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Abstract
In the Arabic grammatical tradition several categories comprising exactly five members can be found, e.g., the types of “meaningful things”, of definite nouns, of tanwîn, of definite article, of tawâbiʿ etc. Given the importance of the number ‘five’ in Islam, it is natural to ask whether these categorizations are affected by the symbolical meaning of that number. This article examines some of these categorizations in order to check the extent to which they are linguistically or theoretically justified, and whether they use ‘five’ as a typological number. In order to answer these questions, the fivefold divisions are tested for consistency and the surrounding discourse is investigated.
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1. Introduction
Organizing material into short lists may be a powerful mnemonic and pedagogical tool, but in light of the frequent use of the specific number ‘five’ in Arabic grammatical literature, we ask whether this particular number has a special meaning and what that meaning can be.

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

1 See SCHIMMEL 1993: 12-14.
2 LAROCHE 1995: 571.
In Islamic tradition (influenced by Greek ideas), the number ‘five’ seems to have a special significance—particularly well-known are the five pillars of Islam and the five daily prayers. In Islamic jurisprudence there are al-ʾāhkām al-ḫamsa ‘the five qualifications’, namely, al-wājib ‘obligatory’, al-mustaḥabb ‘recommended’, al-mubāḥ ‘indifferent’, al-makrūh ‘reprehensible’, and al-ḥarām ‘forbidden’. In Islamic theology there are al-muḡayyabāt al-ḫamsa ‘the five mysteries’, a technical term denoting the five things known only to God. They are the hour of the Last Judgment; when rain will be sent down; what is in the womb (namely, the sex and number of children); the livelihood one will obtain on the morrow; and when one will die.

‘Iḥwān al-Ṣafāʾ ‘The Brethren of Purity’ (the authors of the encyclopedic Rasāʾil ʾIḥwān al-Ṣafāʾ; were active in Baṣra in the 10th century) used numerical symbolism extensively, and seem to have given a special role to the number ‘five’: in their view, it signifies ṭabīʿa ‘Nature’ (that can be divided into celestial nature and the four elemental natures); the five senses correspond to the five types of Nature, and also to the five moving planets. In addition, ‘Iḥwān al-Ṣafāʾ distinguish “five interior faculties”. Interestingly, Ibn Sīnā speaks of “five interior senses”, in addition to the five “exterior senses”.

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

---

3 Schacht 1960: 257. See Larcher 1992: 363-365 for a pragmatic- and logic-oriented discussion of al-ʾāhkām al-ḫamsa.
4 The editors of EI² 1993: 346-347.
5 See Marquet 1971 for a discussion on Rasāʾil ʾIḥwān al-Ṣafāʾ.
6 See Nasr 1993: 51-52, 60-61 for a discussion.
7 Ibid.: 96.
8 Ibid.: 101.
9 See ibid.: 102 for a discussion.
10 See ibid.: 250 for a discussion.
11 The notion of typological numbers is widely used in Bible research—see, e.g., Stone 2011: 69 ff. Conrad 1988 applies this notion to Islamic historiographical literature, claiming that some numbers are used there not in their literal sense, but “to express a general idea of magnitude, proliferation, or great extension” (ibid.: 45).
2. Five types of meaningful things

Al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 868/869) presents in his Kitāb al-Bayān wa-l-Tabyīn “the five modalities of clarity” (‘adawāt al-bayān al-ḥams). Bayān (translated by Montgomery as “clarity”) is a complex term, whose meaning varies from one source to another.15 Al-Jāḥiẓ defines it as follows:

Clarity is a noun which comprises everything which removes for you the headscarf [enveloping] the concept and tears down the veil [covering] the inmost mind, so that the auditor may attain its true reality and seize upon its product whatever that clarity actually is and no matter what type of sign is used16 (wa-l-bayānū smun jāmi’un li-kullī ṣay’in kaṣafa laka qinā’a l-ma’nā wa-hatakã l-ḥijāba ḏûna l-damirī ḥattā yuḍḏā l-sāmī’tu ’ilā ḥaqiqatihī wa-yahjuma ’alā maḥṣūlihi, kā’īnān mā kāna gālika l-bayānū wa-min ’ayyi jinsin kāna l-dallīla).15

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

All varieties of signs, verbal and non-verbal, for concepts [amount to] five things, no less, no more: the first is the oral expression, then gesture, then counting, then writing, then the condition which is called location (nišba). ‘Location’ is the signifying condition, which can take the place of those [other four] varieties and which is no less efficacious than those [other four] signs1 (wa-jāmi’u ašnāfi l-dalālātī ’alā l-ma’ānī min lafẓin wa-gayri lafẓin ḥamsatu ‘āsyā’u lā tanqūs wa-lā tazīdu: ’awwaluhā l-lafẓu, ṭumma l-’išārātu, ṭumma l-‘aqdu, ṭumma l-ḥāṭṭu, ṭumma l-ḥālwa llaṭī tusammā niṣbatan. wa-l-nišbatu hiya l-ḥālu l-dallātu, llaṭī tāṣūmu maqāmā tilka l-ašnāfi wa-lā taqṣūsuhu’ an tilka l-dalālātī).15

These modalities, save for the last one, are clear enough.19 As for nišba, it is one of the Arabic translations suggested for the Greek to keisthai (the other options were wad’ and mawdā‘), one of the ten Aristotelian categories, that can be translated into English as “be-

---

12 MONTGOMERY 2006: 103 ff.
13 See BERNAND 1995 for a discussion on the term bayān in ‘asūl al-fiqh; MONTGOMERY (2006: 122-133) explores the concept of bayān in the Qur’an and in Al-Jāḥiẓ’s view.
14 This translation is taken from MONTGOMERY 2006: 127-128.
15 Al-Jāḥiẓ, Bayān t. 76.
16 MONTGOMERY 2006: 133.
17 This translation is taken from ibid.: 128, with some slight changes.
18 Al-Jāḥiẓ, Bayān t. 76. See RON-GILBOA (2017: 147-156), who, based on this fragment from Kitāb al-Bayān and discussions from Kitāb al-Hayawān, concludes that al-Jāḥiẓ views the entire universe as a “semiotic system”, in which each phenomenon is a sign that can be deciphered by a careful observer.
19 See MONTGOMERY 2006: 129-131 for a discussion.
ing-in-a-position”.20 According to al-Jāḥiẓ, this modality of clarity refers to phenomena of the natural world that can be interpreted, for instance, as signs of God’s presence.21 Montgomery claims that there was “an intellectual and polemical connection between the legal-theoretical Risāla (‘Epistle’) of Šāfī’ī and the Bayān of Jāḥiẓ”22 (note that al-Šāfī’ī’s Risāla also presents five wujūḥ ‘modalities’ of bayān,23 and so does al-Jaṣṣāṣ’ Fuṣūl24).

In the grammatical literature, traces of these ideas can be found in discussions of the definition of ‘word’ by Ibn Ya’īs (d. 1245) and al-ʿAstarābāḏī (d. circa 1289).

At the beginning of his al-Muḥāṣṣal, al-Zamaḥšarī (d. 1144) defines kalima ‘word’ as al-lafzatu̇ l-dālla ‘ālī ma’an nan mufradin bi-l-wad’ī ‘an expression unit that signifies by its coining25 a simple meaning’.26 While explaining components of this definition, Ibn Ya’īs notes that there are five types of “meaningful things” (al-ʿaṣyāʾ al-dālla: al-ḥaṭṭ, al-ʿaqd, al-ʿisāra, al-niṣba, al-lafz,27 the same categories mentioned by al-Jāḥiẓ).

Ibn al-Hājīb (d. 1249) defines ‘word’ as lāfz wudī’a li-ma’n nan mufradin ‘an expression that was coined for a simple meaning’28 (a definition that is very close to al-Zamaḥšarī’s, which is to be expected, given the proven affinity between the latter’s al-Muḥāṣṣal and Ibn al-Hājīb’s al-Muǧaddima al-Kāfiya29). Al-ʿAstarābāḏī explains this definition, and says that mentioning lāfz is necessary because it excludes from the definition al-ḥaṭṭ, al-ʿaqd, al-niṣba and al-ʿisāra, which may signify a simple meaning by their coining, but cannot be considered words.20

20 MONTGOMERY 2006: 128-129.
21 See ibid.: 129-130 and RON-GILBOA 2017: 154-156 for a discussion.
22 MONTGOMERY 2006: 102.
23 See al-Šāfīʾī, Risāla, 14-21; see BERNAND 1995: 149-150 for a discussion. Al-Šāfīʾī’s modalities are completely different from the categories mentioned by al-Jāḥiẓ; however, MONTGOMERY (2006: 131) links between al-Šāfīʾī’s notion of iṯḥāḍ and al-Jāḥiẓ’s notion of niṣba (the fifth modalities of clarity in their respective systems).
24 Al-Jaṣṣāṣ (Fuṣūl II: 14-19) discusses al-Šāfīʾī’s classification of bayān types. He also mentions (ibid.: 31) a classification similar to al-Jāḥiẓ’s, attributing it to “one ancient scholar”. See BERNAND 1995: 152 for a discussion.
25 Coinage (wad’) is an important term in Muslim philosophy, theology and jurisprudence. In the grammatical literature, it is particularly prominent in al-ʿAstarābāḏī’s Šarḥ al-Kāfiya. Al-ʿAstarābāḏī (Šarḥ t. 21) explains the phrase “the coining of a linguistic expression” (wad’ al-lafz) as “the first assignment of [a linguistic expression] to a meaning, with an intention that it will become conventional between people.” An element’s coining determines its form, meaning, categorical identity, syntactic functions, etc. (although in actual use there can be certain deviations from those primary properties of the element). Al-ʿAstarābāḏī’s theory of coining is discussed in SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 84-127.
26 Ibn Ya’īs, Šarḥ t. 18. See GUILLAUME 2011: 51-53 for a discussion of al-Zamaḥšarī’s definition (with a stress on its Aristotelian origin).
27 Ibn Ya’īs, Šarḥ t. 19.
28 Al-ʿAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ t. 19.
29 See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 1 for a survey of some opinions on this issue. GUILLAUME (2011: 56) views this definition as Ibn al-Hājīb’s version of “the standard definition”.
30 Al-ʿAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ t. 22-23. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 84-87 for an additional discussion of al-ʿAstarābāḏī’s definition of ‘word’. See also GUILLAUME 2011 and LARCHER 2011.
Five' as a typological number

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

3. Five types of definite nouns

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

Sibawayhi’s categorization is as follows:

Definite nouns are five things: nouns that are proper nouns; nouns that are annexed to definite nouns, if you do not have in mind the idea of *tanwīn* (i.e., if the annexation is real); [nouns prefixed by] the definite article; vague nouns; personal pronouns (al-maʾrifatu ḥamsatu ‘asyāʿa: al-ʾasmāʾu llatī hiya ‘aʾlāmin ḥāṣṣatun wa-l-mudāfuʾ ilā l-maʾrifaʾi ʾidā lam turid maʾnā l-tanwīn, wa-l-ʾalīfa wa-l-lāmu wa-l-ʾasmāʾu l-mubhamatu wa-l-lādmāru).

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

31 Interestingly, a similar fivefold division of meaningful things appears in al-Suhayli’s Natāʾiǧ al-fīkr fi l-naḥw in a discussion of ‘an al-muṣaffara. Al-Suhayli refers to them as kalām al-nafs ‘the speaking of the self’. See SADAN (forthcoming), Section 3.3.3 for a discussion of the relevant excerpt.

32 Sibawayhi, Kitāb t: 187. See MAROYG 2010: 99-149 for a pragmatics-oriented discussion on the notion of definiteness in Sibawayhi’s Kitāb.

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

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

35 Al-Mubarrad, Muqtaḍab IV: 276; Ibn al-Sarrāj, ’Usūl t: 143; Ibn Jinnī, Luma’, 159-167; al-Zajjājī, Jamāl, 27, 192; Ibn al-ʾAnbārī, Asrār, 341-342.
Al-Zamaḥšārī seems to be the first grammarian who explicitly included the relative pronouns in the category of mubhamāt, together with demonstratives, in the context of discussing definite nouns. His list of categories is: “proper nouns” (al-ʾalam al-hāṣṣ), “personal pronouns” (al-mudmar), “vague nouns, that include two things: demonstrative pronouns and relative pronouns” (al-mubham wa-huwa šayʾāniʾ asmāʾu l-išārati wa-l-mawsūlātu), “[nouns] prefixed by the definite article” (al-dāḫilʾ alayhi harfa l-taʾrīfī), “nouns annexed in a real annexation to one of these [types of nouns]” (al-mudāf ilāʾ aḥadi hāʾulāʾiʾ iḍāfatan haqqiyyatan). Ibn Yaʿīš explains that the principal difference between mubham and mudmar, vague and pronominalized constituents, is that a vague constituent is elucidated by a constituent that follows it, whereas a 3rd person pronoun is elucidated by a constituent that precedes it, i.e., by its antecedent.

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

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

in Kitāb al-Lumaʿ uses the term ‘asmāʾ al-ʾišāra instead of mubhamāt). The order of categories (and, correspondingly, the hierarchy of definite nouns) varies from one author to another.

36 Ibn Jinnī, Lumaʿ, 159.
37 See GATJE 1970, GABUCAN 1972: 40-41, and MAROGY 2010: 117-123 for a discussion of some of such categorizations.
38 Ibn Yaʿīš, Sarḥ V: 85.
39 Ibid.: 86. This excerpt is discussed in GATJE 1970: 234-235 (GATJE translates mubham as “unbegrenzt”). See also SAKAEDANI 2019: 240-242.
40 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Sarḥ I: 148.
41 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Sarḥ II: 237; see SHEYHATOVITCH 2016: 316 for an analysis of al-ʿAstarābiḏī’s discussion on saḥar. See CARTER 1981: 76, 79 for a discussion of ‘anomaly’ as a factor “preventing full declinability” (as formulated in CARTER 1981: 74).
element, the relative pronoun is definite due to the annexation, and its original definiteness is ignored.\footnote{Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, Šarḥ II: 237-238.}

Al-‘Astarābāḏī, similarly to Ibn Ya‘īs, regards relative pronouns, together with demonstrative pronouns, as *mubhamāt*,\footnote{See al-‘Astarābāḏī, Šarḥ III: 240.} but explains the reason for their definiteness differently: he does not consider them as definite due to the definite article (he says that their definiteness resembles that of nouns preceded by *al*,\footnote{See, e.g., *ibid.* II: 312.} implying that it is not the same). Also, he does not accept the view that the relative pronoun is definite due to the relative clause: he argues that if the relative clause could render other constituents definite, it should also have rendered definite the noun *rajul* in the sentence *jahānārajulun darabtuhu* ‘A man whom I hit came to me’.\footnote{*Ibid.*.} So what is al-‘Astarābāḏī’s explanation for the relative pronoun’s definiteness?

The definiteness of the relative pronoun is due to its coinage as a definite noun that is used to refer to a thing known to the speaker and the addressee, \[whereas the common knowledge regarding that thing is\] the content of the relative clause \[that follows that pronoun\] (*taʿrifu l-mawsūli bi-wad’ihi ma’rifatan muṣāran bihi ‘ilā l-ma’āhā bayna l-mutakallimi wa-l-muḥātabi bi-maadhmūni šilatihi*).\footnote{Ibn ‘Aqīl, Šarḥ I: 87.}

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

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

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

\[wa-gayruhu ma’rifatun ka-hum wa-ḏī / wa-hinda wa-bnī wa-l-ġulāmi wa-llaḏī\]

And the other nouns (i.e., that differ from indefinite nouns mentioned beforehand) are definite, like *hum* ‘they’, *ḏī ‘this (fem.)’, / Hind, *ibnī ‘my son’, *al-ġulām ‘the servant’, and *allaḏī*\footnote{Ibn ‘Aqīl, Šarḥ I: 87.}

Ibn ‘Aqīl (d. 1367) in his commentary of this verse explicitly speaks of six types of definite nouns: *al-muḏmar ‘personal pronouns’, ism al-‘isāra ‘demonstrative pronouns’, ‘alam ‘proper nouns’, al-muḥallāt bi-l-‘alif wa-l-lām ‘[nouns] provided with a definite article’, al-mawsīl ‘relative pronouns’, mā ‘udīfa ‘ilā wāḥidin minhā ‘[nouns] that are annexed to one of [these types of definite nouns]’).\footnote{Also SAKAEDANI (ibid.: 245-246) analyzes Ibn Hišām’s categorization of definite nouns, which is also sixfold.}
4. Five types of \textit{tanwīn}

Some grammarians distinguished between five types of \textit{tanwīn}, perhaps in order to match the five categories of definite nouns.\footnote{See \textsc{Gabucan} 1972: 55-56 for a discussion of al-\textsc{Ushmini}'s (d. 1464) view of \textit{tanwīn} as an indefinite article, and of modern linguists who adopted this view. \textsc{Ayoub} (1991: 169 ff.) examines this view, and concludes that it is insufficient as an explanation of all appearances of \textit{tanwīn}, given that proper nouns such as Zayd take \textit{tanwīn} despite their semantic definiteness. She offers a more complicated explanation for the \textit{tanwīn} function: it is related to the nominality of the noun in different modules (the module of logical form, the module of cases and the syntactic module). See \textit{ibid.}: 207-209 for a discussion.} Sibawayhi, al-Mubarrad and Ibn al-Sarrāj do not treat various functions of \textit{tanwīn} systematically (though they occasionally mention them in their discussions). Al-Zajjājī in al-\textit{Īdāḥ} speaks of three functions of \textit{tanwīn}:\footnote{The following excerpt is translated and discussed also in \textsc{Versteegh} 1995: 168-176.}

\begin{enumerate}
    \item It may make the distinction between \textit{mutamakkin} (lit. ‘powerful; established’, fully declinable)\footnote{\textit{Mutamakkin} is an active participle derived from the term \textit{tamakkun}, which, in \textsc{Danecki}'s (2009: 431) words, “is used for a general grammatical and semantic category indicating the ability of words to be inflected and perform various grammatical functions”. See \textsc{Ayoub} 2018: 33, fn. 44 for a survey of various translations offered by modern scholars for this term. \textsc{Ayoub} (2009: 443), \textsc{Ayoub} (2018: 37), and \textsc{Danecki} (2009: 431) relate the notion of \textit{tamakkun} in Sibawayhi’s \textit{Kitāb} to the notions of heaviness/lightness. In \textsc{Ayoub}'s (2018: 38) words, “the notion of \textit{tamakkun} refers to mobility in syntactic position, semantic mobility, morphological flexibility, and wide referential capability”.
} and light constituents, on the one hand, and heavy constituents that are not fully declinable, on the other hand;\footnote{Al-Zajjājī, \textit{Īdāḥ}, 97.}

    \item It may serve as compensation (\textit{iwād}) for an omitted part of the word—for example, the form \textit{jawārin} ‘female slaves’ is derived from a supposed original form *\textit{jawāriyu} in \textit{raf}’ or *\textit{jawāriyi} in \textit{jarr}; the sequences -\textit{iyu} and -\textit{iyi} are considered “heavy”, and therefore \textit{yā}’ becomes quiescent; then the pattern of the word becomes deficient, and the word is joined by a compensating \textit{tanwīn}, becoming *\textit{jawāryin}, and then the \textit{yā}’ is omitted, because it is a quiescent letter followed by a vowelless \textit{nūn}. This is the process by which the form \textit{jawārīn} is obtained.\footnote{See \textsc{Marogy} 2009: 115 ff. for a discussion of cases when proper nouns “lose their specific character and become applicable to each member of a whole class so named”.
} Al-Zajjājī uses this as a central example in his discussion on “a compensating \textit{tanwīn}”, as its \textit{tanwīn} is clearly unrelated to \textit{tamakkun} because the word is diptote by its pattern.

    \item It may make it possible to distinguish between definite and indefinite states in proper nouns and interjections whose ending is usually left unchanged. For instance, the proper noun \textit{Amrawayhi} retains its ending as long as it is used as semantically definite, but once it becomes semantically indefinite (namely, when it is used to signify a class of objects\footnote{\textsc{Al-Zajjājī, \textit{Īdāḥ}}, 98-99. \textsc{Ayoub} (2009: 443) notes that Arab grammarians usually analyze the \textit{tanwīn} of \textit{‘ibrāhīmin} in \textit{mararti bi-‘ibrāhīma wa-‘ibrāhīmin} ‘āhara as \textit{tanwīn al-tamakkun} (and points out that}, the proper noun takes a \textit{tanwīn} to signify that it is used as an indefinite noun. For instance, \textit{hādā ‘amrawayhi wa-mararti bi-‘amrawayhi} ‘āhara ‘This is ‘Amrawayhi and I passed by another [man named] ‘Amrawayhi’.
\end{enumerate}
Al-Zamaḥšarī is probably the first grammarian to speak of five types of *tanwīn*. They are the following:

1. *Al-dāl* ʿalā *mākāna* ‘signifying the status’. According to Ibn Yaʿīs, this type of *tanwīn* signifies that the noun retains its nominal status, becoming neither like a particle (which would render the noun *mabnī*) nor like a verb (which would render the noun diptote). 56 This type of *tanwīn* parallels the first type mentioned by al-Zajjājī.

2. *Al-fāṣil bayna l-maʿrīfa wa-l-nakīra* ‘distinguishing between the definite and indefinite [noun]’. 57 This parallels the third type mentioned by al-Zajjājī.

3. *Al-ʾiwd min al-mudāf ilayhi* ‘compensation for an [omitted] governed element’. Unlike al-Zajjājī, who concentrates on the morphophonological aspects of the phenomenon and speaks of “compensating *tanwīn*” in relation to words whose third root consonant is ʿāw or ʿā, al-Zamaḥšarī and Ibn Yaʿīs speak here about forms such as *yawmaʾīdin* ‘that day’, where, according to Ibn Yaʿīs, the *tanwīn* compensates for an omitted clause (or clauses). For instance, Q 99:1-4: ‘*[iḏā zulzilat-i ʾl-ʿardu zilzālahā wa-ʾaḥrajat-i ʾl-ʿardu ʾatgālahā wa-qāla l-ʾinsānu mā lāhā yawmaʾīdin tuḥaddiṯu ʾaḥbārahā iḏān lahā… When earth is shaken with a mighty shaking and earth brings forth her burdens, and Man says, “What ails her?”*, upon that day she shall tell her tidings’.

The reconstructed original structure is: …*yawmaʾīdin tuẓalzalu ʾl-ʿardu zilzālahā wa-tuḥriju ʾl-ʿardu ʾatgālahā wa-yaqūlu l-ʾinsānu mā lāhā… ‘Upon the day when earth is shaken with a mighty shaking and brings forth her burdens, and Man says, “What ails her?”’, [she shall tell her tidings]’.

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

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

---

56 Ibn Yaʿīs, *Ṣarḥ* 29. See *AYOUB* 2009: 443 for a discussion of this excerpt.
57 See Ibn Yaʿīs, *Ṣarḥ* 29-30 for a discussion.
58 *Ibid.*: 30. See *ibid.*: 31-33 for additional examples.
59 *Ibid.*: 29.
60 See *BONEBAKKER* 1978: 412.
Zamaḥšarī speaks here of a tanwīn used instead of a vowel prolongation at the end of poetry verses, a practice characteristic of Banū Tamīm’s recitation. (5) Al-tanwīn al-gāfli ‘extravagant tanwīn’\(^{62}\) that joins only a ‘fettered’ rhyme.\(^{62}\)

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

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

To sum up, Ibn Ya’īṣ recognizes the following five types of tanwīn: li-l-farq bayna mā yansarifū wa-mā lā yansarifū, al-dāll ʿalā l-nakira, tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ, tanwīn al-tarannum, tanwīn al-muqābala.\(^{68}\) It seems that he chose to join the two types of rhyme-related tanwīns under the title tanwīn al-tarannum in order to maintain the fivefold categorization.

Ibn ’Usfūr presents the same five types: tanwīn li-l-tamakkun, tanwīn al-tankīr, tanwīn al-muqābala, tanwīn al-ʿiwaḍ (unlike al-Zamaḥšarī and Ibn Ya’īṣ, he mentions in this context both cases like yawmaʾīḍin and cases like jawārin), tanwīn al-tarannum (he mentions

\(^{61}\) CARTER (1981: 20) translates the term in al-Širbīnī’s work as “metrical extravagance”.

\(^{62}\) Ibn Ya’īṣ, Šarḥ t. 29.

\(^{63}\) Ibid. t. 24. Ḥāṣṣu ‘property/exclusive attribute’ is one of the five important general terms in logic. See SHEYHATOVITCH, forthcoming, for a discussion of the term’s use by al-ʿAstārābāḍī.

\(^{64}\) Ibn Ya’īṣ, Šarḥ t. 25.

\(^{65}\) Ibid. t. 33.

\(^{66}\) AYOUB 2009: 443.

\(^{67}\) See Ibn Ya’īṣ, Šarḥ t. 34 for a detailed discussion.

\(^{68}\) See AYOUB 1991: 153-155 for a discussion of four types of tanwīn (excluding tanwīn al-tarannum).
only the case of loose rhymes, i.e., the first of the two cases mentioned by Ibn Ya‘īs); he stresses that all types except for the last-mentioned one join only nouns.69

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

Al-‘Astarābāḏī’s discussion of tanwīn al-muqāhala is relatively detailed and complicated. He does not limit this type of tanwīn to proper nouns, but notes that the fact that it is retained in proper nouns, e.g., in Q 2:198 min ‘arafātin ‘from ‘Arafāt’, proves that it is not a marker of establishment (since proper nouns that are feminine by form or meaning should be diptote) nor of indefiniteness (because proper nouns are definite).74 However, his final conclusion is that it is “[a marker] of full declension and establishment” (li-l-šarf75 wa-l-tamakkun). At this point he needs to explain why this tanwīn is not omitted in min ‘arafātin.

His explanation is as follows:

If [the tanwīn] was omitted, it would have been followed by the kasra in the omission, and the nāsh would have followed [the omitted kasra]. That would have differed from the usual state of affairs in the sound plural, where the kasra is followed by others, instead of following others (li-‘annahu law saqaṭa la-tab‘ahu l-kasru fī l-suqīti, wa-tab‘a l-nāshu, wa-huwa ḥilāfu mā ‘alayhi l-jum’u l-sālimu ‘iḏ-i l-kasru fīhi maḥbūna lā tābi‘un).76

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

69 Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, Šarḥ t: 36-40.
70 See Al-‘Astarābāḏī, Šarḥ t: 43-50.
71 Ibid.: 45-49.
72 Ibid.: 45. In such cases, the Arab grammarians usually view the tanwīn as a marker of establishment—see fn. 55 above.
73 Al-‘Astarābāḏī, Šarḥ t: 45.
74 Ibid.: 46.
75 See Åkesson 2009 for a discussion of the term šarf; see Ayoub 2018: 34 ff. for a comparison between the terms related to tamakkun and šarf.
76 Al-‘Astarābāḏī, Šarḥ t: 47.
77 Al-‘Astarābāḏī maintains that the kasra in the ending of diptote nouns is omitted as a consequence of the omission of the tanwīn. See Ibid.: 102-103 for a discussion.
*nasb generally behaves analogously to *jarr, but not vice versa.* According to al-'Astarābāḏī, the *tanwīn in min ʿarafātīn resembles a tanwīn in a diptote noun that received it “due to poetic license” (*li-l-darīra*), as there was something that prevented the *tanwīn’s omission.*

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

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

Al-Širbīnī (d. 1570) views *tanwīn* as one of the identifying features of a noun. He focuses on the four types of *tanwīn* that are added only to nouns: *tanwīn al-tamakkun* (he mentions that it is called also *tanwīn al-amkaniyya and tanwīn al-ṣarf*), *tanwīn al-tankīr* (which, like most grammarians, he limits to *ba’d al-ʿasmā’ al-mabniyyāt ‘certain invariable nouns’), *tanwīn al-muğābalā* (which he does not limit to proper nouns), and *tanwīn al-ʾiwd. As for the latter type, al-Širbīnī says that it joins nouns such as *gawāšin ‘covers’ and jawārin ‘in compensation for the arbitrarily omitted yā’* (*ʿiwadan min-ʾa l-yā’i l-mahḍūfati ‘tibātān,* and also *iḍ in cases such as Q 30:4 *yawmaʾidāna l-muṣminīna ‘on that day the believers shall rejoice, where the *tanwīn* compensates for the omitted governed element (which should be a clause). Al-Širbīnī cites Ibn Hiṣām (d. 1360), who argues that the *tanwīn in kullun ‘all and ba’dun ‘some’ is also *tanwīn al-ʾiwd* that compensates for an omitted governed element. Al-Širbīnī rejects this claim, arguing that this is the *tanwīn* of establishment “which disappears in an annexation and remains in the absence [of annexation]” (*yaḍhabu ma’a l-ʾidāfati wa-yaḥbutu ma’a ‘adamihā*).

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

---

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

79 See ibid.: 47.

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

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

82 Ibid.: 18-19.

83 See ibid.: 18-21.
Five as a typological number

cense, (5) metrical extravagance, (6) after hamza. After that he states that these types “are called tanwīn in a non-literal sense, not in a literal one, since they are not peculiar to nouns” (tasmiyatuhā tanwīnan majāzun li-’adami ḥtiṣāsīhā bi-l-ismi). This is how al-Širbīnī reconciles between his view of tanwīn as one of the identifying features of a noun and the fact that some sources mention tanwīns that can also join other parts of speech.

5. Five types of definite article

Ibn ‘Uṣfūr follows his presentation of tanwīn with a categorization of functions of the definite article:

(1) li-ta’rīfī l-ʿahdī fi šahsīn ‘aw fi jinsin ‘for a definiteness [based on the addressee’s] previous knowledge, of an individual or a genus’ (usually, grammarians view ta’rīf al-ʿahd and ta’rīf al-jins as different categories, but Ibn ‘Uṣfūr probably thinks that speakers may have previous knowledge of genera just like they may have previous knowledge of individuals, and thus these two functions of the definite article are closer to each other than to its other functions). The examples are jā’ant l-rajulu ʿllaḏī jā’aka ‘The man that came to you came to me’ (the referent of the noun prefixed by the definite article is an individual known to both the speaker and the addressee), and al-rajulu ḥayrun min-l-ḥari ṣati ‘Man is better than woman’ (this genus is better than that genus).

(2) li-ta’rīfī l-ḥudūrī ‘for a definiteness based on presence’. Unlike ta’rīf al-ʿahd, which is a definiteness based on previous knowledge, this definiteness is related to the referent’s being present at the moment of utterance. This is the definite article that joins the noun that follows a demonstrative pronoun, e.g., ḥāḏa l-rajulu ‘this man’, or a vocative particle, e.g., yāʾayyuhā l-rajulu ‘O the man!’, or ʿiḏā l-fuḏāʾyya, e.g., ḥa-rajtu fa-ʿiḏā l-ʾasadu ‘I went out and there was the lion’. This is also the definite article that appears in words such as al-ʿān, al-sāʾa, al-ḥīn ‘now’.

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

---

84 See Carter 1981: 20-23 for a detailed discussion.
85 Ibid.: 20-22.
86 See, e.g., GäTje 1970: 245. GäTje explains: “Die Aussonderung aus der Gattung setzt eine Verständigung (ʿahd) zwischen dem Sprechenden und dem Gesprächspartner voraus. Diese erfolgt dadurch, daß das Gemeinte vorher erwähnt wird”.
87 Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, Sarb 1: 40.
88 In Wright’s (1967 I: 284; II: 157) words, this is an adverb “indicating something unexpected”, “introducing a person or thing that comes suddenly into view”.
89 Ibn ‘Uṣfūr, Sarb 1: 40.
ble part of these words, as can be proven by the fact that one may say rajulun ḥārīṯun ‘a plowing man’ and rajulun ʿabbāsun ‘a frowning man’.\(^9\)

(4) li-l-galaba ‘for a predominance’. This is a definite article that joins an indefinite noun in order to render it definite, and then dominates it. The noun consequently becomes a proper noun. For instance, al-Najm, lit. ‘the star’, which denotes the Pleiades; if the intended meaning is the Pleiades (and not just any star), the al- is obligatory.\(^9\)

(5) zāʾida ‘redundant’. This type of article is attached to proper nouns that do not originate in adjectives, and is used only due to poetic license. For instance:

\[ \text{I swear by blood that still penetrates / the upper part of al-}^\text{Uzzā [idol]} \text{and renders al-Nasr blood-red} \]

The poet used al-Nasr instead of Nasr (lit. ‘vulture’; the name of an idol worshipped by the Himyarites).

After mentioning these types of al- (of which there were five), Ibn Ṭuşför adds: “These four types are found only in nouns” (wa-ḥāḍhi al-ʾadrubu l-ʿarbaʿatu lā tājada illā fi l-ʾasmāʾī ḥāṣṣatan), and then starts a discussion on al- with the meaning of allaḏī, which joins particles, but in poetry can also join verbs and clauses.\(^9\) His mention of “four types” is truly surprising, because he clearly listed five types just before. Perhaps this is due to an attempt on his part to create a symmetry between the categorization of tanwīns (five types, of which one type, tanwīn al-ṭarannum, can join various parts of speech, and the rest can join only nouns), and the categorization of al- (again five types, of which one type can sometimes be attached to verbs and clauses, and the rest only to nouns). In defense of Ibn Ṭuşför’s logic, it can only be said that the types of al- that join only nouns could be viewed as four instead of five if we ignore the “redundant” al- (which has no meaning or function besides regularizing the rhythm of a poetic verse). It is the only type in Ibn Ṭuşför’s categorization which is mentioned without the preposition li- ‘for’, and this may mean that the author did not intend to include it in the total.

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

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

\(^9\) Ibn Ṭuşför, Šarḥ: 40.

\(^9\) Ibid.: 41. – See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 148-149 for a discussion of predominant proper nouns according to al- ʿAstarābāḏī.

\(^9\) See Ibn Ṭuşför, Šarḥ: 41, fn. 15 for a discussion of the verse’s authorship and meaning. See also al-Baghdādī, Ḥizāna VII: 214 ff. for a discussion on this verse and its context.

\(^9\) See FAHD 1993.

\(^9\) See Ibn Ṭuşför, Šarḥ: 41-42.
to nouns proves, according to Ibn Hišām, that it is not a definite article (harf al-ta’rīf).\textsuperscript{95}

(2) A definite article, of which there are two types, (a) ‘ahdiyya ‘based on previous knowledge’ and (b) jinsiyya ‘generic’.\textsuperscript{96} Each of these two types is, in its turn, divided into three subtypes.\textsuperscript{97}

(a) ‘ahdiyya

(i) “The [referent of] the noun related to it is known because [that noun] was mentioned before” (yakūnu maṣḥūbuhā ma’ḥūdan ḏikriyyan), e.g., Q 73:15-16 kamā ‘arsalnā ‘ilā fir’awna rasūlān fa-’asā fir’āwnu l-rasūlay ‘as We sent to Pharaoh a Messenger, but Pharaoh rebelled against the Messenger’.\textsuperscript{98} The definite article in al-rasūl signifies that the word’s referent is the same as of the previously-mentioned rasūl. Gabučan notes that this description corresponds to the European notion of “anaphoric article”.\textsuperscript{99}

(ii) “[The referent of the noun related to it] is known, because it is present in the [addressee’s] mind” (ma’ḥūdan ḏihniyyan), e.g., Q 9:40 ‘iḏ humā fī l-gārī ‘when the two were in the Cave’.\textsuperscript{100} Interestingly, this is the first time “the cave” is mentioned in the sūrah; Ibn Hišām considers its referent as “present in the [addressee’s] mind”, because the Muslim tradition links it to a specific event when Muhammad and ‘Abū Bakr were hiding in a cave near Mecca, and their enemies were not able to find them.\textsuperscript{101}

(iii) “[The referent of the noun related to it] is known, because it is present [in the speech situation]” (ma’hūdan ḥuḍūriyyan). Here Ibn Hišām cites Ibn ‘Uṣfūr’s description of cases that the latter classifies as li-ta’rīf al-ḥudūr (the second item in Ibn ‘Uṣfūr’s classification mentioned above). This proves that Ibn Hišām was acquainted with Ibn ‘Uṣfūr’s work, and supports an assumption that his classification of al- is a reformulation of the latter’s.

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

\textsuperscript{95} See Ibn Hišām, Muġnī I: 60-61.
\textsuperscript{96} LARCHER (1991: 146) translates ‘ahdiyya as “thématicus”, and jinsiyya as “générique”.
\textsuperscript{97} See GABUČAN 1972: 46–47 for a discussion of this excerpt.
\textsuperscript{98} Ibn Hišām, Muğnī I: 61.
\textsuperscript{99} GABUČAN 1972: 46.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibn Hišām, Muğnī I: 61.
\textsuperscript{101} See, e.g., al-Zamaḥšarī, Kaššāf II: 259-260; al-Ṭabrisī, Majma’ al-Bayān V: 41.
ʾiḏā l-fujāʾiyya “does not signify the definiteness of a thing present at the speech situation, nor a definiteness that resembles [a definiteness of a thing] present at the speech situation” (layṣa li-taʾrīf šayʾin ḥādirin ḥālata l-takallumi fa-lā ṭuṣbihu mā l-kalāmu fīhi).

This criticism is based on the fact that the thing mentioned after ʾiḏā l-fujāʾiyya is present at the situation presented in the sentence (which may be different from the speech situation).

However, Ibn ʿUṣfūr does not mention the speech situation in his discussion, mentioning only the idea of presence (which is relevant in the case of ʾiḏā l-fujāʾiyya)—thus, Ibn Hišām’s criticism does not seem justified.

Finally, Ibn Hišām says that the al- in al-ʾān should be viewed as redundant (zāʾida) rather than as a definite article. That is because this al- is an inseparable part of the word, whereas the definite article is not known to appear as an inseparable part of the word.

(b) jinsiyya:

(i) “Signifying [that the word] comprises all the individuals [that can be referred by it]” (li-stiğrāqi l-ʾafrādi). This is the al- “that can be replaced by kull in its literal sense” (allaṭi taḥlufuhā kullun ḥaqīqatan).

For instance, Q 4:28 wa-ḥuliqa lʾinsānu daʿifan “for man was created a weakling.” According to the principle formulated by Ibn Hišām, alʾīnšān is definite in a generic, inclusive definiteness, which can be demonstrated by replacing it by the phrase kulluʾīnšānin in its literal sense.

(ii) “Signifying [that the word’s referent] comprises all the exclusive attributes of individuals [that can be referred to by the word]” (li-stiğrāqi ḥaṣāʾisi al-ʾafrādi). This is the al- “that can be replaced by kull in its non-literal sense” (allaṭi taḥlufuhā kullun majāzan).

For instance, zaydun-i l-raju luʾilman “Zayd is the man in terms of knowledge.” This sentence can be paraphrased by zaydun kullu raju lun ʾilman “Zayd equals all men in terms of knowledge”, i.e., Zayd’s knowledge is perfect.

102 Ibn Hišām, Muqni ʾI: 61.
103 ʾiḏā l-fujāʾiyya refers to the same time as the preceding statement. See the examples in WRIGHT 1967 I: 284; II: 157-158.
104 Ibn Hišām, Muqni ʾI: 61.
105 See GABUĆAN 1972: 48-50 for a discussion on generic definiteness according to Ibn Hišām and additional grammarians.
106 Ibn Hišām, Muqni ʾI: 61.
107 Ibid.
108 These are probably the cases described by GÄTJE (1970: 249-250) as “die generelle Determination, wenn sie beim Individuum steht, um zu zeigen, daß dieses die Merkmale der Gattung in vollem Umfang aufweist”.

105
(iii) “That renders the essence definite” (li-ta'rif l-māhiyyati). This al- cannot be replaced by kull, in either its literal or its non-literal sense. For instance, if someone says wa-llāhi lā ‘atatawwaju l-nisā’a ‘By God, I will not marry the women’, his vow would be violated if he married even a single woman.109

(3) zā’ida ‘redundant’:

(a) “[that constitutes] an inseparable part [of the noun]” (lāzima). That is the al- of relative pronouns, according to the view whereby they are rendered definite by the relative clause,110 and of proper nouns, “provided that [al-] joined them when they were transmitted (from their original meaning to functioning as proper nouns)” (bi-šarṭ muqāranatihā l-naqlihā111), which is the case with al-Naṣr, al-Na‘mān, al-Lāt, al-‘Uzzā, or “when they were invented” (li-rtijālihā), which is the case with al-Samawāl, or when “the word became dominant [in referring to] one of its original referents” (li-ġalabatihā ʿalā baʿḍi man hiya lahu fi l-ʾaṣlī), which is the case with al-Bayt, lit. ‘The House’ (referring to the Ka’ba), al-Madīna, lit. ‘The City’ (referring to al-Ṭayyiba ‘The Good’, the city in Saudi Arabia), and al-Najm, lit. ‘The Star’ (referring to the Pleiades).112

This last case of “redundant inseparable al-” corresponds to the fourth item in Ibn ‘Uṣfūr’s classification.113

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

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

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

---

109 Ibn Ḥišām, Muqni: 61-62.
110 See Section 3 above for a discussion on the status of relative pronouns. Ibn Ḥišām cites the view rejected by al-ʾAstarābāḏī—see pp. 86-87 above.
111 LARCHER (1992: 358-359) translates manqūla (a passive participle derived from the same root as naqil, that refers to a change in a constituent’s function) as “transférées”.
112 Ibn Ḥišām, Muqni: 62.
113 See p. 93-94 above for a discussion.
114 Ibn Ḥišām, Muqni: 63.
115 See ibid.: 63-64 for examples.
6. The five types of *tawābi‘*

*Tawābi‘* (sing. *tābi‘*) is a category of words “whose case assignment is caused by their ‘following’ another word”. This category created a special problem for the Arab grammarians, as its case assignment cannot be explained by governance.\(^{116}\)

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

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

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

   (i) “A type in which a noun is repeated literally” (*darb yu‘ādu fihi l-
   ismu bi-lafzihī*). Despite this formulation, Ibn al-Sarrāj demonstrates
   that constituents that are repeated can be nouns, verbs, particles (to-
   gether with the nouns that receive *jarr* from them) and even clauses.
   \(^{118}\) Perhaps he uses the term *ism* here, although he has in mind
   various types of constituents, because of the principle that any word
   can be viewed as a noun, if it is produced with the linguistic expres-
   sion itself in mind (rather than its meaning/referent).\(^{119}\)

   (ii) “[A type in which] the meaning is repeated in different words”
   (*tādat al-ma‘nā bi-lafzin ‘āhara*). For instance, *marartu bi-
   zaydin nafsihi* ‘I passed by Zayd himself’.\(^{120}\)

(b) “signifying comprehensiveness and generality” (*li-l-‘ibāta wa-l-‘umūm*). Ibn
   al-Sarrāj has in mind the derivatives of words such as *kull*, *‘ajma‘*, *‘akta* ‘all’,
   and also *kilā/kiltā* ‘both (masc./fem.)’, *talātatahum* ‘the three of them’, etc.\(^{121}\)

---

\(^{116}\) See the discussions of *tawābi‘* in CARTER 1981: 148-149, 238 ff. (where the term is translated as “concordants”), OWENS 1988: 57-58, 162 ff. (where the term is translated as “modifiers”), VERSTEEGH 2009: 221. As for the governor of *tawābi‘*, Ibn al-‘Anbārī (*‘Asrār*, 294-295) presents two views regarding the governor of an adjectival qualifier: Sībawayhi’s view, that its governor is the same as the head’s, and ’Abū Ḥasan al-‘Aḥfaṣ’s, that the qualifier’s *raf* is assigned by its being a *tābi‘* of a head in *raf* etc. Ibn al-‘Anbārī notes that the former view is more widely accepted (see LēVIN 1995: 215 for a discussion of additional sources that mention the latter view).

\(^{117}\) For instance, while discussing the structure *yā nasrū nasrun nasran* he uses the terms *badal*, *bayān* (which probably corresponds to ‘af *bayān*), and *ma‘raj* (see al-Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab IV*: 210-211), while discussing the structure *yā hādā l-tawīlu* ‘O this tall one!’ he explains that *al-tawīl* is ‘af *bayān* rather than *na‘* (see ibid.: 220).

\(^{118}\) See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *‘Usūl*: 406 for examples.

\(^{119}\) See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 53-54 for a discussion of this principle according to al-‘Astarābāḏī.

\(^{120}\) See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *‘Usūl*: 406-407 for additional examples.

\(^{121}\) Ibid.: 407.
(2) *Naʿ* `adjectival qualifier`. Interestingly, Ibn al-Sarrāj distinguishes five types of it (and thus creates a fivefold division inside another fivefold division, proving his interest in this number):

(a) “An attribute [related to the appearance] of the described thing, which may exist in [that thing] or in something related to it logically” *(mā kāna hijyata takānu fīhi ‘aw fi šay’in min sababihi)*. The examples for the first option are: *marartu bi-rajulin ’azraqa‘/ahmarā‘/tawīlin/iqašīrin* ‘I passed by a blue/red/tall/short man’; the examples for the second option are: *marartu bi-rajulin ḥasanin ‘abūhu* ‘I passed by a man whose father is good’ and *maḍaytu ’lā rajulin tawīlin ‘aḥūhu* ‘I went to a man whose brother is tall’.

(b) “An action of the described thing, which may be performed by [the latter] or by something related to it logically” *(mā kāna fi’lan li-l-mawṣūf yakānu bihi fā’ilan ‘aw muttasilan bi-šay’in min sababihi)*. The examples for the former option are: *marartu bi-rajulin qa‘imin/nā‘imin/ḏāribin* ‘I passed by a standing/sleeping/hitting man’; the examples for the latter option are *marartu bi-rajulin ḍāribin ‘abūhu* ‘I passed by a man whose father is hitting’, *marartu bi-rajulin qa‘imin ‘aḥūhu* ‘I passed by a man whose brother is standing’, *ra‘aytu rajulun ḍāriban ‘aḥūhu* ‘Amran* “I saw a man whose brother is hitting ‘Amr’, etc.*.

(c) “An attribute [of the described thing], that is neither [its] action nor is related to its appearance” *(mā kāna sīfatan ġayra ‘amalin wa-taḥliyatin)*, e.g., *marartu bi-rajulin ‘alimin/‘aqīlin* ‘I passed by a knowledgeable/reasonable man’, *marartu bi-rajulin ‘alimin ‘abīhu* ‘I passed by a man whose father is knowledgeable’, *marartu bi-rajulin ḥāšimīn biżīpitun jāriyatu* ‘I passed by a man whose female slave is charming’.

(d) “Relation” *(nasab)*. These are adjectives that relate a person or thing to a father, a place, a profession, or some category. For instance *marartu bi-rajulin ḥāšimīyin/’arabīyin* ‘I passed by a Hāšimi/Bedouin man’ (with adjectives that relate the man to certain genera), *marartu bi-rajulin bazzāzin/‘aṭṭārin/naḥjūrin* ‘I passed by a man who is a seller of cloth/a seller of perfumes/a carpenter’ (with adjectives that relate the man to things with which he deals),

---

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

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

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

125 See Ibn al-Sarrāj, *ʿUṣūl* t: 410-411 for additional discussion and examples.
marartu bi-rajulin bašrīyyin/mišrīyyin/kāfīyyin ‘I passed by a Bašrī/Egyptian/Kufan man’ (with adjectives that relate the man to places).\(^{126}\)

(e) “Describing [things] by means of ʿẓū ‘possessor’” (al-wasf bi-ʿẓū). For instance, marartu bi-rajulin ʿẓī ḫīlīn ‘I passed by a man who possesses camels’, marartu bi-rajulin ʿẓī ʿadābin ‘I passed by a man who possesses manners’, marartu bi-rajulin ʿẓī ʿaqlīn ‘I passed by a man who possesses reason’.\(^{127}\)

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

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

The difference between ‘af al-bayān and apposition is that the former is intended to be similar to an adjectival qualifier of the head, and the latter is intended to be a constituent that can replace the head. Thus, when the speaker uses ‘af al-bayān, he says ʿāḥāna ʿaydan ‘O our brother Zayd!’\(^{130}\) (zaydan takes naṣb, according to the basic rule regarding words in vocative\(^{131}\)), and when he uses apposition, he says ʿāḥāna ʿaydu (aydu takes damma, as a single noun that follows a vocative particle, as if it followed ʿāḥāna directly).\(^{132}\)

(4) ‘Af al-badal ‘apposition’. Ibn al-Sarrāj recognizes four types of apposition.\(^{133}\)

---

\(^{126}\) See Ibn al-Sarrāj, ‘Usūl t. 411-412.

\(^{127}\) See ibid.: 412. It is interesting to compare this categorization of adjectival qualifiers’ functions with Sibawayh’s three types of ẓī fa: ḥilya, qarāba and mubham (the relevant passages from al-Kitāb are analyzed in Talmon 1981: 286).

\(^{128}\) According to Okazaki 2003: 18-20, Ibn al-Sarrāj was the first grammarian to explicitly distinguish between five categories of mafīl and five categories of al-musabbaḥ bi-l-mafīl. See ibid.: 22 for a discussion of other fivefold categorizations in al-‘Usūl.

\(^{129}\) See Ibn al-Sarrāj, ‘Usūl t. 432.

\(^{130}\) Ibid.

\(^{131}\) According to Ibn al-Sarrāj, the vocative particle ʿāḥāna governs the following noun phrase similarly to the verb unādī ‘I call’. However, a definite single noun takes the hintā ending damma, because such a noun occurs in a position characteristic of personal pronouns (since it denotes a second person instead of its regular meaning). See the discussion in ibid.: 300.

\(^{132}\) Ibn al-Sarrāj, ‘Usūl t. 432. This passage is also discussed in Sartori, forthcoming: Section 1.2. In Sartori’s (forthcoming: Section 1.1) words, “‘af bayān represents in fact an intersection between ẓī fa and badal”, as it shares some characteristics with both of them; thus, the grammarians make efforts to clarify how ‘af bayān is different.

\(^{133}\) See Ibn al-Sarrāj, ‘Usūl t. 432-435 for a discussion. See also Eseesy 2006 and Sartori, forthcoming: Section 1.1 for a discussion on various types of apposition recognized by Arab grammarians.
'Five' as a typological number

(5) Al-ʿatf bi-l-ḥarf ‘coordination by means of a particle’. Ibn al-Sarrāj states that there are ten coordinative particles that “make the constituent that follows them to agree [in case] with the noun or verb that precedes them” (yutbi’na mà ba’dahunna mà qablahkanuna min-a l-ʿasma’i wa-l-ʿafʿāli). Ibn Jinnī mentions the same five types of tawābi‘; Ibn-ʿAnbārī does not speak explicitly of tawābi‘ as a category, but places in a succession the chapters dealing with tawkīd, wasf (a term very close to ṣīʿa), ʿatf al-bayān, badal, and ʿatf. Al-Zajjājī appears to be the first grammarian who speaks about four tawābi‘: al-naʿ, al-ʿatf, al-tawkīd, al-badal (he omits ʿatf al-bayān). Ibn ʿUṣfūr does not challenge this categorization, but incorporates ʿatf al-bayān by distinguishing between two types of ʿatf: ʿatf al-bayān and ʿatf al-nasf ‘coordination’. Al-Baṭalyawṣī (d. 1127) openly criticizes Al-Zajjājī’s categorization of tawābi‘: he says that al-Zajjājī did not mention ʿatf al-bayān, as if it can be included in his four categories, which is not true. Al-Baṭalyawṣī notes that it exists only in definite nouns, and shares some positions with the adjectival qualifier, some with apposition, and some are unique to it (which last point proves that al-Zajjājī’s categorization is not accurate). He mentions three positions that are unique to ʿatf al-bayān:

1. In vocative constructions:

    ‘innī wa-ʾaṣṭārīn suṣṭa ran / la-qā’ilun yā naṣṭu naṣrūn naṣrū naṣrā

    ‘I swear by the lines [of the Qur’ān] that are indeed written, / I say: O Naṣr, Naṣr, Naṣr…’

Al-Baṭalyawṣī explains that those who assign nasb to the second and third nasr, construe them as ʿatf al-bayān that agrees with the position of the first nasr, which follows a vocative particle (because the position following a vocative particle should in principle be occupied by a noun in nasb; however, a semantically definite noun that is not an annexed element takes a binā ending damma in this position). Those who

---

134 Ibn al-Sarrāj, ‘Uṣūl t: 442. See ibid.: 442-446 for a detailed discussion of all coordinative particles.
135 Ibn Jinnī, Luma‘, 138.
136 Ibn-ʿAnbārī, ‘Aṣrār, 283-306. See also Ibn Yaʿāqīb, Šarḥ III 38-39 for a similar discussion.
137 Al-Zajjājī, Jumal, 26.
138 Ibn ʿUṣfūr, Šarḥ t: 174. See ibid.: 268-272 for a detailed discussion of ʿatf al-bayān. This is also the solution of Ibn ʿAqlī in dealing with Ibn Mālik’s fourfold categorization of tawābi‘: he incorporates ʿatf al-bayān into Ibn Mālik’s model (presented in Ibn ‘Aqlī, Šarḥ III: 190) by distinguishing between two types of ʿatf—see ibid.: 218. See ibid.: 218-223 for a further discussion of ʿatf al-bayān. Al-Šīrīnī’s presentation is the same: he first speaks of four types of tawābi‘ (Carter 1981: 148), and then distinguishes between two types of ʿatf (see ibid.: 274). Talmon (1981: 288) notes that the literal meaning of ʿatf—“turning s.o. or s.th. (to)”—allows its application to both “conjunctive” and “appositive” categories.
139 Al-Baṭalyawṣī, Ḥulal, 104.
140 This is a verse by Rūḥa ibn al-ʿAjjāj (d. 762). The Naṣr who is addressed here is Naṣr ibn Sayyār (the last Umayyad governor of Ḫurāsān, d. 748). See Heinrichs 1995. See also al-Ḩādī, Ḥādīma II: 219-224.
141 Al-Baṭalyawṣī, Ḥulal, 105.
142 See fn. 131 above.
assign raf’tanwīn to the second naṣr, construe it as ‘aff al-bayān that agrees with the form of the first one (which is possible, because the damma in the ending of a noun that follows a vocative particle resembles an ‘irāb ending\(^{143}\)), and construe the third naṣr as ‘aff al-bayān that agrees with the position of the first one. Those who assign the second naṣr raf’ without a tanwīn, construe it as an apposition of the first.\(^{144}\) As we shall see below, al-Baṭalyawsī holds that in apposition there is the intention of repeating the governor, whereas there is no such intention in ‘aff al-bayān. Thus, one can imagine the second naṣr as immediately following a suppressed vocative particle, and consequently assign it damma, provided one construes the second naṣr as an apposition.

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

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

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

1. The function of a qualifier is usually performed by adjectives, whereas ‘aff al-bayān is an underived noun, similarly to apposition.\(^{146}\)

2. A qualifier may be either definite or indefinite, whereas ‘aff al-bayān, according to the Baṣran view, must be definite.\(^{147}\)

\(^{143}\) See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 107-109 for a detailed discussion of this point according to al-‘Astarābāḏī.

\(^{144}\) Al-Baṭalyawsī, Ḥulal, 105.

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

\(^{146}\) Al-Baṭalyawsī, Ḥulal, 108.
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3. “A qualifier may [signify an attribute of the referent] of the head noun or of something related to it logically” (‘anna l-na’ta yakūnu bi-mā huwa min-a l-man’ūti wa

bi-mā huwa min sababihi), whereas ‘aff al-bayān is co-referential with its head.

4. A qualifier may be replaced by clauses, time/place expressions and constituents in jarr, and this does not occur with ‘aff al-bayān.

5. A qualifier signifies some part of the head noun’s referent, namely, some attribute of it, whereas ‘aff al-bayān is co-referential with its head.148

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

1. An apposition may be co-referential with its head, and may also signify a part of the head’s referent or a thing that accompanies the head’s referent and is included in it, e.g., suliba zaydun ṭawbahu ‘Zayd was robbed, his garment’.149 An apposition may signify an action of the referent of its head or an accident related to it, whereas ‘aff al-bayān must be co-referential with its head.

2. The function of apposition may be performed by both definite and indefinite nouns, and by both explicit nouns and pronouns, whereas ‘aff al-bayān, according to the Baṣran view, must be a definite explicit noun.

3. In the case of apposition “there is the intention” of repeating the governor” (yuqad-
daru ma’ahu ‘ādatu l-‘āmilī), as if a new sentence is started, whereas in the case of ‘aff al-bayān there is no such intention; the latter resembles in this respect an adjectival qualifier.

4. “There is a type of apposition that is related to mistakes” (‘anna l-badala yaqī’u minhu mā jarā majrā l-ğalati), whereas there is no such thing in ‘aff al-bayān.150

This notwithstanding, al-ʿAstarābāḏī states:

Until now I have not revealed a clear difference between a full substitution and ‘aff al-bayān. Moreover, I hold that ‘aff al-bayān is actually an apposition (wa-ʿanā ‘ilā

147 Al-Baṭalyawsī, Ḥulal, 109. Al-Baṭalyawsī refers here specifically to the Baṣran view, since the Kūfan grammarians held that ‘aff al-bayān is indefinite, if it follows an indefinite head. In contrast, the Baṣran grammarians maintained that ‘aff al-bayān must be a definite noun that follows a definite head, and regarded cases of indefinite nouns following an indefinite head as apposition. See the discussion in ‘Abū Ḥayyān, Bahr 311 10.

148 Al-Baṭalyawsī, Ḥulal, 109.

149 Here reference is made to the three main types of apposition distinguished by the Arab grammarians: badal kull min kull ‘full substitution’, badal ba’d min kull ‘permutative apposition’, and badal istimāl ‘substitution of inclusiveness’. See ESSESY 2006: 124 for a discussion.

150 See LEVIN 1997: 151-157 for a discussion on taqdir in the sense of ‘speaker’s intention’.

151 Here al-Baṭalyawsī has in mind badal al-ğalat ‘permutative of error’, where the speaker self-corrects what he or she has stated. For instance, ra’aytu rajulan himāran ‘I saw a man, [rather,] a donkey’. ESSESY 2006: 124.

152 Al-Baṭalyawsī, Ḥulal, 109. Interestingly, Ibn Hişām mentions eight points of difference between ‘aff al-bayān and apposition. See Ibn Hişām, Muğni, 525-529.
Al-ʾAstarābāḏī argues that Sībawayhi held the same view when he said, with regard to the sentence marartu bi-rajulun ʿabdi llāhi ‘I passed by a man, ʿAbdallāh’, that there is a substitution of a definite noun for an indefinite one, as if the speaker was asked ‘Who did you pass by?’, or thought that someone might ask such a question, and thus replaced the indefinite noun with a more definite one.\(^{153}\)

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

Al-ʾAstarābāḏī says that other grammarians may claim that the difference between ʿaff al-bayān and apposition is that an apposition (and not its head) is “the one intended in the ascription” (al-maqṣūd bi-l-nisba), whereas ʿaff al-bayān is an explanation, and an explanation is secondary in relation to what is explained. Therefore, in the case of ʿaff al-bayān the one intended in the ascription is the head.\(^{154}\) The term nisba in Šarḥ al-Kāfiya refers to semantic relations between constituents, which may be predicative or not.\(^{155}\) When al-ʾAstarābāḏī speaks of “being intended in the ascription”, he probably means that the constituent in question is more important than another one or other ones, it is the one that is really meant to create syntactic connections with other parts of the sentence.\(^{156}\) The grammarians’ claim that the apposition is more important than its head (whereas in the case of adjectival qualifier the head is more important) is well known.\(^{157}\)

Al-ʾAstarābāḏī does not accept the claim that in the case of an apposition the speaker intends the second constituent only; in his view, this is true only for ‘permutative of error’, in which “the second constituent (i.e., the apposition) is obviously intended instead of the first (i.e., the head)” (fa-ʾinna kawna l-jāni fihi huwa l-maqṣūdu dīna l-awwalū zāhirūn).\(^{158}\) He

---

\(^{153}\) Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ II: 379. See SARTORI, forthcoming: Section 1 for an alternative translation of this passage.

\(^{154}\) Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ II: 379. Here al-ʾAstarābāḏī refers to a discussion from Sībawayhi, Kitāb I: 192. However, Sībawayhi did use the term ʿaff al-bayān once—while discussing the above-mentioned verse by Ru′ba (see Kitāb II: 263). See TALMON 1981: 282 for a discussion of a relevant excerpt. TALMON (1981) reconstructs the category of “appositional ʿaff” in Sībawayhi’s al-Kitāb, considering it an important syntactic innovation that can be attributed without doubt to Sībawayhi and al-Ḥallī, in contrast to grammarians of Sībawayhi’s time and of previous generations. According to Talmon’s description, Sībawayhi’s “appositional ʿaff” roughly corresponds to both rawkīd and ʿaff bayān in later grammatical literature.

\(^{155}\) Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ II: 380.

\(^{156}\) See SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 42-51 for a discussion.

\(^{157}\) See ibid.: 142, fn. 66 for a discussion of an excerpt from Ibn al-Ḥājib’s Šarḥ al-Kāfiya, where the head of an adjectival qualifier is presented as “the one intended in the informative ascription”.

\(^{158}\) For instance, al-Jurjānī (Muqtaṣid II: 930) says: “The apposition behaves as if the governor was repeated before it, because the head is neglected for the sake of the apposition” (wa-ʾinna mā kulli l-badalū fī huḵmī takrīri l-ʿamīli li-ʾaḏlī ʿanna l-badalū yatrakhu ʿilāyhi l-mubdalū minhu). See SARTORI, forthcoming for a discussion on this and similar excerpts.

\(^{159}\) Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ II: 380.
explains his position by recalling that in three types of apposition\textsuperscript{160} the head overtly functions as “[a constituent] to which something is ascribed” (\textit{mansūb \text{"i}layhi}). Thus, its mention should create “an (additional) meaning” (\textit{fā\’ida})\textsuperscript{161} that would not have been achieved without it—because the speech of eloquent people (let alone God and his Prophet) should not include useless elements.\textsuperscript{162} Given that the head noun is the one to which something else is overtly ascribed, and that it includes a meaning that justifies other constituents being ascribed to it, it would be inconsistent with the overt structure to claim that it is not intended.\textsuperscript{163}

After that, al-‘Astarābāḍi explains the three possible semantic contributions that may be achieved by the combination of the head noun and full substitution. His conclusion is that ‘\textit{atf al-bayān} is a name for a full substitution in which the second constituent clarifies the head.\textsuperscript{164} In other words, he views ‘\textit{atf al-bayān} as a sub-type of apposition (i.e., a type of full substitution, which, in its turn, is a type of apposition).

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{160} I.e., the types mentioned in fn. 149 above.
\item \textsuperscript{161} This use of the term \textit{fā\’ida} corresponds to “\textit{fā\’ida as an addition to the message}”, one of the meanings of the term distinguished in SHEYHATOVITCH 2012.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Al-‘Astarābāḍi, \textit{Ṣa\‘rī} II: 380. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2019a: 284 for a discussion of another application of this principle in al-‘Astarābāḍi’s \textit{Ṣa\‘rī al-Kāfīya}.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Al-‘Astarābāḍi, \textit{Ṣa\‘rī} II: 380.
\item \textsuperscript{164} Ibid.: 380-381. See SHEYHATOVITCH 2019b: Section 4 for a discussion of two possible types of ‘\textit{atf bayān} according to al-‘Astarābāḍi (interestingly, the number ‘five’ plays an important role in the presentation of the second type).
\item \textsuperscript{165} See p. 103 above. See SARTORI, forthcoming, for a survey of other sources who view “the repetition of the governor” as a distinguishing characteristic of apposition.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Al-‘Astarābāḍi, \textit{Ṣa\‘rī} II: 383. Al-‘Astarābāḍi believes that the governor should be the same in all \textit{tawābī} (see ibid.: 279-282 for a discussion), whereas other grammarians did not necessarily hold the same view. For instance, Ibn al-‘Anbārī maintains that the governor of the adjectival qualifier is the same as the governor of the head (see fn. 116 above), whereas the governor of the apposition “is not the same as the governor of the head, and [the head and the apposition are in] two [sentences]” (\textit{gāyru l-\text{"a}mili fl l-muhdāti, wa-huwa jamlatānī}). He notes that most grammarians held this view. See Ibn al-‘Anbārī, \textit{ʾAṣrār}, 300-301.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Al-‘Astarābāḍi, \textit{Ṣa\‘rī} II: 383.
\item \textsuperscript{168} See p. 103 above.
\end{itemize}
ʾAstarābāḏī says in response that “a constituent that is called ’atf al-bayān” (al-musammā ’atfa bayānin; a formulation that stresses again his disapproval of this term) can also disagree with its head in definiteness. 169

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

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

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

7. Conclusion

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

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

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

169 Al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ: 384.
170 See SARTORI, forthcoming: Conclusion, where a parallel is drawn between apposition in Arabic grammar and “non-restrictive modifiers” in French grammar.
171 See, e.g., al-ʾAstarābāḏī, Šarḥ: 362, 386; ii: 233.
172 See, e.g., ibid. t: 360, 364, 438; ii: 378; iii: 133.
173 See, e.g., SHEYHATOVITCH 2018: 31-41 for some examples demonstrating al-ʾAstarābāḏī’s originality and non-conformism.
174 See ḤASAN 1964 III: 355-545.
relative pronouns in a separate category (thus obtaining a sixfold categorization of definite nouns).

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

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

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

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

---

175 Additional cases, similar to those discussed in the article are the cases of ʾonna and “its sisters” and of “the five/six nouns”. Sibawayhi (Kitāb I: 241) calls the former category al-hurūf al-ḥamsa ‘the five particles’, and lists in this context ʾonna, lākīnna, ḥayyṣa, laʾalla and kaʾonna. Al-Mubarrad (Muqtabal IV: 107) and Ibn al-Sarrāj (ʿUsūl I: 217) speak about “the five particles”, but attempt to integrate both ʾonna and ʿonna into the list, by stressing their similarity. Sibawayhi did not include ʿonna in the list of “the five particles”, because he classified it under ʿism. It seems that later grammarians did not adopt Sibawayhi’s view of ʾonna, but nevertheless kept speaking of “the five particles” (see Kashier 2010-2011 for an analysis of the relevant material). As for “the five/six nouns”, Sartori (2010) argues that kun ‘a thing’ was removed from this category because some grammarians found it embarrassing (because it frequently refers to female genitalia), thus leaving the category with five nouns (which fits into the scheme of fivefold categorizations).

176 This is the main explanation offered by Okazaki (2003) for the fivefold divisions of mafʿul and mafʿul-like constituents accepted by many grammarians. However, he notes that this hypothesis is in-
the number ‘five’. The fact that even al-ʾAstarābāḏī, known for his non-conformism and originality, adheres to fivefold categorizations of tanwīn and tawābīt, despite his own criticism of them, proves that the grammarians’ engagement with number ‘five’ goes beyond mere respect for their predecessors’ authority.
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