Occurrences of the Term *Sa'at al-Kalām* in Arabic Grammatical Descriptions

Abdelnaser Jabarin and Yehudit Dror
University of Haifa

Abstract

The term *sa'at al-kalām* "latitude of speech" is usually associated with three syntactic structures: (1) deletion of a syntactic constituent, (2) adverbs of time and place functioning as direct object, and (3) verbal nouns functioning as direct objects. This article reveals some other syntactic structures which Arab grammarians consider cases of *sa'at al-kalām*, such as word order, agreement, a syntactic constituent which has two possibilities of vowelizing, and various cases of deletion other than the most identified case with *sa'at al-kalām*, which is *wa-s'ali l-qaryata* "Ask the people of the village." Furthermore, it is indicated that *sa'at al-kalām* has nothing to do with semantic and syntactic disorder, but with the existence of two possible syntactic structures, for example, unmarked word order vs. marked word order or syntactic agreement vs. semantic agreement.

Keywords: latitude of speech, marked and unmarked word order, deep and surface structure, ellipsis, poetic necessity, syntactic options, discourse, semantic agreement, Sībawayhi

1. Introduction

The notion *sa'at al-kalām* and the related terms *'ittisā' al-kalām* or *tawassu' al-kalām* are constructed of two components. The first is a verbal noun which literally means "width," "extension" or "spaciousness." The grammatical term *kalām* is far clearer because sometimes the grammarians refer to *jumla* as *kalām* and sometimes it indicates "speech." The term *kalām* occurs at least 666 times in *al-Kitāb* of Sībawayhi, where it has several references: (a) to the speech of the entire community, (b) to everyday speech which has a normative syntactic structure, (c) to a sequence of segments in contrast to isolated segments (for

example, the occurrence of subject without its predicate would not be considered *kalām*), and (d) to the whole or to a part of an expression (accordingly, when Sībawayhi refers to the preposition *ḥattā* "until," he explains that it cannot stand in an initial position and is always preceded by a part of an utterance *ʿalā l-kalāmi llaḏī qablahā*) (Talmon 1988:74, 82-85). In some Arabic sources the term *saʿa* or *ʾittisāʿ* refers to a characteristic of the Arabic language that implies "spaciousness" or "richness" (Dayyeh 2015:67). The use of synonyms exemplifies the "richness" of Arabic language, as Quṭrub explains: *ʾinnamā ʾardafati l-ʿarabu bi-l-lafẓayni ʿalā l-maʿnā l-wāḥidi li-yadullū ʿalā ttisāʿihim fī kalāmihim* "The Arabs [use] two synonyms that indicate one [the same] meaning to imply the spaciousness of their language" (al-Ghūl 2008:12).[1]

       If *kalām* can refer to speech, prose, sentence, clause, segment, or part of a sentence, and *ʾittisāʿ* means "spaciousness," how may we interpret the expression *saʿat al-kalām*? Versteegh excluded translating this expression as "freedom of the speaker" because after examining this feature in Sībawayhi's book, *al-Kitāb*, he concluded that it was not connected to the speaker's individual freedom but was connected to three specific syntactic structures: (1) *wa-sʾali l-qaryata* (Q 12: 82) "Ask the people of the village," where the *nomen rectum ʾahl* is deleted and *al-qarya* takes its syntactic position and becomes the direct object of the verb (Versteegh 1990:281);[2] (2) using adverbials of time and place as direct objects, which allows them to function as a subject when a passive verb is involved, e.g., *ṣīda ʿalayhi yawmāni* "It was mounted for the hunt for two days" (Versteegh 1990:281) (see also section 2.3);[3] (3) using a verbal noun as the direct object of a verb. Thus the verbal noun may serve as the subject of a verbal predicate which is formed as a passive verb; e.g., *ḍuriba ḍarbun shadīdun* "Two forceful blows were struck" (Versteegh 1990:281).

       According to Dayyeh (2015:68-70, 72), in *al-Kitāb* of Sībawayhi *saʿat al-kalām* is associated with semantic and syntactic disorders which can be classified into three types. The first type is related to strange semantic usage; for example, *ʾadkhaltu fī l-qalansuwati raʾsī* "I put my head into the cup" (see Section 2.3 case no. 5). Under the second type, Dayyeh classifies cases such as *hādhā yawmu yaqūmu zaydun* "This is the day Zayd gets up." The meaning in this case is clear, but its form is unusual since the verb is annexed to a noun. The third type is closely related to brevity (*ʾikhtiṣār*) and it involves disorder in the relation

---

[1] Cf. Dayyeh (2015:67).

[2] Cf. Versteegh (1994:279); Owens (1988:191) al-Ghūl (2008:16-18); ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (2015:12-20).

[3] Cf. Fleischer (1968: vol. I, 704).

between meaning and form. Three structures can be categorized under the third type: *wa-s'ali l-qaryata* (Q 12: 82) "Ask the village" (see Section 2.4 case 4), *ṣīda ʿalayhi yawmāni* "It was mounted for the hunt for two days" (see Section 2.3), and *sīra ʿalayhi maqdama l-ḥajji* "It was traveled on, upon the arrival of the pilgrims" (see Section 2.4 case 4). Dayyeh (2015:70) summarizes the occurrence of these three types thus: "The notion of *'ittisāʿ* is associated with a certain flexibility that justifies and allows for disorders in the meaning and/or form of certain utterances. Sībawayhi's use of the term, throughout *al-Kitāb*, refers to a process in which the speaker is allowed to form uncommon structures yet maintain the intended meaning. *'Ittisāʿ* justifies the speaker's extended linguistic usage. Justification of the disorder in various structures by using statements like *li-saʿat al-kalām* or *li-ttisāʿihim* indicates that the term *'ittisāʿ* in *al-kitāb* of Sībawayhi can be considered a cause (*ʿilla*) for such structures. However, in later grammatical descriptions the term *'ittisāʿ* was not recognized as *ʿilla*" (Dayyeh 2015:70-72). al-Mubarrid for example uses this term when referring to cases where adverbs of time and place function as nouns. as-Sarrāj identifies *'ittisāʿ* as a specific type of deletion, where a verbal noun or an adverb occupies the position of the deleted agent (*fāʿil*) (Dayyeh 2015:73-74).[4]

Marogy (2010:86) translates the term *saʿat al-kalām* as "latitude of speech" when she refers to motivated reduction, namely this term is related to brevity or deletion. Marogy explains that due to *saʿat al-kalām* the speaker may delete a specific component without damaging the intelligibility of the utterance. For example, in the case of *wa-s'ali l-qaryata* "Ask the village" the speaker permits himself to delete the noun *'ahl* "people" because he knows that the listener is capable of reconstructing the deleted component and interpreting this utterance as "Ask the people of the village." Baalbaki (2008:204) states that the restriction on all the constructions regarded by Sībawayhi as *saʿat al-kalām* is lack of ambiguity (*labs*). For example in the utterance *ṣīda ʿalayhi yawmāni* "It was mounted for the hunt for two days," although *yawmāni* is in the nominative the speaker can understand that its meaning is adverbial and the utterance should be interpreted as "It was mounted for the hunt in/for two days."

Reading the grammatical descriptions, we noticed that the term *saʿat al-kalām* was associated with additional structures and examples other than those noted by the aforementioned scholars. So our goals in this paper are first, to examine these structures, and based on our findings to suggest a different definition for the term *saʿat al-kalām*.

---

[4] Cf. al-Ghūl (2008:19-20).

2. Cases of *Sa'at al-Kalām*

2.1 *Sa'at al-kalām* and concord issues

Sībawayhi mentions the sentence *'ijtama'at 'ahlu l-yamāmati* "The people of Yamāma gathered together," while it seems that the structure should be *'ijtama'ati l-yamāmatu* "The tribe (fem. sg.) of Yamāma gathered together" or *'ijtama'a 'ahlu l-yamāmati* "The people (collective noun) of Yamāma gathered together." According to Sībawayhi, the verb *'ijtama'at* is in the feminine because it agrees syntactically with the word *al-yamāmati*, a noun in the singular feminine. This structure is considered a case of *sa'at al-kalām* (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 53).[5] In general, two types of agreement might be considered. The first is syntactic agreement, where the related syntactic components agree fully with the noun regarding determination or indetermination, gender, number and case. The second type indicates that the agreement involves the semantics of the noun. Syntactic agreement is exhibited in the sentence *jā'ati l-qaryatu* [lit.] "The village came," while it is intended that "The people of the village came." However, in the example *hādhihi 'amrun* "This (fem.sg) is 'Amr" (masc.sg.) – an agreement pattern that is also allowed due to *sa'at al-kalām* – the semantic agreement is demonstrated because the meaning implied by this structure is *hādhihi l-kalimatu smu 'amrin* "This word is the name of 'Amr" (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 3, 269).

Note in this context that al-'Anbārī points out some exceptional cases of agreement, such as the verbs *ni'ma* and *bi'sa*. These verbs may be in singular masculine even though they are followed by a noun in singular feminine. However, he stresses that these are exceptional cases, while structures such as *qāma l-mar'atu* "The woman stood up" or *qa'ada l-jāriyatu* "The slave-girl sat down," where the verb in singular masculine is followed by a noun in singular feminine, are not even allowed in the so-called feature of *sa'at al-kalām*; i.e., these structures are syntactically ill-formed (al-'Anbārī 2003: vol. 1, 88). This explanation is valuable for understanding the term *sa'at al-kalām* because it specifically clarifies that ill-formed structures, such as incorrect agreement structures, cannot be explained as *sa'at al-kalām*. As we shall explain later, *sa'at al-kalām* can be used only when a syntactic structure has a marked and unmarked form/deep and surface structure. In a case such as *qa'ada l-jāriyatu* only one option exists for structuring this sentence, therefore putting the verb in masculine instead of feminine will simply generate a non-grammatical structure.

---

[5] Cf. as-Sīrāfī (1974: vol. 1, 97).

2.2 Saʿat al-Kalām and Separation of the Annexation's Components

Cases of *faṣl* (i.e., separating the *muḍāf* from the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* by interposing a "foreign" syntactic element between them) is, according to the Baṣra school, usually recorded in poetry where an adverb (of time or place) is introduced between the two annexation components, as in *humā ʾikhwatun fī l-ḥarbi man lā ʾakhā lahu* "They are the brothers in war of him who has no brother" (Ibn Yaʿīsh 1994: vol. 3, 19).[6] On the other hand, grammarians of the Kūfa school argue that syntactic elements other than adverbs might be inserted between the two annexation components, as in *fa-zajajtuhā bi-mizajjatin zajja l-qalūṣa ʾabī mazādah* "I stabbed her with a short lance, as ʾAbu Mazādah stabs the she-camel." In this verse the direct object *l-qalūṣa* is introduced between the *muḍāf* (with *zajja* verbal noun in the accusative case) and the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* (*ʾabī mazādah*). This verse should be reconstructed as *fa-zajajtuhā bi-mizajjatin zajja ʾabī mazādah l-qalūṣa* (al-ʾAnbārī 2003: vol. 2, 427-428, 431).[7] According to Ibn Hishām, the separation between the *muḍāf* and the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* is allowed because of *saʿat l-kalāmi* (Ibn Hishām 1971: vol. 3, 185). He mentions, for example, *wa-ka-dhālika zayyana li-kathīrin mina l-mushrikīna qatla ʾawlādihim shurakāʾuhum* (Q 6:137) **"**And thus their associates made the killing of their children fair-seeming to most of the polytheists**."** The verb *zayyana* functions as a verbal predicate, *šurakāʾuhum* is the subject and the annexation structure *qatla ʾawlādihim* functions as the direct object of the verbal predicate. However, by Ibn ʿĀmir's interpretation, the clause should be read *wa-ka-dhālika zuyyina li-kathīrin mina l-mushrikīna qatlu ʾawlādahum shurakāʾihim* **"**And the killing of the associates' children was made fair-seeming to most of the polytheists**."** In this version, the annexation has a marked structure because the direct object (*ʾawlādahum*) separates the *muḍāf* (*qatlu*) from the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* (*shurakāʾihim*).[8] Using the marked structure rather than the unmarked structure (*qatlu shurakāʾihim ʾawlādahum*) is allowed according to Ibn Hishām due to *saʿat al-kalām*.

Additional syntactic components which can be introduced between the *muḍāf* and the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* due to *saʿat al-kalām* are:

- Expressions of oath; e.g., *hādhā ghulāmu wa-llāhi zaydin* "By God! This is a servant of Zayd."

---

[6] Cf. al-ʾAstarābādhī (1988: vol. 2, 278-279); Ibn Hishām (1971: vol. 3, 181-183); as-Suyūṭī (1989: vol. 4, 293-294).

[7] Cf. al-ʾAstarābādhī (1988: vol. 2, 289-290).

[8] Cf. az-Zamakhsharī (1988: vol. 2, 400-401); ar-Rāzī (1981: vol. 13, 216-217).

- Vocative; e.g., *ka-ʾanna birdhawna ʾabā ʿiṣāmin zaydin ḥimārun duqqa bi-l-lijāmi* "As if the workhorse of Zayd, O ʾAbū ʿIṣām, were a beautiful donkey which was adorned with reins." This verse should be structured as *ka-ʾanna birdhawna zaydin yā ʾabā ʿiṣāmin ḥimārun duqqa bi-l-lijāmi* (Ibn Hishām 1971: vol. 3, 185, 194).[9]

- The adjective of the *muḍāf ʾilayhi* can be introduced between the annexation components, as in *mini bni ʾabī shaykhi l-ʾabāṭiḥi ṭālibin*, where the order should be *mini bni ʾabī ṭālibin šaykhi l-ʾabāṭiḥi* "from Ibn Abū Ṭālib, the chief of the wide valleys [of Mecca]" (ash-Shāṭibī 2007: vol. 4, 174).[10]

Since this section indirectly covers issues of word order, it is necessary to mention in this context that in some specific cases the grammarians clearly state that incorrect grammatical structures cannot be explained by the term *saʿat al-kalām*. For example, Ibn Hishām states that a governed element (*maʿmūl*) cannot precede its governor (*ʿāmil*) due to *saʿat al-kalā*. However, we might find structures where an additional syntactic component is introduced between the (*ʿāmil*) and its governed element (*maʿmūl*), for example, when the subject is indefinite and the predicate is a prepositional phrase; e.g., *ʾinna fī dhālika la-ʿibratan li-man yakhshā* (Q 79: 26) "Verily, in this is an instructive admonition for whomsoever fears Allah" (Ibn Hishām n.d: vol. 1, 264).

2.3 *Saʿat al-kalām* and the existences of two options of *ʾiʿrāb*

(1) The sentence *man ʾanta zaydan* "Who are you [mentioning] Zayd?" should be reconstructed as *man ʾanta tadhkuru zaydan* "Who are you [who] mention Zayd?" but the verb *tadhkuru* was omitted due to *kathrati l-kalām*, namely the speaker uses this structure frequently. However, some people express this sentence by putting the noun *zaydan* in the nominative case, as if stating *man ʾanta dhikruka zaydun* "Who are you whose statement is Zayd?" where *zayd* functions as a predicate of the deleted verbal noun. Though the first option, where *zayd* in the accusative is the preferable option, the second option is allowed due to *saʿat al-kalām* (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 292).

---

[9] Cf. Ibn ʿAqīl (1984: vol. 2, 73); al-ʾAshmūnī (1995: vol. 1, 327-328).

[10] Cf. as-Suyūṭī (1989: vol. 4, 296-297); aṣ-Ṣabbān (1997: vol. 2, 420).

(2) Sībawayhi mentions several examples in a chapter entitled *mā yukhtāru fīhi r-rafʿuʾidhā dhakarta l-maṣdara lladhī yakūnu ʿilājan* "[The cases in which] the nominative case is chosen when you use a verbal noun for remedy."[11] In the sentence *lahu ṣawtun ṣawtun ḥasanun* "He has a voice, a good/beautiful voice" the second noun *ṣawtun* and its adjective *ḥasanun* are in the nominative because this noun phrase has the same meaning and the same syntactic function as an adjective; i.e., the sentence can be paraphrased *lahu ṣawtun ḥasanun* "He has a good/beautiful voice." Another explanation for the nominative is that the expression *ṣawtun ḥasanun* is used for emphasis (*taʾkīd*). In both cases the expression *ṣawtun ḥasanun* refers to the first noun *ṣawtun*. However, in the sentence *lahu ṣawtun ṣawtu ḥimārin* "He has a voice, the voice of a donkey," the expression *ṣawtu l-ḥimāri* does not have the same reference as *ṣawtun*; therefore, the structure of this sentence should be *lahu ṣawtun ṣawta ḥimārin*, where *ṣawta ḥimārin* functions as a type of *mafʿūl muṭlaq li-t-tabyīn* "infinite indicating specification." The nominative case is allowed due to *saʿat al-kalām* as one may say *mā ʾanta ʾillā sayrun* instead of *mā ʾanta ʾillā sayran*, where the verbal noun *sayr* functions as the objective complement of the deleted verb *tasīru* (*mā ʾanta ʾillā tasīru sayran* "Thou dost nothing but journey a journey") (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 363).

(3) The sentence *hādhā rajulun ʿāqilun labībun* "This is an intelligent sensible man" is a classic case where two adjectives are joined together. However, the nominative case of these two adjectives indicates that they agree with the preceding noun in gender, number and case, but also that these two adjectives are simultaneous; i.e., the one who expressed this statement intended to say that this man is at the same time intelligent and sensible. It is also possible, however, to put the second adjective in the accusative due to *saʿat al-kalām*, as in the sentence *hādhā rajulun sāʾirun rākiban dābbatahu* "This is a man moving/traveling and riding an animal." According to Sībawyhi, the accusative case does not necessarily indicate that the two adjectives are not simultaneous (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 2, 51).

(4) In the following examples given by Sībawayhi (1988: vol. 1, 337), the verbal noun may function as an object complement of a deleted verb, or it might be in the nominative (note

---

[11]The term *ʿilājan* literally means "remedy," but in this context it means that the verbal noun is the most appropriate syntactic component, syntactically and semantically, in a particular utterance.

the examples are different from cases such as *ḍuriba ḍarbun shadīdun* "A forceful blow was struck" where the verbal noun functions as *nāʾib al-fāʿil* "the placeholder of the agent" in passive sentences). In the verse *ʾa-lam taʿlam musarraḥiyya l-qawāfī…fa-lā ʿiyyan bihinna wa-la jtilāba* "Do you not know my ability in reciting poetr?/There is no exhaustion during the reciting and no need to take poetic verses from other people," the second part of the verse should be restored as *fa-ʾanā lā ʾaʿyā ʿiyyan bihinna wa-la ʾajtalibuhā jtilāban* "I do not get tired during the reciting and I do not need to take poetry from other people." Another example is *ʾa-lam taʿlam yā fulānu masīrī fa-ʾitʿāban wa-ṭarda*[n] "Do you not know my way?/Then it is continuous with fatigue and expulsion." In both examples one may put the verbal noun in the nominative due to *saʿat al-kalām*, while the verbal noun will function as a nominal predicate: *fa-lā* (*huwa*) *ʿiyyun wa-lā* (*huwa*) *jtilābun* "Reciting the poetry is not a burden [for me] and not 'importing' verses from others" and *fa-huwa ʾitʿābun wa-ṭardun* "[my path is] exhaustion and expulsion" (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 336). The last example is *la-ʿamrī wa-mā dahrī bi-taʾbīni hālikin…wa-lā jazaʿin mimmā ʾaṣāba fa-ʾawjaʿā* "By my life! It is not the time to eulogize a deceased person/There is no apprehension as to what hit him/caused his loss and hurt him." The verbal noun *jazaʿin* is in the genitive because here it means *wa-mā dahrī dahru jazaʿin* "My time is not a time of apprehension." However, it is also possible to put the verbal noun in the accusative by explaining that this verse should be reconstructed as *wa-la ʾajzaʿu jazaʿan* "I am not apprehensive," and after deleting the verb a verbal noun in the accusative will remain (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 337).

(5) To clarify the next case we should first refer to the example that is most closely identified with *saʿat al-kalām*, namely the use of adverbs as direct objects. This is seen in the verse *yawman shahidnāhu sulayma wa-ʿāmiran…qalīlun siwā ṭ-ṭaʿni n-nihāli nawāfiluhu* "On the day we saw Sulaym and ʿĀmir (two tribes of *qays ʿīlān*)/The booty [on this day] is very small, but the stabbings of the bloodletting lances [are many]." The suffixed pronoun *–hu* in *shahidnāhu* which refers to *yawm* functions as a direct object. Had it functioned as an adverb of time the clause should have been structured as *yawman shahidnā fīhi* "A day on which we saw" (al-Warrāq 1999: vol. 1, 282). This rule regarding using adverbs as direct objects is summarized clearly by al-Warrāq: *wa-ʿlam ʾanna ẓ-ẓurūfa matā ʾaradta ʾan tuqīmahā maqāma l-fāʿili fa-la budda min ʾan tukhrijahā min ḥukmi ẓ-ẓarfi wa-tajʿalahā mafʿūlātin ka-zaydin wa-ʿamrin ʿalā saʿati l-kalāmi…fa-ʾidhā jaʿalta ẓ-ẓarfa mafʿūlan ʿalā saʿati l-kalāmi ʾaḍmartahu ka-mā tuḍmiru l-mafʿūla fa-qulta: al-yawmu*

qumtuhu ka-mā taqūlu zaydun ḍarabtuhu (al-Warrāq 1999: vol. 1, 281-282) "Know that the adverbs, when you intend to place them instead of the agent you should remove them from their function as adverbs and make them direct objects similar to the nouns Zayd and ʿAmr [which can function as direct objects] and that is due to *saʿati l-kalāmi* … and by using the adverb as a direct object due to *saʿati al-kalāmi* you could replace it by a pronoun just as you replace a noun with a pronoun saying: the day, I was [found] in it [i.e., on that day], just as you say Zayd, I saw him." It seems that this rule is primarily applied in passive sentences for the following reason: in some cases, when an active sentence is changed into a passive sentence there is no other syntactic component except the adverb which can function as its subject. However, since an adverb cannot function as *nāʾib fāʿil*, it must first be changed into a direct object and then it can function as a subject in the nominative. For example, *sīra ʿalayhi yawmāni* means "It was walked for two days" and *sīra bi-zaydin farsakhāni yawmayni* "Zayd was gone traveling a long journey of two *farsakh* (a measure of length) over two days," where the adverb *farsakhāni* acts as the subject, or *sīra bi-zaydin farsakhayni yawmāni* "Zayd was gone traveling a long journey of two *farsakh* (a measure of length) over two days," where the adverb *yawmāni* acts as the subject (Ibn as-Sarrāj: n.d., vol. 1, 202). It is worth mentioning here that Arab grammarians emphasize that using an adverb of place as a direct object is not always possible. Thus, the structures *sakantu d-dāra* "I lived at the house" or *dakhaltu d-dāra* "I entered the house" are examples of *saʿat al-kalām* because the preposition is omitted and *dār*, which acts as the direct object, is a specified place (*makān mukhtaṣṣ*). However, Arab grammarians regard structures such as *nimtu l-bayta* "I slept [in] the house" as ungrammatical, hence inadmissible as cases of *saʿat al-kalām* because the verb *nāma* is intransitive and requires a preposition to take an indirect object. Similarly, it would be a mistake to say *qaraʾtu d-dāra* when it means *qaraʾtu fī d-dāri* "I read in the house" (al-Jawjarī 2004: vol. 2, 438-439).[12] Sībawayhi (1988: vol. 1, 181) mentions using an adverb as a direct object, which can then function as the subject of a passive verb. He supplies these examples: *ʾudkhila fūhu l-ḥajara* "The stone was introduced into his mouth" instead of *ʾudkhila fāhu l-ḥajaru*, and *ʾadkhaltu fī raʾsī l-qalansuwata* instead of *ʾadkhaltu fī l-qalansuwati raʾsī* "I put my head into the hat." It was previously mentioned that according to Dayyeh (2015:68), the term *saʿat al-kalām* is usually associated with syntactic and semantic disorders, as is shown by the two foregoing examples. Both structures are correct

---

[12] Cf. Ibn Hishām (n.d.: vol. 2, 208); al-ʾAshmūnī (1995: vol. 1, 486).

but the meaning is not: one inserts one's head or the stone into the hat or the mouth, not the reverse. Missing from Dayyeh's explanation, however, is that Sībawayhi discusses these examples to distinguish cases where two options of morpho-syntactic analysis of a word (*'i'rāb*) exist due to *sa'at al-kalām* from cases where an adverb is used as a direct object due to *sa'at al-kalām* in order to serve as subject. Namely, according to Sībawayhi the words *fūhu* and *ra'sī*, are not adverbs like *layl* and *yawm*. Still, these four nouns have one thing in common: all four can have more than one syntactic function due to *sa'at al-kalām* (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 181). A further example provided by Sībawayhi is the verse *tarā th-thawra fīhā mudkhila ẓ-ẓilli ra'sahu...wa-sā'iruhu bādin 'ilā sh-shamsi 'ajma'u* "You see the bull puts his head into the shade/And the rest of his body wholly stays under the sun." The noun *ra'sahu* is in the accusative due to *sa'at l-kalām* although it should be in the genitive *mudkhila ra'sihi* (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 181). Thus, the noun *ra's* has nothing to do with adverbs, but it may have two options of morpho-syntactic analysis.

2.4 *Sa'at al-kalām* and deletion

(1) First let us consider a case where, contrary to expectations, no deletion occurs. *'A-lam ya'tīka wa-l-'anbā'u tanmī bi-mā lāqat labūnu banī ziyādi* "Did the news not reach you when it spread out [among the people] regarding the thing from which the animals that give milk and belong to the people of Ziyād suffer?" Of concern for us here is the verb *ya'tīka*, which is preceded by the particle lam; therefore, the verb should be in the jussive *ya'tika*, where the last radical letter should be omitted. as-Suyūṭī (1989: vol. 1, 205) explains that this verb form is also acceptable when it is regarded as a case of *ḍarūrat ash-shi'r* "poetic license." Interestingly, he adds that this form is allowed or acceptable: *fī sa'ati l-kalāmi wa-'innahu lughatun li-ba'ḍi l-'arabi*. It is inferred from this explanation that in this case *sa'at al-kalām* may be understood as the existence of two options for writing or pronouncing the word, and accords with the people's spoken dialect. As for the Qur'ānic verse *dhālika mā kunnā nabghi* (Q 18:64) "That is what we have been seeking," as-Suyūṭī states that al-Farrā' allows the deletion of the final radical due to *sa'at al-kalām* and there is a great number of such cases in Arabic. However, in the same context as-Suyūṭī refers to 'Abū Ḥayyān stating that there is no dispute among the grammarians that *'alif maqṣūra* can be deleted only due to *ḍarūrat ash-shi'r* "poetic license," for example, *rahṭu marjūmin wa-rahṭu bni l-mu'al* (instead of *al-mu'alā*) "The people of Marjūm and the people of Mu'alā" (as-Suyūṭī 1989: vol. 3, 429). We see that deleting the last radical

10

letter occurs in poetry and prose. Therefore it might be argued that if this feature occurs in poetry it is explained by the term *ḍarūrat ash-shi'r* and if it occurs in texts other than poetry it is considered *sa'at al-kalām*.

(2) The deletion of the particle *fa-* is allowed due to poetic license (*ḍarūrat ash-shi'r*), for example, *fa-'ammā l-qitālu lā qitāla ladaykum wa-lākinna sayran fī 'irāḍi l-mawākibi* "As for the fight, there is no fight among you but journey/walk toward a group of riders and walkers" (al-Mubarrid 1994: vol. 2, 71).[13] as-Suyūṭī (1989: vol. 4, 356) however adds that the particle *fa-* can be deleted in cases other than poetry, and the deletion will be explained as *sa'at al-kalām*. The deletion is allowed only when there is a deleted utterance (*qawlun maḥdhūfun*), as in *fa-'ammā lladhīna swaddat wujūhuhum 'a-kafartum ba'da 'īmānikum* (Q 3:106) "As for those whose faces will become black (to them will be said): Did you reject the Faith after accepting it?" The complete verse should be reconstructed as *fa-'ammā lladhīna swaddat wujūhuhum fa-yuqālu lahum 'a-kafartum ba'da 'īmānikum* "As for those whose faces will become black (to them will be said): Did you reject your Faith after accepting it?"

(3) The classical case where *sa'at al-kalām* is involved in deletion or abbrevation (*'ikhtiṣār*) is the construction of *wa-s'ali l-qaryata* "Ask the people of the village" (Q 12:82). Versteegh explains it as follows: "In an ordinary deletion (*ḥadhf*) the governing word (*'āmil*) of the governed word (*ma'mūl fīhi*) disappears from the construction, while the declensional relationship between them remains intact. In the construction on hand, however, there is nothing missing from the declensional relation, but it is the meaning that does not fit. In the example quoted above, for instance, there is something strange, because you cannot talk to a village in actual life" (1990: 282). While we agree with the first part of the explanation, we would like to comment on the second part, where Versteegh argues that from a semantic point of view the construction *wa-s'ali l-qaryata* is something strange. In one of the passages where Sībawayhi (1988: vol. 1, 211-212) discusses this construction, he goes on to claim that there are additional examples, in which, as in the case of *wa-s'ali l-qaryata*, the *nomen rectum* (*muḍāf*) is deleted. For example, *wa-lākinna l-birra man 'āmana bi-llāhi wa-l-yawmi l-'ākhiri* (Q 2:177) "But righteous is he who believes in Allah, the Last Day" should be reconstructed as *wa-lākinna l-birra birru man 'āmana bi-llāhi wa-l-yawmi l-'ākhiri* "But

---

[13] Cf. al-'Astrābādhī (1988: vol. 6, 507); Ibn Hishām (1969: vol. 1, 58).

righteous is the righteousness of him who believes in Allah, the Last Day." An additional example is *wa-mathalu lladhīna kafarū ka-mathali lladhī yanʿiqu bi-mā lā yasmaʿu ʾillā duʿāʾan wa-nidāʾan* (Q 2:171) "And the parable of those who reject the Faith is like the similarity of the one who shouts to the one who hears no more than a call and a cry." According to Sībawayhi (1988: vol. 1, 212), this verse should be reconstructed as *mathalukum wa-mathalu lladhīna kafarū ka-mathali n-nāʿiqi wa-l-manʿūqi bihi lladhī lā yasmaʿu* "You and those who reject faith are as the similarity of the one who shouts to the one shouted at and hears nothing." Sībawayhi states that these constructions were made due to *saʿat al-kalām*; i.e., there are two options in these constructions: that all components appear in the construction or one of these components will be deleted. However, Sībawayhi restricts this rule by stating: *lākinnahu jāʾa ʿalā saʿati l-kalāmi wa-l-ʾījāzi li-ʿilmi l-mukhāṭabi bi-l-maʿnā* "… but [the deletion] occurred due to latitude of speech and brevity when the addressee understands the complete meaning of the speech" (1988: vol. 1, 212). This explanation is compatible with the modern definition of the term ellipsis which functions as one of the cohesion devices. Ellipsis means that something is left unsaid, but there is no implication that what is unsaid is not understood. Constructions with deleted components can be understood like any other complete construction because every statement does not function in isolation—it is a part of a text and the hearer might interpret a construction when referring to other clauses or sentences whose structure is such as to presuppose some preceding items, which can serve as the source of the missing information (Halliday and Hasan 1976:142-143). Thus, this explanation stands in contrast to the claim that the deletion does not harm the syntactic construction but it is the meaning that is distorted. If we refer back to the construction of *wa-sʾali l-qaryata* "Ask the people from the village," it might be well argued that the meaning is perfectly clear, because this structure is not much different from *ʾijtamaʿati l-yamāmatu* (see section 2.1). Both *qarya* and *yamāma* can be considered collective nouns; i.e., they are morphologically singular with multiple references, singular or plural (Rozumko 2002:132),[14] for example, the following structures are acceptable: *qawmun karīmun* "A noble tribe" or *qawmun kuramāʾu* "A tribe whose people are noble." In the first example, *qawm* has a singular meaning corresponding to the notion of single grouping. In the second example the adjective in plural form indicates the acceptance of plurality; i.e., it refers to the plurality of individuals belonging to the same coherent set. Thus, in the case of *qarya* and *yamāma*, one might understand that the reference

---

[14] Cf. Bock and Eberhard (1993: 61).

is to the group and not to the people (or to the men) comprising the group. To conclude, in this case *sa'at al-kalām* is associated with the feature of *'ikhtiṣār* "brevity" and in our opinion it means that *sa'at al-kalām* indicates that there are two optional structures for expressing an utterance: the first keeps the complete construction and the second shortens it by deleting some components on condition that the deletion does not cause a distorted meaning.

(4) Similar to the case of *wa-s'ali l-qaryata*, where the *nomen regens* takes the place of the deleted *nomen rectum*, we find cases where verbal nouns which have no time indication are used instead of an adverb; e.g., *ji'tuka maqdama l-ḥājji* should be reconstructed as *ji'tuka waqta maqdami l-ḥājji* "I came to you at the time of the pilgrims' arrival" (Ibn as-Sarrāj n.d: vol. 1, 193).[15] This structure is allowed according to the grammarians due to *sa'at al-kalām* and brevity (*'ikhtiṣār*).

(5) Consider the verse *tarta'u mā rata'at ḥattā 'idhā ddakarat…fa-'innamā hiya 'iqbālun wa-'idbārun* "The she-camel was grazing and [suddenly] she remembered/She was only going back and forth." The last part of the verse should be restored as *fa-'innamā hiya dhātu 'iqbālin wa-'idbārin* "The she-camel is the possessor [of the ability] to go back and forth." The nominative case is allowed due to *sa'at al-kalām*; i.e., the possibility to delete one of the syntactic components, which in our case is the *nomen regens dhātu* (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 337).[16]

2.5 Miscellaneous

According to Arab grammarians *ḥāl* "circumstantial accusative" should be indefinite, for example, *jā'a zaydun rākiban* "Zayd came while he was riding." The reason for this is that the circumstantial accusative is a type of a *ḥabar* "enunicative," "announcement" because it informs about the situation of Zayd during his coming, and *ḥabar* as a rule should be indefinite. However, there is at least one case where the circumstantial accusative can be definite. Most Arab grammarians agree that (a definite) verbal noun can occupy the place of a circumstantial accusative (*maṣādiru 'uqīmat maqāma l-ḥāli*), for example, *'arsalahā l-'irāka* and according to the grammarians the original of this structure is *'arsalahā ta'tariku*

---

[15] Cf. Dayyeh (2015:68).

[16] Cf. al-Warrāq (1999: vol. 1, 363).

"He sent the camels all together [to drink]."[17] Another example is *ṭalabtuhu jahdaka wa-ṭāqataka*, which can be reconstructed as *ṭalabtuhu tajtahidu* "I requested it that you will do it to the best of your ability." al-'Anbārī (2003: 93-94)[18] explains further: *taʿtariku wa-tajtahidu jumlatun mina l-fiʿli wa-l-fāʿili fī mawḍiʿi l-ḥāli ka-'annaka qulta 'arsalahā muʿtarikatan wa-ṭalabtuhu mujtahidan 'illā 'annahu 'uḍmira wa-juʿila l-maṣdaru dalīlan ʿalayhi* "The two verbs *taʿtariku* and *tajtahidu* are two clauses consisting of subject and predicate and [both are situated] in the position of a circumstantial accusative, as if you say "he sent the camels, as a group" and "I requested it [you do it] while making the most of your efforts." However, the verb is deleted and instead a verbal noun is used as an indication of the [deleted] circumstantial accusative. Our concern in this case is that Ibn Yaʿīsh (1994: vol. 2, 62) states: *wa-'innamā jāza hādhā li-ttisāʿin fī l-maṣādiri li-'anna lafẓahā laysa bi-lafẓi l-ḥāli* "This elaborateness [i.e., using a definite component] is only allowed when verbal nouns are involved because their formulation is different from the formulation [of syntactic constituents which function as] circumstantial accusative."

2.6 The difference between *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* and *saʿat al-kalām*

Previously we mentioned some cases where both terms *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* and *saʿat al-kalām* are mentioned side by side in the same context. *Ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* "poetic necessity" is defined as "a particular linguistic phenomenon which refers to the use of an irregular or unusual linguistic form that does not go in alignment with the conventional or standardized norm of language or grammar" (Najjar 2012:322).

Thus both *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* and *saʿat al-kalām* refer to the occurrence of a syntactic deviation from the usual rule, while *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* is used for poetry alone and *saʿat al-kalām* for all other contexts. However, the following example indicates that not every unusual structure in poetry created due to *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr* would justifiably be acceptable in other contexts due to *saʿat al-kalām*. According to Sībawayhi, what is allowed in poetry, for example, the appearance of undeclined nouns (*ghayr munṣarif*) as declined nouns with *tanwīn* (*munṣarif*), may be allowed in poetry but not in prose or in everyday speech (Sībawayhi 1988: vol. 1, 32). In the verse *wa-'anta gharīmun lā 'aẓunnu qaḍā'ahu wa-lā l-'anziyyu l-qāriẓu d-dahri jā'iyan* "You are [in] debt and I do not think that your redemption

---

[17]According to Ibn Manẓūr (1994: vol. 4, 317), the verbal noun *ʿirāk* means *'izdikhāmu l-'ibili ʿalā l-mā'i* "The crowding of camels [near a source of] water." He mentions that according to Sībawayhi the clause *'arsalahā l-ʿirāka* means "The man sent the camels altogether".

[18] Cf. al- Mubarrid (1994: vol. 3, 237); Ibn Yaʿīsh (1994: vol. 2, 62-63).

of the debt will ever occur just as I do not hope that the man from the tribe of ʿAnza will ever return." The second direct object of the verb *ʾaẓunnu*, which is *jāʾiyan*, should be positioned at the end of the first part *wa-ʾanta gharīmun lā ʾaẓunnu qaḍāʾahu jāʾiyan*. The postposition of the second direct object is allowed due to *ḍarūrat ash-shiʿr*, where the need to keep the rhyme harmony in the poetry leads poets to make some syntactic changes. According to al-ʿAlāʾī, this marked word order cannot occur in prose and be explained as *saʿat al-kalām*, although some grammarians do not restrict cases of postposing the direct object only to poetry (al-ʿAlāʾī 1990: vol. 1, 153).

3. Discussion and Conclusion

In light of the studied structures, we may well refer to some of the primary explanations provided by Western scholars (and others) and express our reservations about some of these statements.

(1) It was said that *al-ittisāʿ fī l-kalām/saʿat al-kalām* "discourse widening" directly concerns the speaker's usage of language and linguistic behavior (Hnid 2012:65). The question here is what is meant by *linguistic behavior of the speaker*? How can we assess the competence of one's linguistic behavior? For example, if someone whose linguistic skills are weak makes syntactic mistakes, can these mistakes be considered *al-ittisāʿ fī l-kalām* because they reflect the speaker's linguistic behavior?

(2) In *al-Kitāb* of Sībawayhi the term *saʿat al-kalām* is associated with semantic and syntactic disorders (Dayyeh 2015:68). Versteegh (1990:238) claims that the decision of whether or not a statement belongs to the category of *al-ittisāʿ fī l-kalām* is based on the meaning, while common sense has an important role in that decision. We know, for example, that it is impossible to ask the village (*wa-sʾali l-qaryata*); therefore, it must be categorized as *al-ittisāʿ fī l-kalām*. Our question is why does the structure *wa-sʾali l-qaryata* make no sense? We do not see any difference between this structure and a sentence such as "The court has made its decision." Clearly, this sentence cannot be literally interpreted as "The court building made its decision." The hearer/reader may infer that court is a collective noun which refers to the judges and the jury who made their decision. Our argument can draw support from the Qurʾānic verse *wa-jāʾat sayyāratun fa-ʾarsalū wāridahum* (Q 12:19) "Then came a convoy, and they [the travelers] sent one of them." The verb *jāʾat* agrees syntactically with the noun *sayyāra*; however, the verb

ʼarsalū in plural form indicates that *sayyāra* means the people who make up the convoy. Furthermore, we can argue that the following sentence, where both verbal nouns are in the nominative due to *saʻat al-kalām*, is perfectly clear and there is no semantic or syntactic disorder: *ʼa-lam taʻlam yā fulānu masīrī fa-ʼitʻābun wa-ṭardun* "Don't you know my way? Then it is continuous with fatigue and expulsion."

(3) When one changes the active sentence *ṣāda zaydun l-yawma* "Zayd hunted today" into a passive sentence, the subject *Zayd* must be omitted and it seems that the only syntactic component which can act as the subject of the passive verb is the adverb *al-yawma*. However, what seems a syntactic disorder is actually a syntactic constraint. *Saʻat al-kalām* (i.e., putting the adverb in the nominative in this case) is the only possibility left for achieving a grammatical structure.

(4) *Saʻat al-kalām* according to the scholars provides the speaker with the justification to extend linguistic usages (Dayyeh 2015:70). The question is, however, can the speaker generate various structures free of any restrictions and justify them by *saʻat al-kalām*? For example, can one say *raʼaytu l-jamīlata l-binta* "I saw the pretty girl," where he preposes the adjective by explaining it as *saʻat al-kalām*? As we have shown, Arab grammarians are aware of the dangers of using *saʻat al-kalām* to generate ungrammatical structures. Therefore they mention some restrictions on using this term; for example, one may not say *nimtu al-bayta* "I slept [in] the house" as if analogous with *dakhaltu l-bayta* "I entered the house" because *nāma*, in contrast to *dakhala*, is an intransitive verb; or that the adverb must be declinable (*mutaṣarrif*) to be able to function as a direct object.

In light of the above reservations, we would suggest a different definition for the term *saʻat al-kalām*, one that is not associated with semantic and syntactic disorder. We suggest that *saʻa* means having two syntactic options in a specific structure and under specific conditions. *kalām* means sentence, utterance, or word. Therefore, *saʻat al-kalām* can be interpreted as having two options for expressing an utterance. But what are these two options?

- In issues of agreement, the two options are semantic vs. syntactic agreement; e.g., *jāʼati l-qaryatu* "The village came" vs. *jāʼa ʼahlu l-qaryati* "The people of the village came."

16

- In issues of word order, the two options are unmarked word order vs. marked word order. For example, *hādhā ghulāmu wa-llāhi zaydin* "This is a servant, by God, Zayd's." vs. *wa-llāhi hādhā ghulāmu zaydin* "By God! This is Zayd's servant."

- In issues of deletion, the two options are deep structure vs. surface structure; e.g., *ji'tuka maqdama l-ḥājji* "I came to you when the pilgrims arrived" vs. *ji'tuka waqta maqdami l-ḥājji* "I came to you at the time of the pilgrims' arrival."

- In issues of deletion of one of the radical letters, the two options are determined by the spoken dialect; e.g., *lam ya'tika* vs. *lam ya'tīka* "He will not come to you."

- When *saʿat al-kalām* is associated with two options of *'i'rāb*, the two options of vowelizing the noun are determined by the meaning of the speaker; e.g., *hādhā rajulun sā'irun rākiban dābbatahu* "This is a man moving and [afterwards] riding an animal" vs. *hādhā rajulun sā'irun rākibun dābbatahu* "This is a man moving and [at the same time] riding an animal."

- In cases involving an adverb, two options are to place it in the genitive functioning as an adverb, or in the accusative functioning as a direct object; e.g., *yawman shahidnāhu* "A day which we saw/witnessed it" vs. *yawman shahidnā fīhi* "A day on which we saw/witnessed."

REFERENCES

Baalbaki, Ramzi. 2008. *The Legacy of the Kitāb*: *Sībawayhi's Analytical Methods within the Context of the Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Leiden: Brill.

Bock, Kathrryn and Eberhard, Kathleen. 1993. Meaning, Sound and Syntax in English Number Agreement. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 8:57–99.

Dayyeh, Hinadi. 2015. Ittisāʿ in Sībawayhi's Kitāb: A Semantic ʿilla for Disorders in Meaning and Form. In *The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics II: Kitab Sibawayhi*, Amal Elesha Marogy and Kees Versteegh (eds.), 66–80. Leiden: Brill.

Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht. 1968. *Kleinere Schriften*. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.

Halliday Michael and Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.

Hnid, Mohamed. 2012. Spatial Language in the *Kitāb* of Sībawayhi: The case of the Preposition fī/in." In *The Foundation of Arabic Linguistics: Sībawayhi and Early Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Amal Elesha Marogy (ed.), 59-74. Leiden: Brill.

Marogy, Amal E. 2010. *Kitāb Sībawayhi: Syntax and Pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill.

Najjar, Manal. 2012. Poetic Necessity between the Syntax of a Sentence and the Syntax of a Text. *Journal of Law and Social Science* 2:322–327.

Owens, Jonathan. 1988. *The Foundation of Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rozumko, Agata. 2002. Countable, Uncountable and Collective Nouns in the Early Eighteenth Century English. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 37:131–159.

Talmon, Rafael. 1988. Al-Kalām mā kāna muktafiyan bi-nafsihi wa-huwa l-ğumla: A Study in the History of Sentence-concept and the Sībawayhian Legacy in Arabic Grammar. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 138:74-98.

Versteegh, Kees. 1990. Freedom of the Speaker. In *Studies of the History of Arabic Grammar II*, Kees Versteegh and Michael Carter (eds.), 281–293. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

_____. 1994. The Notion of Underlying Levels in the Arabic Grammatical Thought. *Historiographia Linguistica* 21:271–296.

Arabic Sources

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, ʿAbd ar-Raḥman Bahāʾ ad-Dīn. 2015. *Mafhūm al-ittisāʿ wa-ḍawābiṭuhu fī ʿilm an-naḥw*. Available at http://www.alukah.net/library/0/88978/.

al-ʿAlāʾī, Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn ʾAbū Saʿīd. 1990. *al-Fuṣūl al-mufīda fī l-wāw al-mazīda*. Amman: Dār al-Bashīr.

al-’Anbārī. 2003. *al-’Inṣāf fī masā’il al-khilāf bayna al-naḥwiyyīna al-Baṣriyyīna wa-l-Kufiyyīna*. Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Miṣriyya.

al-’Ashmūnī ‘Alī Ibn Muḥammad. 1995. *Sharḥ al-’Ashmūnī ‘alā ’alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.

al-’Astarābādhī, Raḍī ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥasan. 1988. *Sharḥ kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥājib*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.

al-Ghūl, ‘Aṭiyya Nāyif. 2008. *’al-Ittisā‘ al-luġawī bayna al-qadīm wa-l-ḥadīth*. Amman: Dār al-Bayrūnī li-n-Nashr wa-t-Tawzī‘.

Ibn ‘Aqīl, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abdullāh. 1984. *Sharḥ Ibn ‘Aqīl ‘alā ’alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Cairo: Mu’assasat al-Mukhtar li-n-Nashr wa-t-Tawzī‘.

Ibn Hishām, Jamāl ad-Dīn al-’Anṣārī. 1969. *Mughnī al-labīb ‘an kutub al-’a‘ārīb*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.

_____. 1971. *’Awḍaḥ al-masālik ’ilā ’alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Beirut: Dār ’Iḥyā’ at-Turāth al-‘Arabī.

_____. n.d. *Sharḥ shudhūr adh-dhahab*. Damascus: ash-Sharika al-Muttaḥida li-t-Tawzī‘.

Ibn Manẓūr ‘Abū al-Faḍl Jamāl ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn Mukrim. 1994. *Lisān al-‘Arab*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.

Ibn as-Sarrāj, ’Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī. n.d. *al-Uṣūl fī n-naḥw*. Beirut: Mu’assasat ar-Risāla.

Ibn Ya‘īsh, Muwaffaq ad-Dīn. 1994. *Sharḥ al-mufaṣṣal*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

al-Jawjarī, Shams ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Ibn Muḥammad. 2004. *Sharḥ shudhūr adh-dhahab fī ma‘rifat kalām al-‘Arab*. al-Madīnah: ‘Imadat al-Baḥth al-‘Ilmī bi-l-Jāmi‘a al-’Islamiyya.

al-Mubarrid, ’Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad Ibn Yazīd. 1994. *al-Muqtaḍab*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.

ar-Rāzī, Muḥammad Fakhr ad-Dīn. 1981. *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr li-ṭ-Ṭiba‘a wa-n-Nashr wa-t-Tawzī‘.

aṣ-Ṣabbān, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Alī ash-Shāfi‘ī. 1997. *Ḥāshiyat aṣ-Ṣabbān ‘alā sharḥ al-’Ashmūnī ‘alā ’alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.

ash-Shāṭibī, ’Abū ’Isḥāq ’Ibrāhīm Ibn Mūsā. 2007. *al-Maqāṣid ash-shāfiya fī sharḥ khulāṣat al-kāfiya*. Mecca: Ma‘had al-Buḥūth al-‘Ilmiyya wa-’Iḥyā’ at-Turāth al-’Islāmī, Jāmi‘at ’Umm al-Qurā.

Sībawayhi, ’Abū Bishr ‘Amr Ibn ‘Uthmān Ibn Qunbur. 1988. *al-Kitāb*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī.

as-Sīrāfī, Yusūf Ibn ʾAbī Saʿīd. 1974. *Sharḥ ʾabyāt Sībawayhi*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Kuliyya al-ʾAzhariyya.

_____. 1989. *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī sharḥ jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*. Beirut: Muʾassasat ar-Risāla.

as-Suyūṭī, Jalāl ad-Dīn. n.d. *Hamʿ al-hawāmiʿ fī sharḥ jamʿ al-jawāmiʿ*. Cairo: al-Maktaba at-Tawfīqiyya.

al-Warrāq, Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbdullāh Ibn al-ʿAbbās ʾAbū al-Ḥasan. 1999. *ʿIlāl an-naḥw*. Riyad: Maktabat ar-Rushd.

az-Zamakhsharī, ʾAbū al-Qāsim Muḥammad Ibn ʿUmar. 1988. *al-Kashshāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq at-tanzīl wa-ʿuyūn al-ʾaqāwīl fī wujūh at-taʾwīl*. Riyad: Maktabat al-ʿIbīkān.