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

During her Ph.D. research (1992, published in 1995) on the transmission of Sibawayhi’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 2000:8ff.). 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 1995:189ff.). 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 Sibawayhī and al-Mubarrad, namely `Abū l-Ḥasan al-`Aḥfāṣ (d. 215/830), `Abū `Umar al-Jarmī (d. 225/839–840) and `Abū `Uṯmān al-Māzīnī (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 Ḫuṭbat al-wuʿāt (1, 164), `Abū l-Ḥasan `Aḥmad ibn Naṣr's teachings where transmitted by one of Ta'lab's (d. 291/904) disciples, namely `Abū `Umar al-Zāhid. This scholar's full name is Muhammad ibn `Abd al-Wāḥid ibn `Abī Ḥišām `Abū `Umar al-Zāhid (d. 345/956–957), and he was called ḡulām Ta'lab “Ta’lab's young disciple”. The conclusion of Humbert (1993:138) is that the Ambrosiana recension of the Kitāb may have a link with Ta’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 들과 `Abd al-Wāḥid 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 Ḥamad (Kolkata, 1887), the Būlāq edition (Cairo, 1898), the edition by `Abd al-Salām Hārūn (1966–1977) and the edition by Muḥammad Kāẓim al-Bakkā’ (Beirut, 2015). Commercial editions of the Kitāb regularly appear. See for example the edition by Ţūmīl Bādi` Ya’qūb (Beirut, 2009) or
Muhammad Fawzi Hamza (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 Hamza, 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-Zamaḥšari (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).


ii. The edition of Kabīr al-Dīn ʿAlīmad (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-Sīrāfī and al-Šantamaři (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 =

v. The edition of al-Bakkā‘ (Beirut, 2015) is based on Bağdād ‘Awqāf 1351 (dated 1202 according to al-Bakkā‘ and 1204/1789–1790 according to Humbert = Humbert vi0). Al-Bakkā‘ says that he has collated Mawsil 6184 Sā‘īg 14/11 as well as Hārūn’s and Būlāq’s editions. Humbert has not consulted Bağdād ‘Awqāf 1351 and she does not mention the existence of Mawsil 6184 Sā‘īg 14/11. She mentions Sā‘īg 252 (= vi3), 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 20).
- Kolkata for the Kolkata edition by Kabīr al-Dīn ‘Ahmad in 1887.
- Bakkā‘ will refer to the Beirut edition by al-Bakkā‘ in 2015. Any discrepancy mentioned by al-Bakkā‘ between Bağdād ‘Awqāf 1531 used as the base (= Humbert: vi0) and Mawsil 6184 Sā‘īg 14/11 (= Humbert: vi3?) will be mentioned.
- I will follow Humbert and call M1 the first hand in Ambrosiana (5th/11th century?) and M2 the corrector (715/1315).
3.1 Results of the Collation

There are 127 cases where either $M_1$, $M_2$, $A$, $B$ and/or $L$ has a different reading (although collated in the notes, the 66 additional cases where Kolkata and/or al-Bakka’ 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), $M_1$ and $M_2$ disagree. In the other 44 cases (40%), $M_1$ and $M_2$ 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 $M_1$ is opposed to $M_2$: 78 cases (60% of 127 cases)
- $M_1$ vs $M_2$, $A$, $B$, $L$: 65 cases
- $M_1$, $A$ vs $M_2$, $B$, $L$: 4 cases
- $M_1$, $A$, $B$, $L$ vs $M_2$: 4 cases
- $M_1$, $A$, $B$ vs $M_2$, $L$: 1 case
- $M_1$ vs $M_2$, $B$, $L$ vs $A$: 2 cases
- $M_1$ vs $M_2$, $A$ vs $B$, $L$: 1 case
- $M_1$ vs $M_2$ vs $A$, $B$, $L$: 1 case

Cases where $M_1$ and $M_2$ have the same readings, different from the others: 44 cases (40% of 127 cases)
- $M_1$, $M_2$ vs $A$, $B$, $L$: 22 cases
- $M_1$, $M_2$, $B$, $L$ vs $A$: 15 cases
- $M_1$, $M_2$, $A$ vs $B$, $L$: 3 cases
- $M_1$, $M_2$, $A$, $L$ vs $B$: 2 cases
- $M_1$, $M_2$, $A$, $B$ vs $L$: 1 case
- $M_1$, $M_2$, $B$ 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. $M_1$ and $A$ contain the two furthest versions, they differ in 107 cases (84% of all 127 variant cases). $M_2$, which is an attempt to align $M_1$ on the Rabahî recension (represented here by $L$), still differs from $L$ in 33 cases. It also differs from the Zamaḥšarî recension (represented here by $A$) in 50 cases.
On the basis of these three chapters, we can say that M₁ originally contained a very different version from both the Zamaḥšarī and the Rabāḥi recensions, confirming what Humbert had already noted. After correction by M₂, 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 M₁ in our three chapters, if compared with the other variants (A, B and L), not only M₂. The number refers to the footnotes in the critical edition below, where the case is presented in detail.

- 10 cases where M₁ 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 M₁ and were not known to us before: 15, 98 and 168.

- 4 cases where M₁ 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 M₁.

- 1 case where M₁ 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 M₁ 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 M₁ 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 M₁ 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 M₂: 122, 123.

- 1 case where M₂ has a better reading, different from A, B, L and M₁: 81

- 1 case where M₂ has suppressed a series of grammatical examples found in A, B, L and M₁: 91

- 1 case where M₂ has completed a verse that is incomplete in A, B, L and M₁: 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°.4, M2 has struck through six words ('illā fī l-alif wa-l-lām wa-l-alif al-hāfīfa) 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°.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°.18, M2 changed the singular hālihi into the dual hālīhimā, which is the reading of all other versions (see n. 168). The grammatical point at stake here is the modification of the status of īṭnānī in the compound numeral īṭnā–‘ašar. The formulation of the sentence lam tuqayyirū l-īṭnaynī could lead the reader to think that al-īṭnaynī refers to both īṭnay and ‘ašar, not to īṭnay, the first part of the compound, and that the text comments the hāl of both īṭnay and ‘ašar, which is not the case. It only deals with the hāl of īṭnānī, the first part of the compound, with 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 *tāʾ 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 it 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 Sibawayh’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 ʿAbū l-Hasan Ṭālī Ibn Ḥarūf al-Ḥadrāmi (d. ca. 609/1212), kept in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, arabe 6499, which contains a sophisticated critical recension. Even though our understanding of Sibawayh’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 M1, and the corrections of M2 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 M2, A, B, L, Kolkata and al-Bakkā. This means that one can easily see in the text the many cases where M2 has aligned M1 to the ‘Vulgate’, as well as any discrepancy inside this ‘Vulgate’.

The following coding has been used for the corrections done by M2 within the text:

- **words struck through**: M2 simply struck them through.

- **(words put between brackets)**: M2 added brackets instead of striking the words through.

- **deletion marks in the text**: In some cases, M2 added deletion marks above the words to delete. If one word, he added a single mark, similar to the head of a śād ـ above the word to be deleted. When more than one word, M2 added a mark similar to the head of a mim ـ above the first word and a reversed head of a mim 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’āhhar above the first word and the word muqadd-dam above the second one. In the edition, I have simply reproduced them as in: 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°.11). Lastly, I have left in the text the paragraph markers (dāra): 0.

Geminated verbs: Ambrosiana 6iv°.2–63v°.20 = Derenbourg chapter 408–409, 11, 162.1–165.7 = Kolkata 703–707 = Bakkā’ī, 237–241

---

1 M2 added nahwa which was missing in M1 but found in all the other versions collated here. This nahwa 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 sadda, as in al-Sirāfi’s commentary (xiv, 57.9).

3 Kolkata has the erroneous ḵuṣaḍatu.

4 A has wa-sārartu. B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā’ī have wa-dārārtu. M1 has wa-sārartu and M2 did not correct it. Al-Sirāfi’s commentary (Ṣarah xiv, 57.9) has the example ḏarra.

5 Kolkata has wa-tawādaddnā.
فالأعراب مجرون 6 على [6] الإدغام وذلك فيما زعم الخليل 7 في أوهي 8 لأنه ما كان 9 من موضوع واحد
تقلل 7 [على] 10 أن يفرفا ألسنتهم من موضوع ثم يعودوها إلى ذلك الموضوع للحرف 8 الأخر فلا
تقلل عليهم ذلك أرادوا أن يفرفا رقعة واحدة وذلك قوائم رقدي [9] وإجتراء والقحوادة 12 وإسديري
وضارزي 13 زيدا وهم يردادان 14 وإحمار وهو [10] يطمني 15 فإذا كان حرف من هذا
الحروف في موضوع تكن 17 فيه لام الفعل 11 فإن أهل الحجاز يضافون لاتهم أسكنكو الآخر فلعين
بد من تحريك الذي [12] قبله لأنه لا يلتقي ساكان وذلك قولك ارْأَدَه، وإجترأ وإن تضاير أضاؤه
13 وإن استعداد استعددي وكذلك جميع هذه الحروف وينقولوا ارْأَدَه، وإن استعداد اليوم
استعداد اليوم 19 يدعوه على [15] حاله ولا يدرمون لأن هذا التحريك ليس بلازم لها إما حركة
في [16] هذا الموضوع لانتقاء الساكنين وليس الساكن الذي بعده 21 في [17] الفعل منها عليه كانون
ذكروا من المحررين فيسكنون الأو ل ويجرون الآخر 3 لأنهم لا 22 يسكنون جميعا وهو قول غيرهم
من العرب وهم كثير 0 فإذا كان الحرف الذي قبل الحروف الأو ل من الحروف ساكاً أي فيت

6 A has the passive mujma’un. B, L and Bakkā’ have the active mujmi’un. M1 has mujmi’un
and M2 did not correct it. Kolkata is not vocalized.
7 According to Bakkā’, Mawṣil adds rahāmahū Allâh ta‘ālā.
8 M2 added the two words ‘awla bihi that were lacking in M1 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. M1 has the singular kāna
and M2 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 maqṣura and superscript ‘alif.
14 A has the bizarre form yu’raddanāni.
15 Vocalised yutma’ānnu by Derenbourg (according to A, B, L?). Bakkā’ and M1 have the better
vocalization yatma’ānnu, which M2 did not change. Kolkata is not vocalized.
16 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā’ have the more correct hāḍīhi. M1 has hāḏa, and M2 did not
correct this obvious grammatical mistake. Did it escape the attention of the corrector?
17 Kolkata has yaskaunu.
18 Kolkata has urduu.
19 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā’ do not have this al-yawm. It is not found either in al-Sirāfī’s
commentary (Šarh xiv, 58.1). M1 has it and M2 did not correct it.
20 A and Bakkā’ have the less correct harraki’ā. B, L and Kolkata have harraki’ahu. M1 has harra-
ri’ahu and M2 did not modify it.
21 Kolkata has only ba’da, without the suffix pronoun.
22 Not clear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.
فافتحه وإن كان قال الذي يلقى عليه الحركة [7] ألفًا وصلى حدقتها لأنه قد استغني
كما فعل ذلك في رد وفر [12] ولا تُذُّف ألفًا لأن الحرف الذي بعد
فصارت الألف في الإدعو والمزم مثلها [15] في الخير [34] وذلك قولك إطماني وإطمنة أي مثل [16]
فذلك ذلك أخْطَب في الجزم.

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 istağnā, with an ending ‘alif maqṣūra and superscript ‘alif.
26 A is the only one to have the ending vocalization wa-‘in taruddū ‘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 minḥā, 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 ḥajīzān.
31 A has yataharraku. B, L and Bakkā‘ have yataḥawwala. M1 had yataharraku and M2 corrected it to yataḥawwala. The wording is different, but I am not sure whether one is better than the other. The same root in yataḥawwala and hāl 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-qṣā‘arra.
34 Kolkata clearly has wa-‘in tāṣmāyīz “‘aṣmāyīz, with a yā’, which is probably only a spelling issue of the ḥamza.
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.
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 Mi 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 wasl is maintained after assimilation of the repeated consonants).

Kolkata has kāna l-harf alladi, which only makes the expression clearer.

The initial reading of Mi is not correct because al-haraka cannot be the subject of the verb lam tugayyar. 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 wasl will still be needed. All the versions collated here bear the corrected reading of M2.

Kolkata does not have al-‘alif.

Kolkata has yataharrak.

A, B and L do not have this nahwa. Kolkata has it. Bakkā has qawluka instead of nahwa. Mi has nahwa and M2 did not correct it.

Kolkata has nangadda.

According to Bakkā, Mawsil has banāt instead of tabāt.

A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkā have wa-‘idā instead of this wa-‘in. Mi has wa-‘in and Mz did not correct it.

Kolkata has yugayyar.

Kolkata has hādā.

Kolkata has yataharraku.

Kolkata has wa-dālika qawluka.

Kolkata has tataqayyaru.

Vocalised tudārī by Derenbourg (according to A, B, L?) and by Bakkā. Kolkata is not vocalized. Mi has an ending fatha, which Mz 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.

The ‘alif is unclear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.

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

Without li-ʾannahu the text is less easy to read (less correct?) Mi is the only version not to have it.

Kolkata has wa-huwa al-ʾawwal.

Mi had a different particle than all the other versions, with no implication for the meaning or for the quality of the language.

Mi is the only text to have jaʿala before the conjugated verb yuḥarrik, which is a possible construction meaning ‘to begin to’ (see Kitāb 1, 364.20). However, this construction makes no sense here and M2 struck this word through.

Bakkā has an erroneous mā after madmūman.

A: wa-qṣaʿa arra wa-tmaʾinna wa-staʿiddi; B, L and Kolkata: wa-tmaʾinna wa-taʿiddi; Bakkā: wa-qṣaʿa irri wa-tmaʾinna wa-taʿiddi; Mi: wa-ʾamiddi wa-tmaʾinna wa-staʿiddi; M2: wa-tmaʾinna wa-staʿiddi. Mi has an additional example (wa-ʾamiddi) which M2 struck through, and a long ʿalif in wa-tmaʾinna. Mi, M2 did not correct. The additional example ʿamiddi is already found above in 62v6.6–11, 163.9. Although it does not really add to the demonstration at this point, it is consistent with the teaching.

Kolkata has li-ʾanna mā qablahā.

A and Bakkā: fa-hiyaʿ ajdaruʿ an tuftaha; B, L and Kolkata: fa-huwa ajdaruʿ an yuftaha; Mi: fa-hiyaʿ ajdaruʿ an yuftaha; M2: fa-huwa ajdaruʿ an yuftaha. There is no difference in the use of the masculine or the feminine.

Mi had one more example, that M2 rejected by adding a superscript mark above it. This additional example is found nowhere else.

Kolkata has wa-maddanī with a fatḥa on the šadda as if the verb was in the past tense, not the imperative.

The lām and its vocalization is unclear. To be checked on the manuscript.

A, B, L and Bakkā have fa-ʿin. Kolkata and al-Sirāfī’s commentary (Šarh XIV, 61.1) have fa-ʿidā. Mi also has fa-ʿidā and M2 did not correct it.

According to Bakkā, Mawsil adds rahimahu Allāh taʿālā. Kolkata adds rh.

The omission of ʿalif in Mi is clearly a mistake because it misses the very point of the demonstration, namely that the ending fatḥa is like a lightened ʿalif.

A is the only one to have the incorrect ruddān wa-ʾamiddan wa-gullan with tanwin.

L and Bakkā are the only ones to add wa-ʾamiddahā after wa-gullahā.
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-ḥafiṣa which is a clear mistake.
73. Kolkata has taharraka, which also was in M1 before correction by M2. The introduction of the apodosis by fī‘ and the passive form may reflect a higher language standard.
74. Not only has M2 corrected the form in the dactus, 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 ‘aṣlāhi. M1 has al-‘aṣl and M2 did not correct it.
76. A and Bakkā‘ have fī‘ B, I, and Kolkata have ‘alā. M1 has ‘alā 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 Hijāzī majzūm form, and there is no difference with Tamīm in this. This is the rule for all verbs, including non-geminated ones.
78. M3 has struck this gayr through. It is found in no other version collated here.
79. Kolkata has lam tabqa.
80. M1 had a different example, which has been erased by M2. All the versions collated here have qādin.
81. M1 had a different wording. Al-Sīrāfī’s commentary (Ḥarh xiv, 62.9) has a combination of the two readings: ‘iḍā ḫitama’a sākinānī.
82. It is surprising that M2 has struck these words through, because all of A, B, L, Bakkā‘ and al-Sīrāfī’s commentary (xiv, 62.9–10) have them. Kolkata has ‘iḥla fī al-‘alif wa-l-‘alif wa-l-lām al-ḥafiṣa. If it is really the case, as al-Ḥalil says, that these assimilated verbs have been treated like ‘ayna, kawfa and sawfa, i.e. with an invariable ending fatha, then M2 is right to strike these words through because these verbs would take a fatha in all cases, even before a waṣla and an article.
84. Kolkata has ‘udā.

84 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkâ have sami’nâhu. M1 has sami’nâ and M2 has not corrected it. The form sami’nâhu is probably better.
85 A, Kolkata and Bakkâ have turtâ. B and L have turtadâ. M1 has turtadâ 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’uhi, which makes no sense.
87 A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkâ 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 Bakkâ have fa‘atba’u. M1 has wa‘atba’u and M2 has not corrected it.
89 The lâm is unclear. To be checked directly on the manuscript.
90 A, B, L and Bakkâ have wa-kamâ. Kolkata has only kamâ.
91 The text that M2 has put between brackets is found in the matn of A, B, L, Kolkata and Bakkâ, with the variants described above. It could be that M2 considered it to be an added gloss.
92 A, B, L and Bakkâ have ibnimin wa-bnumun wa-bnman. Kolkata has ibnimin ibnumun ibnman. M1 has ibnumun wa-bnimin wa-bnman and M2 did not correct it.
93 M1 did not have the expression ālā ǧālihi, 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 yâ, which is probably a typo, not to be read bi-ja’lihi.
95 The addition of ka‘-iyna 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 Bakkâ have wa-lâ yaksiru halumma. B and L have wa-lâ taksiru halumma. M1 has wa-halumma la yaksiru and M2 has corrected it into wa-lâ yaksiru halumma by adding the two words muʿahhar and muqaddam above the expression. The wording of M1 should probably be read in the passive wa-halumma lâ 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 qala halumma wa-halummi, that M2 added to M1. It modifies the text by adding a condition to the impossibility of an end-
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي. لذا، لا يمكنني تقديم نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي.
١١١ ب، ل و كولكاتا التي فاعِلَ.
١١٢ كولكاتا التي المداد م.
١١٣ مرة، يُتِبَّع، ويُتْبَع، أي، وهو ما وُضِعَ في الآية الأولى.
١١٤ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١١٥ حسب بكتا، موضِع، يُرِى، يُرِى، وهو ما وُضِعَ في الآية الأولى.
١١٦ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١١٧ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١١٨ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١١٩ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٠ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢١ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٢ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٣ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٤ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٥ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٦ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٧ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
١٢٨ كولكاتا هي المداد م.
يشكوُ الوحي من أَنْتَيِّلَ وَأَظَلَلَ
[٢٠]
وهذا النحو في الشعر كثير


١٣٠ A has našku; B has yašku; L, Kolkata, Bakkā’ and al-Sirāfī’s commentary (Šarh xiv, 65.6) have tašku (Kolkata even has an ending ‘ālf as in plural verbs). M1 has yašku and M2 has not corrected it.

١٣١ Kolkata has only hādā without the wāw.

١٣٢ Kolkata has taqā’u.

١٣٣ Kolkata has li-l’-adād.

١٣٤ Kolkata has jāwazat.

١٣٥ M1 did not have this lahu. All the versions collated here have it, and M2 added it to the text. It is not found in al-Sirāfī’s commentary (Šarh xiv, 116.7).

١٣٦ M1 has struck through these words that are repeated in M1, probably due to the similarity between the words tabayyana and bānīn. It is surprising that M1 did not correct himself, considering that the text stops abruptly (allašihiya alāmā) before continuing with the correct text. If M1 had noticed the error, why didn’t he erase the passage and rewrite over it?

١٣٧ Kolkata has ‘aw hamsatu.

١٣٨ M2 has added dā and a collation mark in the margin.

١٣٩ A, B, L, Bakkā’ and Kolkata have wa’-in. M1 had fa’-dā which M2 corrected into fa’-in.

١٤٠ A, B and Bakkā’ have the plural. L and Kolkata have a singular. M1 had a plural, which M2 corrected it into a singular.

١٤١ M1 is the only one to have this lahu and M2 did not correct it. A, B, L, Bakkā’ and Kolkata do not have it.

١٤٢ M1 is the only version that did not have hādā but only dā. M2 has added the ha’.

١٤٣ M1 had the form al-ašara which M2 corrected into al-aṣr. It is consistent with the exam-
plies dealt with here to use the form 'aṣr, since the text is dealing with feminine counted objects. But it is more common to use the forms with a ṭāʾ 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 jamālān.

145 M2 has erased the word that was initially found in M1 and replaced it by 'alif, which is the reading found in all the versions collated here. According to al-Sirāfī in his commentary (Samālī, 149.14–123.2), some people thought that the expression layya fi ʾaṣar 'alif was a mistake and that what was intended was layya fi ʾaṣar ḏāʾ (i.e. ṭāʾ marbūṭa). Al-Sirāfī comments by saying that Sibawayhi intends here to correct the erroneous dialectal forms such as ʾaḥādā ʾaṣar, with a long 'alif. M1 had another reading, which is unfortunately lost.

146 A, Bakka and al-Sirāfī's commentary (XIV, 117.6) have harfānī. B, L and Kolkata have ismān. M1 had harfānī, which M2 corrected into ismān. 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 ʾaṣara before coalescence in the compound numeral, whereas M2 corrected it in the actual form -ʾaṣar, after coalescence, which is the reading of all the collated versions.

148 A and Bakka have the plural yuğayyirū. 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 ǧayr, which is a clear misunderstanding of the text (or simply a typo).

152 In our three chapters, haytū (6 times) and ḥīna (twice) are apparently interchangeable. In addition to these eight cases, we see here that M1 replaces haytū in M1 by ḥīna, which is the reading of all the other versions. And in another case, see note 180, M1 and M2 agree on haytū against most of the versions, that have ḥīna.

153 M2 replaces the expression al-ʾidda lam tunjāwiz by al-ʾadad lam yuġāwiz, which is the reading of all the other versions. In this chapter, ʾadad is found 5 other times, and ʾidda, also 5 other times, both words being eventually associated with the verb jāwasa.

154 Kolkata has wa-ʾiddā.

155 Same kind of correction as described in notes 143 and 147. When mentioning the form alone, M1 systematically prefers the isolated form with ṭāʾ marbūṭa rather than the forms that actually appear in the examples discussed.

156 Bakka has fa-ṣādū ʾaḥadān where the initial wāw and 'alif in wāhīd were confused with the plural mark in the verb.

157 The omission of the expression ka-annamā qulta in M1 makes the text difficult to follow, if not incorrect.

158 M1 had a different example from all the versions collated here. Unfortunately, M2 has erased it and the original word is not readable any more. In his commentary, al-Sirāfi (Šarh xiv, 119.4) has the same example, nabīqa.

159 M1 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-Sirāfi (Šarh xiv, 119.5) has the same example, tamra.

161 Kolkata has the erroneous form humāni.

162 A and Bakka’ have munfaridatan. B, L and Kolkata have mufradatan. M1 had munfaridatan, which M2 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 Bakka’ has fa-‘in. M1 has fa-‘in, which M2 did not correct.

164 M2 has struck through these words, which are repeated in M1, with no apparent explanation.

165 A, B, L, Bakka’ and Kolkata have wa-‘inna. M1 has fa-‘inna, which M2 did not correct.

166 A has the incorrect itnā.

167 A, B, L, Bakka’ and Kolkata have the singular lam tugayir. M1 has a plural, which M2 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 M2 has corrected the singular of M1 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 ‘asār.

169 Same correction as described above in notes 143, 147 and 155.

170 M2 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 Bakka’ have harf ʿirāb, without the article.

172 M2 has inserted a deletion mark above hāluhu. The text was actually easier to follow in M1.

173 This mā is not found in A, B, L and Bakka’. It is found only in Kolkata. M1 has it and M2 did not correct it.
174 M1 corrected ‘ida by ‘in. Above, see note 139, it was the other way round. Altogether, ‘ida 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 tinta. Apparently, M1 had the same form itnatā ‘aśira twice. M2 has erased the wasla in the first occurrence, turning the example into tinta ‘aśira, which is present in all the other versions.

177 M2 had a missing ta’ 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 itnataymi.

180 A, B, L and Bakka have hina. Kolkata is the only one to have ḥaytu. M1 has ḥaytu 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 Bakka have fa nähwu hādā. Kolkata has wa nähwu hādā. M1 has wa nähwu dā and M2 did not correct it. No reading can really be said to be better than the others.

184 Kolkata has the erroneous urāda.

185 Kolkata has al-karf alladhi al-awwal.

186 A has lam yuyāwīs. And Kolkata has lam yatajāwāz.

187 M2 corrected the expression fa-min dālika by wa-dālika, 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 ābdan, which is found in all the other versions. Without it, the example is still understandable, although less clear.
A Primary Sources
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190 A has lam yujāwiz. Kolkata has lam yatajāwaz.
191 A has bayna ’ihdā wa-talātīna, which makes no sense, instead of ba’dā ’ihdā wa-ṣītayni.
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 Bakkāʾ have fa-farraqū. B, L and Kolkata have farraqū. M1 had fa-farraqū but M2 corrected it to farraqū. The reading with faʾ 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.
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