

# Can Ambrosiana X 56 Sup. Improve Our Understanding of Sībawayhi's Grammar?

*Jean Druel*

## 1 Ambrosiana X 56 Sup., an Exceptional Witness of the *Kitāb*

During her Ph.D. research (1992, published in 1995) on the transmission of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, Geneviève Humbert discovered a fragment of the text in the Ambrosiana library in Milan. This manuscript, X 56 Sup., is entirely copied on parchment, which, according to her, is rare for a secular text. See Humbert (1995:199–203) for the complete codicological description. The manuscript is divided in 'ajzā' (probably around 12), and only the ninth and tenth *juz'* have reached us, in 115 folios. It contains chapters 327–435, according to Derenbourg's numbering (Humbert 1995:170–186). Humbert believes that chances are good that the Milan manuscript has been copied in the region of Kairouan before the middle of the 5th/11th century (Humbert 1995:172). Al-Munajjid (1960: plate 17) published the reproduction of two folios from a microfilm copy of Ambrosiana X 56 Sup. held by the Manuscript Institute of the Arab League in Cairo. He dates the manuscript to the 4th/10th century. Forty-eight other folios of the same manuscript are found in the State Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan under the call number фонд 10, опись 5, дело 822 (Khalidov 2000:8 f.). Khalidov knows a "very ancient" Milan copy, that he believes comes from Ṣan'ā', but he does not identify both fragments as being *membra disjecta* of the same codex. He dates the Kazan folios to the 6th/12th century, or the beginning of the 7th/13th. Geneviève Humbert saw the Kazan folios in June 2009 and formally recognized them as part of the same codex as the Milan folios (personal communication, December 4, 2014).

The text of the *Kitāb* that has reached us today is actually the result of an "authoritarian stranglehold" on the text by al-Mubarrad (Humbert 1995:92), which the Ambrosiana manuscript escaped, at least until it was "authoritatively corrected" around the year 715/1315, by a corrector who either put the variant readings between brackets, or struck them through, or even deleted them, based on a collation with copies containing the recensions of al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/949?) and al-Rabāḥī (d. 358/969) (Humbert 1995:189 f.).

The main interest of the Ambrosiana manuscript, according to Humbert (1995:180) lies in two facts: its recension ignores the "canonical corpus of internal glosses" that are found in all other manuscripts, and its text seems to con-

tain “less altered readings” which are “visibly more authentic”. What Humbert calls the canonical corpus of internal glosses is attributed to the three intermediaries between Sībawayhi and al-Mubarrad, namely ‘Abū l-Ḥasan al-‘Aḥfaš (d. 215/830), ‘Abū ‘Umar al-Jarmī (d. 225/839–840) and ‘Abū ‘Uṭmān al-Māzinī (d. 248 or 249/863) (Humbert 1995:187), and that she believes have been added by al-Mubarrad to the text.

Humbert says that she was unable to trace the exact origin of this Milan recension. She notes that the Ambrosiana fragment carries the name of ‘Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Aḥmad ibn Naṣr, who is barely known to the grammatical tradition (Humbert 1995:189). According to al-Suyūṭī, in his *Buḡyat al-wu‘āt* (I, 164), ‘Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Aḥmad ibn Naṣr’s teachings were transmitted by one of Ṭa‘lab’s (d. 291/904) disciples, namely ‘Abū ‘Umar al-Zāhid. This scholar’s full name is Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn ‘Abī Hišām ‘Abū ‘Umar al-Zāhid (d. 345/956–957), and he was called *ḡulām Ṭa‘lab* “Ṭa‘lab’s young disciple”. The conclusion of Humbert (1993:138) is that the Ambrosiana recension of the *Kitāb* may have a link with Ṭa‘lab, al-Mubarrad’s Kufan main opponent.

According to Humbert, the Ambrosiana recension of the *Kitāb* is a “fossil manuscript that challenges the edited text in a fundamental way” (Humbert 1995:186). Its text is less “worn out” and textual criticism proves that its readings are “more ancient and better” than that of the ‘Vulgate’ (Humbert 1995:189). She does not hesitate to write that this manuscript is “more valuable than all other manuscripts [of the *Kitāb*] together” (Humbert 1993:139). According to her, this manuscript may well support ‘Abū l-‘Abbās Ibn Wallād’s (d. 332/943–944) claim that al-Mubarrad’s copy of the *Kitāb* was of poor quality (Humbert 1995:190).

Humbert (1995:183 f.) provides an edition of one chapter of the Milan manuscript, chapter 332 according to Derenbourg’s edition, to support her claim. In her edition, this chapter covers 25 lines, 8 of which are not found in Derenbourg’s edition because of haplography. She explains that Derenbourg’s text is so mutilated that it is difficult to understand if one does not have the Milan manuscript at one’s disposal.

## 2 The Existing Editions of the *Kitāb* and Their Manuscript Basis

There are five main editions of the *Kitāb*: by Hartwig Derenbourg (Paris, 1881–1889), by Kabīr al-Dīn ‘Aḥmad (Kolkata, 1887), the Būlāq edition (Cairo, 1898), the edition by ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn (1966–1977) and the edition by Muḥammad Kāzīm al-Bakkā’ (Beirut, 2015). Commercial editions of the *Kitāb* regularly appear. See for example the edition by Émile Badī‘ Ya‘qūb (Beirut, 2009) or

Muḥammad Fawzī Ḥamza (Cairo, 2015). Ya‘qūb made an eclectic selection of either Derenbourg’s or Hārūn’s edition, with no justification and no manuscript collation. He has only filled the margins with lexicographical notes and identifications of the poetical verses. As for Ḥamza, he simply reproduced Būlāq’s edition and added in the margins a selection taken from two different commentaries.

- i. The edition of Hartwig Derenbourg (Paris, 1881–1889). This edition is based on four main manuscripts, which Derenbourg calls A, B, C, and L. Whenever possible, he chose A for the text and collated B, C and L in the margins. C covers only the first part and L was only available to Derenbourg when he was working on the second part of the *Kitāb* (Derenbourg 1881–1887:xiii). I will not mention C here, since the chapters I will study are in the second part of the *Kitāb*. Derenbourg used other manuscripts but they contain no variant reading in the three chapters I will study here.

The manuscript that Derenbourg calls A (= Humbert: Ça) is an 18th-century copy made on a descendant of an autograph of al-Zamaḥṣarī (d. 538/1144). This descendant (= Humbert 2Ç), dated 647/1249 was probably discovered in Cairo in the 18th century and copied many times: 17 copies have reached us and A is one of them. A = Ça = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, arabe 3887 (supplément arabe 1155). See Humbert (1995:297–300).

Manuscript B (= Humbert: 4G) is dated 1138/1725–1726. This late copy carries many mistakes. B = 4G = Saint Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (Akademija Nauk) C-272. See Humbert (1995:197).

Manuscript L (= Humbert: 2O) is dated 629/1232. It contains the recension of ‘Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Rabāḥī (d. 358/969). L = 2O = Escorial, Biblioteca del Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo, ar. 1. See Humbert (1995:275–279).

- ii. The edition of Kabīr al-Dīn ‘Aḥmad (Kolkata, 1887). The editor does not mention which manuscripts he worked on. This edition is partly princeps and completely independent from the other existing editions. The text contains the same corpus of inner glosses that is found in all known manuscripts, except that of Ambrosiana (Humbert 1994:9, n. 1).
- iii. The Būlāq edition (Cairo, 1898) has exactly the same text as that of Derenbourg, no manuscript was collated. It only adds some marginal glosses from al-Sirāfī and al-Šantamarī (Humbert 1995:30).
- iv. Hārūn’s edition (Cairo, 1966–1977) is eclectic. He used Derenbourg’s edition as the basis of his edition and collated two different manuscripts that are late: Dār al-Kutub Naḥw Mīm 65 (probably from the 18th century =

Humbert: v8), *Dār al-Kutub Naḥw* 141 (dated 1139/1726–1727 = Derenbourg: G = Humbert v6). Humbert has not consulted these two manuscripts. See Humbert (1995:196).

- v. The edition of *al-Bakkā'* (Beirut, 2015) is based on *Baġdād 'Awqāf* 1351 (dated 1202 according to *al-Bakkā'* and 1204/1789–1790 according to Humbert = Humbert v10). *Al-Bakkā'* says that he has collated *Mawṣil* 6184 *Ṣā'ig* 14/11 as well as *Hārūn's* and *Būlāq's* editions. Humbert has not consulted *Baġdād 'Awqāf* 1351 and she does not mention the existence of *Mawṣil* 6184 *Ṣā'ig* 14/11. She mentions *Ṣā'ig* 252 (= v13), which she believes to be the same manuscript (personal communication, June 8, 2017). See Humbert (1995:196).

In the end, it seems that Derenbourg remains the best critical edition, based on an excellent manuscript (A = Ça). In my edition, I will collate only the editions of Derenbourg, Kolkata and *al-Bakkā'*, since they are completely independent from one another. However, as I will show in the footnotes to the chapters edited by me, Kolkata and *al-Bakkā'* are full of typos and they have either no critical apparatus (Kolkata) or only an extremely basic one (*al-Bakkā'*). In my study, I will only compare X 56 Sup. with what Derenbourg has collated from A, B and L.

### 3 Survey of Three Chapters: Numerals and Doubled Verbs

In order to check the quality of Ambrosiana X 56 Sup., I decided to begin with three chapters. The first one, 412 on numerals, was a natural choice, since I studied it in great detail for my Ph.D. dissertation (Druel 2012), the second and third ones, 408 and 409 on geminated verbs, were a suggestion from Michael Carter, who said that these two chapters were quite obscure and maybe the manuscript would shed a new light on them.

I will use the following reference system:

- A, B, L for the three main manuscripts used by Derenbourg (= Humbert: Ça, 4G and 2O).
- Kolkata for the Kolkata edition by Kabīr al-Dīn 'Aḥmad in 1887.
- *Bakkā'* will refer to the Beirut edition by *al-Bakkā'* in 2015. Any discrepancy mentioned by *al-Bakkā'* between *Baġdād 'Awqāf* 1351 used as the base (= Humbert: v10) and *Mawṣil* 6184 *Ṣā'ig* 14/11 (= Humbert: v13?) will be mentioned.
- I will follow Humbert and call M<sub>1</sub> the first hand in Ambrosiana (5th/11th century?) and M<sub>2</sub> the corrector (715/1315).

### 3.1 *Results of the Collation*

There are 127 cases where either M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, A, B and/or L has a different reading (although collated in the notes, the 66 additional cases where Kolkata and/or al-Bakkā' have a different reading from all other versions are not taken into consideration here because they are actually of poor quality and most of the cases seem to be typos, as will appear in the notes). In 78 cases (60% of these 127 cases), M<sub>1</sub> and M<sub>2</sub> disagree. In the other 44 cases (40%), M<sub>1</sub> and M<sub>2</sub> agree, but there are discrepancies between the other readings, A, B or L (between A and B in 28 cases; between A and L in 28 cases; between B and L in 5 cases). Here are the details of these cases.

Cases where M<sub>1</sub> is opposed to M<sub>2</sub>: 78 cases (60% of 127 cases)

- M<sub>1</sub> vs M<sub>2</sub>, A, B, L: 65 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, A vs M<sub>2</sub>, B, L: 4 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, A, B, L vs M<sub>2</sub>: 4 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, A, B vs M<sub>2</sub>, L: 1 case
- M<sub>1</sub> vs M<sub>2</sub>, B, L vs A: 2 cases
- M<sub>1</sub> vs M<sub>2</sub>, A vs B, L: 1 case
- M<sub>1</sub> vs M<sub>2</sub> vs A, B, L: 1 case

Cases where M<sub>1</sub> and M<sub>2</sub> have the same readings, different from the others: 44 cases (40% of 127 cases)

- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub> vs A, B, L: 22 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, B, L vs A: 15 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, A vs B, L: 3 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, A, L vs B: 2 cases
- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, A, B vs L: 1 case
- M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, B vs A vs L: 1 case

There are 5 cases where it is difficult to decide and the Ambrosiana manuscript should be directly consulted.

Conclusion: A carries some original readings (in 18 cases it differs from all the other versions), but most of these original readings are of poor quality. B and L are highly dependent on A, although they still differ from it in 28 cases out of 127. B and L are very dependent on one another, and only differ in 5 cases. In 92 cases, 72% of all cases, A, B and L agree. M<sub>1</sub> and A contain the two furthest versions, they differ in 107 cases (84% of all 127 variant cases). M<sub>2</sub>, which is an attempt to align M<sub>1</sub> on the Rabāhī recension (represented here by L), still differs from L in 33 cases. It also differs from the Zamaḥṣarī recension (represented here by A) in 50 cases.

On the basis of these three chapters, we can say that M<sub>1</sub> originally contained a very different version from both the Zamaḥṣarī and the Rabāḥī recensions, confirming what Humbert had already noted. After correction by M<sub>2</sub>, the text partly keeps its originality against these two recensions.

### 3.2 *Evaluation of the Variant Readings*

In this section an attempt will be made to sort and evaluate the variant readings of M<sub>1</sub> in our three chapters, if compared with the other variants (A, B and L), not only M<sub>2</sub>. The number refers to the footnotes in the critical edition below, where the case is presented in detail.

- 10 cases where M<sub>1</sub> has a probably better reading: correct conjugation 14, 15, 148; clearer teaching: 29, 98, 191; better syntax: 20, 68, 166, 168. Out of these ten cases, only three cases are typical of M<sub>1</sub> and were not known to us before: 15, 98 and 168.
- 4 cases where M<sub>1</sub> is easier to understand: gloss added: 53; example added: 62; clearer syntax: 172, 194. Three of these four cases (53, 62 and 172) are known to us only through M<sub>1</sub>.
- 1 case where M<sub>1</sub> had a different (but today unreadable) reading at a place where the ‘canonical’ reading is difficult: 145. All the versions collated here have the canonical reading.
- 14 cases where M<sub>1</sub> is more difficult to understand than the other versions: syntactic difficulties: 1, 35, 54, 93, 100, 157, 195; grammatical explanation or example lacking: 95, 97, 102, 149, 189, 193; anonymous poet: 125.
- 16 cases where M<sub>1</sub> contains a ‘mistake’: repetition of a sequence of words: 136, 164, 176; syntactic mistakes: 8, 16, 39, 67, 167, 178, 181; inaccurate glosses: 37, 108; spelling mistake: 177; undue negation: 77; conjugation mistakes: 9, 121.
- 71 cases where M<sub>1</sub> has a different reading than the other versions, with no impact on the meaning: different grammatical examples: 2, 4, 19, 26, 32, 33, 51, 59, 69, 79, 106, 113, 118, 130, 135, 141, 143, 147, 155, 158, 160, 169, 175, 188, 192; different verbal forms: 6, 24, 103, 114; different wording: 31, 42, 45, 56, 57, 61, 65, 71, 73, 75, 76, 80, 84, 85, 92, 104?, 109, 110, 111, 129, 138, 139, 140, 142, 146, 152, 153, 159, 162, 163, 165, 170, 171, 173, 174, 180, 183, 186, 187, 190, 196; different authorities quoted: 116.
- 2 cases where it is difficult to decide without knowing what has been erased by M<sub>2</sub>: 122, 123.
- 1 case where M<sub>2</sub> has a better reading, different from A, B, L and M<sub>1</sub>: 81
- 1 case where M<sub>2</sub> has suppressed a series of grammatical examples found in A, B, L and M<sub>1</sub>: 91
- 1 case where M<sub>2</sub> has completed a verse that is incomplete in A, B, L and M<sub>1</sub>: 96.

In order to reach the total of 127 cases, one should add to these 121 cases the 5 doubtful cases (notes 22, 52, 64, 89 and 105) plus one case (note 124) where the text of A, B and L differ inside an addition that M2 has done to M1 (note 125).

Altogether, our harvest of ‘better’ readings is really meagre: in 3 cases, the readings of M1 can probably be said to be better than the other versions and original to M1, and in 3 other cases, the readings are easier to understand than in the other versions. But in 14 cases, the readings in M1 are more difficult to understand, and in 16 cases, they are erroneous. In the large majority of cases (71 cases) the readings in M1 are different from at least one of the other versions, but these differences cannot be said to be better or worse. Interestingly, M2 brings a better reading, that was not known from the other versions.

### 3.3 *Examples of Corrections by the 8th/15th Collator (M2)*

In 63r<sup>o</sup>.4, M2 has struck through six words (*‘illā fī l-‘alif wa-l-lām wa-l-‘alif al-ḥafifa*) that are found in all the versions collated here (see n. 81). The situation here is surprising, since M2 supposedly aims at correcting the text whenever it differs from the canonical version. Just like A, B and L, M1 actually had these six words but M2 struck them through. As commented upon in the note, the presence of these six words is not consistent with the grammatical teaching in this chapter.

In 63r<sup>o</sup>.11, M2 added the words *man qāla halummā wa-halummī* that were not in the *matn* of M1 (see n. 98). All the other variants have them, however, they could well be an example of an internal gloss that has made its way into the text. Their implication in terms of grammatical teaching is not edge-cutting. They add a condition to a grammatical teaching that is otherwise more general. Based only on the evidence of the teaching, I believe it plausible that these words are a later addition to the text.

In 71r<sup>o</sup>.18, M2 changed the singular *ḥālihi* into the dual *ḥālihimā*, which is the reading of all other versions (see n. 168). The grammatical point at stake here is the modification of the status of *itnāni* in the compound numeral *itnā-‘ašar*. The formulation of the sentence *lam tuḡayyirū l-itnayni* could lead the reader to think that *al-itnayni* refers to both *itnay* and *‘ašar*, not to *itnay*, the first part of the compound, and that the text comments the *ḥāl* of both *itnay* and *‘ašar*, which is not the case. It only deals with the *ḥāl* of *itnāni*, the first part of the compound, which does not change after coalescence.

Establishing the text of the *Kitāb* is not an easy task because of the amount of glosses that have entered its *matn* and Derenbourg’s effort to ‘clean’ the text from these glosses has created new mistakes (Humbert 1995:41). In our three chapters, there are a few places where we can study the issue of the glosses (see n. 37, 91 and 108, as well as the case presented above with n. 98). In 37,

a gloss has been added in the margin and then put between brackets. In 91, M2 has put between brackets a passage that is found in the *matn* of all the collated versions and that he probably considered to be an internal gloss providing additional examples. And in 108, a passage found only in the *matn* of M1 was put between brackets by M2, who probably considered it to be a gloss.

In five different places (see n. 143, 147, 155, 169, 175), M1 systematically used the isolated forms of numerals when discussing them, i.e. the forms with an ending *tā' marbūṭa* between 'three' and 'ten', and the masculine form for eleven, whereas M2 changed them into the form actually used in the examples.

In one place (see n. 145), the canonical version was doubted by many grammarians and M1 had a different reading, which is illegible on the photo of the manuscript at my disposal. I hope that a direct consultation of the manuscript can reveal what the original reading was.

Lastly, it is really interesting to see how often M1 had different grammatical examples (25 cases, see the list above). In most cases, it is impossible to read the original readings in M1 because M2 has erased them and written above them. However, their mere existence is in itself a very eloquent testimony that, at some point in history, the text of the *Kitāb* was still flexible but that in 715/1315 this was not the case anymore.

#### 4 Conclusion

M1 contains a version that greatly differs from A, the base of Derenbourg's edition and later editions. And even after its correction by M2, the text still contains a good number of variant readings. This very old parchment (5th/11th century?) is an exciting witness of the reception of the *Kitāb* in the West of the Arab world, in particular because it is indirectly connected to Ta'lab, the main 'Kufan' opponent of al-Mubarrad. The three chapters that I have edited in this paper have revealed interesting readings (6 out of 127), and there is little doubt that the remaining 106 chapters contained in the Milan manuscript (along with the Kazan folios) will bring more.

My conclusion at this point, and based on only three of the 109 chapters is contains, is that the text of M1 and M2 cannot be said to be generally better than Derenbourg's edition, yet, it is imperative to check the Milan manuscript whenever one studies a particular chapter of the *Kitāb* in case it may contain a rare and valuable reading.

The quest for the 'original' text, that has led Derenbourg to create new mistakes by suppressing what he considered to be glosses, is comparable to the effort of M2 on the text of M1. What Ambrosiana X 56 Sup. points to is that

the text of the *Kitāb* has long been considered to be flexible, i.e., available for editing and adaptation at the hand of the grammarians who created their own working copies. When M2 corrects the text in 715/1315, it is clear that for him the text is no longer flexible and that he believes an ‘original’ version exists and can be reached.

As Humbert (1994:10) puts it, the rich manuscript tradition of Sībawayh’s *Kitāb* has been overlooked by modern editors and scholars. Another exceptional manuscript, that has not received the attention it deserves is the autograph by the Andalusian grammarian ‘Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī Ibn Ḥarūf al-Ḥaḍramī (d. ca. 609/1212), kept in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, arabe 6499, which contains a sophisticated critical recension. Even though our understanding of Sībawayh’s teachings is not fully renewed at this point, at least our vision of the richness of the textual tradition is.




### Edition of Three Chapters

The following guiding principles have been used in the present edition. The base text is that of M<sub>1</sub>, and the corrections of M<sub>2</sub> are inserted directly into it, with the coding explained below and a note providing a brief commentary. Any other note, i.e. not following a correction mark in the text, indicates a discrepancy within the ‘Vulgate’ itself, represented here by the agreement of M<sub>2</sub>, A, B, L, Kolkata and al-Bakkā’. This means that one can easily see in the text the many cases where M<sub>2</sub> has aligned M<sub>1</sub> to the ‘Vulgate’, as well as any discrepancy inside this ‘Vulgate’.

The following coding has been used for the corrections done by M<sub>2</sub> within the text:

~~words struck through~~: M<sub>2</sub> simply struck them through.

(words put between brackets): M<sub>2</sub> added brackets instead of striking the words through.

**deletion marks in the text:** In some cases, M<sub>2</sub> added deletion marks above the words to delete. If one word, he added a single mark, similar to the head of a *ṣād*  above the word to be deleted. When more than one word, M<sub>2</sub> added a mark similar to the head of a *mīm*  above the first word and a reversed head of a *mīm*  on the last word. In both cases, I have underlined the words in my edition.

[words erased by M2]: M2 erased them and eventually rewrote above them.

[×××]: erased words that are not readable anymore. The number of ‘×s’ roughly corresponds to the number of characters erased.

‘words added by M2’: M2 has either added these words in the *matn*, either above an erased passage, or between the lines or in the margins, and consistently uses signes-de-renvoi.

[abc]→‘def’ thus means that M2 has erased ‘abc’ and replaced it by ‘def’.

‘margins added by M2’: M2 has added these words as commentaries in the margin, not as part of the *matn*. These margins are found only in the Milan manuscript. They are either glosses or collation marks.

There are also cases where M2 has mentioned an inversion in the order of the words by adding the word *mu‘aḥḥar* above the first word and the word *muqaddam* above the second one. In the edition, I have simply reproduced them as in: مؤخر وهلم مقدم لا يكسر which means that the expression in M1 was *wa-halumma lā yaksiru* and that M2 corrected it into *wa-lā yaksiru halumma* (see below, folio 63r<sup>o</sup>.11). Lastly, I have left in the text the paragraph markers (*dāra*): ⊙.

Geminated verbs: Ambrosiana 61v<sup>o</sup>.2–63v<sup>o</sup>.20 = Derenbourg chapter 408–409, II, 162.1–165.7 = Kolkata 703–707 = Bakkā’ V, 237–241

[61ظ] [2] هذا باب مضاعف الفعل واختلاف العرب فيه [3] والتضعيف أن يكون آخر الفعل حرفان من موضع واحد وذلك نحو<sup>1</sup> رَدَدْتُ [4] و[ص؟]←وَدَدْتُ<sup>2</sup> واجتررت<sup>3</sup> وانقددت<sup>3</sup> واستعددت<sup>3</sup> وصارزت<sup>4</sup> وتراددنا<sup>5</sup> واحمررت<sup>5</sup> [5] واحمارزت<sup>5</sup> وإطمأنت<sup>5</sup> فإذا تحرك الحرف الآخر

1 M2 added *naḥwa* which was missing in M1 but found in all the other versions collated here. This *naḥwa* makes the text of M1 smoother. Maybe this could be a witness of a less ‘polished’ text.

2 M1 had a different example from all other collated versions before its correction. Maybe it was the verb *ṣadda*, as in al-Sīrāfi’s commentary (XIV, 57.9).

3 Kolkata has the erroneous *inḡadadtū*.

4 A has *wa-ṣārartū*. B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā’ have *wa-ḡārartū*. M1 has *wa-ṣārartū* and M2 did not correct it. Al-Sīrāfi’s commentary (*Ṣarḥ* XIV, 57.9) has the example *ḡārra*.

5 Kolkata has *wa-tawādadnā*.

فالعربُ يُجمعون<sup>6</sup> على [6] الإدغام وذلك فيما زعم الخليل<sup>7</sup> أولى به<sup>8</sup> لأنه لما كان<sup>9</sup> من موضع واحدٍ ثقلَ [7] عليهم<sup>10</sup> أن يرفعوا ألسنتهم من موضعٍ ثم يعيدوها إلى ذلك الموضع للحرف [8] الآخر فلها ثقل عليهم ذلك أرادوا أن يرفعوا رَفْعَةً واحدةً وذلك قولهم رُدِّي [9] واجتَرَّ<sup>11</sup> وانقَدُوا<sup>12</sup> واستَعَدِّي وضارِّي<sup>13</sup> زيداً وهما يُرادان<sup>14</sup> وإحمرَّ وإحمارَّ وهو [10] يَطْمَنُ<sup>15</sup> ⊙ فإذا كان حرفٌ من هذا<sup>16</sup> الحروف في موضعٍ تَسْكُن<sup>17</sup> فيه لامُ الفعل [11] فإن أهل الحجاز يضاعفون لأنهم أسكنوا الآخر فلم يكن بدُّ من تحريك الذي [12] قبله لأنه لا يلتقي ساكنانٍ وذلك قولك ا رُدُّ<sup>18</sup> واجتَرُّ وإن تضارُّ أضرارُّ [13] وإن تستعدُّ استعدُّ وكذلك جميع هذه الحروف ويقولون ا رُدِّ [14] الرجل وإن تستعدُّ اليوم استعدُّ اليوم<sup>19</sup> يدعونه على [15] حاله ولا يدغمون لأن هذا التحريك ليس بلازمٍ لها إنما حرَّكه<sup>20</sup> في [16] هذا الموضع لالتقاء الساكنين وليس الساكن الذي بعده<sup>21</sup> في [17] الفعل مبنياً عليه كالنون الثقيلة والخفيفة [62] و[1] وأما بنو تميم فيدغمون المجزوم كما أدغموا إذ كان الحرفان متحرِّ [2] كين لما ذكرنا من المتحرِّكين فيسكنون الأوّل ويحرِّكون الآخر [3] لأنهما لا<sup>22</sup> يسكنان جميعاً وهو قول غيرهم من العرب وهم كثيرٌ ⊙ [4] فإذا كان الحرف الذي قبل الحرف الأوّل من الحرفين ساكناً ألقيت

- 6 A has the passive *mujma'ūn*. B, L and Bakkā' have the active *mujmi'ūn*. M<sub>1</sub> has *mujmi'ūn* and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it. Kolkata is not vocalized.
- 7 According to Bakkā', Mawṣil adds *rahimahu Allāh ta'ālā*.
- 8 M<sub>2</sub> added the two words *'awlā bihi* that were lacking in M<sub>1</sub> and without which the text makes no sense. All the other versions collated here have them.
- 9 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have the more correct dual *kānā*. M<sub>1</sub> has the singular *kāna* and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it.
- 10 Bakkā' has the obviously erroneous *'alayhi*.
- 11 Kolkata has *wa-jtarrū*.
- 12 Kolkata has *wa-nqaddū*.
- 13 Kolkata has *wa-sta'iddā wa-dārrā* with a clear ending *'alif maqṣūra* and superscript *'alif*.
- 14 A has the bizarre form *yurāddanāni*.
- 15 Vocalised *yutma'innu* by Derenbourg (according to A, B, L?). Bakkā' and M<sub>1</sub> have the better vocalization *yaṭma'innu*, which M<sub>2</sub> did not change. Kolkata is not vocalized.
- 16 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have the more correct *hādihi*. M<sub>1</sub> has *hādā*, and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct this obvious grammatical mistake. Did it escape the attention of the corrector?
- 17 Kolkata has *yaskunu*.
- 18 Kolkata has *urdudū*.
- 19 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' do not have this *al-yawm*. It is not found either in al-Sirāfi's commentary (*Ṣarḥ* XIV, 58.11). M<sub>1</sub> has it and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it.
- 20 A and Bakkā' have the less correct *ḥarrakū*. B, L and Kolkata have *ḥarrakūhu*. M<sub>1</sub> has *ḥarrakūhu* and M<sub>2</sub> did not modify it.
- 21 Kolkata has only *ba'da*, without the suffix pronoun.
- 22 Not clear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.

[5] حركة الأول عليه إن كان مكسوراً فأكسره وإن كان مضموماً [6] فضمه وإن<sup>23</sup> كان مفتوحاً فأفتحه وإن كان قبل الذي يلقى<sup>24</sup> عليه الحركة [7] ألف وصل حذفها لأنه قد استغني<sup>25</sup> عنها حيث حرك وإنما احتيج [8] إليها لسكون ما بعدها ○ وذلك قولك رُدَّ وفرَّ وعَصَّ وإن تردَّ [9] أرَدَّ<sup>26</sup> أَلْقَيْتَ حركة الأول منهما<sup>27</sup> على الساكن الذي قبله وحذ [10] فت<sup>28</sup> الألف كما فعلت ذلك في غير الجزم ○ وذلك قولك رُدَّا ورُدُّوا [11] وإن كان الساكن الذي قبل الأول بينه وبين الألف<sup>29</sup> حاجزاً<sup>30</sup> أَلْقَيْتَ [12] عليه حركة الأول لأن كل واحدٍ منهما [يتحرك] ← يتحوَّل<sup>31</sup> في حال صاحبه [13] عن الأصل كما فعلت ذلك في رُدَّ وفرَّ و[ل×××] ← عَصَّ<sup>32</sup> ولا تحذف الألف [14] لأن الحرف الذي بعد ألف الوصل ساكنٌ وذلك قولك إطمأنَّ [15] وإقشعرَّ<sup>33</sup> وإن تَشَمَّتْ أَشْمَّتْ<sup>34</sup> فصارت الألف<sup>35</sup> في الإدغام والجزم مثلها [16] في الخبر<sup>36</sup> وذلك قولك إطمئنوا وإطمئنا ومثل (ذلك إن تَشَمَّتْ أَشْمَّتْ

23 Kolkata has *fa-'in*.

24 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *tulqī*. M1 has *yulqā* and M2 did not correct it. The meaning is the same, only that it is in the passive voice.

25 Kolkata clearly has the wrong form *istagnā*, with an ending *'alif maqṣūra* and superscript *'alif*.

26 A is the only one to have the ending vocalization *wa-'in taruddu 'aruddu*. There are various possible ending vocalizations, as presented in the following chapter of the *Kitāb*, and it is not the point at stake here. What is at stake here is the middle vocalization.

27 Kolkata has *minhā*, which is incorrect.

28 Kolkata has *ḥadafta* without the connecting *wāw*.

29 A is the only one to have *al-'awwal* instead of *al-'alif*. This formulation makes no sense, since *al-'awwal* refers already to the first of the two consonants that will be assimilated. What is intended is the presence of a phoneme between the first letter to be assimilated and the *'alif waṣl*. In this case, the *'alif waṣl* remains, and the first of the two consonants takes the vowel of the second identical consonant.

30 Kolkata has *ḥājizan*.

31 A has *yataḥarraku*. B, L and Bakkā' have *yataḥawwalu*. M1 had *yataḥarraku* and M2 corrected it to *yataḥawwalu*. The wording is different, but I am not sure whether one is better than the other. The same root in *yataḥawwalu* and *ḥāl* probably pleads in favor of this verb over *yataḥarraku*.

32 M1 had a different example, apparently with an ending *'alif*.

33 B is the only one to add *wa-šma'azza* after *wa-qša'arra*.

34 Kolkata clearly has *wa-'in tašmay'izz 'ašmay'izz*, with a *yā'*, which is probably only a spelling issue of the *hamza*.

35 Without the addition of *al-'alif*, the sentence is very unclear. The subject (the first *al-'alif*) would be very far from this new verb. Does this addition amend a difficult 'original' reading in M1, as was the case above in note 1? All the other versions collated here have this *al-'alif*.

36 Kolkata has *al-jarr*, which makes no sense in the context here.

ومثل<sup>س</sup> 37 [17] ذلك استعد وإن كان الذي<sup>38</sup> قبل الأول متحرراً وكان في الحرف [18] ألف وصل لم يغير<sup>ه</sup> 39 الحركة عن حال [هما] ← هـ لأنه لم يكن حرفاً يضطر [19] إلى تحريكه ولا تذهب الألف<sup>40</sup> لأن الذي بعدها لم يحرك<sup>41</sup> وذلك نحو<sup>42</sup> [20] اجتر واحمر وانقد وإن تنقد<sup>43</sup> انقد فصار في الإدغام وثبات<sup>44</sup> [21] الألف مثله في غير الجزم وإن<sup>45</sup> كان قبل الأول ألف [62ظ] [1] لم يغير<sup>46</sup> لأن الألف قد يكون بعدها الساكن المدغم فيحتمل ذلك وتكون ألف [2] الوصل في ذا<sup>47</sup> الحرف لأن الساكن الذي بعدها لا يحرك<sup>48</sup> وذلك<sup>49</sup> إحمار وإشهاب [3] وإن تدهام أدهام فصار في الإدغام وثبات الألف مثله في غير الجزم [4] وإن كان قبل الأول ألف ولم يكن في ذلك الحرف حرف وصل لم يغير<sup>50</sup> عن [5] بنائه وعن الإدغام في غير الجزم وذلك قولك ماد ولا تضار<sup>51</sup> ولا تجار [6] وكذلك ما كانت<sup>52</sup> ألفه مقطوعة نحو أمد وأعد<sup>2</sup> فتح الدال من أمد وأعد حسن والكسر أجود<sup>س</sup> 53

37 It is not clear who added this marginal gloss and who put it between brackets. If we consider that M2 put it between brackets, then we probably have to consider that it is M1 who added it, as an auto-correction. It could also reflect more than two hands at work on this manuscript. This addition is of poor interest, it does not fit with the examples dealt with here (i.e. the cases where the *'alif waṣl* is maintained after assimilation of the repeated consonants).

38 Kolkata has *kāna l-ḥarf alladī*, which only makes the expression clearer.

39 The initial reading of M1 is not correct because *al-ḥaraka* cannot be the subject of the verb *lam tuḡayyar*. What is at stake here is not a change in the vowel added on the doubled consonant, but the fact that adding this vowel will not change the morphology of the verb, i.e. the *'alif waṣl* will still be needed. All the versions collated here bear the corrected reading of M2.

40 Kolkata does not have *al-'alif*.

41 Kolkata has *yataḥarrak*.

42 A, B and L do not have this *naḥwa*. Kolkata has it. Bakkā' has *qawluka* instead of *naḥwa*. M1 has *naḥwa* and M2 did not correct it.

43 Kolkata has *nanqadda*.

44 According to Bakkā', Mawṣil has *banāt* instead of *tabāt*.

45 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *wa-'idā* instead of this *wa-'in*. M1 has *wa-'in* and M2 did not correct it.

46 Kolkata has *yugayyar*.

47 Kolkata has *hādā*.

48 Kolkata has *yataḥarraku*.

49 Kolkata has *wa-dālika qawluka*.

50 Kolkata has *tataḡayyaru*.

51 Vocalised *tuḡārru* by Derenbourg (according to A, B, L?) and by Bakkā'. Kolkata is not vocalized. M1 has an ending *fathā*, which M2 did not change. This point is not what is at stake here and will be discussed at length in the next chapter, and lots of variation happens. So both forms can be regarded as equally possible here.

52 The *'alif* is unclear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.

53 The marginal addition is found only in M2, if it is really an addition by M2 and not an

[7] هذا باب اختلاف العرب في تحريك الآخر <sup>54r</sup>لأنه لا يستقيم [8] أن يسكن هو والأول <sup>55</sup>  
 [في؟] ← من <sup>56r</sup>غير أهل الحجاز [9] اعلم أن منهم من جعل <sup>57</sup>يحرك الآخر كتحرريك ما قبله فإن  
 كان مفتوحاً فتحوه [10] وإن كان مضموماً <sup>58</sup>ضموه وإن كان مكسوراً كسروه وذلك قولك رُدُّ  
 [11] وعَضَّ وفِرِّيا فتى وأَمَدَّ وأَطْمَأَنَّ واستَعَدَّ <sup>59</sup>واجترَّ وإحمرَّ وضارَّ لأن [12] قبلها <sup>60</sup>فتحةً وألفاً  
 فهـ[ي] ← <sup>61</sup>أجدر أن يفتح ورُدُّنا ولا يُشَلِّكُم اللهُ وعَضِّنِي <sup>62</sup>[13] وعَضَّنَا ومدُّني <sup>63</sup>إليك ولا  
 يُشَلِّك <sup>64</sup>الله وليَعَضَّكُمْ فإذا <sup>65</sup>جاءت الهاء والألف [14] فتحوا أبداً ⊙ [15] وسألت الخليل <sup>66</sup>لم  
 ذاك فقال لأن الهاء خفية فكانهم قالوا رُدُّوا وأَمَدَّ <sup>67r</sup>وغلَّا <sup>68</sup>[16] إذا قالوا رُدُّها وغلَّها <sup>69</sup>فإذا كانت

auto-correction by M<sub>1</sub>. This addition is compliant with the teaching of the next chapter, i.e. the vocalization of the Tamīm forms, where the *fatha* is far from being the best form (although not stated clearly).

- 54 Without *li-ʿannahu* the text is less easy to read (less correct?) M<sub>1</sub> is the only version not to have it.
- 55 Kolkata has *wa-huwa al-ʿawwal*.
- 56 M<sub>1</sub> had a different particle than all the other versions, with no implication for the meaning or for the quality of the language.
- 57 M<sub>1</sub> is the only text to have *jaʿala* before the conjugated verb *yuḥarrik*, which is a possible construction meaning 'to begin to' (see *Kitāb* I, 364.20). However, this construction makes no sense here and M<sub>2</sub> struck this word through.
- 58 Bakkāʿ has an erroneous *mā* after *maḍmūman*.
- 59 A: *wa-qšaʿarra wa-ṭmaʿinna wa-staʿidda*; B, L and Kolkata: *wa-ṭmaʿinni wa-staʿiddi*; Bakkāʿ: *wa-qšaʿirri wa-ṭmaʿinni wa-staʿiddi*; M<sub>1</sub>: *wa-ʿamiddi wa-ṭmāʿinni wa-staʿiddi*; M<sub>2</sub>: *wa-ṭmāʿinni wa-staʿiddi*. M<sub>1</sub> has an additional example (*wa-ʿamiddi*) which M<sub>2</sub> struck through, and a long *ʿalif* in *wa-ṭmāʿinni*, which M<sub>2</sub> did not correct. The additional example *ʿamiddi* is already found above in 62v<sup>o</sup>.6=II, 163.9. Although it does not really add to the demonstration at this point, it is consistent with the teaching.
- 60 Kolkata has *li-ʿanna mā qablahā*.
- 61 A and Bakkāʿ: *fa-hiya ʿajdaru ʿan tuftaha*; B, L and Kolkata: *fa-huwa ʿajdaru ʿan yuftaha*; M<sub>1</sub>: *fa-hiya ʿajdaru ʿan yuftaha*; M<sub>2</sub>: *fa-huwa ʿajdaru ʿan yuftaha*. There is no difference in the use of the masculine or the feminine.
- 62 M<sub>1</sub> had one more example, that M<sub>2</sub> rejected by adding a superscript mark above it. This additional example is found nowhere else.
- 63 Kolkata has *wa-maddanī* with a *fatha* on the *šadda* as if the verb was in the past tense, not the imperative.
- 64 The *lām* and its vocalization is unclear. To be checked on the manuscript.
- 65 A, B, L and Bakkāʿ have *fa-in*. Kolkata and al-Sīrāfi's commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 61.1) have *fa-idā*. M<sub>1</sub> also has *fa-idā* and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it.
- 66 According to Bakkāʿ, Mawṣil adds *raḥimahu Allāh taʿālā*. Kolkata adds *rh*.
- 67 The omission of *ʿalif* in M<sub>1</sub> is clearly a mistake because it misses the very point of the demonstration, namely that the ending *fatha* is like a lightened *ʿalif*.
- 68 A is the only one to have the incorrect *ruddan wa-ʿamiddan wa-ḡullan* with *tanwīn*.
- 69 L and Bakkāʿ are the only ones to add *wa-ʿamiddahā* after *wa-ḡullahā*.

الهَاءُ مضمومةٌ ضموا كأنهم قالوا [17] مدوا وعصوا إذا قالوا<sup>70</sup> مدّه وعصه فإن جئت بالألف واللام والألف [18] لف<sup>71</sup> الخفيفة<sup>72</sup> كسرت الأول كله لأنه كان في الأصل مجزوماً لأن الفعل [19] إذا كان مجزوماً [ت] ← فحرّك<sup>73</sup> صح<sup>74</sup> فحرك<sup>74</sup> لالتقاء الساكنين كسر ذلك قولك اِضْرِبِ الرَّجُلَ وِاضْرِبِ ابْنَكَ فلما جاءت الألف واللام والألف الخفيفة [21] رددته إلى الأصل<sup>75</sup> لأن أصله أن يكون مسكناً على<sup>76</sup> لغة أهل الحجاز [63و] [1] كما أن نظائره من غير المضاعف على غير<sup>77</sup> ذلك جرى ومثل ذلك مُذِّذٌ وَذَهَبْتُمْ [2] فيمن أسكن تقول مُذُّ يَوْمٍ وَذَهَبْتُمْ يَوْمَ لَأَنَّكَ لَمْ تَبِنِ<sup>78</sup> الميم [3] على أن أصله السكون ولكنه حذف كياء قا [x] ← ض<sup>79</sup> ونحوها ومنهم من يفتح [4] إذا [اجتمع] ← التقى ساكنان<sup>80</sup> على كل حال إلا في الألف واللام والألف الخفيفة<sup>81</sup> فزعم [5] الخليل<sup>82</sup> أنهم شبهوه بأين وكيف وسوف وأشباه ذلك وفعلوا [6] به إذ<sup>83</sup> جاءوا بالألف واللام والألف الخفيفة ما فعل

70 Kolkata has *qāla*.

71 A, B, L and Bakkā' have *wa-bi-l-'alif*. M1 has *wa-l-'alif* and M2 did not correct it. No incidence on meaning.

72 Kolkata has *bi-l-'alif wa-l-lām al-ḥafīfa* which is a clear mistake.

73 Kolkata has *taḥarraka*, which also was in M1 before correction by M2. The introduction of the apodosis by *fā'* and the passive form may reflect a higher language standard.

74 Not only has M2 corrected the form in the *ductus*, but he also has added the corrected form in margin and added a collation mark. As above, in note 37, this could be the work of more than one corrector.

75 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *ʾaṣlihi*. M1 has *al-ʾaṣl* and M2 did not correct it.

76 A and Bakkā' have *fī*. B, L and Kolkata have *ʿalā*. M1 has *ʿalā* and M2 did not correct it.

77 This *gayr* is inconsistent with the teaching: the verb takes a final *kasra* before the article and the *waṣla*, because it is the base form, i.e. a Ḥijāzī *majzūm* form, and there is no difference with Tamīm in this. This is the rule for all verbs, including non-geminated ones. M2 has struck this *gayr* through. It is found in no other version collated here.

78 Kolkata has *lam tabqa*.

79 M1 had a different example, which has been erased by M2. All the versions collated here have *qāḍin*.

80 M1 had a different wording. Al-Sirāfi's commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 62.9) has a combination of the two readings: *ʾidā ijṭamaʿa sākināni*.

81 It is surprising that M2 has struck these words through, because all of A, B, L, Bakkā' and al-Sirāfi's commentary (XIV, 62.9–10) have them. Kolkata has *ʾillā fī al-ʾalif wa-l-ʾalif wa-l-lām al-ḥafīfa*. If it is really the case, as al-Ḥalīl says, that these assimilated verbs have been treated like *ʾayna*, *kayfa* and *sawfa*, i.e. with an invariable ending *fathā*, then M2 is right to strike these words through because these verbs would take a *fathā* in all cases, even before a *waṣla* and an article.

82 According to Bakkā', Mawṣil adds *raḥimahu Allāh taʿālā*. Kolkata adds *rḥ*.

83 Kolkata has *ʾidā*.

الأولون وهم [7] بنو أسدٍ وغيرهم من بني تميم وسمعنا<sup>84</sup> ممن ترضى<sup>85</sup> عريته ولم [8] يتبعوا<sup>86</sup> الآخر الأول كما (قالوا امرؤ وامرئ<sup>87</sup> وأتبعوا<sup>88</sup> الآخر الأول<sup>89</sup> كما<sup>90</sup>) [9] قالوا ابنم وابنم<sup>92</sup> وابنم<sup>92</sup> ومنهم من يدعه إذا جاء بالألف واللام على حاله<sup>93</sup> مفتو [10] حاً يجعله<sup>94</sup> في جميع الأشياء<sup>95</sup> كائين<sup>95</sup> ○ وزعم يونس أنه سمعهم يقولون

غُضَّ [11] الطَّرْفُ إِنَّكَ مِنْ نَمِيرٍ<sup>96</sup> فَلَ كَعْبًا بَلِغْتَ وَلَا كَلَابًا<sup>96</sup>

مؤخروهلّمّ مقدم لا يكسر<sup>97</sup> البتّة<sup>97</sup> من قال هَلْمًا وَهَلِيَّ<sup>98</sup> ولكن يجعلها في الفعل تجري [12] مجراها في لغة أهل الحجاز بمنزلة رُوَيْدٍ ○ [13] ومن العرب من يكسر ذا أجمع على كلّ حال فيجعله بمنزلة

- 84 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *sami'nāhu*. M1 has *sami'nā* and M2 has not corrected it. The form *sami'nāhu* is probably better.
- 85 A, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *turdā*. B and L have *turdaqā*. M1 has *turdaqā* and M2 has not corrected it. Both forms have the same meaning and construction and it is not clear whether one form is better than the other.
- 86 Kolkata has *yutbi'ūhu*, which makes no sense.
- 87 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' add here *wa-mra'an*. M1 does not have it and M2 has not added it (actually, M2 has put the whole expression between brackets, which may explain why he did not correct what was between the brackets).
- 88 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *fa-'atba'ū*. M1 has *wa-'atba'ū* and M2 has not corrected it.
- 89 The *lām* is unclear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.
- 90 A, B, L and Bakkā' have *wa-kamā*. Kolkata has only *kamā*.
- 91 The text that M2 has put between brackets is found in the *matn* of A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā', with the variants described above. It could be that M2 considered it to be an added gloss.
- 92 A, B, L and Bakkā' have *ibnīmin wa-bnumun wa-bnāman*. Kolkata has *ibnīmin ibnumun ibnāman*. M1 has *ibnumun wa-bnīmin wa-bnāman* and M2 did not correct it.
- 93 M1 did not have the expression *'alā ḥālihi*, which is found in all the versions collated here. M2 has added it. Without it, the sentence is less clear in M1. Just like in notes 1 and 35 above, this could be a trace of a less "polished" original text.
- 94 Kolkata has only one dot under the *yā'*, which is probably a typo, not to be read *bi-ja'lihi*.
- 95 The addition of *ka-'ayna* by M2, which is found in all the versions collated here, makes the text clearer by providing an example. See notes 1, 35 and 93 above for other cases where M2 makes M1 easier to read.
- 96 M2 has completed the verse in the margin, but this addition is not found in the other versions collated here.
- 97 A, Kolkata and Bakkā' have *wa-lā yaksiru halumma*. B and L have *wa-lā taksiru halumma*. M1 has *wa-halumma lā yaksiru* and M2 has corrected it into *wa-lā yaksiru halumma* by adding the two words *mu'ahḥar* and *muqaddam* above the expression. The wording of M1 should probably be read in the passive *wa-halumma lā yuksaru*, since M1 does not contain the following example added by M2. This could once more be considered a less polished reading in M1.
- 98 All the versions collated here have the expression *man qāla halummā wa-halummī*, that M2 added to M1. It modifies the text by adding a condition to the impossibility of an end-

إِضْرِبِ الرَّجُلَ [14] وَإِضْرِبِ ابْنَكَ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَجْعَ 99 بِالْأَلْفِ وَاللَّامِ لِأَنَّهُ فَعْلٌ حَرَكٌ لِاتِّقَاءِ السَّاكِنِينَ  
 [15] وَكَذَلِكَ إِضْرِبِ ابْنَكَ وَإِضْرِبِ الرَّجُلَ وَلَا يَقُولُهَا فِي هَلْمٍ [و] لَا 100 يَقُولُ هَلْمٌ [16] يَا فَتَى 101 مِنْ  
 يَقُولُ هَلْمُوا فَيَجْعَلُهَا بِمَنْزِلِ [تته] ← 102 رُوَيْدٌ وَلَا يَكْسِرُ هَلْمٌ أَحَدٌ لِأَنَّهَا لَمْ [17] تُصْرَفَ تُصْرَفُ الْفِعْلُ  
 وَلَمْ تَقْوُوتَهُ وَمَنْ يَكْسِرُ كَعْبٌ وَغَنِيٌّ ⊙ [18] وَأَهْلُ الْحِجَازِ وَغَيْرُهُمْ مَجْتَمِعُونَ 103 عَلَى أَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ لِلنِّسَاءِ  
 أُرْدُدَنَّ [19] وَذَلِكَ لِأَنَّ الدَّالَ لَمْ [××××] ← 104 تَسْكُنَ هَاهُنَا لِأَمْرٍ وَلَا نَهْيٍ وَكَذَلِكَ كُلِّ حَرْفٍ  
 [20] قَبْلَ نُونِ النِّسَاءِ لَا يَسْكُنُ لِأَمْرٍ وَلَا لِحَرْفٍ يَجْزَمُ أَلَا 105 تَرَى أَنَّ السَّكُونَ [63ظ] [1] لِأَنَّهُ لَزِمَ لَهُ  
 فِي حَالِ النَّصْبِ وَالرَّفْعِ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ [×] ← 106 رَكَدَدَنَّ وَهَنْ يَرْدَدَنَّ وَعَلِيٌّ 107 أَنْ يَرْدَدَنَّ [2] (أَخْبَرَنِي  
 أَبُو عَيْبَةَ أَنَّهُمْ لَا يَقُولُونَ هَلْمٌ زَيْدًا إِنَّمَا يَقُولُونَ هَلْمٌ أ نَت) 108 وَكَذَلِكَ [3] يَجْرِي غَيْرُ الْمُضَاعَفِ قَبْلَ  
 نُونِ النِّسَاءِ لَا 109 يَحْرُكُ فِي حَالِ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ ضَرَبَنَّ [4] وَيَضْرِبَنَّ وَيَذْهَبَنَّ فَلَمَّا كَانَ هَذَا الْحَرْفُ  
 يَلْزِمُهُ السَّكُونُ فِي كُلِّ مَوْضِعٍ وَكَانَ [5] السَّكُونُ حَاجِزًا عَنْهُ مَا سِوَاهُ مِنَ الْإِعْرَابِ وَتَمَكَّنَ فِيهِ  
 مَا لَمْ يَتَمَكَّنَ فِي غَيْرِهِ [6] مِنَ الْفِعْلِ كَرَهُوا أَنْ يَجْعَلُوهُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ مَا يُجْزَمُ [ل] لِأَمْرٍ 110 أَوْ لِحَرْفِ الْجَزْمِ

ing *kasra* in *halumma*, whereas M1 teaches that this impossibility is absolute, for some speakers, and that they always treat *halumma* like *ruwayda*, i.e. not like an assimilated verb. Could this addition by M2 actually reflect a gloss that was absent in M1?

99 Kolkata has *yaji*?

100 Unlike all the collated versions, M1 has *wa-lā*, which seems to be introducing a new argument. The suppression of this *wāw* makes the text smoother since what follows is not a new argument but an example.

101 Kolkata has two dots below the *yā*?, which are probably a typo, not intended to be read *fatayya*.

102 M2, just like all the other versions, explicitly adds the example of *ruwayda* instead of a mere pronoun. This change makes the text easier to follow.

103 B and L are the only ones to have *mujmaʿūn*. Kolkata is not vocalized.

104 M1 had a different word. All other versions have *taskun*. The original word may be readable directly on the manuscript.

105 The *ʿalif* is unreadable. To be checked directly on the manuscript.

106 M1 had a different example. The original word is unreadable. It could be either *wadadna* or *šadadna*, according to the examples found above in the text. All other versions have *radadna*.

107 Kolkata has *ʿalā* with an ending *ʿalif maqṣūra* and a superscript *ʿalif*, which is clearly a typo.

108 This gloss was inserted here in the text in M1, although it does not relate to the topic at stake here. M2 has put it between brackets.

109 A and Bakkāʿ are the only ones to have *wa-lā*.

110 M1 has the definite *li-l-ʿamr*, which M2 corrected into *li-ʿamrin*. The difference is insignificant.

[7] فلا<sup>111</sup> يلزمه السكون كلزوم هذا الذي هو غير مضاعف<sup>112</sup> ومثل ذلك قولهم [8] [و؟]←  
 رَدَدْتُ<sup>113</sup> ومددتُ لأنَّ الحرف بُني<sup>114</sup> على هذه التاء كما بُني على النون وصار [9] السكون فيه  
 بمنزلة فيما فيه نون النساء يدلُّك على ذلك أنه في موضع [10] فتجّ ○ وزعم الخليل<sup>115</sup> وغيره<sup>116</sup> أن ناساً  
 من بكر بن وائل يقولون رَدَنَ<sup>117</sup> ومَرَّنَ [11] ورَدَّ [××××]←ت<sup>118r</sup> جعلوه<sup>119</sup> بمنزلة رَدَّ ومدَّ وكذلك  
 جميع المضاعف [12] يجري كما ذكرتُ لك في لغة أهل الحجاز وغيرهم والبكرين ○ [13] فأما<sup>120</sup> رَدَدَ  
 ويردُّ فلم يدغموه لأنه لا يجوز أن يسكن حرفان فيلتقيان<sup>121</sup> [14] ولم يكونوا ليحركوا العين الأولى  
 لأنهم لو فعلوا ذلك لم ينجوا من أن [15] يرفعوا ألسنتهم مرتين فلما كان ذلك لا يُنجيهم أجروه على  
 الأصل ولم [16] يجز [××]<sup>122</sup> غيره ○ واعلم أن الشعراء إذا اضطروا إلى ما يجتمع أهل الحجاز [17]  
 وغيرهم على إدغامه أجر [×] وه<sup>123</sup> على الأصل ○ قال الشاعر وهو<sup>124</sup> قَعْنَبُ بن أمِّ صاحب<sup>125r</sup>  
 [18] مهلاً أعاذلَ قد جربت<sup>126</sup> من خلقي أنني أجود لأقوام<sup>127</sup> وإن ضنونا<sup>128</sup>  
 [19] وقال<sup>129</sup> ومثله قول الراجز

111 B, L and Kolkata have *fa-lam*.

112 Kolkata has *al-muḍāʿaf*.

113 Again, M<sub>1</sub> had a different example, probably *wadadtu*, which M<sub>2</sub> corrected into *radadtu*, which is the reading in all the other versions collated here.

114 B has *yubnā*.

115 According to Bakkāʾ, Mawṣil adds *raḥimahu Allāh taʿālā*.

116 M<sub>2</sub> has added a deletion mark above *wa-ḡayruhu*, which was in M<sub>1</sub>. This *wa-ḡayruhu* is also found in al-Sīrāfi's commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 64.4).

117 Kolkata vocalized *ruddanā*.

118 M<sub>1</sub> probably had two examples here and M<sub>1</sub> has erased the second one and replaced by a large ending *tāʾ* of the first example.

119 Kolkata has the strange *yajʿalūhu*. We would have at least expected a *marfūʿ* form.

120 Kolkata has the obviously erroneous *wa-lammā*.

121 Kolkata is the only one to have the erroneous final *nūn* that was in M<sub>1</sub> before M<sub>2</sub> struck it through.

122 M<sub>2</sub> has erased the two ending letters. The original reading of M<sub>1</sub> is not clear.

123 M<sub>2</sub> has erased a letter. The original reading of M<sub>1</sub> is not clear.

124 A, B, L and Bakkāʾ omit *wa-huwa*.

125 Kolkata has *qāla Ibn ʿUmm Ṣāḥib*. M<sub>1</sub> did not mention the name of the poet. Maybe this is a sign of an earlier, less explicit version of the text.

126 Kolkata has an erroneous *yāʾ* instead of the *bāʾ*.

127 Kolkata has *al-ʿaqwām*.

128 Kolkata has *zaninū*.

129 M<sub>2</sub> has put deletion marks above the expression *wa-mitluhu qawl al-rājiz*, which is found only in M<sub>1</sub>, and added *wa-qāla*, which is the reading all other versions contain.

يَشْكُو<sup>130</sup> الْوَجِي مِنْ أَظْلَلٍ وَأَظْلَلٍ

[20] وهذا<sup>131</sup> النحو في الشعر كثير ○

Numerals: Ambrosiana 70 v<sup>o</sup>.16–71 v<sup>o</sup>.15 = Derenbourg chapter 412, II, 176.12–177.19 = Kolkata 721–722 = al-Bakkā' v, 257–258

[70ظ] [16] هذا باب الأسماء التي تُوقَع<sup>132</sup> على عدّة [17] المؤنث والمذكر [18] لتبين ما العدد<sup>133</sup> إذا جاوز<sup>134</sup> الإثني والثني إلى أن تبلغ تسعة عشر [19] وتسع عشرة ○ اعلم أنّ ما جاوز الإثني إلى العشرة [20] مما واحده مذكر فإن الأسماء التي تبين بها عدته مؤنثة فيها الهاء<sup>135</sup> التي هي علامة التأنيث وذلك قولك<sup>136</sup> له<sup>135</sup> ثلاثة بنين بها عدته مؤنثة [22] فيها الهاء التي هي علامة<sup>136</sup> وأربعة أجمال وخمسة<sup>137</sup> أفراس [23] إذا كان الواحد مذكراً [71و] [1] وستة أجمرة وكذلك جميعها إذا<sup>138</sup> صح<sup>138</sup> ثبت فيه الهاء حتى تبلغ العشرة [2] في [ذا] ← ان<sup>139</sup> كان الواحد مؤنثاً فإنك تُخرج هذه الهاء [ات] [140] من هذه [3] الأسماء وتكون مؤنثة ليست فيها علامة التأنيث وذلك قولك [4] له<sup>141</sup> ثلاث بنات وأربع نسوة وخمس أيتي وست لبن وسبع تمرات [5] وثماني بعلات وكذلك جميع<sup>142</sup> ه<sup>142</sup> إذا<sup>142</sup> حتى تبلغ العشرة<sup>143</sup> فإذا جاوز [6] المذكر العشرة فراد عليها واحداً قلت أ<sup>143</sup> حد عشر [7] كأنك قلت

130 A has *naškū*; B has *yaškū*; L, Kolkata, Bakkā' and al-Sirāfi's commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 65.6) have *taškū* (Kolkata even has an ending *'alif* as in plural verbs). M<sub>1</sub> has *yaškū* and M<sub>2</sub> has not corrected it.

131 Kolkata has only *hādā* without the *wāw*.

132 Kolkata has *taqa'u*.

133 Kolkata has *li-l-'adad*.

134 Kolkata has *jāwazat*.

135 M<sub>1</sub> did not have this *lahu*. All the versions collated here have it, and M<sub>2</sub> added it to the text. It is not found in al-Sirāfi's commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 116.7).

136 M<sub>1</sub> has struck through these words that are repeated in M<sub>1</sub>, probably due to the similarity between the words *tabayyana* and *banīn*. It is surprising that M<sub>1</sub> did not correct himself, considering that the text stops abruptly (*allatī hiya 'alāma*) before continuing with the correct text. If M<sub>1</sub> had noticed the error, why didn't he erase the passage and rewrite over it?

137 Kolkata has *'aw ḥamsatu*.

138 M<sub>2</sub> has added *dā* and a collation mark in the margin.

139 A, B, L, Bakkā' and Kolkata have *wa-'in*. M<sub>1</sub> had *fa-'idā* which M<sub>2</sub> corrected into *fa-'in*.

140 A, B and Bakkā' have the plural. L and Kolkata have a singular. M<sub>1</sub> had a plural, which M<sub>2</sub> corrected it into a singular.

141 M<sub>1</sub> is the only one to have this *lahu* and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it. A, B, L, Bakkā' and Kolkata do not have it.

142 M<sub>1</sub> is the only version that did not have *hādā* but only *dā*. M<sub>2</sub> has added the *hā'*.

143 M<sub>1</sub> had the form *al-'ašara* which M<sub>2</sub> corrected into *al-'ašr*. It is consistent with the exam-

أَحَدٌ جَمَلٌ 144 وَلَيْسَتْ فِي عَشْرٍ [×××××××] ← الْفُ 145 وَهُمَا [8] [حرف] ← اسْمٌ 146 جُعِلَا اسْمًا  
 وَاحِدًا ضَمُّوا أَحَدًا إِلَى عَشْرٍ [ة] 147 وَلَمْ يَغْيِّرْ 148 أَحَدٌ 149 عَنْ 150 بِنَائِهِ [9] الَّذِي كَانَ عَلَيْهِ مَفْرَدًا  
 حِينَ قَلَّتْ لَهُ أَحَدٌ وَعِشْرُونَ عَا [10] مَا وَجَاءَ الْآخِرُ عَلَى غَيْرِ 151 بِنَائِهِ حَيْثُ [ت] ← نِ 152 كَانَ مَفْرَدًا  
 وَالْعَدِ [ة] ← دُ 153 لَمْ [11] [ت] ← يَ جَاوَزَ 153 عَشْرَةً وَإِنْ 154 جَاوَزَ الْمُؤَنَّثُ الْعَشْرَ [ة] 155 فَزَادَ وَاحِدًا 156

ples dealt with here to use the form *ʿašr*, since the text is dealing with feminine counted objects. But it is more common to use the forms with a *tāʾ marbūṭa* when referring to numerals in isolation. In the end, both forms can be accounted for and none is better than the other.

- 144 Kolkata has the incorrect *jamalan*.
- 145 M2 has erased the word that was initially found in M1 and replaced it by *ʿalif*, which is the reading found in all the versions collated here. According to al-Sirāfi in his commentary (*Šarḥ* XIV, 119.14–120.2), some people thought that the expression *laysa fī ʿašar ʿalif* was a mistake and that what was intended was *laysa fī ʿašar hāʾ* (i.e. *tāʾ marbūṭa*). Al-Sirāfi comments by saying that Sibawayhi intends here to correct the erroneous dialectal forms such as *ʾaḥadā-ʿašar*, with a long *ʿalif*. M1 had another reading, which is unfortunately lost.
- 146 A, Bakkāʾ and al-Sirāfi's commentary (XIV, 117.6) have *ḥarfāni*. B, L and Kolkata have *ismāni*. M1 had *ḥarfāni*, which M2 corrected into *ismāni*. It is common to find *ḥarf* in the meaning of *ism*, so in the end it is difficult to prefer one reading over the other.
- 147 As above in note 143, one might assume that M1 intended the isolated form *ʿašara* before coalescence in the compound numeral, whereas M2 corrected it in the actual form *-ʿašar*, after coalescence, which is the reading of all the collated versions.
- 148 A and Bakkāʾ have the plural *yugayyirū*. B, L and Kolkata have the singular. M1 also has the singular, to be read in the passive. The plural would imply an active form meaning 'they'.
- 149 The addition of *ʾaḥad* by M2 makes the text easier to follow. All the other versions have it.
- 150 Kolkata has *min*.
- 151 Kolkata omits this *gayr*, which is a clear misunderstanding of the text (or simply a typo).
- 152 In our three chapters, *ḥaytu* (6 times) and *hīna* (twice) are apparently interchangeable. In addition to these eight cases, we see here that M2 replaces *ḥaytu* in M1 by *hīna*, which is the reading of all the other versions. And in another case, see note 180, M1 and M2 agree on *ḥaytu* against most of the versions, that have *hīna*.
- 153 M2 replaces the expression *al-ʿidda lam tujāwiz* by *al-ʿadad lam yujāwiz*, which is the reading of all the other versions. In this chapter, *ʿadad* is found 5 other times, and *ʿidda*, also 5 other times, both words being eventually associated with the verb *jāwaza*.
- 154 Kolkata has *wa-ʿidā*.
- 155 Same kind of correction as described in notes 143 and 147. When mentioning the form alone, M1 systematically prefers the isolated form with *tāʾ marbūṭa* rather than the forms that actually appear in the examples discussed.
- 156 Bakkāʾ has *fa-zādū ʾaḥadan* where the initial *wāw* and *ʿalif* in *wāḥid* were confused with the plural mark in the verb.

قلت [12] إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ بِلُغَةِ بَنِي تَمِيمٍ كَأَنَّمَا قَلْتِ 157ر إِحْدَى [××××] ← نَبَقَةٌ 158ر وَبِلُغَةِ أَهْلِ الْحِجَازِ  
 [13] إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ كَأَنَّ [ك] ← هُمَا 159ر قَلْتِ إِحْدَى [××××] ← تَمْرَةٌ 160ر وَهُمَا 161ر حِرْفَانٍ جُعِلَا اسْمًا  
 [14] وَاحِدًا ضَمُّوا إِحْدَى إِلَى عَشْرَةَ وَلَمْ يُغَيِّرُوا إِحْدَى عَنْ حَا [15] لَهَا م [نذ] فَرْدَةٌ 162 [16] حِينَ قَلْتِ  
 لَهُ إِحْدَى وَعِشْرُونَ سَنَةً وَإِنْ 163ر زَادَ الْمَذْكُورُ وَاحِدًا عَلَى [17] أَحَدَ عَشَرَ قَلْتِ لَهُ إِثْنَا عَشَرَ قَلْتِ لَهُ إِثْنَا  
 عَشَرَ 164ر فَإِنَّ 165ر لَهُ إِثْنَيْ 166ر عَشَرَ [18] لَمْ تَغَيِّرُوا 167ر الْإِثْنَيْنِ عَنْ حَالِ [هـ؟] ← هُمَا 168ر إِذَا ثَبَّتَ الْوَاحِدَ  
 غَيْرَ أَنَّكَ حَذَفْتَ [19] النُّونَ لِأَنَّ عَشَرَ [ة] 169ر بِمَنْزِلَةِ النُّونِ وَالْحَرْفِ الَّذِي قَبْلَ الْـنُونِ فِي 170ر الْإِثْنَيْنِ  
 [20] حَرْفِ الْإِعْرَابِ 171ر وَليْسَ حَالُهُ 172ر نَحْمَسَةُ عَشَرَ وَقَدْ بَيَّنَّا ذَلِكَ [21] فِيمَا يَنْصَرَفُ وَمَا 173ر لَا

- 157 The omission of the expression *ka-'annamā qulta* in M<sub>1</sub> makes the text difficult to follow, if not incorrect.
- 158 M<sub>1</sub> had a different example from all the versions collated here. Unfortunately, M<sub>2</sub> has erased it and the original word is not readable any more. In his commentary, al-Sīrāfī (*Šarḥ* XIV, 119.4) has the same example, *nabiqa*.
- 159 M<sub>1</sub> replaced *ka-'annaka* by *ka-'annamā*, which is the reading of all the other versions. Both forms are found in our chapters.
- 160 Same case as presented in note 158. In his commentary, al-Sīrāfī (*Šarḥ* XIV, 119.5) has the same example, *tamra*.
- 161 Kolkata has the erroneous form *humāni*.
- 162 A and Bakkā' have *munfaridatan*. B, L and Kolkata have *mufradatan*. M<sub>1</sub> had *munfaridatan*, which M<sub>2</sub> corrected into *mufradatan*. Both *mufrad* and *munfarid* are used once each in the lines above in the same meaning of 'singular'.
- 163 A, B, L and Kolkata have *wa-'in* and Bakkā' has *fa-'in*. M<sub>1</sub> has *fa-'in*, which M<sub>2</sub> did not correct.
- 164 M<sub>2</sub> has struck through these words, which are repeated in M<sub>1</sub>, with no apparent explanation.
- 165 A, B, L, Bakkā' and Kolkata have *wa-'inna*. M<sub>1</sub> has *fa-'inna*, which M<sub>2</sub> did not correct.
- 166 A has the incorrect *itnā*.
- 167 A, B, L, Bakkā' and Kolkata have the singular *lam tujayyir*. M<sub>1</sub> has a plural, which M<sub>2</sub> did not correct. This plural makes no sense here, since the whole sentence is constructed in the singular (2nd pers. masc.), not the plural.
- 168 M<sub>2</sub> has corrected the singular of M<sub>1</sub> into a dual, which is the reading of all the other versions. However, the singular makes more sense here, since the text comments what happens to *itnāni*, not to *ašar*.
- 169 Same correction as described above in notes 143, 147 and 155.
- 170 M<sub>2</sub> changes the construction of the expression in order to align it on the other versions, without any incidence on the quality of the text.
- 171 A and Bakkā' have *ḥarf 'irāb*, without the article.
- 172 M<sub>2</sub> has inserted a deletion mark above *ḥāluhu*. The text was actually easier to follow in M<sub>1</sub>.
- 173 This *mā* is not found in A, B, L and Bakkā'. It is found only in Kolkata. M<sub>1</sub> has it and M<sub>2</sub> did not correct it.

ينصرف وإ[ن]← إذا<sup>174r</sup> زاد المؤنث واحداً على [أ]← إحدَى عشر<sup>175r</sup> [22] قلت له [ا]ثنتا<sup>176</sup> عشر<sup>177</sup> وإثنتا عشر<sup>178</sup> وإن له ثنتي عشر<sup>177</sup> وإثنتي عشر<sup>178</sup> [وا] الثنتين<sup>179</sup> عن حالهما [71ظ] [1] حيث<sup>180</sup> ثنيت الواحدة إلا أن النون ذهبت هنا كما ذهبت في الإثنتين لأن [2] قصة المذكر والمؤنث سواءً وبني الحرف الذي بعد إحدى وثنيتين<sup>181r</sup> على [3] غير بنائه والعدد لم يجاوز العشر كما فعل ذلك بالمذكر<sup>182</sup> وقد يكون [4] اللفظ له بناءً في حال فإذا انتقل عن تلك الحال تغير بناؤه ⊙ فن [5] ذلك تغييرهم الاسم في الإضافة قالوا في الأُفق أفقي وفي [6] زينة زباني ونحو ذلك<sup>183</sup> كثير في الإضافة وقد بيناه في بابه ⊙ [7] وإذا زاد العدد واحداً على اثني عشر فإن الحرف الأول<sup>185</sup> لا يتغير [8] بناؤه عن حاله وبنائه حيث لم تجاوز<sup>186</sup> العدة ثلاثة والآخر بمنزلة [9] لته حيث كان بعد أحد وإثنتين ⊙ [فن]← وذلك<sup>187</sup> قولك له<sup>188r</sup> ثلاثة [10] عشر<sup>189r</sup> عبداً وكذلك ما بين هذا العدد إلى تسعة عشر وإذا زاد العدد [11] واحداً فوق ثنتي عشر<sup>189r</sup> فالحرف الأول بمنزلة

174 M1 corrected 'idā by 'in. Above, see note 139, it was the other way round. Altogether, 'idā is found 18 times and 'in 15 times in our three chapters in equivalent conditional constructions, so that one cannot be said to be preferable to the other.

175 Just like in the four cases above (see notes 143, 147, 155 and 169), M2 corrects the masculine form of M1 into the feminine form which is discussed here. M2 has the same reading of all the other versions collated.

176 Kolkata has the incorrect *tintā*. Apparently, M1 had the same form *itnatā 'ašira* twice. M2 has erased the *wašla* in the first occurrence, turning the example into *tintā 'ašira*, which is present in all the other versions.

177 M2 had a missing *tā* in the word *itnatay*.

178 M2 has corrected the plural form of M1 into a singular. The plural makes no sense, since the whole sentence is constructed in the singular. See above, note 167. Did M2 forget to correct this plural form above?

179 Kolkata has *itnatayni*.

180 A, B, L and Bakkā' have *hūna*. Kolkata is the only one to have *haytu*. M1 has *haytu* and M2 did not correct it. See above, note 152.

181 The omission of 'alā in M1 is clearly a mistake. The sentence makes no sense without it. All the other versions have it.

182 Kolkata has the obvious typo *al-dikr*.

183 A, B, L and Bakkā' have *fa-naḥwu hādā*. Kolkata has *wa-naḥwu hādā*. M1 has *wa-naḥwu dā* and M2 did not correct it. No reading can really be said to be better than the others.

184 Kolkata has the erroneous 'arāda.

185 Kolkata has *al-ḥarf alladī al-'awwal*.

186 A has *lam yujāwiz*. And Kolkata has *lam yatajāwaz*.

187 M2 corrected the expression *fa-min dālīka* by *wa-dālīka*, which is found in all the other versions. None can be said to be better.

188 Same correction as above, see note 135.

189 M1 did not have 'abdan, which is found in all the other versions. Without it, the example is still understandable, although less clear.

حيث لم تجاوز<sup>190</sup> [12] العدة ثلاثاً والآخر بمنزلة حيث كان بعد إحدَى وثنتين<sup>191</sup> [13] وذلك قولك له ثلاث عشرة جارياً<sup>192</sup> وعشرة بلغة أهل الحجاز<sup>193</sup> وكذلك ما بين هذه العدة [14] إلى تسع عشرة [ف] فرقوا<sup>194</sup> ما<sup>195</sup> بين التأنيث والتذكير في جميع ما ذكرنا<sup>196</sup> من [15] في هذا الباب ○

## Bibliographical References

### A Primary Sources

- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* = 'Abū Bišr 'Amr ibn 'Uṭmān Sībawayhi (d. ca. 180/796), *al-Kitāb*. Ed. by Hartwig Derenbourg, *Le livre de Sībawaihi*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1881–1889. (Repr., Hildesheim and New York: G. Olms, 1970.)/Ed. by Kabīr al-Dīn 'Aḥmad, *Hādā Kitāb ismuhu al-Kitāb wa-huwa fī l-naḥw miṭla 'umm al-Kitāb*. Kolkata: Maṭba' Urdū Gā'id, 1887./Ed. Būlāq, *Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-'Amīriyya, 1898./Ed. by 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, *Kitāb Sībawayhi*, I. Cairo: Dār al-Qalam, 1966; II. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1968. III–V. Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Miṣriyya al-'Āmma li-l-Kitāb, 1973–1977./Ed. by Émile Badī' Ya'qūb, *al-Kitāb*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2009./Ed. by Muḥammad Kāzīm al-Bakkā', *al-Kitāb*. Beirut: Maktabat Zayn, 2015. /Ed. by Muḥammad Fawzī Ḥamza, *al-Kitāb*. Cairo: Maktabat al-'Ādāb, 2015.
- Suyūṭī, *Buḡya* = Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abū l-Faḍl 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Abī Bakr al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *Buḡyat al-wu'āt fī ṭabaqāt al-luḡawiyīn wa-l-nuḥāt*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Abū l-Faḍl 'Ibrāhīm. Cairo: 'Īsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1964–1965.
- Sīrāfī, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abdallāh al-Sīrāfī (d. 368/979), *Šarḥ Kitāb Sībawayhi*, XIV. Ed. by Hudā Qirā'a. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā'iḳ al-Qawmiyya, 2010.

190 A has *lam yujāwiz*. Kolkata has *lam yatajāwaz*.

191 A has *bayna 'iḥdā wa-ṭalātīna*, which makes no sense, instead of *ba'da 'iḥdā wa-tintayni*.

192 M1 is the only one who has this *lahu* and M2 did not correct it. See the opposite situation above, in notes 135 and 188.

193 M1 did not supply the Ḥijāz form, which is found in all the other versions and added by M2.

194 A and Bakkā' have *fa-farraqu*. B, L and Kolkata have *farraqū*. M1 had *fa-farraqu* but M2 corrected it to *farraqū*. The reading with *fā'* was probably smoother to read.

195 M1 did not have this *mā*, the addition of which is maybe slightly better grammatically. All the other versions have it.

196 M2 corrected *fī* by *min*, which is the reading found in all the other versions. None can be said to be better than the other.

## B *Secondary Sources*

- Druel, Jean N. 2012. *Numerals in Arabic grammatical theory: An impossible quest for consistency?* Ph.D. diss., Nijmegen University.
- Humbert, Geneviève. 1992. *Premières recherches sur le Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. I. *Les voies de la transmission*. II. *Les documents*. Ph.D. diss., Université de Paris-VIII.
- Humbert, Geneviève. 1993. "Un témoin fossile du *Kitāb* de Sībawayhi". *Développements récents en linguistique arabe et sémitique*, ed. by Georges Bohas, 121–139. Damascus: Institut français de Damas.
- Humbert, Geneviève. 1994. "Le *Kitāb* de Sībawayhi d'après l'autographe d'un grammairien andalou du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle". *Le manuscrit arabe et la codicologie*, ed. by Ahmed-Chouqi Binebine, 9–20. Rabat: Faculté des lettres et de sciences humaines.
- Humbert, Geneviève. 1995. *Les voies de la transmission du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Khalidov, A.B. 2000. "A Kazan manuscript of Sībawayhi". *Manuscripta orientalia* 6/2.8–9.
- Munajjid, Ş. al- 1960. *al-Kitāb al-‘arabī l-maḥṭūṭ ‘ilā l-qarn al-‘āšir al-hijrī*. I. *al-Namāḍij*. Cairo: Jāmi‘at al-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya, Ma‘had al-Maḥṭūṭāt al-‘Arabiyya.