

From Description to Prescription

The exceptive in Arabic grammatical theory*

Hana Zabarrah

Georgetown University in Qatar

1. *Introductory observations*

The most famous scholarly work on Arabic grammatical theory is Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb* (d. 161–94 AH/777–810 A.D.), which has been an object of examination by scholars from the time it was written, long before it became an authoritative source, to the present. *Al-Kitāb* is of a descriptive nature and is an examination of the Arabic language as it was used in the 2nd/8th century. Sibawayhi's deductions were exploratory in nature, often ambiguous and vague. However, the prescriptive nature of an instructional manual does not require more than pedagogical explanations; therefore, teaching brief and concise material becomes more effective. Comparing instructional manuals such as al-Zaġġāġi's *Ġumal* (d.337–340/948–951) and Ibn Bābašād's *Muqaddima* (d.469/1077) to Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, consequently, does not do justice to either type. How did these instructional manuals evolve? In what way do they differ, and where are they similar to *al-Kitāb*? What makes one more accessible to learners? These are some of the questions this study aims to answer through a careful examination of selected chapters from each type.

Scholarly investigation precedes writing instructional manuals, since investigative research leads to discovery which then evolves into educational materials. The science of linguistics is no exception. The linguist's task is to analyse speech meticulously in order to describe the language examined and bring out the meaning behind its linguistic structure (Lehmann 1989: 140). In many cases this descriptive analysis includes prescriptive elements, especially if the language under study is undergoing a process of standardization. Once these elements are

* I would like to thank the editor of the journal and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper. I would also like to acknowledge a dissertation on the topic that was brought to my attention by a reviewer: *La taxinomie des traités de grammaire arabe médiévaux (IVe/Xe/VIIIe/XIV siècle), entre représentation de l'articulation conceptuelle de la théorie et visée pratique* by Marie Viain (2014). Unfortunately, I could not access this thesis before the publication of this paper.

thoroughly investigated, the basic theory of that particular language is formed (Dik 1989: 33). For many languages the investigative journey ends at this point. However, for the majority of languages that are investigated, the teaching of these languages is the next logical step, and different materials need to be developed, i.e., pedagogical or instructional manuals. Nevertheless, it is well known that descriptive grammars sometimes have been used for pedagogy. In this case teachers and learners must be made aware of the anomalies these descriptive grammars contain due to speculative approaches and theorizing of linguistic structures (Greenberg 1968: 28). A specifically pedagogical grammar can only be possible after the descriptive research and the need for instruction are established. Descriptive analysis then becomes the basis for “pedagogical prescription” (Widdowson 1991: 12). The prescribed language in pedagogical grammars is based on the form of language chosen to be described. If standardization of a language is the aim of research, or more accurately, the result of such investigative research, then such a description ultimately becomes prescriptive, although not necessarily with this intention in mind when investigation starts.

Linguistic description and linguistic prescription are ultimately linked, and “the role of the linguist is still in large part prescription of a particular description” (Newmeyer 1978: 585). Effectively, pedagogical grammars must first rely on accurate descriptive grammars. Observations attained from interpretation and examination of analysed data in a particular language must be reflected in pedagogy with simple direct rules that are ready to be understood by the learner of the language (Dirven 1989: 58). The speculative nature of grammatical analysis does not belong in pedagogy, and pedagogy in languages cannot exist without linguistic description as “pedagogical grammars are ultimately translations of linguistic descriptions” (Tomlin 1994: 143). The need for such instructional materials is ultimately the driving force behind creating them, but, without descriptive grammars, they cannot exist.

In the case of Arabic, biographers report that the beginning of grammar was to preserve the language of the Quran from linguistic impurities that had infiltrated it through language contact as Islam and the Islamic empire expanded in the 1st/7th century (Baalbaki 2008: 2–4). Arabs settled primarily in military camps within the newly conquered territories. As they mixed with the indigenous peoples of the conquered lands and non-Arabs began to embrace Islam, the Arabic language served as the language of the new empire: it became the means of official and unofficial communication. It was the language of government, culture, and the sciences. Arabic thus no longer belonged only to the people of Arabia. It became the *lingua franca* of the Islamic empire. Since Arabs born in the new territories, as well as indigenous people, used Arabic for communication, the language they used started to shift away from the Arabic of the peninsula due to language

contact and language evolution. Scholars realized the challenge this posed to the understanding and correct recitation of the language of the Quran. Thus, the examination of the Arabic language began within the Quranic sciences in order to instruct people on the proper ways of reading Arabic. Accordingly, the study of grammar began to serve a pedagogical purpose.

The earliest stages of the development of Arabic grammatical theory remain obscure. Scholars have attempted to reconstruct this period, but with the scarce extant material, they cannot reach definitive conclusions. Consequently, the discussion begins with the famous scholarly work on Arabic grammar, *al-Kitāb*, composed by the Persian-born Sibawayhi (d.161–194/777–810),¹ which provides a descriptive, highly speculative analysis of the rules of Arabic grammar and essentially severs the tie it had with Quranic exegeses. By starting the investigation of Arabic grammar with Sibawayhi's *Kitāb*, early pedagogical purposes for grammatical analysis are no longer noticeable in the descriptive language of the *Kitāb* itself. The initial interest for a pedagogical tool is lost in Sibawayhi's theoretical approach (Baalbaki 2005: 40). The shift from a need to instruct learners of Arabic, in order to correctly recite the Quran, to the development of a highly speculative grammar, unfortunately, cannot be traced with the extant sources available.

As time passed, the dwindling segment of society who lived outside urban settlements and spoke "good" Arabic naturally passed away and thus this spoken form of the language died out. Arabic grammar could not remain a descriptive grammar. It transformed, by necessity, into a highly prescriptive grammar of a language that should be spoken and written in a certain way. All this translates into the growing need for instructional manuals in the way people ought to speak and write.

It has long been thought that Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb* is difficult to read and understand, especially because early Arab grammarians attested to this belief. According to al-'Aḥfaṣ al-Ṣaḡīr (d.315–316/928–929), *al-Kitāb* contained *muṣṭabāḥ* "obscure points" for scholars to *istanbaḥ-a wa-naẓar-a* "deduce and examine" (Baḡdādī *Ḥizāna*, p. 372). Other scholars, such as al-Zaḡḡāḡ (d.310–16/922–928) and al-Sirāfī (d.368/978), confirmed the complexity and difficulty in understanding *al-Kitāb* (Hārūn 1988: 33). Sibawayhi's *al-Kitāb* is an immense and even intimidating piece of work. He painstakingly described and analysed the language of the Arabs, interpreting data to make sense of the language, and in the process, descriptions of grammatical structures for Arabic emerged. Reaching these deductions, he needed to examine a multitude of examples, often contradictory, and

1. Abū Biṣr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar, known as Sibawayhi (d. 161-94/777-810), was Persian born and educated in Basra. For further details see Qifī ('*Inbāh* II, pp. 346–360) and Sezgin (1984:51).

provide a plausible explanation and rule for each point. Without appreciating this aspect of his contribution, one may lose sight of the nature of his work.

Sibawayhi was not only engaged in the practice of language description, his aim was the explanation of the language's structure. He was not writing a pedagogical manual. According to Carter, Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* "is no pedagogical treatise: indeed, it is so inclusively descriptive, accommodating all the variations and irregularities found in natural language (but not in the language of pedagogues), that it is completely unusable for teaching" (Carter 2005: 329). Although scholars of Arabic grammar of the time studied *al-Kitāb*, it was by no means a manual for beginners. These scholars were interested in the speculative nature of early Arabic grammatical theory, and this fact is discernable throughout the history of Arabic grammar. However, in due course, Arab grammarians had no choice but to be prescriptivists, as they could no longer engage in descriptive grammar, because native speakers of Classical Arabic eventually died out and disappeared (Owens 1993: 210). This does not mean that later grammarians' focus on prescription caused them to consider instructional manuals. They were interested in the process of prescribing the way Arabic should be, yet remained speculative and theoretical. Baalbaki (2005) discusses how early Arab grammarians were "so heavily engaged in" speculative grammar that they "were hardly concerned with the pedagogical attainability of their interpretations and justifications." Their application and defense of the theory was "at the expense of simple or straightforward explanations which would have made better pedagogical sense" (39–40). Grammarians were more inclined to justifying usage than simplifying for learners by avoiding speculative methods. The concern "of the grammarians for theoretical coherency" was "at the expense of pedagogical attainability" (43, 45).

The process of moving from Sibawayhi's grammar to a more pedagogical approach took time. His observations needed to be adjusted by later grammarians in order to be presented in a form more easily understood by learners of Arabic. This process started early but took centuries to reach its peak (Carter 2005: 329). Later grammarians, who were concerned with language instruction, wrote manuals primarily for beginners in order to fill the gap left by theoretical grammars. These grammar manuals that were written for instructional purposes did not and could not replace those books that were dedicated to theoretical grammars. Both sets of grammars existed throughout the Arabic grammatical tradition (Baalbaki 2005: 42); however, especially at earlier times, pedagogy was not able to escape theory. It took time for traces of theoretical grammar to slowly fade away from pedagogy, but this was necessary for the education and instruction of those who sought instruction in Arabic.

The process of shifting to a more pedagogical approach did not happen in an atmosphere clear of conflict. The translation movement and the development

of the rational sciences were well under way in the 3rd/9th century (Versteegh 1977: 117–118). Rational thinking and logic stimulated minds, resulting in fierce debates in all sciences, including grammar. Additionally, sources tell us that from the earliest stages of grammatical analysis, there were two schools of grammar: the Basran and the Kufan. Versteegh stresses the importance of acknowledging that there was underlying agreement between both schools, despite the exaggerated differences mentioned in the literature (ibid., 111–112). The rivalry between both schools reached its peak in Baghdad during the second half of the 3rd/9th century, where it became the center of grammatical thinking, and scholars were able to seek both traditions often studying with scholars from both camps.

Approximately fifteen to twenty years elapsed following the shift of the grammatical schools of Basra and Kufa to Baghdad and the rivalry between both schools had subsided, allowing scholars to study under scholars trained in both camps. This tolerant atmosphere along with the infusion of logic and philosophy in scholars' reasoning reinforced the deductions and rationale behind grammatical rules. At this stage in the history of Arabic grammar, al-Zaġġāġī² emerges as one of the leading grammarians of the period, especially with his *'Idāh*³ and *Ġumal*.

Zaġġāġī's *Ġumal* is a concise general introduction to Arabic grammar. Zaġġāġī explains and simplifies grammatical terminology used by the grammarians of his era, asserting the need to *taqrīb 'alā al-mubtadi'* "clarify for beginners" (Zaġġāġī *Ġumal*, p. 90). Unfortunately, there is no introduction for the book; consequently, the reason behind writing it is based on statements he made in his book. However, it is clear that by the time of Ibn Ḥarūf in 6th/13th century, *al-Ġumal* was used as a textbook for learners of Arabic. He believes that Zaġġāġī had written his work for "beginners", asserting that Zaġġāġī *waḍa'a-hu li-l-mubtadi'-īna wa-ittakal-a fī bayān-i-hi 'alā al-mu'allim-īna* "wrote it down for beginners and relied on instructors to clearly explain it" (*Šarḥ*, p. 243). Later, in the 7th/14th century, Ibn 'Abī al-Rabī' mentions that *al-Ġumal* was taught from childhood, affirming that *'aḥad-a al-naš'at-u al-šigār-u bi-ḥifẓ-i [al-Ġumal] wa-ta-fahhum-i-hi* "the young [generation] undertook the memorization and understanding of *al-Ġumal*" (*Basīṭ*, p. 157).

2. 'Abū al-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Ishāq al-Zaġġāġī (d. 337-40/948-951) was also Persian born. He was educated in Baghdad and taught in Damascus towards the end of his life (Qiftī *Inbāh* II, pp. 160–161, Sezgin 1984: 88).

3. *Al-'Idāh fī 'ilal al-naḥw* is a philosophical debate on the rational motivation of linguistic rules in Arabic grammar. It is not a textbook dealing with grammatical rules, but it deals with the reasons behind the rules. The book is divided into 23 chapters followed by several pages dealing with additional issues.

Zağğāğī himself mentions throughout the book that *al-Ġumal* is *muḥtaṣar* “condensed”; however, other scholars of the period held this against *al-Ġumal*, criticizing Zağğāğī for his “exaggerated conciseness and condensation” (Baṭalyawṣī *Ḥulal*, p. 57). The shift to instructional simplicity was not readily appreciated by all. Yet others, while acknowledging that Zağğāğī was brief and concise, note that he *’ittakal-a ... f ī bayān-i hādā al-faṣl-i ‘alā al-mu’allim-i li’ ann-a-hu iḥtaṣar-a ‘alā ‘ādat-i-hi* “relied on instructors to explain and clarify this section, since, as usual, he condensed [the material]” (Ibn Ḥarūf *Šarḥ*, p. 408).

By the 5th/10th century, the grammatical shift towards instructional manuals reached a pivotal stage in history with Ibn Bābašād’s *Muqaddima*.⁴ He divides it into ten sections that thoroughly deal with the parts of speech, all the forms of inflection, operators, modifiers and finally orthography. Ibn Bābašād explains in his commentary that he wrote his *Muqaddima* for the purpose of *tashīl wa-tawṭī’a* “simplification and introduction” to Arabic grammar for beginners (Šarīf 1978:2:16). He describes how some of his contemporaries had renamed this book as *al-Muqaddima al-Muḥsiba*. ‘Abd al-Karīm explains that the meaning of *al-Muḥsiba* is *al-Kāfiya*, i.e., that which should suffice without the need to consult other grammatical books (1976–1977:27). Nevertheless, his *Muqaddima* has been considered so short and concise that Ibn Bābašād’s students asked him to give them a commentary on his work more than 30 years later. This commentary is widely known as *Šarḥ al-Muqaddima al-Muḥsiba*. Other grammarians also thought his *Muqaddima* too concise, motivating them to write their own commentaries.

According to Carter (1985) in his examination of the term *naḥw*, the *Muqaddima*’s significance stems from the fact that its composition provided the definitive form of *naḥw*, because of the existence of three main elements. The first element is the highly developed indigenous tradition of grammatical analysis, which was documented in Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb* as the manner in which the people spoke and was studied and examined for centuries. The second element is what Carter calls “imported scientific methodology,” which came about with the translation movement and introduced the importance of presenting clear and precise definitions. The third is the new Islamic educational system represented by the establishment of the *madrasa* or ‘academy’. Institutionalized learning emerged at the beginning of the 11th century, and thus a systematic methodology for instruction

4. ‘Abū Ḥasan Ṭāhir b. ‘Aḥmad b. Bābašād b. Dāwūd b. Sulaymān b. ‘Ibrāhīm (d. 469/1077) was born in either Iraq or Egypt. Both editors of his commentary are in disagreement as to his birthplace, but they agree that he had received his education in both Baghdad and Egypt (Šarīf 1978:27; ‘Abd al-Karīm 1976–1977:11). He settled in Egypt where he became a well-known government official and taught at Ibn al-‘Aṣ mosque.

was needed. After examining *al-Muqaddima*, I came to believe that, in addition to the historical elements mentioned by Carter, its simplified and concise presentation with its division into ten sections, makes it an exceptional instructional manual in its time.

In order to appreciate fully the gradual development of instructional manuals this paper examines the chapters on *istiṭnā* ‘exception’ using the particle ‘*illā*’ ‘except’, written by the aforementioned scholars in their respective books. Before I go into the details these grammarians offer, I present a simple illustration of grammatical rules of exception in Arabic. Exception involves three distinct elements: the exceptive particle, in this paper, we will only deal with the particle ‘*illā*’ ‘except’; the *mustaṭnā* ‘excepted noun’ or the noun after ‘*illā*’; and the *mustaṭnā min-hu* ‘noun excepted from’ or the noun before ‘*illā*’. The following example maps these three elements:

ما رأيت أحدا إلا زيدا
mā ra’ay-tu ’aḥad-an ’illā Zayd-an
 not saw-I anyone-ACC except Zayd-ACC
 “I did not see anyone except Zayd.”

Here we can see the three exceptive elements: the exceptive particle ‘*illā*’; the *mustaṭnā* ‘excepted noun’ or the noun after ‘*illā*’, which is the proper noun Zayd; and the *mustaṭnā min-hu* ‘noun excepted from’ or the noun before ‘*illā*’, which is ‘*aḥad*’ ‘anyone’, where Zayd is clearly not part of and is excluded from ‘anyone’.⁵

2. *The role of Sibawayhi’s Kitāb*

Baalbaki (2008) argues that Sibawayhi presents basic grammatical rules throughout his book to account for the majority of grammatical usage, and, at the same time, finding appropriate explanations for anomalies (134–135). Sibawayhi supports his examples to prove these rules and thus establishes what Baalbaki calls ‘Basic Rules’, which Sibawayhi applies throughout his book while at the same time he is able to explain any variation from these rules (ibid.; 2005: 43). This flexibility allows Sibawayhi to document anomalies without jeopardizing the rules deduced from the data. Baalbaki argues that Sibawayhi is ‘keen to uphold what we called ‘basic rules’ by maximizing the applicability of the norm and minimizing deviations which undermine it’ (2008: 155). Baalbaki further elaborates on the early grammarians’ obsession with maintaining the concept of ‘basic rules’, with the

5. See Ḥasan 1968: 292–337 for a detailed account for the rules of *istiṭnā*.

use of *taqdīr* “suppletive insertion”, which “denotes the restoration of missing elements by the grammarians to explain various aspects of the construction” (Baalbaki 2005: 45) and modification of grammatical function, which allows for a shift in grammatical function without jeopardizing the “basic rule” (p. 55).

Sībawayhi’s presentation of the *istiṭnāʾ* follows this ‘basic rule principle’ by introducing general guidelines that govern the majority of cases, followed by explanations for those cases that do not follow these general rules. Sībawayhi covers *istiṭnāʾ* in several chapters, beginning with the basic rules. He states that the *mustatnāʾ*, the noun after *ʾillā*, takes one of two options: (1) the case ending that the noun would normally receive without *ʾillā*, i.e., before introducing the particle, or (2) the accusative case in the *tanwīn-naṣb* construction.

Sībawayhi utilizes the phrase *ʾiṣr-ūna dirham-an* to explain the *tanwīn-naṣb* construction. He explains *kamā taʿmal-u ʾiṣr-ūna fī-mā baʿd-a-hā ʾidā qulta ʾiṣr-ūna dirham-an* “as the twenty operates on the dirham when you say twenty dirhams” (*Kitāb* II, p. 310).⁶ This convoluted explanation is Sībawayhi’s way describing the *tanwīn-naṣb* construction.⁷ Sībawayhi’s grammatical theory involves elements acting upon each other in different ways. One type of operation involves the *tanwīn-naṣb* “accusative” structure, where it represents non-agreement between its elements, occurs outside already complete sentences, and cannot form true annexation units. He uses the phrase *ʾiṣr-ūna dirham-an* “twenty dirhams” to represent this operation in his *Kitāb* (Carter 2004: 91–92). Carter explains that the “*tanwīn-naṣb* structure was as much an identifiable type of syntactical unit as the more familiar ‘true’ annexation and subject-predicate constructions” (Carter 1972: 495). In Sībawayhi’s theory this includes all verbal complements (cf. Carter 2004: 91). Unfortunately, later grammarians did not preserve this category, and, consequently, it has been lost to the theory.

To illustrate the first option, Sībawayhi explains that *ʾillā* and the *mustatnāʾ* “noun that follows” are introduced into an utterance to establish the existence or affirm the situation that has been excluded or negated in the utterance before *ʾillā*. His statement *tudhīl-u al-ism-a fī ṣayʾ-in tanfī ʾan-hu mā siwā-hu* “You introduce the [excepted] noun to where everything else has been excluded” (*Kitāb* II, p. 310), also indicates that Sībawayhi means that the sentences he is considering are negated, proven by the examples he gives (ibid.):

6. For a detailed discussion on the effect of *ʾiṣr-ūna* on *dirham* see Carter (1972).

7. Later grammarians used the term *tamyīz* for specific elements of this structure.

- (1) ما أتاني إلا زيدٌ
mā 'atā-nī 'illā Zayd-un
 not came-me except Zayd-NOM
 “None came to me except Zayd,”
- (2) ما لقيت إلا زيدا
mā laqī-tu 'illā Zayd-an
 not met-I except Zayd-ACC
 “None did I meet except Zayd,” and
- (3) ما مررت إلا بزيد
mā marar-tu 'illā bi-Zayd-in
 not passed-I except by-Zayd-GEN
 “None did I pass by except Zayd.”

The sentence structure before *'illā* in the above examples reflects negated sentences, and the function of the particle *'illā* is to exclude what follows from these negated structures. Thus, Zayd did come, did meet with, and did pass by the speaker. The nouns after the particle *'illā* all receive the appropriate grammatical inflections they would have received if the particle was never introduced into each sentence: Zayd in the first sentence is in the nominative case as the subject; Zayd is in the accusative case as the direct object in the second sentence; and Zayd is in the genitive case in the third sentence as the object of a preposition.

Sibawayhi clarifies *tuğrī al-ism-a mağrāh-u ... wa-lākin-n-a-ka 'adħalta 'illā li-tuğib-a al-'af'āl-a li-hādihi al-asmā'-i wa-li-tanfiy-a mā siwā-hā* “You give the noun its rightful place [in the sentence structure] ... however you introduce *'illā* to affirm the verbs for these [excepted] nouns and exclude others” (*Kitāb* II, p. 310). The only reason *'illā* is used is to deactivate the negation in the sentence structure just before it is used, and thus, affirming that Zayd did come, did meet with, and did pass by the speaker. The reason that this is allowed is that the main verbs in these clauses do not have all their arguments: the verb *'atā-ni* “came to me” is missing the subject Zayd. The verb *laqītu* “I met” is missing the object Zayd, and the verb *marartu bi* “I passed by” is missing the object of the preposition Zayd. These missing arguments are needed for these sentences to be complete, and they are not complete sentences, because they do not have the *mustatnā min-hu* “the noun before *'illā*”. Sibawayhi explains *lam tašğal 'an-hā qabl-a 'an talħaq-a 'illā al-fi'l-a bi-ğayr-i-hā* “you do not [allow] the verb to be occupied by anything before the insertion of *'illā*” (*Kitāb* II, p. 311). By depriving a verb of one of its arguments, *'illā* is treated as if it does not exist, and the noun that follows takes the appropriate case ending as dictated by the sentence structure as the final argument of the verb. Therefore, the particle *'illā* does not govern what follows and is treated as if it does not syntactically exist.

However if the *mustatnā min-hu*, the noun before 'illā, is present, the sentence is complete before reaching the particle 'illā. In this case, the *mustatnā* or the noun after 'illā may be considered *badal*⁸ “apposition” standing for the first noun, the *mustatnā min-hu*: the second noun substituting for the first (*Kitāb* II, p. 311):

- (4) ما أتاني أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ
mā 'atā-nī 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-un
 not came-me anyone-NOM except Zayd-NOM
 “None other came to me except Zayd,”
- (5) ما مررت بأحدٍ إلا زيدٌ
mā marar-tu bi-'aḥad-in 'illā Zayd-in
 not passed-I by-anyone-GEN except Zayd-GEN
 “None other did I pass by except Zayd,” and
- (6) ما رأيت أحداً إلا زيدا
mā ra'ay-tu 'aḥad-an 'illā Zayd-an
 not saw-I anyone-ACC except Zayd-ACC
 “None other did I see except Zayd.”

It is noteworthy to mention that if 'aḥad “anyone” is removed from these sentences, the verbs will be missing one argument as mentioned above, and what is left would be sentences (1)–(3) above, where the particle 'illā does not govern and does not syntactically exist. However, since the *mustatnā min-hu*, the noun before 'illā, is present, and therefore all the arguments of the verb are present, the appropriate structure, Sībawayhi affirms, is *badal*. Sībawayhi explains that *hādā waḡh-u al-kalām-i 'an taḡ'al-a al-mustatnā badal-an min al-laḏi qabl-i-hi li'ann-a-ka tudḡil-u-hu fi-mā 'aḡraḡta min-hu al-'awwal-a* “this is the proper utterance. You make the excepted [noun] substitute for [the noun] that precedes ['illā.], because you introduce [the excepted noun] to where the first [noun] has been excluded” (*Kitāb* II, p. 311). He considers this construction the most appropriate and preferred option, because both nouns are equal in status and one can replace the other. He supplies the reader with further examples all illustrating the same *badal* constructions.

Within *badal* structures, both the nominative and accusative are acceptable under certain conditions when using sentential verbs, because, in Arabic, they need two accusatives.⁹ His examples include (*Kitāb* II, p. 313):

8. *Badal* refers to constructions where a noun substitutes for a previous noun and follows it in case. It is generally translated as apposition or substitution.

9. Sentential verbs are verbs that need sentences as their complements. In Arabic, a specific class of verbs called 'af'āl al-qulūb “verbs of the heart” are introduced to complete equational

- (7) ما أظن أحدا يقول ذاك إلا زيداً
mā 'aẓunn-u 'aḥad-an ya-qūl-u ḏāka 'illā Zayd-un/an
 not think-I anyone-ACC he-says-IND that except Zayd-NOM/ACC
 "I do not think anyone says that except Zayd."

The accusative case is chosen as a substitution for *'aḥad* "anyone", and the nominative is chosen as a substitution for the subject pronoun in the verb *yaqūl-u* "he says", since both are objects of the verb *'aẓunn-u* "I think." Consequently, the noun after *'illā* may substitute *'aḥad* "anyone" and therefore is accusative, or it may substitute the subject pronoun in the verb *yaqūl-u* "he says" and therefore is nominative. Nevertheless, these sentential verbs do not convey actions. They convey what is in the speaker's mind. Sībawayhi maintains that these verbs are not in the same category as "verbs of action", *wa-'innamā yadull-u 'alā mā fī 'ilm-i-ka* "but they represent what is in your knowledge" i.e., what is in the mind (*Kitāb* II, p. 314); and therefore can also be called "verbs of the mind". As for verbs conveying action such as (p. 313):

- (8) ما ضربتُ أحدا يقول ذاك إلا زيداً
mā ḏarab-tu 'aḥad-an ya-qūl-u ḏāka 'illā Zayd-an
 not hit-I anyone-ACC he-says-IND that except Zayd-ACC
 "I did not hit anyone saying that except Zayd."

only the accusative is permissible, because only one object is needed, and the noun after *'illā* can only be in apposition to *'aḥad* "anyone."

Sībawayhi (*Kitāb* II, p. 314) also introduces *badal* in different syntactic positions. The substitution for the position of *mubtada'* "subject" is illustrated in examples including:

- (9) قل رجلٌ يقول ذاك إلا زيداً
qalla rağul-un ya-qūl-u ḏāka 'illā Zayd-un
 few man-NOM he-says-IND that except Zayd-NOM
 "There is hardly anyone who would say that except Zayd."

where Zayd does not substitute for *rağul-un* "man" but for *qalla rajul-un* "hardly a man", functioning as the *mubtada'*, therefore Zayd receives the nominative case. Substitution for the position of *mubtada'* is also seen (p. 318) in:

sentences with a *mubtada'* and a *ḥabar*, subject and predicate noun, and govern both in the accusative case. A simple example will suffice. Both parts of the following equational sentence turn into two accusatives when the verb *ẓanna* is inserted: *al-walad-u ṭālib-un* "The boy is a student." The boy is the *mubtada'* and student is the *ḥabar*. Once the verb *ẓanna* is inserted, such as *ẓanan-tu al-walad-a ṭālib-an* "I thought that the boy is a student" both *mubtada'* and *ḥabar* become accusative as objects of the verb *ẓanna* "to think."

- (10) لَا أَحَدَ فِيهَا إِلَّا زَيْدٌ
 lā 'aḥad-a fī-hā 'illā Zayd-un
 not anyone-ACC in-it except Zayd-NOM
 “No one is there except Zayd.”

where Zayd also substitutes for the *mubtada'* lā 'aḥada “no one” and receives the nominative case.

Sibawayhi (p. 317) also presents substitution with other syntactic positions, such as the noun after 'inna:

- (11) مَا عَلِمْتُ أَنْ فِيهَا إِلَّا زَيْدًا
 mā 'alim-tu 'anna fī-hā 'illā Zayd-an
 not knew-I that in-it except Zayd-ACC
 “I did not know anyone was there except Zayd.”

where Zayd substitutes for the accusative noun after 'anna, which, in this case, has been dropped from the sentence, and therefore Zayd is accusative

Other similar *badal* constructions occur in sentences (Kitāb II, p. 315) such as:

- (12) مَا أَتَانِي مِنْ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا زَيْدٌ
 mā 'atā-nī min 'aḥad-in 'illā Zayd-un
 not came-me of anyone-GEN except Zayd-NOM
 “None of them came to me except Zayd” and
- (13) مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا زَيْدًا
 mā ra'ay-tu min 'aḥad-in 'illā Zayd-an
 not saw-I of anyone-GEN except Zayd-ACC
 “I did not see any of them except Zayd,”

where in both cases *min 'aḥad-in* “of anyone” is equivalent to *'aḥad-un* “anyone” in the nominative, functioning as the subject of 'atā “to come”, or *'aḥad-an* “anyone” in the accusative, functioning as the object of ra'ā “to see” in (12) and (13), respectively. Both cases are *badal* constructions.¹⁰

As for the alternate choice Sibawayhi gives at the beginning of the chapter, when he mentions that the noun after 'illā receives the accusative case, he states that the accusative is also acceptable since *ba'ḍ-u al-'arab-i al-mawṭūq-i bi-'arabiyyat-i-hi* “some Arabs whose Arabic is trustworthy” use the accusative (Kitāb II, p. 319). Sibawayhi cites the same examples used with *badal* constructions in sentences (4)–(6) above, but instead of alternating between cases depending on the case of the substituted noun, all employ the accusative case (ibid.):

10. The preposition *min* “of” in both sentences *daḥalat hunā tawkid-an* “is inserted here for emphasis”, as explained by Sibawayhi (Kitāb II, p. 316).

- (14) ما أتاني أحدٌ إلا زيدا
 mā 'atā-nī 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-an
 not came-me anyone-NOM except Zayd-ACC
 “None other came to me except Zayd,”
- (15) ما مررت بأحدٍ إلا زيدا
 mā marar-tu bi-'aḥad-in 'illā Zayd-an
 not passed-I by-anyone-GEN except Zayd-ACC
 “I did not pass by anyone except Zayd,” and
- (16) ما رأيت أحداً إلا زيدا
 mā ra'ay-tu 'aḥad-an 'illā Zayd-an
 not saw-I anyone-ACC except Zayd-ACC
 “I did not see anyone except Zayd.”

If the nouns after 'illā are accusative, then they are not *badal*, but they are considered *munqati'* “detached”, and the verbs governing the first nouns, i.e., the nouns before 'illā, the *mustatnā min-hu 'aḥad* “anyone” do not have an effect on what comes after 'illā, the *mustatnā* Zayd. It is interesting that Sibawayhi uses the term *munqati'* “detached” in these cases, because the meaning is clearly different from what later grammarians used. Later grammarians used *istiṭnā' munqati'* “detached exception” for when the excepted noun is heterogeneous with the *munstatnā min-hu* (Carter 1975: 69), i.e., both nouns do not belong to the same category.

Once again, the verbs in examples (14)–(16) have all their arguments, just as they did in *badal* sentences (4)–(6) above. However, Sibawayhi explains that in structures similar to sentences (14)–(16), where the *tanwīn-naṣb* structure is used, they are not *badal* structures. Verbs in these sentences do not govern nouns after 'illā, unlike what has been stated earlier with sentences (4)–(6) in the *badal* structures. This is clarified by Sibawayhi's statement *wa-dālīka 'anna-ka lam taḡ'al al-'āḥir-a badal-an min al-'awwal-i wa-lākinna-ka ḡa'alta-hu munqati'-an mim-mā 'amil-a fī al-'awwal-i* “you do not substitute the second [noun] for the first [noun] but you detach it from what governs the first [noun]” (*Kitāb* II, p. 319). Sibawayhi explains this discrepancy by explaining why these structures are not *badal*. The meaning of 'illā, in these specific sentences, occurs as *lākin* “but” or *lā 'a'nī* “I do not mean”, in effect meaning, “No one came but Zayd”, or “No one came; I do not mean Zayd.” As Baalbaki (2008: 56–68) explains, similarity in meaning can be an 'illa “cause” according to Sibawayhi, which he sometimes employs to justify usage. This resemblance in meaning could have triggered Sibawayhi's explanation of the accusative in his illustration. In both cases Zayd is accusative, in the first as the subject-noun following *lākin*, and in the second as the object of 'a'nī. Sibawayhi asserts that both constructions are acceptable: *badal* and 'inqiṭā' “apposition and detachment”, although he prefers *badal*, as stated earlier.

However, *badal* constructions are not acceptable if the substitution does not make sense, in which case, the noun after 'illā must occur detached. Such structures occur when the noun after 'illā cannot be an element of or cannot relate to the first noun.¹¹ Examples such as (*Kitāb* II, p. 319):

- (17) ما فيها أحدٌ إلا حمارا
mā fi-hā 'aḥad-un 'illā ḥimār-an
 not in-it anyone-NOM except donkey-ACC
 “No one is there except for a donkey”

perfectly illustrate this concept, since a donkey cannot be an appropriate substitute for humans.

Sibawayhi presents more examples upholding the accusative choice. He explains that nouns after 'illā must be accusative in sentences such as (p. 331):

- (18) أتاني القومُ إلا أباك
'atā-nī al-qawm-u 'illā 'ab-ā-ka
 came-me the-people-NOM except father-ACC-your
 “People came to me except for your father.”

His justification is that the *mustatnā* is not included in the *mustatnā min-hu*. 'Ab-ā-ka “your father” is not part of *al-qawm* “the people” who actually came, and, therefore, the verb 'atā “to come” does not govern 'ab-ā-ka “your father” and is detached. Sibawayhi explains that the reason is *li'anna-hu muḥriḡ-un mim-mā 'adḥalta fi-hi ḡayr-a-hu fa-'amila fi-hi mā qabl-a-hu kamā 'amila al-'iṣr-ūna fī al-dīham-i* “because [the noun that follows 'illā] is excluded from what has been included [before]. Therefore 'illā operates on it just like 'iṣr-ūna operates on *dirham*” in a *tanwīn-naṣb* construction (*Kitāb* II, p. 330). He continues *intaṣaba al-'ab-u 'iḏ lam yakun dāḥil-an fī-mā daḥala fi-hi mā qabl-a-hu wa-lam yakun ṣifā wa-kāna al-'āmil-u fi-hi mā qabl-a-hu min al-kalām-i* “‘ab ‘father’ is accusative because it is not included in what has been included before ['illā]; it is not an attribute, and what precedes operates on it” as in a *tanwīn-naṣb* construction (ibid., p. 331). He further elaborates by explaining the difference between two types of sentences (ibid.):

- (19) ما اتاني القوم الا ابوك
mā 'atā-nī al-qawm-u 'illā 'ab-ū-ka
 not came-me the-people-NOM except father-NOM-your
 “None of the people came to me except for your father”

11. In other words, heterogeneous with the *munstaṭnā min-hu*.

and sentence (18) above. Sentence (19) is acceptable with the *mustaṭnā* 'ab-ū-ka "your father" in the nominative case, because had the *mustaṭnā min-hu*, *al-qawm* "the people", been missing, the resulting sentence (ibid.):

- (20) ما أتاني إلا أبوك
mā 'atā-nī 'illā 'ab-ū-ka
 not came-me except father-NOM-your
 "None came to me except for your father"

is acceptable since it conveys the same meaning. In this case, the *badal* structure is appropriate, and thus, the nominative case.

However, if the *mustaṭnā min-hu*, *al-qawm* "the people", is missing from (18), the resulting sentence would be (ibid.):

- (21) *أتاني إلا أباك
 **'atā-nī 'illā 'ab-ā-ka*
 *came-me except father-ACC-your
 "*[No subject] came except for your father."

This is an absurd or an inconceivable utterance, or in Sibawayhi's words *muḥāl*. Sentences (18) and (21) do not mean the same thing, and therefore, the structure cannot be *badal*. The only possible choice is *munqaṭi'* "detached" structure in which the function of the verb 'atā "he came" does not govern the *mustaṭnā* 'ab-ā-ka "your father." The only explanation that potentially clarifies this ambiguity is Sibawayhi's unique way of describing negated and affirmed sentences. For negated sentences, his preferred structure for the noun after 'illā, the *mustaṭnā*, is *badal*, since the presence of the *mustaṭnā min-hu* is optional, because, as stated above, the particle 'illā deactivates the negation of the verb, and thus the verb governs the *mustaṭnā* as its subject when the *mustaṭnā min-hu* is not present. Sibawayhi uses vague sentences to explain his argument. He says that the *mustaṭnā* in negated sentences *tudḥil-u-hu fī-mā 'ahraḡta min-hu al-awwal-a* "is included in what the [*mustaṭnā min-hu*] has been excluded" (*Kitāb* II, p. 311), so the verb is allowed to govern it. However, the *mustaṭnā* in affirmed sentences is not part of the *mustaṭnā min-hu*, as observed in sentence (18) above. This exclusion makes it impossible for the verb to govern the noun after 'illā, the *mustaṭnā*, which must be "detached" from the verb. In affirmed sentences, the *mustaṭnā muḥriġ-un mim-mā 'adhḥalta fī-hi ġayr-a-hu* "is excluded from what the [*mustaṭnā min-hu*] has been included" (ibid., p. 330), so the verb is not allowed to govern it. Essentially, it can only be accusative. With this in mind, it is clear that there is a choice with negated sentences: either *badal* or detachment, but, for affirmed utterances, the only option is accusative.

An additional mandatory accusative structure is when *'illā* and its noun, the *mustatnā*, are fronted, i.e., occurring before the noun that would otherwise be substituted, the *mustatnā min-hu*. If the *mustatnā* occurs at the beginning of the sentence, it cannot be *badal* structure, because the noun that is supposed to be replaced does not appear before the *mustatnā*. According to Sībawayhi, and this only applies to negated sentences, when the *badal* is an option, *al-istiṭnā' ḥadd-u-hu 'an tadārak-a-hu ba'd-a-mā tanfī fa-tubdil-u-hu* “the definition of exception is that you reach it after negation then you substitute it with [the previous noun]” (*Kitāb* II, p. 335). Essentially the noun after *'illā* can only occur as the noun that substitutes for a previous noun; otherwise, there is no *badal* construction. Sībawayhi uses the sentence (*ibid.*):

- (22) ما لي إلا أباك صديق
mā l-ī 'illā 'ab-ā-ka ṣadīq-un
 not to-me except father-ACC-your friend-NOM
 “No one is there for me except your father as a friend”

with an accusative *mustatnā*, noun after *'illā*, to illustrate this structure, with *ṣadīq* “friend” occurring after the exceptive phrase, and therefore forcing the accusative case on *'ab* “father”, because a *badal* structure is not allowed. However, Sībawayhi also introduces what seems to be the opposite structure in (p. 336):

- (23) من لي إلا أبوك صديقا
man l-ī 'illā' ab-ū-ka ṣadīq-an
 who to-me except father-NOM-your friend-ACC
 “Who is [there] for me except your father as a friend”

with a nominative *'ab* “father” after *'illā*. His explanation here is that *'ab* “father” is a substitute for *man* “who” in a *badal* structure and *ṣadīq* “friend” is in a *ḥāl* “circumstantial state” in the accusative.

Sībawayhi introduces a non-exceptive *'illā*, where it occurs as an attribute meaning *ḡayr* “other than.” Ibn Mālik explains that *ḡayr* “other than” primarily occurs as an attribute, and *'illā* “except” primarily occurs in *istiṭnā'*, but then both assume the [role] of the other in where each primarily occurs (*Tashīl*, pp. 297–298). In this case the noun after *'illā* cannot be in a *badal* structure, and the whole phrase can only be an attribute (Sībawayhi *Kitāb* II, p. 331):

- (25) لو كان معنا رجل إلا زيد لغلبنا
law kāna ma'a-na raḡul-un 'illā Zayd-un la-ḡulib-nā
 if was with-us man-NOM except Zayd-NOM would-defeated-we
 “Had we had with us a man, other than Zayd, we would have been defeated.”

Sibawayhi explains that if what is meant were an exceptive phrase, it would be an impossible utterance (p. 331):

- (26) *لو كان معنا إلا زيد لهلكنا*
**law kāna ma'a-nā 'illā Zayd-un la-halak-nā*
 *if was with-us except Zayd-NOM would-perished-we
 “*Had we had with us, except Zayd, we would have perished.”

He further explains that if you say sentence (26) *wa-'anta turīd-u al-istiṭnā' la-kun-ta qad 'aḥalta* “and you want the exception, you would have said an absurd [utterance]” (p. 331). Sibawayhi does not explain the impossibility of this utterance, but Ibn Mālik relates Sīrāfi's explanation that a *badal* structure in *istiṭnā'* necessitates an affirmed, or non-negated *mustaṭnā*, noun after *'illā* (*Tashīl*, p. 299), in which case it would give a different meaning indicating that if Zayd were present, they would have been defeated, and this is not what is meant by sentence (25). Effectively, Sīrāfi gives the sentence *law kāna ma'a-nā Zayd-un la-halak-nā* “Had Zayd been with us, we would have perished” (Ibn Mālik *Tashīl*, p. 299). Additionally, he tells us that *al-badal-u ba'd-a 'illā fī al-istiṭnā'-i mūjab-un* “*badal* after *'illā* is affirmative in exception” (ibid.), since a *badal* can only occur in a negated sentence in exception. So, if sentence (25) has a *badal* structure, Zayd would not be excluded, and this proves the impossibility of the utterance. On the contrary, it indicates that without Zayd, they would have been defeated.

Sibawayhi cites one Quranic verse (21:22) that uses this non-exceptive *'illā* (*Kitāb* II, p. 332):

- (27) *{لو كان فيهما آلهة إلا الله لفسدتا}*
law kāna fī-him-ā 'ālihat-un 'illā l-lāh-u la-fasadat-ā
 if was in-them-DU gods-NOM except Allah-NOM would-ruined-DU

If *Allah*¹² “God” were a *badal*, *Allah* “God” would substitute for *'ālihah* “gods” and ultimately put “God” in place of “gods”; and, therefore, would translate according to Sīrāfi as related by Ibn Mālik (*Tashīl*, p. 299) as:

- *لو كان فيهما الله لفسدتا*
**law kāna fī-himā l-lāh-u la-fasadat-ā*
 *if was in-them-DU Allah-NOM would-ruined-DU
 “*If God was [in Heaven and Earth,] both would be in ruin.”

This is an unthinkable expression in the Quran. However, this sentence means (Ibn al-'Anbārī *Inṣāf*, p. 235):

12. I use the conventionally written Allah in the text as opposed to the transliteration I use in the example: *al-lāh*.

لو كان فيهما آلهة غيرُ الله [لفسدتا]

law kāna fī-himā 'ālihat-un ġayr-u

if was in-them-DU gods-NOM other-NOM

l-lāh-i [la-fasadat-ā]

Allah-GEN [would-ruined-DU]

“If there were gods *other than* God, in [Heaven and Earth, both would be in ruin].”

Treating 'illā as the attribute *ġayr* would change the meaning of the sentence to a perfectly acceptable expression.

Sibawayhi never explains the nominative “God” after 'illā, except by treating it as an attribute not a *badal*. He also never explains the function of the conditional *law* “if”. Later grammarians explain further by reiterating that *badal* only occurs in negated sentences. Ibn al-'Anbārī states that *al-badal-u fī al-'itbāt-i ġayr-u ġā'iz-in* “substitution in affirmed sentences is not permissible” (*'Inšāf*, p. 235). Astarābādī states that *al-badal-u lā yağūz-u 'illā fī ġayr-i al-mūğab-i* “substitution is only allowed in non-affirmed sentences” (*Šarḥ al-Rađī*, p. 185). Zamaḥšarī states that *al-badal-u lā yasūğ-u 'illā fī al-kalām-i ġayr-i al-mūğab-i* “substitution is not allowed except in non-affirmed sentences” (*Kaššāf*, p. 86). Others add that conditionals indicate affirmed sentences. Ibn Ya'īs states that *al-šarṭ-u fī ḥukm-i al-mūğab-i* “conditionals are virtually affirmed [sentences]” (*Mufaššal*, p. 89), and Ibn Mālik indicates that speech is affirmative with conditionals (*Tašhīl*, p. 298). Astarābādī states that *laysa al-šarṭ-u...min ġayr-i al-mūğab-i* “conditionals are not beyond affirmed [sentences]” (*Šarḥ al-Rađī*, p. 185). Finally, Zamaḥšarī indicates that speech with *law* “if” is affirmative (*Kaššāf*, p. 86). Furthermore, Ibn Ya'īs asserts that the function of 'illā in this verse is to indicate the antithesis (*Mufaššal*, p. 89). He further elaborates that [*'illā*] *wa-mā ba'd-a-hā taḥliyat-un li-l-maḍkūr-i bi-l-muğāyarat-i* “[*'illā*] and [the noun] that follows describe the attributes of what was mentioned [before] as contradictory” (*Mufaššal*, p. 89). He continues explaining that the case of the noun after 'illā follows the case of the noun before 'illā, which explains the nominative case in “God.” In explaining the nominative, Ibn Ya'īs states that *mā ba'd-a 'illā fī al-waṣf-i yakūn-u 'i'rāb-u-hu tābi'-an li-'i'rāb-i mā qabl-a-hā* “[the noun] after 'illā [occurring] as an attribute follows the previous noun in case” (*Mufaššal*, pp. 89–90). It is not a *badal* for “gods”, but an attribute in antithesis, thus receiving the same case ending as “gods.”

This is what Baalbaki (1995:7) calls “Reclassification according to grammatical function”, where grammarians allowed a shift from the 'aṣl to explain certain constructions, which otherwise would have been unacceptable. In this case, 'illā as a particle has been modified to function as the noun *ġayr*, as an attribute, in order to explain the nominative after the particle 'illā, which otherwise would have been

badal, indicating an unacceptable utterance in the Quran. The noun after *'illā* in affirmed sentences is accusative, though, in order to maintain this “basic rule,” this construction in this verse is considered something other than *istiṭnā*. The shift in grammatical category is necessary to explain this anomaly. Sībawayhi “opts to confirm an exception to the boundaries between the parts of speech rather than an exception to the specific case under discussion,” namely the *istiṭnā* (Baalbaki 2008: 164, 166).

In brief, Sībawayhi starts his chapters on *'illā* with the *'illā* of no effect in negated sentences. He then presents the *badal* as his primary choice if the sentence is complete before *'illā*, revealing other *badal* possibilities, especially those that involve different syntactic positions. What is remarkable is his non-technical use of the word “detached” to explain the *tanwīn-naṣb* construction if the sentence is complete before *'illā*. Since the verb cannot operate on the word after *'illā*, it is considered detached, and the *tanwīn-naṣb* structure is allowed. He also uses the word “detached” when referring to different categories, as will be used by later grammarians as a technical term in the development of the grammatical theory.

3. *Zaḡḡāḡī's Ġumal*

The topic of *istiṭnā* in Zaḡḡāḡī's *Ġumal* is presented with clear rules without considerable analysis, and examples serve as proof as well as good illustrative models for the rules. Unlike Sībawayhi, Zaḡḡāḡī starts with affirmative sentences (*Ġumal*, p. 235):

- (28) قام القوم إلا زيدا
qāma al-qawm-u 'illā Zayd-an
 stood the-people-NOM except Zayd-ACC
 “The people stood except for Zayd.”

In which case, the *mustatnā* must be in the accusative case in the *tanwīn-naṣb* structure. However, if the sentence is negated, you have a choice (ibid.):

- (29) ما قام القوم إلا عمرو وإلا عمرا
mā qāma al-qawm-u 'illā 'Amr-un wa-'illā 'Amr-an
 not stood the-people-NOM except 'Amr-NOM and-except 'Amr-ACC
 “The people did not stand except for 'Amr.”

The *mustatnā* is nominative under *badal* rules or accusative if there is a complete sentence before the particle *'illā*.

These are simple rules. If the sentence is affirmed, then the noun after *'illā* is accusative, but if it is negated, then the noun may be *badal* or accusative in a

tanwīn-naṣb structure, but only if there is a complete sentence before the particle 'illā. Zağğāgī states that 'idā kāna mā qabl-a [ʿillā] min al-kalām-i mūğab-an kāna mā baʿd-a-hā maṣṣūb-an ... “if what comes before 'illā is affirmed in utterance, then what comes after it is accusative” (Ĝumal, p. 235). He continues *wa-'idā kāna mā qabl-a 'illā ġayr-a mūğab-in kāna mā baʿd-a-hā tābi'-an li-mā qabl-a-hā 'alā al-badal-i wa-ğāza fī-hi al-naṣb-u 'idā tamma al-kalām-u dūn-a-hu* “and if what comes before 'illā is not affirmative then what comes after it modifies what comes before in substitution, and the accusative is permissible if the utterance is complete before [the 'illā phrase]” (ibid.).

However, if the *mustaṭnā min-hu* is not present, the verb governs what follows. He elaborates 'idā farrāğta mā qabl-a 'illā li-mā baʿd-a-hā 'amila fī-hi wa-lam taʿmal 'illā šayʿ-an “if you free [the verb] before 'illā for what follows, then [the verb] governs [what follows] and 'illā does not govern anything” (Zağğāgī Ĝumal, p. 236). This is the *istiṭnāʾ mufarrağ* “exhaustive exception” as used by later grammarians. The use of the verb *farrāğ* “to free”, I believe, does not yet convey the technical term, but it indicates the opposite of *šağala* “to operate”, because Zağğāgī already uses the technical terms *istiṭnāʾ muqaddam* “fronted exception” (ibid., p. 238) and *istiṭnāʾ munqatiʿ* “detached exception” (p. 239). If *istiṭnāʾ mufarrağ* “exhaustive exception” was already considered a technical term at this time, he would have used it in the same way he used the other technical terms. Zağğāgī gives the following examples if you remove the *mustaṭnā min-hu* (Ĝumal, p. 236):

- (30) ما قام إلا زيد
mā qāma 'illā Zayd-un
 not stood except Zayd-NOM
 “No one stood except Zayd,”
- (31) ما رأيت إلا زيدا
mā raʿay-tu 'illā Zayd-an
 not saw-I except Zayd-ACC
 “None did I see except Zayd,” and
- (32) ما مررت إلا بزید
mā marar-tu 'illā bi-Zayd-in
 not passed-I except by-Zayd-GEN
 “I did not pass by [anyone] except Zayd.”

Zayd in sentence (30) is nominative because it is the subject of the verb, Zayd in sentence (31) is accusative because it is the object of the verb, and Zayd in sentence (32) is genitive because it is the object of a preposition. This applies to sentences where the verb does not have all its arguments before the exception particle 'illā and thus has no effect on what follows.

Zağğāgī continues with other examples where the accusative case is the only choice: if the *mustatnā* is fronted, or if the *mustatnā* and the *mustatnā min-hu* do not belong to the same category, where both *mustatnā* and *mustatnā min-hu* cannot replace one another. Zağğāgī explains that *'idā kāna al-mustatnā min ġayr-i ġins-i al-'awwal-i kāna munqaṭi'-an min-hu manšūb-an* “if the noun after *'illā* is not of the same category as the first [noun], then it is detached and is accusative” (Ġumal, p. 239). Zağğāgī gives the following examples if the noun after *'illā* is fronted (p. 238):

- (33) مالي إلا العسل شرابٌ
mā l-ī 'illā al-ʿasal-a šarāb-un
 not to-me except the-honey-ACC drink-NOM
 “I have nothing except honey as a drink” and
- (34) مالي إلا أباك صديقٌ
mā l-ī 'illā 'ab-ā-ka šadiq-un
 not to-me except father-ACC-your friend-NOM
 “I have no one except your father as a friend.”

Similarly, if we have two different categories (p. 239):

- (35) ما في الدار أحدٌ إلا حماراً
mā fī al-dār-i 'aḥad-un 'illā ḥimār-an
 not in the-house-GEN anyone-NOM except donkey-ACC
 “No one is in the house except for a donkey.”

The *mustatnā* must be accusative, because *ḥimār* “donkey” is not in the same category as *'aḥad* “anyone”. We here have two species, and thus, one cannot substitute for the other.

Zağğāgī contrasts affirmed and negated sentences at the beginning of his chapter, where *tanwīn-naṣb* structure is the only choice or is preferred to *badal* in negated sentences, but only if the sentence is complete before *'illā*; otherwise, *'illā* has no effect. Zağğāgī's primary concern is the difference between affirmed and negated sentences, and based on this distinction rests his grammatical choice.

4. *Ibn Bābašād's Muqaddima*

As for the *Muqaddima* of Ibn Bābašād, *istiṭnā'* is presented with direct, straightforward explanations providing only one example for each rule. According to Ibn Bābašād, exception indicates *'iḥrāğ-u ba'd-in min kull-in bi-'illā* “extracting some from [the] whole with [the use] of *'illā*.” (Ibn Bābašād *Naḥwiyya* (Šarīf) II, p. 263). Exception is used to extract something from all else. He explains that the noun

after *'illā* is accusative if it is in an affirmed sentence or *fī ta'wīl-i al-mūğab-i* “what is similar to an affirmed sentence” (ibid., p. 264):

- (36) قام القوم إلا زيدا
qāma al-qawm-u 'illā Zayd-an
 stood the-people-NOM except Zayd-ACC
 “The people stood except for Zayd” and
- (37) ما أكل أحد إلا الخبز إلا زيدا
mā 'akala 'aḥad-un 'illā al-ḥubz-a 'illā Zayd-an
 not ate anyone-NOM except the-bread-ACC except Zayd-ACC
 “No one ate [anything] except bread except Zayd,”

which is similar to an affirmed sentence meaning that everyone but Zayd ate bread.

The *mustaṭnā* is also accusative if it precedes the *mustaṭnā min-hu* or is *mun-qatī* “detached”, as respectively expressed by the following sentences (ibid.):

- (38) ما لي إلا الله راحم
mā l-i 'illā l-lāh-a rāḥim-un
 not to-me except Allah-ACC merciful-NOM
 I have [no one] except God[to be] merciful” and
- (39) ما بالدار أحد إلا حمارا
mā bi-l-dār-i 'aḥad-un 'illā ḥimār-an
 not in-the-house-GEN anyone-NOM except donkey-ACC
 “No one is in the house except for a donkey.”

The latter must be detached because it deals with two different species.

The accusative for the *mustaṭnā* is also a possibility *ba'd-a tamām-i al-kalām-i* “after a complete sentence” (ibid.):

- (40) {ما فعلوه إلا قليلا منهم}
mā fa'al-ū-hu 'illā qalīl-an min-hum
 not did-they.NOM-it except few-ACC of-them
 “They did not do it except for a few of them.” (Quran 4:66)

Ibn Bābašād also explains in his commentary that the *mustaṭnā* in sentence (40) can also be considered *badal*, and would thus receive the nominative case, only because the *mustaṭnā* occurs after a complete sentence (ibid., p. 269):

- (41) ما فعلوه إلا قليل منهم
mā fa'al-ū-hu 'illā qalīl-un min-hum
 not did-they.NOM-it except few-NOM of-them
 “They did not do it except for a few of them.”

where the noun after *'illā qalīl* “few” would substitute for the subject pronoun in the verb *fa'al-ū-hu* “they did it.” Ibn Bābašād̲ does not give the alternative example where *qalīl* “few” is nominative in his *Muqaddima*, but he elucidates in his commentary in both editions (ibid., p. 269; Ibn Bābašād̲ *Muḥsiba* (Abd al-Karīm) II, p. 324).

Ibn Bābašād̲ further states that if the sentence starts with an interrogative, it is negated, or prohibitive, the *mustatnā*, *ġālib-an* “usually”, follows the *mustatnā min-hu* in case (Ibn Bābašād̲ *Naḥwiyya* (Šarīf) II, p. 264), i.e., a *badal* structure:

- (42) هل قام أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ
hal qāma 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-un
 Q stood anyone-NOM except Zayd-NOM
 “Did anyone stand except Zayd?” and
- (43) لم يَقم أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ
lam ya-qum 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-un
 not he-stood anyone-NOM except Zayd-NOM
 “No one stood except Zayd.”

While this example is given as part of the original *Muqaddima* as an example for *nafy* “negation”, in his commentary, edited by both Šarīf and ‘Abd al-Karīm, a slightly different version is presented (ibid. p. 270; Ibn Bābašād̲ *Muḥsiba* (‘Abd al-Karīm) II, p. 325):

- (44) ما قام أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ
mā qāma 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-un
 not stood anyone-NOM except Zayd-NOM
 “No one stood except Zayd,”

While the translation is not affected, however, the difference between the negation particles *lam* and *mā* is noteworthy, which leads me to think that Ibn Bābašād̲ did in fact chose a different example in his commentary. This is possible since the *Muqaddima* and its commentary were written almost thirty years apart.

For the *nahy* “prohibitive” (Ibn Bābašād̲ *Muqaddima*, manuscript, leaf 22; Ibn Bābašād̲ *Muḥsiba* (‘Abd al-Karīm) II, p. 321), he gives:

- (45) لا يَقم أحدٌ إلا زيدٌ
lā ya-qum 'aḥad-un 'illā Zayd-un
 not.IMP he-stand anyone-NOM except Zayd-NOM
 “Let no one stand up except for Zayd.”

This example occurs in the manuscript as well as in ‘Abd al-Karīm’s edition. In the Šarīf edition, however, Ibn Bābašād̲ only provides this example for *nahy* “prohibitive” in the commentary (*Naḥwiyya* (Šarīf) II, p. 270). Given that the manuscript

in my hand, ‘Abd al-Karīm’s edition, and the commentary edited by Šarīf have the same example, I speculate that that the manuscripts Šarīf used are to blame or that it is an editorial slip on the part of Šarīf.

His use of *gālib-an* “usually” reflects the fact that the accusative is also allowed if the utterance is complete before *’illā*, i.e., if the *mustatnā min-hu* is present and thus serves its function in the sentence and completes all the arguments of the verb, as in sentence (40) above.

Ibn Bābašād presents all *tanwīn-našb* “accusative” possibilities, whether affirmed sentences, fronted, detached, or after a complete sentence if negated, at the beginning of his chapter. He then mentions the *badal* only as a possibility with negated sentences. Ibn Bābašād’s primary concern is to emphasize the *tanwīn-našb* structure as primary and the *badal* only as a possibility.

5. Concluding observations

Comparing these *istiṭnā’* “exception” excerpts, the fundamental rules are the same; however, presentation varies widely, particularly when comparing Sibawayhi with the latter grammarians. Rules become simpler as one progresses in time, and lengthy explanations come to an end. In addition to the lack of extensive justification in the latter two selections, different *badal* “apposition” structures, elaborated by Sibawayhi are missing from Zaġġāġi and Ibn Bābašād. Whereas Sibawayhi’s treatment of *badal* “apposition” in *istiṭnā’* “exception” is primary, since he deals with negated structures first, it is only mentioned as a possibility in Zaġġāġi and Ibn Bābašād, as their primary *istiṭnā’* “exception” structure is the *tanwīn-našb* structure: accusative. Furthermore, Zaġġāġi and Ibn Bābašād already use the term “detached” as a technical term referring to nouns that belong to two different categories. The word, as used by Sibawayhi, has dropped from usage as the other two grammarians found no reason to justify the *tanwīn-našb* “accusative” structure as Sibawayhi did. Likewise, the controversial attributive *’illā* is missing from both Zaġġāġi’s *Ġumal* and Ibn Bābašād’s *Muqaddima*. This is possibly because it is not considered an exceptive, a structure clearly not required to be mastered by beginners. This similarity between Zaġġāġi and Ibn Bābašād may also originate in the fact that the latter composed a commentary on Zaġġāġi’s *Ġumal*. Ibn Bābašād further neglects mentioning *istiṭnā’* “exception” when the *mustatnā min-hu* “noun before *’illā*” is missing, as *’illā* in this case is neutralized.

Although neither Zaġġāġi nor Ibn Bābašād, justify usage in presenting their rules, the main difference between their presentations is the number of examples used. Zaġġāġi has seventeen examples in addition to three poetic references and four Quranic verses, while Ibn Bābašād only uses seven examples (eight in the manuscript and the ‘Abd al-Karīm edition) in addition to two Quranic verses.

This is in complete contrast to Sibawayhi who uses more than 120 examples in addition to nineteen poetic references and seven Quranic verses. Although Zaġġāġi's *Ġumal* and Ibn Bābašād's *Muqaddima* are brief and concise and evidently should be used for beginners, other grammarians found the need to write extensive commentaries expanding and clarifying missing justifications. That grammar needed to be speculative was clearly expected by scholars of the period. These commentaries, however, serve as necessary substitutes for instructors, who were essential in the teaching of these manuals and often offered their own commentaries along with their teaching.

It is clear that Sibawayhi describes the language in order to generate rules of usage by examining multitudes of examples taken from the language in use. His explanations justify the rules he deduces from the data. He is therefore obligated to present these lengthy clarifications to rationalize his rules. Rules of *istiṭnā'* emerge from within his explanations, yet he further explains any structures where the rules do not exactly correspond. By the time of Zaġġāġi these explanations were stripped from all but the most necessary rules for the exception. He gives clear explanations but still finds the need occasionally to supply multiple examples to support these rules, albeit not close in number to Sibawayhi's. However, Ibn Bābašād finds that he needs only one example to convey each rule. Although the last two books do include minimal speculation and justification, they are definitely more accessible to learners for their clarity and simple presentation. Lengthy justifications are not needed for learners of the language. They have their acceptable, and well appreciated, role in speculative and theoretical grammars.

REFERENCES

A. Primary literature

- Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-Raḍī* = Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Astarābādī, *Šarḥ al-Raḍī 'alā Kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāḡib*. Ed. by 'Abd al-'Āl Sālim Makram. Vol. II. Cairo: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 2000.
- Baġdādī, *Ḥizāna* = 'Abd al-Qādir b. 'Umar al-Baġdādī, *Ḥizānat al-'Adab wa-Lubb Lubāb Lisān al-'Arab*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Vol. I. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Našr, [1967?].
- Baṭalyawsī, *Ḥulal* = 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad b. al-Sid al-Baṭalyawsī, *Kitāb al-Ḥulal fī 'Iṣlāḥ al-Ḥalāl min Kitāb al-Ġumal*. Ed. by Sa'īd 'Abd al-Karīm Sa'ūdī. Beirut: Dār al-Ṭalī'a li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Našr, 1980.
- Ibn 'Abī al-Rabī', *Basīṭ* = 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Aḥmad Ibn 'Abī al-Rabī', *al-Basīṭ fī Šarḥ Ġumal al-Zaġġāġi*. Ed. by 'Ayyād b. 'Īd al-Ṭabīṭi. Vol. I. Beirut: Dār al-Ġarb al-'Islāmī, 1986.
- Ibn al-'Anbārī, *'Inšāf* = 'Abū al-Barakāt Ibn al-'Anbārī, *al-'Inšāf fī Masā'il al-Ḥilāf bayna al-Bašriyyin wa-l-Kūfiyyin*. Ed. by Jawda Mabrūk Muḥammad Mabrūk. Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḥanjī, 2002.

- Ibn Bābašād, *Muḥsiba* = Ṭāhir b. 'Aḥmad Ibn Bābašād, *Šarḥ al-Muqaddima al-Muḥsiba*. Ed. by Ḥālid 'Abd al-Karīm. 2 vols. Kuwait: (no pub.), 1976–1977.
- Ibn Bābašād, *Naḥwiyya* = Ṭāhir b. 'Aḥmad Ibn Bābašād, *Šarḥ al-Muqaddima al-Naḥwiyya*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Abū al-Futūḥ Šarīf. 2 vols. (n.p.): Dār al-Zahrā' li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Našr, 1978.
- Ibn Bābašād, *Muqaddima* = Ṭāhir b. 'Aḥmad Ibn Bābašād, *Kitāb al-Muqaddima al-Muḥsiba fī al-Naḥw*. Copied by 'Abd al-Mu'min 'Abdallāh al-Ḥabašī. Mss. n. 6427. Riyadh: Ġāmi'at al-'Imām Muḥammad b. Su'ūd al-'Islāmiyya. Location: London & Cairo: Mu'assasat 'Ilm (al-Maktabah al-Dawliyya li-l-Maḥṭūṭāt al-'Islāmiyya), ca.12th century.
- Ibn Ḥamza, *Ḥāšir* = Yaḥya Ibn Ḥamza, *al-Ḥāšir li-Fawā'id Muqaddimat Ṭāhir fī 'Ilm Ḥaqā'iq al-'I'rāb*. Ed. by Muḥammad Šalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥintāya. Sanaa: Markaz 'Ubādi li-l-Dirāsāt wa-l-Našr, 2007.
- Ibn Ḥarūf, *Šarḥ* = 'Alī b. Muḥammad Ibn Ḥarūf, *Šarḥ Ġumal al-Zaġġāġi*. Ed. by Salwā Muḥammad 'Umar 'Arab. Vol. I. Mecca: Ġāmi'at 'Umm al-Qurā, 1419 AH [1998–1999 A.D.].
- Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl* = Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abdullāh Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl*. Ed. by 'Abdulrahmān al-Sayyid and Muḥammad Badawī al-Maḥtūn. Vol. II. Cairo: Haġr li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Našr wa-l-Tawzī' wa-l-'I'lān, 1990.
- Ibn Ya'īs, *Mufaššal* = Muwaffaq al-Dīn Ya'īs b. 'Alī Ibn Ya'īs, *Šarḥ al-Mufaššal*. Vol. II. Beirut: 'Ālam al-Kutub, [1970].
- Qiftī, 'Inbāḥ = Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qiftī, 'Inbāḥ al-Ruwāt 'alā 'Anbāḥ al-Nuḥat. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Abū al-Faḍl 'Ibrāhīm. 4 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1952.
- Sibawayhi, *Kitāb* = 'Abū Bišr Sibawayhi, *al-Kitāb*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. 5 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Ḥanjī, 1988.
- Zaġġāġi, *Ġumal* = 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Ishāq al-Zaġġāġi, *al-Ġumal: Précis de Grammaire Arabe*. Ed. by Mohammed Ben Cheneb. 2nd ed. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1957.
- Zamaḥšari, *Kaššāf* = Maḥmūd b. 'Umar al-Zamaḥšari, *al-Kaššāf 'an Ḥaqā'iq Ġawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl wa-'Uyūn al-'Aqāwīl fī Wujūh al-Ta'wīl*. Ed. by Mušṭafā Ḥusayn 'Aḥmad. Vol. III. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-'Istiqāma, 1953

B. Secondary literature

- 'Abd al-Karīm, Ḥālid. 1976–1977. See Ibn Bābašād, *Muḥsiba*.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi. 1995. "Reclassification in Arab Grammatical Theory". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 54:1.1–13. doi:10.1086/373717
- Baalbaki, Ramzi. 2005. "Theoretical Coherency versus Pedagogical Attainability: The conscious bias of Arab grammarians". *Alltagsleben und materielle Kultur in der arabischen Sprache und Literatur: Festschrift für Heinz Grotzfeld zum 70. Geburtstag* ed. by Thomas Bauer & Ulrike Stehli-Werbeck, 39–68. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Baalbaki, Ramzi. 2008. *The Legacy of the "Kitāb": Sibawayhi's analytical methods within the context of the Arabic grammatical theory*. Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/ej.9789004168138.i-338
- Carter, Michael G. 1972. "'Twenty Dirhams' in the *Kitāb* of Sibawayhi". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35:3.485–496. doi:10.1017/S0041977X0012123
- Carter, Michael G. 1975. "A Note on Classical Exceptive Sentences". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20.69–72. doi:10.1093/jss/XX.1.69
- Carter, Michael G. 1985. "When Did the Arabic Word *Naḥw* First Come to Denote Grammar?" *Language and Communication* 5:4.265–272. doi:10.1016/0271-5309(85)90021-7
- Carter, Michael G. 2004. *Sibawayhi*. London & New York: I. B. Tauris.

- Carter, Michael G. 2005. "Sibawayhi." *Dictionary of Literary Biography Volume 311: Arabic Literary Culture, 500–925* ed. by Michael Cooperson and Shawkat M. Toorawa, 325–331. Detroit: Thomson Gale.
- Dik, Simon C. 1989. "Functional Grammar and its Relevance to Grammar Writing." *Reference Grammars and Modern Linguistic Theory* ed. by Gottfried Graustein & Gerhard Leitner, 33–55. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. doi:10.1515/9783111354590.33
- Dirven, René. 1989. "Cognitive Linguistics and Pedagogic Grammar." *Reference Grammars and Modern Linguistic Theory* ed. by Gottfried Graustein & Gerhard Leitner, 56–75. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. doi:10.1515/9783111354590.56
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1968. *Anthropological Linguistics: An introduction*. New York: Random House.
- Hārūn, 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad. 1988. See Sibawayhi, Al-Kitāb.
- Ḥasan, 'Abbās. 1968. *Al-Naḥw al-Wāfi*. Vol. II. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1989. "Language Description and General Comparative Grammar." *Reference Grammars and Modern Linguistic Theory* ed. by Gottfried Graustein & Gerhard Leitner, 133–162. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. doi:10.1515/9783111354590.133
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1978. "Prescriptive Grammar: A reappraisal." *Approaches to Language: Anthropological Issues* ed. by William C. McCormack & Stephen A. Wurm, 581–593. The Hague: Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783110800036.581
- Owens, Jonathan. 1993. "Arabic Syntactic Theory." *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research* ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann, Vol. I, 208–215. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Šarīf, Muḥammad 'Abū al-Futūḥ. 1978. See Ibn Bābašād, Naḥwiyya.
- Tomlin, Russell S. 1994. "Functional Grammars, Pedagogical Grammars, and Communicative Language Teaching." *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar* ed. by Terence Odlin, 140–178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524605.009
- Sezgin, Fuat. 1984. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Band IX: *Grammatik*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1991. "The Description and Prescription of Language." *Georgetown University Round Table of Languages and Linguistics 1991* ed. by James E. Alatis, 11–24. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Versteegh, Cornelis H. M. 1977. *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

SUMMARY

Once the need to learn a language arises, grammatical instructional manuals evolve from descriptive grammars of that language. Language description involves the uncovering of the rules of the language from collected data, and teaching those rules is the reason grammatical manuals exist. The most comprehensive descriptive grammar of Arabic is Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* (d. ca.161–94 AH/777–810 A.D.). He includes the rules of Arabic as he deduced them from the language of the Arabs. As time passed and the need to learn Arabic increased, many grammarians started to write grammatical manuals for beginners. Sibawayhi's monumental work was too speculative and highly theoretical for this task and was never suitable for instruction. The descriptiveness of Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* needed to morph into a more approachable grammar. Zağğāğī's *Ġumal* (d. ca.337–340/948–951) and

Ibn Bābašād's *Muqaddima* (d.469/1077) are two instructional manuals that are concise and more suitable for beginners. This study examines how pedagogy in Zaġġāġi's *Ġumal* and Ibn Bābašād's *Muqaddima* evolved from the descriptive rules of Sibawayhi's *Kitāb* through a careful analysis of *istiṭnā* 'exception' rules presented by each grammarian in this study. Although the rules are essentially the same in all three books, presentation and description or lack thereof are sufficiently different illustrating their distinct objectives.

RÉSUMÉ

Quand surgit le besoin d'apprendre une langue, les manuels d'enseignement de la grammaire se développent à partir des grammaires descriptives de cette langue. La description linguistique implique la découverte des règles de la langue à partir des données collectées et l'enseignement de ces règles est la raison pour laquelle les manuels grammaticaux existent. La grammaire descriptive la plus complète de l'arabe est le *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi (m. entre 161 et 194 AH/777–810 ap. J. C.). Il inclut les règles de l'arabe, telles qu'il les déduit de la langue des Arabes. À mesure que le temps passait et que la nécessité d'apprendre l'arabe augmentait, de nombreux grammairiens commencèrent à écrire des manuels grammaticaux pour les débutants. Le travail monumental de Sibawayhi était trop spéculatif et hautement théorique pour cette tâche et n'a jamais été adapté à l'enseignement. Le caractère descriptif du *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi avait besoin de se transformer en une grammaire plus accessible. Le *Ġumal* de Zaġġāġi (m. vers 337–340/948–951) et la *Muqaddima* d'Ibn Bābašād (m. 469/1077) sont deux manuels pédagogiques concis et plus adaptés aux débutants. Cette étude examine comment la pédagogie dans le *Ġumal* de Zaġġāġi et la *Muqaddima* d'Ibn Bābašād a évolué à partir des règles descriptives du *Kitāb* de Sibawayhi par une analyse minutieuse des règles de "l'exception" (*istiṭnā*) présentées par chaque grammairien dans cette étude. Bien que les règles soient essentiellement les mêmes dans les trois ouvrages, la présentation et la description de celles-ci (ou leur absence) sont suffisamment différentes pour illustrer leurs objectifs distincts.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Sobald es notwendig wird, eine Sprache zu erlernen, entstehen Lehrbücher aufgrund beschreibender Grammatiken der Sprache. Während es die Absicht einer Sprachbeschreibung ist, die Regeln der Sprache aufgrund erhobener Sprachdaten aufzudecken, sind Lehrbücher dazu da, diese Regeln zu unterrichten. Die umfangreichste beschreibende Grammatik des Arabischen ist Sibawayhis *Kitāb* (gest. um 161–194 AH / 777–810 A.D.). Das Buch enthält die Regeln des Arabischen, wie der Verfasser sie aus der Sprache der Araber erschlossen hat. Als im Laufe der Zeit das Bedürfnis wuchs, Arabisch zu lernen, begannen Grammatiker, grammatische Lehrbücher für Anfänger zu schreiben. Sibawayhis monumentales Werk war zu spekulativ und theoretisch für diese Aufgabe, und ohnehin war es niemals für den Unterricht geeignet. Die im *Kitāb* vorhandenen ausführlichen Beschreibungen mussten

daher in eine zugängliche Grammatik umgewandelt werden. Zaġġāġis Ġumal (gestorben um 337–340/948–951) und Ibn Bābašāḍs *Muqaddima* (gest. um 469/1077) sind zwei Lehrbücher, die aufgrund ihrer knappen Darstellungen für Anfänger geeignet sind. In diesem Artikel wird untersucht, wie sich Zaġġāġis Ġumal und Ibn Bābašāḍs *Muqaddima* aufgrund der beschreibenden Regeln in Sibawayhis *Kitāb* als didaktische Lehrbücher gestalten. Das Hauptaugenmerk der Analyse richtet sich auf die Weise, wie die beiden Grammatiker Ausnahmen (*istiṭnāʾ*) darstellen. Obwohl die Regeln in allen drei Büchern im Wesentlichen identisch sind, stellt sich heraus, dass die Darstellungen und Beschreibungen unterschiedlich ausfallen, was darauf hinweist, dass die Verfasser jeweils andere Ziele verfolgten.

Author's address

Hana Zabarah
Georgetown University in Qatar
Education City
P.O. Box 23689
DOHA, State of Qatar
zabarahh@georgetown.edu