included in the unfinished listing of "sadida". The "sadida" feature in Sibawayhi includes only the non-continuant type of letters, and the inclusion of [s] among them is not easily understood or explainable.

5 Final Observations

It appears from the discussion of Ibn Durayd and his bold attempt to rewrite what was a unique and original composition that he would have been memorialized in the annals of lexicography. In addition, his phonetic/phonological discussions witness to a continuing dynamic tradition that was not slavish to an immutable doctrine of phonetics and phonology. It is quite clear that discussions took place espousing different orientations. In the report of Ibn Durayd, there is no clear favoritism towards al-Halll or Sibawayhi's approach. He gives them both equal treatment, albeit, neither complete nor exhaustive. In the process of discussing the theories of other linguists, he provides a description of Arabic that is not an exact replica of his predecessors.
He is, presumably, describing his own speech with the tools of linguistics, and if his articulation is at all representative, it shows sound shifts that will become part of the spoken Arabic in subsequent centuries. The most obvious case is that of /d/. The other changes are more subtle. They need more space, and a more comprehensive and detailed analysis of the totality of his work.
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ARABE CLASSIQUE — ARABE DIALECTAL
PRODUIT D'UNE RENCONTRE

Aziza Boucherit

Université René Descartes
C.L.L.A.S. CNRS-Paris III

Les langues, leurs variétés, actuellement en usage en Algérie sont le reflet des liens qu'elles ont tissés au cours du temps, qu'il s'agisse des liens entre arabe et berbère, arabe et français, berbère et français, ou encore, pour ce qui nous occupe aujourd'hui, entre "arabe et arabe". Et, la présence de productions où interfèrent et alternent arabe classique et dialectal atteste des contacts établis depuis des siècles entre les deux variétés et réactivés depuis les années soixante par la décision de faire de l'arabe classique la langue nationale et officielle du pays.

On se doute que cette décision eut des effets. Tout d'abord, il convient de souligner que l'ensemble des mesures visant à faire pénétrer — par le biais de l'appareil scolaire et des institutions politiques, administratives, sociales et culturelles — l'arabe classique dans le champ de la vie publique a eu pour conséquence d'accroître considérablement la présence du classique dans l'environnement linguistique des Algériens. Et du fait de la généralisation progressive de l'enseignement et du développement des médias écrits et audio-visuels le classique n'a jamais été aussi présent dans l'histoire linguistique du pays. Il est donc normal que le dialectal en porte les traces; à l'inverse, tout arabophone étant avant tout dialectophone, il est tout aussi normal que des dialectalismes colorent le classique. Ce ne sont là que les phénomènes normaux qui manifestent des contacts, des liens étroits entre les deux variétés et de la créativité des locuteurs qui, autant que faire se peut, adaptent les moyens linguistiques à leurs besoins.

Le produit de ces contacts peut se manifester sous la forme d'emprunts, adaptés ou non à la langue d'accueil, de mélange de formes ou encore d'alternance où chacune des langues ou variétés en présence dans le discours conserve ses spécificités.

Les usages qui en sont faits dépendent étroitement de la situation de communication et de la langue qu'elle impose, du degré de connaissance, active ou passive, qu'ils en ont. Par ailleurs, ces usages révèlent des compétences linguistiques diverses: l'emprunt peut être pratiqué par des monolingues, tandis que le mélange et l'alternance impliquent une certaine compétence dans les variétés dont disposent les communicants. De ce point de vue, il convient de nuancer les jugements plus ou moins normatifs, ou puristes, portés sur ce type de productions, en distinguant "maîtrise" et "usage". Tel locuteur ayant une maîtrise satisfaisante du classique pourra utiliser des formes mélangées ou alterner classique et dialectal pour des raisons stylistiques ou...
He is, presumably, describing his own speech with the tools of linguistics, and if his articulation is at all representative, it shows sound shifts that will become part of the spoken Arabic in subsequent centuries. The most obvious case is that of /d/. The other changes are more subtle. They need more space, and a more comprehensive and detailed analysis of the totality of his work.
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situations, tandis que chez tel autre, des hypercorrections manifestent des
manques en ce domaine.
C'est dans ce cadre général que doivent être situés les phénomènes d'interférence
et d'alternance qui apparaissent dans de nombreux recueils effectués à Alger entre
Aussi, pour cette communication un sermon religieux prononcé par Ali Bel Hadj à la mosquée Sunna (Bab el Oued, Alger) en avril 1991.
A son propos on peut faire les observations suivantes.
1. Dans ce type de discours qui appelle l'arabe classique on constate que l'orateur
utilise tour à tour le classique et le dialectal mais, proportionnellement, les séquences
en classique reste beaucoup plus nombreuses que celles en dialectal. Le français est re-
presenté sous la forme d'emprunts adapté à l'arabe (deux cas: *barlaman*, *barlamaniya*
pour "parlement" et "parlementaire") et d'alternance séquentielle (un cas: "n-nayab
l-âm / le procureur général" où l'on note la reprise en français d'une expression qui
risquait de ne pas être comprise en arabe).
2. Formellement, l'arabe classique utilisé ne répond peut-être pas aux normes
fixées par les grammaires arabes traditionnelles mais, comparé à l'arabe dialectal utilisé
dans des situations discursives plus ordinaires, il est indéniable que l'on a affaire à une
variété de langue particulière.
3. L'orateur glose le verset coranique servant de base au prêche en arabe classique
et développe les commentaires appelés par ce verset en classique ou en dialectal. Mais,
on l'a dit, tout arabophone étant avant tout dialectophone des dialectalismes trans-
paraissent et à l'inverse dans ces situations plus formelles où le classique est de
rigueur, le dialectal met ses "habits du dimanche". Il est alors difficile de distinguer
ce qui relève de l'emprunt, de l'alternance ou du mélange car si ces notions sont en
principe opératoires dans le cas de contact entre des langues structurellement dis-
tinctes, il est quelquefois délicat de placer la limite dans le cas de variétés étroitement
apparentées.

De ce point de vue, l'analyse montre que dans la réalité de la communication les
effets des contacts sont complexes et qu'il y a lieu de considérer des degrés plutôt que
des distinctions binaire car à côté des cas d'alternance où les deux variétés restent dis-
tinctes, à côté des emprunts où il y a adaptation à une forme de base, le mélange, de
nature hybride, est plus difficile à déceler.
En d'autres termes, la distinction binaire qui permet de situer les formes aux deux
extrémités d'un axe est un bon principe de classement théorique mais elle ne reflète
pas les pratiques réelles de la communication. Certes des différences linguistiques
importantes orientent les formes vers telle ou telle variété mais l'analyse du détail des
faits révèle que le contact produit de subtils mélanges.
4. Le point de la chaîne parlée où se produit l'alternance n'est pas libre au plan
syntactique, c'est un phénomène connu, mais elle n'est pas non plus tout-à-fait libre
au plan de l'énonciation comme le montre les faits suivants. Si l'on prend en con-

* [Editorial note: This article is a version abbreviated by the author of her paper read at the colloquium.]
situationnelles, tandis que chez tel autre, des hypercorrections manifesteront des
manques en ce domaine.

C'est dans ce cadre général que doivent être situés les phénomènes d'interférence
e d'alternance qui apparaissent dans de nombreux recueils effectués à Alger entre

Aux fins d'illustration, j'ai retenu, pour cette communication un sermon religieux
prononcé par Ali Bel Hadj à la mosquée Sunna (Bab el Oued, Alger) en avril 1991.
A son propos on peut faire les observations suivantes.

1. Dans ce type de discours qui appelle l'arabe classique on constate que l'orateur
utilise tour à tour le classique et le dialectal mais, proportionnellement, les séquences
en classique reste beaucoup plus nombreuses que celles en dialectal. Le français est re­
presenté sous la forme d'emprunts adapté à l'arabe (deux cas: \textit{barlaman}, \textit{barlamaniya}
pour "parlement", et "parlementaire") et d'alternance séquentielle (un cas: \textit{n-nâyab}
\textit{l-âm / le procureur général} où l'on note la reprise en français d'une expression qui
risquait de ne pas être comprise en arabe).

2. Formellement, l’arabe classique utilisé ne répond peut etre pas aux normes
fixées par les grammaires arabes traditionnelles mais, comparé à l'arabe dialectal utilisé
dans des situations discursives plus ordinaires, il est indéniable que l'on a affaire à une
variété de langue particulière.

3. L'orateur glose le verset coranique servant de base au prêche en arabe classique
et développe les commentaires appels par ce verset en classique ou en dialectal. Mais,
on l’a dit, tout arabophone étant avant tout dialectophone des dialectalismes trans­
paraissent et à l’inverse dans ces situations plus formelles où le classique est de
rigueur, le dialectal met ses “habits du dimanche”. Il est alors difficile de distinguer
ce qui relève de l’emprunt, de l’alternance ou du mélange car si ces notions sont en
principe opératoires dans le cas de contact entre des langues structurellement dis­
tinctes, il est quelquefois délicat de placer la limite dans le cas de variétés étroitement
apparentées.

De ce point de vue, l'analyse montre que dans la réalité de la communication les
effets des contacts sont complexes et qu’il y a lieu de considérer des degrés plutôt que
de distinctions binaires car à côté des cas d’alternance où les deux variétés restent distin­
tes, à côté des emprunts où il y a adaption à une forme de base, le mélange, de
nature hybride, est plus difficile à déceler.

En d'autres termes, la distinction binaire qui permet de situer les formes aux deux
extrémités d’un axe est un bon principe de classement théorique mais elle ne reflète
pas les pratiques réelles de la communication. Certes des différences linguistiques
importantes orientent les formes vers telle ou telle variété mais l'analyse du détail des
faits révèle que le contact produit de subtils mélanges.

4. Le point de la chaîne parlée où se produit l’alternance n’est pas libre au plan
syntactique, c’est un phénomène connu, mais elle n’est pas non plus tout-à-fait libre
au plan de l’énonciation comme le montre les faits suivants. Si l’on prend en con-

sidération le fait que dans cet "échange" la communication se déroule de manière uni-
latérale et qu'à la différence du dialogue, le destinataire n'a pas la possibilité d'inter-
venir, on constate que le destinataire joue néanmoins son rôle dans la communication
et que le fonctionnement de l’alternance linguistique peut, en partie, s'expliquer par
sa présence. Ainsi, les passages en dialectal se situent, pour l'essentiel, à la fin du
sermon. Cela pourrait être interprété comme l'indice d'un "relâchement" de l'orateur
mais l'analyse montre que le passage du classique au dialectal a une fonction de signal:
indiquer aux interlocuteurs que l'orateur délaisse l'instance de la constatation
atemporelle dans laquelle la plupart des énoncés se manifestent pour instaurer une
relation plus personnelle avec eux. De manière plus ou moins consciente l'orateur
indique ainsi qu'il quitte le domaine de l’"éternel" pour aborder celui du "temporel".
Mais ce passage au dialectal constitue aussi une mise en relief du contenu du message.

Pour terminer j’illustrerai ce qui vient d’être dit par un exemple. Dans ce discours,
où il est question de justice et de la manière d'être juste et équitable quelles que soient
les parties en présence, les commentaires généraux (ce que disent les textes religieux
ou tel ou tel savant auquel il est fait référence) sont dans l'ensemble énoncés en
classique, alors que le parallèle qui est fait avec la situation actuelle et notamment
avec la manière dont la justice a été rendue lors d'un procès intenté au Front
islamique du salut par les autorités algériennes est en dialectal. L'usage du dialectal
devenant alors un procédé de mise en relief stylistique*.

* [Editorial note: This article is a version abbreviated by the author of her paper read at the
colloquium.]
INTRA- AND INTERCOMMUNAL APPELLATIONS IN JUDEO-YEMENI

Moshe Piamenta

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

In Judeo-Yemeni, or the Arabic dialect of the Jews of the Yemen, both urban and rural, a specific lexicon developed over the ages including epithets, additional, or synonymous popular names – word coinages not current with the Muslim majority. These were appellations of an augmentative nature, typical of entries in a dictionary. They symbolised the spiritual life of Jews in the Diaspora, the Holy Scriptures, the religious ceremonies, Jewish manners and customs, their yearning for redemption, and their nostalgia for Zion.

The tension between the devotion of the Yemeni Jews to their Law and their faith in being 'the chosen people' on one hand, and their inferior status as dimmis, as protected subjects of the harsh Zaidite Islamic rule on the other hand pushing them to the edge of society, urged them to turn inward, though being essential for the general society because of their diligence in craftsmanship and skills. Moreover, their social situation communally and individually intensified their psychic tensions. Their sense of discrimination depressed them as a minority. Permanent tension between them and the Muslim majority deriving from conflicting beliefs claimed at least a verbal vent to their suppressed feelings expressed by appellations towards and against Muslims, including disgraceful ones by which they wished to prove their own pride. Cants were widespread among believers in both creeds. Reciprocal appellations will further be defined as intercommunal.

Intracommunal Jewish appellations in the Yemen are of religious and secular types coined by eloquent poets in their diwans, their collections of poems. Religious appellations refer to Holy Scriptures and places, to the Sabbath and holidays, while secular appellations become established in daily usage. Tendentious intercommunal appellations include reciprocal disgraceful ones aiming at defiling believers in the other creed. Furthermore, there are objective intercommunal appellations and an objective range of cants. The usage of tendentious cants is implicit. Yemeni Jews resort to literal manoeuvres in cants to hide their intentions. They abide by metaphor, by insertion of Hebrew words in an Arabic context, by transposition of sounds and letters, or partial transposition by change of word structure or sporadic consonants, or by usage of euphemisms.

The scientific apparatus of this paper is authentic and fully attested. Due to abundance of citations and limitation of space we have chosen not to fully cite our bibliographical references. Instead, the reader is suggested to consult our Dictionary.
of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic through its page numbers, bracketed after each and every citation attested below.

1 Religious and secular appellations

Yemeni Jews did not discredit the usage of Arabic appellations commonly used in Islam. By regarding them as metonymical transfers, they validated their application as parallel sacred concepts in Judaism.

1.1 Religious appellations

1.1.1 Divine and Messianic appellations

Following are some exemplary divine appellations: rabb as-sinā‘ī God, the Hearer (of Israel) vs. saw-sinā‘ī, one of the Beautiful Names of Allah in Islam (233a); ‘al-lā‘im ‘the Most Sage’ vs. ‘al-lā‘im, in Islam (338b); ḥūrī l-‘ājīn ‘the Fair of the gardens’; ḥādīd l-‘ājīn l-quṣṭ ‘the fair Gazelle has gone astray’, fig(uratively) the Divine Presence has departed (with the destruction of the Temple) (112b).

Messianic appellations: al-mabdi ‘the Messiah’ vs. ‘the rightly guided’ in Islam (506a); imām al-budā‘ ‘the king of the straightforward religion’ (12b); umm al-hū‘r ‘the prince of those who have eyes with a marked contrast of white and black’ (the Jews) (13b); al-fātih ‘the Man’ (366a); al-muṣīr ‘the aided (by God)’ (487b); al-‘asāf ‘the Bird that has a majestic splendour’ (349b); al-khārij ‘the man of the green Tent’, cf. al-khārij ‘Elijah’ in Muslim literature (142a).

1.1.2 Nicknames and given names

The Jews considered themselves the descendants of Jacob (274a), al-‘āfāq ‘the offspring of Jacob’ (229a), ṣāḥif ‘Joseph’ (Ps 80:2), al-‘adhab, calque of Hebrew (further: Heb.) ha-sa‘ī ‘the gazelle’ (II Sam 1:19), or metaphor of ‘the Torah’ (555b); ṭābī‘a ni‘n wa-sa‘ī ‘[God has chosen the people of Israel] from amongst n [50 in numerology] + k (20) = seventy, i.e., many [nations] (501b), cf. the reference to k and n in Islam: The Imam facing the worshippers in a Friday sermon turns to them in supplication, saying: yi man amru ‘hu bi-ni‘n wa-sa‘i n... ‘You [Allah], Whose order is [summed up in two letters] k and n attested in fa-da-qada amran fa-in-ni‘ma ‘ayqūla luhub kun ‘in’ fa-yakun ‘and when He decreeth a thing, He only saith unto it, Be, and it is’ (Sale’s translation of the Qur‘ān 40:68).

Isaac, the Patriarch, is nicknamed ḥādābīth ‘the Slaughtered’, which is the epithet of Ishmael amongst Muslims (166a). Jacob, the Patriarch, is nicknamed ar-rāgīth ‘the Righteous, the Godfearing, the Just, the Upright’ (175b). Joseph is nicknamed mawtālā‘īn (l) (Classical Arabic: ru‘ā‘ī ‘the Dreamer’ (Gen 37:19) (533a). Moses is nicknamed ibn ‘imrān (40b), or wa‘lād ‘imrān ‘the son of Amram’ (532a), as well as ar-rasā‘ī ‘the Messenger’ (181b), or an-nabīyī al-murṣī‘l ‘the delegated prophet’ (477a), which appellations are of Muhammad in Islam. Moreover, according to Muslim commentators, Yāsin is one of the nicknames of Muhammad and Moses, rather of all ten prophets revered in Islam (535a). Jewish commentators break yāsin into yā as vocative, and sin as the initial of sinā‘a [Mt.] Sinai’, or of (Heb.) snēb ‘fire-bush’ (Exod 3:2), of sayyid, or of insān ‘man’ (535a). Yāsin is also the nickname of the recitation of (Heb.) ṣā‘ī... proclaiming the belief in the Unity of God attested in Deut 6:49, ibid.11:13-21, and Num 15:37-41 vs. yāsin the name of sūr 36 of the Qur‘ān (548f).

While contrasting Judaism with Islam, it is appropriate to mention at this point that a statement intended a) to call someone’s attention to an issue, or b) when introducing an important conversation, or c) when dissuading someone from committing an offence, or d) when warning someone of an obstacle or pointing to his error, the person is reminded of Moses, who brought down the Torah to the people of Israel, by saying ṣā‘īr Muḥāma ‘remember Moses!’ i.e., consider, regard, reconsider the matter! or think it over! cf. ṣā‘īr Muḥāma ‘remember Muhammad!’ or ṣā‘īr n-nabīyī ‘pray for the prophet!’ responded to by ṣā‘īr l-lāhū ‘call upon God’ and bless him salvation! Jews respond, saying ‘olow hāl-tolōm ‘on him (Moses) be peace!’ (168a).

Aḥaron (Aaron), his brother, is nicknamed al-imām ‘the Priest’. min nasī al-imām ‘one of the descendants of the priest’ is one whose surname is (Heb.) Cohen ‘Priest’. Whereas al-imām in Islam is ‘the prayer leader’ who ascends the pulpit in the mosque and holds his sermon facing the worshippers, the imām, or ‘Priest in the Temple, or the Cohen in the synagogue’ faces the worshippers from the Holy Ark, and blesses them in the course of morning prayers (12b).

al-ḥāriq ‘the Elders’ is the nickname for the (Heb.) Sanhedrin, an assembly of 71 ordained scholars, which functioned in the days of the (Second) Temple in Jerusalem as Supreme Court and Legislature (273a).

Maimonides is nicknamed by the Jews an-nasr al-kabīr, calque of (Heb.) ha-nasār ha-gēdōl ‘the great Eagle’ (483b), al-ḥokūm al-kabīr ‘the great Rabbi’ (80b), and in short, sayyidnā, calque of (Heb.) raḥibnū ‘our lord, our master’ (237b). assumīn ‘ibn āqīlān ‘the nickname of Rabbi Shim'on Bar-Yohai, who carried on discourses with rabbis named in the Zohar, a commentary on the Pentateuch (233a).

The poet laureate of Yemeni Jewry since the 17c. CE was Rabbi Shalom (Shalem) Shabazi. His agnomen are abī yūbī ‘yūhūdū, abī ‘ibī šā‘īm, abīb ‘ālōm, or abīb ‘ālōm (244), wa‘lād yāyīf (538a), ibn yāyīf (40a), ibn māltā ‘misti-ha – his birth-place in southern Yemen, or al-muṣalā‘yī ‘al-muṣalā‘yī‘a, or bint al-muṣalī‘阵营 the daughter of the Rabbi’, Shabazi, was the nickname of his daughter šāmā‘a, a renowned righteous woman whose tomb was frequently visited (246a and 339a).
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1 Religious and secular appellations

Yemeni Jews did not discredit the usage of Arabic appellations commonly used in Islam. By regarding them as metonymical transfers, they validated their application as parallel sacred concepts in Judaism.

1.1 Religious appellations

1.1.1 Divine and Messianic appellations

Following are some exemplary divine appellations: rabba as-simā‘ ‘God, the Hearer (of Israel)” vs. as-samī‘, one of the Beautiful Names of Allah in Islam (233a); ‘alim al-dā‘ ‘the Most Sage’ vs. al-‘ālim, in Islam (338b); hārī l-‘ṣālih ‘the Fair of the gardens’; sarad hārī l-‘ṣālih ‘the fair Gazelle has gone astray’, figuratively) the Divine Presence has departed (with the destruction of the Temple) (112b).

Messianic appellations: al-mabdi ‘the Messiah’ vs. ‘the rightly guided’ in Islam (506a); inām al-bā‘udah ‘the king of the straightforward religion’ (12b); amīr ar-rā‘īr ‘the prince of those who have eyes with a marked contrast of white and black’ (the Jews) (13b); al-fātā ‘the Man’ (366a); al-mansūr ‘the aided (by God)’, ‘the triumphant’ (487b); al-as‘yāmūs ‘the Bird that has a majestic splendour’ (349b); ‘al-kāyimah al-kādwa‘ ‘the man of the green Tent’, cf. al-kādwa ‘Elijah’ in Muslim literature (142a).

1.1.2 Nicknamed and given names

The Jews use names, as previously stated, al-ḥār ‘the fair ones’, al-ḥāmā‘a ‘the community’ (73a), al-‘uqūb (537a), or fi‘at al-‘uqīb ‘the descendents of Jacob’ (274a), sīsīlāt yāqūb ‘the offspring of Jacob’ (229a), yā‘āf ‘Joseph’ (Ps 80:2), al-γexad, calque of Hebrew (further: Heb.) hā-γer ‘the gazelle’ (II Sam 1:19), or as metaphor of ‘the Torah’ (555b); mā ba‘yūna nūn wa-kāf ‘[God has chosen the people of Israel] from amongst n (50 in numerology) + k (20) = seventy, i.e., many [nations] (501b), cf. the reference to k and n in Islam: The Imam facing the worshippers in a Friday sermon turns to them in supplication, saying: yā man amrubah ba‘yūn l-kāf wa-n-nūn… ‘You [Allah], Whose order is [summed up in two letters] k and n attested in fa‘ālā qūdā amrūn fa‘innāma yaqūlū lahu kūn [lhn] fa-yakīn ‘and when He decreeth a thing, He only saith unto it, Be, and it is’ (Sale’s translation of the Qur‘ān 40:68).

Isaac, the Patriarch, is nicknamed ad-dā‘ibih ‘the Slaughtered’, which is the epithet of Ishmael amongst Muslims (166a). Jacob, the Patriarch, is nicknamed ar-rā‘î‘ ‘the Righteous, the Godfearing, the Just, the Upright’ (175b). Joseph is nicknamed mawālā‘ yā‘ūsīn () (Classical Arabic: mu‘jā‘) ‘the Dreamer’ (Gen 37:19) (533a). Moses is nicknamed ibn ‘imrān (40b), or walad ‘imrān ‘the son of Amram’ (532a), as well as ar-rasīl ‘the Messenger’ (181b), or as-sabbī ‘al-mursal ‘the delegated prophet’ (477a), which appellations are of Muhammad in Islam. Moreover, according to Muslim commentators, Yāsin is one of the nicknames of Muhammad and Moses, rather of all ten prophets revered in Islam (535a). Jewish commentators break yāsin into yā as vocative, and sin as the initial of sinā ‘[Mt.] Sinai’, or of (Heb.) sīnēh ‘fire-bush’ (Exod 3:2), of sayyid, or of insān ‘man’ (535a). Yāsin is also the nickname of the recitation of (Heb.) ʾāmīn… proclaiming the belief in the Unity of God attested in Deut 6:49, ibid.11:13-21, and Num 15:37-41 vs. yāsin the name of sura 36 of the Qur‘ān (543f).

While contrasting Judaism with Islam, it is appropriate to mention at this point (a) that a statement intended a) to call someone’s attention to an issue, or b) when introducing an important conversation, or c) when dissuading someone from committing an offence, or d) when warning someone of an obstacle or pointing to his error, the person is reminded of Moses, who brought down the Torah to the people of Isra­el, by saying ʿal-kadr ‘remember Moses’ i.e., consider, regard, reconsider the matter! or think it over! cf. ʿal-kadr Muhammad ‘remember Muhammad!’ or yāsin ‘al-nasibyy ‘pray for the prophet!’ responded to by yāsin ‘al-ʿalayh wās-sallam ‘God bless and grant him salvation!’, Jews respond, saying ‘al-ʿolōw hāl-tolōm ‘on him (Moses) be peace!’ (168a).

Aharon (Aaron), his brother, is nicknamed al-imām ‘the Priest’. min nās al-imām ‘one of the descendants of the priest’ is one whose surname is (Heb.) Cohen ‘Priest’.

Whereas al-imām in Islam is ‘the prayer leader’ who ascends the pulpit in the mosque and holds his sermon facing the worshippers, the imām, or ‘Priest in the Temple, or the Cohen in the synagogue’ faces the worshippers from the Holy Ark, and blesses them in the course of morning prayers (12b).

ʿal-ḥiir ‘the Elders’ is the nickname for the (Heb.) Sanhedrin, an assembly of 71 ordained scholars, which functioned in the days of the [Second] Temple in Jerusalem as Supreme Court and Legislature (273a).

Maimonides is nicknamed by the Jews an-nās al-kabīr, calque of (Heb.) han-māsār ha-gātōl ‘the great Eagle’ (483b), al-ḥokom al-kabīr ‘the great Rabbi’ (80b), and in short, sayyidnā, calque of (Heb.) rabbenū ‘our lord, our master’ (237b), assumūn ‘ibn ʿaglān is the nickname of Rabbi Shim'on Bar-Yohai, who carried on discourses with rabbis named in the Zohar, a commentary on the Pentateuch (233a).

The poet laureate of Yemeni Jewry since the 17c. CE was Rabbi Shalom (Shalem) Shabazi. His agnomen are abū yūdō/yohudō, abu/ah simīn, abū bīlūm, or abū šīyāl (244), wālad yūsīf (538a), ibn yūsīf (40a), ibn mlītī/musātā – his birth-place in southern Yemen, or al-mūsīla’yya, al-mūsālīyya, or bint al-imām al-mūsālīyya ‘the daughter of the Rabbi’, Shabazi, was the nickname of his daughter ’āmīn, a renowned righteous woman whose tomb was frequently visited (246a and 339a).
1.2 Secular appellations

Habbani Jews in eastern Yemen use burēb as a pet-name for Abraham vs. Muslim brayhîm (29b). burēnb and burēni are affective forms for A(h)aron in Jewish circles in al-Gades, Lower Yemen (507a). A Jew addresses an unacquainted adult co-religionist with the vocative 'ammî 'uncle!', and a young man with ibn 'ammî 'cousin!' (340a). Urban Jews denigrate rural Jews by nicknaming them yhûd al-bawâdî 'country Jews' (23b), otherwise yihawd bilâd (37b).

2 Appellations of Holy Scriptures

The Torah is pronounced (isy) at-tawırîyîh, or at-tawırîyîh, tawra in al-Gades, and tawârî in Hujariyya, both in Lower Yemen vs. at-tawrîbâ in Cl. Arabic (54b). al-'îhm is the appellation of the Torah and the Tal'mud (338a), cf. the appellation of the Qur'ân (as-Suyûtî, Itqân, 117). al-qur'ân is the appellation of the Torah and the Ten Commandments. In Lower Yemen ('Ammaî) the Torah is pronounced al-qurâb (391a), cf. al-qur'ân 'the Qur'ân' in Islam.

Other appellations of the Torah: an-nâjîm 'the Rosary' (490a), al-fîrdaws 'Paradise' (370a) and dâr al-shân 'the world of beauty' (160a). at-ta'q 'the Crown' is the traditional Judeo-Yemeni Pentateuch (54b). Rhyming constraints may impair syntactic structure, such as āyît marrûm (!) 'written [Jewish] Law' (17a), for ā. marrûma, and ktîsî matîsur (!) 'the Ten Commandments, the Decalogue' (328a) for â. marrûma. furiî al-'âsîrîs are the Torah laws, or Halâchâh vs. 'îlm al-furiî lit(eral)y 'the doctrine of the branches', i.e., applied fîsh, applied 'ethics' elaborating canonical law in Islam (371b).

The Mishna is translated as maţâînî, in the pl(ural) vs. maţnhâb, singular:sg, in Cl. Arabic (58b), cf. al-maţâînî 'the Repetition', an appellation of the Qur'ân in Islam (as-Suyûtî, Itqân, 117). The Halâchâh, or Jewish law is sunna vs. the Sunna, or the Law established by the Qur'ân and the usage sanctioned by Muslim tradition (233b). A command of Jewish law is maţgîm, pl. maţîqîm (120b), and a precept of Jewish law is farq, pl. furqûd vs. 'religious duty' in Islamic law (371). The Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud compiled about 375 CE is nicknamed al-ğomor aš-šâmi (243a), where the Aramaic Gemara, lit. 'Completion', the second and supplementary part of the Talmud (providing a commentary on the first part, i.e., the Mishna) is insinuated. The Zohar, an essential in Cabalistic literature is nicknamed either al-`azâhir, imitating the sound of (Heb.) zôhar 'Shining' (207a), or bekîb al-luma, its calque in Arabic (453b). Cabalistic literature, dealing with Jewish mysticism is nicknamed either ktîb as-samâîn at after the name of the author of the Zohar, Rabbi Shim'on Bar-Yohai, as-sumu'î ibn 'âshîm (233a), or ktîb at-ta'qîdî dâlih (410b).

As for the works of Maimonides, the book (Heb.) mînhâb tôroh, otherwise (Heb.) hay yad ha-hazzogoh, including all Jewish oral laws, in 14 volumes is nicknamed maţâîn l-îlm (58b), mînhâb nevîkîm is the Hebrew title for his work dalâlah al-`âhrîn 'Guide of the Perplexed', written in Judeo-Arabic and, as usual, in Hebrew characters. It is called, in short, ad-dalâlah, whereas dalâlah in the pl. refers to 'Scriptures' in general (155a) by dint of metonymy. Finally, his sefâr ham-miṣrûqî 'the Book of Precepts' is nicknamed mevasîrî, relating to (Heb.) mîsîr 'ethics, morals' (474).

Some Yemeni Jews pray according to the balâdî 'local', i.e., Yemeni version, while others pray according to the sâmî 'Jerusalem (Palestinian)' version. The Yemeni version prayer-book is nicknamed tikîlîh, pl. t'aqlîkîlîh, 'inclusive, comprehensive', including also Jewish laws, marriage bonds and divorce certificate versions, ritual songs, and songs of praise (434a). An introductory chapter of a Jewish prayer is termed fâţîhah, pl. fawâdîth vs. the fâţîhah, or introductory sura of the Qur'ân (365a). tâsîlah, calque of (Heb.) tiqâqîn is a 'Jewish night-liturgy or prayer, Sabbath songs and readings etc., believed to purify the soul and cancel a bad decree' (286a), tafîsîr at-tafâsîr 'Commentary of commentaries' is a Jewish Yemeni enlarged and more common commentary of Sa'adiah Ga'on's tafîsî 'commentary' – Arabic translation of the Bible (374).

3 Appellations of Holy places

The Garden of Eden is nicknamed 'adnân, sounding like (Heb.) ġan 'èdan vs. the name of a legendary ancestor of the North Arabs (319a). The Temple in Jerusalem is nicknamed al-quds, bayt al-quds, or al-maqûds. Hence al-maqûds at-ta'qînî is 'the Second Temple' (530 BCE-70 CE) (389a); baṣît al-maqûds is a lit. translation of (Heb.) baṣît hammânîdîl 'the Temple' (45).

Other epithets of the Temple are:

madrasat sa'm 'the Temple of S(h)em', cf. al-madrasa, name of a mosque in San'a (148b), and referring to its brightness, it is nicknamed rawâsan 'verandah' (192b), and baṣît assamâwîa lit. 'the house under the open sky', fig. 'divine house', which appellation refers also to Jerusalem (45b), known in Jewish Yemeni circles as (Heb.) yorûkâlâyîm, or as (undefined) quds (389a). The Holy of Holies in the Temple is nicknamed al-gawwâniyya 'the Innermost' (76b), which epithet refers, incidentally, to the innermost place in the Cave of (Heb.) Machpelah, or al-bâhâm al-`ibbrîhîmî in Hebron by local Muslims. On the other hand, al-ba'ashayn 'the Field', (Heb.) ba'sâ-dâh (Gen 24:63) is the epithet for the site of the Temple in Jerusalem, and in a wider sense Judea and Galilee too (244a). The Lord is addressed with the words mîhrâb sa'întak lit. 'the Place of worship where Your divine Presence dwells', (Heb.) sîkînâh is Cl. Arabic sakînah 1. 'dwelling' < skîn. 2. 'divine Presence', i.e., Your Temple (in Jerusalem) (88b) vs. mîhrâb 1. 'niche which shows the direction of the qiblîh', 2. 'a place of worship, also of the Children of Israel' (Lane 1863-93:541c). qiblîh is 'north' for all Yemenis. Therefore, al-qibla is the northward direction to which Yemeni Jews turn when praying to Jerusalem through the Holy Ark in their synagogues (385b), cf. al-qibla in Islam – the Ka'ba, northward to Mecca, and ilâ l-qiblatayn 'the first of
2 Appellations of Holy Scriptures

The Torah is pronounced (ṣifṭ) at-tawūryṣḥya, or at-tawūryṣḥyāt, tawrā in al-Gades, and tawrā in Hujariyya, both in Lower Yemen vs. at-tawrāb in Cl. Arabic (54b). al-ṭīm is the appellation of the Torah and the Talmud (338a), cf. the appellation of the Qurʾān (as-Suyūṭī, Itqān, 117). al-ṭurān is the appellation of the Torah and the Ten Commandments. In Lower Yemen (ʿAmmār) the Torah is pronounced al-ṭurāb (391a), cf. al-ṭurān ‘the Qurʾān’ in Islam.

Other appellations of the Torah: an-nidām ‘the Rosary’ (490a), al-firdaws ‘Paradise’ (370a) and dār al-ṣeyān ‘the world of beauty’ (160a). at-taʿāq ‘the Crown’ is the traditional Judeo-Yemeni Pentateuch (54b). Rhyming constraints may impair syntactic structure, such as ayāt marṣūm (lit. ’written [Jewish) Law’) (17a), for ā. marṣūma, and ḫusūr marṣūr (lit. ’the Ten Commandments, the Decalogue’) (328a) for ḫ. marṣūra. furūʿ al-ṭarīqīyya are the Torah laws, or Halachah vs. ʿilm al-furūʿ (lit.) ‘the doctrine of the branches’, i.e., applied, applied ‘ethics’ elaborating canonical law in Islam (371b).

The Mishna is translated as maṭānī, in the pl(ural) vs. maṭnāb, singular, in Cl. Arabic (58b), cf. al-maṭānī ‘the Repetition’, an appellation of the Qurʾān in Islam (as-Suyūṭī, Itqān, 117). The Halachah, or Jewish law is sunna vs. the Sunna, or the Law established by the Qurʾān and the usage sanctioned by Muslim tradition (233b). A command of Jewish law is maqṣūm, pl. maqṣūmī (120b), and a precept of Jewish law is fard, pl. furūʿ vs. ‘religious duty’ in Islamic law (371). The Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud compiled about 375 CE is nicknamed al-γωνορ as-ṣami (243a), where the Aramaic Gemara, lit. ‘Completion’, the second and supplementary part of the Talmud (providing a commentary on the first part, i.e., the Mishnah) is insinuated. The Zohar, an essential in Cabbalistic literature is nicknamed either tafsir at-tafasir ‘Commentary of commentaries’ is a Jewish Yemeni enlarged and more common commentary of Sacadia Gaon’s tafsir ‘commentary’ – Arabic translation of the Bible (374).

3 Appellations of Holy places

The Garden of Eden is nicknamed ʿadhān, sounding like (Heb.) ʿan ʿēḏan vs. the name of a legendary ancestor of the North Arabs (319a). The Temple in Jerusalem is nicknamed al-quds, bayt al-quds, or al-maqdis. Hence al-maqdis at-tānī is ‘the Second Temple’ (530 BCE-70 CE) (389a); bayt al-maqdis is a lit. translation of (Heb.) bayt hammigod ‘the Temple’ (45).

Other epithets of the Temple are:

madrasat ṣām ‘the Temple of S[h]em, cf. al-madrasa, name of a mosque in Sanʿā’ (148b), and referring to its brightness, it is nicknamed rawḥān ‘verandah’ (192b), and bayt as-sumāwya lit. ‘the house under the open sky’, fig. ‘divine house’, which appellation refers also to Jerusalem (45b), known in Jewish Yemeni circles as (Heb.) yarḥūlāyim, or as (undefined) quds (389a). The Holy of Holies in the Temple is nicknamed al-gawwaniyya ‘the Innermost’ (76b), which epithet refers, incidentally, to the innermost place in the Cave of (Heb.) Machpelah, or al-baram al-ibrāḥim i in Hebron by local Muslims. On the other hand, al-barṣayn ‘the Field’, (Heb.) ḫāṣ-ṣodah (Gen 24:63) is the epithet for the site of the Temple in Jerusalem, and in a wider sense Judea and Galilee too (24a). The Lord is addressed with the words mibrāb sakintak lit. ‘the Place of worship where Your divine Presence dwells’, (Heb.) ṣḵinān is Cl. Arabic sakīna 1. ‘dwelling’ < skn. 2. ‘divine Presence’, i.e., Your Temple (in Jerusalem) (88b) vs. mibrāb 1. ‘nicht which shows the direction of the qiblāb, 2. ‘a place of worship, also of the Children of Israel’ (Lan 1863-93:541c). qiblā is ‘north’ for all Yemenis. Therefore, al-qibla is the northward direction to which Yemeni Jews turn when praying to Jerusalem through the Holy Ark in their synagogues (385b), cf. al-qibla in Islam – the Kaʿba, northward to Mecca, and ʿula l-ṣ̱ibālatayn ‘the first of
4 Holiday appellations

Yemeni Jews nickname a weekday yawm al-bayn, pl. ayyamat al-bayn 'intervening days (between two Sabbaths)' (538b), or bayn al-aḥlāl lit. 'included in () the weekdays', aḥlāl being the Yemeni pl. of (Heb.) hol 'workday, excluding the Sabbath' (103a), or wa'd 'weekday', pl. ṣa'd, or wa'id, generally meaning 'week' (527a). A holiday is 'id, pl. a'yād, and taww,' id, pl. taww'id (ibid.), or yawm sāḥib, calque of (Heb.) yōm tōv lit. 'good day' (Esther 9:22) (538b). A holiday eve is 'ar bī-'id < (Heb.) 'īratu (320b).

Following are appellations of Jewish holidays:

'iḍ al-kāmis 'New Year's day' referring to the agricultural marking star kāmis lit. 'fifth', relating to the month of ayyāl 'September' when the dhurah in the fields becomes full-grained and brilliant (137), and the first croppings are harvested (348b). 'iḍ al-al'ara 'feast of the booth[s]' is the feast of Tabernacles, (Heb.) Sukkoth, 'iḍ as-sevaq 'feast of the lamp, of lights' is (Heb.) Hanukkah. Purim is either called by its Hebrew name (Esther 9:26), or translated into Arabic as a calque, sirām, sg. (Heb.) pīr/sabn, lit. 'arrow', 'lot' (236b). 'iḍ al-qārisūq 'feast of the cups' is so called because Jews drink excessively on this occasion, falling at the end of the rainy season in the Yemen. 'iḍ al-adārā 'feast of the lamp, of lights' is confirmed for the Qabīlīs (tribesmen), referring to the Hebrew citation wa-qārisūq kol b'mey tēyēg (read myshēq, the second and destroying all the Children of Sheth) (Num 24:17), as Purim is a token of submission of the enemies to the Jews (394b). 'iḍ al-fāṭir is the feast of the unleavened bread, i.e., Passover, otherwise nicknamed 'iḍ al-māyda 'feast of the table (of the night of Passover)' (475a), or 'iḍ al-mīyā 'the one hundredth day' since the last season of sowing wheat and barley (348b). Incidentally, the evening (not the eve) of the first day of Passover, when after prayers in the synagogue the Jewish community visits the residences of the chief rabbis in groups, in order to congratulate them and receive their blessing, that evening is called yawm as-salāt 'the evening of congratulations' (457a).

Quite as the month of Šā’bān precedes Ramadan, the fasting month, and is pregnant with it, so is the Hebrew month of Iyyar pregnant with Sivan, the month of the reception of the Torah including the feast of (Heb.) loyāt 'Pentecost'. It follows that the Judeo-Yemeni religious poetry nicknames the revelation on Mt. Sinai (Heb.) mātton tōrōt 'giving of the Law', as good tidings hidden in the month of Iyyar and as a secret – sirā l-bīyāmūn 'the hidden secret of Sha'bān' (257a). Pentecost is called as-salām, or 'iḍ al-as-salām, (Heb.) ṣāʾirat (Talmudical) Pentecost (329b), cf. al-ansūs, or 'iḍ al-ansūs in Arabic, 'Christian' Pentecost < Greek pentekostē fiftieth (day)'. It is also nicknamed 'iḍ al-kāmis, because the sowing of dhurah takes place within fifty days starting with the first day of Passover, and ending precisely on Pentecost (348b), which is also nicknamed 'iḍ al-kudayrah, or al-kudayra' (131a), 'feast of the greenery, verdure'.

In southern Yemen, Pentecost is nicknamed 'iḍ al-ʿūr 'feast of doughnuts (327b), termed zalābiyāh by Jewish women of San'a (203b). In Aden, Pentecost is nicknamed 'iḍ an-nāʾīgīl 'the feast of coconuts' on which occasion the Jews prepare and eat coconut jam (476b). In San'a, iyalat al-ghrīyāb 'the night throughout which reading takes place' is the first night of Pentecost, when sacred texts are read in groups in the synagogue (391a). Another appellation of this night is laylat al-ṣawr 'the night when the Gates of heaven are open' (as on every mid Jewish month, according to the Cabballah), and the Jews stay awake throughout, praying and awaiting the Hour decreed by God to arrive. Thereupon, they express their wishes, which God fulfills, including the distribution of living provisions (457a), cf. the attestation that 'some say that the appellation of laylat al-ṣawr in sura 97 of the Qur'an is the night wherein the means of subsistence are apportioned' (Lane, 1863-93:2494c). According to this sura, the Qur'an was revealed in laylat al-ṣawr celebrated through the night between 26 and 27 of Ramadan. In Christianity on the other hand, laylat al-ṣawr, otherwise called laylat al-ṣawrīs 'the eve of baptism' is the night preceding January 6, the day on which the baptism of Christ is celebrated (457a).

In concluding, we refer to the following appellations: yawm al-mdhar, or yawm al-mansīb, calques of (Heb.) yōm ham-mā'mod, refer to the Day of the Event, to the revelation of the Torah on Mt. Sinai (97b and 487a). yawm al-wād, or simply al-maw'rīda, is the Appointed Day, the end of days, the Day of Redemption, and the Days of the Messiah's advent (527a); yawm al-qābil is the Day of Redemption, otherwise called yawm al-path māṭar i-lit. 'the Day of the Buyer' – the Redeemer of the people of Israel, i.e., the Day of Redemption by the Messiah (539a). Finally, yawm al-hisāb wa-d-daftar lit. 'the Day of Reckoning and of [checking one's] "register" [by God] i.e., the Day of Judgement, doomsday (538b).
the two qiblas' - Jerusalem. *bilād al-quds (fīyyah)* is the Holy Land (37a). In the *Dīwān* of Rabbi Shalom Shabazi, Samarqand is figuratively the vision of the Jewish people: 'īdnā lī-maqdisna samarqand arghā syyyān qāryatna maqām al-awwal i 'turn our back to our Holy Temple, [to] the vision of our land, [to] Zion (Jerusalem) our City, the residence of our ancestors'! Samarqand, used metaphorically in this context, was ruined by Genkiz Khan in 1229 CE, like Jerusalem. It was Tamerlane's capital in the 14th century CE (37a), ruined later in history to be rebuilt again.

*as-sālam* 'the north' has different notions communally speaking. Yemeni Jews refer to Jerusalem, and in a narrower sense to the Temple in it, whereas Muslims refer by it to Syria, and in a narrower sense to Damascus (242b). By extension, *dār as-salām* is Jerusalem vs. Baghdad in Islam, or, again in Islam – lit. 'the peaceful zone' an appellation for Islamic countries vs. *dār al-harb* lit. 'the war zone, enemy territory', an appellation for non-Muslim, Christian countries. However, Yemeni Jews include Palestine, queerly, under *diyyār al-harb* (160a), or *ad-diyyār ad-dākila* lit. 'the interior countries', i.e., overseas, countries abroad (146a).

### 4 Holiday appellations

Yemeni Jews nickname a weekday *yawm al-bayn*, pl. *ayyāmāt al-bayn* 'intervening days' (between two Sabbaths) (538b), or *bayn al-aḥlāl* lit. '[included] in () the weekdays', *aḥlāl* being the Yemeni pl. of (Heb.) *hol* 'workday, excluding the Sabbath' (103a), or *wād* 'weekday', pl. *ādād*, or *wādād*, generally meaning 'week' (527a). A holiday is *'id*, pl. *'ayād*, and *tawwād*, pl. *tawwād* (ibid.), or *yawm sāliḥ*, calque of (Heb.) *yom tov* lit. 'good day' (Esther 9:22) (538b). A holiday eve is *'arb al-'id* < (Heb.) *'eravu* (320b).

Following are appellations of Jewish holidays:

* 'id al-kāmis 'New Year's day' referring to the agricultural marking star *kāmis* lit. 'fifth', relating to the month of *ayḥāl* 'September' when the dhurah in the fields becomes full-grown and brilliant (137), and the first crops are harvested (348b).

* 'id al-`arba'a 'feast of the booth[s]' is the feast of Tabernacles, (Heb.) Sukkoth. *'id as-serāq* 'feast of the lamp, of lights' is (Heb.) Hanukkah. *'id al-maṣṣūr* 'feast of the cups' is so called because Jews drink excessively on this occasion, falling at the end of the rainy season in the Yemen. *'id al-qārāqīr* 'feast of the cups' is so called because Jews drink excessively on this occasion, falling at the end of the rainy season in the Yemen. *'id al-miyāda* 'feast of the table (of the night of Passover)' (475a), or *'id al-nīsīyā* 'the one hundredth day' since the last season of sowing wheat and barley (348b). Incidentally, the evening (not the eve!) of the first day of Passover, when after prayers in the synagogue the Jewish community visits the residences of the chief rabbis in groups, in order to congratulate them and receive their blessing, that evening is called *laylāt al-salām* 'the evening of congratulations' (457a).

Quite as the month of Sh'ban precedes Ramadan, the fasting month, and is pregnant with it, so is the Hebrew month of Iyyar pregnant with Swian, the month of the reception of the Torah including the feast of (Heb.) *lōvāq* 'Pentecost'. It follows that the Judeo-Yemeni religious poetry nicknames the revelation on Mt. Sinai (Heb.) *matton tōroh* 'giving of the Law', as good tidings hidden in the month of Iyyar and as a secret – *sīr al-sālim* lit. 'the hidden secret of Sha'bān' (257a). Pentecost is called *as-ghāra*, or *'id al-`asghara*, (Heb.) *'asghara* (Talmudical) Pentecost (329b), cf. *al-ansara*, or *'id al-ansāra* in Arabic 'Christian' Pentecost < Greek *pentecoste* 'fiftieth (day)'. It is also nicknamed *'id al-kāmis*, because the sowing of dhurah takes place within fifty days starting with the first day of Passover, and ending precisely on Pentecost (348b), which is also nicknamed *'id al-κuδyrra*, or *al-κuδyrra* (131a), 'feast of the greenery, verdure'.

In southern Yemen, Pentecost is nicknamed *'id al-ul`d* 'feast of doughnuts (327b)', termed *zalābiyyā* by Jewish women of San`ā' (203b). In Aden, Pentecost is nicknamed *'id an-nā`īgīl* 'the feast of coconuts' on which occasion the Jews prepare and eat coconut jam (476b). In San`ā', *laylāt al-`arbbāyā* 'the night throughout which reading takes place' is the first night of Pentecost, when sacred texts are read in groups in the synagogue (391a). Another appellation of this night is *laylāt al-wārd* 'the night when the Gates of heaven are open' (as on every mid Jewish month, according to the Talmud). Yet another is *laylāt al-qadr* (476b). In San`ā', *laylāt al-qadr*, the night preceding January 6, the day on which the Jews stay awake throughout, praying and awaiting the Hour decreed by God to arrive. Thereupon, they express their wishes, which God fulfills, including the distribution of living provisions (457a), cf. the attestation that 'some say that the appellation of *laylāt al-qadr* in sura 97 of the Qur'ān is the night wherein the means of subsistence are apportioned' (Lan., 1863-93.2494c). According to this sura, the Qur'ān was revealed in *laylāt al-qadr* celebrated through the night between 26 and 27 of Ramadan. In Christianity on the other hand, *laylāt al-qadr*, otherwise called *laylāt al-`izās* 'the eve of baptism' is the night preceding January 6, the day on which the baptism of Christ is celebrated (457a).

In concluding, we refer to the following appellations: *yawm al-maṣṣūr*, *yawm al-maṣṣūr*, calques of (Heb.) *yom ha-ma`āmōd* refer to the Day of the Event, to the Revelation of the Torah on Mt. Sinai (97b and 487a). *yawm al-wād*, or simply *al-mawwādah*, is the Appointed Day, the end of days, the Day of Redemption, and the Days of the Messiah's advent (527a); *yawm al-qabul* is the Day of Redemption, otherwise called *yawm al-mustārва* lit. 'the Day of the Buyer' – the Redeemer of the people of Israel, i.e., the Day of Redemption by the Messiah (539a). Finally, *yawm al-bisāb* *tas-dāfars* lit. 'the Day of Reckoning and of [checking one's] "register" [by God] i.e., the Day of Judgement, doomsday (538b).
5 Intercommunal appellations

5.1 Jewish appellations for Muslims

Yemeni Jews nickname the Arabic language lofîn hasrî 'the language of Haggar', mother of Ishmael (Gen 16) (504a). Muslims are nicknamed abl al-amayyam 'the turban wearers', or abl as-siyam 'the fasting in Ramadan' (15b). An urban Muslim of Sanâ'î is a muslim versus 'arabi 'a tribal and rural Muslim' (321a), whereas a musulmânî is a Jewish orphan bound to be kidnapped for forced conversion to Islam according to Yemeni Zaidite law (230a). In Sharcab, southern Yemen, the Muslim or Gentile is nicknamed (yd) sidi 'Sir!' (237b). When in an official document a Jew states that the signing of it took place in the presence of one or more Muslim witnesses, his or their epithet(s) following his or their full name(s) is 'azzabu, or 'azzahum allâb 'God keep him or them honoured, esteemed!' (324b).

5.2 Muslim appellations for Jews

Urban Muslims nickname Jews abl as-sabt 'keepers of the Sabbath', or abl as-salâb 'the Jewish congregation' (15b), and in Muslim official documents - mu'saweyyân 'people related to Moses' (474a). The Qabilis (tribesmen) nickname them bani l-ashât [l-asbat] 'the descendants of the tribes of (Israel)' (39b and 40a), or bani himyar, sg. ibn al-himyari 'the descendants of (the kings of) Himyar' (39b), or yibid kaybar 'the Jews of Khaybar' (140b), relating to a Jewish tribe defeated by Muhammad in an Arabian oasis. By appearance, a Jew is nicknamed abî zimmâr 'wearing side-locks (curls)' distinguishing him from a Muslim (1b). Jews and Christians are nicknamed abl al-kitâb 'the people of the Book, the Bible', and locally - abl al-kutâb attested in Damâr (15b).

6 Disgraceful appellations

6.1 Towards Jews in the Yemen

A derogatory nickname given to Yemeni Jews is bani mîta 'sons of a carrion' (40a). A Yemeni proverb relating to hypocrisy and insincerity attests the attitude to Jews: fi l-udn wa- yahawdi 'in your presence [he says] "Sir!" and in your absence - "Jew!" (538a). When a Jew is mentioned by a party in a dialogue between Muslims, he may be detested as someone to be guarded against. This is expressed by the formula sânak allâb 'God guard you!' by the interlocutor. If the word yahawdi 'Jew' is mentioned, one adds the formula allâb yiîazzak 'may God keep you honoured, esteemed!', which formula is invoked also when mentioning something distasteful (324b). Yahawdi, it should be noted, is not a denotation, but a cacophonous connotation. Still worse, the form gahawi is a denigration of yahawdi (76a).

6.2 Disgraceful appellations towards Muslims in the Yemen

The degradation and suppression which the Jews suffered in Yemeni society under the authorities of the Zaidite Yemenis and the Sunni Turks, as well as under hostile inhabitants, made life for the Jews intolerable. They had no choice but to condemn their oppressors secretly and hesitatingly, to express their distress and cry for help in prayers and supplications, and in poetic themes of yearning to Zion and Messianic redemption. The sounds of Arabic names of persons they disgraced and hated inspired them with forming disgraceful appellations in Hebrew words, or in words of similar Hebrew roots from a traditional Hebrew stock, or in pseudo-Hebrew words inlaid in their Yemeni speech.

Following are exemplary appellations:

Muhammad, the prophet of Islam, is nicknamed al-armani (7a). A confiscating tax as 'the Aramean' (7a). A shari' named (Heb.) sârij 'bombed', is of the sârij class (253a), a descendant of Muhammad by his daughter Fatimah, wife of Ali of the tribe of banû hâmîm, honoured by all, except by the Qabilis who hate him for his haughtiness (237a). The Imam Yahya, the king, would address a Jewish 'asîl elected by the notables of the community to represent Jewish interests in the Royal Court, and raise poll-tax for the Treasury (353a), as al-kawâga as-salum-So-and-So, a title and form of address for non-Muslims since Turkish rule (139a), not as-sayyid So-and-So for Muslims (237a).
5 Intercommunal appellations

5.1 Jewish appellations for Muslims

Yemeni Jews nickname the Arabic language *lošın hağrī* 'the language of Hagar', mother of Ishmael (Gen 16) (504a). Muslims are nicknamed *‘abd al-amāyim* 'the turban wearers', or *‘abd as-siyyām* 'the fasting in Ramadan' (15b). An urban Muslim of San’ā’ is a *muslim* vs. *‘arabi* 'a tribal and rural Muslim' (321a), whereas a *musulmanī* is a Jewish orphan bound to be kidnapped for forced conversion to Islam according to Yemeni Zaidite law (230a). In Shā’b, southern Yemen, the Muslim or Gentile is nicknamed *rādīm* pl. *rudmān*, ‘guarantor (on behalf of the Jews)’ (179b), and *gāsari*, or *gātih*, ‘Gentile’ (69b and 75a). A Yemeni Jew addresses a Yemeni Muslim with the vocative (*yā*) *sīdī* 'Sir!' (237b). When in an official document a Jew states that the signing of it took place in the presence of one or more Muslim witnesses, his or their epithet(s) following his or their full name(s) is *‘azzahu, or ‘azzahum allāh ‘God keep him or them honoured, esteemed!’ (324b).

5.2 Muslim appellations for Jews

Urban Muslims nickname Jews *‘abd as-sabt* ‘keepers of the Sabbath’, or *‘abd as-salāb* ‘the Jewish congregation’ (15b), and in Muslim official documents - *musawwiyān* ‘people related to Moses’ (474a). The Qabilis (tribesmen) nickname them *bāni l-ashāt* ['l-ashāt] ‘the descendants of the tribes (of Israel)’ (39b and 40a), or *bāni himyar, sq. *ibn al-himyarī* ‘the descendants of (the kings of) Himyar’ (39b), or *yībūd khybar* ‘the Jews of Khaybar’ (140b), relating to the Jewish tribe defeated by Muhammad in an Arabian oasis. By appearance, a Jew is nicknamed *‘abd zimmār* ‘wearing side-locks (curls)’ distinguishing him from a Muslim (1b). Jews and Christians are nicknamed *‘abd al-kitāb* ‘the people of the Book, the Bible’, and locally - *‘abd al-kuba* attested in Damār (15b).

6 Disgraceful appellations

6.1 Towards Jews in the Yemen

A derogatory nickname given to Yemeni Jews is *bāni miṭa* ‘sons of a carrion’ (40a). A Yemeni proverb relating to hypocrisy and insincerity attests the attitude to Jews: *fi l-wāṣī yā sīdī wāsī *l-gafe yā yihuddi ‘in your presence [he says] “Sir!” and in your absence - “Jew!”’ (538a). When a Jew is mentioned by a party in a dialogue between Muslims, he may be detested as someone to be guarded against. This is expressed by the formula *sānak allâh ‘God guard you!’ by the interlocutor. If the word *yihuddi ‘Jew’ is mentioned, one adds the formula *allâh y‘izzak ‘may God keep you honoured, esteemed!’*, which formula is invoked also when mentioning something distasteful (324b). *yihuddi, it should be noted, is not a denomination, but a cacophonous connotation. Still worse, the form *gahuddi* is a denigration of *yabuddi* (76a). To the

Yeemeni the term *yuhawdi* is a simple epithet of abuse bandied about among Muslims without a thought as to its meaning. Thus *kalb wa-yuhawdi* means ‘fighting like cat and dog’ (538a). A walking or riding Muslim of al-Hawtah would tell a walking Jew facing him *sīlī yā kalb *‘pass to my left, you dog!’ (267a). To state an incident, a 17th century Muslim farmer hailed the Judeo-Yemeni poet laureate Rabbi Shalom Shabazi, saying: *as-sa‘īl ‘alayk yahuddi l-khaybarī ‘hot ashes on you, O man [of the Jewish tribe] of Khaybar!’ denying him the greeting hailing Muslims only - *‘alayka s-salām ‘peace on you!’ (227b). In Muslim dialogues, the word *ibrīyy ‘Hebrew’ stands for the common word *yuhawdi ‘Jew’* (315a).

In official documents signed by the Imam Yahya, the king would address a Jewish *‘aqīl* elected by the notables of the community to represent Jewish interests in the Royal Court, and raise poll-tax for the Treasury (335a), as *al-khawāṣa So‘ayd and So‘ayd, a title and form of address for non-Muslims since Turkish rule (139a), not as-suyyid So‘ayd and So‘ayd for Muslims (237a).

*sifrat at-sawārat ‘sheep’s hide of the Torah’ is a cacophony of *sifr ‘Book’ by a certain Muslim denigrating the Torah (224a). When a Muslim is asked about something of which he knows nothing, he says *hāqq wa‘id al-yahuddi ‘it belongs to Sa‘īd, the Jew’, i.e., I don’t know (222b), Sa‘īd being a common name for a Jew.

In Guraz, northern Yemen, whoever wishes to disparage Jewish belief, resorts to the saying *al-qāṣ yislim ‘alāk sab ‘in yihuddi ‘the qāṣ (Catha edulis) is so good that seventy, i.e., many Jews would turn to Islam for it’ (230a).

6.2 Disgraceful appellations towards Muslims in the Yemen

The degradation and suppression which the Jews suffered in Yemeni society under the authorities of the Zaidite Yemenis and the Sunni Turks, as well as under hostile inhabitants, made life for the Jews intolerable. They had no choice but to condemn their oppressors secretly and hesitatingly, to express their distress and cry for help in prayers and supplications, and in poetic themes of yearning to Zion and Messianic redemption. The sounds of Arabic names of persons they disgraced and hated inspired them with forming disgraceful appellations in Hebrew words, or in words of similar Hebrew roots from a traditional Hebrew stock, or in pseudo-Hebrew words inlaid in their Yemeni speech.

Following are exemplary appellations:

Muhammad, the prophet of Islam, is nicknamed *al-‘armanī* (cf. (Heb.) *rammād* ‘the deceiver, scoundrel’ probably related to *al-‘armanī* the Syrian, an epithet of the uncle and father-in-law of Jacob the Patriarch (Gen 28:5), and of Jacob proper, matriarchally related (Deut 26:5), thus translated into Arabic by Sa‘ādīa: ‘the Aramean’ (7a). A *sawīf* nicknamed (Heb.) *sarīf ‘burnt’, is of the seyyid class (253a), a descendant of Muhammad by his daughter Fatimah, wife of Ali of the tribe of *bānū hāšim*, honoured by all, except by the Qabilis who hate him for his haughtiness (237a). The *imām ‘Yemeni king’ nicknamed (Heb.) *mīm defect, fault as a cacophony (474b) is
affiliated to the Zaidite sect nicknamed (Heb.) zhidim 'wicked, insolent', or (Heb.) 'amoleq 'Amalekites', i.e., wicked, cruel (210a). This sect ruled the Yemen over a thousand years, while the Ottoman Turks who ruled it twice in the meantime, and treated the Jews harshly were nicknamed abnini hinting to the (Heb.) 'abnh 'guilt, sin' to mean 'upanini 'Ottoman' (9a). Gentile nations are generally nicknamed as-sinami 'the left side', based on the Aramaic phrase siwar di-sinamla insinuating that they are of 'Evil Inclination' (267a). al-awileq, a tribe which levied local taxes from the Jews of Habbân, in addition to the poll-tax levied from them by the Central government were called 'amoleq 'Amalekites', i.e., wicked, cruel (338a). al-akdam who were on the lowest scale of trades, yet ranked above the Jews (122a) were nicknamed by the Jews of al-Gades in southern Yemen kano, derived from 'Canaan', the slave people cursed in Gen 9:25 (437b).

A small village al-balqâ [al-balqä] bordering on the southern edge with the Jewish quarter of Sanâ‘ named qâ‘ al-yahbûd in bîr al-‘azab, a neighbourhood in the western precincts of Sanâ‘ (18b), included an anti-Jewish population which compelled the Chief Rabbi of the community to construct a gate named bâb al-balqâ [b. al-balqâ] in 1932 to the south of the Jewish quarter for the sake of security. The hostile population was nicknamed (Heb.) bolôg for balqâ insinuating the Meobite king Balâq who hired Balaam (Num 22 ff.), (39a and 43a).

San‘ani Muslims and Jews deride speakers of the dialect of al-yaman al-asfal 'Lower Yemen'. luglûgî, pl. laglîla is the nickname of a Lower Yemeni such as a citizen of Ibb (450b). So is galgalî, pl. galágila, a Jew of Shar‘ab derided by a Jew of San‘a for pronouncing his (Heb.) shibboleth [g] instead of /q/ (358b). We may recall that of Ibb (450b). So is

erm Yemen’, population was nicknamed (Heb.) luglugi, or

7 Yemeni cant

Yemeni cant called lugâ tistlâhyya 'secret language' (450b), or 'conventional language' is conducted by vague codes. It is a language of Jewish labourers skilled in building, silver-smiths, and utensil repairers – a Yemeni language including some traditional Hebrew words. It is generally defined as lugât al-asädîya (sg. uṣîṭa) 'secret, or private language of master-craftsmen' (9b), as lugât al-amâmvîn 'secret, or private language of builders' (341a), or as lugât al-mawâgîsî (sg. mawâgig) 'secret, or private language of stone-cutters, stone-dressers' (529b). The Qabilis would address a referred to the (Heb.) 'utṣa "Mr. Sâlim", Jews being members of the community of master craftsmen and silversmiths (9a).

The contents of Ms. Heb 24° 6395 in our sources, a ledger of an Adeni Jewish merchant, written in Judeo-Yemeni in the years 1945-48 CE (xiv) were amazing by their data encoded in a secret bookkeeping technique, transacting with his brother

who had emigrated to Tel-Aviv. In order to keep his ledger in secrecy, to be encoded by his brother, he used an idiosyncratic business argot of the following complex: (a) two intertwined lexicons, Arabic and Hebrew; (b) two scripts, Arabic and Hebrew; (c) acronyms of words and dates; (d) four mixed calendars: Hebrew, Hegira, Common Era (A.D.), and Macedonian relating to Alexander the Great, an era otherwise called the Era of Contracts, (Heb.) isdorî, beginning in 311 BCE; (e) symbols of arithmetical digits and fractions in Hebrew characters, Arabic or Indian ciphers, and local symbols of fractions (ix and x). Dates were also marked by the name of the specific portion of the Torah read in the synagogue on the Sabbath preceding the day of this or that transaction.

Under the category of Jewish cant we find verbal tricks in Judeo-Arabic speech by which Jews slipped away from Muslims, cheated and thwarted them hiding their intentions. They would resort to metaphor, to inlay ordinary Hebrew words, to fully or partly distorted words in a different structure, to substitutes of Hebrew consonants inlaid in an Arabic text, moreover to euphemisms, and to Hebrew synonyms of words similar in sound to their Arabic counterparts for fear of revealing their cunning intentions.

Following are some exemplary instances:

a) Metaphor: When a quarrel ends in blows between a Muslim and a Jew, the friends of the latter who are witnessing encourage him, saying ñdkîl wast at-tow 'find shelter in the (Heb.) !t' – acronym of the (Heb.) tamîm 'perfect' adduced in Deut 18:13 "Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God", i.e., fear not your enemy! (145b).

b) Inlaying of a Hebrew word: In the previous context of urging a fellow Jew in a row, one may also say: wâwêq ji 'ibrî w-sâlh 'beat your adversary, you Jew, and cry loud!'. The Hebrew verb wâwêq means 'to distort', i.e., to beat (344b). When the Muslim overpowers the Jew, the latter is encouraged by the cry wul-barîhâ 'run away!'. (Heb.) barîhâ 'running away' (25b). A cry urging a fellow Jew to find shelter from an enemy, or urging to completely deny an affair in a controversial issue with a non-Jew, or to keep a secret as if one’s fellow Jew has not seen anything is al-barîm [Heb.] to the mountains! a corruption of (Heb.) al-hâborîm 'upon the mountains' (Ezech 18:6) (508a).

c) Distorting of a Hebrew word: When warning a Jew to escape from an approaching enemy or authority intending to put him in jail, or when quarrelling with a non-Jew, one cries dâhî 'run for your life!'. The intransitive Hebrew verb dôhôb means 'to slip, escape, go away' (145a), cf. Sa‘addia’s Arabic translation: VII indâhâ 'to be driven' in Deut 30:4 and Ps 36:62, and of mundâhî 'driven' (Deut 30:4). When hushing a Jew, one says: insâm (imperative only) 'hush!' being either a corruption of (Heb.) en som 'there isn’t' (486b), or of Arabic insâm 'recover your breath!' (484a), cf. (Heb.) nîsîm. hânî 'mediation charges received in intercommunal transactions' is a corruption of (Heb.) hano‘ôh 'pleasure, enjoyment', used metaphorically (513a).
affiliated to the Zaidite sect nicknamed (Heb.) zēdim 'wicked, insolent', or (Heb.) 'amōlēq 'Amalekites', i.e., wicked, cruel (210a). This sect ruled the Yemen over a thousand years, while the Ottoman Turks who ruled it twice in the meantime, and treated the Jews harshly were nicknamed ʾalmōnī hinting to the (Heb.) ʾalmōh 'guilt, sin' to mean ʾupmnī 'Ottoman' (9a). Gentle nations are generally nicknamed ʾal-ṣīnāl 'the left side', based on the Aramaic phrase ʾšērā Ṭīsamālā insinuating that they are of 'Evil Inclination' (267a). al-ʾawāleq, a tribe which levied local taxes from the Jews of Habbān, in addition to the poll-tax levied from them by the Central government were called 'amōlēq 'Amalekites', i.e., wicked, cruel (338a). al-ʾakdām who were on the lowest scale of trades, yet ranked above the Jews (122a) were nicknamed by the Jews of the-Gadès in southern Yemen kano, derived from 'Canaan', the slave people cursed in Gen 9:25 (437b).

A small village al-balqā (al-balqā) bordering on the southern edge with the Jewish quarter of Sanāʾ named qāʾ al-yahūd in bīr al-ʾazāb, a neighbourhood in the western precincts of Sanāʾ (18b), included an anti-Jewish population which compelled the Chief Rabbi of the community to construct a gate named bāb al-balqā [b. al-balqā] in 1932 to the south of the Jewish quarter for the sake of security. The hostile population was nicknamed (Heb.) bolog for balqā insinuating the Meobite king Balq who hired Balaam (Num 22 ff.), (39a and 43a).

Sanāʾi Muslims and Jews deride speakers of the dialect of al-ʾiyāman al-asfāl 'Lower Yemen'. luglū, pl. laqlāliga is the nickname of a Lower Yemeni such as a citizen of līb (450b). So is gūgūlī, pl. galāgala, a Jew of Sharʿāb derided by a Jew of Sanāʾ for pronouncing his (Heb.) shibboleth [g] instead of /q/ (358b). We may recall that for pronouncing his (Heb.) shibboleth [g] instead of /q/ (358b). We may recall that

7 Yemeni cant

Yemeni cant called lugā ittalāhyya 'secret language' (450b), or 'conventional language' is conducted by vague codes. It is a language of Jewish labourers skilled in building, silver-smiths, and utensil repairers - a Yemeni language including some traditional Hebrew words. It is generally defined as lugāt al-asādiyya (ṣg. ʿuṣṭa) 'secret, or private language of master-craftsmen' (9b), as lugāt al-ʿammārin 'secret, or private language of builders' (341a), or as lugāt al-mawāqigii (ṣg. mawāqigi) 'secret, or private language of stone-cutters, stone-dressers' (352b). The Qabilis would address a relative of words similar in sound to their Arabic counterparts for fear of revealing their intentions. They would resort to metaphor, to inlaid ordinary Hebrew words, to fully or partly distorted words in a different structure, to substitutes of Hebrew consonants inlaid in an Arabic text, moreover to euphemisms, and to Hebrew synonyms of words similar in sound to their Arabic counterparts for fear of revealing their cunning intentions.

Following are some exemplary instances:

a) Metaphor: When a quarrel ends in blows between a Muslim and a Jew, the friends of the latter who are witnessing encourage him, saying idkil wast at-tōw 'find shelter in the (Heb.) ti! – acronym of the (Heb.) ʾtamīm 'perfect' adduced in Deut 18:13 "Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God", i.e., fear not your enemy! (145b).

b) Inlaying of a Hebrew word: In the previous context of urging a fellow Jew in a row, one may also say: rāwēq yā ʾibri u-ṣāwīh 'beat your adversary, you Jew, and cry loud!'. The Hebrew verb ʾrāwēq means 'to distort', i.e., to beat (344b). When the Muslim overpowers the Jew, the latter is encouraged by the cry 'ul-ʾbarīḥāh! run away!'. (Heb.) ʾbarīḥāh 'running away' (25b). A cry urging a fellow Jew to find shelter from an enemy, or urging to completely deny an affair in a controversial issue with a non-Jew, or to keep a secret as if one's fellow Jew has not seen anything is al-ʾbarīm [Heb. translation: VII mound] to the mountains!' a corruption of (Heb.) al-ḥaborīm 'upon the mountains' (Ezech 18:6) (508a).

c) Distorting of a Hebrew word: When warning a Jew to escape from an approaching enemy or authority intending to put him in jail, or when quarrelling with a non-Jew, one cries dahhī 'run for your life!'. The intransitive Hebrew verb dohōb means 'to slip, escape, go away' (145a), cf. Saʿādīa's Arabic translation: VII indhāb 'to be driven' in Deut 30:4 and Ps 36:62, and of mandahī 'driven' (Deut 30:4). When hushing a Jew, one says: inšām (imperative only) 'hush!' being either a corruption of (Heb.) ʾnšēm 'there isn't' (486b), or of Arabic inšām 'recover your breath!' (484a), cf. (Heb.) nūm. ḥanū 'mediation charges received in intercommunal transactions' is a corruption of (Heb.) hanoʾōb 'pleasure, enjoyment', used metaphorically (513a).
Euphemism: *bint (bagg) al-zodat* lit. 'girl of holiness', i.e., prostitute, public girl, (Heb.) *qidēlokh* (40a), (Heb.) *hōqōm* 'wise, sage' stands for *h.k.m.*, acronym of the Arabic phrase *himār kahib mulaqgam* 'big, bridled donkey' (102b). By crying out *yā hārim ubin* 'O "intimate one" of your father!' one hides the intended curse *yā-ha-rim = yā(a)b(a)rim* ubin 'damn your father!' (91a).

e) Usage of a synonym of a Hebrew word which might reveal one's intention: Since *qirs*, pi. *qurus*, 'Maria Theresa thaler', or *riyaP* (392b) sounds like (Heb.) *qaras* 'plank, board', Jews would resort to its synonym (Heb.) *das* as a cant for *qirs* (152a), which like its Aramaic counterpart *dappa* has an alloseme - 'page' of a book etc.

To sum up, the intricate life of Yemeni Jews as keepers of the glowing ember of Judaism in a remote and hostile diaspora, a life that was reflected by their devotion to religious values and by preserving themselves from the Zaidite rule, placed them in a situation wherein they were compelled to use appellations expressive of their innermost feelings and their everyday life within their community on one hand, and on the other, to secretly express the texture of their psycho-social relations with, and their definition of, the Muslim majority, which on its part vented its supremacy and arrogance in various appellations disgracing the Jewish community.

REFERENCES

A. Primary sources


The Old Testament.

B. Secondary sources


d) Euphemism: *bint (bagh) al-zodat* lit. 'girl of holiness', i.e., prostitute, public girl, (Heb.) *qiddeleb* (40a). (Heb.) *hoqon* 'wise, sage' stands for *h.k.m.*, acronym of the Arabic phrase *himar kahir mulagag* 'big, bridled donkey' (102b). By crying out *yâ hârimâ ubiik* 'O "intimate one" of your father!' one hides the intended curse *yâ-ha-rim = yâ-after hârim ubiik* 'damn your father!' (91a).

e) Usage of a synonym of a Hebrew word which might reveal one's intention: Since *qirs*, pi. *qurus*, 'Maria Theresa thaler', or 'riyaP' (392b) sounds like (Heb.) *qaras* 'plank, board', Jews would resort to its synonym (Heb.) *daff* as a cant for *qirs* (152a), which like its Aramaic counterpart *dappa* has an alloseme - 'page' of a book etc.

To sum up, the intricate life of Yemeni Jews as keepers of the glowing ember of Judaism in a remote and hostile diaspora, a life that was reflected by their devotion to religious values and by preserving themselves from the Zaidite rule, placed them in a situation wherein they were compelled to use appellations expressive of their innermost feelings and their everyday life within their community on one hand, and on the other, to secretly express the texture of their psycho-social relations with, and their definition of, the Muslim majority, which on its part vented its supremacy and arrogance in various appellations disgracing the Jewish community.
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NEGATION IN YEMENI ARABIC

Hamdi A. Qafisheh

University of Arizona

0 Abstract

Negation in Yemeni Arabic, based on the dialect of San'a', includes negating perfect and imperfect forms of the verb by the particle /mâ/ in pre-verbal position and the verb normally takes the suffix /-s/. /mâ/ is also used in two verbal constructions joined by /wa/ 'and'. Such constructions are negated by /mâ ... wa-mâ .../ or /la ... wa-la .../. In constructions with /illa/ 'except' /mâ/ is used to negate the verb, and such constructions have the meaning of 'nothing' or 'nobody ... except' or 'not anything or anybody except'. /mâ/ also negates pseudo verbs: there is/are, 'to have', etc. /la/ followed by the imperfect form of the verb negates an imperative.

Nouns, pronouns, adjectives, particles, and prepositional phrases are negated by /mis/, /la ... wa-la .../ or /mâ ... wa-la/ is used with the meaning of 'neither ... nor'. There will be a lot of illustrative sentences, and some proverbial phrases.

1 Introduction

1.1 Informants and Material

The native speakers ('informants') whose speech served as the basis for the data selected for inclusion in this article are unsophisticated bona fide speakers of san'a'i Arabic. They are male and their ages range between twenty and forty. A frequency word list of approximately 2,000 vocabulary items was compiled from native speakers in different situations, such as greetings, telephone conversations, comments, interviews, etc. On most occasions the informants talked to each other either in their homes during gâat sessions or in such places as office buildings, coffeehouses, etc. There was a search for tales, fables, anecdotes and stories from storytellers, poets and informants. In informant interviews the question, "How do you say ...?" was avoided as much as possible for the sake of authenticity. Indeed, some of them had the tendency to emulate my dialect or other Arabic dialects, especially Egyptian and Palestinian'. I have run across contrast of styles in the same speakers on different occasions.

1 It should be pointed out that most of my informants have come in direct contact with a number of Arab immigrants working in San'a', especially Egyptians and Palestinians. I was on the lookout for "speech emulation", e.g., one informant said, *bakêt bagayir*, 'a package of cigarettes' on one occasion and *gafas sigayir* on another occasion. The latter is the SA form. In instances such as this one, I would check with the informant again, or another informant would contribute saying, "we do not use this in our
occasions. Because of limitations of time and for circumstances beyond my control no children or female informants were interviewed.

A limited but careful use was made of the following secondary data, including texts, word lists, grammars, etc. Rossi (1938 and 1939), Nāmi (1946 and 1953), al-Akwā' (1967), and Renaud (1977).

Rossi's *L'Arabo Parlato a Sanca* (1939) is based on the speech of Sanca' and the immediate vicinity. It presumes to some extent a knowledge of literary Arabic. There is a good selection of text materials in transcript, which covers a wide range of phrases and dialogues on common subjects, proverbs, stories, popular songs, and poetry. A lexicon lists words under various headings, followed by a vocabulary of about 1,000 items. The major drawback of the book is that it is too short; the grammar part is only forty-six pages long. Only eight pages are devoted to phonology. The phonology part does not discuss the following topics, which are essential features in any study of the phonology of SA: phonological processes (such as pausal glottalization, pausal diphthongization, devoicing of voiced geminates, epenthesis, etc.), consonant clusters, diphthongs, and features of /r/, /l/ and /g/ and /h/. The chart (on page 1) does not include the glides /w/ and /y/. It labels /s/, /z/, and /s/ as dentals, and the glottal stop, /h/, /h/ and /c/ as laryngeals. The morphology also suffers from an inadequate treatment of verb forms, derivation and inflection of nouns, noun modification, pronouns and particles. Moreover, the book does not include any description of syntax, which includes negation.

The San'āni Arabic of today differs from that Rossi described. Rossi (1939) lacks a modern linguistic treatment and reflects theory and practice of some fifty years ago, in addition to its shortcomings. It is not a description of the speech of present urban semi-educated San'ānis.

1.2 Data Treatment and Limitations of the Study

This study is a descriptive analysis of major negative forms in SA; it is essentially synchronic. No attempt has been made to refer to any diachronic facts. Features that are not mentioned in this presentation may be assumed to be either similar to those in other Arabic dialects or needing further investigation, which lies beyond the scope of this study, which is a sketch of the chief or salient features of negative forms in SA.

2 Negation in Yemeni Arabic

2.1 Negating Verbs

2.1.1 Perfect and Imperfect

The perfect and imperfect forms of the verb are usually negated by /mā/, which always precedes the verb; the verb normally takes the suffix /-s/.

limīh mā hazzants? Why didn't you (m.s.) chew qat?  
mā agdar agī sā'at āms. I can't come at five.  
mā sīrnās as-sūg al-yawm. We didn't go to the market today.  
mā yi'ikīs. Honestly, I didn't understand.  
mā yisbirī. He doesn't want.  
mīblīs mā yḥarīb daymatīs. No one harms oneself.  
iğnayn mā yīmīštīs layhum markab.

Imperfect verb forms that denote a passive-potential sense are also negated by /mā ... /-

dayya mā yītɡayyarī. This cannot be changed.  
yītɡawwa walla mā yītɡawwā? Can it be made stronger or not?  
mā yītɡammanī. It cannot be priced; it is priceless.  
mā yītɡara'. It cannot be read.  
mā yīstantaḡ. He cannot be interrogated.

Two verbal constructions with a perfect or an imperfect verb joined by /wa/ 'and' are negated by /mā ... wa-mā .../ or /mā ... wa-lā .../ or /lā ... wa-lā/ ... Examples:

mā yīstantaḡ wa-mā yīthakās. He can neither be interrogated nor talked to.  
mā yīstantaḡ wa-lā yīthakās. (lit., "What your brother has is of no avail to you; neither will his lantern give you light." ) (Meaning: Depend on yourself.)  
lā yīstantaḡ wa-lā yīthakā. I neither went nor came.


dialect*. See: Cadora 1970 for a detailed linguistic study of this phenomenon.

2 It was almost impossible for me to hold a direct conversation with a woman. Only on two short occasions was I able to talk to a wife through her husband. She was very shy and conservative in her speech. Women in the YAR have their own living rooms and their own qat chewing sessions.

3 None of those texts and grammars deals with the negation of SA. I have used a very small number of the vocabulary items in them if my informants accepted them as words being authentic SA words.

4 I was able to stay in San'a' for approximately two months in 1985 and for another two months in 1986. The financial support for this research was provided by the U.S. Department of Education.
occasions. Because of limitations of time and for circumstances beyond my control no children or female informants were interviewed.²

A limited but careful use was made of the following secondary data, including texts, word lists, grammars³; e.g., Rossi (1938 and 1939), Nāmî (1946 and 1953), al-Akwât (1967), and Renaud (1977).

Rossi’s L’Arabo Parlato a Sanca’a (1939) is based on the speech of Sančâ’ and the immediate vicinity. It presumes to some extent a knowledge of literary Arabic. There is a good selection of text materials in transcript, which covers a wide range of phrases and dialogs on common subjects, proverbs, stories, popular songs, and poetry. A lexicon lists words under various headings, followed by a vocabulary of about 1,000 items. The major drawback of the book is that it is too short; the grammar part is only forty-six pages long. Only eight pages are devoted to phonology. The phonology part does not discuss the following topics, which are essential features in any study of the phonology of SA: phonological processes (such as pausal glottalization, pausal diphthongization, devoicing of voiced geminates, epenthesis, etc.), consonant clusters, diphthongs, and /r/, /l, /g/ and /h/. The chart (on page 1) does not include the glides /w/ and /y/. The morphology also suffers from an inadequate treatment of verb forms, derivation and inflection of nouns, noun modification, pronouns and particles. Moreover, the book does not include any description of syntax, which includes negation.

The Sančâni Arabic of today differs from that Rossi described. Rossi (1939) lacks a modern linguistic treatment and reflects theory and practice of some fifty years ago, in addition to its shortcomings. It is not a description of the speech of present urban semi-educated Sančâniis.

1.2 Data Treatment and Limitations of the Study

This study is a descriptive analysis of major negative forms in SA; it is essentially synchronic.⁴ No attempt has been made to refer to any diachronic facts. Features that are not mentioned in this presentation may be assumed to be either similar to those in other Arabic dialects or needing further investigation, which lies beyond the scope of this study, which is a sketch of the chief or salient features of negative forms in SA.

2 Negation in Yemeni Arabic

2.1 Negating Verbs

2.1.1 Perfect and Imperfect

The perfect and imperfect forms of the verb are usually negated by /mā/, which always precedes the verb; the verb normally takes the suffix /-s/:

- limih ma hazzants?
- ma agdar aği sa'at hams.
- mā sirnâs as-sâg al-yawm.
- wallahi ma fihims.
- ma yistuls.
- ma yisbirs.
- iblis mā yḥarrīb daymatih.
- ignment mā yimšišlahum markab.
- iblis mā yḥarrīb daymatih.
- ignment mā yimšišlahum markab.

Perfect verb forms that denote a passive-potential sense are also negated by /mā ...

- ancybox ma yinfcak ma mac ahuk wa-la siragih yidi' lak.
- ma sîrs wa-ma gi'ts.

He can neither be interrogated nor talked to. (lit., "What your brother has is of no avail to you; neither will his lantern give you light.") (Meaning: Depend on yourself.)

I neither went nor came.

Imperfect verb forms that denote a passive-potential sense are also negated by /mā ...

- ancybox ma yinfcak ma mac ahuk wa-la siragih yidi' lak.
- ma sîrs wa-ma gi'ts.

He can neither be interrogated nor talked to. (lit., "What your brother has is of no avail to you; neither will his lantern give you light.") (Meaning: Depend on yourself.)

I neither went nor came.
Depend on yourself.

He neither slept nor let anybody (else) sleep.

He didn't have lunch; neither did he have dinner.

He neither prayed nor fasted.

A leopard cannot change his spots.

Note that if /la ... wa-la/ ... is used the particle /-s/ is not used and that /la ... wa-la/ may precede a noun.

In constructions with /illa/ 'except' /ma/ is used to negate the verb. Such constructions have the meaning of 'nothing or nobody ... except' or 'not ... anything or anybody except':

Nothing remained except his personal effects.

He didn't find anything (i.e., any other kind of meat) except beef.

There is nothing that disperses clouds except rain.

Nothing breaks a rock except its sister.

Nobody saw them except Abdalla.

They (m.) didn't see anybody except Abdalla.

/má/ may be followed by a prepositional phrase:

They do not go (at any time) except at night.

You will not see him except in Bab al-Yaman.

Nobody saw them except Abdalla.

They (m.) didn't see anybody except Abdalla.

/wala/ can be used by itself in a pre-nominal position to express the meaning of 'and not, not even, not so much as':

Something is better than nothing.

Out of sight out of mind.

One today is better than two tomorrow. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

Two prepositional pseudo-verbal constructions are usually negated by /lá ... wala .../ or /má ... wala/ .../ 'neither ... nor':

There isn't any qat here.

They don't have any children.

Don't you (f.s.) have any gold?

He doesn't have any debts (lit., "Debts are not on him.")
lā yinfa‘ak mā mi‘ axūk
wa-lā sirāqīh yiḏi‘ lak.
lā ragad wa-lā ḥalla ahad yurgud.
mā taqaddās wa-mā ta‘aššās.
lā salla wa-lā șām.
lā me‘ yirūb wa-lā gahbeh titūb.

Depend on yourself.
He neither slept nor let anybody (else) sleep.
He didn’t have lunch; neither did he have dinner.
He neither prayed nor fasted.
A leopard cannot change his spots.

Note that if /lā ... wa-lā/ ... is used the particle /-s/ is not used and that /lā ... wa-lā/ may precede a noun.

In constructions with /illa/ ‘except’ /mā/ is used to negate the verb. Such constructions have the meaning of ‘nothing or nobody ... except’ or ‘not ... anything or anybody except’:
mā bigiy illa ladātih.
mā ligis illa bagāriy.
mā yfarrig as-sahāb illa ṭal-matar.
mā yiǧis al-ḥaṣr illa karrah.
mā tiksir al-ḥāṣr illa l-ḥāṣr.
mā ibsaruw illa ‘abdalla.
mā ibsarhum illa cabdalla.

/mā/ may be followed by a prepositional phrase:
mā yslrūw illa fi l-layl.
mā tibsirūs illa fi l-mudun gayr sanca wa-fi l-bawādī ruṣābāh.
mā cindahum gihhāl.
mā cindis dahāb?
mā calayh dūyun.

/mā/ and /lā/ are used to negate other parts of speech and express the meaning of ‘there isn’t; there aren’t; you cannot find, etc.’ /mā/ is used with ‘illa’ ‘except’ or /gayr/ ‘other than’. Proverbs and sayings abound with such examples:
mā malīẖ illa fih ‘ayb.
mā fi l-dunyā illa rahmat allāh.
mā šay‘ sa’ šay‘.
mā ahad ħāna illa yahya.

(lit., “There isn’t anything good, but there is a defect in it.”)
There is nothing in this world except God’s blessing.
Your fingers are not the same. Different strokes for different folks.
No one is here except Yahya.

mā fi l-mudun ġayr șan’a wa-fi l-bawādī ruṣābāh.
San’a is the best of cities and Rusābā is the best of farm lands.

Examples with /lā/:
lā me‘ yirūb wala gahbeh titūb.
lit., “No water turns into yogurt, nor does a prostitute repent.” Meaning: You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear. A leopard cannot change his spots.
lā zgayyir ymayyiz kabīr wala kabīr yirham zagīr.
(lit., “There isn’t a young person who respects an older one, nor is there an old person who has compassion for a young one.”)

In classicisms /lā/ negates indefinite nouns, in which case it has the function of literary Arabic /lā/ of absolute negation:
lā šakk
(lit., “No doubt”).
lā šukr(a) ‘ala wāǧīb.
(lit., “No thanks for one’s duty.”) You’re welcome.
lā budd min as-safar.
Travel is inevitable.
lā mafarr
/no escape

/wala/ can be used by itself in a pre-nominal position to express the meaning of ‘and not, not even, not so much as’:
walad ‘aši wala mābīš.
Something is better than nothing.
Ṣārak al-ḡarīb wala aljūk al-ḥa’īd.
Out of sight out of mind.
ra’s kabī wala gīraṭ garād.
One today is better than two tomorrow. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

2.1.2 Negating Pseudo-Verbs
Prepositional pseudo-verbs are negated by /mā/:
mā biš gat ħāna.
There isn’t any qat here.
mā ‘indahum ǧihhaīl.
They don’t have any children.
mā ‘indīḏ ǧähah?
Don’t you (fs.) have any gold?
mā ‘alayh duyūn.
He doesn’t have any debts (lit., “Debts are not on him.”)

Two prepositional pseudo-verbal constructions are usually negated by /lā ... wala .../ or /mā ... wala .../ ‘neither ... nor’:
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2.1.3 Negating Imperatives

A negative command (or request), which is used to tell s.o. not to do s.th. consists of the negative particle /la/ followed by the imperfect of the verb.

- /la tragim an-nas/ (lit., "Do not throw rocks at people if your house is made of glass.") (Meaning: Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.)
- /la tusrug wa-la thaf/ (lit., "Do not steal and do not be afraid!") (Meaning: If you do not steal, you should not be afraid.)
- /la tqsawwaq wa-âd gurgus/ (lit., "Do not get married and your mother's cap is still in the window.") (Meaning: Haste makes waste.)
- /la tsirayn as-sug/ (lit., "Don't go to the market!")
- /la thazzinu hana/ (lit., "Do not chew qat here!")
- /la tguli ma bis/ (lit., "Don't say: "There isn't.""")

Two negative commands are joined by /wa/ 'and':

- /la bayt wa-la zalat/ (lit., "neither a house nor money"")
- /la 'âtiš wa-la ġawi/ (lit., "neither thirsty nor hungry"")
- /la šay' šay' wa-da š-sabâh/ (lit., "There is nothing like anything else"")
- /la sâ' al-šâfîy/ (lit., "and the morning is not like the evening.")
- /la kull sahme la/ (lit., "we are not comfortable there.")

2.2 Negating Other Parts of Speech

Nouns, pronouns, adjectives, particles, and prepositional phrases are negated by /miș/:

- /huw miș gârig/ (lit., "He is not mad.")
- /miș hâkađa?/ (lit., "Isn't it so?")
- /hin sârayn, miș hâna/ (lit., "They (f) left; they are not here.")
- /hna miș mirtâhîn hânak/ (lit., "We are not comfortable there.")
- /miș nâhîy?/ (lit., "Isn't it good?")
- /miș dala-dalâ, fîsa/ (lit., "not slowly, quickly, at once")
- /miș hâkađa/ (lit., "not in this manner")
- /miș sâ'at š-tîâyîn/ (lit., "not at two o'clock")
- /miș sâ' ma huw/ (lit., "not like him")
- /miș 'ala sibbih/ (lit., "not because of him")
- /miș min šan'a/ (lit., "not from San'a")

Either /la ... wa-la/ or /ma ... wa-la/ is used with the meaning of 'neither ... nor':

- /la bayt wa-la zalat/ (lit., "neither a house nor money"")
- /la 'âtiš wa-la ġawi/ (lit., "neither thirsty nor hungry"")
- /ma šay' ŝay' wa-da š-sabâh/ (lit., "There is nothing like anything else"")
- /sâ' al-šâfîy/ (lit., "and the morning is not like the evening.")
- /ma kull sawdèh tamrah/ (lit., "we are not comfortable there.")
- /wa-la kull šâhme la hêmeh/ (lit., "and the morning is not like the evening.")

The negative form of /ahad/ 'somebody, someone' is /mahad/ 'nobody, no one'. It is usually used as the subject of a sentence:

- /mahad ibsarîh/ (lit., "nobody saw it/bhim.")
- /mahad yudhûl hâna/ (lit., "nobody enters here.")
- /mahad màt min al-ğû'/ (lit., "no one died of hunger.")
- /ma ıbsart ahad/ (lit., "I did not see anybody.")
- /*ıbsart mahad/ (lit., "Didn't you hit anybody?")
- /*labâgtâs mahad/ (lit., "Didn't you hit anything?")

When /ma/ negates a noun or a phrase and is followed by /illa/ or /gayr/ 'except' the meaning expressed in English is usually 'there isn't any + N (that can be found) except':

- /ma fi l-mudun ġayr šan'a/ (lit., "There isn't any other city except San'a.") (i.e., San'a is the best of cities.)
2.1.3 Negating Imperatives

A negative command (or request), which is used to tell s.o. not to do s.th. consists of the negative particle /la/ followed by the imperfect of the verb.

la tragim an-nas
(lit., “Do not throw rocks at people if your house is made of glass.”) (Meaning: Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.)

wa-baytak min zugag!
(lit., “Your house is made of glass!”) (Meaning: Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.)

la tizawwag wa-cad gargus
(lit., “Do not get married and your mother’s cap is still in the window.”) (Meaning: Haste makes waste.)

la tsirayn as-sug!
(lit., “Don’t go (f.p.) to the market!”)

la thazzinu hana!
(lit., “Do not chew (m.p.) qat here!”)

la tguli ma bis.
(lit., “Don’t say (f.s.): “There isn’t.””)

Ida sahbak casal la
don’t use up your credit all at once.

Two negative commands are joined by /wa/ ‘and’:

la bayt wa-la zalat
(lit., “Neither a house nor money”)

la ‘atiš wa-la ḡawi’
(lit., “Neither thirsty nor hungry”)

ma ṣay’ sa’ ṣay’ wa-da ᵃ-sabah
(lit., “There is (is) nothing like anything else”)

sā’ al-‘āšiy.
(lit., “The morning is not like the evening.”)

ma kull sawdeh tamrah
(lit., “Not every piece of charcoal is a date, and not every piece of fat is meat.”) (Meaning: Do not judge people by their appearance.)

ma kull šahmeh lahmeh.
(lit., “Not every piece of meat is meat.”)

Two negative commands are joined by /wa/ ‘and’:

la tizawwag wa-cad gargus
(lit., “Do not get married and your mother’s cap is still in the window.”) (Meaning: Haste makes waste.)

2.2 Negating Other Parts of Speech

Nouns, pronouns, adjectives, particles, and prepositional phrases are negated by /miš/:

huw miš ḡārig.
(lit., “He is not mad.”)

miš ḡādaq?
(lit., “Isn’t it so?”)

hin sārayn, miš hāna.
(lit., “They (f.) left; they are not here.”)

hna miš mīrtāhin hānāk.
(lit., “We are not comfortable there.”)

miš nāhiy?
(lit., “Isn’t it good?”)

miš dala-dale, fiṣa
(lit., “not slowly, quickly, at once”)

miš ḡādaq
(lit., “not in this manner”)

miš sā’at ūṭayn
(lit., “not at two o’clock”)

miš sā’ma huw
(lit., “not like him”)

miš ‘ala sibbih
(lit., “not because of him”)

miš min šan’a
(lit., “not from San’a”)

Either /lä ... wa-lä/ or /ma ... wa-lä/ is used with the meaning of ‘neither ... nor’:

la bayt wa-la zalat
(lit., “Neither a house nor money”)

la ‘atiš wa-la ḡawi’
(lit., “Neither thirsty nor hungry”)

ma ṣay’ sa’ ṣay’ wa-da ᵃ-sabah
(lit., “There is) nothing like anything else”)

sā’ al-‘āšiy.
(lit., “The morning is not like the evening.”)

ma kull sawdeh tamrah
(lit., “Not every piece of charcoal is a date, and not every piece of fat is meat.”) (Meaning: Do not judge people by their appearance.)

The negative form of /ahād/ ‘somebody, someone’ is /mahād/ ‘nobody, no one’. It is usually used as the subject of a sentence:

mahād ibsarih.
(lit., “Nobody saw it/him.”)

mahād yudhul hānā.
(lit., “Nobody enters here.”)

mahād māt min al-ġū’.
(lit., “No one died of hunger.”)

but:

ma ibsart ahadh.
(lit., “I did not see anybody.”)

*kbart mahād.
(lit., “Didn’t you hit anybody?”)

When /ma/ negates a noun or a phrase and is followed by /illa/ or /gayr/ ‘except’ the meaning expressed in English is usually ‘there isn’t any + N (that can be found) except’:

ma fi l-mudun ġayr šan’a.
(lit., “There isn’t any other city except San’a.” i.e., San’a is the best of cities.)
There isn't any friend except at the time of distress (i.e., A friend in need is a friend indeed.)

There isn't anything in the snake except its head, (i.e., The head of a snake is its most important part.)

A negative response to a yes- or no-question is either /la/ or /‘abadan/ (lit, "never")

Do you chew qat?
No.

Do you smoke cigarettes?
No, never.

The phrase /miš ḥākada/ 'isn't it so' is appended to a statement to form what is known in English as a tail question; it is usually known as a question tag; it is invariable. The phrase /miš ḥākada/ occurs more frequently.

Qat is expensive, isn't it?
No.

The children went to school, didn't they?
No, never.

He will come tomorrow, won't he?

You are not hungry, are you?

I am not yet tired. I am certainly not tired.

You (m.s.) aren't an adult.

You (f.s.) aren't a bride.

There isn't anything left. It's all gone.

Examples:

I (certainly) am not...

You (m.s.) aren't...

You (f.s.) aren't...

They (m.) aren't...

They (f.) aren't...

If /mā gad/ precedes the pseudo-verb /bih/ 'there is,' the resultant negatative form of the whole phrase is:

There isn't anything left. It's all gone.

2.4 Assimilation of /-h/ of the third person masculine singular suffix /-ih/ on to a following negative particle /-s/:

*ma sallaytihs -* ma sallaytiss.

He didn't see it.

She didn't filter it.

She didn't tell him.

If the verb ends with a long vowel, simultaneous shortening occurs when the verb is negated:

He found it.
When the negative particle /mā/ precedes /gad/ with a following personal pronoun, stem change takes place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Negative Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>mā gada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>hana</td>
<td>mā gad-hana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>ant</td>
<td>mā gant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>antu</td>
<td>mā gantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>anty</td>
<td>mā ganty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>antuy</td>
<td>mā gantuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>huw</td>
<td>mā gahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>mā gahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>hiy</td>
<td>mā gahiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>mā gahin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:

mā gada tā'īb
I (certainly) am not ...  
mā gada hna
We (certainly) aren’t ...

If /mā gad/ precedes the pseudo-verb /bih/ ‘there is,’ the resultant negative form of the whole phrase is:

mā gad bih → mā gad bih → mā gabi → [mā gaeppi’s].
There isn’t anything left. It’s all gone.

2.4 Assimilation of /-h/ of the third person masculine singular suffix /-ih/ on to a following negative particle /-s/:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Negative Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šallaytih</td>
<td>I (you) took it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā šallaytihs</td>
<td>I (you) didn’t take it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibsarih</td>
<td>He saw it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā ibsarihs</td>
<td>He didn’t see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šanmatih</td>
<td>She filtered it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā šanmatihs</td>
<td>She didn’t filter it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galitih</td>
<td>She told him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mā galatihs</td>
<td>She didn’t tell him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the verb ends with a long vowel, simultaneous shortening occurs when the verb is negated:

līgih | He found it. |
TOWARDS A GRAMMAR OF THE HEART:
AL-QUŞAYRI’S NAHW AL-QULŪB'

Tamás Iványi
Budapest

1 The Grammarian and the Boatman

In Ġalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī’s Mathnawi there is a famous anecdote of ancient origin, well known in the Arab world even today: ‘The grammarian and the boatman’¹. A grammarian, having embarked in a boat, boasts of his superficial knowledge of worldly (and hence secondary) things and asks the boatman whether he knows grammar. After receiving a negative answer the grammarian (man of knowledge ‘ilm) condemns the boatman (man of practice ‘amal), saying that the other has lost half of his life. In the open sea, however, a violent storm breaks out and now the boatman, who does know how to swim, asks the grammarian whether he can swim, and after a negative answer he rightly notices that at that case the grammarian will lose his whole life.

In this story the grammarian stands for everything worldly and he is the representative of the officially recognized science. As for “swimming”, it is used here as a metaphor for mystical training and experience required for the voyage to union with God. “God upholds and exalts those who have died to self, while those who rely on their own attainments and efforts are submerged in the whirlpools of illusion”². As Rūmī emphasises, the great scholar, with all his pride of intellect, is unable to take a single step towards true knowledge.

Sūfī manuals usually begin with pointing to the difference between ‘ilm and ‘arif, i.e. between scholars who deal with religious prescriptions (farr‘a) and the knowers of the ‘true reality’ (haqiqa).

The grammarian, on the one hand, is highly suitable to represent the scholar (‘ilm). Firstly, because to scorn and ridicule him is less dangerous than to do the same with men of religion (rigal ad-dīn). Secondly, because by the 11/12th centuries grammar had become one of the recognised subjects in the curriculum of the madrasas, it served as the typical example of the ‘superfluous casuistry’ and worldly-

---

¹ The paper presented at the conference contained the linguistic analysis of al-Qusayri’s Nahw al-qulub. It seemed, however, more appropriate that the publication of the manuscript should precede the presentation of the analysis which will be published later.


---
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* The paper presented at the conference contained the linguistic analysis of al-Qusayri’s Nahw al-qulub. It seemed, however, more appropriate that the publication of the manuscript should precede the presentation of the analysis which will be published later.
He didn't find it.

He finds it.

They (m.) found it.

They (m.) didn't find it.
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1 The Grammarian and the Boatman

In Ğalîl ad-Dîn Rûmî’s *Mâthnawi* there is a famous anecdote of ancient origin, well known in the Arab world even today: "The grammarian and the boatman". A grammarian, having embarked in a boat, boasts of his superficial knowledge of worldly (and hence secondary) things and asks the boatman whether he knows grammar. After receiving a negative answer the grammarian (man of knowledge ‘ilm) condemns the boatman (man of practice ‘amal), saying that the other has lost half of his life. In the open sea, however, a violent storm breaks out and now the boatman, who does know how to swim, asks the grammarian whether he can swim, and after a negative answer he rightly notices that at that case the grammarian will lose his whole life.

In this story the grammarian stands for everything worldly and he is the representative of the officially recognized science. As for "swimming", it is used here as a metaphor for mystical training and experience required for the voyage to union with God. "God upholds and exalts those who have died to self, while those who rely on their own attainments and efforts are submerged in the whirlpools of illusion". As Rûmî emphasises, the great scholar, with all his pride of intellect, is unable to take a single step towards true knowledge.

Sûfî manuals usually begin with pointing to the difference between ‘âlim and ‘ârif, i.e. between scholars who deal with religious prescriptions (*fârî‘a*) and the knowers of the ‘true reality’ (*hâqiqa*).

The grammarian, on the one hand, is highly suitable to represent the scholar (‘âlim). Firstly, because to scorn and ridicule him is less dangerous than to do the same with men of religion (*rîgâl ad-dîn*). Secondly, because by the 11/12th centuries grammar had become one of the recognised subjects in the curriculum of the madrasas, it served as the typical example of the ‘superfluent casuistry’ and worldly-
ness of sciences for non-specialists. On the other hand, Rumi’s interpretation of the story makes "repentance" possible, since the sea, the symbol of gnosis (ma’rifā), purifies those who submerge in it and brings them nearer to "annihilation" (fanā) by obliterating (ma’rifah) their original attributes.

Rumi’s commentary contains yet another interesting aspect. He uses the well-known associative technique of the Sufis based on al-istiqd al-kabīr or al-akbar stating that instead of nahw (grammar) mahw (self-effacement) is needed here. “We have stitched in (inserted) the (story of the) grammarian, that we might teach you the grammar of self-effacement (mahw). In self-loss [in becoming less] ... you will find ... the grammar of grammar (nahw nahw)”.

2 The Nahw al-qulub

Ṣāri ʿAbdallāḥ Efendi (d. 1660/61) quotes a small Sufi treatise in his great commentary on the first part of Rumi’s Mathnawi, in connection with the story of the grammarian and the boatman (Ṣāri, Mathnawi IV, 89-92). This passage is Abū l-Qasīm ʿAbdālkarīm b. Ḥawāzīn al-Qusayri’s (d. in 1072) Nahw al-qulub, “The Grammar of the Hearts”.

This treatise represents a serious attempt to present Sufi thoughts in a form analogous to an acknowledged science which had been then on the curriculum of teaching institutions for a long time. Naturally, the seriousness of the attempt does not mean that it may be considered fully successful as well. It is, however, worth studying since it reflects many interesting basic features of Sufi thinking and their way of linguistic expression.

The conceptual framework peculiar to Sufi thinking has two main characteristics: (i) The special emphasis laid on opposition pairs (antonyms, contradictions, etc.) which are later dissolved into each other; and (ii) The technique of limitedly free association. Limited here means limited by traditions and by taqlid. All these influence the language of Sufi texts, consequently Sufi authors pay great attention to the linguistic formation and composition of their texts and grammar as a science in itself. These characteristics also serve the purposes of a ‘mystical vagueness’ on a deeper level. This kind of controversy between clear linguistic expression and more contradictory contents can well be conceived as one aspect of the opposition pair zabir and bātin.

---

3 Rumi, Mathnawi II, 156, ll. 2846-47. In this last passage of his commentary to the story Rumi turns to the use of two well-known technical linguistic devices of mystical writings: (i) The use of one and the same word in two forms or meanings: nahw corrected to mahw then used together with it at one and the same time: nahw mahw. (ii) Intensification by way of forming a genitive construction with the same word as mudaf and mudaf shahih: nahw mahw.

4 For the life and works of al-Qusayri see Basyuni 1972.
ness of sciences for non-specialists. On the other hand, Rumi’s interpretation of the
story makes “repentance” possible, since the sea, the symbol of gnosis (ma’rif),
purifies those who submerge in it and brings them nearer to “annihilation” (fanā)”
by obliterating (nahw) their original attributes.

Rumi’s commentary contains yet another interesting aspect. He uses the well-
known associative technique of the Sufis based on al-‘istiqd al-kabir or al-akbar
stating that instead of nahw (grammar) mahw (self-effacement) is needed here. “We have
stitched into (inserted) the (story of the) grammarian, that we might teach you the
grammar (nahw) of self-effacement (mahw). In self-loss [in becoming less] ... you will
find ... the grammar of grammar (nahw nahw)”.  

2 The Nahw al-quliib

Ṣārī ʿAbdallah Efendi (d. 1660/61) quotes a small Sufi treatise in his great com-
mentary on the first part of Rumi’s Matnawi, in connection with the story of
the grammarian and the boatman (Ṣārī, Matnawi IV, 89-92). This passage is Abū ʿl-Qāsim
ʿAbdalkarīm b. Hawāzīn al-Qusayri’s (d. in 1072) Nahw al-quliib, “The Grammar
of the Hearts”.

This treatise represents a serious attempt to present Sufi thoughts in a form
analogous to an acknowledged science which had been then on the curriculum of
teaching institutions for a long time. Naturally, the seriousness of the attempt
does not mean that it may be considered fully successful as well. It is, however, worth
studying since it reflects many interesting basic features of Sufi thinking and their
way of linguistic expression.

The conceptual framework peculiar to Sufi thinking has two main characteristics:
(i) The special emphasis laid on opposition pairs (antonyms, contradictions, etc.)
which are later dissolved into each other; and (ii) The technique of limitedly free association.
Limited here means limited by traditions and by taqlid. All these influence the lan-
guage of Sufi texts, consequently Sufi authors pay great attention to the linguistic
formation and composition of their texts and grammar as a science in itself. These
characteristics also serve the purposes of a ‘mystical vagueness’ on a deeper level. This
kind of controversy between clear linguistic expression and more contradictory
contents can well be conceived as one aspect of the opposition pair zābir and bātin.

---

3 Rumi, Mathnawi II, 156, ll. 2846-47. In this last passage of his commentary to the story Rumi
turns to the use of two well-known technical linguistic devices of mystical writings: (i) The use of one and the
same word in two forms or meanings: nahw corrected to mahw then used together with it at one and
the same time: nahw mahw. (ii) Intensification by way of forming a genitive construction with the same
word as mudaf and mudaf ʿalayhi: nahw nahw.

4 For the life and works of al-Qusayri see Basyuni 1972.
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باب الأساطير واعتقاداتها
قال أبو الطرية، الاسم مشتق من السموه، عن السماقة على الخلاف، فقال: أهل الإشارة اسم عبد ما وسعه الله تعالى، في السماقة من سماحة وشقاوة الفن، قرية في ساحل شمالي قسم، فيه بين شريته ونبعه، rebel the people، مكتب التعليم طالب أحمد الجراح، قبل أمهم، وجعل أمهم، محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم، الحاكم، في سبيل على الناس، حتى ينفع به، على كل موضع ثم خذوه، يقول: "أقرأ يا رب النبي، فقلما قرأ وذهب. "قيل: يا محمد قد عرفتني بأسماء الأشياء والصفات فتعوذ!"، إنها بالاذة "أقرأ، وربك الأكرم". "قلل الله ثم درهم في خوضهم يلعبون"، فلما غاب عن الاسم وجد المسمى فلما 1 أعرض

"قال أبو الطرية"، نافع من ص
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في أ.ب، "من"
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باب الأسماء واتخاذها
قال: "أحب العباءة" الأسم مشتق من السمووم و"أسماه على الحلف" فقال: "أحب ال
العربية" اسم نعم ما وسعه الله تعالى" في ما شأته من سعادة وشفاءه" قرناً
进行全面اً لقسمه وقدسمه 10 فقرة 1 "بالٌ من بنيه ولهما مذهب" مكتب التعليم
طالع أدم ورحمه وفرأ" وعلم آدم الإنسان له" وطلعت محمد صلى الله
عليه وسلم وضر أرجح "فأعرض له ببساطة الحال ضع من بك" على كل موجود ثم
خرج وقوله "بجراً ربك الذي خلق"! "فلم يقرأ وهذب ودوب" قال: "يا محمد
قد يرتكنوا يُجمِّلان وذات فتفرغو" إلي بابل وذات "بجراً" ورُك الأكرم".
كله ثم دره مث فضِيعهم يلعبون" فإنما غاب عن الكلام نجد المسمى فلمما 1 أرض

<table>
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<tr>
<th>الأصل: لوبي</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>في أ. ب. ج: &quot;قالت الأمة&quot;</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>زيارة في ص: &quot;علىه&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>في: أ. ب. ج: &quot;قال&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
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<td>سورة البقرة: 422</td>
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باب موائع الصرف

موائع الصرف،" عند أهل العبارة تسمى "俄乌رة" و"عند" أهل الإشارة الجماعة أن يجعل الناس علماً على جسم وإجماع "عليه"ずに "وجوههم" إليه والوصف أن يزيد أن بيض بخيسكل و"تحل" بين المثير "الرمز"، والمشتقة "أي عرف ثم يقصر" عن "الشکر" وال"حجة" عن يدك" "عمة الله ط" في: ب، ج، ص: "اللم"، 198. 199
باب موانع الصرف

موانع الصرف: عند أهل العبارة تسع وهي معروفة وعنده أهل الإشارة الجمع أن يبتكب العالم عن جمع وإجماع الناس عليه وصرف وجوههم إليه والوصف أن يريك أن يوصف بالخير ويعرف به والتأثيث ضعف العزم والرضى بالرذائل ومعروف أن يحرف نعم الله ثم يقصر عن الشكر والعجامة أن يذكر تعمة الله

THE GRAMMAR OF THE HEART
فصل الأسماء: معرفة ونكتات وكذلك المبادئ منهم معرفة له تسبب معه فهمه هو
به معرف وفهم في الناس هو به معرفة ومنهم مبادر لا تسبب معه ولا
تحظ له سوى الأكل والتنوع.
فصل الفعل معروف لجردته عن العوامل اللحظية والقفر المتجرد مرفوع القرآن
وخادم مرفع لكتابه عن العوامل تتعله بالخلال.
فصل الأطفال ثلاث محبة والمستقبل وأحوال الحمو مختلفة فمنهم من فكرته
في الحمو ومنهم من فكرته في الحمو، ومنهم من اشتم بإسحاق وقته الذي هو
فقط في الفكره في مستقبله وفظل الفعل مرفوع ما لم يدخل عليه
ناصب أو جاز فنانا لرواية الصغير لفعل والهماز فترته عن سلوك إذا سلم
بعد الكلم والكلم، وطلب الفعل محمد علمه الله لإسحاق عيبته وميتس فاستخدامه لوداده قال
الله تعالى: "لهم الله الخبيث من الطيب".

منصوبة: "لله خبيث من الطيب" إلى الله تعالى في إصلاح حاله مبتدأ في تنكرها:
فاأنا فرغت فناسبه إلى ريك فرغت، فناسبه لعبادة في أب. ح.: ص. "وفي"
فصول الحلال ووصفه الفاعل والمفعول ومن شرطه أن يكون: "نكره".

(171) في الأصل: منصوبة "ناقصة من أب. ح.
(172) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(173) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(174) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(175) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(176) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(177) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(178) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(179) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(180) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(181) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(182) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(183) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(184) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
(185) في الأصل: منصوبة "من أب. ح.
فصل الأسماء، معارف ونُكرات وكذلك العبادات، منهم معروف له نصيب مع القرآن، هو

بـ المعروف والمعلوم في الصنف هو بن موصوف، ومنهم مكن لا نصيب له مع القرآن ولا

حث له سوى الأكمل والقيم، فصل المبلغ مرفوع لترجيه عن الوظائف اللطيفة والكثير المتجرد مرفع القدر

وخبره مرفع لاتقطعه عن العلائق وترفعه بالخلال.

فصل الأطفال ثلاثة حالات حالتين وأحوال العفاوى مختلفة فمنهم من فكرت في السبعة وهما منهم من

فيهم عن الفكرة في مستقبل ومضى وفعل الحلال مرفع ما لم يدخل عليه، ناصب أو حرام. فالناسب رؤية العيد لغلى والجاريز فترته من سلوك فإنما سلم

العيد من الملاحظة والفتح ارتفع قدره عند العزيز الفروع. إنه يُصدِّد الكلام

الطيب والعمل الصالح يرفعه.

فصل الفاعل مرفع والمفعول منصوب فلا رأي العبار أن لا قالّ إلا الله عزّ وجلّ ويرفع ذكره ويخضع مجلّة، ويتوضّع عند شهود كماله وأي شيء مفعول.

فانتسب لعبادة: فإنها فرغت فانصب إلى ريك فرغه.

فصل الحال وصف هيئة الفاعل والمفعول ومن شرطه أن يكون النكرة

من مسومة، فالعوارف، متوجه إلى الله تعالى في إصلاح حاله مجتهد في تنكرها.

فلانا، غفرنا، ونحن عدل مع مستقيمة مسومة، وصلة التوبة، والكيرة.

محتفية، يحسبها الجاهل أغلبهم من الفقه.

فصل التمييز لتفصيل ما أتىهم. وثبت، ما لم يكن يفهم فالقوم، بالعلم أيوماً.

الحق من الباطل وثنيهم له، بالسلاسل الحالي من الحلال ولا يكون التمييز إلا بعد

تمام الكلام وكذلك، حيث يقلب، تغلق يُعتزلوا وأحكموا. والعلم ثم، تميروا قلما.

تنته رتبة التمييز، تسبهم الله إصلاح عبادته، ويبرزهم فاستخلاصهم لوداده قال

الله تعالى: "ليمِّيهم الله الخبيث من الطيب".

في الأصل: مسومة، "نافحة" من "112"
في الأصل: "توجه" 113
في الأصل: "يجعلها" 114
في الأصل: "(Subordinate)
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 115
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 116
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 117
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 118
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 119
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 120
في الأصل: "Subordinate" 121
فصل التوكيل

فصل حروف الجر

فصل حروف الجر يصف الأسماء ومن المعروف أن الأجسام أن الأشياء وهم
الله إلى الله أن يكونوا أنفسهم تواضعًا扰乱 تعالى وتعالى، فتعزز
بالإضافة إلى جناب الله تعالى للذين استراحهم لقيه وجعلهم في حزب
يجمعنا منهم وأين يلحقنا به إنه كريم وهاهناء
وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله وسلم

زيادة في ج: "التركيل" في: الص: التوكيل

زيادة في ج: "حرف الخر" في: الإنشاء

زيادة في: "نافصة من ا ب: ج: ص: في: ص: في: إنشاء


زيادة في: "جودة نافصة من ب: ج" في: "التركيل" في: "التركيل" ص: 161

زيادة في "التركيل" ص: 161
فصل التوكيل 143 هو التحقق والقوم أدركوا إيمانهم بالتصديق 113 وعقد مع الله

التحقق وشرحهم في ملائمة الطريق.

فصل حروف الجر 116 تخفض الأسماء فلما علم المسلمون أن الأشياء 117 بالله ومن

الله إلى الله خفضوا أنفسهم تواضعًا شكرًا 153 فتعزروا 153 بالإضافة إلى جناب 153 الله

 تعالى 113 أولئك الذين استخضتم 113 لفريبه وجعلهم في 113 حذية تسلل الله العظيم أن

يجعلنا منهم وأن يلقيناهم إنه كريم 113 وحنا.

وصلى الله على سيدنا 113 محمد 113 وآله وسلم 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

باب البلد

البلد على أربعة أقسام بلد كل من الكل وهو بلد العارفين تركوا الكل لمن له

الكل فهمهم الكل 113: "وجوهكم بوجه نافذة إلى ربي آمنة،" 113 وبدل البعض بلد

العارفين 113 بدل 113 العباد في اللزجة 113 بالمجادلات «أولئك أدخل الله

سيائهم حسنًا» 113 وبدل الإشتمال 113 قوم اشتملت أعمالهم على خوف ورهاة

فاعلون ما يرون وأمنوا مما يخافون إلا أن أولياء الله لا خوف عليهم ولا هم

يحرمون» 113 وبدل الغفظ بلد المترودين ببعا تصيبهم من الغرب بحسب عاجلة

»بس للظلمين 116: "بلاً" 116

فصل التنبيه تابع للمستوى والوصف تابع للموضوع كذلك أعمال العباد لا تزال فيما

حصل من خير وشر 116 فهو لاحقته

فصل حروف العطف 116: تبلغ 116 الأخضر الأول وأهل الإشارة توصلوا إلى الله 116

في

الخط على الله ولفظهم بارمهم القرب ويجعلهم في 115 حزيه

الكل" 113 "نافذة من أ. ب. ج. ص.

زيادة في ج: "التوكيل" في أ. بالتقريض.

زيادة في ج: "حرف الجر" 116

في أ. الإشتمال.

" تعالى" نافذة من أ. ب. ج. ص.

زيادة في ج: "الله" 116

زيادة في ج: "فاز عم" 116

زيادة في ج: "ليف حليم" 116

زيادة في ج: "مسحون" في ج: "ثم كتاب نمو القلب" 116

"سيدنا" نافذة من أ. ب. ج.

زيادة في ج: "فهم" 116

زيادة في ج: "خير" 116

"وصلى ... وسلم" نافذة من أ. ب. ج.
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In two recent papers (Jones 1994 and 1996), I have drawn attention to the linguistic affinity of the Qur'ān to three literary prose registers that existed in pre-Islamic Arabia: those of the ḥāṭīb, the kāḥīn and the qāss. I also placed the three registers, and hence that of the Qur'ān, between that of poetry, on the one hand, and that of the dialects, on the other. Little or nothing survives of these registers, but their existence is clear enough. We may thus schematize the registers of Arabic at the rise of Islam as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{sā'ir} & \text{ḥāṭīb} & \text{qāss} & \text{al-qawm} \\
\text{kāḥīn} & \text{kāṭīb} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

With the Qur'ān included this becomes:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{sā'ir} & \text{ḥāṭīb} & \text{qāss} & \text{al-qawm} \\
\text{kāḥīn} & \text{kāṭīb} & & \\
\text{Qur'ān} & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Two objections have been raised to these schemata.

The first is that nowhere in the Qur'ān is there any reflection of opponents ridiculing Muhammad on the ground that he is a ḥāṭīb in the same way that they claim that he is a sā'ir or a kāḥīn. That might be a valid objection if one were to accept Zwettler's premise that: “The single feature that we can be sure the Qur'ān shared with the mantic expressions of the kāḥīns and, especially, the poets was .... the use of a non-vernacular classical 'arabiyya, the language that had been created, conditioned and cultivated through an old-inherited and seemingly pan-Arab tradition of poetic rendition” (Zwettler 1978:159-60).

I have to say that I think that this premise is totally implausible, even if, for the sake of argument, we accept Zwettler’s unproved, and unprovable⁠¹, hypothesis that

---

¹ Rabin (1951:13) reminds us that, “It cannot be strongly enough stressed that we do not possess a single sentence in genuine dialect, apart from the Himyaritic material”. 
all the Arabic dialects of Muhammad's time had lost their ṣrāb and were consequently at not small remove from the poetic register (the only other one that he takes into consideration). The Qur'ān itself shows us that references to Muhammad as a ṣā'ir and/or as a kāhin were part of his opponents' claims that he was 'possessed'. In fact, ṣā'ir occurs 4 times, in two of which it is linked to kāhin'. Even if we add the reference to ṣā'ir in 36:69, this is markedly fewer than the 11 instances of māğānūn and 4 of bihi gīmina'. Perhaps the most conclusive evidence of the meaning comes from a verse such as 34:8: aflāna-hu am bihi gīnna. Here we have the two most potent objections of Muhammad's Meccan opponents put together in the form of a question that invites the answer No: Has he invented lies against God or is he possessed?

In any case, it is surely just plain common sense that it is a more grievous accusation to say 'You are mad' than to say 'You are using high-flown language'. Zwettler half conceives this, but it is hardly enough to say: "One generally, and, I believe, correctly, assumes that [the] comparisons had their basis in some sort of perceived similarities of form and style, and, to unsympathetic observers, source of inspiration as well" (Zwettler 1978:156).

The second objection is that there is very little difference between the 'arabīyya of poetry, on the one hand, and the Qur'ān, on the other. I am not sure that this is true on close analysis. Whilst the most striking differences between the Qur'ān and poetry lie in content, form and style, some syntactic differences soon show up on close examination: conditional structures and the uses of la'alla or li- or an, to mention only a small sample, show variations from poetic usage. In any case, the received text of the Qur'ān does not take us directly back to the time of Muhammad (and one should not forget that there is a similar problem with pre-Islamic poetry: it exists only in an 'Abbasid guise).

Leaving aside the red herring about the meaning of ummi, there is no real disagreement that during the lifetime of Muhammad the Qur'ān, though "a scripture", was normally conveyed (i.e. recited and/or transmitted) orally. There is no convincing argument against this view: even if one were to make the unlikely supposition that the Islamic community has somehow managed to suppress reports of Muhammad reciting from sheets, as other prophets are said to have done in 98:2-3, delivery would still be oral.

On the other hand, it is generally agreed that at least some of the Qur'ān was committed to writing during Muhammad's lifetime, particularly by the scribes he employed for that purpose at Medina. There is no agreement when the copying started or if the whole was copied during his lifetime, though there is a tendency to 'feel' that most of it was committed to writing in the final years.

However, there clearly was no textus receptus at the time of Muhammad's death, nor, it would seem, after Abu Bakr's collection. It was left to 'Uthmān to stabilize the text. From then on, the importance of the written text grew steadily, despite early opposition from the Qur'ān; and, mirroring developments in other Islamic sciences, the written text became the one that formed the basis for the detailed studies increasingly demanded by the Islamic community. The original oral Recitation became almost entirely dominated by the written Book. Though recitation has retained its own special niche, the commentator or grammarian will normally have recourse to the written text.

Western scholars, too, have a predisposition for written texts that comes from their own background. It has thus been inevitable that they have directed their attention almost entirely to the written text of the Qur'ān, and that their focus has coincided with that of the major works of traditional Islamic scholarship. Hence they too normally pay little attention to the oral side of the Qur'ān.

When we now look at a copy of the Qur'ān, we find full ṣrāb (with some anomalies by later standards, it is true). However, this is due to developments that took place well after Muhammad's death. These developments, it should be emphasized, affect the whole of the text, not just ṣrāb. For example, it is a matter of record that hamza has been added to the text in hundreds of places, the number depending on the linguistic stance of the qāri' concerned. Confirmation of this is readily available when one compares a copy of the Qur'ān from Egypt with one from Algeria. The former gives us mu'min, the latter mūmin, and so on.

It seems unlikely that there was ever full ṣrāb, unless our definition of ṣrāb allows for iskān at the end of Quranic verses. Yet look at the written text. Those verses in which iskān occurs in recitation are all written with full vocalization. Look again.

---

1. 2. A messenger from God reciting purified pages. 3. In which are true documents.
3. There is a good summary of the problem in Rabin 1951:130-40.
all the Arabic dialects of Muhammad's time had lost their \textit{i'rāb} and were consequently at no small remove from the poetic register (the only other one that he takes into consideration). The Qur'ān itself shows us that references to Muhammad as a \textit{sā'īr} and/or as a \textit{kāhin} were part of his opponents' claims that he was 'possessed'. In fact, \textit{sā'īr} occurs 4 times, in two of which it is linked to \textit{kāhin}. Even if we add the reference to \textit{sīr} in 36:69, this is markedly fewer than the 11 instances of \textit{mağūn} and 4 of \textit{bi-hi ġinnā}. Perhaps the most conclusive evidence of the meaning comes from a verse such as 34:8: \textit{aṭ-fa'ara-hu am bi-hi ġinnā}. Here we have the two most potent objections of Muhammad's Meccan opponents put together in the form of a question that invites the answer No: Has he invented lies against God or is he possessed?

In any case, it is surely just plain common sense that it is a more grievous accusation to say 'You are mad' than to say 'You are using high-flown language'. Zwettler half concedes this, but it is hardly enough to say: "One generally, and, I believe, correctly, assumes that [the] comparisons had their basis in some sort of perceived similarities of form and style, and, to unsympathetic observers, source of inspiration as well" (Zwettler 1978:156).

The second objection is that there is very little difference between the \textit{ṣarābiyya} of poetry, on the one hand, and the Qur'ān, on the other. I am not sure that this is true on close analysis. Whilst the most striking differences between the Qur'ān and poetry lie in content, form and style, some syntactic differences soon show up on close examination: conditional structures and the uses of \textit{lā'alla} or \textit{li-} or \textit{an}, to mention only a small sample, show variations from poetic usage. In any case, the received text of the Qur'ān does not take us directly back to the time of Muhammad (and one should not forget that there is a similar problem with pre-Islamic poetry: it exists only in an 'Abbāsid guise).

Leaving aside the red herring about the meaning of \textit{ummi}, there is no real disagreement that during the lifetime of Muhammad the Qur'ān, though "a scripture", was normally conveyed (i.e. recited and/or transmitted) orally. There is no convincing argument against this view: even if one were to make the unlikely supposition that the Islamic community has somehow managed to suppress reports of Muhammad reciting from sheets, as other prophets are said to have done in 98:2-3, delivery would still be oral.

On the other hand, it is generally agreed that at least some of the Qur'ān was committed to writing during Muhammad's lifetime, particularly by the scribes he employed for that purpose at Medina. There is no agreement when the copying started or if the whole was copied during his lifetime, though there is a tendency to 'feel' that most of it was committed to writing in the final years.

However, there clearly was no \textit{textus receptus} at the time of Muhammad's death, nor, it would seem, after Abū Bakr's collection. It was left to Utma'n to stabilize the text. From then on, the importance of the written text grew steadily, despite early opposition from the \textit{qurra}; and, mirroring developments in other Islamic sciences, the written text became the one that formed the basis for the detailed studies increasingly demanded by the Islamic community. The original oral Recitation became almost entirely dominated by the written Book. Though recitation has retained its own special niche, the commentator or grammarian will normally have recourse to the written text.

Western scholars, too, have a predisposition for written texts that comes from their own background. It has thus been inevitable that they have directed their attention almost entirely to the written text of the Qur'ān, and that their focus has coincided with that of the major works of traditional Islamic scholarship. Hence they too normally pay little attention to the oral side of the Qur'ān.

When we now look at a copy of the Qur'ān, we find full \textit{i'rāb} (with some anomalies by later standards, it is true). However, this is due to developments that took place well after Muhammad's death. These developments, it should be emphasized, affect the whole of the text, not just \textit{i'rāb}. For example, it is a matter of record that \textit{hamza} has been added to the text in hundreds of places, the number depending on the linguistic stance of the \textit{qari} concerned. Confirmation of this is readily available when one compares a copy of the Qur'ān from Egypt with one from Algeria. The former gives us \textit{mu'min}, the latter \textit{mūmin}, and so on.

It seems unlikely that there was ever full \textit{i'rāb}, unless our definition of \textit{i'rāb} allows for \textit{iskān} at the end of Quranic verses. Yet look at the written text. Those verses in which \textit{iskān} occurs in recitation are all written with full vocalization. Look again.

\footnote{\textit{Sa'īr}, 21:5; 37:36; 52:30; 69:41; \textit{kāhin}: 52:29; 69:43.}

\footnote{In addition to the four places [7:184; 23:35; 23:70; 34:8] where \textit{ginna} means 'possession' 'madness', there are also four places where it means 'the \textit{jinns}'. More interestingly, there are two places [34:46 and 37:138, 1st occurrence] where there seems to be a blurring of the two meanings.}

\footnote{For details, see my \textit{Quranic Grammar}. \textit{Lā'alla}, for example, occurs over a hundred times in the Qur'ān. It is possible to find the odd example in poetry, but its rarity contrasts sharply with Quranic usage.}

\footnote{The notion that \textit{ummi} means 'illiterate' is neither early nor accurate. It can only mean 'of the \textit{umma}'.}

\footnote{2. A messenger from God reciting purified pages, 3. In which are true documents.}

\footnote{Cf. Jones 1983.}

\footnote{There is a good summary of the problem in Rabin 1951:130-40.}
Take, for example, the famous crux from Sūra 85, to the general importance of which I have already referred elsewhere. The text of verses 21-22 reads:

\[
\text{bal huwa qur'ānun mağīdun | fi lawhin mahfuzun}/n
\]

The problem about the final syllable can only have arisen because the ends of the verses originally had iskān (and still do so in recitation):

\[
\text{bal huwa qur'ānun mağīd | fi lawhin mahfūz}/n
\]

The assonance is clearly in -ii/i + d/t/z, with no final vowel. (It would also be nice to know more about huwa, qurān (which would not have had hamza) and lawh, but we never shall.)

An altogether more important question lies behind the disagreement about the final word in 85:22. When did the differentiation between mahfūzun and mahfūzin become important? In the end, the ṣārī's came out six to one in favour of mahfūzun, with only Nafīc in favour of mahfūzin. If we accept the information about the lives of the ṣārī's at face value, it must have been before the deaths of Ibn Kāṭīr (d. 120/738) and Ibn ʿAmīr (d. 118/736). But was it really a first century problem? I have my doubts.

Though the two variants are now perceived to focus on a grammatical problem, one may also wonder whether this was the original perception. However, it has to be said that many canonical qirdāt centre on grammar and/or the written text or both.

This is less so with the non-canonical (lāwād) readings, which deserve much more attention than has normally been paid to them. Without being able to go into detail, I think that I may fairly say that a significant proportion of them are synonyms or parallel versions of what we find in the received text. A number of readings attributed to Ibn Masʿūd, who notoriously resisted the introduction of the ʿUtmanic text, will readily illustrate this. First, a group of simple variations in Sūra 12:

\[
\text{ʿattā (said to be the dialect of Huḍayl) for ḥatta [v. 35];}
\]

\[
\text{ˈinaban for ḥamran and ˈaridan for ḥibzan [36];}
\]

\[
\text{sanāḥīl for sunbulāt [43 and 46];}
\]

for parallel phrases see, for example, 19:27:

\[
\text{wa-ḡāʿat bi-bi tahmilu-hu ʾilā qawmi-hā (for wa-atat bi-bi qaumah-ba tahmilu-hu);}
\]

and 19:29:

\[
\text{fa-ʾāṣarat ʾilā man fi l-mahdi (for fa-ʾāṣarat ilay-hi).}
\]

\[9\] The most convenient summary is to be found in Jeffery 1937.

\[10\] See Kahle 1948.

Synonyms, dialect variants and parallel texts are typical of oral material, and there, in my view, lies the primary difference between lāwād readings and the canonical (mahbūr) ones. The early (in traditional terms, pre-ʿUtmanic) lāwād readings are primarily concerned with oral texts; the later mahbūr readings primarily focus on written variants on a received consonantal text. There is no apparent continuity between the two. The emphasis is clearly quite different. It can hardly have been otherwise. We may accept, for example, that Ibn Masʿūd read fa-sabran gamilan for fa-sabran gamilun [12:18 and 83]. However, any grammatical reasoning on the part of Ibn Masʿūd must have been instinctive. We have no convincing evidence of the existence of grammatical terminology during his lifetime.

We know that there was a long battle about ʾrāb, lasting into the fourth century of Islam. Quite what was entangled can only be guessed at; but it can hardly have been confined to what happened at verse endings. I think it timely to draw attention once again to an attempt by Arberry to put pausal endings at natural pauses. He gave the following transliterations of Sūra 101:

(a) “ḥaṭīb” form (my description)

\[
\text{al-qārī a : mā l-qārī a}
\]

\[
\text{wa-mā adrāk : mā l-qārī a}
\]

\[
\text{yauwna ʾyakinu n-nās : ka-l-farāšī l-mabhūt}
\]

\[
\text{wa-takinu l-ʾjährā : ka-l-šīmā l-manṣūḥī}
\]

\[
\text{fa-amāmA man ṣaquṭat mawāzīnūb : fa-huwa fi ṣaṭīn rādiya}
\]

\[
\text{wa-amūmA man ṣaquṭat mawāzīnūb : fa-ummuhu hāwīya}
\]

\[
\text{wa-mā adrāk : mā hiya}
\]

\[
\text{nārun hāmiyya}
\]

(b) the fully vocalized form

\[
\text{al-qārī aṭa : mā l-qārī aṭa}
\]

\[
\text{wa-mā adrāk kā l-qārī aṭa}
\]

\[
\text{yauwna ʾyakinu n-nās : ka-l-farāšī l-mabhūtī}
\]

\[
\text{wa-takinu l-ʾjährā : ka-l-šīmā l-mamṣūḥī}
\]

\[
\text{fa-amāmA man ṣaquṭat mawāzīnūb : fa-huwa fi ṣaṭīn rādiyyatīn}
\]

\[
\text{wa-amūmA man ṣaquṭat mawāzīnūb : fa-ummuhu hāwīyatīn}
\]

\[
\text{wa-mā adrāk kā hiyaḥ}
\]

\[
\text{nārun hāmiyattān}
\]

\[11\] This does not of course mean that people do not react adversely to what they perceive as ‘incorrect’ or ‘impossible’ grammar. For an illustration for present-day unlearned Yemeni’s see Qāfisheh 1996.

\[12\] This avoids dealing with the problem of ʾrāb elsewhere in the verse.
Take, for example, the famous crux from Sūra 85, to the general importance of which I have already referred elsewhere\(^9\). The text of verses 21-22 reads:

\textit{bal huwa qur‘ānun maqādīd | fi lawhin mahfīzun/in}

The problem about the final syllable can only have arisen because the ends of the verses originally had \textit{iskān} (and still do so in recitation):

\textit{bal huwa qur‘ānun maqād | fi lawhin mahfīz}

The assonance is clearly in -ii/i + d/t/z, with no final vowel. (It would also be nice to know more about \textit{huwa}, \textit{qur‘ān} (which would not have had \textit{hamza}) and \textit{lawh}, but we never shall.)

An altogether more important question lies behind the disagreement about the final word in 85:22. When did the differentiation between \textit{mahfīzin} and \textit{mahfīzun} become important? In the end, the qārī’s came out six to one in favour of \textit{mahfīzun}, with only Nafīc in favour of \textit{mahfīzin}. If we accept the information about the lives of the qārī’s at face value, it must have been before the deaths of Ibn Kālīr (d. 120/738) and Ibn Āmir (d. 118/736). But was it really a first century problem? I have my doubts.

Though the two variants are now perceived to focus on a grammatical problem, one may also wonder whether this was the original perception. However, it has to be said that many canonical \textit{qur‘āt} centre on grammar and/or the written text or both.

This is less so with the non-canonical (\textit{lawwād}) readings\(^10\), which deserve much more attention than has normally been paid to them. Without being able to go into detail, I think that I may fairly say that a significant proportion of them are synonyms or parallel versions of what we find in the received text. A number of readings attributed to Ibn Maṣūd, who notoriously resisted the introduction of the Li‘manic text, will readily illustrate this. First, a group of simple variations in Sūra 12:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{‘attā} (said to be the dialect of Ḥudayl) for \textit{ḥattā} [v. 35];
  \item \textit{‘inæn} for \textit{ḥamran} and \textit{gāridan} for \textit{ḥubzan} [36];
  \item \textit{sanābi} for \textit{sunbulāt} [43 and 46];
\end{itemize}

for parallel phrases see, for example, 19:27:

\textit{wa-ga‘at bi-bi tahmilu-hu īla qawmi-ha} (for \textit{wa-atat bi-bi qawmi-ha tahmilu-hu});

and 19:29:

\textit{fa-āṣarat īla man fi l-mahdi} (for \textit{fa-āṣarat ilay-hi}).

\footnote{The most convenient summary is to be found in Jeffery 1937.}

\footnote{See Kahle 1948.}

Synonyms, dialect variants and parallel texts are typical of oral material, and there, in my view, lies the primary difference between \textit{lawwād} readings and the canonical (\textit{maṣūd}) ones. The early (in traditional terms, pre-‘Uṭmanic) \textit{lawwād} readings are primarily concerned with oral texts; the later \textit{maṣūd} readings primarily focus on written variants on a received consonantal text. There is no apparent continuity between the two. The emphasis is clearly quite different. It can hardly have been otherwise. We may accept, for example, that Ibn Maṣūd read \textit{fa-sabran gamilun} for \textit{fa-sabran gamilan} [12:18 and 83]. However, any grammatical reasoning on the part of Ibn Maṣūd must have been instinctive. We have no convincing evidence of the existence of grammatical terminology during his lifetime\(^11\).

We know that there was a long battle about \textit{i‘rāb}, lasting into the fourth century of Islam. Quite what was entailed can only be guessed at; but it can hardly have been confined to what happened at verse endings. I think it timely to draw attention once again to an attempt by Arberry to put pausal endings at natural pauses\(^12\). He gave the following transliterations of Sūra 101:

(a) “\textit{lāḥīb}” form (my description)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{al-qārī}: \textit{mā l-qārī}
  \item \textit{wa-mā adrāk}: \textit{mā l-qārī}
  \item \textit{yawmna yakīnu n-nās}: \textit{ka-l-farāsī l-mabţūt}
  \item \textit{wa-takīnu l-gīblāl}: \textit{ka-l-lībī l-manfūsī}
  \item \textit{fa-ammā man ṭagqālat mawāzinuh}: \textit{fa-hawu fi ʾiṣatin rādiya}
  \item \textit{wa-ammā man ʾaṣṣafat mawāzinuh}: \textit{fa-ummuhu hāwiya}
  \item \textit{wa-mā adrāk}: \textit{mā hiya}
  \item \textit{nārūn hāmiyya}
\end{itemize}

(b) the fully vocalized form

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{al-qārī} ath: \textit{mā l-qārī} ath
  \item \textit{wa-mā adrāk ma l-qărī atu}
  \item \textit{yawmna yakīnu n-nās ka l-farāsī l-mabţūtī}
  \item \textit{wa-takīnu l-gīblāl ka l-lībī l-manfūsī}
  \item \textit{fa-ammā man ṭagqālat mawāzinuhu}: \textit{fa-hawu fi ʾiṣatin rādiyatin}
  \item \textit{wa-ammā man ṣṣafat mawāzinuhu}: \textit{fa-ummuhu hāwiyatin}
  \item \textit{wa-mā adrāk ma hiyab}
  \item \textit{nārūn hāmiyyatun}
\end{itemize}

\footnote{This does not of course mean that people do not react adversely to what they perceive as ‘incorrect’ or ‘impossible’ grammar. For an illustration for present-day unlearned Yemeni’s see Qafisheh 1996.}

\footnote{This avoids dealing with the problem of \textit{i‘rāb} elsewhere in the verse.}
All this (and more that I cannot deal with here) points to a need to pay more attention to the Qur'an against its seventh century, oral background. Other questions then begin to open up though not necessarily to be solved. Chief among these I would put the compilation of suras and general coherence, though more detailed problems such as semantic yield are also important. With all of these we are dealing not so much with solving problems as removing ignorance.

Let me first say a few words about general coherence. It is undoubtedly true that many verses of the Qur'an are clearer in recitation than on the printed page. Abrupt changes of subject rarely cause problems. Take, for example, the beginning of Sura 6:

1. Praise belongs to God, who created the heavens and the earth and made darkness and light. Yet those who do not believe ascribe equals to their Lord.
2. [It is] He who has created you from clay and then fixed a term - and [it is] a term stated with Him. Yet you still doubt.
3. He is God in the heavens and the earth. He knows what you keep secret and what you make public, and He knows what you amass.
4. None of their Lord's signs come to them without them turning away from it.
5. They denied the truth when it came to them; but news of what they used to scorn shall come to them.

The change from 3rd to 2nd person in verse 2 and back again in verse 4 is hardly noticeable to a listener. That may also be so with some apparent grammatical problems. There is the famous crux in 5:69 where we find:

\[\text{inna lladina amanu wa-lladina hadu wa-s-sabi'una wa-n-nasard,}\]

as opposed to the \[\text{wa-s-sdbi'ina}\] that we might expect and indeed do find in the other two verses in which the phrase occurs, 2:62 and 22:17. When one listens one is hardly troubled; yet it leaps out from the page. The two perceptions are quite different, and at the very least we should be aware of that.

Turning to compilation, the question of how the suras came into their present form is one that most Muslim scholars are unwilling to press. Indeed they have no real need to, for they may fairly believe it to be the work of God. However, awkward problems were not always avoided\(^1\), though the probing is never very deep. We are told, for instance, that in sura x verses y and z are Medinan, whilst the rest of the sura is Meccan, and so on.

\(^1\) This is in contrast with the sura order, which is certainly not due to Muhammad though possibly to the 'Uthmanic editors. The order, in very rough order of length, after the fatihah, appears to be deliberately neutral.

Amongst orientalists it was Noldeke who set the trend in more detailed probing, particularly in his *Geschichte des Qorans*\(^4\), which though now dated, is still both useful and influential. Much more striking, however, was the work of Richard Bell in his translation of the Qur'an (Bell 1937-39). Bell was a learned and meticulous scholar, steeped in the ways of scholarly biblical criticism. In his translation he took the suras apart and then more or less put them back again, with an explanation of how the 'pieces' had come together. It is a painstaking and opus, from which a great deal may be learned - though one gets the impression that Bell's own ways of thinking are ever present. Yet it is all based on a staggering misconception: "The translation goes frankly on the assumption that the Qur'an was in written form when the redactors started their work, whether actually written by Muhammad himself, as I personally believe, [A.J.'s italics] or by others at his dictation".

He further tells us: "The alterations, substitutions, and other derangements of the text have been indicated by the setting of the print on the page. Later additions have been set in a space or two from the margin. Where parts of the text are printed in parallel columns, that which stands on the left is taken as first, and that which is on the right as a later substitution for it. Where an addition has been made on the back of a scrap or scraps from elsewhere, these are separated from what follows by lines ..." (ibid.).

The results are interesting for scholars but hardly convincing. A fair example is the way he treats a passage from Sura 54:

43. Are the unbelievers of you better than these?  
Fourth continuation of 43a; Medinan.  
Or have ye an (assurance of) immunity in the scroll?  
44. Or do they say: 'We as a body will get victory'?  
45. The whole body (of them) will be routed and will turn the back.

\(^4\) One needs to consult the version revised by Schwally, and with a third volume on the text added by Bergsträsser and Pretzl.

All this (and more that I cannot deal with here) points to a need to pay more attention to the Qur'ān against its seventh century, oral background. Other questions then begin to open up though not necessarily to be solved.

Chief among these I would put the compilation of suras and general coherence, though more detailed problems such as semantic yield are also important. With all of these we are dealing not so much with solving problems as removing ignorance.

Let me first say a few words about general coherence. It is undoubtedly true that many verses of the Qur'ān are clearer in recitation than on the printed page. Abrupt changes of subject rarely cause problems. Take, for example, the beginning of Sūra 6:

1. Praise belongs to God, who created the heavens and the earth and made darkness and light. Yet those who do not believe ascribe equals to their Lord.
2. [It is] He who has created you from clay and then fixed a term - and [it is] a term stated with Him. Yet you still doubt.
3. He is God in the heavens and the earth. He knows what you keep secret and what you make public, and He knows what you amass.
4. None of their Lord's signs comes to them without them turning away from it.
5. They denied the truth when it came to them; but news of what they used to scorn shall come to them.

The change from 3rd to 2nd person in verse 2 and back again in verse 4 is hardly noticeable to a listener. That may also be so with some apparent grammatical problems. There is the famous crux in 5:69 where we find:
inna lladina amanu wa-lladina hadu wa-s-sabi'una wa-n-nasard,
as opposed to the wa-s-sdbi'ina that we might expect and indeed do find in the other two verses in which the phrase occurs, 2:62 and 22:17. When one listens one is hardly troubled; yet it leaps out from the page. The two perceptions are quite different, and at the very least we should be aware of that.

Turning to compilation, the question of how the suras came into their present form is one that most Muslim scholars are unwilling to press. Indeed they have no real need to, for they may fairly believe it to be the work of God. However, awkward problems were not always avoided14, though the probing is never very deep. We are told, for instance, that in sūra x verses y and z are Medinan, whilst the rest of the sūra is Meccan, and so on.

Amongst orientalists it was Nöldeke who set the trend in more detailed probing, particularly in his Geschichte des Qur'āns15, which though now dated, is still both useful and influential. Much more striking, however, was the work of Richard Bell in his translation of the Qur'ān (Bell 1937-39). Bell was a learned and meticulous scholar, steeped in the ways of scholarly biblical criticism. In his translation he took the suras apart and then more or less put them back again, with an explanation of how the 'pieces' had come together. It is a painstaking and opus, from which a great deal may be learned - though one gets the impression that Bell's own ways of thinking are ever present. Yet it is all based on a staggering misconception: "The translation goes frankly on the assumption that the Qur'ān was in written form when the redactors started their work, whether actually written by Muhammad himself, as I personally believe, [A.J.'s italics] or by others at his dictation".

He further tells us: "The alterations, substitutions, and other derangements of the text have been indicated by the setting of the print on the page. Later additions have been set in a space or two from the margin. Where parts of the text are printed in parallel columns, that which stands on the left is taken as first, and that which is on the right as a later substitution for it. Where an addition has been made on the back of a scrap or scraps from elsewhere, these are separated from what follows by lines ...").

The results are interesting for scholars but hardly convincing. A fair example is the way he treats a passage from Sūra 54:

Application to Muhammad's own people; same time as original stories, but several times altered.

43. Are the unbelievers of you better than these?

Fourth continuation of 43a; Medinan.
Or have ye an (assurance of) immunity in the scroll?

44. Or do they say: 'We as a body will get victory'?

45. The whole body (of them) will be routed and will turn the back.

14 One needs to consult the version revised by Schwally, and with a third volume on the text added by Bergsträsser and Pretzl.
First continuation of 43a

49. Everything have We created with a limit. Nay, the Hour is their appointed time, and the Hour is grievous and bitter. 46. The sinners are in error and madness. 47. On the day when they will be dragged into the Fire upon their faces; 'Taste the effect of Saqar.'

Second continuation of 43a

50. And Our affair is but one (flash) like a glance of the eye. 48. On the day when they will be destroyed your madness.

51. We have destroyed your allies, but is there any one who takes heed? be dragged into the Fire upon their faces; 'Taste the effect of Saqar.'

52. When every thing they have done is in the scrolls, with a river, with a river,

53. And every little and every great (deed) is inscribed?

54. Lo, the pious are in gardens

55. In a sure seat in the presence of a kingly powerful (one).

The spark has gone, and the logic is hardly improved. Yet Bell came closer than anyone else so far to the heart of the problems that often face us about the contents of any given sura. It is not enough to indicate, as the Egyptian edition does, that the final edition of Sura 73 is Medinan. It is even less satisfactory when there is no comment about 74:30 ff.;

30. Over it are nineteen.

31. We have appointed only angels to be masters of the Fire, and We have appointed their number simply as an affliction for those who are ungrateful, that those who have been given the Book may have certainty, and that neither those who have been given the Book nor the believers may be in any doubt; and that those in whose hearts is sickness and the ungrateful ones may say, 'What did God mean by this as a parable?' Thus God sends astray those whom He wishes and guides those whom He wishes. No one knows the hosts of your Lord but He. This is simply a reminder for mankind.

32. No indeed. By the moon,

Here it is quite clear that verse 31 is Medinan. Various phrases, such as 'those in whose hearts is sickness' indicate that. There is also no difficulty if one reads 30 and then 32 onwards. Bell is quite right to assign verse 31 to the Medinan period, and he does so without reference to 'scraps'. The question remains: how did verse 31 get inserted? If one examines such passages in the context of oral tradition, there is no great problem. The text of every sura would have remained open during Muhammad's lifetime, but closed at his death. Every time Muhammad recited a sura changes could have occurred. (Changes might very well occur when another person recited, but only Muhammad's changes would have had authority.) My Muslim colleagues need not be alarmed - I am not suggesting that we have to believe that Muhammad was the conscious author of the Qur'an. The sort of mechanism I envisage can be shown by the following analogy.

A large number of academics know the text of their lectures more or less by heart, and they can deliver them orally, without reference to notes. However, from time to time they will suddenly feel that they must add a piece; and if one can look at the notes of a student who is present, one will find the added piece (at least, in note form). The lecturer simply feels impelled to add the piece. Equally, pieces may be changed or substituted.

If in the case of Muhammad one wishes to call that 'divine inspiration', so be it. The inspiration is working on known, explicable lines.

I am therefore inclined to suggest that intuitive change is the basic force in the building up of suras. With that in mind one can make a good deal of sense out of the suggestions of Bell or Blachère. But caveat lector. One should be very cautious about imposing one's own logic on the text. That simply replaces one set of problems with another. Appreciating the situation is one thing; reconstruction is altogether more dubious. That may not satisfy our intellectual instincts to identify problems, analyse and comment; but those instincts often stop us from doing the right thing: saying 'I have no basis for going further'.

Limited space, as well as prudence, prevents me from going further. I am painfully aware that I have just scratched the surface of the problems I have mentioned. However, if I have pointed ilâ l-huda and not ilâ d-dalal, I shall have been more than fortunate.
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52. When every thing they have done is in the scrolls, with a river, of Saqar.'
53. And every little and every great (deed) is inscribed?
54. Lo, the pious are in gardens with a river,
55. In a sure seat in the presence of a kingly powerful (one).

The spark has gone, and the logic is hardly improved. Yet Bell came closer than anyone else so far to the heart of the the problems that often face us about the contents of any given sura. It is not enough to indicate, as the Egyptian edition does, that the final edition of Sura 73 is Medinan. It is even less satisfactory when there is no comment about 74:30 ff.
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31. We have appointed only angels to be masters of the Fire, and We have appointed their number simply as an affliction for those who are ungrateful, that those who have been given the Book may have certainty, and that neither those who have been given the Book nor the believers may be in any doubt; and that those in whose hearts is sickness and the ungrateful ones may say, 'What did God mean by this as a parable?' Thus God sends astray those whom He wishes and guides those whom He wishes. No one knows the hosts of your Lord but He. This is simply a reminder for mankind.
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Here it is quite clear that verse 31 is Medinan. Various phrases, such as 'those in whose hearts is sickness' indicate that. There is also no difficulty if one reads 30 and then 32 onwards. Bell is quite right to assign verse 31 to the Medinan period, and he does so without reference to 'scraps'. The question remains: how did verse 31 get inserted? If one examines such passages in the context of oral tradition, there is no great problem. The text of every sura would have remained open during Muhammad's lifetime, but closed at his death. Every time Muhammad recited a sura changes could have occurred. (Changes might very well occur when another person recited, but only Muhammad's changes would have had authority.) My Muslim colleagues need not be alarmed - I am not suggesting that we have to believe that Muhammad was the conscious author of the Qur'ân. The sort of mechanism I envisage can be shown by the following analogy.

A large number of academics know the text of their lectures more or less by heart, and they can deliver them orally, without reference to notes. However, from time to time they will suddenly feel that they must add a piece; and if one can look at the notes of a student who is present, one will find the added piece (at least, in note form). The lecturer simply feels impelled to add the piece. Equally, pieces may be changed or substituted.

If in the case of Muhammad one wishes to call that 'divine inspiration', so be it. The inspiration is working on known, explicable lines.

I am therefore inclined to suggest that intuitive change is the basic force in the building up of suras. With that in mind one can make a good deal of sense out of the suggestions of Bell or Blachère. But caveat lector. One should be very cautious about imposing one's own logic on the text. That simply replaces one set of problems with another. Appreciating the situation is one thing; reconstruction is altogether more dubious. That may not satisfy our intellectual instincts to identify problems, analyse and comment; but those instincts often stop us from doing the right thing: saying 'I have no basis for going further'.
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In this paper I shall be dealing with a group of Arabic chronicles dating from the second half of the seventeenth century in Egypt, when Egypt was under Ottoman rule. I have already studied lengthily, for my doctorate dissertation, one of the chronicles referred to here, a chronicle known under the title of Waqā‘ī Misr al-Qāhira. Some readers may already be familiar with an important aspect of what I shall be discussing.

Here, however, I shall be considering this chronicle, and others close to it, in the context of folk literature and as representatives of folk literature and of popular culture. My claim is that these chronicles, which have usually been considered as historical documents, could actually be counted — according to the analysis which follows — as part of folk literature. Both form and content would seem to indicate that these chronicles are very similar to epics aimed at entertaining an audience of listeners be either the militaries or other.

This paper will perhaps answer certain questions while leaving others unanswered. The part which I believe I have an answer to concerns the nature of the text(s) and the condition of its composition; the part unanswered concerns the material, historical side of my hypothesis, such as for instance being more precise about the authorship or audience of the account.

1. Waqā‘ī Misr al-Qāhira and its sister chronicles (mainly, another work known under the title of ad-Durra al-musnāt fī abhār al-kinān by al-Amır Ahmad Kuṭūdā ‘Azābān ad-Damūrā) are known as the Damūrā group1 and have been considered by the historians of that period as popular chronicles2.

All of them tell very much the same story and share the same vision du monde which will be defined later in this study. The story is that of Egypt and more particularly the events which took place in Cairo in the middle of the seventeenth century between all the factions then present in Egypt: pashas, Mamluks, soldiers belonging to different militia, and even Arab tribes standing in favour of one faction

---

1 The Damūrā group is usually considered to consist of the various copies and versions of Waqā‘ī Misr al-Qāhira as well as the copies and versions constituting ad-Durra al-musnāt fī abhār al-kinān. Cf. Crecelius (1989:7-9).
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In this paper I shall be dealing with a group of Arabic chronicles dating from the second half of the seventeenth century in Egypt, when Egypt was under Ottoman rule. I have already studied lengthily, for my doctorate dissertation, one of the chronicles referred to here, a chronicle known under the title of Waqā‘ī ‘Mīr Aλ QāhirA. Some readers may already be familiar with an important aspect of what I shall be discussing.

Here, however, I shall be considering this chronicle, and others close to it, in the context of folk literature and as representatives of folk culture. My claim is that these chronicles, which have usually been considered as historical documents, could actually be counted — according to the analysis which follows — as part of folk literature. Both form and content would seem to indicate that these chronicles are very similar to epics aimed at entertaining an audience of listeners. be either the militaries or other.

This paper will perhaps answer certain questions while leaving others unanswered. The part which I believe I have an answer to concerns the nature of the text(s) and the condition of its composition; the part unanswered concerns the material, historico-critical side of my hypothesis, such as for instance being more precise about the authorship or audience of the account.

1. Waqā‘ī ‘Mīr Aλ QāhirA and its sister chronicles (mainly, another work known under the title of ad-Durra al-musāna fi aḥbār al-kināna by al-Amīr Ahmad Kaṭūdā ‘Azābān ad-Damūrāšī), are known as the Damūrāšī group1 and have been considered by the historians of that period as popular chronicles2.

All of them tell very much the same story and share the same vision du monde which will be defined later in this study. The story is that of Egypt and more particularly the events which took place in Cairo in the middle of the seventeenth century between all the factions then present in Egypt: pashas, Mamluks, soldiers belonging to different militia, and even Arab tribes standing in favour of one faction.

1 The Damūrāšī group is usually considered to consist of the various copies and versions of Waqā‘ī ‘Mīr Aλ QāhirA as well as the copies and versions constituting ad-Durra al-musāna fi aḥbār al-kināna. Cf. Creceilius (1989:7-9).

or the other. In the background also sometimes appears the local population, with the ulemas, the tradesmen, and the people of Cairo who lived as victims of the internal strife and warfare launched by the various factions.

On the level of the content, the series of manuscripts of *al-Waqa'ī* tells the same narrative as the text of *ad-Durra*, they moreover share, as I was saying earlier, the same ideology or *vision du monde*. With a sharp split dividing the society in two clans the so called Fiqāris and the Qāsimis; most of the conflicts told in the narrative take origin or end up serving this split: pashas or *waši* sent from Istanbul will be in favour of one or the other of the factions, *əğaqs* will be partisans of one or the other etc. When and why the conflict started between the two parties little is known (see below) if it were not for the information given by the Damurdāšī set of texts. However, it seems clear that this major split has been instigated by the conflict between two Mamliḳ households of the time.

Before getting further into the analysis it would be useful to read the paragraphs at the beginning of both *al-Waqa'ī* and *ad-Durra* in order to get a feeling of the text and understand what is meant by the *vision du monde* I was alluding to as appears through the following passage extract from the Vienna manuscript (see below):

"The people of Egypt from times immemorial have been split into two clans, [both] militaries and civilians, a white flag and [vs?] a red flag, the white one Tābī, the red one Kulaŷbi, Zugbi and [vs?] Hilāli, Qalāwūni and [vs?] Baybarsī, up till the rule of al-'Uṯmān — may God help him — Fiqārī, Sa'd; Qāsimī, Harām, two clans within themselves, but against the Arabs united. The Fiqārī enjoys modes of music [*garāqā* Dozy 1881 I, 187]; the Qāsimī enjoys the silk strings decorating the cavalrymen. And so the people of "Miśr al-Mahruṣa" could recognize the Fiqārī from the Qāsimī in the processions — either the procession of Holy Pilgrimage or the procession of the Pasha — by the spears".

In this text as in others of the Damurdāšī group, the conflict between Qāsimīs and Fiqāris is said to have started as early as the beginning of Ottoman rule in Egypt. According to other sources, probably more reliable, the split was a recent one (1640 A.D., according to al-Ǧabarti, *Ağā'y I*, 38-45). In a recent research¹, Sabri shows that by dating it at an earlier stage the conflict is thus exalted and given a more noble lineage.

On the other hand, one can see how the present split is associated with previous ones which took place between tribal groups. So for instance, the Qāsimīs are associated with the Harām tribe while the Fiqāris are associated with the Sa'd tribe. On the other hand, the Hilālīs and their opponents the Zugbls are put in parallel to the present parties in conflict.

2. The particular chronicle of *Waqa'ī* is represented by a set of five different copies of a text. Not exactly one and the same text, however, since between one and the other of the manuscripts there are a number of differences, in spite of the fact that they all bear the same name of the supposed "author" or "scribe". This common name found on all of the extant copies would permit us to admit that all the group could have been written or at least copied by the same person. al-Ḥagg Muṣṭafā b. al-Ḥagg Ibrahim is that common name found in all of the copies known to me, only one of them (the Vienna version), and that is the one I have used to edit the text, adds to the previous name: al-Maddāḥ al-Qinālī. The mention of the *kunya*, as well as al-Maddāḥ, "the panegyrist" seems to indicate the profession of the "author" or of the scribe.

Considering the differences which appear between one copy and the other(s) may already raise questions about the nature of the text and the conditions of its composition.

Briefly, these discrepancies (between the manuscripts) vary from very slight ones (orthographic, such as for instance, the proper name Isma'īl written with a long or a short vowel), to major differences concerning the total structure of the account. To have an idea of these discrepancies, one could consider two texts relating the same event as can be observed in the following:

**Vienna copy**

"He left, heading the holy pilgrimage on the second year after a hundred and returned on the third, mistreated and robbed, soldiers of his and men from the militias (*əğaqs*) were killed. So Darwīš bek went to his rescue and met him at al-'Aqaba and accompanied him back to Cairo. And the reason was that 'Ali pasha had charged Ibrahim bek as-Saṣūr, son of Dūl-Fiqār bek and Darwīš bek to order the Arabs [bedouins] of ad-Daštā in order for them to carry the grains to the two Holy sites [Mecca and the tomb of the Prophet]. The *ṣangags* started off in the early morning from behind of [the tomb of] Qa'itbay, they suddenly pierced at them, the Arabs thought they were enemy troops, and so

¹ Sabri 1995:29-36 where the Qāsimī Fiqārī split is discussed.
or the other. In the background also sometimes appears the local population, with the ulemas, the tradesmen, and the people of Cairo who lived as victims of the internal strife and warfare launched by the various factions.

On the level of the content, the series of manuscripts of *al-Waqa‘* tells the same narrative as the text of *ad-Durra*, they moreover share, as I was saying earlier, the same ideology or *vision du monde*. With a sharp split dividing the society in two clans the so called Fiqāris and the Qāsimis; most of the conflicts told in the narrative take origin or end up serving this split: pashas or *waqīls* sent from Istanbul will be in favour of one or the other of the factions, *ogaqs* will be partisans of one or the other etc. When and why the conflict started between the two parties little is known (see below) if it were not for the information given by the Damurdāsi set of texts. However, it seems clear that this major split has been instigated by the conflict between two Mamluk households of the time.

Before getting further into the analysis it would be useful to read the paragraphs at the beginning of both *al-Waqa‘* and *ad-Durra* in order to get a feeling of the text and understand what is meant by the *vision du monde* I was alluding to as appears through the following passage extract from the Vienna manuscript (see below):

"The people of Egypt from times immemorial have been split into two clans, [both] militaries and civilians, a white flag and [vs?] a red flag, the white one Tabrī, the red one Kulaybi, Zugbi and [vs?] Hilālī, Qalāwūnī and [vs?] Baybarsī, up till the rule of al-Uṯmān — may God help him — Fiqārī, Sa‘d; Qāsimī, Harām, two clans within themselves, but against the Arabs united. The Fiqārī enjoy modes of music [garāqā Dozy 1881 I, 187]; the Qāsimī enjoy the silk strings decorating the cavalrymen. And so the people of "Mīsr al-Mahrūsa" could recognize the Fiqārī from the Qāsimī in the processions — either the procession of Holy Pilgrimage or the procession of the Pasha — by the spears".

In this text as in others of the Damurdāsi group, the conflict between Qāsimī and Fiqārī is said to have started as early as the beginning of Ottoman rule in Egypt. According to other sources, probably more reliable, the split was a recent one (1640 A.D., according to al-Ǧābarī, ‘Algā‘īb 1, 38–45). In a recent research¹, Sabrī shows that by dating it at an earlier stage the conflict is thus exalted and given a more noble lineage.

On the other hand, one can see how the present split is associated with previous ones which took place between tribal groups. So for instance, the Qāsimīs are associated with the Harām tribe while the Fiqārīs are associated with the Sa‘d tribe. On the other hand, the Hilālīs and their opponents the Zugbīs are put in parallel to the present parties in conflict.

2. The particular chronicle of *Waqa‘* is represented by a set of five different copies of a text. Not exactly one and the same text, however, since between one and the other of the manuscripts there are a number of differences, in spite of the fact that they all bear the same name of the supposed “author” or “scribe”. This common name found on all of the extant copies would permit us to admit that all the group could have been written or at least copied by the same person. al-Hāq Muṣṭafā b. al-Hāq Ibrahim is that common name found in all of the copies known to me, only one of them (the Vienna version), and that is the one I have used to edit the text, adds to the previous name: al-Maddāh al-Qinālī. The mention of the kunya, as well as al-Maddāh, “the panegyrist" seems to indicate the profession of the “author” or of the scribe.

Considering the differences which appear between one copy and the other(s) may already raise questions about the nature of the text and the conditions of its composition.

Briefly, these discrepancies (between the manuscripts) vary from very slight ones (orthographic, such as for instance, the proper name Ismā‘īl written with a long or a short vowel), to major differences concerning the total structure of the account. To have an idea of these discrepancies, one could consider two texts relating the same event as can be observed in the following:

**Vienna copy**

"He left, heading the holy pilgrimage on the second year after a hundred and returned on the third, mistreated and robbed, soldiers of his and men from the militias (ogaqs?) were killed. So Darwīš bek went to his rescue and met him at al-‘Aqāba and accompanied him back to Cairo. And the reason was that ‘Ali pasha had charged Ibrahim bek as-Saṣūr, son of Dū ‘I-Fiqār bek and Darwīš bek to order the Arabs [bedouins] of ad-Daṣīṣ to in order for them to carry the grain to the two Holy sites [Mecca and the tomb of the Prophet]. The sanāqas started off in the early morning from behind of [the tomb of] Qa‘īthbay, they suddenly pierced at them, the Arabs thought they were enemy troops, and so"

---

¹ Sabrī 1995:29–36 where the Qāsimī Fiqārī split is discussed.
they fought them. Men were killed from the Guzz (Turks) and the Arabs, at sunrise they discovered that these were sanqâqs and fled. The soldiers looted the Arabs’ homes, the sanqâqs drove the camels. At that point the Arabs assembled and watched (laid in an ambush) for the pilgrims at as-šûrafâ’ pass (strait), when Ibrahim bêk Abû Şanab appeared they waged war to him. So then happened what was to happen at as-šûrafâ’.”

**Tâyûrî copy**

“Ibrahim bêk departed, heading the holy pilgrimage on the third year after a hundred. He accomplished the pilgrimage and returned; the Arabs (bedouins) attacked him at as-šûrafâ’, people were killed, militia men, men of wisdom as well as pilgrims, they also robbed some of the pilgrims. He sent a message to ‘Ali pasha to inform him of what had happened to him; ‘Ali pasha sent Darwîš bêk who went to meet them at al-‘Aqaba. They entered Cairo safely, it was lost for those who had gone. It was said that this had been a plot from the Fiqârîyâ since the treasury [daftardâriyya] was in the hand of Murâd bêk, the command of the pilgrimage was with Ibrahim bêk. But the truth is different: ‘Ali pasha had ordered the Daftard Arabs to carry the grains to the two Holy sites for [?] the sanqâqs, Darwîš bêk and the son of Zayn al-Fiqrâr, Ibrahim bêk. They reached the Arabs moving on the hills, behind of [the tomb of] Qâit-bây. Suddenly they pierced at them with the call of as-Sâfî, the Arabs thought they were enemy troops so they pierced at them and fought the sanqâqs for about an hour. Men died from the two sides, that was until the Arabs realized that it had been sanqâqs and so they fled. So the sanqâqs looted their houses and their camels. That happened on the beginning of Muharram at the start of the fourth year after a hundred. It is then that the Arabs gathered their forces and prepared the ambush on the way of the pilgrimage, and happened what was to happen.”

Even a rapid reading of the two passages can show a number of variations between the texts, such as the dating of the event, or the fact that the second passage phrased in a different way although demonstrating a similar level of language. As to the extant copies known they are as follows:

On the one hand, the version of the National Library of Vienna (cod. H.O. 38) which stands alone. On the other hand, a group of four copies sharing grossly a common structure of account and formulation, of these, three belong to Cairo’s Dîr al-Kutub, an old manuscript (cod. G. 8505) and two recent ones (cod. Târîh Tâyûrî 1402 and cod. Târîh 4048).

Within this set of manuscripts the differences concern only details: the presence vs. the absence of religious formulas in one text or the other, lexical or orthographi-cal variations, but all the copies follow the same ordering of the account. The fourth copy belongs to the Royal Library of Copenhagen (cod. CLIX). It would seem that this manuscript was copied from a different source than the previously mentioned ones since this copy is the only complete one. The general presentation of this manuscript would seem to indicate that it is the most recent one.

To make the story even more puzzling I should add that the sister text I have referred to earlier (in 1.), ad-Dûrûr by al-Amir Ahmad Kathûdû “Azâbân ad-Damurdâsh, shares the same features as the text I was mainly concerned with both in form and content. The same level of language, the same vision du monde, the same degree of importance given to very much the same events.

3. Faced with this multiplicity of copies and with the wide differences appearing between one of the copies and the others plus the presence of such a close sister text, I have come up with a double hypothesis:

The first is that the chronicle of al-Wâqa’î was originally an oral account, the variations found within copies of a “single” text being one of the characteristics of oral literature. As Guillaume (1987) puts it, the variation found between copies “is not accidental (due to copyists’ errors, etc.) but structural, since the written word is not, as usually the case, the place where the narrative is elaborated, […] rather the written word is only a way by which the narrative is stocked”. The narrative is elaborated during the live performance, writing is only a way of preserving the text so as to prevent it from being forgotten. The multiplicity of forms by which a text appears may thus be a sign or an indication of vocal or oral origin.

The second hypothesis is that the Damurdâsh group (the Damurdâsh and Qinâli series of texts) constitutes in fact one and a single narrative, transmitted in different manners and then eventually transcribed by different individuals. Instead of trying to decide on one original text, which would be the older, the most authentic, would it not be wiser to follow Cerquiglini’s (1989) advice where he warns the philologist from searching for a “unique authentic text”. Why not, as he recommends, admit to a generalized authentic?

My hypothesis seems also enhanced by the internal observation of the text, by that I mean the observation of a) indications as to the oral nature of the text, and b) linguistic signs of the orality of the text.

3.1 Indications as to the oral nature of the text

It should be remarked that the chronicle does not bear a title. Wâqa’î Mîr al-Qâhîrî is a formula found in the first lines of all of the extant copies. Unlike a written text, this one appears as an aide-mémoire without a specific title.

The qualification of al-Maddah, the panegyrist, found in the Vienna copy may be an indication of the profession of Mustâfâ b. al-Hâgh Ibrahim, that of a bard who either composed or recited the story telling the events happening in Cairo in the days
they fought them. Men were killed from the Guzz [Turks] and the Arabs, at sunrise they discovered that these were sanqāqs and fled. The soldiers looted the Arabs' homes, the sanqāqs drove the camels. At that point the Arabs assembled and watched (lied in an ambush) for the pilgrims at ʿā-Shūrafāʾ pass (strait), when İbrahim bēk Abū ʿAināb appeared they waged war to him. So then happened what was to happen at ʿā-Shūrafāʾ.

Taṣmūr copy

"İbrahim bēk departed, heading the holy pilgrimage on the third year after a hundred. He accomplished the pilgrimage and returned; the Arabs (bedouins) attacked him at ʿā-Shūrafāʾ, people were killed, militia men, men of wisdom as well as pilgrims, they also robbed some of the pilgrims. He sent a message to ʿAlī pasha to inform him of what had happened to him; ʿAlī pasha sent Dar-wiš bēk who went to meet them at ʿā-Qāqaba. They entered Cairo safely, it was lost for those who had gone. It was said that this had been a plot from the Fiqāriyya since the treasury [daftardāriyya] was in the hand of Murād bēk, the command of the pilgrimage was with İbrahim bēk. But the truth is different: ʿAlī pasha had ordered the Dāšās Arabs to carry the grains to the two Holy sites for [?] the sanqāqs, Darwīš bēk and the son of Ẓayn al-Fiqrā, İbrahim bēk. They reached the Arabs moving on the hills, behind of [the tomb of] Qāʿībāy. Suddenly they pierced at them with the call of as-Saficī, the Arabs thought they were enemy troops so they pierced at them and fought the sanqāqs for about an hour. Men died from the two sides, that was until the Arabs realized that it had been sanqāqs and so they fled. So the sanqāqs looted their houses and their camels. That happened on the beginning of Muḥarram at the start of the fourth year after a hundred. It is then that the Arabs gathered their forces and prepared the ambush on the way of the pilgrimage, and happened what was to happen."

Even a rapid reading of the two passages can show a number of variations between the texts, such as the dating of the event, or the fact that the second passage is phrased in a different way although demonstrating a similar level of language.

As to the extant copies known they are as follows:

On the one hand, the version of the National Library of Vienna (cod. H.O. 38) which stands alone. On the other hand, a group of four copies sharing a generally similar text, but differing in some details: the presence or absence of religious formulas in one version or the other, lexical or orthographic variations, but all the copies follow the same general ordering of the account. The fourth copy belongs to the Royal Library of Copenhagen (cod. CLIX). It would seem that this manuscript was a copy of a different source than the previously mentioned ones since this copy is the only complete one. The general presentation of this manuscript would seem to indicate that it is the most recent one.

To make the story even more puzzling I should add that the sister text I have referred to earlier (in 1.), ʿad-Durra by al-ʿAmīr Ahmad Kāthūdā, Ḥazābān ad-Damurdāšī, shares the same features as the text I was mainly concerned with both in form and content. The same level of language, the same vision du monde, the same degree of importance given to very much the same events.

3. Faced with this multiplicity of copies and with the wide differences appearing between one of the copies and the others plus the presence of such a close sister text, I have come up with a double hypothesis:

The first is that the chronicle of ʿal-Waqāʾī is essentially an oral account, the variations found within copies of a "single" text being one of the characteristics of oral literature. As Guillaume (1987) puts it, the variation found between copies "is not accidental (due to copyists' errors, etc.) but structural, since the written word is not, as usually the case, the place where the narrative is elaborated, [...] rather the written word is only a way by which the narrative is stocked". The narrative is elaborated during the live performance, writing is only a way of preserving the text so as to prevent it from being forgotten. The multiplicity of forms by which a text appears may thus be a sign or an indication of vocal or oral origin.

The second hypothesis is that the Damurdāšī group (the Damurdāšī and Qānālī series of texts) constitutes in fact one and a single narrative, transmitted in different manners and then eventually transcribed by different individuals. Instead of trying to decide on one original text, which would be the older, the most authentic, would it not be wiser to follow Cerquigni's (1989) advice where he warns the philologist from searching for a "unique authentic text". Why not, as he recommends, admit to a generalized authentic?

My hypothesis seems also enhanced by the internal observation of the text, by that I mean the observation of a) indications as to the oral nature of the text, and b) linguistic signs of the orality of the text.

3.1 Indications as to the oral nature of the text

It should be noted that the chronicle does not bear a title. Waqāʾī Mīr al-Qāhirī is a formula found in the first lines of all of the extant copies. Unlike a written text, this one appears as an aide-mémoire without a specific title.

The qualification of al-Maddāh, the panegyrist, found in the Vienna copy may be an indication of the profession of Mustafa b. al-Hāfīz İbrahim, that of a bard who either composed or recited the story telling the events happening in Cairo in the days...
of agitation when Mamluks were at war against each other and the characters of the Qasimi clan to whose ranks Qinali seems to belong lived fought and died like heroes or traitors.

Another indication is the presence of formalistic expressions, a feature of folk literature. So for instance standard epithets and clichés are attached to the characters of the narrative. The mention of Isma'il b. al-Wad, an important character of the narrative, is most often followed by the formula "a small lump of sugar, young in age but of great value." To the same person is also attached the epithet of generosity "dabik assinn." Ibrahim b. Abu Sanab, another character of the narrative is usually described in a pejorative manner: so he is qualified as being coward and double faced "bi-waghayn.

Formulas do not just appear in the forms of clichés but also in that of entire passages which are almost textually repeated. One of these passages repeated all through the text is the one recounting the episode of the enthronement of the new pasha, after the deposition of his predecessor:

"He arrived at the chief town of Alexandria, a messenger came to announce him. The agas, the soldiers and the lieutenants met him and to the port of Rosetta led him. He stayed there for the customary period. They flew him down the blessed Nile river, until they arrived to the port of al-Warraq. There he spent the night and on the next morning, after having eaten he crossed to open the banquet. He offered the customary kaftans and received the presents in honour of his arrival. Then by the evening he visited the chief town of Alexandria, and walked up to the Citadel. There the canons were activated by the corps of the Inkisarīya from the towers. He spent the night and on the next morning, after having eaten he crossed to open the banquet. He offered the customary kaftans and received the presents in honour of his arrival. Then by the evening he visited the chief town of Alexandria, and walked up to the Citadel. There the canons were activated by the corps of the Inkisarīya from the towers. He started giving the orders..."

The repetition of a passage within a text is among the features indicating an oral strategy (Zumthor 1982).

Actually, repetition in itself is usually recognized as a factor of orality. Since on the level of communication repetition is what prevents a message, mainly based on linearity, from being partly lost. Since one cannot "look back" as in a reading process, repetition makes the message more "resistant." On the other hand as has been shown by Lord (1981), repetition is a functional part of the narrative since it gives the oral poet a pattern to follow (in Lord's case the pattern is rhythmic since he deals with oral poetry and the works he based his observations on were sung epic poetry).

Enhancing the theory of oral or vocal origin we can also notice that on some occasions the recurrent passage is even told using some rhyme in the verse as it is the case in the passage we read: *laqūb sanilā tāfrī hadīt ǧābnah.*

These episodes are very similar to a refrain appearing as many times as a new pasha was welcomed to Egypt during the period narrated, and that is 25 times. The fact that this refrain/passage is historically justified, does not diminish the folk quality of the document. Although the historical genre of this chronicle follows the so-called Sultan-Pasha framework which supposedly constitutes the *raison d'etre* of these narratives, as noticed by Hathaway, the mention of pashas does not really command the narrative and "as the chronicler nears his own time, he tends to include more and more events in each pasha's term, with the result that the viceroyalty begins to lose its coherence" (Hathaway 1990:58). One can indeed see in the repetition of the passage concerning the enthronement of a pasha not just in its historical function but as part of the oral narrative strategy.

Some sequences of the text are loaded with suspense and other dramatic features in the aim of entertaining the audience. In the prelude to a confrontation between two Mamluk warriors, Garkas Muhammad, the one we are siding with, wakes up in the morning with a bad premonition, he addresses his war companion, Sulaymān bēk: "Today is a bad omen for us", but his companion discards this presentiment: "How can a one day old newborn kill a two days old?" In the course of the battle, Sulaymān bēk is hurt, a horse is presented to him, but Sulaymān feels that the horse would not bear carrying him with all the weight of harness he is wearing. He refused to ride because his destiny was to be killed on that day (p. 329).

3.2 Linguistic signs of the orality of the text

The hypothesis of an oral origin of the chronicle is enhanced because the texts exhibit various features of orality which I will try to set forth in this section.

3.2.1 Pronoun ambiguity

According to our modern habits a good writer is supposed to be as "explicit" as he can, and to leave little work to his potential reader. The writer must take into account the "readability" of his text. This is a fundamental condition in order for the reader to learn something he did not know beforehand.
of agitation when Mamluks were at war against each other and the characters of the Qasimi clan – to whose ranks Qinali seems to belong – lived, fought and died like heroes or traitors.

Another indication is the presence of formalistic expressions, a feature of folk literature. So for instance standard epithets and clichés are attached to the characters of the narrative. The mention of Ismā‘īl b. ʿIwad, an important character of the narrative, is most often followed by the formula

"a small lump of sugar, young in age but of great value". To the same person is also attached the epithet of generosity "dābk as-sinn kabir al-miqdar". Ibrahim b. Abū Ṣanāb, another character of the narrative is usually described in a pejorative manner: so he is qualified as being coward and double faced bi-waḥḥāyīn.

Formulas do not just appear in the forms of clichés but also in that of entire passages which are almost textually repeated. One of these passages repeated all through the text is the one recounting the episode of the enthronement of the new pasha, after the deposition of his predecessor:

"He arrived at the chief town of Alexandria, a messenger came to announce him. The agas, the soldiers and the lieutenants met him and to the port of Rosetta led him. He stayed there for the customary period. They flew him down the blessed Nile river, until they arrived to the port of al-Warrāq. There he spent the night and on the next morning, after having eaten he crossed to open the banquet. He offered the customary kaftans and received the presents in honour of his arrival. Then by the evening he visited his Highness al-Imām al-Ṣafi‘ī, returned, spent the night at al-Raydānīyya and by the next morning, in a great procession, he entered Cairo, and walked up to the Citadel. There the canons were activated by the corps of the Inkišāriyya from the towers. He started giving the orders..."

The repetition of a passage within a text is among the features indicating an oral strategy (Zumthor 1982).

Actually, repetition in itself is usually recognized as a factor of orality. Since on the level of communication, repetition is what prevents a message, mainly based on linearity, from being partly lost. Since one cannot "look back" as in a reading process, repetition makes the message more "resistant". On the other hand as has been shown by Lord (1981), repetition is a functional part of the narrative since it gives the oral poet a pattern to follow (in Lord’s case the pattern is rhythmic since he deals with oral poetry and the works he based his observations on were sung epic poetry).

Enhancing the theory of oral or vocal origin we can also notice that on some occasions the recurrent passage is even told using some rhyme in the verse as it is the case in the passage we read: laqib ta‘īlā taqīr ratid gānūh.

These episodes are very similar to a refrain reappearing as many times as a new pasha was welcomed to Egypt during the period narrated, and that is 25 times. The fact that this refrain/passage is historically justified, does not diminish the folk quality of the document. Although the historical genre of this chronicle follows the so-called Sultan-Pasha framework which supposedly constitutes the raison d’être of these narratives, as noticed by Hathaway, the mention of pashas does not really command the narrative and "as the chronicler nears his own time, he tends to include more and more events in each pasha’s term, with the result that the viceroyalty begins to lose its coherence" (Hathaway 1990:58). One can indeed see in the repetition of the passage concerning the enthronement of a pasha not just in its historical function but as part of the oral narrative strategy.

Some sequences of the text are loaded with suspense and other dramatic features in the aim of entertaining the audience. In the prelude to a confrontation between two Mamluk warriors, Garkās Muhammad, the one we are siding with, wakes up in the morning with a bad premonition, he addresses his war companion, Sulaymān bēk: "Today is a bad omen for us", but his companion discards this presentiment: "How can a one day old newborn kill a two days old?" In the course of the battle, Sulaymān bēk is hurt, a horse is presented to him, but Sulaymān feels that the horse would not bear carrying him with all the weight of harness he is wearing. He refused to ride because his destiny was to be killed on that day (p. 329).

### 3.2 Linguistic signs of the orality of the text

The hypothesis of an oral origin of the chronicle is enhanced because the texts exhibit various features of orality which I will try to set forth in this section.

#### 3.2.1 Pronoun ambiguity

According to our modern habits a good writer is supposed to be as "explicit" as he can, and to leave little work to his potential reader. The writer must take into account the "readability" of his text. This is a fundamental condition in order for the reader to learn something he did not know beforehand.
Some passages of the text are difficult to understand because of the ambiguity of pronominal reference. The following examples are but a few among many in which it is almost impossible to understand the passage out of its context:

"wa-narūfā ilā 'Utmañ būk ḫūdi l-Fiqrār ahrād iqlimi al-Mansūra wa-arwal lāha Sālīh Khāṣf min taht yādīh awrāl suwa 'ufūrī iqlimi taṣawwūf bi-hānim bint ‘Īwad būk"

"To come back to ‘Utmañ būk ḫūdi l-Fiqrār, he took over the region of Mansūra and sent Sālīh Khāṣf to represent him the first year and on the second he married the daughter of ‘Īwad būk."

Without reading the following pages, it is unclear whether the master or the follower got married. The context as well as the proper intonation accompanying it could provide the absent information:

In another example the reference of the pronoun is absent from the text; only common knowledge of the political and historical situation could provide the absent information:

"nalqāfī li-fīqrat al-qāsimiyā, tafarrajū ‘alā dālika l-muwākib, nazarī fih, lam ṭāqādī l-adḥ minhum, li-kašūm lam ‘arraf ṭādī minhum, li-kašūm anna marāḏī yīzīr al-fiqrārīyya ilā abī Mīr"

"Coming back to the Qāsimī’s, they saw this procession, they watched it, and found none of them [of their own clan] among its ranks, since he had informed none of them, since his will was to parade the power of the Fiqrārī’s."

Although the name of the person to whom he and his refer, which I have emphasized in the text, is not explicitly revealed, it should have been clear to anyone that it was Zayn al-Fiqrār, the leader of the victorious Fiqrārī faction.

It can be assumed that for the listener or the reader of the account during this period, the references were clear since the text is part of a living situation.

3.2.2 Asyndetic constructions have been observed to be a factor common to Middle and to colloquial Arabic (Hopkins 1984:228-236), but this feature has not been linked to the factor of orality. In what follows, I shall be more concerned with studying the asyndetic relation which can be observed in the junction between phrases, as well as the ellipsis (absence or omission) of argumentative elements.

i) ellipsis of argumentative elements:

"nahnu kāfīf min taraqīt 'askar wa-ra'īyya rāya baydā wa-ra'īyya hamārā"

"The people of Egypt, military as well as civilian, has been divided since early times into two factions, the red flag and the white flag."

In the original Arabic text, ‘'askar wa-ra'īyya can be interpreted not as an intermediate group of words defining more precisely the constitution of the people of Egypt, but as the two factions dividing the country. In the translation, the meaning is obtained by means of the punctuation marks.

3.2.3 Word order can also be a sign of orality in a written text. In the following examples focalization is no doubt one of the factors justifying the word order followed. I have intentionally preserved in the translation of these sentences, the word order of the original text:

"ahād as-sandūq sābihb wa-tawaghāb"

"He took the chest, its owner, and left"

"rattab al-hurb ‘Īwad būk"

"He prepared the battle, ‘Īwad būk"

4 Mu'tdhir is the term used to designate the sum of money to be paid to the woman in the case of an eventual divorce; mut'a designates the sum of money payed to the divorcee in compensation of the pleasure one has had with her.
Some passages of the text are difficult to understand because of the ambiguity of pronominal reference. The following examples are but a few among many in which it is almost impossible to understand the passage out of its context:

"wa-nargâ'ilâ ṣūr mân bek Du' l-Fiqâr ahad iqlim al-Manṣûra wa-arwaal laha Sâlih Kâfîf min taht yadhî arwaal sana wa-ũfî fî-qâriyya aṭawwâgu b-hânim bint 'Iwâd bek"

"To come back to Ṣūr mân bek Du' l-Fiqâr, he took over the region of Manṣûra and sent Sâlih Kâfîf to represent him the first year and on the second he married the daughter of 'Iwâd bek."

Without reading the following pages, it is unclear whether the master or the follower got married. The context as well as the proper intonation accompanying it would probably have removed the ambiguity from these written sentences.

In another example the reference of the pronoun is absent from the text; only common knowledge of the political and historical situation could provide the absent information:

"nargâ'ilâ iqlim al-qâsîmîyya, tfarrâqâ'ilâ l-dâlika l-matwâkih, nazarî šib, lam wâqî-du ahad minhum, li-kawunum lam 'arraf ahad minhum, li-kawun anna marâdih yuzbir al-fiqâriyya ilâ ahl Mîhr"

"Coming back to the Qâsîmî's, they saw this procession, they watched it, and found none of them [of their own clan] among its ranks, since he had informed none of them, since his will was to parade the power of the Fiqârî's."

Although the name of the person to whom he and his refer, which I have emphasized in the text, is not explicitly revealed, it should have been clear to anyone that it was Zayn Al-Fiqâr, the leader of the victorious Fiqârî faction.

It can be assumed that for the listener or the reader of the account during this period, the references were clear since the text is part of a living situation.

3.2.2 Asyndetic constructions have been observed to be a factor common to Middle Arabic (Hopkins 1984:228-236), but this feature has not been linked to colloquial Arabic (Hopkins 1984:228-236), but this feature has not been linked to the factor of orality. In what follows, I shall be more concerned with studying the asyndetic relation which can be observed in the junction between phrases, as well as the ellipsis (absence or omission) of argumentative elements.

i) ellipsis of argumentative elements:

"nahnu kayfa namliuk al-bâb min al-qâsîmîyya? Ahmad Bağdâdî sâhîdabâši wa-Gâlîb Halîl kaṭhâda la-waqt wa-Murâd Gâwîs bâyî al-mâl, wa-l-bâkîyîya min târâfîm?"

"How can we take over the military corps from the Qâsîmîyya if Ahmad Bağdâdî is baṭîdâbâši (chief of a military corps company), if Gâlîb Halîl is kaṭhâda (lieutenant), if Murâd Gâwîs is in charge of tax collection, and if the chief of the guard is on their side?"

The last example I shall give of asyndesis is, I believe, a very good illustration of the ambiguity which can result from a text closer to the code of speech than to the code of writing. Indeed, vocal communication relies on intonation as a vital element in the production of meaning; punctuation contributes only to a small degree to substitute for the role of intonation. The text of al-Qinâlî does not, of course, even bear the marks of punctuation. In some cases, the intelligibility of the text depends on restoring the intonation which we suppose accompanied the phrase, as is the case in the following example:

"kânat ahl Mîhr min qâdim az-zâmân fîrqatayn 'askar wa-ra'îyya ra'îyya bâyîdâ wa-ra'îyya bâyîmâ"

"The people of Egypt, military as well as civilian, has been divided since early times into two factions, the red flag and the white flag."

In the original Arabic text, 'askar wa-ra'îyya can be interpreted not as an intermediate group of words defining more precisely the constitution of the people of Egypt, but as the two factions dividing the country. In the translation, the meaning is obtained by means of the punctuation marks.

3.2.3 Word order can also be a sign of orality in a written text. In the following examples focalization is no doubt one of the factors justifying the word order followed. I have intentionally preserved in the translation of these sentences, the word order of the original text:

"ahad as-sanduq saḥîbu wa-tawaggah"

"He took the chest, its owner, and left"

"rattab al-harb 'Iwâd bek"

"He prepared the battle, 'Iwâd bek"

---

4 *Mu'ahhir* is the term used to designate the sum of money to be paid to the woman in the case of an eventual divorce; *muta* designates the sum of money paid to the divorcee in compensation of the pleasure one has had with her.

5 In the conflict between the Qâsîmî and the Fiqârî clans, the latter are plotting to take over the Janissary military corps, an obstacle remains: the main officers of the Janissaries are from the opposite clan.
"They opened the al-Hadid Gate, the water-sellers".

In all of the preceding examples the same word-order is followed, that is V-O-S. It is as if the sentences had been composed first as verbal phrases formed by a verb and an object, the subject then coming as an afterthought responding to a need for further precision. This structure is reminiscent of the oral behaviour in which information adds up as one talks, in some cases, by the addition of details while the utterance takes place.

3.2.4 In some cases, the notion of “sentence” is impossible to apply to the utterances of the Waq’i', just as is often the case in oral productions:

\[\text{nahmu qasidin as-sulh "alâ kulli hâl algâr min as-sarr jatavallad minhu alf-sâd} \]

“We ask for reconciliation, in any case better than evil, it engenders corruption”.

The phrases which constitute this utterance come as a series of successive elements, each dependent upon the previous. The notion of sentence is impossible to apply to it.

So from what has preceded it seems possible to prove that the text of al-Waqqā’i was orally transmitted and that in putting it down in a written form the oral features were not obliterated. 

Waqqā’i Misr al-Qahira is not a text written using the dialect, rather it is written in a variety of language where features of literary Arabic appearing do not respect the grammatical norms of this level. This variety is known as Middle Arabic; the particularity of this text, however, resides elsewhere, i.e. in the oral nature of its writing as I have tried to show. It shows a sample of layman writing much more authentically than does another better known text of the same period Hazz al-qubâf fi sarh qasid Abî Sadîf whose author al-Širbîni, was an Azhari capable of imitating and reproducing the local speech of the Mansûra area peasants while also mastering the literary language and the art of writing, while Mustaţâ Îbrahîm is an amateur, non-professional writer who writes as he would speak, using the same strategies, and very much the same manner.

4. al-Waqqā’i as folk literature in the social life of the period

If the chronicle considered was, as I have tried to show, of oral origin, one could then ask for whom and by whom it was performed. Who was al-Hâg Mustaţâ b. al-Hâg Îbrahîm? Was he a bard or a panegyrist as the title of al-Madâdh would suggest? If so, the question still remains partly unanswered. Because then, for whom was al-Qinâlî a madâdh, a panegyrist? Perhaps for the benefit of the Mamlûk emirs who represent the heroes of the narrative such as Ismâ’îl b. 'Iwad or Kuğûk Muhammad, the fair and righteous man whose deeds remind us of some episodes of the 1001 Nights? In her recent research, historian Nelly Hanna shows how various forms of cultural activities developed around individual Mamlûk households (Hanna forthcoming).

In any case al-Qinâlî’s inclination evidently went in favour of the Qâsimi rather than the Fiqârî group, and in this his attitude did not differ from that of the historian al-Qâbarî.

We can also say that he was close to the 'Azab military corps, the second in importance after the Inkişârîyya since he informs us that he was a follower of Hasan Ağa 'Azabân. It is also known that the 'Azab corps were in favour of the Qâsimîs in the great split we mentioned above. If close to the ranks of the 'Azab, his role was perhaps that of following the activity of the men of these corps and of telling their deeds and exploits in order to strengthen their courage and boost their morale for coming fights. So he might have been a military bard, and for that matter let me quote what Lord (1981) observed in the situation he studied, "that the singers do not seem to form a special class. They can belong to any group in society. The oral singer in Yugoslavia, is not marked by a social distinction; he is not an oral poet because he is a farmer or a shopkeeper or a bey. He can belong to the "folk, the merchant class or the aristocracy".

al-Qinâlî was perhaps an oral poet close to the military ranks and following their movement, telling his stories to military who gathered in cafés "situated near the citadel of Cairo which got much business from the soldiers". These soldiers and military would gather in the cafés and be entertained hearing the heroic acts of their seniors in the oğaq told by the storyteller. The audience could have been constituted by military men or generally by broader groups of the population of Cairo, artisans of the Qâsimî rank who used to gather in the cafés and listen to the stories telling the exploits of heroes, men such as Ismâ’îl b. 'Iwad who lived courageously and to whose death the poet could even claim to have been present at.

I have tried to answer the questions concerning the nature of the chronicles considered, their condition of production and the nature of the language used in them.

Another question, which will remain unanswered, concerns the audience of the chronicle. If it is to be considered as a piece of popular literature then one should expect to be able to define the public or audience to which it was addressed. This public or audience could have been very close to the military society since the story tells about the conflicts which most often turn into armed conflicts between the partisans of the two clans.

The view I suggest for the Damurdaşî chronicles should not be seen as an attempt to empty these chronicles from their historical interest or undermining their value as sources for the understanding of Egypt, as it has been said by Crecelius - historian .

6 Hatoux, 1982: 155 ff. See also Wiet 1969: 101 where it is said that in the area of Bayn al-Qasrayn: "De nombreuses réunions s’y tenaient pour écouter la lecture de pièces biographiques ou historiques, ou encore des récitations de poèmes...".
In all of the preceding examples the same word-order is followed, that is V-O-S. It is as if the sentences had been composed first as verbal phrases formed by a verb and an object, the subject then coming as an afterthought responding to a need for further precision. This structure is reminiscent of the oral behaviour in which information adds up as one talks, in some cases, by the addition of details while the utterance takes place.

3.2.4 In some cases, the notion of “sentence” is impossible to apply to the utterances of the Waqā‘ī’s, just as is often the case in oral productions:

naḥnu qāsidūn ʿasyūḥ ‘alā kullī bāl ʿalā yā mar ʿamār jātar walid luṭhayn fī al-fasād
“We ask for reconciliation, in any case better than evil, it engenders corruption”.

The phrases which constitute this utterance come as a series of successive elements, each dependent upon the previous. The notion of sentence is impossible to apply to it.

So from what has preceded it seems possible to prove that the text of al-Waqā‘ī’s was orally transmitted and that in putting it down in a written form the oral features were not obliterated.

Waqā‘ī’s Misr al-Qahira is not a text written using the dialect, rather it is written in a variety of language where features of literary Arabic appearing do not respect the grammatical norms of this level. This variety is known as Middle Arabic; the particularity of this text, however, resides elsewhere, i.e. in the oral nature of its writing as I have tried to show. It shows a sample of layman writing much more authentically than does another better known text of the same period Ḥazz al-qubāf fi šārī ṣaṣīd Abī Ṣādiq whose author al-Ṣirbini, was an Azhari capable of imitating and reproducing the local speech of the Mansūra area peasants while also mastering the literary language and the art of writing, while Mustafā Ibrāhim is an amateur, non-professional writer who writes as he would speak, using the same strategies, and very much the same method.

4. al-Waqā‘ī’s as folk literature in the social life of the period

If the chronicle considered was, as I have tried to show, of oral origin, one could then ask for whom and by whom it was performed. Who was al-Hāqq Mustafā b. al-Hāqq Ibrāhim? Was he a bard or a panegyrist as the title of al-Maḍāḥ would suggest? If so, the question still remains partly unanswered. Because then, for whom was al-Qinā’ī a maddah, a panegyrist? Perhaps for the benefit of the Mamlūk emirs who represent the heroes of the narrative such as Ismā‘īl b. Ṭawād or Kuğuk Muhammad, the fair and righteous man whose deeds remind us of some episodes of the 1001 Nights?

In her recent research, historian Nelly Hanna shows how various forms of cultural activities developed around individual Mamlūk households (Hanna forthcoming).

In any case al-Qinā’ī’s inclination evidently went in favour of the Qāsimi rather than the Fiṣārī group, and in this his attitude did not differ from that of the historian al-Ǧabarti.

We can also say that he was close to the ‘Azab military corps, the second in importance after the Inkišāriyya since he informs us that he was a follower of Ḥasan Ağa ‘Azabān. It is also known that the ‘Azab corps were in favour of the Qāsimis in the great split we mentioned above. If close to the ranks of the ‘Azab, his role was perhaps that of following the activity of the men of these corps and of telling their deeds and exploits in order to strengthen their courage and boost their morale for coming fights. So he might have been a military bard, and for that matter let me quote what Lord (1981) observed in the situation he studied, “that the singers do not seem to form a special class. They can belong to any group in society. The oral singer in Yugoslavia, is not marked by a social distinction; he is not an oral poet because he is a farmer or a shopkeeper or a bey. He can belong to the “folk, the merchant class or the aristocracy”.

al-Qinā’ī was perhaps an oral poet close to the military ranks and following their movement, telling his stories to militaries who gathered in cafés “situated near the citadel of Cairo which got much business from the soldiers”6. These soldiers and military men would gather in the cafés and be entertained hearing the heroic acts of their seniors in the qāṣf told by the storyteller. The audience could have been constituted by military men or generally by broader groups of the population of Cairo, artisans of the Qāsimi rank who used to gather in the cafés and listen to the stories telling of the exploits of heroes, men such as Ismā‘īl b. Ṭawād who lived courageously and to whose death the poet could even claim to have been present at.

I have tried to answer the questions concerning the nature of the chronicles considered, their condition of production and the nature of the language used in them.

Another question, which will remain unanswered, concerns the audience of the chronicle. If it is to be considered as a piece of popular literature then one should expect to be able to define the public or audience to which it was addressed. This public or audience could have been very close to the military society since the story tells about the conflicts which most often turn into armed conflicts between the partisans of the two clans.

The view I suggest for the Damurdās chronicles should not be seen as an attempt to empty these chronicles from their historical interest or undermining their value as sources for the understanding of Egypt, as it has been said by Crecelius – historian

6 Hattox 1982:155 ff. See also Wiet 1969:101 where it is said that in the area of Bayn al-Qasrayn: “De nombreuses réunions s’y tenaient pour écouter la lecture de pièces biographiques ou historiques, ou encore des récitations de poèmes...”
of Ottoman Egypt. — “The Damurdashi group of manuscripts written by the semilit­
erate men of the Odjaqs are actually a major source for al-Jabarti’s history, and for
the history of Ottoman Egypt” (Crecelius 1989:8). As he puts it, these sources “ought
to be given greater importance”. Viewing the function of these texts as elements of
folk literature could add to the information we have on the period of the second half
of the 17th century, since this understanding can shed light on the inclination of the
people at whose intention these texts were composed and told, their views and their
passion.
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All of us are familiar with the phenomenon of the author of a collection of poetry, or prose and poetry — a so-called adab book — making changes in a line of poetry. The fact is even more common among the rāwīs, the earliest transmitters of poetry. Such changes may result in what in western textual criticism is known as the lectio facilior, “the easier reading”.

Sometimes such interventions may be useful in the sense that they give us an indication of how the line of poetry should be interpreted, but it goes without saying that caution is necessary. The rāwī or the collector may have misinterpreted the line; or, what is worse, he may not understand the line and wilfully change a word or two to make the text intelligible to himself, or even to make it conform to his taste. This is, I think, what happened to two sets of two lines which I intend to discuss in this short note.

I

A. There exists a contemporary collection of poems by Ibn Raṣiq (390-456 or 463 / 1000-1065/64 or 1070/71) which goes under the title Diwan Ibn Raṣiq. It quotes the following two lines (basit) (Ibn Raṣiq, Diwan 24, no. 4):

B. Among as-Silafi’s (ca. 478/1086-576/1181) biographies of Spanish scholars and poets¹ we find a different text. The poem is again attributed to Ibn Raṣiq:

The second line is the same in all versions I am going to quote. Its Biblical and Quranic allusions speak for themselves and need no further explanation. I will therefore limit myself from now on to a discussion of the first line.

¹ In the partial edition by Ihsan ʿAbbās: as-Silafi, Muʿgam 98, no 62.
C. In Ibn Dihya’s (d. 633/1236) *Mutrib*, we find these two lines in the following form and once more attributed to Ibn Rasiq (Ibn Dihya, *Mutrib* 65):

> وأمر بعض الملوك ابن رشيق بركوب البحر فلاكذ ماذا السهر. 

Ibn Dihya does not specify to whom these lines were addressed. The editors quote, in a footnote, texts which claim that they were the poet’s reply to al-Muctamid b. cAbbad (d. 487/1095). Also interesting is another footnote by the editor which explains: *arr-rā’ ay arra’ay*.

D. Ibn Hallikan (d. 681/1282) quotes the poem in the following form:

> امرتني بركوب البحر في عَجْل غَيْرِ فَذِيَّة فَفَضَّلَهَا بِذَا الْرَّاء

In Ibn Hallikan there is question of an invitation by al-Muctamid b. cAbbad addressed, not to Ibn Rasiq, but to two other poets, to the blind poet Abu 1-Hasan cAli al-Husri (420/1029-488/1095) who left Qayrawan, lived in Ceuta, later in Spain, and died in Tangiers, and to Abu l-cArab as-Siqilli (423/1032-after 507/1113). The above reply is attributed to al-Husri; Abu l-cArab sends his own reply. al-Husri’s story ends as follows:

> وقد عصمت فماضي غرباً ناً إلى الْرَّاء

It is worth noting, however, that in the edition by Ihsan cAbbas of the *Wafayat* (III, 333-334) the reading *bi-dā d-dā‘* is adopted.  

---


4 See *EP*, III, 640a-641a; Ibn Bassām (d. 542/1144), *Dahira*, VII, 245-283; ‘Imādaddin (d. 597/1201), *Harida* II, 186-187 (no 40); ḥa‘ī‘ poem on Abū l-cArab al-Siqilli; as-Safādī (d. 764/1363), *Wafī* XXI, 249-251. The monograph on al-Husri mentions the second of the two lines (al-Marzūqī & al-Gilānī 1963: introduction, 41), but the section on al-Husri’s poetry does not have either of the two lines.

5 After 450 according to al-Humaydi (d. 488/1096), *Nahda* 296.

6 Abū l-cHasan ‘Alī al-Husri is not to be confused with Abū 1-Ishaq Ibrahim al-Husri, the author of the *Zahr al-adab*.

7 as-Safādī (d. 764/1363) quotes the story from Ibn Hallikan (as-Safādī, *Wafī* XXI, 250-251) and in his *Nahda* 214. The editors read in both cases ḥa‘ī‘ d-dā‘ā‘.

---

The second poet, Abū l-cArab as-Siqilli, according to Ibn Hallikan, replies in the following way. He argues that the sea belongs to the Rūm and the mainland (ḥarr) to the Arabs. This reply is worth quoting:

> إِلَّا عَلَى غَرْرِ الْجَمِيعِ بِهَذَا الْرَّاء

E. We find the two lines of the ḥa‘ī‘ poem in al-Dhabi’s (d. 748/1374), *Sīyār* (XIX, 26-27) in the biography of al-Husri:

> وكان المعتد بن عَجْل، بعد ذلك بعض من دُلُوَّه على كُتبه: 

F. In the *Tiraż al-magālīs* (22) by a much later author, Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-H-aftāği (d. 1069/1659), the ḥa‘ī‘ is attributed to Ibn Rasiq:

> وقد عصمت فماضي غرباً ناً إلى الْرَّاء

We have two more versions found in relatively modern collections which offer no further information. They attribute the lines to Ibn Hamdis and Abū Ishaq (sic) al-Husri.

G. In a modern collection (al-Azhari 1986 I, 13) we find the same lines, this time attributed to Ibn Hamdis (447/1055-527/1132) with the following introduction:

> كانَ فِي وُثُوقِ الأُمَامِ بِهِ جُمُودُ كَأَنِ يُسَافِر بِهِ ... فَفَضَّلَهَا بِذَا الْرَّاءُ

In a footnote the author observes that the two lines are not part of the *Diwan*; but the *Diwan* (533-534) quotes two other poems by Ibn Hamdis in the same vein as we shall see later.

H. Ibn al-Hatib (d. 776/1375) attributes the lines to Abū Ishaq al-Husri:

> جَمَعُ الْعَصُمَتِ فَماضي غرباً ناً إلى الْرَّاء
C. In Ibn Dihya’s (d. 633/1236) *Mutrib* we find these two lines in the following form and once more attributed to Ibn Rāṣiq (Ibn Dihya, *Mutrib* 65):

> وأمر بعض الملوك ابن راشق بركوب البحر فحالة بهذا الشعر: 
> أميرتي بركوب البحر في عجل 
> غيري فخيصره هذا الراء.

Ibn Dihya does not specify to whom these lines were addressed. The editors quote, in a footnote, texts which claim that they were the poet’s reply to a request by al-Mu’tamid b. cAbbad (d. 487/1095). Also interesting is another footnote by the editor which explains: *arrā’* *ay arrā’*.

D. Ibn Hallikān (d. 681/1282) quotes the poem in the following form:

> أميرتي بركوب البحر أقطعه 
> غيري لك الخبر فخارصة هذا الداء.

In Ibn Hallikān there is question of an invitation by al-Mu’tamid b. cAbbad addressed, not to Ibn Rāṣiq, but to two other poets, to the blind poet Abu 1-Hasan cAli al-Husri (420/1029-488/1095) who left Qayrawan, lived in Ceuta, later in Spain, and died in Tangiers, and to Abu l-cArab as-Siqilli (423/1032-after 507/1113). The above reply is attributed to al-Husri; Abu l-cArab sends his own reply. al-Husri’s story ends as follows:

> ثم دخل الالانس بعد ذلك وامتدت المعتمد وغيره.

It is worth noting, however, that in the edition by Ihsān cAbbas of the *Wafayat* (III, 333-334) the reading *باذا الداء* is adopted.

---

2 See *EF*, VII, 766a-768a.
4 See *EF*, III, 640a-641a; Ibn Bassām (d. 542/1144), *Dawla*, VII, 245-283; 1mādishin (d. 597/1201), *Harida* II, 186-187 (no 40); ḫaṭī poem on Abu l-cArab as-Siqilli; as-Safādī (d. 764/1363), *Wafī* XXI, 249-251. The monograph on al-Husri mentions the second of the two lines (al-Marzūqī & al-Gilānī 1963: introduction, 41), but the section on al-Husri’s poetry does not have either of the two lines.
5 After 450 according to al-Humaydi (d. 488/1096), *Gawza* 296.
6 Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali al-Husri is not to be confused with Abu Ishaq ʿAbraham al-Husri, the author of the *Zahr al-adab*.
7 as-Safādī (d. 764/1363) quotes the story from Ibn Hallikān (as-Safādī, *Wafī* XXI, 250-251) and in his *Nakt* 214. The editors read in both cases *biḏā dāda*.
The translation (164, no. 671) agrees with this version. In the *fihrist al-qawafî*, however, we find *bi-da' r-ra'yi*.

I. But a third late text must also be considered, since its author is a famous scholar. This text is the *Tāq* (I 256b-257a) by az-Zabîdî (d. 1205/1791) which in the entry *râ*: *waaw-râ* states the following:

وأَنفَدُ شَيْخَا: 
أُرِئَتِ كَبُرُوبُ الْبَحْرِ أَرْكِبَ 
غَرِيِّرِ لِكَ الخَيْرِ فَخَاصِصَهُ بِهِ الْوَرَاءَ 
قَلَتْ أَمْ بَعْضُ الْبَعْضِ حَسِنُ علَى بَعْضٍ علَى الْغَلِيْقِ السَّفِرُ الْخَرَّ بِالْمَسْتَرَبِ أَيْنَ خَالِقُ الْحَسَنِ صَاحِبُ زَرْعُ الْأَدَابِ: وأَمَّا الْأَدوَى فَفَخَاصَصَهُ بِهِ الْيَدِ الْبَالَدَةِ الْمِهْلَكَةِ لِلْيَوْمِ كَمَا زَعِمَ شَيْخَا فَشُكَّ عَلَيْهِ مَا مَدَأَ

Possible translations of I

Before going any further we must decide which of the nine versions has the original text. This is not particularly difficult when it comes to the last word in the first line, *arrâ'i* or *ad-dâ'i*. The disaster — the *dâ* — would refer to the dangers of the sea journey, and it is therefore easy to see that somebody would have preferred this as a better reading. On the other hand I do not find that the other variants, such as *fa-bahshu* change the meaning of the line materially.

1. The only variant of real importance, therefore, is the reading *bi-da' r-ra'yi* which could, of course, simply be translated as 'this idea'. Indeed, the editor of the *Mutrib* believes that *hâdâ r-ra'yi* stands for *hâdâ r-ra'yi*, 'this view'11 which, with some stretching of the usual translations ('opinion, view'), one could translate as 'this idea', 'this project'.

But I feel that one should also look for other interpretations of *ar-râyi* which I strongly believe is the original reading.

2. It should be noted that both Ibn Manzûr's *Lisân* and Zabîdî's *Tāq* quote the following observation by Abû 1-Hayyâm (d. 276/889)12: *ar-râ* *zabad al-bahr*, but then quote a line intended as a *sâhid* for the term *râ* in the sense of 'foam on the mouth of a horse'13. Does this mean that there is sufficient reason to consider seriously that *râ* stands for 'foam of the sea'? Would Ibn Rašiq or al-Husri, or whoever composed these two lines, have been aware of this meaning which clearly belongs in the *garîb* category? If so, would they feel inclined to use *râ* in the sense of 'foam' in a playful poem, a poem intended as a joke?14 Perhaps they would, but only if the joke were addressed to a poet-scholar (an *adîb* in the wider sense of the word) who was thoroughly familiar with the dictionary. If that were the case, we could consider the following translation: "Find somebody else to venture on that foam".

3. One could also argue that Ibn Rašiq (if he is indeed the author of the lines) vented his anger over the unwelcome invitation by vituperating the five *râ*s in the first hemistich, if one reads *mušâgîrâtan*; or the two *râ* or *rukab al-bahr*15 if one adopts one of the other readings, the more so since, whatever reading is correct, the second hemistich is a reply to the first and because this first hemistich, taken by itself, states the problem clearly. Unless *râ* is intended as a synonym of *marân* 'view' or rather '[frightening] view' — for which I have no evidence — I would translate the first line of as-Sîlafi's version as follows:

"You ordered me to ride on the sea making me suffer [its] perils. Find someone else! then order him to submit to [all these words with] the letter *ra*", or:

"Find someone else; then order him to venture on that foamy seal!"

The theme of the poem is not unique; our *qî'a* appears in the context of poems on the same theme by Ibn Hamdis (*Diwân* 533):16

11 See Wright 1962 II, 376B.

12 For Abû 1-Hayyâm (d. 276/889) see GAS VIII, 160-161. He seems to have been used by al-Azhâri in his *Tabâjîb*. The same observation appears in al-Ḥâlîl, *Târyîf* 29: *al-qurâd as-sâ'îf* [wac-rasul al-ad-dajf] [fas-râ' zabâd al-bahr aydan]; but the last of the three interpretations appears only in two late manuscripts of this brief treatise and may therefore be an addition of much later date.

13 *Zabad* is a common term for 'foam, froth, scum' that applies also to the foam of the sea, cf. Ibn Manzûr, *Lisân* III, 193a.

14 The foaming of the sea appears as a simile in a line by Ibn Ḥamdis, *Diwân* 141, l. 2, no. 88.

15 There would be four if one reads *ar-ka-why* with l. 1.

16 For the reference to an *âya* in the following poem, see Qur'an 16:14, 17:66, 45:12.

17 See Ibn Čubayr (539/540-634 / 1146-1218), *Riba* 315; al-Maqârrî (d. 1041/1632), *Nafl* l, 33. This same *qî'a* as, well as the preceding one by Ibn Ḥamdis, appears in *an-Nuwayrî* (d. 732/1332), *Nihâya* l, 255. Both Ibn Čubayr and al-Maqârrî give the line anonymously. In al-Ḥâlîl's *Târyîf* and Ibn Ḥamdis's *Diwân*, however, it is explicitly attributed to Ibn Rašiq.
The translation (164, no. 671) agrees with this version. In the *fihrist al-qawafi*, however, we find *bi-dā ṭarāʿī*.

I. But a third late text must also be considered, since its author is a famous scholar. This text is the Ṭāq (I 256b-257a) by az-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1791) which in the entry *rāʾ wāw-yaʿ* states the following:

وأَنفَذَ سِيَحُنَّا
أَمَّرَنَا بِكُرُوبِ الْبَحْرِ أَرْكِبْهُ
لِلْخِيْرِ فَاخْضَصْهُ بِهِ الْرَّاءُ
فَلَتَ أَمْثَلَ فَلُكَفُّ الْحَسَنِ ٢
عِنْدَ الْفِتَّانِ العَنْدِيَّ الْمَفْرَجِ لِلْشَّرِّيْرِ بِأَنَّهَا خَالِئَةٌ أَي
إِسْحَاقُ الْحَسَنِ صَاحِبُ زِهْرُ الْاَدْابِ فَأَعْلَى فَاخْضَصُهُ بِهِ الْدَّاءُ بِالْدَاءِ الْمَهْمِلُ أَلَّا
بِالْرَّاءِ كَمَا زَعْمَهُ سِيَحُنَّا فَإِنْذَرَ عَلَى مَا قَدَّمَهَا

possible translations of I

Before going any further we must decide which of the nine versions has the original text. This is not particularly difficult when it comes to the last word in the first line, *ar-rāʾī* or *ad-dāʾī*. The disaster — the dāʾ — would refer to the dangers of the sea journey, and it is therefore easy to see that somebody would have preferred this as a better reading. On the other hand I do not find that the other variants, such as *fa-husnū* change the meaning of the line materially.

1. The only variant of real importance, therefore, is the reading *bi-dā ṭarāʿī* which could, of course, simply be translated as 'this idea'. Indeed, the editor of the *Mutrib* believes that *hādā ṭarāʾī* stands for *hādā ṭarāʾyi* 'this view'11 which, with some stretching of the usual translations ('opinion', 'view'), one could translate as 'this idea', 'this project'.

But I feel that one should also look for other interpretations of *ar-rāʾī* which I strongly believe is the original reading.

2. It should be noted that both Ibn Manzūr's *Lisān* and Zabīdī's *Ṭāq* quote the following observation by Abū 1-Hayyām (d. 276/889):12 *ar-rāʾī zabād al-bahr*, but then quote a line intended as a *ṣabīd* for the term *rāʾ* in the sense of 'foam on the mouth of a horse'.13 Does this mean that there is sufficient reason to consider seriously that *rāʾ* stands for 'foam of the sea'? Would Ibn Rašiq or al-Husrī, or whoever composed

---

11 See Wright 1962 II, 376B.
12 For Abū 1-Hayyām (d. 276/889) see GAS VIII, 160-161. He seems to have been used by al-Azhārī in his *Taḥṣīl*. The same observation appears in al-Ḥalīl, *ṣarraf 29*: *al-qurān as-sagīf* [va-rāʾūd al-dāʾif] [fuṣūl rāʾ zabād al-bahr aydan]; but the last of the three interpretations appears only in two late manuscripts of this brief treatise and may therefore be an addition of much later date.
13 *Zabād* is a common term for 'foam, froth, scum' that applies also to the foam of the sea, cf. Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān* III, 193a.

---

these two lines, have been aware of this meaning which clearly belongs in the *gārīb* category? If so, would they feel inclined to use *rāʾ* in the sense of 'foam' in a playful poem, a poem intended as a joke?15 Perhaps they would, but only if the joke were addressed to a poet-scholar (an adīb in the wider sense of the word) who was thoroughly familiar with the dictionary. If that were the case, we could consider the following translation: "Find somebody else to venture on that foam".

3. One could also argue that Ibn Rašiq (if he is indeed the author of the lines) vented his anger over the unwelcome invitation by vituperating the five *rāʾ*’s in the first hemistich, if one reads *maṣūrāturan*; or the two *rāʾ*’s of *raḥīb al-bahr*15 if one adopts one of the other readings, the more so since, whatever reading is correct, the second hemistich is a reply to the first and because this first hemistich, taken by itself, states the problem clearly. Unless *rāʾ* is intended as a synonym of marān ‘view’ or rather ‘[frightening] view’ — for which I have no evidence — I would translate the first line of as-Sīfī’s version as follows:

“You ordered me to ride on the sea making me suffer [its] perils.
Find someone else! then order him to submit to [all these words with] the letter *rāʾ*”,

or:

“Find someone else; then order him to venture on that foamy sea!”

The theme of the poem is not unique; our *qīrā* appears in the context of poems on the same theme by Ibn Hamdis (*Dīwān* 533):

١١ ْلا أرَكِبُ الْبَحْرِ هُوْا
١٢ ْطِينَ أَنَا وَهُوَ مَاءٌ
وَبِلِبِّ الرِّجَالِ
١٣ ْوَعَدَتْهُ كَأَنَّهَا رَكِبَتْ
١٤ ْأَيَّا رَبَّ أَنَّ الْطِينَ قَدَّرَ الْمَاءَ

Ibn Hamdis also lists, on this theme, a second *qīrā* by Ibn Rašiq:

١٥ ْلا رَكِبْتُ حَاجَتُيْ لِيْهِ
١٦ ْفَضُّ عِنْسَانُ عِيْنِيْهِ
١٧ ْالْبَحْرِ صَبْعِ العَمَّانِ مِثْر
١٨ ْأَيِّسَ مَا وَقَنَطْتُ مِنْ عِيْنٖ

---

14 The foaming of the sea appears as a simile in a line by Ibn Ḥamdīs, *Dīwān* 141, l. 2, no. 88.
15 There would be four if one reads *arkuswā* with I.
16 For the reference to an *āya* in the following poem, see Qurʾān 16:14, 17:66, 45:12.
17 See Ibn Ḫubayr (539/540.634 / 1146-1218), *Rihla* 315; al-Maqṣūrī (d. 1041/1632), *Nafḥ* I, 33. This same *qīrā*, as well as the preceding one by Ibn Ḥamdīs, appears in an-Nuwayrī (d. 732/1332), *Nihāya* I, 255. Both Ibn Ḫubayr and al-Maqṣūrī give the line anonymously. In al-Ḥalīl’s *Taḥṣīl* and Ibn Ḥamdīs’s *Dīwān*, however, it is explicitly attributed to Ibn Rašiq.
Further examples on the same theme by Ibn Ḥamdis and Ibn Raṣiq may be found in al-Hafagl (d. 1069/1659), biographies Ibn Raṣiq, Abu l-cArab and Ibn Hamdis are credited with poems about the miseries of sea travel.

Yet this may not exhaust the translations of ar-ra’i that could be suggested. I observed earlier that other variants such as fāshushu bi-dā r-ra’i ‘choose him for’, select him for ...’ do not help us to determine the correct interpretation. I am not aware of any symbolic meaning of the ra’, but this letter, as we will see next, is used in similes for something curved, by which ‘the waves’ may be intended. In Dozy 1925:493a one finds that the ra’ stands for ‘something bent’ (allusion à ce qui est courbe, [le] saumon). Could ‘something bent’ be a proverbial phrase indicating something unpleasant? Or could the ra’ be taken as a simile describing the — curved — waves of the sea? The term rukīb ‘ubādīb ‘riding his waves, billows, or surges’ (cf. Lane 1863-93:1932) is in the poem by Ibn Ḥamdis lends perhaps some support to this interpretation; but one could claim as well that it supports the interpretation of the ra’ as referring to rukīb al-babr.

We have a similar case in a poem found in as-Ta’ālibī’s work (d. 429/1038) Mutrib, where we read the following. The theme is now different, but in some respects more difficult. The poem is attributed to Ibn al-Muṭazz:

In the older edition of as-Ta’ālibī’s work the editor offers in a footnote the following explanation:

The editor of the later edition does not agree; he repeats the explanation of the old edition, but adds: wa-arā annabhu min ra’ihi.

If one follows the suggestion by the first editor a better solution would be to think of the letter ra’ as the first letter of riqq, ‘slavery’, that is: “... the heart of his lover partakes of his status as a slave”. I did not find these two lines in the partial edition of the Divān of Ibn Muctazz by Lewin, nor in the old Cairo edition.

B. However, Ibn Abī ‘Awn, Taḥḥānah 98, likewise attributes the lines to Ibn al-Muṭazz, but he reads: qatla mubībbī min da’ibi for qalb mubībbī min ra’ibi. Of course this may be an error on the part of a copyist. If one reads min da’ibi the phrase could mean: “The death of his lover will be brought about by love sickness for this beloved dressed in blue”. Another variant is sabīta liwam samā’ībi.

The following quotations show more such variants in the second line; they do not significantly change the meaning of the qī’ta and can therefore be disregarded. Invariably the lines are attributed to Ibn al-Muṭazz.

C. A late author, al-Muḥibbī (1061-1111), Naṣfa I, 303, reads qatil for qalb and wa-bnafṣāgī l-lavmi, but lets the line end on min ra’ibi. The context deals with the colour of the sky. A footnote refers to Ibn Basām (Ḍabīḥa, ed. al-Abbādī & al-Ṣāzmān, 1/2 37) where it ends on min dābībī (= min da’ibī) and min saḥābībī thereby completely altering the sense of the two lines. Both variants clearly show that even in the Middle Ages the first of the two lines was considered unintelligible by some philologists.

87 See also as-Silafi, Muʿjam 68: One ‘Abdalhamid b. Muhammad al-Balaqī meets as-Silafi in Alexandria after stating that he was born in 487, and was ḥajj in Tilimsan, he mentions that he met Abū l-cArab in Majorca; the note on p. 137-138 mentions that al-Walid b. Ismail al-Gafiqi met Abu l-cArab in Spain and heard him recite two lines of poetry, the first of which was the line quoted here.


20 as-Ta’ālibī, Mutrib 87, ed. al-Mallahī, I, 127.

21 See also as-Silafi, Muʿjam 68: One ‘Abdalhamid b. Muhammad al-Balaqī meets as-Silafi in Alexandria after stating that he was born in 487, and was ḥajj in Tilimsan, he mentions that he met Abū l-cArab in Majorca; the note on p. 137-138 mentions that al-Walid b. Ismail al-Gafiqi met Abu l-cArab in Spain and heard him recite two lines of poetry, the first of which was the line quoted here.

22 So far I have not found the poem in other texts by as-Ta’ālibī.

23 But in the appendix of the edition of as-Sāmaraʾī’s (Ibn al-Muṭazz, ʿArrī) we find the following: wa-qīla fi gula ʿalayhi dībaq garmī ... Follows the text as in as-Ṣāmaraʾī (see below).
Further examples on the same theme by Ibn Hamdis and Ibn Raṣīq may be found in al-Hafagl (d. 1069/1659), biographies of Abu l-cArab and Ibn Hamdis are credited with poems about the miseries of sea travel.

Yet this may not exhaust the translations of ar-ra'ī that could be suggested. I observed earlier that other variants such as fa-hushu bi-dār r-ra'ī 'choose him for', 'select him for'... do not help us to determine the correct interpretation. I am not aware of any symbolic meaning of the ra', but this letter, as we will see next, is used in similes for something curved, by which 'the waves' may be intended. In Dozy 1925:493a one finds that the ra' stands for 'something bent' (allusion à ce qui est courbe, [le] saumon). Could 'something bent' be a proverbial phrase indicating something unpleasant? Or could the ra' be taken as a simile describing the — curved — waves of the sea? The term rukīb 'ubdībī 'riding his waves, billows, or surges' (cf. Lane 1863-93:1932)20 in the poem by Ibn Hamdis lends perhaps some support to this interpretation; but one could claim as well that it supports the interpretation of the ra' as referring to rukīb al-babar21.

We have a similar case in a poem found in at-Ta'ālībī (d. 429/1038) Mutrib22, where we read the following. The theme is now different, but in some respects more difficult. The poem is attributed to Ibn al-Mu'tazz:

A.

In the older edition of at-Ta'ālībī’s work the editor offers in a footnote the following explanation:

The editor of the later edition does not agree; he repeats the explanation of the old edition, but adds: wa-ara annahu min ra'yihi.

If one follows the suggestion by the first editor a better solution would be to think of the letter ra' as the first letter of riqq, 'slavery', that is: "... the heart of his lover partakes of his status as a slave". I did not find these two lines in the partial edition of the Divān of Ibn Mu'tazz by Lewin, nor in the old Cairo edition23.

B. However, Ibn Abī 'Awān, Taḥbīḥ 98, likewise attributes the lines to Ibn al-Mu'tazz, but he reads: qalb muḥbibbi min da'ibhi for qalb muḥbibbi min ra'ibi. Of course this may be an error on the part of a copyist. If one reads min da'ibhi the phrase could mean: "The death of his lover will be brought about by love sickness for this beloved dressed in blue". Another variant is sulūṣa lāw samā'ibi. The following quotations show more such variants in the second line; they do not significantly change the meaning of the qī'a and can therefore be disregarded. Invariably the lines are attributed to Ibn al-Mu'tazz.

C. A late author, al-Muhībbī (1061-1111), Nafṣa I, 303, reads qatīl for qalb and wa-banaṣṣaṣṣi l-lawami, but lets the line end on min ra'ibi. The context deals with the colour of the sky. A footnote refers to Ibn Bassām (Maḥiya, ed. al-Abbādi & al-Aẓzām, I/2 37) where it ends on min ḍabībi (= min da'ibhi) and min saḥābībi thereby completely altering the sense of the two lines. Both variants clearly show that even in the Middle Ages the first of the two lines was considered unintelligible by some philologists.

---

18 See also as-Silāfī, Muṣfam 68: One 'Abdalhamīd b. Muḥammad al-Balāghī meets as-Silāfī in Alexandria; after stating that he was born in 487, and was ḥārī in Tilīmān, he mentions that he met Abū l-cArab in Majorca; the note on p. 137-138 mentions that al-Walīd b. Ismā'īl al-Gafīqī met Abu l-cArab in Spain and heard him recite two lines of poetry, the first of which was the line quoted here.


20 An interesting example of curves appearing on the surface of the sea in a different way is Ibn Hānī, Divān 818 quoted from an-Nuwayrī, Nasīṣa I, 257.

21 at-Ta'ālībī, Mutrib 87, ed. al-Mallāḥī, I, 127.

22 So far I have not found the poem in other texts by at-Ta'ālībī.

23 But in the appendix of the edition of as-Sāmarrāʾī (Ibn al-Mu'tazz, Šīr) we find the following: wa-qīla fi qulām 'alābihi dibāṣ ṣārīmi ... Follows the text as in al-Širī (see below).
D. The edition by Ihsân ‘Abbâs of the *Dahîra* of Ibn Bassâm again reads *qatlu mubahibbi min râ‘ibi*.

E. In aš-Šarâ‘î’s (d. 620/1222) *Ṣarb* (ed. Hafâqî I, 62) the author quotes the first line in the following way:

> قال ابن المعتمز في غلام عليه ذبيب بنفسجى: ومبهسبى الكوب قتل محببى من حاله

omitting the second line.

F. In aš-Šarâ‘î, *Ṣarb* (ed. 1306, I, 43) we find:

> ومبهسبى الكوب قتل محببى من دانه لأن صرت الورد إذ أثبت لون سمائه

Possible translations of II

One could suggest the following translations of the second example, some of which may be worth considering, while others may be too far fetched to be worth mentioning:

1. Again I feel that one must think first of *min râ‘ibi* as another way of writing *min ra‘yihi*, a *darâra*, the pronoun of *ra‘yibi* referring to *banafsâqiyyi t-tawbi* and interpret:

    There is this beloved clad in a violet coloured garment (or: Oh, you, my friend draped in a garment colour violet!) From (that is: as a result of) seeing him [thus attired], the heart of his lover [feels/thinks]

    Now you have become the full moon [your face being like the full moon] since you are cloaked in its blue sky, or:

    The heart of his lover, following what it sees, [thinks, that is: says, prompted by his imagination]

    Now you have become...

But taking into account the perplexity of the mediaeval scholars over the idiom *min râ‘ibi*, there are other possibilities that may have to be considered.

2. Again: *min râ‘ibi* stands for *min ra‘yi qalbi muhibbihi*.  

Oh, you (my friend) dressed in a garment colour violet on whom the heart of his lover depends! (that is: the heart of his lover cannot live without seeing him)

Now you have become the full moon since you are cloaked in its blue “sky”, or:

The heart of his lover, following what it sees, [thinks, that is: says, prompted by his imagination]

Now you have become...

3. Keeping in mind that blue is a colour associated with sadness:

    There is this beloved dressed in a violet coloured garment. The heart (that is: the mood) of his lover, as a result of seeing his [blue] garment [becomes sombre and thinks]

    Since you have become the full moon being cloaked in its blue sky [I have lost you forever].

4. Ibn ‘Abdrabbih (*Iqd* VI, 475) quotes a line by an anonymous *muḥdât* poet in which the ‘lock of hair’, the *sudâq*, is compared to the râ’

    With this in mind we could translate our line:

    ... The heart of whose lover belongs to, depends on, (that is: the lover admires) his lock of hair [and thinks]:

    Now you have become...

5. A free translation following the same interpretation would be:

    ... The heart is in love with him because of his lock of hair [and thinks]:

    Now you have become...

6. Finally one may think of the râ’ as a letter that a slave born in a foreign country cannot pronounce and therefore neglects or replaces with other letters. This would yield the following:

    ... The heart of whose lover is attached to his slave’s râ’ which has become a cause of endearment (or: which he has come to like), or even:

    ... The heart of whose lover is attached to [something missing that is:] the letter râ’. [Not seeing his slave he thinks]:

    Now you have become...

Strange though this last interpretation may seem at first, it is nevertheless supported by examples in Ibn Bassâm’s *Dahîra* (I, 308-309), Ibn Hallikân’s *Wafâyât* (ed. ‘Abdal-hamid, V, 61-62, VI, 226 = ed. ‘Abbâs, VI, 8-9, VII, 227), and as-Safâ‘î’s *Nusra* (240).

24 Vol. III, 231 of the same edition quotes the second of the two lines in the context of verses on the moon contrasting with the bluish sky.

25 I owe these references to my colleague, Prof. G. J. Kanazi.

26 Or, reading *alhtâta*, “Now you have become/have been transformed into the moon since you have been made to wear (i.e.: you are dressed in) the colour of its sky.”

27 For *min* in the sense of ‘as a result of’ see Nöldeke 1963:143b, additions to 54, 1, fn. 56.

28 al-Azîl (*Garîb* 150-153) mentions *ar-rây*, a fish found in the Nile. As far as I know there are no similes relating this fish to part of the human face. For Persian literature, see Zand 1977.
D. The edition by Ihsan 'Abbās of the Dāhīra of Ibn Bassām again reads qatl muhibbi min rā'ihi.24

E. In as-Sarśli's (d. 620/1222) Sarb (ed. Hafagī I, 62) the author quotes the first line in the following way:

omitting the second line.

F. In as-Sarśli, Sarb (ed. 1306, I, 43) we find25:

Possible translations of II

One could suggest the following translations of the second example, some of which may be worth considering, while others may be too far fetched to be worth mentioning:

1. Again I feel that one must think first of min rā'ihi as another way of writing min ra'yihib, the pronoun of ra'yib referring to banafsagiyyi t-tawbi and interpret:

There is this beloved clad in a violet coloured garment (or: Oh, my friend draped in a garment colour violet!) From (that is: as a result of) seeing him [thus attired], the heart of his lover [feels/thinks]27.

Now you have become the full moon [your face being like the full moon] since you are cloaked in its blue sky, or:

The heart of his lover, following what it sees, [thinks, that is: says, prompted by his imagination]
Now you have become...

3. Keeping in mind that blue is a colour associated with sadness:

There is this beloved dressed in a violet coloured garment. The heart (that is: the mood) of his lover, as a result of seeing his [blue] garment [becomes sombre and thinks]27.

Since you have become the full moon being cloaked in its blue sky [I have lost you forever].

4. Ibn 'Abdrabbih (Iqd VI, 475) quotes a line by an anonymous muḥdāt poet in which the 'lock of hair', the sudg, is compared to the rā':

With this in mind we could translate our line:

... The heart is in love with him because of his lock of hair [and thinks]:
Now you have become ...

5. A free translation following the same interpretation would be:

... The heart is in love with him because of his lock of hair [and thinks]:
Now you have become ...

6. Finally one may think of the rā' as a letter that a slave born in a foreign country cannot pronounce and therefore neglects or replaces with other letters. This would yield the following:

... The heart of whose lover is attached to his slave's rā' which has become a cause of endearment (or: which he has come to like),
or even:

... The heart of whose lover is attached to [something missing that is:] the letter rā'. [Not seeing his slave he thinks]:
Now you have become ...

Strange though this last interpretation may seem at first, it is nevertheless supported by examples in Ibn Bassām's Dāhīra (I, 308-309), Ibn Hallikan's Wafayat (ed. 'Abdal-ḥamid, V, 61-62, VI, 226 = ed. 'Abbās, VI, 8-9, VII, 227), and as-Safadi's Nusra (240).

24 Vol. III, 231 of the same edition quotes the second of the two lines in the context of verses on the moon contrasting with the bluish sky.
25 I owe these references to my colleague, Prof. G. J. Kanazi.
26 Or, reading albhata, "Now you have become/have been transformed into the moon since you have been made to wear (i.e.: you are dressed in) the colour of its sky."
I limit myself to an example by ar-Ramāḍī where the ra' stands apparently for the slave himself:

لا الراء تتمتع في الوصل ولا أنا
فإذا خلوته فثبت في حديثي
فكم على أن الراء

and a line on the next page of the Dahira by Abū l-Qāsim b. al-Ārīf (d. 395/1004) said to be inspired by ar-Ramāḍī and again addressed to an al-tāg (I quote the second of three lines):

فهمك الراء مثل حري صواب

Since I do not find enough evidence to support any of the above interpretations, I have been wondering if, after all, the reading qatlu muhibbihi min dā'ībi/min ra'ībi is not the correct reading. As I argued above, if one adopts this reading the line could mean:

... the death of whose lover will be brought about by sickness caused by him (or by his ra' which is dear to him). "Now ... etc."

The correct interpretation of the two sets of two lines may yet be determined when we are lucky enough to chance upon convincing parallels or a convincing explanation. The number of collections of poetry available has increased dramatically in the last decennia, but it seems hardly worth while to make an exhaustive search for the sake of two fragments that cannot be said to represent the most attractive in Arabic poetry. The above therefore may only serve, at this time, to add to our inventory of medieval themes.

A brief glance at the indexes of Ibn Bassām's Dahira reveals that the influence of Ibn al-Mu'tazz in Spain was considerable. Could the following lines by ar-Ramāḍī quoted in Ibn al-Kattāni's (d. before 420/1030) Tašbihāt (134, no. 251) have been inspired by the line attributed to Ibn al-Mu'tazz?

Can we trust at-Ṭa'ālībi, as-Silafi, Ibn Dihya, and Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Haḍāği against other authors I quoted when they attribute the first set of two lines to Ibn Raḍq? I have no doubt that we can, but answering this question in detail would require more space than can be justified for a brief note and needs a separate communication. The authorship of the second set of lines has, as far as I know, not been disputed. Again I would need more space to argue that the poet was indeed Ibn al-Mu'tazz.

---

29 Ibn Hallikan, ed. 'Abdalhamid, V, 62, VI, 226; ed. 'Abbas, VI, 9, VII, 227; as-Safadi, Nura (238) by an anonymous:

وأما رأى الشهب راه مبتعث
توافق أن الوصل لم راه ووصل
وشبه الوصل بوصل وشبه الشهب براه وصاح أنه جاهو جها وصل الراء

On the same page the Nura quotes the above line by ar-Ramāḍī which, he says, is fi malīth.

30 Ibn al-Farādī (d. 403/1012), Tarīq I, 134-135.

31 According to the Fibrist of Ibn Ḥayr (d. 575/1179), 404-405 the poetry of Ibn al-Mu'tazz was introduced in Spain by Abī 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Qāli al-Baghdādi. See also, e.g. al-Qādi 'Iyād (d. 544/1149), Gunaya 165.

32 Not in the partial editions known to me.

33 Unless Abū Ḥāfiṣ b. Burd is meant which is less likely since the alternative is Ibn ar-Rūmī.

34 Dhawān I, 137, no 100 (first and third lines; taken from Ibn Bassām's Dahira).

35 Ibn al-Kattāni, Tašbihāt 142 (no. 275) also offers an example of a lady clothed in a bunafsagi garment:

عَالِدَة فِي ثوب عِلَاءٍ يَنَبِفُسُهُ

showing that the colour of the violet may also be associated with brightness.

36 I also feel that to justify to the full extent some of the arguments I have suggested in support of different interpretations of the two qir'ās would require extensive footnotes or appendices: Again these have to wait for another occasion.
I limit myself to an example by ar-Ramāḍī where the ṭaʿ stands apparently for the slave himself:

Ibn Bassām (Dahīra I, 506, III, 231, see above D) thinks so. He quotes the first of the two lines by Ibn al-Muṭṭazz (ṭaḵla for ṭataḵ) and then cites the first and last lines of the above poem. It is strange, however, that Ibn Bassām attributes ar-Ramāḍī’s lines to Eastern poets, to Bassār(?) b. Burd (d. 167/783)33 or to Ibn ar-Rūmī (d. 283/896)34. We find them in the edition of Ibn ar-Rūmī by Husayn Nāṣṣār, but only in a section on poems not found in the Dhīlān itself35.

The authorship of I and II

The vicissitudes of two lines of poetry

Can we trust at-Taʿālībī, as-Silāfī, Ibn Dihyā, and Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Hāfāẓī against other authors I quoted when they attribute the first set of two lines to Ibn Raḍīq? I have no doubt that we can, but answering this question in detail would require more space than can be justified for a brief note and needs a separate communication. The authorship of the second set of lines has, as far as I know, not been disputed. Again I would need more space to argue that the poet was indeed Ibn al-Muṭṭazz36.

---

29 Ibn Hallikān, ed. ‘Abdalhamid, V, 62, VI, 226; ed. ‘Abbas, VI, 9, VII, 227; as-Safādī, Nuṣra (238) by an anonymous:

30 Ibn al-Farādī (d. 403/1012), Tārīḵ I, 134-135.

31 According to the Fihrist of Ibn Hayr (d. 575/1179), 404-405 the poetry of Ibn al-Muṭṭazz was introduced in Spain by Abū ‘Ali b. Ahmad al-Qalī al-Baghdādī. See also, e.g. al-Qādī ‘Iyād (d. 544/1149), Guriyā 165.

---

32 Not in the partial editions known to me.

33 Unless Abū Hāfīs b. Burd is meant which is less likely since the alternative is Ibn ar-Rūmī.

34 Dhīlān I, 137, no 100 (first and third lines; taken from Ibn Bassām’s Dahīra).

35 Ibn al-Kattānī, Taḥfīẓat 142 (no. 275) also offers an example of a lady clothed in a banafṣaḡi garment:

36 I also feel that to justify to the full extent some of the arguments I have suggested in support of different interpretations of the two qirāʿas would require extensive footnotes or appendices: Again these have to wait for another occasion.
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**IBN TABÂTABÂ ON THE PERCEPTION AND INFLUENCE OF POETRY**

László Tüske

*Budapest*

The famous book of Ibn Tabataba al-ʿAlawi1 (d. 334/933) from tenth-century Isfahān, titled *Ṭjar al-ʿṭār* (*The Standard of Poetry*), has a special place in the history of Arab criticism. In this work Ibn Tabataba analyses the main elements of literary communication: the author, the literary work of art and the perceiver (actually, the ṣāmiʿ, hearer). Ibn Tabataba describes the literary process as a complete unit and at the same time he demonstrates its main elements in progress, *in statu nascendi*. He is the first author in the history of medieval Arab criticism who studied systematically the perception of literary work and its effect on the perceiver. The purpose of this paper is to outline Ibn Tabataba’s concept of this perception and his ideas on the effect of the literary work.

The book has a short theoretical introduction, and, for the greatest part, it contains practical criticism and stylistics (Ibn Tabataba, *Ṭjar* 25-219). If we are to understand Ibn Tabataba’s idea, we have to follow the main issue of the theoretical introduction.

Ibn Tabataba’s work is poetic, a systematic doctrine of poetry in the classical meaning of the word. This conception states that “poetry cannot be anything except: 1) poems which ‘narrate’ (yuqtass) things (asṭād) already present (qaʿima) in men’s souls and minds (an-nufūs wa-l-ṣuqūl)..., 2) poems which ‘give’ wisdom (ḥikmā), and 3) poems which contain truthful descriptions (ṣifat sādiqa), suitable similes (tasbihāt muwāfiqa) and appropriate parables (amqāl mutābiqa), or poems which contain these elements”2. Keeping in mind these general statements concerning the content, the author defines poetry as: *kalam manzūm bāna can al-mantur ... bi-md hussa bihi min an-nazm* (Ibn Tabataba, *Ṭjar* 5). This definition and its background constitute the most important side of Ibn Tabataba’s concept in examining the author’s activity.

---


2 There is only one copy of this work in the Library of the Escorial (No. 327, 22-57). al-Ḥāǧirī and Salām edited it from a photocopy in 1956. The revised version was produced by Salām in 1980 from the same source. The last and the most reliable edition by al-Mānī appeared in 1985.

3 For an evaluation of this work see Heinrichs 1973.

4 We used al-Mānī’s edition. Further references are to this edition. The introduction covers pp. 5-24.

IBN TABÁTABÁ ON THE PERCEPTION AND INFLUENCE OF POETRY

László Tüske

Budapest

The famous book of Ibn Tabatabá al-‘Alawi1 (d. 334/933) from tenth-century Isfahán, titled ‘Iyār al-‘īr (The Standard of Poetry)2, has a special place in the history of Arab criticism. In this work Ibn Tabatabá analyses the main elements of literary communication: the author, the literary work of art and the perceiver (actually, the sāmi‘, hearer). Ibn Tabatabá describes the literary process as a complete unit and at the same time he demonstrates its main elements in progress, in statu nascendi. He is the first author in the history of medieval Arab criticism who studied systematically the perception of literary work and its effect on the perceiver. The purpose of this paper is to outline Ibn Tabatabá’s concept of this perception and his ideas on the effect of the literary work.

The book has a short theoretical introduction4, and, for the greatest part, it contains practical criticism and stylistics (Ibn Tabatabá, ‘Iyār 25-219). If we are to understand Ibn Tabatabá’s idea, we have to follow the main issue of the theoretical introduction.

Ibn Tabatabá’s work is poetics, a systematic doctrine of poetry in the classical meaning of the word. This conception states that “poetry cannot be anything except: 1) poems which ‘narrate’ (yuqtass) things (asīyā) already present (qa’ima) in men’s souls and minds (an-nufs wa-l-cuqul)... , 2) poems which ‘give’ wisdom (hikma), and 3) poems which contain truthful descriptions (sifat sadiqa) and appropriate parables (a‘mgāl mustābiqa), or poems which contain these elements”. Keeping in mind these general statements concerning the content, the author defines poetry as: kalām manzūm bana ‘an al-majār... bi-mā ḥṣṣa bihi min an-nazm (Ibn Tabatabá, ‘Iyār 5). This definition and its background constitute the most important side of Ibn Tabatabá’s concept in examining the author’s activity.


2 There is only one copy of this work in the Library of the Escorial (No. 327, 22-5). al-Hāĝirī and Salām edited it from a photocopy in 1956. The revised version was produced by Salām in 1980 from the same source. The last and the most reliable edition by al-Mānī‘ appeared in 1985.

3 For an evaluation of this work see Heinrichs 1973.

4 We used al-Mānī‘’s edition. Further references are to this edition. The introduction covers pp. 5-24.
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B. Secondary sources

First of all he makes an important distinction at this point between two preliminary conditions of poetry, seated in the personality or subjectivity of the author. These are natural disposition (tabl) and the knowledge of the whole Arabo-Muslim literary culture, named in this context as 'the tools of poetry' (adawat al-sir'), mastered by the intellect ('aqil) of the poet.

Ibn Tabataba does not deal with natural disposition at length; it can be regarded as a kind of natural sense (talent) or literary taste (dawq). It is an inborn faculty of the author, but it may be acquired by studying as well (Ibn Tabataba, 'Iyār 6-7). This idea, however, gives us a free hand in the interpretation of Ibn Tabataba's concept: it seems to us that this inborn capability is restricted to the natural sense of rhythm, does not mean an imaginative faculty, and does not include at all the poem's mythological, its inspiration, the urge or devotion that sets a poet to work. We do not find in Ibn Tabataba's work the usual stories about the inspiration of poets by demons (qinn). Naturally, the question arises: what is the cause of this lack? Although Arabic literary traditions have preserved the testimonies of pagan poets about these phenomena and it is probable that our author knew of these data, he excluded them from his investigation. I think that this is a conscious step, and it seems to be dictated by his own understanding of poetics. The exact answer needs more investigation concerning the ideological issues of Islam and the Weltanschaung of medieval Muslim civilization. Leaving now aside these general elements, let us examine our text for an answer. If we follow the way of expression present in the concept of tabl (also meaning 'natural disposition, the sense of rhythm'), we can detect a kind of literary phenomenon known in the history of literary criticism: the usage of this word vaguely reminds us of the two main constituent elements of literary theory, i.e., ingenium, and its opponent, studium. The traditional pre-Islamic concept states that the poet's inspiration comes from outside of himself, and now, in this work, we read that the source of this operation is in the inner, inborn world of the poet. This is a new concept, a new understanding of poetry. Poetically it is expressed in Abu Nuwas's poem: "gayra anni q'llum māʿānī * min zunimī mukālibūn il-īwānī // abīdu naṣīf bi-taʿlīfī šayīn * wahīdīn fi l-lāfītī šātta l-māʿānī // qaʿīman fi l-wahmī bāttā idā mā * ṭurmtuḥu ṭurmtu muʿammā l-makānī 7". The answer may be that it was a conscious decision not to mention inspiration.

---

6 Grunebaum (1952:323) stressed the importance of this question: "medieval Muslim thought never abandoned Aristotelian psychology, which assigns imagination a comparatively low place, ranking it with the animal faculties".


8 See the story of 'Abid b. al-'Abra (Diwarī 1-2).

9 Abū Nuwas, Diwarī 18, wa-muʾātī ṭarṣīfī, ll. 4-6.

As to the second preliminary condition, it includes the knowledge of Arabic vocabulary, the grammatical, historical and genealogical traditions as well as the poet's familiarity with the whole of Arabic poetry (Ibn Tabataba, 'Iyār 6-7), inherited from the pre-Islamic and the early Muslim centuries. It contains elements of the cultural background of poetry, structural requirements, language, imagery etc. This enumeration demonstrates a kind of "classicism", the base of which is a belief that the great age of poetry is in the past and that it contained all the models of poetic excellence. To sum up the second preliminary condition of poetry, Ibn Tabataba says: "gān ḥāḍīhī l-dawātū ḥānāl al-aqīl ... wa-iṭār al-ḥasan, wa-iṣīmūb al-qaḥib hāl wa-waad al-ṣāḥib  muwāḍītābī (Ibn Tabataba, 'Iyār 7).

The distinction between ingenium and studium reminds us of the Hellenistic concept of dynamics and technē, or nūrāt and ars, as sources of poetry and shows that Ibn Tabataba, consciously or not, belongs to this tradition in the study of the poet's activity. The poet's natural sense of rhythm together with literary education and qualification are the main sources of a poetic work. Ibn Tabataba's opinion follows the scheme of the well-known philological tradition embodied in the works of Ibn Qutayba (Ṣīr, author's introduction), Qudama b. Ġ̣a'far (Naṣa') and others.

As an inevitable consequence of the preliminary factors, Ibn Tabataba presents the poet as a conscious worker and gives dominance to functions of intellect, 'aqil, in his activity. The poet works out the poem in details, fits words together according to his intention (trāda) under the continuous control of intellect. The poetic tools, metre, rhythm and rhymes, of traditional Arabic poetry become formal elements of a pattern-store; the genres, motifs, images become matter for the poetic intention. Ibn Tabataba describes the literary composition as a unity of matter, pattern and poetic intention. This structure of the construction in poetry is identical with that of the painter's and the goldsmith's. Ibn Tabataba uses the method of weaving, building and goldsmith's work in order to illustrate his main issue: poetry belongs to the special human activity of the arts, it is a šīna, and the poem is an artefact (Grunebaum 1952:325).

Ibn Tabataba examines the poem (qaṣīda) on different levels. He says that the poem 'alā taṣāḥtī ḡinnisī wa-muṣafīt iṣbīh muṭafābīb al-ḵūmā muṭaṣāfīt at-taṣāḥtī (Ibn Tabataba, 'Iyār 10). This statement shows us that our author recognized the poem as an entity, as an independent unit. Further, Ibn Tabataba says, that poems differ from each other kāšīfīl an-nās fi šawābihm... wa-kāshīfīl aṣ-ṣāʿār muṣaṣāfīla fi l-hānīl ala taṣaṣābiš fi l-ḡīnī (ibid). These statements deserve consideration in many respects. The most important for us is that in Ibn Tabataba's opinion the poem is a unity which appears in different forms and shapes. The relative evaluation examines the inner relations in a given poem (like harmony, symmetry, appropriateness etc.) between the poetic instruments. This is the question of the relationship between concepts (maʿānī) and expressions (al-fāzā). Ibn Tabataba says: "lī-maʿānī al-fāzā thālīkīlīb ūtaḥṣūnū ṭībā wa-taqābūhū ṭī geyrībā (Ibn Tabataba, 'Iyār 11). This idea reminds us
First of all he makes an important distinction at this point between two preliminary conditions of poetry, seated in the personality or subjectivity of the author. These are natural disposition (tabī) and the knowledge of the whole Arabo-Muslim literary culture, named in this context as 'the tools of poetry' (adawāt al-šārīʿ), mastered by the intellect (ṣaqī) of the poet.

Ibn Tabātabā does not deal with natural disposition at length; it can be regarded as a kind of natural sense (talent) or literary taste (dqawq). It is an inborn faculty of the author, but it may be acquired by studying as well (Ibn Tabataba, ‘Īyār 6). This idea, however, gives us a free hand in the interpretation of Ibn Tabātaba’s concept: it seems to us that this inborn capability is restricted to the natural sense of rhythm, does not mean an imaginative faculty, and does not include at all the poem’s mythical formation, its inspiration, the urge or devotion that sets a poet to work. We do not find in Ibn Tabātaba’s work the usual stories about the inspiration of poets by demons (ğinnī). Naturally, the question arises: what is the cause of this lack? Although Arabic literary traditions have preserved the testimonies of pagan poets about these phenomena and it is probable that our author knew of these data, he excluded them from his investigation. I think that this is a conscious step, and it seems to be dictated by his own understanding of poetical. The exact answer needs more investigation concerning the ideological issues of Islam and the Weltanschauung of medieval Muslim civilization. Leaving now aside these general elements, let us examine our text for an answer. If we follow the way of expression present in the concept of tabī also meaning ‘natural disposition, the sense of rhythm’, we can detect a kind of literary phenomenon known in the history of literary criticism: the usage of this word vaguer reminds us of the two main constituent elements of literary theory, i.e., ingenium, and its opponent, studium. The traditional pre-Islamic concept states that the poet’s inspiration comes from outside of himself, and now, in this work, we read that the source of this operation is in the inner, inborn world of the poet. This is a new concept, a new understanding of poetry. Poetically it is expressed in Abu Nuwas’s poem: *gayra annī q’illun mā atdnī * min zninin mukābilun l-tṣārīni // ābdun nafsi bi-ta’lifi say’in * wahidin fi-l-faṣī ṣattā l-manāni // qa’imen fi l-wahmi hattā idā mā * rmttb hu ru mtm mu’ammā l-makāni? The answer may be that it was a conscious decision not to mention inspiration.

As to the second preliminary condition, it includes the knowledge of Arabic vocabulary, the grammatical, historical and genealogical traditions as well as the poet’s familiarity with the whole of Arabic poetry (Ibn Tabataba, ‘Īyār 6-7), inherited from the pre-Islamic and the early Muslim centuries. It contains elements of the cultural background of poetry, structural requirements, language, imagery etc. This enumeration demonstrates a kind of “classicism”, the basis of which is a belief that the great age of poetry is in the past and that it contained all the models of poetic excellence. To sum up the second preliminary condition of poetry, Ibn Tabataba says: *gamē hādīhi l-adawāt kamāl al-ṣaqī ... wa-ṣīrār al-ḥasan, wa-ṣidmāb al-qabīb wa-ṣa’d al-ābī ma wa-dī al-ṣaqī mawādī al-ṣaqī (Ibn Tabataba, ‘Īyār 7).

The distinction between ingenium and studium reminds us of the Hellenistic concept of dynamics and technē, or natura and ars, as sources of poetry and shows that Ibn Tabataba, consciously or not, belongs to this tradition in the study of the poet’s activity. The poet’s natural sense of rhythm together with literary education and qualification are the main sources of a poetic work. Ibn Tabataba’s opinion follows the scheme of the well-known philological tradition embodied in the works of Ibn Qutayba (Ṣīr, author’s introduction), Qudama b. Ga’far (Naqd) and others.

As an inevitable consequence of the preliminary factors, Ibn Tabataba presents the poet as a conscious worker and gives dominance to functions of intellect, ʿaqī, in his activity. The poet works out the poem in details, fits words together according to his intention (irda) under the continuous control of intellect. The poetic tools, metre, rhythm and rhymes, of traditional Arabic poetry become formal elements of a pattern-store, the genres, motifs, images become matter for the poetic intention. Ibn Tabataba describes the literary composition as a unity of matter, pattern and poetic intention. This structure of the construction in poetry is identical with that of the painter’s and the goldsmith’s. Ibn Tabataba uses the method of weaving, building and goldsmith’s work in order to illustrate his main issue: poetry belongs to the special human activity of the arts, it is a ṣināʿa, and the poem is an artefact (Grunebaum 1952:325).

Ibn Tabataba examines the poem (qasīda) on different levels. He says that the poem *alā taṣfil ǧinsīh wa-maʿrifat ʿinābi muṭlaṣībīl al-ṣināʿa muṭlaṣīfīt at-taṣfil (Ibn Tabataba, ‘Īyār 10). This statement shows us that our author recognized the poem as an entity, as an independent unit. Further, Ibn Tabataba says, that poems differ from each other kaḥtul al-nnas fi-ṣuwarhum ... wa-ṣaḍīka al-ʿaṣār muṭlaṣālīlā fi l-ḥsan *alā taṣwilīh fi ǧins (ibid). These statements deserve consideration in many respects. The most important for us is that in Ibn Tabataba’s opinion the poem is a unity which appears in different forms and shapes. The relative examination evaluates the inner relations in a given poem (like harmony, symmetry, appropriateness etc.) between the poetic instruments. This is the question of the relationship between concepts (maʿānī) and expressions (alfaq). Ibn Tabataba says: *li-māʿānī alfaq tāskīlihā fa-tahsunu fihi wa-taṣbīhu fi ǧeryīhā (Ibn Tabataba, ‘Īyār 11). This idea reminds us
of the concept of "classical" art. We can read in Ibn Ṭabātābā that the poet, composing a new work of art, connects contents and appropriate expressions. There work two registers in the process of poetic work: the register of content, concepts (maʿānī, ra), and the register of expressions (al-fuṣūl, verba). We are familiar with this Horatian idea in the history of literary criticism from the antiquity, and we know that the theory of imitation (or the lack of originality) is among the distinctive features of the pre-romantic concept of art. Medieval Muslim and Christian poets were expected to imitate the classical pattern in classical matter and in classical literary forms. Ibn Ṭabātābā, turning himself and his readers to the past, fits into this tradition, or we can say that his activity shows parallel features.

Historically, it is clear that it is not Ibn Ṭabātābā who first expresses these requirements in the history of Arabic literature. Ibn Ṭabātābā, claiming a coherent theory of poetry, uses the results of philological, exegetical and other literary activities, and outlines the theoretical background of medieval Arabic literary "classicism".

The linguistic tools of classical Arabic poetry are description (wasf), simile (taṣbih) and proverb (bikma). The word bikma means 'wisdom, sentence, gnome, proverb' and expresses the concise reflections of mankind about themselves and the surrounding world. In this context, Ibn Ṭabātābā enumerates the main linguistic tools of poetic work, therefore the word bikma does not mean 'maxims, gnome etc.' but it denotes a vehicle, a proverb-like structure of poetic expression, a characteristic syntax of poetic sentence. Actually, the usage of bikma in poems reminds us the well-known problem of "molecular structure" in Arabic literature, initiated by Kowalski in the thirties of the century. Now, these linguistic-rhetorical tools belong to the formal elements of a poem, and their main concern is to guarantee the structural connection between concepts and expressions.

On a different, conceptual level, there works a special dichotomy in the description of these rhetorical instruments, too. It seems, on the one hand, that Ibn Ṭabātābā stresses wasf and taṣbih as representing mankind's environment, Lebensraum. They also might be used to reflect the outward appearance of the world. On the other hand, he does not completely preclude the possibility of understanding bikma as giving exact summary of ethical norms and maxims. As for description and simile, Ibn Ṭabātābā stresses the importance of truthfulness and agreement between the reality of the outward world and the poetic world created by these tools and instruments. The value of traditional literature lies in its truthfulness. Poets in the past

10 See Quintilianus, Institutio (chapter II) 68 ff. about imitation.
of the concept of “classical” art. We can read in Ibn Ṭabāṭabā that the poet, composing a new work of art, connects contents and appropriate expressions. There work two registers in the process of poetic work: the register of content, concepts (maʿānī, re), and the register of expressions (alfūz, verba). We are familiar with this Horatian idea in the history of literary criticism from the antiquity, and we know that the theory of imitation (or the lack of originality) is among the distinctive features of the pre-romantic concept of art. Medieval Muslim and Christian poets were expected to imitate the classical pattern in classical matter and in classical literary forms. Ibn Ṭabāṭabā turns himself and his readers to the past, fits into this tradition, or we can say that his activity shows parallel features.

Historically, it is clear that it is not Ibn Ṭabāṭabā who first expresses these requirements in the history of Arabic literature. Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, claiming a coherent theory of poetry, uses the results of philological, exegetical and other literary activities, and outlines the theoretical background of medieval Arabic literary “classicism”.

The linguistic tools of classical Arabic poetry are description (wasf), simile (talḥīb) and proverb (bikma). The word bikma means ‘wisdom, sentence, gnome, proverb’ and expresses the concise reflections of mankind about themselves and the surrounding world. In this context, Ibn Ṭabāṭabā enumerates the main linguistic tools of poetic work, therefore the word bikma does not mean ‘maxims, gnome etc.’ but denotes a vehicle, a proverb-like structure of poetic expression, a characteristic syntax of poetic sentence. Actually, the usage of bikma in poems reminds us the well-known problem of “molecular structure” in Arabic literature, initiated by Kowalski in the thirties of the century. Now, these linguistic-rhetorical tools belong to the formal elements of a poem, and their main concern is to guarantee the structural connection between concepts and expressions.

On a different, conceptual level, there works a special dichotomy in the description of these rhetorical tools, too. It seems, on the one hand, that Ibn Ṭabāṭabā stresses wasf and talḥīb as representing mankind’s environment, Lebensraum. They also might be used to reflect the outward appearance of the world. On the other hand, he does not completely preclude the possibility of understanding bikma as giving exact summary of ethical norms and maxims. As for description and simile, Ibn Ṭabāṭabā stresses the importance of truthfulness and agreement between the reality of the outward world and the poetic world created by these tools and instruments. The value of traditional literary lies in its truthfulness. Poets in the past

10 See Quintilianus, Institutio (chapter II) 68 ff. about imitation.
framework. I think that this idea corresponds with the psychology of Ibn Ṭabāṭaba’s cultural environment, and, as the terminology used in the source matter shows us, this idea or its main tenets were accepted by his successors, as well.\(^\text{14}\)

Ibn Ṭabāṭaba introduced the function of understanding, and rendered it in a way of epistemology, but, unfortunately, he did not explain its nature, its structure and its relations to other functions of the human psyche. Is it the sensus communis or is it another element in the human entity? The question is unanswerable at the present stage of our work. The only thing we know is that fāhām is the receptive element of speech in the human being, and, secondly, that the cognitive ascertaining or judging of a poem fulfils its valuation. Our author says in this concern that “al-fāhīm ya’nāsu min al-kalām bi-l-adli ḥaqqī wa-l-ḥāzi l-ma’rifī l-ma’dī fī wa-yatāqāwūsfī ilayhi wa-yataqāllā labū wa-yasta‘wīšu min al-kalām al-ḥāzi l-bu‘thi l-mu‘hāli l-maṣāli l-munkari wa-yansūrū minhu wa-yāṣda’tu labū” (Ibn Ṭabāṭaba, Ḥayār 20). These lines give us a sketchy picture of the connection between understanding and speech (kalām) on a general level, and at the same time they show that Ibn Ṭabāṭaba insists on truth and gives it a favoured and distinguished position.

But, naturally, understanding refuses those poems which do not have the above-mentioned formal, conceptual and structural peculiarities. Every-day speech relies on truth, but qualified speech, poetry, complies with further requirements as well. The question arises how a given poem gets formal, conceptual and structural features? The main element in the creative process is temperance. Symmetry plays a dominant role in poetry; as Ibn Ṭabāṭaba expresses: “šallat kulli ḥasanin maqṣūlin al-ṣiddālī karnā anna šallat kulli ḥasanin maqṣūlin al-ṣiddālī” (Ibn Ṭabāṭaba, Ḥayār 21). It is significant that Ibn Ṭabāṭaba speaks about beauty and ugliness in this respect and only in this place. He does not analyse their nature at all but repeats the traditional opinion: the criteria of beauty are temperance, harmony and symmetry. Reading again the description of composition, we see that in Ibn Ṭabāṭaba’s concept the mind (intellect, ‘aql) penetrates matter, it imposes form (i.e., order, proportion, quantity and quality) upon it, and in this process concepts do get appropriate expression. At the end of composition, inasmuch as the objects which the perceiver discerns harmonize in form, or, in our terminology, make a perfect form, they are beautiful. When understanding accepts the poem, it identifies and weighs construction, proportion, the actual form of concept, and realises in it the perfection or the shortcomings of the ideal form. Ibn Ṭabāṭaba says that a poem which stirs pleasure and joy, is a perfect work (wafī), and, on the other hand, a poem which incites unpleasant experiences is an imperfect work (nāqīs). The criteria of truth, ethical good and unity, which we detected in the progress of constructing a work of art, get a new dimension at the moment of perception, a new couple of parameters, the perfection – imperfection

\(^{14}\) See below at the problem of aryaḥyaya.
framework. I think that this idea corresponds with the psychology of Ibn Tabataba’s cultural environment, and, as the terminology used in the source matter shows us, this idea or its main tenets were accepted by his successors, as well14.

Ibn Tabataba introduced the function of understanding, and rendered it in a way of epistemology, but, unfortunately, he did not explain its nature, its structure and its relation to other functions of the human psyche. Is it the *sensus communis* or is it another element in the human entity? The question is unanswerable at the present stage of our work. The only thing we know is that *fahm* is the receptive element of speech in the human being, and, secondly, that the cognitive ascertaining or judging of a poem fulfils its valuation. Our author says in this concern that "*al-fahm wa-n-nafsu min al-kalami bi-l-adli ya-sawabi la-baqqui wa-l-ghāzi l-ma’rufi l-ma’tşi wa-watatatwawafu ilayhi wa-yatagarallahu lahu wa-yastawwihi min al-kalami al-ghāzi l-haqiqi l-tālīn l-ghāzi l-mu-bāti l-ma’ghīlī l-munkari wa-r-sa in minhu wa-yadda lahu\" (Ibn Tabataba, *Iyār* 20). These lines give us a sketchy picture of the connection between understanding and speech (kalām) on a general level, and at the same time they show that Ibn Tabataba insists on truth and gives it a favoured and distinguished position.

But, naturally, understanding refuses those poems which do not have the above-mentioned formal, conceptual and structural peculiarities. Every-day speech relies on truth, but qualified speech, poetry, complies with further requirements as well. The question arises how a given poem gets formal, conceptual and structural features? The truth, but qualified speech, poetry, complies with further requirements as well. The work actual form of concept, and realises in it the perfection or the shortcomings of the standing accepts the poem, it identifies and weighs construction, proportion, the composition, inasmuch as the objects which the perceiver discerns harmonize in inscription of composition, we see that in Ibn Tabataba’s concept the mind (intellect, the criteria of beauty are temperance, harmony and symmetry. Reading again the description of composition, we see that in Ibn Tabataba’s concept the mind (intellect, *‘ayn*) penetrates matter, it imposes form (i.e., order, proportion, quantity and quality) upon it, and in this process concepts do get appropriate expression. At the end of composition, inasmuch as the objects which the perceiver discerns harmonize in form, or, in our terminology, make a perfect form, they are beautiful. When understanding accepts the poem, it identifies and weighs construction, proportion, the actual form of concept, and realises in it the perfection or the shortcomings of the ideal form. Ibn Tabataba says that a poem which stirs pleasure and joy, is a perfect work (*waṣfī*), and, on the other hand, a poem which incites unpleasant experiences is an imperfect work (*nāqīs*). The criteria of truth, ethical good and unity, which we detected in the progress of constructing a work of art, get a new dimension at the moment of perception, a new couple of parameters, the perfection – imperfection dichotomy. We do see that these are the latent principles of the theory of art in Ibn Tabataba’s work. In this theory truth, goodness, unity and perfection, the terms of ontology, are the most important points of orientation. It can also be said that Ibn Tabataba’s principles of literary theory rest upon ontology, not aesthetics proper.

To sum up the statements about the progress and conditions of perception, we repeat, that Ibn Tabataba connects perception to cognitive intellect, understanding (*fahm*). By analogy with the organic senses, understanding perceives the speech which is harmonious with its own temper, and refuses the effects which are inconsistent with it: "*wa-n-nafaṣ su tabkumu ilā kulli mā waṣṣaqa hawakha wa-taqlaqu mimmat yuḥādilahā wa-labā bi ‘aydrīm tatasarrafu bihā fahmā ‘ad nafṣa lāmad ‘adlābi fi ḥalātahā lā mu’ṣsafābihā ihtazzat lahu wa-haddaqt lahā arayāhyya wa-tarābā*" (Ibn Tabataba, *Iyār* 21). Two points merit our attention in this text. First, that perception demands an appropriate subjective condition in the reader; also, in Ibn Tabataba’s opinion, the reader’s wish and temper contribute to the influence of a given poem. The other point is that the effect of a poem results in a change in the soul, temper moves from its previous state to pleasure, joy, or to the opposite state, that of disgust and aversion. Consequently, the perceiver can or cannot appreciate the ethical message of a given poem according to this pleasure or the lack of it.

Ibn Tabataba, analyzing the perception and influence of the work of art, demonstrates its cognitive and ethical sides. A question arises at this moment: What is the basis of these ideas, what is the source of the cognitive, intellectual view of poetry? As for the structural aspect, we have already stressed that poetry in Ibn Tabataba’s system belongs to the artificial activities like the work of a painter or that of a goldsmith. This structural analysis can explain construction, rules and formulas of a literary work, but not its nature in the progress of perception. It needs a more generalised and metaphysically valid argumentation. Ibn Tabataba’s words which give a general view of poetry can be traced back into the Muslim past, referring to a well-known and important case of perception, that of the holy Qur’an. It seems to me, that Ibn Tabataba drew a parallel between the effect of the Qur’an and that of poetry. The Qur’an is the guidance, the command and the leading speech for mankind. The cognitive intellect has a distinguished role in its acceptance, in the perception of this divine message. The perceiving soul understands it by the cognitive function of the mind. It is known in the Muslim tradition that sometimes this acceptance results in an unusual psychological state. A report says that a Bedouin collapsed when hearing the Prophet’s recitation. This effect is reported as a kind of purification which changed the mind of the hostile Bedouin, and changed his directions, wishes, emotions, too. Ibn Tabataba did not refer to the Qur’an in his argumentation. The Qur’an and its role, however, always need to be investigated in Muslim intellectual activities. Ibn Tabataba wrote his work in the beginning of the tenth century. This century was the formative period of the Muslim dogma, and the emergence of the concept of the Qur’an’s inimitability (*‘īgāz al-qur’ān*) happened at this time as well.

14 See below at the problem of arayyya.
The common analysis of poetry and the Qur'an was legitimated by the fact that both of them were regarded as special manifestations of the same Arabic speech (kalām). Ibn Tabatabā says that poetry contains the main ethical principles and values of mankind, and demonstrates it in a magic, bewitching form. This double character appears in the so-called prophetic words: *inna min al-šīr ighnāmat* and the other one: *inna min al-beṣān la-sibrān*. It seems to me that these statements and the traditional perception of the Qur'an are the central points of universe for Ibn Tabatabā in his poetics and literary criticism.

The poem results in pleasure and joy. We have seen that Ibn Tabatabā uses different words to denote pleasure and joy of the perceiving intellect. These are: *aryāhiyya*, *tārīb* or *irtiyāb*, *iltiyyād*. We find these expressions at other authors, like al-Askari (K. as-sīnā'ataymi, 143), al-Qādi al-Ǧurgānī (Wasāṣa 4, 19, 27, 100), ʿAbdalqāhir al-Ǧurgānī (Arār 247 and Dālāʾil 21), al-Marzubānī (Mawṣūṣāt 70, 422), Ibn Haldūn (Muqaddima III, 1318) etc., too. According to al-ʾAṣmaʿī *aryāhiyya* is *hīfā*, while according to al-Ǧawhari (Ṣīhāb 1, 371) *aryābi* means *al-wāṣī al-julūq*, and other authors repeat these explanations and interpretations. And these explanations constitute the essence of this experience. It seems that for Ibn Tabatabā *aryāhiyya* has a sensual and an intellectual reference at the same time. But the perceiving soul exceeds the sensual stage at the very moment of perception. Acceptable poems open the way to the very essence of a human being. This happens by a magic, bewitching and pleasure-inciting power, the sensual-oriented side of poetry. Ibn Tabatabā says: "*tārīb* n tālīfī ... maṣṣaqa r-rīha wa-lamā l-ṣafma wa-kānā anfūṣa min nafsī l-sāhib wa-dhabībīn min ar-ruqā wa-aladda irṭabān min as-sīnā' ' (Ibn Tabatabā, *Iyār* 23). The result of this state is that the very essence of the perceiver changes: "*fa-salla s-sahma, wa-balalla l-ṣaghā wa-sāhibī wa-yāqqa l-ṣahīna*" (ibid). Pleasure originates in recognizing harmony, unity, and truth; and the mind dominated by rationality, through this recognition and perception, wishes and longs for good and beneficence.

Is then *aryāhiyya* an aesthetic or a purely cognitive state of the soul? The answer could be very important. As for aesthetics we can say that *aryāhiyya* is not one of its categories because the progress of perception is dominated by the cognitive function of the human soul. As for the pure cognitive function, we can say that *aryāhiyya*, by reason of sensual references, is not one of its categories either. Ultimately, *aryāhiyya* is a kind of enthusiasm, the intellect's appetitive activity.

The history of literary criticism shows various patterns of critical and poetical interests that are regarded as types, because they recur constantly, and independently, in different literatures. A few arise out of philosophical issues, others represent theoretical cross sections of criticism, where the evaluation of works and authors is distinguished from analytical description on one side, and literary theory on the other, and considered as a type of judicial criticism. We have already stated that Ibn Tabatabā's present work is poetics *par excellence*, his main issue being to give a concise description of the nature and work of the Arabic poem. Dealing with the literary phenomena in question, Ibn Tabatabā uses a vague framework of ideas which are congenial with that of the late Hellenistic and Christian Middle Ages. The intellectual and cultural environment of tenth-century ʿĪṣahān, the historical fact that his work is among the first poeties of Arabic literature, and that it demonstrates a "frustratingly inconsistent" form of descriptive and philosophical, prescriptive and regulative statements demand our interest and necessitates a further comparative analysis of his views as to what poetry is, and as to what poetry should be.
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15 Ibn Tabatabā uses these sentences in his argumentation, *Iyār* 22-23.

16 Hamori (1984:385) uses these words speaking of Ibn Tabatabā.
The common analysis of poetry and the Qur'an was legitimated by the fact that both of them were regarded as special manifestations of the same Arabic speech (kalām). Ibn Tabātábā says that poetry contains the main ethical principles and values of mankind, and demonstrates it in a magic, bewitching form. This double character appears in the so-called prophetic words: *inna min al-ajnāf hikmatan* and the other one: *inna min al-bayān la-sibran*. It seems to me that these statements and the traditional perception of the Qur'an are the central points of universe for Ibn Tabātábā in his poetics and literary criticism.

The poem results in pleasure and joy. We have seen that Ibn Tabātábā uses different words to denote pleasure and joy of the perceiving intellect. These are: *aryahiyya, tarab or iriyiyah, iltidād*. We find these expressions at other authors, like al-Askari (K. as-sinā'atayni, 143), al-Qādi al-Gurgānī (Wasāṭa 4, 19, 27, 100), ‘Abdalqāhir al-Gurgānī (Asrār 247 and Dala’īl 21), al-Marzubānī (Muwāṣṣāt 70, 422), Ibn Haldūn (Muqaddima III, 1318) etc., too. According to al-Asma’i *aryahiyya* is *bīfa*, while according to al-Ǧawhari (Ṣīḥāh I, 371) *aryāb* means al-wāsi‘ al-’ilmuq, and other authors repeat these explanations and interpretations. And these explanations constitute the essence of this experience. It seems that for Ibn Tabātábā *aryahiyya* has a sensual and an intellectual reference at the same time. But the perceiving soul excels the sensual stage at the very moment of perception. Acceptable poems open to the way of the very essence of a human being. This happens by a magic, bewitching and pleasure-inciting power, the sensual-oriented side of poetry. Ibn Tabātábā says: "*aš-šīr l-ḥāfi fa-salla s-sahāma, wa-ārūna ṣalāma l-fiṣṣa, wa-ḥākima wa-kāna aštāfī min nasīfī wāsīnī wa-ajhīfī wādībī min ar-ruqā wa-aladda itrākīn min l-alīnā’*" (Ibn Tabātábā, *Iyār* 23). The result of this state is that the very essence of the perceiver changes: "fa-salla s-sahāma, wa-ḥākima l-ṭayyada wa-sabāha l-šīrīhā wa-ṣa-kāna l-ḥāfi*sā*" (ibid.). Pleasure originates in recognizing harmony, unity, and truth; and the mind dominated by rationality, through this recognition and perception, wishes and longs for good and beneficence.

Is then *aryahiyya* an aesthetic or a purely cognitive state of the soul? The answer could be very important. As for aesthetics we can say that *aryahiyya* is not one of its categories because the progress of perception is dominated by the cognitive function of the human soul. As for the pure cognitive function, we can say that *aryahiyya*, by reason of sensual references, is not one of its categories either. Ultimately, *aryahiyya* is a kind of enthusiasm, the intellect’s appetitive activity.

The history of literary criticism shows various patterns of critical and poetical interests that are regarded as types, because they recur constantly, and independently, in different literatures. A few arise out of philosophical issues, others represent theoretical cross sections of criticism, where the evaluation of works and authors is distinguished from analytical description on one side, and literary theory on the other, and considered as a type of judicial criticism. We have already stated that Ibn Tabātábā’s present work is poetics *par excellence*, his main issue being to give a concise description of the nature and work of the Arabic poem. Dealing with the literary phenomena in question, Ibn Tabātábā uses a vague framework of ideas which are congenial with that of the late Hellenistic and Christian Middle Ages. The intellectual and cultural environment of tenth-century Ǧisfān, the historical fact that his work is among the first poeties of Arabic literature, and that it demonstrates a "frustratingly inconsistent" form of descriptive and philosophical, prescriptive and regulatory statements demand our interest and necessitates a further comparative analysis of his views as to what poetry is, and as to what poetry should be.
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15 Ibn Tabātábā uses these sentences in his argumentation, *Iyār* 22-23.

16 Hamori (1984:385) uses these words speaking of Ibn Tabātābā.
The Kitāb al-idrāk li- lisān al-ātrāk (literally, 'the book of the grasp of the language of Turks') is an outstanding work from many points of view. On the one hand, it can be regarded as the first true grammar of the Turkish language (previous books which include grammatical notes are mainly lexicographic in character). On the other hand, it is the only case of a work written by a major Arab grammarian (Abū Hasyān al-Garnāṭ, the teacher of Ibn ʿAqīl and Ibn Hisām) which is not concerned with Classical Arabic. The importance of such a choice is hard to overestimate. Arab grammarians did not confine themselves to the study of Arabic language for lack of knowledge of other languages: many of them, including prominent scholars like Sībatwayhi or az-Zamahsāri, came from a Persian stem, and had a good command of Farsi. Rather, this self-limitation stems from an epistemological choice. The aim of nabū and tasyīf was mainly to get a better understanding of the Qur'ān and to choose among alternative readings: far though the vertiginous theoretical constructions of Arab grammarians went, this basic assumption always lay in the background. Consequently, only the data relevant to the reconstruction of the Purest Arabic language (al-carābiyya al-fusha) were taken into account: the rejection of suspicious material went so far to give hadīṯ only a marginal role (mainly limited to cases where no evidence from more reliable sources was available) owing to the risk of linguistic contamination through the chain of transmitters.

Why did a grammarian as Abū Hasyān so blatantly deviate from this basic theoretical tenet? The sources, as usual, give an anecdotal account, and explain everything by appealing to the curiosity of the author towards foreign languages, an account strengthened by Abū Hasyān's own statements.

Modern scholars, both Easterners and Westerners, generally accept this explanation with unbelievable lack of criticism; the only exception is Mansuroğlu (1977-88) who views the Idrāk as an answer to the desire, widespread among Egyptian ʿulāmā',...
The Kitāb al-ıdrak li-lisān al-attrāk (literally, 'the book of the grasp of the language of Turks') is an outstanding work from many points of view. On the one hand, it can be regarded as the first true grammar of the Turkish language (previous books which include grammatical notes are mainly lexicographic in character). On the other hand, it is the only case of a work written by a major Arab grammarian (Abū Hāyyān al-Garnātī, the teacher of Ibn ʿAqīl and Ibn Ḥishām) which is not concerned with Classical Arabic. The importance of such a choice is hard to overestimate. Arab grammarians did not confine themselves to the study of Arabic language for lack of knowledge of other languages: many of them, including prominent scholars like Sibawayhi or az-Zamahsari, came from a Persian stem, and had a good command of Farsi. Rather, this self-limitation stems from an epistemological choice. The aim of nabū and tasyif was mainly to get a better understanding of the Qurʾān and to choose among alternative readings: far though the vertiginous theoretical constructions of Arab grammarians went, this basic assumption always lay in the background. Consequently, only the data relevant to the reconstruction of the Purest Arabic language (al-carabiyya al-fusha) were taken into account: the rejection of suspicious material went so far to give hadīṯ only a marginal role (mainly limited to cases where no evidence from more reliable sources was available) owing to the risk of linguistic contamination through the chain of transmitters.

Why did a grammarian as Abū Hāyyān so blatantly deviate from this basic theoretical tenet? The sources, as usual, give an anecdotal account, and explain everything by appealing to the curiosity of the author towards foreign languages, an account strengthened by Abū Hāyyān’s own statements.

Modern scholars, both Easterners and Westerners, generally accept this explanation with unbelievable lack of criticism; the only exception is Mansuroğlu (1977-88) who views the İdrāk as an answer to the desire, widespread among Egyptian ʿulamāʾ,

---

1 Even Kalqārī’s Diwan, in spite of many scattered grammatical remarks (especially in the introductory section devoted to word structure), remains basically a Turkish-Arabic dictionary, or rather a lexicographic encyclopedia.

2 az-Zamālqārī composed one of the first Arabic-Persian dictionaries (Lexicon), see Haywood 1965: 107, 118-19, for a discussion.

3 See Bohas, Guillaume & Kouloughli 1990:18 ff.

4 See Abū Hāyyān, İdrāk 5.
to understand the language of the Egyptian ruling class: under this view, the *Idrāk* would be just a little more than a practical handbook.

Both views are trivially true, both do not really explain anything: obviously, Abū Hayyān could not write his treatise if he had no interest and curiosity for foreign languages; obviously as well, the *Idrāk* has a teaching function too. But the latter is mainly confined to the lexicographic section, whereas the *tasrij* and *nahw* sections are grammatical treatises on their own: their concern is much more theoretical than a practical handbook could ever need.

Further, two statements by Mansuroğlu are likely to be false: that the knowledge of Turkish could be useful to Egyptian *'ulamā* getting in touch with the ruling class, and that the grasp of such a knowledge was so important to urge a famous ulama to write a grammar of the Turkish dialects spoken in Egypt.

First, there is no evidence that Turkish was used as a medium of communication outside the Mamluk barracks (and even there, most curriculum studies were held in Arabic): *'ulamā* speaking Turkish were so rare that this ability is explicitly noted in the texts. Second, if the demand for Turkish handbooks was really so large, it is not clear why no other Arab grammarian but Abū Hayyān wrote Turkish grammars: for instance, Ibn *'Aqīl* who, as both a pupil of Abū Hayyān’s and a leading *ālim* in the Egyptian judiciary (he reached the office of qādi l-qudat in 759/1358, even if for just a few months), seems the ideal candidate for such a task, never did.

The hypothesis I propose in this paper gives a rather different account. I think that the production of *Idrāk* can only be explained within the cultural policy of the Mamluk regime. The essential reason of this cultural policy was a need for legitimacy: Mamluks had the usual legitimacy problems which every non-Arab ruler (that is, virtually every ruler in Abū Hayyān’s times) met, with the addition of the obvious lack of a viable genealogy (Mamluks were kidnapped from their lands and eradicated, so the genealogical artifacts built for other non-Arab rulers were impossible for them) and the contemptuous attitude most Egyptian *'ulamā* shared towards Turks. The latter aspect is convincingly shown by Haarmann’s seminal article about the Arab image of the Turk (Haarmann 1988b). The sources depict Abū Hayyān as an independent man, who fiercely refused every compromise with the power and obtained appointments owing to his intellectual capacities only. But many episodes in his life and career are clearly counterfactual to this image, and show the tight ties Abū Hayyān had with the Mamluk court. In the next sections, I shall examine the sources and their contradictions, and shall propose an alternative explanation for some doubtful episodes.

**The sources**

The main primary source for our knowledge of the life and career of Abū Hayyān is *Naḥī* (I, 823-862), the history (and literary history) of Muslim Spain by al-Maqqari. al-Maqqari includes a biography of Abū Hayyān in the fifth book of his work, entirely dedicated to the scholars who travelled eastwards to fulfil their intellectual achievements, *ar-rāḥil min al-andalus ila l-mawriq*; as Glazer points out in his introduction to *Manbaḥ* (Abū Hayyān’s commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *Alfiyya*), al-Maqqari gives much room to this biography, which shows to be the longest among the *tarāḥim* of grammarians.

al-Maqqari’s compilation is based on several previous sources, among which are Ibn Ḥaǧar al-‘Asqalānī, al-Kutubi (who on its turn draws extensively from as-Safādi), Ibn Rāǧīǧ, and so on. Many of these sources are still extant, notably the *Durūr* by Ibn Ḥaǧar, and the *Fawād* by al-Kutubi. Additional information is provided by az-Zarkašī’s *Taʿrīḥ* and as-Suyūṭī’s *Buga*. Just a few information come from Abū Hayyān’s own works. His *muqaddimāt* are usually scanty, the rare autobiographical statements are scattered.

Secondary literature is not much extended. The most dedicated Western scholar to the study of Abū Hayyān’s work is Glazer, the editor of Abū Hayyān’s unfinished commentary on the *Alfiyya*, who, in the introduction of his edition and in a couple of previous articles as well (Glazer 1941 & 1942), devoted himself to the respectable task of separating Abū Hayyān from the shadow his more celebrated pupils, Ibn *'Aqīl* and Ibn Ḥišām, cast upon him. Glazer is also the author of the article “Abū Hayyān” in the new edition of *Encyclopedie de l’Islam*, which is basically a résumé of the introduction to *Manbaḥ*.

A monograph on Abū Hayyān has been more recently published by the Iraqi scholar al-Hāḍīṭi (1966); this work is useful in that it gathers what the sources relate on the grammanian, which al-Hāḍīṭi groups in chapters devoted to single aspects, but it shows unfortunately almost no critical attitude. Moreover, nor Glazer nor al-Hāḍīṭi give much room to the *Idrāk*, since both are mainly interested in Abū Hayyān’s works on Arabic language. al-Hāḍīṭi also co-edited with Ahmad Maṭlūb the *Tadhkira*, a shorter treatise by Abū Hayyān on lexicographic rarities in the Qur’an; the short introduction to the treatise does not add significant information to our knowledge. Another grammatical work by Abū Hayyān, the *Tadhkira*, has also been edited; in this case too, the 22-page general introduction (fifteen more pages are devoted to the description of the manuscripts and principles of the edition) is a summary of the data supplied by primary sources.

---

5 The label ‘Turkish’ is used here to refer to the bundle of dialectal varieties spoken by Turks in Mamluk Egypt, that is mainly (but not only) Qipšaq and Turkman.

to understand the language of the Egyptian ruling class: under this view, the *Idrāk* would be just a little more than a practical handbook.

Both views are trivially true, both do not really explain anything: obviously, Abū Hayyān could not write his treatise if he had no interest and curiosity for foreign languages; obviously as well, the *Idrāk* has a teaching function too. But the latter is mainly confined to the lexicographic section, whereas the *tasrīf* and *nahw* sections are grammatical treatises on their own: their concern is much more theoretical than a practical handbook could ever need.

Further, two statements by Mansuroğlu are likely to be false: that the knowledge of Turkish⁵ could be useful to Egyptian *‘ulamā’* getting in touch with the ruling class, and that the grasp of such a knowledge was so important to urge a famous grammarian as Abū Hayyān to write a grammar of the Turkish dialects spoken in Egypt. And the texts⁶. Second, if the demand for Turkish handbooks was really so large, it is not clear why no other Arab grammarian but Abū Hayyān wrote Turkish grammars: for instance, Ibn ‘Aqīl who, as both a pupil of Abū Hayyān’s and a leading *ālim* in the Egyptian judiciary (he reached the office of qādi l-qudat in 759/1358, even if for just a few months), seems the ideal candidate for such a task, never did.

The hypothesis I propose in this paper gives a rather different account. I think that the production of *Idrāk* can only be explained within the cultural policy of the Mamluk regime. The essential reason of this cultural policy was a need for legitimacy: Mamluks had the usual legitimacy problems which every non-Arab ruler (that is, virtually every ruler in Abū Hayyān’s times) met, with the addition of the obvious lack of a viable genealogy (Mamluks were kidnapped from their lands and eradicated, so the genealogical artifacts built for other non-Arab rulers were impossible for them) and the contemptuous attitude most Egyptian *‘ulamā’* shared towards Turks. The latter aspect is convincingly shown by Haarmann’s seminal article about the Arab image of the Turk (Haarmann 1988b). The sources depict Abū Hayyān as an independent man, who fiercely refused every compromise with the power and obtained appointments owing to his intellectual capacities only. But many episodes in his life and career are clearly counterfactual to this image, and show the tight ties Abū Hayyān had with the Mamluk court. In the next sections, I shall examine the sources and their contradictions, and shall propose an alternative explanation for some doubtful episodes.

**The sources**

The main primary source for our knowledge of the life and career of Abū Hayyān is *Naṣīr* (I, 823-862), the history (and literary history) of Muslim Spain by al-Maqṣūrī. al-Maqṣūrī includes a biography of Abū Hayyān in the fifth book of his work, entirely dedicated to the scholars who travelled eastwards to fulfil their intellectual achievements, *ar-rāḥil min al-Andalus ila l-Masriq*; as Glazer points out in his introduction to *Manḥāb* (Abū Hayyān’s commentary on Ibn Mālik’s *Alfīyya*), al-Maqṣūrī gives much room to this biography, which shows to be the longest among the *tarāǧīm* of grammarians.

al-Maqṣūrī’s compilation is based on several previous sources, among which are Ibn Ḥaǧr al-‘Asqalānī, al-Kutubi (who on its turn draws extensively from as-Safadī), Ibn Ṭājī, and so on. Many of these sources are still extant, notably the *Dawwar* by Ibn Ḥaǧr, and the *Fusūṣ* by al-Kutubi. Additional information is provided by as-Zarkashī’s *Ta’rīh* and as-Suyūṭī’s *Busya*.

Just a few information come from Abū Hayyān’s own works. His *muqaddimāt* are usually scanty, the rare autobiographical statements are scattered.

Secondary literature is not much extended. The most dedicated Western scholar to the study of Abū Hayyān’s work is Glazer, the editor of Abū Hayyān’s unfinished commentary on the *Alfīyya*, who, in the introduction of his edition and in a couple of previous articles as well (Glazer 1941 & 1942), devoted himself to the respectable task of separating Abū Hayyān from the shadow his more celebrated pupils, Ibn ‘Aqīl and Ibn Ḥiṣām, cast upon him. Glazer is also the author of the article “Abū Hayyān” in the new edition of *Encyclopédie de l’Islam*, which is basically a *rēsumé* of the introduction to *Manḥāb*.

A monograph on Abū Hayyān has been more recently published by the Iraqi scholar al-Hāḍīṣī (1960); this work is useful in that it gathers what the sources relate on the grammarian, which al-Hāḍīṣī groups in chapters devoted to single aspects, but it shows unfortunately almost no critical attitude. Moreover, nor Glazer nor al-Hāḍīṣī give much room to the *Idrāk*, since both are mainly interested in Abū Hayyān’s works on Arabic language. al-Hāḍīṣī also co-edited with Ahmad Mālūb the *Taḥṣīl*, a shorter treatise by Abū Hayyān on lexicographic rarities in the Qurʾān; the short introduction to the treatise does not add significant information to our knowledge. Another grammatical work by Abū Hayyān, the *Taḏkīra*, has been also edited, in this case too, the 22-page general introduction (fifteen more pages are devoted to the description of the manuscripts and principles of the edition) is a summary of the data supplied by primary sources.

---

⁵ The label ‘Turkish’ is used here to refer to the bundle of dialectal varieties spoken by Turks in Mamluk Egypt, that is mainly (but not only) Qıpçaq and Turkmān.

On the Turkish side, we first have the remarkable edition of the Idrāk by Caferoğlu, which is much better than the former edition by Mustafa Bey (1309/1891, for which see the note in the quoted article "Ebu Hayyān" in İslam Ansiklopedisi). If the critical apparatus of the edition is noteworthy, however, Caferoğlu adds just a few more remarks in his introduction: so, he says nothing about such a crucial matter as the process by which Abu Hayyān adapted the tools provided by *īlim an-nahw wa-t-tasrif* to the description of the far different Turkish language. In general, the Turks who studied Abu Hayyān did it in a way which is exactly specular to the approach of Arab scholars: they were uniquely interested in the works the grammarian wrote on Turkish (apart from the Idrāk, three lost treatises are mentioned in medieval bibliographies, and some remarks can be found in the Manbaḥī).

In fact, it was the Turks who first re-discovered the works of Abu Hayyān, whom Arab scholars almost forgot. Köprüllüzade, whose importance for contemporary Turkish culture is hard to overestimate (Caferoğlu, himself a pupil of Köprüllüzade's, dedicates to the latter his edition of Idrāk), in his History of Turkish Literature gives Abu Hayyān a key role in the history of Turkish literary self-consciousness (Köprüllüzade 1926:366 ff.). This way, most Turkish studies on Abu Hayyān shared this 'nationalist' attitude, which led them to overlook other works by Abu Hayyān. Thus, Mansuroğlu (1977-88) only examines works about Turkish. The leading interpretative hypothesis in the article, as already mentioned, is that Abu Hayyān answered to a demand for Turkish-learning material. The core of the article (apart from the introductory, not too accurate and sometimes mistaken, biographical section, and the final notes on the editions of the Idrāk) is devoted to an analysis of the historical and sociolinguistic background of the emergence of Turkish language in Egypt.

We may conclude these remarks on the sources by stating that doubtless Abu Hayyān has not yet obtained the interest he deserves. Most scholars who studied him often show an unbelievable carelessness. Let us just see a couple of cases.

Mansuroğlu (1977-88:1, 30) closes the introductory biographical sketch by stating that "Abu Hayyān died in the Mataḥarsa borough of Granada". Now, this statement holds two mistakes: first, the name of the borough in the source is Mataḥarsa, and not Mataḥarsa (which moreover gets no diacritics); second, and worse, Abu Hayyān was born in Granada, and, after he fled al-Andalus, never came back. He definitely died in Cairo.

Another incredible mistake can be found in Glazer's introduction to the edition of Manbaḥī. After telling the break in the relationship among Abu Hayyān and Ibn Taymiyya, an episode to which we shall return below, he makes some hypotheses about the date of the break. Since Abu Hayyān is reported by Goldziher to have answered a pilgrim who called him to declaim his madīb of Ibn Taymiyya that he deleted the poem from his divān, and since the latter episode took place during Abu Hayyān's pilgrimage to Mecca in 737/1336, Glazer concludes that "it must have taken place some time before 1336" (Abū Hayyān, Manbaḥī xx). The statement is trivially true, since Ibn Taymiyya died in the Citadel of Damascus in 1328, and the quarrel presumably took place before his death.

Finally, an omission should be signalled in the otherwise magnificent study by Haarrmann on *awādī an-nās* (Haarrmann 1988a), the descendants of Mamluks who were themselves banned from entering the army. Haarrmann dedicates a part of the article to the few 'ulama' who mastered Turkish: Abū Hayyān, whose Idrāk, apart from three other lost treatises of his on aspects of Turkish language, should be regarded as having some knowledge of Turkish, is missing from the list. Curiously enough, two Egyptian 'ulama' are said in footnotes to have been pupils of Abū Hayyān.

This carelessness does not seem to be casual: the sensation is that the fact that Abū Hayyān was not just an Arab grammarian, not just the author of the first grammar of Turkish, not just the only dissenting commentator of Ibn Mālik, not just a Zāhirī scholar who fled eastwards and became a Šāfī’ī, makes people disoriented and creates a feeling of annoyance.

The sources and their contradictions

If we give a closer examination to the biography of Abū Hayyān provided by the primary sources, some important facts remain unexplained. Let us briefly examine the biographical data, focusing on the problematic points. 7

Agīr ad-Dīn Muhammad b. Yusuf b. ‘Ali b. Yusuf b. Abū Hayyān al-Garnūtī al-Gayyānī an-Nafīzī al-Andalusī (other *kunan* include an-Nawī, and, significant enough as we shall see, al-Shafi‘ī) was born (and did not die) in Granada, or in its township (both possibilities are related by al-Maqqārī, depending on whether Matahbars is regarded as a borough of Granada or a town on its own), in 654/1256.

After some years of study under some of the most renowned Zāhirī scholars in al-Andalus, Abū Hayyān left his motherland in 679/1280. The sources provide various reports to explain this departure: they share the composition of a libel by Abū Hayyān against a teacher of his, and the subsequent flight of the young student (he was only 24). Whatever the contingent reason which led Abū Hayyān, both the desire to acquire a better instruction and to look for fortune have probably been decisive. al-Andalus in the end of 13th century, with its restricted bounds and the inescapable pull of the Reconquista, was by no means a land of opportunity, and

---

7 Although we should not forget the pages Goldziher devoted to Abū Hayyān in his study on the Zāhirī madīb (Goldziher 1884:187-193).
On the Turkish side, we first have the remarkable edition of the *Idrāk* by Çafe­roğlu, which is much better than the former edition by Mustafa Bey (1309/1891, for which see the note in the quoted article "Ebu Hayyān" in İslam Ansiklopedisi). If the critical apparatus of the edition is noteworthy, however, Çafe­roğlu adds just a few more remarks in his introduction: so, he says nothing about such a crucial matter as the process by which Abu Hayyān adapted the tools provided by *ilm an-nahw wat-tasrif* to the description of the far different Turkish language. In general, the Turks who studied Abu Hayyān did it in a way which is exactly specular to the approach of Arab scholars: they were uniquely interested in the works the grammarian wrote on Turkish (apart from the *Idrāk*, three lost treatises are mentioned in medieval bibliographies, and some remarks can be found in the *Manbaḥ*).

In fact, it was the Turks who first re-discovered the works of Abu Hayyān, whom Arab scholars almost forgot. Köprülüzade, whose importance for contemporary Turkish culture is hard to overestimate (Çafe­roğlu, himself a pupil of Köprülüzade’s, dedicates to the latter his edition of *Idrāk*), in his History of Turkish Literature gives Abu Hayyān a key role in the history of Turkish literary self-consciousness (Köprülüzade 1926:366 ff.). This way, most Turkish studies on Abu Hayyān shared this ‘nationalist’ attitude, which led them to overlook other works by Abu Hayyān. Thus, Mansuroğlu (1977-88) only examines works about Turkish. The leading interpretative hypothesis in the article, as already mentioned, is that Abu Hayyān answered to a demand for Turkish-learning material. The core of the article (apart from the introductory, not too accurate and sometimes mistaken, biographical section, and the final notes on the editions of the *Idrāk*) is devoted to an analysis of the historical and sociolinguistic background of the emergence of Turkish language in Egypt.

We may conclude these remarks on the sources by stating that doubtless Abu Hayyān has not yet obtained the interest he deserves. Most scholars who studied him often show an unbelievable carelessness. Let us just see a couple of cases.

Mansuroğlu (1977-88:1, 30) closes the introductory biographical sketch by stating that “Abu Hayyān died in the Mataḥšara borough of Granada”. Now, this statement holds two mistakes: first, the name of the borough in the source is Mataḥšara, and not Mataḥšara (which moreover gets no diacritics); second, and worse, Abu Hayyān was born in Granada, and, after he fled al-Andalus, never came back. He definitely died in Cairo.

Another incredible mistake can be found in Glazer’s introduction to the edition of *Manbaḥ*. After telling the break in the relationship among Abu Hayyān and Ibn Taymiyya, an episode to which we shall return below, he makes some hypotheses about the date of the break. Since Abu Hayyān is reported by Goldziher to have answered a pilgrim who called him to declaim his madīḥ of Ibn Taymiyya that he deleted the poem from his *dīvān*, and since the latter episode took place during Abu Hayyān’s pilgrimage to Mecca in 737/1336, Glazer concludes that “it must have taken place some time before 1336” (Abū Hayyān, *Manbaḥ* xx). The statement is trivially true, since Ibn Taymiyya died in the Citadel of Damascus in 1328, and the quarrel presumably took place before his death.

Finally, an omission should be signalled in the otherwise magnificent study by Haarmann on *awādī an-nās* (Haarmann 1988a), the descendants of Mamluks who were themselves banned from entering the army. Haarmann dedicates a part of the article to the few ‘ulumā’ who mastered Turkish: Abu Hayyān, whose *Idrāk*, apart from three other lost treatises of his on aspects of Turkish language, should be regarded as having some knowledge of Turkish, is missing from the list. Curiously enough, two Egyptian ‘ulumā’ are said in footnotes to have been pupils of Abu Hayyān.

This carelessness does not seem to be casual: the sensation is that the fact that Abu Hayyān was not just an Arab grammarian, not just the author of the first grammar of Turkish, not just the only dissenting commentator of Ibn Mālik, not just a Zāhīrī scholar who fled eastwards and became a Şāfī‘, makes people disoriented and creates a feeling of annoyance.

The sources and their contradictions

If we give a closer examination to the biography of Abu Hayyān provided by the primary sources, some important facts remain unexplained. Let us briefly examine the biographical data, focusing on the problematic points.

Agīr ad-Dīn Muhammad b. Yūṣuf b. ʿAlī b. Yūṣuf b. Abū Hayyān al-Garnāṭī al-Gāyāyīnī an-Nāfīzī al-Andalusī (other kunan include an-Nahwi, and, significant enough as we shall see, ʿāŠāfī‘ī) was born (and did not die) in Granada, or in its township (both possibilities are related by al-Maqqārī, depending on whether Mataḥšaras is regarded as a borough of Granada or a town on its own), in 654/1256.

After some years of study under some of the most renowned Zāhīrī scholars in al-Andalus, Abū Hayyān left his motherland in 679/1280. The sources provide various reports to explain this departure: they share the composition of a libel by Abū Hayyān against a teacher of his, and the subsequent flight of the young student (he was only 24). Whatever the contingent reason which led Abū Hayyān, both the desire to acquire a better instruction and to look for fortune have probably been decisive. al-Andalus in the end of 13th century, with its restricted bounds and the inescapable pull of the Reconquista, was by no means a land of opportunity, and

---

7 Although we should not forget the pages Goldziher devoted to Abū Hayyān in his study on the Zāhīrī maḏhab (Goldziher 1884:187-193).
travels in the Maṣriq are a commonplace in the biographies of Hispano-Arabic scholars.

After about ten years of wanderings that led him as far as Ethiopia and gave him the possibility to fulfil the ḥaggū, Abū Ḥayyān finally settled in Egypt, where he had shortly passed by some years before. In the few years elapsed from his arrival at Cairo till 698/1298, he succeeded in a remarkable career: first, he got a position as a head teacher at the qubba Mansūriyya, by reading the Qur‘ān in the Aqmar mosque as well, then he obtained a post to teach philology at the Ibn Tulūn mosque.

The sources offer no convincing explanation for this extraordinary career. They account for everything by appealing to the ability of the young scholar, and to the fame that preceded him when he arrived at Cairo. Both reasons are insufficient, and moreover doubtful: Abū Ḥayyān had probably composed none of his most important treatises before his arrival in Egypt (he was not thirty years old); besides, he was not yet regarded as an authority, if he had to pursue his grammatical studies under the Egyptian nabis Ibn an-Nahhās even after his nomination at the Mansūriyya (Ibn an-Nahhās held the position at the Tulūnīyya which Abū Ḥayyān was appointed to after the death of the former).

It is highly unlikely that a young, unknown foreigner could pursue such a career without being sponsored by the establishment. As Escovitz showed in his seminal study on the office of qādi l-quḍāt under the Bahri Mamluks (Escovitz 1984), both the Mansūriyya and the Tulūnīyya were among the leading teaching institutions in Mamlūk Cairo. Many of the jurists who were charged with the office of qādi l-quḍāt worked there before their appointment to the highest office; some of them held the teaching position even later. The appointment to these positions was strictly under state control: the establishment was a conditio sine qua non to hope for a teaching career in high-level institutions.

Another unexplained event in the life of Abū Ḥayyān is strictly tied to his career. Some time after his settlement in Egypt, the grammarian passed from the Zāhirī madhhab to the Ṣafī‘ī: the sources relate the information without comments. The date of the conversion is not easy to fix: the terminus ante quem is 1312, date of the composition of the Idrāk, in whose introduction Abū Ḥayyān is referred to with the nisba aṣ-Ṣāfī‘ī.

I think that the conversion is to be placed in the first years Abū Ḥayyān spent in Egypt, immediately before his first appointment at the Mansūriyya, if we just have a look at the developments of appointments to teaching institutions in Egypt (we shall follow the reconstruction in Escovitz’s article).

9 Teaching was an obligatory stage in a top judge’s career: “All the judges held teaching posts before and after they were appointed” (Escovitz 1984:173).

The office of chief judge, originally an ‘Abbāsid institution, was created in Egypt in the second half of 4th/10th century under the Fātimids, among other decisions to mark the proclamation of the caliphate (the provincial chief judge in Egypt was before, at least formally, dependent from the qādi l-quḍāt in Baghdad).

The Mamlūks introduced a novelty in the mechanism: the sultan az-Zāhir Baybars al-Bunduqdārī (658-676/1260-1277) replaced the single chief judge, always a member of the leading madhhab in Egypt, the Ṣafī‘ī, with four chief judges, one for each of the four madhhab represented in the Near East (Ṣafī‘ī, Hanafī, Mālikī, and Ḥanbalī). Subsequently, positions in most juridical and academic institutions were occupied according to the share of each madhhab.

Shares were not equal, anyway: research by Escovitz shows that “of the four madhhab, the Ṣafī‘ī were the most successful in acquiring posts, the Hanafī second (but not nearly so successful), the Mālikī third, and the Ḥanbalī were far beyond anyone else” (Escovitz 1984:173). Vacancies were usually filled according to madhhab, so that only candidates belonging to a certain madhhab were eligible to positions granted to that madhhab. This way, the passage of Abū Ḥayyān from the Zāhirī to the Ṣafī‘ī finds a natural explanation: belonging to one of the four official madhhab was a precondition to get a state-controlled position; Abū Ḥayyān, as a Zāhirī, had no chance to enter the system; thus, he converted, and choose the most promising madhhab, the one that controlled more positions.

An interesting episode gives some ground to my hypothesis. According to al-Maqrīzī (quoted by Escovitz), in 767/1365-66, the Mamlūk amīr Sayf ad-Dīn al-‘Umarī established seven teaching posts in the Ibn Tulūn mosque, which were granted to the Hanafī. This decision is said to have caused a wave of conversions to the Ṣafī‘ī madhhab among the Ṣafī‘īs. The formal character of Abū Ḥayyān’s decision is further shown by the otherwise curious statement of Ibn Ḥaḡār that “Abū Ḥayyān was a Zāhirī even in grammar”.

In the light of this situation, Glazer’s statement that “the real reason for this [that is, the conversion of Abū Ḥayyān] is still unknown” is incredibly naive. Mutatis mutandis, it amounts to wonder why a young foreigner without means tears the membership card of a small party of his remote motherland to enter the ruling party of the country.

Of course, becoming a Ṣafī‘ī was not enough for a career. Abū Ḥayyān needed some powerful support, too. He found it in the person of the amīr Sayf ad-Dīn...
travels in the Maṣriq are a commonplace in the biographies of Hispano-Arabic scholars.

After about ten years of wanderings that led him as far as Ethiopia and gave him the possibility to fulfil the ḥaggā, Abū Hayyān finally settled in Egypt, where he had shortly passed by some years before. In the few years elapsed from his arrival at Cairo till 698/1298, he succeeded in a remarkable career: first, he got a position as a head teacher at the qubba Mansūriyya, by reading the Qur‘ān in the Aqmar mosque as well, then he obtained a post to teach philology at the Ibn Tulun mosque.

The sources offer no convincing explanation for this extraordinary career. They account for everything by appealing to the ability of the young scholar, and to the fame that preceded him when he arrived at Cairo. Both reasons are insufficient, and moreover doubtful: Abū Hayyān had probably composed none of his most important treatises before his arrival in Egypt; in the meantime he was thirty years old; besides, he was not yet regarded as an authority, if he had to pursue his grammatical studies under the Egyptian nabū al-an-Nabhās. Even after his nomination at the Mansūriyya (Ibn an-Nabhās held the position at the Tuluniyya which Abū Hayyān was appointed to after the death of the former).

It is highly unlikely that a young, unknown foreigner could pursue such a career without being sponsored by the establishment. As Escovitz showed in his seminal study on the office of qādī l-quipdat under the Bahri Mamluks (Escovitz 1984), both the Mansūriyya and the Tuluniyya were among the leading teaching institutions in Mamluk Cairo. Many of the jurists who were charged with the office of qādī l-quipdat worked there before their appointment to the highest office; some of them held the teaching position even later. The appointment to these positions was strictly under state control: the establishment was a conditio sine qua non to hope for a teaching career in high-level institutions.

Another unexplained event in the life of Abū Hayyān is strictly tied to his career. Some time after his settlement in Egypt, the grammarians passed from the Zāhirī maddhib to the Șāfī‘īs: the sources relate the information without comments. The date of the conversion is not easy to fix: the terminus ante quem is 1312, date of the constitution of the Idrāk, in whose introduction Abū Hayyān is referred to with the nisba al-Șāfī‘ī.

I think that the conversion is to be placed in the first years Abū Hayyān spent in Egypt, immediately before his first appointment at the Mansūriyya, if we just have a look at the developments of appointments to teaching institutions in Egypt (we shall follow the reconstruction in Escovitz’s article).

The office of chief judge, originally an ‘Abbasid institution, was created in Egypt in the second half of 4th/10th century under the Fātimids, among other decisions to mark the proclamation of the caliphate (the provincial chief judge in Egypt was, at least formally, dependent from the qādī l-quipdat in Baghdad).

The Mamluks introduced a novelty in the mechanism: the sultan az-Zahir Baybars al-Bunduqdarī (658-676/1260-1277) replaced the single chief judge, always a member of the leading maddhib in Egypt, the Șāfī‘īs, with four chief judges, one for each of the four maddhib represented in the Near East (Șāfī‘īs, Hanafīs, Mālikīs, and Hanbalīs). Subsequently, positions in most juridical and academic institutions were occupied according to the share of each maddhib.

Shares were not equal, anyway: research by Escovitz shows that "of the four maddhib, the Șāfī‘īs were the most successful in acquiring posts, the Hanafīs second (but not nearly as successful), the Mālikīs third, and the Hanbalīs were far beyond anyone else" (Escovitz 1984:173). Vacancies were usually filled according to maddhib, so that only candidates belonging to a certain maddhib were eligible to positions granted to that maddhib. This way, the passage of Abū Hayyān from the Zāhirīs to the Șāfī‘īs finds a natural explanation: belonging to one of the four official maddhib was a precondition to get a state-controlled position; Abū Hayyān, as a Zāhirī, had no chance to enter the system; thus, he converted, and choose the most promising maddhib, the one that controlled more positions.

An interesting episode gives some ground to my hypothesis. According to al-Maqrīzī (quoted by Escovitz), in 767/1365-66, the Mamluk amīr Yalbuga al-Ḥāṣikī al-‘Umārī established seven teaching posts in the Ibn Tulun mosque, which were granted to the Hanafīs. This decision is said to have caused a wave of conversions to the Hanafī maddhib among the Șāfī‘īs. The formal character of Abū Hayyān’s decision is further shown by the otherwise curious statement of Ibn Ḥāḍir that “Abū Hayyān was a Zāhirī even in grammar”. In the light of this situation, Glazer’s statement that “the real reason for this [that is, the conversion of Abū Hayyān] is still unknown” is incredibly naive. Mutatis mutandis, it amounts to wonder why a young foreigner without means tears the membership card of a small party of his remote motherland to enter the ruling party of the country.

Of course, becoming a Șāfī‘ī was not enough for a career. Abū Hayyān needed some powerful support, too. He found it in the person of the amīr Sayf ad-Dīn

---

9 Teaching was an obligatory stage in a top judge’s career: “All the judges held teaching posts before and after they were appointed” (Escovitz 1984:173).

10 Glazer’s Introduction in Abū Hayyān, Manhāǧ xx.
Arğün an-Nāṣirī, nāʿīb (that is, roughly viceroy) of Egypt, who accepted Abū Hayyān among his intimates.

The client ties with Arğün help to explain the relationship among Abū Hayyān and Ibn Taymiyya, another black spot in traditional reports. Abū Hayyān was for some years a public supporter of Ibn Taymiyya, after the latter’s triumphal re-entrance in Cairo with an-Nāṣir Muhammad’s third and definitive ascent to the power. His enthusiasm went till the composition of a mādīḥ in his honour.

Some years later, the two definitively broke. The sources give anecdotal explanations, which is understandable; modern scholars accept that, which is much less understandable. Ibn Ḥaḍar (Durar IV, 308) attributes the quarrel to the reading of Ibn Taymiyya’s Kitāb al-‘arṣ, which convinced Abū Hayyān of the error of Ibn Taymiyya’s anthropomorphism (tashbīḥ). al-Maqqari, on the other hand, says that “among the causes” of Abū Hayyān’s rage was Ibn Taymiyya’s alleged statement that “Sibawayhi lies” (Nafḥ I, 857).

Now, things must be more complex: both explanations should lead us to a poor idea of Abū Hayyān. If we think of the relationship among the Mamlūk power and Ibn Taymiyya’s religious reform, a more reasonable account can be found.

Episodically persecuted in the convulse first decade of fourteenth century, Ibn Taymiyya was finally freed from accusations by the sultan Muhammad b. Qalāwūn after the latter’s third access to the power (709/1310) and became an intimate of his. The amīr Sayf ad-Dīn Arğun, the protector of Abū Hayyān, was among the most convinced supporters of Ibn Taymiyya, which helps to explain the enthusiasm of Abū Hayyān, or at least its public manifestations.

For some years, an-Nāṣir Muhammad endorsed Ibn Taymiyya’s movement for the restoration of orthodoxy: it was doubtless a good chance to enhance the Mamlūk’s public image as pious Sunnīs, an important element of their self-legitimation policy, and Ibn Taymiyya’s anthropomorphism (tashbīḥ). Under the theoretical conception of the caliphate, to belong to the family of the Prophet, or at least to his tribe.

After the end of the real political control by the ‘Abbāsīd caliphs, the split among authority and power became apparent. The caliphs progressively lost the effective control over the state, whereas they were still considered the only legitimate source of power. This new situation was embodied in the institution of sultanate, first established by the Seljuk Ṭughrīl Bey in 105512. Turkish rulers had always to accept the paradoxical situation of the true holder of power who receives his formal legitimisation from a weaker, theoretical ruler: their lack of legitimacy could not allow them to assume directly the caliphate, as others (e.g., the Fātimids) could.

Mamlūks felt in a particularly strong way the problem of their legitimisation. As military slaves who reversed in a palace coup their legitimate masters, the only legitimacy of their power was the capacity of holding it, an unbearable situation in the long run. So, they soon introduced the fiction of a formal investiture: after the Mongols took Baghdad in 1258 and killed the last ‘Abbāsīd caliph, al-Musta’sīn billâh, the Mamlūk az-Zahir Baybars hosted an ‘Abbāsīd amīr, al-Mustansîr b. az-Zâhir, who settled in Cairo as the legitimate caliph, and granted to him the title of universal sultan of Islam. These ‘Abbāsīd shadow-caliphs continued to formally invest the Mamlūk sultans till the fall of the dynasty.

On the other hand, the Mamlūks lost no occasion to stress their behaviour as legitimate Muslim rulers. They fought the enemies of Islam (first the Mongols, whose rush was stopped at ‘Ayn Ḍalāt, then the Franks in Palestine, whose last stronghold, Accrra, fell in 690/1291); they always behaved as pious rulers, by supporting Sunnī Islam and granting privileges to the ‘ulāma’.

These measures, however, did not ensure full legitimacy to the Mamlūks. The worst obstacle was the pious attitude most Egyptians, and virtually all the ‘ulāma’,

Thus, Abū Hayyān arrived at Cairo as a young, foreign scholar; he quickly entered the entourage of Sayf ad-Dīn Arğun and, approximately in the same time, passed to the Šafī‘ī madīḥah, which assured him a relatively rapid career. He went on sharing the Mamlūks’ choices of cultural policy, by first strongly supporting Ibn Taymiyya’s movement, and leaving him (under some occasional quarrelling) after he fell in disgrace.

A sketch of Mamlūk ideology

The legitimacy of rulers has always been a key question in Islamic political thinking. At least in theory, the caliph, as the leader of the umma, had to fulfil mostly religious requirements, but also, under the theoretical conception of the caliphate, to belong to the family of the Prophet, or at least to his tribe.
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Argūn an-Nāṣirī, naʿīb (that is, roughly viceroy) of Egypt, who accepted Abū Hayyān among his intimates.

The client ties with Argūn help to explain the relationship among Abū Hayyān and Ibn Taymiyya, another black spot in traditional reports. Abū Hayyān was for some years a public supporter of Ibn Taymiyya, after the latter’s triumphal re-entrance in Cairo with an-Nāṣir Muhammad’s third and definitive ascent to the power. His enthusiasm went till the composition of a madīḥ in his honour.

Some years later, the two definitively broke. The sources give anecdotal explanations, which is understandable; modern scholars accept that, which is much less understandable. Ibn Ḥaḍar (Durar IV, 308) attributes the quarrel to the reading of Ibn Taymiyya’s Kitāb al-ʿarṣ, which convinced Abū Hayyān of the error of Ibn Taymiyya’s anthropomorphism (taṣbih). al-Maqqari, on the other hand, says that “among the causes” of Abū Hayyān’s rage was Ibn Taymiyya’s alleged statement that “Sibawayhi lies” (Naḥḥ I, 857).

Now, things must be more complex: both explanations should lead us to a poor idea of Abū Hayyān. If we think of the relationship among the Mamluk power and Ibn Taymiyya’s religious reform, a more reasonable account can be found.

Episodically persecuted in the convulse first decade of fourteenth century, Ibn Taymiyya was finally freed from accusations by the sultan Muhammad b. Qalāwūn after the latter’s third access to the power (709/1310) and became an intimate of his. The amīr Sayf ad-Dīn Argūn, the protector of Abū Hayyān, was among the most convinced supporters of Ibn Taymiyya, which helps to explain the enthusiasm of Abū Hayyān, or at least its public manifestations.

For some years, an-Nāṣir Muhammad endorsed Ibn Taymiyya’s movement for the restoration of orthodoxy: it was doubtless a good chance to enhance the Mamluks’ public image as pious Sunnis, an important element of their self-legitimisation policy, as we shall see. But eventually the Hanbali reformer fell in disgrace, probably after his involvement in the plots managed by Humayda, amīr of Mecca, with the ilḥān Hudābanda, discovered in 716/1317.

In the following eleven years, Ibn Taymiyya suffered an alternation of imprisonments and conditional releases, until his death in the Citadel of Damascus in 728/1328. It can be reasonably assumed that the fall of Ibn Taymiyya was the true cause of Abū Hayyān’s change of attitude, whatever the accidental reason could be. If the quoted episode of the pilgrim asking Abū Hayyān for his panegyric to Ibn Taymiyya is real, we may conclude that the grammarian made a safe choice by deleting it from his diwān.

Summing up the previous discussion, we may trace a sketch of the biography of Abū Hayyān, which allows to give the traditional story a more logical succession.

Thus, Abū Hayyān arrived at Cairo as a young, foreign scholar; he quickly entered the entourage of Sayf ad-Dīn Argūn and, approximately in the same time, passed to the Ṣafī’s madīḥ, which assured him a relatively rapid career. He went on sharing the Mamluks’ choices of cultural policy, by first strongly supporting Ibn Taymiyya’s movement, and leaving him (under some occasional quarrelling) after he fell in disgrace.

A sketch of Mamlūk ideology

The legitimacy of rulers has always been a key question in Islamic political thinking. At least in theory, the caliph, as the leader of the umma, had to fulfil mostly religious requirements, but also, under the theoretical conception of the caliphate, to belong to the family of the Prophet, or at least to his tribe.

After the end of the real political control by the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, the split among authority and power became apparent. The caliphs progressively lost the effective control over the state, whereas they were still considered the only legitimate source of power. This new situation was embodied in the institution of sultanate, first established by the Seljuk Tugrīl Bey in 1055. Turkish rulers had always to accept the paradoxical situation of the true holder of power who receives his formal legitimisation from a weaker, theoretical ruler: their lack of legitimacy could not allow them to assume directly the caliphate, as others (e.g., the Fātimids) could.

Mamluks felt in a particularly strong way the problem of their legitimisation. As military slaves who reversed in a palace coup their legitimate masters, the only legitimacy of their power was the capacity of holding it, an unbearable situation in the long run. So, they soon introduced the fiction of a formal investiture: after the Mongols took Baghdad in 1258 and killed the last ‘Abbāsid caliph, al-Musta’sim billāh, the Mamluk az-Zahir Baybars hosted an ‘Abbāsid amīr, al-Musta’sir billāh b. az-Zāhir, who settled in Cairo as the legitimate caliph, and granted to him the title of universal sultan of Islam. These ‘Abbāsid shadow-caliphs continued to formally invest the Mamluk sultans till the fall of the dynasty.

On the other hand, the Mamluks lost no occasion to stress their behaviour as legitimate Muslim rulers. They fought the enemies of Islam (first the Mongols, whose rush was stopped at ‘Ayn Čalāt, then the Franks in Palestine, whose last stronghold, Accra, fell in 690/1291); they always behaved as pious rulers, by supporting Sunni Islam and granting privileges to the ‘ulama’.

These measures, however, did not ensure full legitimacy to the Mamluks. The worst obstacle was the pious attitude most Egyptians, and virtually all the ‘ulama’,

---

11 See Laoust 1960.
had towards the Turks. Haarmann (1988b) shows very clearly the strength of anti-Turkish biases in Mamlûk Egypt.

Egyptian ‘ulamâ’ built what we can call an anti-Turkish ideology. The core of this ideology is represented by a bulk of negative features attributed to the Turks: they are depicted as savage people, uncouth, without any historical background (which was readily granted to other non-Arab peoples, e.g. the Persians), alien to the country, not able to speak Arabic in an acceptable way, and so on.

Even if this anti-Turkish ideology was not directly translated into opposition against the Mamlûk rulers, it was however intrinsically dangerous for them: a sultan who is generally regarded by the intellectual class of his country as the leader of a mass of barbarian, violent foreign slaves, has not much chance to really obtain legitimacy for his power.

The Mamlûks had therefore to develop an alternative ideology, which could on the one hand further legitimate the religious rightfulness of the power, and on the other hand spread a more positive image of the Turks and their culture. The issue comes to a fuller development with the definitive seizure of power by Muhammad b. Qalâwûn an-Nâşir. The latter, in fact, had for the first time a chance to organize the country having neither internal troubles which deprived him twice of the power, nor the external pressure which Mongols and Franks caused to his predecessors. Muhammad immediately began a program of radical restructuring of the Mamlûk state, together with a cultural policy on his own. The latter is remarkably witnessed by the architectural policy of the period. A tireless builder, Muhammad an-Nâşir enlarged the area of Cairo to unprecedented dimensions, writing in stone the signs of his glory.

The religious ideology of the Mamlûks was shortly embodied in the reform movement of Ibn Taymiyya. As we saw before, Muhammad an-Nâşir supported from some years the Hanbali theologian. Even if it is difficult to reach a conclusion about the true aims of this support, the Mamlûks were likely to try to enhance their image as champions of Sunni Islam. Perhaps, if Ibn Taymiyya showed himself more prone to compromise with the power, the religious history of Mamlûk Egypt could have run another way.

Anyway, many episodes, like the remembered equalisation of the four main madjâbîb, reveal the project of Mamlûks to break the compactness of Egyptian ‘ulamâ’ as an opposition group, although in a masked way. The transformation of a reactionary Hanbali movement in a, more or less officially, state-backed view of Islam seems to fit in this project.

The other aspect of Mamlûk ideology is the reaction to the anti-Turkish bias which was widespread among Egyptian intellectuals. This reaction is clearly witnessed from both the curriculum of Mamlûk education, in which literary culture took an important weight, far more than what the formation of a military elite could require, and the cultural activities of the avslâd an-nâs, the descendants of Mamlûk soldiers, who were rigidly excluded from the army. The latter became to assume a growing role in fourteenth-century Egyptian culture. Many of them entered the ‘ulamâ’ institutions, and contributed to the fight against the anti-Turkish ideology by depicting Turks in a more favourable way in their works.

The Idrâk can be considered a contribution to the pro-Turkish, Mamlûk ideology. In its deliberately linguistic-theoretical shape, it seems addressed to the ‘ulamâ’ more than to people wishing to learn the language. Under this aspect, it clearly differs from other previous or contemporary works which had more practical aims. The quoted hypothesis by Mansuroğlu, according to which the Idrâk is a product of the need of Egyptian intellectuals to master the Turkish language, can be applied to the lexicographic part only, which, much more accurate though, does not essentially differ from other Turkish-Arabic word-lists. But the same cannot absolutely be said for the tasrif and nabw sections.

Abû Ḥayyân himself is aware of that. In the introduction to the Idrâk, he says: “The aim of this book is to fix (dabt) a large part of the language of Turks, lexicon, morphonology and syntax. I have fixed this language letter by letter and have ordered the treatment of the lexicon according to the letters of the alphabet in the Turkish language: I give the Turkish form and let it be succeeded by its analogous in the Arabic language; then, I make it be followed by morphonology (tasrif), and then by syntax (nabw). Lexicon is taken from people I trust, masters in the art of translation: the amazing arrangement and the marvellous abridgement are mine. In morphonology and syntax, I have imitated nothing: rather, I brought them from power to reality by enquiring and asking” (Abû Ḥayyân, Idrâk 6-7).

What are the ideological aims of Abû Ḥayyân? We must keep in mind the linguistic side of the anti-Turkish ideology: Turks are regarded as barbarians in the etymological sense, their language is not given any dignity. The answer to this bias is indirect, yet powerful: by describing within a theoretical approach the structures of Turkish morphonology and syntax, Abû Ḥayyân supports the view that Turkish is a language on its own, which has the same expressive power than Arabic. Thus, the Idrâk addresses itself more to ‘ulamâ’ than to learners. It is more a scholarly demonstration than a handbook for students.

**The rhetoric of the Idrâk**

If the Idrâk is the vehicle of an ideology, its formal shape and its descriptive means are to be regarded as the rhetoric that expresses that ideology. We are accustomed to speak of rhetoric in a narrower meaning, but in a broader sense we can
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had towards the Turks. Haarmann (1988b) shows very clearly the strength of anti-Turkish biases in Mamluk Egypt.

Egyptian 'ulama' built what we can call an anti-Turkish ideology. The core of this ideology is represented by a bulk of negative features attributed to the Turks: they are depicted as savage people, uncouth, without any historical background (which was had towards the Turks. Haarmann (1988b) shows very clearly the strength of anti-Turkish ideology. The core of this ideology is represented by a bulk of negative features attributed to the Turks: they are depicted as savage people, uncouth, without any historical background (which was readily granted to other non-Arab peoples, e.g. the Persians), alien to the country, not able to speak Arabic in an acceptable way, and so on.

Even if this anti-Turkish ideology was not directly translated into opposition against the Mamluk rulers, it was however intrinsically dangerous for them: a sultan who is generally regarded by the intellectual class of his country as the leader of a mass of barbarian, violent foreign slaves, has not much chance to really obtain legitimacy for his power.

The Mamluks had therefore to develop an alternative ideology, which could on the one hand further legitimate the religious rightfulness of the power, and on the other hand spread a more positive image of the Turks and their culture. The issue comes to a fuller development with the definitive seizure of power by Muhammad b. Qalawun an-Nasir.

The latter, in fact, had for the first time a chance to organize the country having neither internal troubles which deprived him twice of the power, nor the external pressure which Mongols and Franks caused to his predecessors. Muhammad immediately began a program of radical restructuring of the Mamluk state, together with a cultural policy on his own. The latter is remarkably witnessed by the architectural policy of the period. A tireless builder, Muhammad an-Nasir enlarged the area of Cairo to unprecedented dimensions, writing in stone the signs of his glory.

The religious ideology of the Mamluks was shortly embodied in the reform movement of Ibn Taymiyya. As we saw before, Muhammad an-Nasir supported from some years the Hanballi theologian. Even if it is difficult to reach a conclusion about the true aims of this support, the Mamluks were likely to try to enhance their image as champions of Sunni Islam. Perhaps, if Ibn Taymiyya showed himself more prone to compromise with the power, the religious history of Mamluk Egypt could have run another way.

Anyway, many episodes, like the remembered equalisation of the four main madhābih, reveal the project of Mamluks to break the compactness of Egyptian 'ulama' as an opposition group, although in a masked way. The transformation of a reactionary Hanbalī movement in a, more or less officially, state-backed view of Islam seems to fit in this project.

The other aspect of Mamluk ideology is the reaction to the anti-Turkish bias which was widespread among Egyptian intellectuals. This reaction is clearly witnessed from both the curriculum of Mamluk education, in which literary culture took an important weight, far more than what the formation of a military elite could require, and the cultural activities of the awlad an-nās, the descendants of Mamluk soldiers, who were rigidly excluded from the army. The latter became to assume a growing role in fourteenth-century Egyptian culture. Many of them entered the 'ulama' institutions, and contributed to the fight against the anti-Turkish ideology by depicting Turks in a more favourable way in their works.

The Idrāk can be considered a contribution to the pro-Turkish, Mamluk ideology. In its deliberately linguistic-theoretical shape, it seems addressed to the 'ulama' more than to people wishing to learn the language. Under this aspect, it clearly differs from other previous or contemporary works which had more practical aims. The quoted hypothesis by Mansuroğlu, according to which the Idrāk is a product of the need of Egyptian intellectuals to master the Turkish language, can be applied to the lexicographic part only, which, much more accurate though, does not essentially differ from other Turkish-Arabic word-lists. But the same cannot absolutely be said for the tasrif and nahu sections.

Abū Ḥayyān himself is aware of that. In the introduction to the Idrāk, he says: "The aim of this book is to fix (dabt) a large part of the language of Turks, lexicon, morphonology and syntax. I have fixed this language letter by letter and have ordered the treatment of the lexicon according to the letters of the alphabet in the Turkish language: I give the 'Turkish form and let it be succeeded by its analogous in the Arabic language; then, I make it be followed by morphonology (tasrif), and then by syntax (nahu). Lexicon is taken from people I trust, masters in the art of translation: the amazing arrangement and the marvellous abridgement are mine. In morphonology and syntax, I have imitated nothing: rather, I brought them from power to reality by enquiring and asking." (Abū Ḥayyān, Idrāk 6-7).

What are the ideological aims of Abū Ḥayyān? We must keep in mind the linguistic side of the anti-Turkish ideology: Turks are regarded as barbarians in the etymological sense, their language is not given any dignity. The answer to this bias is indirect, yet powerful: by describing within a theoretical approach the structures of Turkish morphonology and syntax, Abū Ḥayyān supports the view that Turkish is a language on its own, which has the same expressive power than Arabic. Thus, the Idrāk addresses itself more to 'ulama' than to learners. It is more a scholarly demonstration than a handbook for students.

The rhetoric of the Idrāk

If the Idrāk is the vehicle of an ideology, its formal shape and its descriptive means are to be regarded as the rhetoric that expresses that ideology. We are accustomed to speak of rhetoric in a narrower meaning, but in a broader sense we can
The rhetorical means employed in the *Idrāk* show the typical features of acculturation: Abū Hayyān fits his description of Turkish within the categories elaborated by Arabic *šī‘āl an-nabīwa tat-tasrif*, rather than creating new categories, more appropriate for a language deeply different from the original pattern.

This choice can be disapproved of, but Abū Hayyān had in fact simply no alternative. He had a theoretical instrument at his disposal, namely the grammar as had been elaborated in about six centuries of Arabic linguistic thinking, and an ideological aim, namely showing that Turkish is a language with the same expressive power than Arabic. Given these data, he could do nothing but try to describe Turkish with the tools provided by Arabic grammar: if he chose to formulate new theoretical principles, expressly designed to describe Turkish language, he would demonstrate exactly what his opponents claimed, namely that Turkish is not on the same plane as Arabic.

Let us see some samples of Abū Hayyān’s descriptive strategy. The first section of *tasrif*, after a short description of the letters (baynīf, that is, consonants, or more properly graphemes) of the Turkish language, is dedicated to the patterns (*mawsūţān*) of Turkish words (Abū Hayyān, *Idrāk* 101-104). These patterns are described by employing the metalinguistic forms of *fa‘āla*. This way, all possible patterns of Turkish words, from two to six letters, are catalogued, with a taxonomy that strictly parallels Arabic *tasrif* works like Ibn ‘Usfir’s *al-Mamti‘*. Abū Hayyān reaches the goal to show that Turkish words are not arbitrary, but fit into a (relatively) small number of patterns; the strangeness of some of these patterns (the structure of Turkish words needs metalinguistic forms like *fa‘ālulilat* and *fa‘āllilat*) is not relevant to this goal.

Next follows a series of small chapters, each devoted to a category of flexional or derivational morphology. The chapters are organised in a way which strictly corresponds to the subdivisions of Arabic *tasrif*. Thus, categories like *ism al-makān* (place-nouns), *taflil* (comparatives), or *madsar* (verbal nouns) are given a role which is perhaps not fully justified by their usage in Turkish (Abū Hayyān, *Idrāk* 107-109). But even in this case, one must keep in mind the ideal reader, an Arab scholar who looks for the morphological categories of Arabic and discovers, perhaps to his dismay, that all these categories can be found, and aptly translated, in Turkish.

If we pass to syntax, the process of adaptation is more complex, given the deep difference in syntactic structure between the two languages. We shall only examine the treatment of the relative order of verb and agent-subject (*afṣil wa-l-fad‘il*) (Abū Hayyān, *Idrāk* 129-130).

Within the concept of Arabic grammar, the underlying order (at the level of base-form, *adif*) of verb and subject cannot be but one and the same. Since one of the basic principles of Arabic grammar states that the regent (*‘amil*) always precedes the governed word (*ma‘mil*), the verb must precede its subject.

Given this underlying order, utterances that happen to show a different ordering must be explained by some reordering operation. If Turkish usually shows subject-verb order, the natural explanation is that Turkish-speaking people prefer, by what nowadays would be called a stylistic rule, the anteposition of the subject. In fact, Abū Hayyān defines the anteposition (*taqdim*) of the subject to the verb ‘more eloquent’ (*afṣil*), which puts it on a stylistic, rather than structural, plane.

This attitude should not be blamed. Modern generative linguistics shares it, when it assumes that Universal Grammar invariably has subject—verb—object order at an adequate level of representation (D-structure in most analyses). Under the most rigid, and highly influential, version of this assumption, proposed by Kayne (1993), SVO order is a theoretical necessity, established by tree structure requirements.

Now, any analysis of Turkish within Kayne’s framework (no extensive one has been put forth, for the tremendous difficulties it would show) should assume that the underlying order of Turkish sentences is SVO, and that actual sentences are obtained by upward movements of the object (and of the subject too, since the verb is assumed to move upwards to some higher functional projection).

As one can see, the change in the attitude to regard one’s linguistic habits as universal is slight, if any. If we think that generative linguistics is one branch of social sciences more open to cultural diversity, we can measure the difficulty to escape the traps of acculturation and inculturation.

Conclusions

Let us briefly sum up the main conclusions reached in this paper.

First, I have proposed to re-interpret the known data about Abū Hayyān’s life and works in the light of his ties with the Mamluk power. This interpretation offers a natural explanation for many otherwise unclear episodes reported by the sources.

Then, I tried to consider the *Idrāk* within the cultural policy of Mamluk sovereigns, especially Muhammad b. Qalāwūn, by showing the ideological aims of such a policy and the function of the treatise as a rhetorical support for such an ideology.

Finally, a sketch has been given of the tools Abū Hayyān employed. They show typical acculturation features, as the adaptation of patterns and structures created for the analysis of Arabic language to a very different context.

A conclusive remark is in order about the success of Abū Hayyān’s work, and indirectly the success of the Mamluks’ cultural policy. As far as we know, the path began by Abū Hayyān has not been continued. No other major Arab grammarians studied foreign languages (except for lexicographic works), nor the pro-Turkish ideology seems to have gained much support to the Mamluks. The reasons for that can be many; I think that a key reason is the internal troubles that immediately followed the death of sultan Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn (741/1341). A cultural policy
label rhetoric every means of expression of an ideology. This use of the term is close to the definitions given by Eco (1975).

The rhetorical means employed in the Idrāk show the typical features of acculturation: Abū Hayyān fits his description of Turkish within the categories elaborated by Arabic 'ilm an-nahw wa-t-tasrif, rather than creating new categories, more appropriate for a language deeply different from the original pattern. This choice can be disapproved of, but Abū Hayyān had in fact simply no alternative. He had a theoretical instrument at his disposal, namely the grammar as had been elaborated in about six centuries of Arabic linguistic thinking, and an ideological aim, namely showing that Turkish is a language with the same expressive power than Arabic. Given these data, he could do nothing but try to describe Turkish with the tools provided by Arabic grammar: if he chose to formulate new theoretical principles, expressly designed to describe Turkish language, he would demonstrate exactly what his opponents claimed, namely that Turkish is not on the same plane as Arabic.

Let us see some samples of Abū Hayyān’s descriptive strategy. The first section of tasrif, after a short description of the letters (barrif, that is, consonants, or more properly graphemes) of the Turkish language, is dedicated to the patterns (asużu) of Turkish words (Abū Hayyān, Idrāk 101-104). These patterns are described by employing the metalinguistic forms of ɪa'ula. This way, all possible patterns of Turkish words, from two to six letters, are catalogued, with a taxonomy that strictly parallels Arabic tasrif works like Ibn ‘Usfūr’s al-Mumti’. Abū Hayyān reaches the goal to show that Turkish words are not arbitrary, but fit into a (relatively) small number of patterns; the strangeness of some of these patterns (the structure of Turkish words needs metalinguistic forms like ɪa'ullulul and ɪa'ullulul) is not relevant to this goal.

Next follows a series of small chapters, each devoted to a category of flexional or derivational morphology. The chapters are organised in a way which strictly corresponds to the subdivisions of Arabic tasrif. Thus, categories like ɪs̱m al-maḥān (place-nouns), ɪaftıll (comparatives), or ɪaşdar (verbal nouns) are given a role which is perhaps not fully justified by their usage in Turkish (Abū Hayyān, Idrāk 107-109). But even in this case, one must keep in mind the ideal reader, an Arab scholar who looks for the morphological categories of Arabic and discovers, perhaps to his dismay, that all these categories can be found, and aptly translated, in Turkish.

If we pass to syntax, the process of adaptation is more complex, given the deep difference in syntactic structure between the two languages. We shall only examine the treatment of the relative order of verb and agent-subject (afsal ‘us-l-fa'ilihan) (Abū Hayyān, Idrāk 129-130).

Within the concept of Arabic grammar, the underlying order (at the level of base-form, ɪa’d) of verb and subject cannot be but one and the same. Since one of the basic principles of Arabic grammar states that the regent (‘amīl) always precedes the governed word (ma’amīl), the verb must precede its subject.

Given this underlying order, utterances that happen to show a different ordering must be explained by some reordering operation. If Turkish usually shows subject-verb order, the natural explanation is that Turkish-speaking people prefer, by what nowadays would be called a stylistic rule, the anteposition of the subject. In fact, Abū Hayyān defines the anteposition (taqdim) of the subject to the verb ‘more eloquent’ (afsal), which puts it on a stylistic, rather than structural, plane. This attitude should not be blamed. Modern generative linguistics shares it, when it assumes that Universal Grammar invariably has subject—verb—object order at an adequate level of representation (D-structure in most analyses). Under the most rigid, and highly influential, version of this assumption, proposed by Kayne (1993), SVO order is a theoretical necessity, established by tree structure requirements.

Now, any analysis of Turkish within Kayne’s framework (no extensive one has been put forth, for the tremendous difficulties it would show) should assume that the underlying order of Turkish sentences is SVO, and that actual sentences are obtained by upward movements of the object (and of the subject too, since the verb is assumed to move upwards to some higher functional projection).

As one can see, the change in the attitude to regard one’s linguistic habits as universal is slight, if any. If we think that generative linguistics is one branch of social sciences more open to cultural diversity, we can measure the difficulty to escape the traps of acculturation and inculturation.

Conclusions

Let us briefly sum up the main conclusions reached in this paper. First, I have proposed to re-interpret the known data about Abū Hayyān’s life and works in the light of his ties with the Mamlūk power. This interpretation offers a natural explanation for many otherwise unclear episodes reported by the sources.

Then, I tried to consider the Idrāk within the cultural policy of Mamlūk sovereigns, especially Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn, by showing the ideological aims of such a policy and the function of the treatise as a rhetorical support for such an ideology.

Finally, a sketch has been given of the tools Abū Hayyān employed. They show typical acculturation features, as the adaptation of patterns and structures created for the analysis of Arabic language to a very different context.

A conclusive remark is in order about the success of Abū Hayyān’s work, and indirectly the success of the Mamlūk’s cultural policy. As far as we know, the path began by Abū Hayyān has not been continued. No other major Arab grammanian studied foreign languages (except for lexicographic works), nor the pro-Turkish ideology seems to have gained much support to the Mamlūks. The reasons for that can be many; I think that a key reason is the internal troubles that immediately followed the death of sultan Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn (741/1341). A cultural policy
is possible and effective only if the power can hold the control. The decadence of Bahri Mamluks is likely to have hindered further developments of this policy.

The fact that Arabic grammar ignored the possibility to be applied to other languages was probably one of the causes of its decadence. It is a pity for the history of culture, since Arabic grammar in the 13th-14th centuries was still in a powerful age. As many studies are clearly showing, the so-called Late Arab Grammarians are to be regarded among the most important representatives of the Arabic linguistic thinking.

An age which produced such grammarians as Ibn Ya‘îl, Ibn Mâlik, Abu Hayyân, Ibn ‘Aqîl and Ibn Hišâm certainly had remarkable chances of development. If the Idrâk had been followed by other works in the same spirit, the importance of Arab grammarians in the history of linguistics could have been far greater.
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FIRĀSA AND INTELLIGENCE:
THE SILLY AND THE INTELLIGENT IN ARAB PHYSIOGNOMY

Antonella Gheretti

University of Venice

Contact with the cultural heritage of the classical world created a great interest in physiognomy in the Arab one and this was a stimulus that fell on fertile ground. In fact disciplines of divination based on induction and the spirit of observation, as qiyāfa, were already well known and came from a long tradition1, as one can see from the famous episode of the sons of Nizār b. Ma‘add2. Firāsa3 (physiognomy), though, was something that the Arab world always saw as a foreign branch of knowledge and it was thus not by chance that the recognised authorities of this science were Greek. Polemon of Laodiceia (Stegemann 1952), who died in 114 A.D., and Aristotle himself, are quoted by Ḥāġġī Ḥalīfa (Kāṣf IV, 388) and, with Eleos, by Ya‘qib b. Ishaq al-Kindi4. al-Ḡāţiz repeatedly mentions Polemon in his Ḥayawān (III, 146, 269, 284). What was attributed to Aristotle were two treatises on physiognomy, the contents of which are in large part taken and quoted in the firāsa works: Sirr5 and Physiognōmonika6.

The term firāsa itself, used to translate the Greek physiognōmonika, brings out the inductive character which it has in common with the typically Arab qiyāfa mentioned above and is an interesting clue to how physiognomy was perceived and assimilated into the Arab culture. It, in fact, stands for acute observation, the capacity to grasp the recondite and what is inaccessible to the senses (idrāk al-bātin) thanks to attentive consideration of exterior aspect7. Firāsa was used, in the scientific sense,
to define the physiognomic among the natural sciences and in the mystical sense to indicate the capacity inspired by divine grace to read into the hearts of men 8.

The science of physiognomy was of interest and was a subject of study for Arab writers of various disciplines. For the theologian Faḫr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzi, who died in 1209, it was the subject of a systematic treatise, *Fīrāsā*. One work on this argument 9 has been attributed to the legalist al-Šafī, who died in 820, and who is considered an authority in his field. And obviously, another attribution of this kind has been erroneously given to such a prolific polygraphe as al-Ǧahiz, i.e. *Irāsaf* (clearly spurious). Finally, there is an excellent work of synthesis on ideas of physiognomy to be ascribed to Sams ad-Dīn al-Anṣārī, who died in 1327. In the works of philosophy, medicine and religion, there are also passages devoted to the discipline of physiognomy. The famous Andalusian mystic, Ibn ‘Arabi, who died in 1240, and who is considered one of the greatest in this field 10, gives us a systematic treatment of it in a part of his *Tadhbīrāt* and of his *Futuḥāt* (II, 235-241), and Muhammad b. Zakariyyā ar-Rāzi, who died in 925, dedicates the second book of his treatise on medicine, *Ṭibb*, to physiognomy. Even in less specialised and more accessible works, one finds physiognomy called in. One finds references to physiognomy in encyclopaedic books such as an-Nuwayri’s *Nihāya* (III, 149 ff. & 353-357) or in the *Mustatraf* by al-İbšī (II, 191-192), as well as in story collections like the *Aǧhīya* and the *Ḥamqā* by Ibn al-Ǧawzi. 11 Even in treatises for scribes (kuttāb) one finds some notion of physiognomy in the description of the ideal scribe: excellent examples are the prescriptions of al-Ṣaybānī (*Risāla 9*) 12, later to be taken up by al-Qalqasandi (Subh I, 67). This leads us to think that there was some notion of this discipline as a common heritage among the learned. Often enough, listing of the physiognomical meaning of physical characteristics is linked to the question of intelligence (đakā’, fitna, faḥm, aṣq). This is a question that nearly always finds its canonical place among the subjects treated in the *adab* works, also for its doctrinal importance in that it is strictly connected with intelligence as a gift of God and a guide to the strait and narrow way 13.

We consider it interesting to give the following brief review of the physical indices of intelligence (and of its opposite) as seen by the physiognomical tradition in the Arab world, with an indication of traces in *adab* works of the classical and post-classical periods.

The physical type of the intelligent person (ar-raṣūj al-ḥāfin) that we find repeated with slight differences in ar-Rāzi, in the Arab Pseudo-Polemon, and the aforementioned Qabs, more or less faithfully reflects the Aristotelian concept of the proper mean, the Greek *mesotēs*, as an expression of ethical virtue. The physical characteristics of the man gifted with a good intelligence and a good nature, in fact, refer, also in the stylistic and lexical choices, to the concepts of measure and balance between the two extremes. This surely Aristotelian concept probably comes through the *Physiognomonike*, the Pseudepigraph of the Aristotelian school, translated into Arabic by Hunayn b. Ishāq. The quotation that follows, taken from Qabs fol. 21 v. is a physiognomical portrait of the intelligent man.

"If the proportioned state of the body corresponds to the same balance of temperament, and the temperament corresponds to the soul, then one can say that the following are the signs of the intelligent man. He should have flesh that is soft, tender and not abundant, he should be neither corpulent nor fragile, his face should not be fleshy and his shoulders should slope properly. He should not have too much flesh along his backbone and his complexion should be between the white and the red, luminous, with a fine skin. He should have neither too much nor too little hair and it should be neither too wiry nor too black. His eyes should be black with shades of blue, and soft 14. His stature should be between the short and the tall, his hands and feet well-proportioned and neither big nor small, neither fleshy nor too fleshyless, his head well proportioned and neither great nor small, his neck not thick and his hair tending towards the red and between curly and straight, his face round and his nose straight 15."
to define the physiognomic among the natural sciences and in the mystical sense to indicate the capacity inspired by divine grace to read into the hearts of men. 

The science of physiognomy was of interest and was a subject of study for Arab writers of various disciplines. For the theologian Fārābī al-Rāzī, who died in 1209, it was the subject of a systematic treatise, Fīrāsā. One work on this argument9 has been attributed to the legalist al-Šafi`ī, who died in 820, and who is considered an authority in his field. And obviously, another attribution of this kind has been erroneously given to such a prolific polygraphe as al-Ǧāhiz, i.e. ʿIrāsā (clearly spurious). Finally, there is an excellent work of synthesis on ideas of physiognomy to be ascribed to ʿAṣṣ ad-Dīn al-Anṣārī, who died in 1237. In the works of philosophy, medicine and religion, there are also passages devoted to the discipline of physiognomy. The famous Andalusian mystic, Ibn ʿArabī, who died in 1240, and who is considered one of the greatest in this field10, gives us a systematic treatment of it in a part of his Tadhbīrāt and of his Futūḥāt (II, 573-77), and Muhammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī, who died in 925, dedicates the second book of his treatise on medicine, Tibb, to physiognomy.

Even in less specialised and more accessible works, one finds physiognomy called in. One finds references to physiognomy in encyclopaedic books such as an-Nuwayrī's Nihāya (III, 149 ff. & 353-357) or in the Mustataf' by al-Iṣṣāḥī (II, 191-192), as well as in story collections like the Adkiyā and the Hamqā by Ibn al-Ǧāwzī11. Even in treatises for scribes (kuttāb) one finds some notion of physiognomy in the description of the ideal scribe: excellent examples are the prescriptions of as-Saybānī, the famous Andalusian mystic, Ibn ʿArabī, who died in 1240, and who is considered one of the greatest in this field10, gives us a systematic treatment of it in a part of his Tadhbīrāt and of his Futūḥāt (II, 235-241), and Muhammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī, who died in 925, dedicates the second book of his treatise on medicine, Tibb, to physiognomy.

Often enough, listing of the physiognomical meaning of physical characteristics is linked to the question of intelligence (dakāʿ, fiṣnā, fahm, ṣaqīl). This is a question that nearly always finds its canonical place among the subjects treated in the adab works, also for its doctrinal importance in that it is strictly connected with intelligence as a gift of God and a guide to the straight and narrow way12. We consider it interesting to give the following brief review of the physical indices of intelligence (and of its opposite) as seen by the physiognomical tradition in the Arab world, with an indication of traces in adab works of the classical and post-classical periods.

The physical type of the intelligent person (ṣurājul ʿalāfahim) that we find repeated with slight differences in ar-Rāzī, in the Arab Pseudo-Polemon, and the aforementioned Q̄abs, more or less faithfully reflects the Aristotelian concept of the proper mean, the Greek mesotēs, as an expression of ethical virtue. The physical characteristics of the man gifted with a good intelligence and a good nature, in fact, refer, also in the stylistic and lexical choices, to the concepts of measure and balance between the two extremes. This surely Aristotelian concept probably comes through the Physiognōmonikes, the Pseudograph of the Aristotelian school, translated into Arabic by Hunayn b. Ishāq. The quotation that follows, taken from Qabs fol. 21 v. is a physiognomical portrait of the intelligent man.

"If the proportioned state of the body corresponds to the same balance of temperament, and the temperament corresponds to the soul, then one can say that the following are the signs of the intelligent man. He should have flesh that is soft, tender and not abundant, he should be neither corpulent nor fragile, his face should not be fleshy and his shoulders should slope properly. He should not have too much flesh along his backbone and his complexion should be between the white and the red, luminous, with a fine skin. He should have neither too much nor too little hair and it should be neither too wiry nor too black. His eyes should be black with shades of blue, and soft14. His stature should be between the short and the tall, his hands and feet well-proportioned and neither big nor small, neither fleshy nor too fleshy, his head well proportioned and neither great nor small, his neck not thick and his hair tending towards the red and between curly and straight, his face round and his nose straight15."

---

9 The mystical interpretation is based on the famous ḫāliṭ: "ittaqā min fīrāsā al-muṭʿāmin" (at-Tirmūgli, Gāmiʿ V, 298).

10 But compare Mourad 1939:57-61.

11 See Rescher 1914:63. To Ibn ʿArabī is also attributed the Q̄abs, in all probability apocryphal. The texts contains a chapter on physiognomy, see Ghersetti 1994.

12 According to az-Zirikli (1980: III, 316) Luqat al-manafi fi t-tibb fi ʿIrāsā by the same author (GAL S I, 920) is devoted to ʿIrāsā al-firdsā.

13 All the following works include almost one chapter about intellect and intelligence (but also one about silliness): an-Nuwayrī, Nihāya III, 230 ff.; ar-Rāzī al-Ǧāfshānī, Muḥādārat 4 ff.; Ibn ʿAbdallāh, Bahgā I, 532 ff.; al-Iṣṣāḥī, Mustataf' 1, 33-41; Ibn ʿAbdulbarr, ʿIqd II, 104-116; Ibn Qutayba, Ṭibb I, part 1, 393-396.

14 The colour of eyes should be black mixed with blue: although all the colours are to be blamed, this mixture seems to be acceptable. This explanation is given by Fārābī al-Rāzī, Fīrāsā 64. Up to this point see the descriptions of the intelligent man in ar-Rāzī, Tibb 174 and Pseudo-Polemon, Phys. 160. Compare also Pseudo-Aristotle, Physiognōmonikes 98.

15 For this description, attributed to the "good-natured man" see ar-Rāzī, Tibb 175. Compare Pseudo-Aristotle Physiognōmonikes 100, with slight omissions.
In Sirr (123) and in Ibn 'Arabi’s two treatises, there is a very similar description attributed to the man of good intelligence and good nature and this is developed to the point of including characteristics that are pertaining to the hakim in the source from where we quoted the aforementioned passage. The affinities between physical build and moral attributes as a theoretical premise is clearly lifted from Aristotelian sources for the theory of the temperaments, duly elaborated and systematically set out by Galen in his treatise *Ott tais tou somatos kranesin ai tes psychês dynamis epointai*, translated into Arabic by the nephew of Hunayn, Hubayb b. al-Hasan ad-Dimashqi at the end of the third/ninth century. A balanced nature and a constitution fitted to become a sign of good intelligence.

Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi, describing the balanced temperament (*al-mizâq al-mu'tadil*) points out how euchasia, which lies in the just mean between the two poles, assures optimal functioning in the psychological faculties (*Firâsas* 37-38), and Ibn al-Gawzi considers it axiomatic that there is a correspondence between a balanced temperament and a good intelligence. Even from a preliminary linguistic analysis, what emerges is a semantic identity in both measure and equilibrium in both lexical and syntactical choice. Attenuation in the use of litotes, e.g., “he should not have a fleshy face” or “neither fat nor thin” points to the proper mean between the two poles, another example being “between the white and the red” thus giving yet greater emphasis to the Aristotelian concept of virtue as equilibrium and the proper mean, and a large part of the physiognomical descriptions in question come under this heading.

It must also be said that many of the characteristics that are signs of a good intelligence, listed as a catalogue of physical signs, also recall the concept of equilibrium and measure that stand out in the passage we have quoted. For example these point to a good intellect and a good nature: well proportioned eyebrows, an averagely large nose, a tone of voice that is neither too high nor too low, and a neck of average proportions. Then there are other physical signs that reveal intelligence: abundance of flesh, little fat at the stomach and a thin face. These, in fact, are also connected with a warm temperament, one of whose characteristics is brilliant intellectual capacities, with its variants in warm and dry and warm and moist. There are, however, three characteristics that recur constantly even outside this particular scheme: broad shoulders, tender flesh and soft and thin hands (sign of rapidity of intelligence). Finally, physiognomy does not neglect the correlation between the physical and the intellective which is connected to differences of sex and race. Men, it would appear, have a more perfect intelligence than women and the intelligence quotient would appear to vary according to race. The Egyptians, it seems, are not particularly perspicacious whereas the Macedonians are. The geographical area in which one is born appears also to have its influence on human psychological and intellective capacity. This latter theory finds its origin in the works of Hippocrates in particular as the *auctoritas* quoted by al-Masûdî (*Murâjî* I, 528-530) evaluating the correlation between environment and temperament.

Then, there are signs of intelligence that have nothing to do with the physical sphere, but rather with the behavioral one. These too hark back to the concept of measure: a proper speed of speech, sobriety in the way of being seated and in conversation and gesture, are signs of a good intellect. In the anecdotic and aphoristic literature the action and speech of the intelligent man are also connected to the concept of moderation: whoever it is that has a good intellect knows how to hold his tongue, to know his station in society, to recognise his own mistakes and to be prudent in both act and word. He is in charge of his own passions and above all has a way of behaviour that is measured and consonant with both situation and environment.

In the quantitative sense, indices of stupidity are far more numerous than those for intelligence, both in the physiognomical works and those which take them up,


21 Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi, *Firâsa* 25; according to al-Ghazî (*Bayân*, I, 139; Fahr I, 196-197) women are silly by nature.


23 According to Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi (*Firâsa* 58) the dwellers of the eastern areas have a better physical constitution and mental faculties than those of the western areas have (!).

24 Hippocrates in his treatise *Peri aerôn* theorizes the influence of environment on the nature of the human being. The Hippocratical theory is referred to by Galen who, in his *Ott tais tou somatos*, quotes many passages from the book of Hippocrates.

25 Ibn 'Arabi, *Fatâhât* 239; *Idem*, *Tadhîrât* 166, 167; compare Sirr 121.


In *Sirr* (123) and in Ibn 'Arabī’s two treatises, there is a very similar description attributed to the man of good intelligence and good nature16 and this is developed to the point of including characteristics that are pertaining to the ḥakīm in the source from where we quoted the aforementioned passage. The affinities between physical build and moral attributes as a theoretical premise is clearly lifted from Aristotelian sources for the theory of the temperaments, duly elaborated and systematically set out by Galen in his treatise *Ott tai sōmatos kreasin ai tēs psychēs dynamēs eponta*, translated into Arabic17 by the nephew of Hunayn, Hubayyā b. al-Hasan ad-Dimāḳī at the end of the third/ninth century. A balanced nature and a constitution fitted to it become a sign of good intelligence.

Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī, describing the balanced temperament (*al-mizāq al-mu’taḍī*) points out how eucrasia, which lies in the just mean between the two poles, assures optimal functioning in the psychological faculties (*Firāsā* 37-38), and Ibn al-Gawzī considers it axiomatic that there is a correspondence between a balanced temperament and a good intelligence18. Even from a preliminary linguistic analysis, what emerges is a semantic isotopy in both measure and equilibrium in both lexical and syntactical choice. Attenuation in the use of litotes, e.g., “he should not have a fleshy face” or “neither fat nor thin” points to the proper mean between the two poles, another example being “between the white and the red” thus giving yet greater emphasis to the Aristotelian concept of virtue as equilibrium and the proper mean, and a large part of the physiognomical descriptions in question come under this heading.

It must also be said that many of the characteristics that are signs of a good intelligence, listed as a catalogue of physical signs, also recall the concept of equilibrium and measure that stand out in the passage we have quoted. For example these point to a good intellect and a good nature: well proportioned eyebrows, an averagely large nose, a tone of voice that is neither too high nor too low, and a neck of average proportions. Then there are other physical signs that reveal intelligence: abundance of flesh, little fat at the stomach and a thin face19. These, in fact, are also connected with a warm temperament, one of whose characteristics is brilliant intellectual capacities, with its variants in warm and dry and warm and moist. There are, however, three characteristics that recur constantly even outside this particular scheme: broad shoulders, tender flesh and soft and thin hands (sign of rapidity of intelligence)20. Finally, physiognomy does not neglect the correlation between the physical and the intellective which is connected to differences of sex and race. Men, it would appear, have a more perfect intelligence than women21 and the intelligence quotient would appear to vary according to race. The Egyptians, it seems, are not conspicuously more intelligent whereas the Macedonians are22. The geographical area in which one is born23 appears also to have its influence on human psychological and intellectual capacity. This latter theory finds its origin in the works of Hippocrates in particular as the *actoritas* quoted by al-Masʿūdī (*Munṣīg I*, 528-530) evaluating the correlation between environment and temperament24.

Then, there are signs of intelligence that have nothing to do with the physical sphere, but rather with the behavioral one. These too hark back to the concept of measure: a proper speed of speech, sobriety in the way of being seated and in conversation and gesture, are signs of a good intellect25. In the anecdotic and aphoristic literature the action and speech of the intelligent man are also connected to the concept of moderation: whoever it is that has a good intellect knows how to hold his tongue, to know his station in society, to recognise his own mistakes and to be prudent in both act and word26. He is in charge of his own passions and above all has a way of behaviour that is measured and consonant with both situation and environment27.

In the quantitative sense, indices of stupidity are far more numerous than those for intelligence, both in the physiognomical works and those which take them up,

16 Ibn ‘Arabī, obviously considering it from a doctrinal viewpoint, attributes to the Prophet the aspect corresponding to the best constitution and the well-proportioned temperament (*Futuḥāt* II, 238 and *Tadhvīrāt* 163).


18 “The sages say: a well-proportioned constitution and the corresponding body indicate the faculty of intellect and a good intelligence” (Ibn al-Gawzī, *Afgūsād* 18).

19 See the following sources (quoted, for brevity, in one and the same list even if not every source presents the complete catalogue): *Sirr* 120, 121, 122; Ibn ‘Arabī, *Futuḥāt* II, 238, 239; *Idem., Tadhvīrāt* 164-166; *Qabs* fol. 22 r.; Ibn al-Gawzī, *Afgūsād* 18; Pseudo-Polygon, *Phys.* 155, 156; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 169; Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī, *Firāsā* 31-32, 34-36, 72.


21 Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī, *Firāsā* 25; according to al-Ghāzī (*Bayān*, I, 139; Fahr I, 196-197) women are silly by nature.


23 According to Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī (*Firāsā* 58) the dwellers of the eastern areas have a better physical constitution and mental faculties than those of the western areas have (ף).

24 Hippocrates in his treatise *Peri aerōn* theorizes the influence of environment on the nature of the human being. The Hippocratic theory is referred to by Galen who, in his *Ott tai sōmatos*, quotes many passages from the book of Hippocrates.


such as the *adab* encyclopaedias, where one usually finds, alongside the signs and attributes of intelligence, those of stupidity. Here the concept of stupidity, such as *humāq*, *gahb* and *qillat al-fitna*, to be found in the literature, mirrors those of intelligence in sense of measure and expediency and substantially deals with congruity between *modus operandi* and situation or context. This, in fact, in the classical dictates among others, is presented as stagnation of the intellect and is better defined as dissonance, often for lack of measure, between an evaluation of reality and reality itself, or between conduct and the exigencies of the situation. The concept of excess, be it towards the positive or the negative, and of disharmony has brought much to the physical and behavioral indices of stolidity mentioned in the works on physiognomy. Many of them, in fact, are to be found as signs of the dyscrasic temperament, that is the one which lacks harmonic proportion in its parts.

The following passage, taken from Ibn al-Ǧawzi (*Hamḍa* 19-20), gives us the complete catalogue of the signs of stupidity, bringing together descriptions to be found in various sources. We shall point out those passages that recur in the sources of physiognomy we have consulted.

"The sages say this: that if the head is small and is not well-formed, this is a sign of bad conformation of the brain. Galen says that smallness of head never fails to be a sign of bad conformation of the brain. If the neck is short, this is a sign of a weak and scarce brain. Whoever has a disproportionate physical build is one of little value, both in his intentions and his intellect, just as whoever has a large paunch, short fingers, a round face, a small head, and forehead, face, neck, and feet, fleshy, or a face like a semi-

---

28 In literary works this is perhaps due to the comical value of the anecdotes illustrating sayings and actions of silly people.


30 For the relation between form and size of the head (seat of the brain that controls the intellectual functions) see also Fahr ad-Din al-Razi, *Firasā* 39-40. See also Ibn ‘Arabi, *Tadhib al-Razi*, *Idem*, *Futuḥāt* 239.


32 Batal must probably be read *gahb*, as in the corresponding passage of Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi (*Firasā* 38).

33 Sirr 122; compare Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi, *Firasā* 74; Pseudo-Polemon, *Phys.* 157; ar-Razi, *Tibb* 172; Qabs fol. 22 r.


such as the *adab* encyclopaedias, where one usually finds, alongside the signs and attributes of intelligence, those of stupidity\(^{28}\). Here the concept of stupidity, such as *humaj, gahi* and *qillat al-fitna*, to be found in the literature, mirrors those of intelligence in sense of measure and expediency and substantially deals with congruity between *modus operandi* and situation or context. This, in fact, in the classical dictionaries, is presented as stagnation of the intellect and is better defined as dissonance, often for lack of measure, between an evaluation of reality and reality itself, or between conduct and the exigencies of the situation\(^{27}\). The concept of excess, be it towards the positive or the negative, and of disharmony has brought much to the physical and behavioral indices of stolidity mentioned in the works on physiognomy. Many of them, in fact, are to be found as signs of the dyscrasic temperament, that is the one which lacks harmonic proportion in its parts.

The following passage, taken from Ibn al-Ǧawzi (*Hamqā* 19-20), gives us the complete catalogue of the signs of stupidity, bringing together descriptions to be found in various sources. We shall point out those passages that recur in the sources of physiognomy.

"The sages say this: that if the head is small and is not well-formed, this is a sign of bad conformation of the brain. Galen says that smallness of head never fails to be a sign of bad conformation of the brain\(^{29}\). If the neck is short, this is a sign of a weak and scarce brain\(^{31}\). Whoever has a disproportionate physical build is one of little value, both in his intentions and his intellect, just as whoever has a large paunch\(^{32}\), short fingers\(^{33}\), a round face\(^{34}\), tall stature, a small head, and forehead, face, neck, and feet, fleshy\(^{35}\), or a face like a semi-circle. In the same way, if the head and forehead are round\(^{36}\), but the face large and with a look of stupidity and shiftiness in his eyes, he belongs to those furthest from the good\(^{37}\). If the eyes protrude the person is insolent and talks too much\(^{38}\) and if they look you up and down, then he is cunning and thieving\(^{39}\). If the eyes are large\(^{40}\) and tremulous, then he is lazy, vain and a lover of women\(^{41}\). Blue eyes with an admixture of saffron yellow are signs of ignoble customs\(^{42}\). Cow-eyes\(^{43}\) are signs of stupidity. Whoever has bulging eyes with falling eyelids is stupid\(^{44}\). Whoever has eyelids that are not of one piece or that are variously coloured, but not for reasons of illness, is sly and stupid (*Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā 62*). Hair on the shoulders and neck is a sign of stupidity and stubbornness, and if there is hair on the chest and the stomach, it is a sign of little sagacity\(^{45}\). Whoever has a long neck creates noise and confusion, is stupid and is a coward\(^{46}\). Whoever has a large and full neck is slow on the uptake (*ibid*). Whoever has fleshy lips is stupid and dense\(^{47}\). Whoever has a decidedly round face suffers from pride\(^{48}\). Whoever has large ears, likewise, and he is long-lived\(^{49}\). A lovely voice is a sign of stupidity and..."

\(^{28}\) In literary works this is perhaps due to the comical value of the anecdotes illustrating sayings and actions of silly people.

\(^{29}\) See Ghersetti 1993: esp. 92-94.

\(^{30}\) For the relation between form and size of the head (seat of the brain that controls the intellectual functions) see also *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 39-40. See also Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 167; *Idem, Futūḥat* 239.

\(^{31}\) But compare *Sirr* 121; Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 167; *Idem, Futūḥat* 239 and *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Tibb* 170.

\(^{32}\) *Batal* must probably be read *gabha*, as in the corresponding passage of *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī (Fīrāsā) 38*.

\(^{33}\) For the passage in Arabic form and size of the head (seat of the brain that controls the intellectual functions) see also *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 39-40. See also *Sirr* 122; Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 167; *Idem, Futūḥat* 239.

\(^{34}\) *Sirr* 122; compare *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 74; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 157; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 172; *Qabs* fol. 22 v.

\(^{35}\) ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 168; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 153; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.

\(^{36}\) Compare *Qabs* fol. 21 v.; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 152 and ar-Rāzī, *Tibb*, 164-165; *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī*.

\(^{37}\) *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 63; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 151; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 165; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.

\(^{38}\) *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 64; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 152; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 165; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.

\(^{39}\) Compare *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 62; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 152; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 166.

\(^{40}\) *Idem, Futūḥat* 238; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 150; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 163; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.

\(^{41}\) *Sirr* 121; Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 167; *Idem, Futūḥat* 239 and ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 170.

\(^{42}\) *Sirr* 120; Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 166 and Futūḥat 239; *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 67, 68; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 168, compare *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 153.

\(^{43}\) ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 168; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 153; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.

\(^{44}\) *Sirr* 121; Ibn ʿArabi, *Tadhḵᵛāt* 165 and Futūḥat 238; *Qabs* fol. 21 v.; *Fahr ad-Din ar-Rāzī, Fīrāsā* 70; *Pseudo-Polemon, Phys.* 154; ar-Rāzī, *Tibb* 169. Compare an-Nuwayri, *Niḥḍya* III, 149.
scarce intelligence50. Abundant and solid flesh are signs of sensations and density of intelligence51. Idiocy and stolidity are to be found for the most part among those who are tall of stature. Among the infallible signs there is also length of beard, because who has a long beard does not lack in stupidity. And this is taken back to the Torah: the beard comes out of the brain and if somebody has an excessively long beard, it is a sign of little brain - and who has little brain has little intellect and who has little intellect is stupid. Some sages say that stupidity is what fertilises the beard: who has a long beard is very stupid. One who saw a man with a long beard says, 'By God, if that (the beard) came out of a river, the river would dry up'. al-Alhakam b. Qays said, 'If you see a tall man with a long beard, know that he is an imbecile, even if he were Umayya b. 'Abd-Sams52.'

This description covers all the characteristics that ar-Raži, in his Fīrāsa, ascribes to the dyscrasic temperament and which, as we have pointed out earlier, denote a lack of equilibrium and also excess in one sense or the other, be it a large stomach, short fingers, a round face, shortness of stature, a head that is either very large or very small, or fleshliness in the face, eyes or feet53. Other characteristics are strictly associated with the bad cerebral conformation, the brain being held to be the seat of the intelligence. One example: if the forehead is low, it corresponds to a smaller brain, which can only implicate scarce intellective faculties54. Many and varied are the characteristics to be considered as signs of stupidity, in analogy with the somatic features of certain animals: the fixed look the animals have, eyes similar to a goat's, a nose that is large and reminiscent of the bovine species55, for example. The theory according to which the similarity of somatic features between man and the animals implicates a similarity in character traits, finds a systematic exposition in the treatise of Polemon of Laodiceia56. Fahr ad-Din ar-Raži, although he considers

50 Sīr 121; compare Ibn 'Arabi, Taḏḥiḥat 165 and Futūḥat 239; Qābih fol. 21 v., 22 r.; Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Ražī, Fīrāsa 71 (at 45-46 a "physiological" explanation of this statement); Pseudo-Polemon, Phys. 155; ar-Ražī, Tibb 169.
51 Qābih fol. 22 r.; Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Ražī, Fīrāsa 72; ar-Ražī, Tibb 169.
52 Concerning the long beard as a sign of silliness see the quotes provided in Ghesetti 1993:90-91.
53 Even in handbooks for kuttab these features are quoted; according to their prescriptions scribes mustn't have disproportionate limbs, a very big head or a long beard, since these are signs which cannot be associated with intelligence (al-Šaybānī, Risāla 9, quoted by al-Qalqasandi, Subh I, 67).
54 Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Ražī, Fīrāsa 60, ar-Ražī, Tibb 168; Qābih fol. 21 v.; but compare an-Nuwayri, Nihāyat III, 149, 356.
55 Ibn 'Arabi, Taḏḥiḥat 165 and Futūḥat 238; Fahr ad-Dīn ar-Ražī, Fīrāsa 66; Pseudo-Polemon, Phys. 152; ar-Ražī, Tibb 164, 165; Qābih fol. 21 v.
56 Polemon, Fīrāsa; the second chapter is devoted to animal psychology.

this criterion among the last of the hierarchy of signs, nonetheless calls it in fairly often where it is useful as a physiognomic explanation.

Alongside the physical signs, what has also to be taken into consideration are the behavioral ones where, likewise, the concepts of lack of measure and disharmony are Leitmotifs. Too rapid speech, for example, is a sure indication of stupidity57, just as is inappropriate intervention in a discourse, or loquacity or too hurried answers58. These are all traits tied to a distorted (excessive or dyscrasic) use of the faculty of speech. Also connected to this same semantic isotopy are the concepts of incongruity and inadequacy in any given context and these constitute the phenomenology of the best-known definition of stupidity such as "putting things in the wrong place". The catalogue of the actions of the silly person is in fact characterized by lack of measure. In what the fīrāsa works and the works of adab bring us (these works seem to us to contain a certain conceptual coherence) one can isolate, in the concept of intelligence, as presented in the sources taken into consideration, a dichotomy of structure. In this the positive pole - that of a good intelligence - is represented by all that is inspired by eucrasia and measure both in the sphere of physical constitution and in that of behaviour, while the negative pole - stupidity - is represented by all that is inspired by dyscrasia and excess, in both the physical and the behavioral.
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58 These two are among the most widespread definitions of "silliness" which can be found in adab works. See Ghesetti 1993:86-89.
scarce intelligence. Abundant and solid flesh are signs of sensations and density of intelligence. Idiocy and stolidity are to be found for the most part among those who are tall of stature. Among the infallible signs there is also length of beard, because who has a long beard does not lack in stupidity. And this is taken back to the Torah: the beard comes out of the brain and if somebody has an excessively long beard, it is a sign of little brain - and who has little brain has little intellect and who has little intellect is stupid. Some sages say that stupidity is what fertilises the beard: who has a long beard is very stupid. One who saw a man with a long beard says, 'By God, if that (the beard) came out of a river, the river would dry up'. al-Ahnaf b. Qays said, 'If you see a tall man with a long beard, know that he is an imbecile, even if he were Umayya b. 'Abdšams.'

This description covers all the characteristics that ar-Razi, in his Firdasa, ascribes to the dyscrasic temperament and which, as we have pointed out earlier, denote a lack of equilibrium and also excess in one sense or the other, be it a large stomach, short fingers, a round face, shortness of stature, a head that is either very large or very small, or fleshiness in the face, eyes or feet. Other characteristics are strictly associated with the bad cerebral conformation, the brain being held to be the seat of the intelligence. One example: if the forehead is low, it corresponds to a smaller brain, which can only implicate scarce intellective faculties. Many and varied are these characteristics to be considered as signs of stupidity, in analogy with the somatic features of certain animals: the fixed look the animals have, eyes similar to a goat's, a nose that is large and reminiscent of the bovine species, for example. The theory according to which the similarity of somatic features between man and the animals implicates a similarity in characters, finds a systematic exposition in the treatise of Polemon of Laodiceta. Fahr ad-Din ar-Razi, although he considers this criterion among the last of the hierarchy of signs, nonetheless calls it in fairly often where it is useful as a physiognomic explanation.

Alongside the physical signs, what has also to be taken into consideration are the behavioral ones where, likewise, the concepts of lack of measure and disharmony are Leitmotifs. Too rapid speech, for example, is a sure indication of stupidity, just as is inappropriate intervention in a discourse, or loquacity or too hurried answers. These are all traits tied to a distorted (excessive or dyscrasic) use of the faculty of speech. Also connected to this same semantic isotropy are the concepts of incongruity and inadequacy in any given context and these constitute the phenomenology of the best-known definition of stupidity such as "putting things in the wrong place". The catalogue of the actions of the silly person is in fact characterized by lack of measure. In what the firdasa works and the works of adab bring us (this works seems to us to contain a certain conceptual coherence) one can isolate, in the concept of intelligence, as presented in the sources taken into consideration, a dichotomy of structure. In this the positive pole - that of a good intelligence - is represented by all that is inspired by eurasia and measure both in the sphere of physical constitution and in that of behaviour, while the negative pole - stupidity - is represented by all that is inspired by dyscrasia and excess, in both the physical and the behavioral.
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57 Aristotile, Sirr 121 (compare Ibn 'Arabi, Tadhibîrât 166); Ibn 'Arabi, Futuhat 239; Fahr ad-Dîn ar-Razi, Firdasa 71; ar-Razi, Tibb 169; Ibn 'Arabi, Qadh fol. 21 v.-22 r.
58 These two are among the most widespread definitions of "silliness" which can be found in adab works. See Gheretti 1993:88-89.
Maghrebian francophone literature evokes the possibility of a representative subjectivity by scrutinizing strategic ideological communities and by critiquing socio-ethnic categorizations upon which social life appears to be ordered. The voice of the narrative is constructed through its conscious differentiation and assimilation of other subject positions. Nevertheless, one must conscientiously question narrative’s ability to achieve the kind of reflection prerequisite to imagining a literature of the people. Post-colonial writing has come to terms with the temptations of such theoretical proposals, even though the questions of community, representation and public responsibility remain critically unresolved.

Some Maghrebian francophone literature has demonstrated a kind of theoretical affiliation with a European tradition of philosophy and criticism which has condemned the absolutism of the knowing subject. This modernity is considered to have superceded the strategically necessary subjective community essential to successful resistance against colonial rule. A citation from a presentation given by Beida Chikhi in 1991 at the Université Mohamed V in Rabat, encapsulates the position that in Maghrebian literature and culture, the ideal of an oppositional community has given way to the location of revolutionary exploration within the individual subject itself:

“In opposition to reductive and recuperative ideologies, the modernity of Maghrebian texts consists in taking a position of “auto-reflection” and “auto-comprehension” opening onto the debut of a new “I” which speaks in its own name and no longer in the name of the community for which it could only be the spokesman, as was the case in the realist works of the revolution”.

The ease with which the subjective and the personal assimilate hermetically here suggests the possibility of an absolute determination and seizure of meaning in a subject rendered transcendent of its nationalist historical context. Chikhi’s comments suggest that contemporary writing in post-independence countries strikes out a resounding affirmation of difference which articulates the potential for universality from its own subjective position. The danger lies in equating the philosophically engendered subject of the narrative with the socially-situated subjectivity of post-colonial experience. Can narrative tending toward universality achieve the kind of representative transcendence that allows for more than a particular insight into the cultures of colonialism and post-colonialism?

In opposition to a post-colonial literature which depicts the subject’s introspective journey into self awareness, the literature of radical difference deploys a plurivocalic
and multi-cultural subjective experimentation which bases its own universalizing tendencies on the principles of openness and multiplicity. In the Maghreb, the works of Abdelkebir Khatibi epitomize this trans-lingual, trans-cultural genre. He argues in *Maghreb Pluriel* that the idea of an authentic and ontological plurality of being particular to the Maghreb is founded on a historical, linguistic and cultural heterogeneity which distinguishes North Africa from both Western and Oriental civilizations. Through the subjective rise to consciousness of this difference, the pluralized subject purports to integrate historical and psychological aspects of culture and to address the concerns of a heterogeneous community in reconstruction. This accumulation of diverse experiences into a unique subjective perception draws reference to a historical identity which, as numerous literary examples demonstrate, needs to prove its contemporary relevance.

Sharing this vantage point, Abdallah Memmes describes the act of writing "Meaning and Interculturality" as one in which multiplicity is a presupposition to Maghrebian subjectivity:

"Whether on the scriptural or on the thematic level, the procedure is the same: the approach at hand is one of a collection of subversive practices, to combat the systems of uniformizing order and to substitute the hegemonic and coercive unity they impose, in order to realize from the starting point of heterogeneity a liberating unity." (Memmes, 101).

According to Memmes, several writers from the Maghreb have used this approach to subvert and reinvent the autobiographical genre, so that the "I" slips into the collective deictic "we" and a representation of the community's life and development is realized. What's more, this strategy of reinvention purports to achieve pluralism from within subjectivity; the enunciation of plural existence by the "I" immediately and immanently dispels otherness from the harmony of a shared cultural experience. Memmes' formulac conception of the Maghrebian narrative would equate autobiographical writing in the Maghreb with writing the story of a community's rise to collective expression. The writing of community becomes therefore a writing of pluralized modernity, inclusive of difference and capable of expression in the singular voice of the people.

Despite Memmes' wishful pluralizing of the unified subject, inner limitations, ideological biases and mythological foundations persist present obstacles to ultimate self-knowledge in subjectivity when it is forced to confront, through its very openness, a recalcitrant social reality vocalized from within the heterogeneity of the people. While the representative transcendence of a particular subjective perspective seems possible in the writing of Mouloud Feraoun or Mohamed Dib, radical disruptions on the levels of family, community, and ideology disorient the subject perspective in its attempt to make sense of its social world. I believe that it is through the exploration of this disorientation of community that the subject questions the foundations on which society and the subject are mutually constructed. And this exploration through the contradictory formations of communicative subjectivity permanently discredit the absolute status of the representative popular narrative. But as it denaturalizes the collective, popular object of the writing of communities, it forces a reckoning between oppositional forces, communities of disunity, and contradictory ideals of belonging. This collection of tensions necessitates a rethinking of the foundations upon which narrativity in Maghrebian fiction rests. Subjectivity cannot be conceived as lying outside of the social realm; nor can it truly maintain political integrity by remaining open to extreme heterogeneity. In the final analysis, subjectivity is characterized by an ambivalent perspective on community, articulated imperfectly throughout its obstacle-ridden trajectory through incommensurable strands of identity.

By treating six literary texts written by six different authors from the Maghreb, this analysis creates a community linked by its common interrogation on the possibility of community. In creating this space of analytical difference, I will demonstrate how the texts collectively argue the construction of community and how the formation of subjectivity is challenged by its approach to that otherness which, in various guises, emerges from its conceptions of popular unity.

The stable construction of a narrative community is disputed in one of the earliest, "revolutionary", texts. In Kateb Yacine's *Nedjma*, the errant narrative reveals the personal histories of four protagonists whose family backgrounds are characterized by the enigma of uncertain paternity and violence. The novel is simultaneously the representation of a pervasive symbolic and political stagnation which preempts identity reconstruction according to any prior conceptions of community and genealogy. This stagnation comes in spite of the urgently required popular solidarity against the colonial occupation. In the poetic reconstruction of a meeting between an unnamed peasant and Lakhdar, a student militant in flight, the novel offers an example of the multi-layered schism which divides the Algerian people: "I called to him, but he didn't come. He made a sign. He signed to me that he was at war. / At war with his stomach. Everybody knows ... / Everybody knows that a peasant has no mind. / A peasant is only a stomach. A catapult." (Kateb Yacine 54). Lakhdar is incapable of communicating with his interlocutor linguistically, which is not in itself remarkable in the multilingual Maghreb. But in an ironic reflection of both the peasant's body language and the received message, Lakhdar parodies their mutual unease, both with each other and with the world in which they live: "Me, I was at war. I entertained the peasant. / I wanted him to forget his hunger. I played the fool. I played/ the fool before my father the peasant" (54). The experience of conflict with the world is the only point of commonality, even if Lakhdar recognizes the outward signification of age and generational continuity. Radically different perspectives on "war", the incommensurability of individual experiences of "war" and the absence of a common idiom with which to construct a composite simulacrum of the object in question defy
and multi-cultural subjective experimentation which bases its own universalizing tendencies on the principles of openness and multiplicity. In the Maghreb, the works of Abdelkebir Khatibi epitomize this trans-lingual, trans-cultural genre. He argues in *Maghreb Pluriel* that the idea of an authentic and ontological plurality of being particular to the Maghreb is founded on a historical, linguistic and cultural heterogeneity which distinguishes North Africa from both Western and Oriental civilizations. Through the subjective rise to consciousness of this difference, the pluralized subject purports to integrate historical and psychological aspects of culture and to address the concerns of a heterogeneous community in reconstruction. This accumulation of diverse experiences into a unique subjective perception draws reference to a historical identity which, as numerous literary examples demonstrate, needs to prove its contemporary relevance.

Sharing this vantage point, Abdallah Memmes describes the act of writing "Meaning and Interculturality" as one in which multiplicity is a presupposition to Maghrebian subjectivity:

"Whether on the scriptural or on the thematic level, the procedure is the same: the approach at hand is one of a collection of subversive practices, to combat the systems of uniformizing order and to substitute the hegemonic and coercive unity they impose, in order to realize from the starting point of heterogeneity a liberating unity." (Memmes, 101).

According to Memmes, several writers from the Maghreb have used this approach to subvert and reinvent the autobiographical genre, so that the "I" slips into the collective deictic "we" and a representation of the community's life and development is realized. What's more, this strategy of reinvention purports to achieve pluralism from within subjectivity; the enunciation of plural existence by the "I" immediately and immanently dispels otherness from the harmony of a shared cultural experience. Memmes' formulaic conception of the Maghrebian narrative would equate autobiographical writing in the Maghreb with writing the story of a community's rise to collective expression. The writing of community becomes therefore a writing of pluralized modernity, inclusive of difference and capable of expression in the singular voice of the people.

Despite Memmes' wishful pluralizing of the unified subject, inner limitations, ideological biases and mythological foundations present persistent obstacles to ultimate self-knowledge in subjectivity when it is forced to confront, through its very openness, a recalcitrant social reality vocalized from within the heterogeneity of the people. While the representative transcendence of a particular subjectivistic perspective seems possible in the writing of Mouloud Feraoun or Mohamed Dib, radical disruptions on the levels of family, community, and ideology disorient the subject perspective in its attempt to make sense of its social world. I believe that it is through the exploration of this disorientation of community that the subject questions the foundations on which society and the subject are mutually constructed. And this exploration through the contradictory formations of communicative subjectivity permanently discredits the absolute status of the representative popular narrative. But as it denaturalizes the collective, popular object of the writing of communities, it forces a reckoning between oppositional forces, communities of disunity, and contradictory ideals of belonging. This collection of tensions necessitates a rethinking of the foundations upon which narrativity in Maghrebian fiction rests. Subjectivity can not be conceived as lying outside of the social realm; nor can it truly maintain political integrity by remaining open to extreme heterogeneity. In the final analysis, subjectivity is characterized by an ambivalent perspective on community, articulated imperfectly throughout its obstacle-ridden trajectory through incommensurable strands of identity.

By treating six literary texts written by six different authors from the Maghreb, this analysis creates a community linked by its common interrogation on the possibility of community. In creating this space of analytical difference, I will demonstrate how the texts collectively argue the construction of community and how the formation of subjectivity is challenged by its approach to that otherness which, in various guises, emerges from its conceptions of popular unity.

The stable construction of a narrative community is disputed in one of the earliest, "revolutionary", texts. In Kateb Yacine's *Nedjma*, the errant narrative reveals the personal histories of four protagonists whose family backgrounds are characterized by the enigma of uncertain fatherhood and violence. The novel is simultaneously the representation of a pervasive symbolic and political stagnation which preempts identity reconstruction according to any prior conceptions of community and genealogy. This stagnation comes in spite of the urgently required popular solidarity against the colonial occupation. In the poetic reconstruction of a meeting between an unnamed peasant and Lakhdar, a student militant in flight, the novel offers an example of the multi-layered schism which divides the Algerian people: "I called to him, but he didn't come. He made a sign. /He signed to me that he was at war./ At war with his stomach. Everybody knows ... /Everybody knows that a peasant has no mind./ A peasant is only a stomach. A catapult." (Kateb Yacine 54). Lakhdar is incapable of communicating with his interlocutor linguistically, which is not in itself remarkable in the multilingual Maghreb. But in an ironic reflection of both the peasant's body language and the received message, Lakhdar parodies their mutual unease, both with each other and with the world in which they live: "Me, I was at war. I entertained the peasant. /I wanted him to forget his hunger. I played the fool. I played/ the fool before my father the peasant" (54). The experience of conflict with the world is the only point of commonality, even if Lakhdar recognizes the outward signification of age and generational continuity. Radically different perspectives on "war", the incommensurability of individual experiences of "war" and the absence of a common idiom with which to construct a composite simulacrum of the object in question def
any genuine notion of paternity and invite a closer view of the barriers which impede the transmission of cultural meaning on identity in *Nedjma*.

Lakhdar’s inability to communicate with his “father” suggests that generational, geographical, linguistic and class barriers prevent a concerted popular movement against the foreign oppressors. Another of the protagonists, Rachid, is susceptible to psychic and hallucinatory mental pergerinations, which reveal to him both the enigmas of his own identity and the profound fracture in the affiliations of his tribal ancestry. In one of the most poignant critiques of attempts to re-establish cultural continuity through the mythical historic links of tribal genealogy, he has a vision in which the critical schisms of distinct communities are revealed:

“And the old legendary Keblout appeared to Rachid in a dream ... He, the ancestor with the face of a ferocious beast, with somber and crafty eyes, passed his superb gaze over his tribe, with his cane in hand; with this gaze, he ironically recounted the history of each one ... he alone had lived their existence to its full extent.” (134)

The history of tribal disloyalty and irrevocable fragmentation is revealed to Rachid, but the evocation here of a legendary tribal figure serves not to remind him of his forgotten tribal identity; rather, it demonstrates on a psychological level that the contemporary absence of community has origins which precede the current conflict. The emphasis on a “lived history” reinforces the relation between experience and belonging. This relationship is further strengthened by the camaraderie which unites the four protagonists. Individually, they experience a personal exile whose debut stems from the disruption of their paternal origins: “Who among us has not seen his origins blur like a stream in the sand, who hasn’t closed his ears to the subterranean gallop of the ancestors, who hasn’t run and frolicked on the tomb of his father” (97).

Collectively, with the story of each one comprising part of a cyclical and interwoven unity, they bear witness to a generalized environment of alienation in a nation racked by the factionalism of a colonial war.

Kateb Yacine’s *Nedjma* weaves personal, mythological and historical identities together in order to highlight collective and communicative fragmentation on several levels. This composite form of representation loosens the narrative integrity of subjectivity but seeks to reconstruct an entity, the female figure of Nedjma, around which narrative instances are generated. Nedjma’s own enigmatic origins offer the possibility of a necessarily partial reflective plenitude for the alienated protagonists.

Tahar Ben Jelloun’s *Moha le fou, Moha le sage* similarly constructs a subversive figure which serves as the wandering witness to the fragmentation of cultural continuity. Moha also vocalizes the collective concerns of a people victimized by post-independence transitions of power. While tracing the forgotten origins of a collective consciousness, Moha receives and transmits the personal histories of marginalized elements of contemporary society:

“Neither Aicha, the little maid, wrenched from her village, nor Dada, the black slave woman bought in Sudan at the beginning of the century, had the right to speak in the house of the patriarch. Mute, excluded, both of them. Nevertheless, they spoke. Aicha spoke at night in the wood, and Dada in the evening on the roof of the house. Their words will reach the ears of Moha. It is again he who relates them.” (Ben Jelloun 39)

*Moha le fou, Moha le sage* argues blatantly that even if they are deemed socially acceptable, permissible in Islam, or politically necessary, the abuse of children forced into servile labor, the virtual enslavement of women, and the torture of political dissidents are symptoms of a single social disorder. It is only by collecting these stories, and by transmitting them through the ambivalent optic of the madman/wiseman that a concerted resistance is possible.

Ben Jelloun’s interpretation is dependent however, on the retrieval from a mythic past of a unified popular ideal, in which language is the hybridized vehicle of expression of the body. The contemporary dislocation of social unity can only be corrected by remembering the future possibility of a harmony whose promise is already present in the world, on a corporal, natural and social level:

“I sing of a people which is absent for the moment behind the wall. A people which will one day push the wall forward. I say a people and not a dream or an image, a living people, which knows patience and furor, an unpredictable people. It descends on the streets with its naked kids and its trees suspended in the sky” (Ben Jelloun 49).

The primary element of popular renewal is “absent” but “present”, tangible yet incomplete in its potential. It speaks in a singular voice which has not yet been integrated behind the concrete action that only a figure like Moha can usher into linguistic form.

In the Manichean imaginary of Ben Jelloun’s fictive world, post-independence Morocco effectively silences popular opposition in the name of a degenerative social order whose tenets are no longer an orthodox Islam, national pride and humanism. Rather, they have given way to the vice, greed and injustice which are inevitable in a society which forgets to recognize value in its weakest members: the poor, women, and especially children. Ultimately, however, it is not so much that human behavior fails in the face of absolute ideals which remain resolute to enslave humanity in its fallibility. At issue is whether a reason which fails to recognize the ethical, corporal and mystical composition of human society can ever be anything but abusive. The “people” in Ben Jelloun’s writing presupposes this preexistent integrity which society has distorted beyond recognition and which can only be regained through the emergent plural conscience.

As it attempts to narrate the composite experience of victimization in post-independence Morocco, *Moha le fou, Moha le sage* frequently degenerates into the caricature. While Ben Jelloun strives to create a revolutionary prototype, Moha is
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easier read as an essentialized Jeremiah crying in the wilderness of a post-colonial world that has lost its ideals. It is in critiquing the absolutism of such myth, even in its popular and folkloric simulacra, that Mohamed Khair-Eddine’s Agadir narrates a similar condemnation of the generalized disintegration of Moroccan society. Agadir stages the collision of popular, historical and mythic identity in order to confront the impossibility of ever rebuilding a society constructed on received notions, but it is at the same time a deconstruction of its own subjective position on society. In a society founded on precariously crafted mythologies of identity, colossal catastrophe not only destroys but it also unearths the inner workings of mythologies. In the text, subjectivity itself is revealed to be the most important of those mythologies according to which the experience of belonging is purveyed.

The narrator is a minor functionary sent to the cataclysmic scene of a city ravaged by earthquake in order to reestablish official order. As he receives the survivors’ documentation of their ruined possessions and property, he notes that their “descriptions are without analogy, but all interconnected by an intrinsic line, shall we say by a similar motif” of reparable loss (Khair-Eddine 19). The claims which pass through his hands range from the loss of shops, homes and family members, to the banal job application totally unrelated to the catastrophe. The narrator dismissively critiques the survivors for not simply abandoning their former lives, for they act as if their city were “the cradle of civilization and the matrix on which its history will form” (15). It is evident that the narrator’s pessimism was already predetermined by the particular culture of the Moroccan civil service, and he quickly reveals what the actual mission is: “I must admit that I’m not looking for truth. I received orders to...” (126). The narrator suggests that both the social and the psychological ruins which litter the subjective landscape can only be overcome by radically reorienting thought on humanity. Human existence is unmistakably animal, and the human animal is quite definitely amoral: “GOD WOULD BE THE MONUMENTAL ZERO OF MY EYE WHERE EVERYTHING COLLAPSES” (126); any effort short of a reconsideration of human collectivity according to this ultimate recognition will simply rebuild society on the same faulty foundations.

Building a rationally ordered community in Agadir seems to lie outside the realm of human possibility. Inevitably human community is constructed, but the text suggests that the impediment to a more natural existence stems from a characteristic linguistic egocentrism: “And then each one speaks especially about his own life. Each one regrets his past life” (126). While the individual claims lodged against an indifferent social order remain disjointed, the cooperative potential of consciousness is also denied the possibility of transcending the limitations of its present existence.

The narrator in Agadir has no prior faith in either human community or in the stable rationalism of the individual subject. In this respect, he is quite different from the protagonist and autobiographical “I” in Driss Chraibi’s Le Passe Simple. Written in Morocco just prior to its independence, the text depicts a similar breakdown of cultural continuity, this time located squarely in the domestic sphere. On behalf of his weaker family members, the narrator, Driss Ferdi, the western-educated second son of a traditional Moroccan patriarch, launches a counterattack against the tyrannical authority of his stoic, bourgeois father. While Driss perceives himself as the subversive liberator of the oppressed, the genuine breakdown is in the construction of the self as a representative of others. Whereas Driss anticipates a degree of solidarity from his mother and brothers, their skepticism merely aggravates his already impa-

When the “I” reemerges in several points in the text, but just as it loses itself in the polyphony of social and historical personifications of larger social segments, the notions of belonging and existence on which its distinct self is attached are increasingly constricted: “Was I born? I was born, therefore, I live, so it’s me that was born... No, I didn’t see myself being born” (86). The search for the origins of civil society gives way to the narrative fixation on the origins of the particular persona which the “I” has become. Memory is tested as an adequate process for the verification of existence and as a viable ideology for the constitution of social belonging. The common ideal of a rural, tribal heritage and an original wisdom, which can be reintegrated through the activation of a continuous, intergenerational memory, becomes nothing short of nightmarish, as the “I” is haunted by his buried father through the marshes and slime of his ancestral homeland.

It is nevertheless in the penultimate section of Agadir that the threatened narrative subject emphatically plots out the architectural design of the new city, in which its citizens will “DEFINITIVELY CONTRADICT THE POSTULATE WHICH AIDS TO DEGRADE US AND ACCORDING TO WHICH GOD IS GOD THE BOSS AND US WHAT ARE WE EXCEPT THE VERTEBRATES OF A REPUGNANT AND DECONSTRUCTIBLE RACE...” (124). The narrator suggests that both the social and the psychological ruins which litter the subjective landscape can only be overcome by radically reorienting thought on humanity. Human existence is unmistakably animal, and the human animal is quite definitely amoral: “GOD WOULD BE THE MONUMENTAL ZERO OF MY EYE WHERE EVERYTHING COLLAPSES” (126); any effort short of a reconsideration of human collectivity according to this ultimate recognition will simply rebuild society on the same faulty foundations.

Building a rationally ordered community in Agadir seems to lie outside the realm of human possibility. Inevitably human community is constructed, but the text suggests that the impediment to a more natural existence stems from a characteristic linguistic egocentrism: “And then each one speaks especially about his own life. Each one regrets his past life” (126). While the individual claims lodged against an indifferent social order remain disjointed, the cooperative potential of consciousness is also denied the possibility of transcending the limitations of its present existence.

The narrator in Agadir has no prior faith in either human community or in the stable rationalism of the individual subject. In this respect, he is quite different from the protagonist and autobiographical “I” in Driss Chraibi’s Le Passe Simple. Written in Morocco just prior to its independence, the text depicts a similar breakdown of cultural continuity, this time located squarely in the domestic sphere. On behalf of his weaker family members, the narrator, Driss Ferdi, the western-educated second son of a traditional Moroccan patriarch, launches a counterattack against the tyrannical authority of his stoic, bourgeois father. While Driss perceives himself as the subversive liberator of the oppressed, the genuine breakdown is in the construction of the self as a representative of others. Whereas Driss anticipates a degree of solidarity from his mother and brothers, their skepticism merely aggravates his already impa-
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tient pathos and his disgust at their inertia. He challenges his mother verbally to speak her defiance against the patriarch and overcome her wretched status:

"... Do you prefer to remain a wreck? Because, if so, tell me and instead of treating you like some sort of imbecile, I'll treat you like a wreck ... Did you never think that I wasn't proud of you? You could have been a mother, and you're only a wreck. Or do you think that, from the moment you threw me outside with three or four hundred grammes of placenta, I would continue to spend my life blessing you? No way! So? So?" (Chraibi 153).

Driss eventually abandons the struggle to emancipate his mother. According to his perception, his mother has passed the point in which she can communicate her feelings. Because she has been reduced to her reproductive capacity, the only gesture available to her now is involuntary procreation. In fact virtually the only family member with whom Driss communicates his collectively-conceived struggle is his father, his declared opponent. The text opens up the dual possibility, first that Driss is the only one whose education provides the terms and understanding for concerted action against tyranny, and second that Driss has ultimately mistaken the collective will for a highly personal one. Active and passive resistance may simply be unrecognizable and incommunicable. But the text also jeopardizes its own privileged narrative position by denying the Western educated, humanist-oriented subject the ultimate liberty to coopt incommensurably divergent life experiences.

The inadequacy of the interpretive function of subjectivity is also at issue in Abdellatif Laâbi's Le Chemin des Ordalies. When the narrative subject reemerges from prolonged detention, he only partially recognizes the society which inspired his embittered revolutionary idealism. While the text seems to want to maintain an ideal for an idealized social body of resistance is implicitly restored. A second recognition of community counteracts the skepticism which characterizes the text according to ideological lines. Even as the narrator argues that one must "dig and dig this hard rock of [social] reality ... to place ourselves into question...to spring up on the other side of the tunnel or the Cavern of our Ideas" (191), community in Le Chemin des Ordalies is preserved directly along affective lines: family and close friends, but also a kind of love which characterizes the affective solidarity of resistance writers.

The experience of incarceration indelibly imprints a strategic conception of community on the narrator. This conception allows the inevitable contradictions of pessimism and faith in social ideals to co-exist. Shared experience invites a close affiliation between the narrator and others who have similarly suffered, even as the text expresses a loss of faith in "brotherhood". The unity achieved through shared experience translates itself into an indistinct usage of the pronominal designations "I" and "you" in several texts. The "I" in Abdelhak Serhane's Les enfants des rues étrées closely follows the experiences of another, presumably very like him. The "I" attempts to recall and interpret what the other sees, what his position is vis-à-vis other people and what the other person must certainly feel. While they are both spectators at a public story-telling (halqa), the "I" narrates his interlocutor's experience, communicates that experience to him and proposes a simultaneous, yet distinct similitude in the representation of their existence:

"You went back to your place in order to listen to the rest of the story. I still couldn't see the expression on your face. Drowned in the overexcited crowd, I could distinguish the worn collar on your jacket. This detail opened wide before my eyes two great parentheses where the itinerary of our two lives were traced in parallel in an ink of misery." (Serhane 37)

The text demonstrates a consciousness of its own narrative production. But it does not incite its own closure according to this model of affective and dual subjectivity. Rather, its several loosely connected stories exhibit radical variations in the collective
tient pathos and his disgust at their inertia. He challenges his mother verbally to speak her defiance against the patriarch and overcome her wretched status:

"... Do you prefer to remain a wreck? Because, if so, tell me and instead of treating you like some sort of imbécile, I'll treat you like a wreck ... Did you never think that I wasn't proud of you? You could have been a mother, and you're only a wreck. Or do you think that, from the moment you threw me outside with three or four hundred grammes of placenta, I would continue to spend my life blessing you? No way! So? So?" (Chraibi 153).

Driss eventually abandons the struggle to emancipate his mother. According to his perception, his mother has passed the point in which she can communicate her feelings. Because she has been reduced to her reproductive capacity, the only gesture available to her now is involuntary procreation. In fact virtually the only family member with whom Driss communicates his collectively-conceived struggle is his father, his declared opponent. The text opens up the dual possibility, first that Driss is the only one whose education provides the terms and understanding for concerted action against tyranny, and second that Driss has ultimately mistaken the collective will for a highly personal one. Active and passive resistance may simply be unrecognizable and incommunicable. But the text also jeopardizes its own privileged narrative position by denying the Western educated, humanist-oriented subject the ultimate liberty to coopt incommensurably divergent life experiences.

The inadequacy of the interpretive function of subjectivity is also at issue in Abdellatif Laabi’s Le Chemin des Ordalies. When the narrative subject reemerges from prolonged detention, he only partially recognizes the society which inspired his embittered revolutionary idealism. While the text seems to want to maintain an ideal of collectivity, pertinent to particular shared experiences, there is an increasingly evident mistrust of ideological platforms whose defense slips into its primary raison d’être:

“What was I and what have I become? What have we done? How much of it was error and how much blindness? What must be let go in order to safeguard something, the most precious of our selves, of our dreams, the most precious of this “for what, for whom” have the sacrifices been accorded, the blood been spilled?” (Laabi 188).

While Laabi’s narrator recognizes the flaw of ideological forces to unify the inner lives of individuals, it is loss of personal control over the actions required to support doctrine that inspires the most profound regret. It is the return to an awareness of the complexities of the social world which places the subject as a redemptive figure into question. While in detention, his world is constricted in both time and space, and the solidarity that prisoners of conscience feel is easily mistaken for a generalized spirit of solidarity which would link them directly with political and social forces in the outside world. At the same time, the text refuses to idealize and totalize the self-effacing capacities of martyrs for a particular cause. The suffering of the individual torture victim may be a consequence of pervasive oppression, and it certainly has wider social implications. But Laabi refuses to repeat the violation by collapsing one man’s particular trajectory into a collectivity “whose vultures attack their victim before he has even breathed his last breath” and “who won’t pass up the opportunity to deform your words, to keep what suits it, and what it wants to keep, hold them back or drop them after taking them out of context, from their logical development” (197).

Whereas Laabi ambivalently questions whether an individual case of resistance and suffering truly represents anything greater than personal tragedy, he nevertheless resurrects the ideal of community. Despite his pessimism concerning the utility of his own sacrifice, the narrator nevertheless repeats in a fairy-tale text-within-the-text an allegory of the inner self which attains a sublime state through selfless love. The model for an idealized social body of resistance is implicitly restored. A second recognition of community counteracts the skepticism with which fraternity is conceived according to ideological lines. Even as the narrator argues that one must “dig and dig this hard rock of [social] reality ... to place ourselves into question...to spring up on the other side of the tunnel or the Cavern of our Ideas” (191), community in Le Chemin des Ordalies is preserved directly along affective lines: family and close friends, but also a kind of love which characterizes the affective solidarity of resistance writers.

The experience of incarceration indelibly imprints a strategic conception of community on the narrator. This conception allows the inevitable contradictions of pessimism and faith in social ideals to co-exist. Shared experience invites a close affiliation between the narrator and others who have similarly suffered, even as the text expresses a loss of faith in “brotherhood”. The unity achieved through shared experience translates itself into an indistinct usage of the pronominal designations “I” and “you” in several texts. The “I” in Abdelhak Serhane’s Les enfants des rues étroites closely follows the experiences of another, presumably very like him. The “I” attempts to recall and interpret what the other sees, what his position is vis-à-vis other people and what the other person must certainly feel. While they are both spectators at a public story-telling (halqa), the “I” narrates his interlocutor’s experience, communicates that experience to him and proposes a simultaneous, yet distinct similitude in the representation of their existence:

“You went back to your place in order to listen to the rest of the story. I still couldn’t see the expression on your face. Drowned in the overexcited crowd, I could distinguish the worn collar on your jacket. This detail opened wide before my eyes two great parentheses where the itinerary of our two lives were traced in parallel in an ink of misery.” (Serhane 37)

The text demonstrates a consciousness of its own narrative production. But it does not incite its own closure according to this model of affective and dual subjectivity. Rather, its several loosely connected stories exhibit radical variations in the collective
conception of subjectivity. The public storyteller promises that the power of his words, are “capable of healing your pain and precipitating you into the absence of people without history…” (Serhane 37). The particular language arena of the halqa speaks of a transcendence toward a community fixed outside historical time. But when the narrator’s gaze is attracted to a veiled woman being seduced by men on either side of her, the sexual and the discursive compete for attention in a contrived doubling of the spectacle: “While the two men resolved their differend with punches, the storyteller gathered his belongings and grabbed the woman by the arm and they both disappeared down an obscure alley” (Serhane 56). The woman’s presence in the halqa is remarkable not only because it disrupts Moroccan gender decorum. She also objectifies the participant observer position so key to halqa’s communicative approach to narration. Finally, her presence subverts the narration by usurping its audience, leaving the storyteller with no other option than to interrupt the scene of social and discursive interaction.

Communicative exchange is key to subjective transcendence of social realities. Another scene constructs a public forum in a train compartment heading West on the Marrakech-Oujda line where “ten people, stacked up like sardines in a can, occupied eight places” (113), debate political and social issues, share advice and criticism concerning the behavior of their fellow travelers. As various positions articulating poignant feelings on topics ranging from the price of bread to the causes of juvenile delinquency, the text asserts that “Something new was being born. Discourse (la parole). People were talking, saying what they thought of the concerns of the day. What was happening? Had they conquered fear?” (121).

In a world where power is derived from deceit and misrepresentation, silence and balking signify an abdication of social responsibility. Serhane depicts a social world in which truth is paid for in cash. The individual must satisfy the demands of an all-encompassing and monstrous administration. The language appropriate to discuss feelings on topics ranging from the price of bread to the causes of juvenile delinquency, the text asserts that “Something new was being born. Discourse (la parole). People were talking, saying what they thought of the concerns of the day. What was happening? Had they conquered fear?” (121).

But community discourse is ephemeral in Serhane’s text. Permanent communities inevitably produce individuals who feel alienated from them. Exploring the position of the subject in the social world necessarily confronts the dynamics of the particular groups which share its historical and social reality. In the interest of conceptualizing a principle of radical difference, reference must be made to the effects on the subject exalted by these other popular formations. Heterogeneity as a principle in thought requires an openness to the expression of multiple opinions, but some will inevitably argue for the formation of exclusive communities, and others will seek to undermine the premise of social unity. If it is naive to assume that absolute unity ever exists in a society, it is equally invalid to claim that the pressure of multiplicity leaves no marks on particular groups. The principle of heterogeneity risks becoming an absolutist discourse, especially in its tendency to conceive of marginality as a site of primary and permanent subversion. The words of Abdellatif Laâbi show how writing in the Maghreb has in some respects passed through the period in which ideological presuppositions overrule more tempered approaches to the heterogeneity within society:

“We’re past the time of the lightening-bolt discourse which can set the plains on fire, past the slap-dash analyses whose conclusions are already programmed in their premises.” (Laâbi 194)

Communities may achieve their autonomy through the articulation of their experience, but discourse is rarely able to adapt painlessly to social and historical transitions. Ideologies which manipulate communities unfaithfully alienate their others, and they indirectly contribute to their own demise and to the eventual generation of more socially apt discourse.
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