III SOURCE STUDIES FOR THE IBĐAL WORKS

General remarks

The purpose of this part of the book is to investigate the sources and mutual dependence of the ibdāl works. In this kind of study, I find it imperative, though this is often neglected, to differentiate between a) immediate and b) ultimate sources. By ‘immediate’ source I mean the direct source from which each particular piece of information has been taken by the author of the book under examination. ‘Ultimate’, on the other hand, signifies the “original” authority of the information, i.e. the ultimate link in the chain of authorities (whether this chain has been indicated or not) which leads to the first attestation of this piece in the philological literature. Thus, e.g., in an article of AṬ where al-Asma‘ī is given as an authority for an ibdāl pair, but where the article is in fact taken from IS-Y, IS-Y is the immediate source for AṬ, and al-Asma‘ī is the ultimate source.

Often in recent lexicographical and other studies, more attention seems to have been spent on the ultimate authorities, probably because they are more easily recognizable than the immediate sources, as the lexicographical material is usually quoted in the later (in our case 9th to 11th century) sources on the authority of the early philologists only. The study of these ultimate authorities naturally has its own importance, e.g. when one is interested in the later influence of a certain philologist, yet, if we focus on one lexicographical work and want to study its sources (or the sources and mutual dependencies of the works of one genre, which is the purpose of the present study), the search for ultimate authorities is of secondary importance. If, e.g., we know that a certain article of AṬ quoted on the authority of, e.g. Abū ‘Ubayda is based on information directly copied from ID, then, in a study on the sources of AṬ, it is not very relevant to list the case under a heading ‘Abū ‘Ubayda’ nor to speculate from which monograph (or scholarly oral tradition) of Abū ‘Ubayda the piece (ultimately!) derives — especially as the earliest sources have often disappeared (and consequently, little positive can be said about the origins of the piece) and most probably were already lost by the time of Abū‘l-Tayyib.

In the search for immediate sources, our task is facilitated by the habit of the 9th-10th century lexicographers to quote their sources a) in blocks, b) in the order in which the articles were given in the original source, and c) faithfully copying the wording of the original source with often easily recognizable additions and some other minor changes.

318 These ‘ultimate’ authorities (al-Asma‘ī, al-Kisā‘ī etc.) naturally relied on their Bedouin informants who are sometimes known by name and also on earlier philological tradition, but the latter is usually anonymous; the men of al-Asma‘ī’s generation rarely quote their predecessors.
319 The habit of identifying the written — and immediate — source is, on the other hand, usual in the works of the post-Classical authors, e.g. as-Suyūṭī and ‘Abdalqādir al-Baghdādī.
320 Cf. e.g. the vain attempts of El Berkawy (p. 154-174) to go through the extant works of the early philologists in order to locate the “sources” of AṬ.
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By 'blocks' I mean the tendency of the authors, clearly visible, e.g. in IS-Y and even more so in AT, to excerpt from one source at time and to include this material in their work in one block, without adding new articles derived from other sources between the articles of the block (additions may on the other hand be found within the articles) nor trying to adapt the material to any overall system of their own, contrary to the method of the compilers of the great lexica who organized the material according to a general system, e.g. in alphabetical order. Thus the order of the articles in AT does not show any organizing principles of Abû-Tayyib himself; each block comes in the same order as the excerpted pieces were in the original source, so that, e.g. the "ID block" is still in the anagrammatic order of Ibn Durayd in AT though in the other parts of AT there are no traces of any such order.

Closely related to the concept of 'ultimate' vs. 'immediate' source, is the distinction between a) material quoted on the authority of X, and b) material quoted from a work of X. Thus we shall see that the ibdãls quoted in IS-Y on the authority of al-Asma'î can — and must — be separated in two groups, viz. those coming (probably directly) from the ibdãl work of al-Asma'î, and those excerpted from other sources, quite possibly at least partly not al-Asma'î's own works.

The later we go in the philological literature, the greater the role of the written tradition becomes. In the earliest works we still see traces of the oral tradition, which makes a study of their immediate sources problematic if not impossible: if the author himself (e.g. al-Asma'î) does not indicate his source, we have no means of identifying it. In the field of ibdãl studies, the earliest extant work, IS-Y, is already heavily dependent on the written tradition. In IS-Y, as well as in other ibdãl works, a certain number of articles cannot be shown to derive from any identifiable work nor do they seem to form any blocks. There does not seem to be any reliable method to ascertain whether they came through the oral tradition or whether they had been excerpted by the author from various non-lexicographical works (e.g. diwãns and their sharhs) and contemporary (Bedouin) usage. The similarities, e.g. between al-Asma'î quotes and some extant monograph of al-Asma'î, are not very convincing if they are not numerous, do not form blocks nor contain any remarkable variants (especially mistakes) differing from other works containing the same piece, for it is well known that the conservative nature of Arabic lexicography causes the same piece of information to be found in very many sources, especially when the piece discusses Qur'anic material. Without unequivocal evidence one should not assume that a later text has borrowed from an earlier one on the sole basis of one, or a few, short passage(s) even if they are identical in wording.

---

321 I leave aside the question of the precise mode of this 'written' tradition; if a work is read aloud in the class-room and taken down in writing by the students after the dictation of their master, the work may well be said to belong to the written tradition. On the other hand, topics dealt with in philological maqalâs without any one book as a source, belong to the oral tradition as the notes taken down by the students are not a copy of any already extant book, but a totally new whole.

322 Cf. e.g. the example discussed in note 102.
The sources of IS-Y

Most of the ibdāl cases in IS-Y are given by Ibn as-Sikkīt on the authority of the earlier philologists, among whom al-Ašma’ī is the most prominent. Anonymous articles form a clear minority.

Contrary to the study of the later ibdāl works, especially AT, it is in most cases not possible to find an extant written source for the articles given by Ibn as-Sikkīt, and it seems probable that many of the articles come via the oral scholarly tradition, although one should not underestimate the fact that the majority of the old monographs have been lost. Because of this, the study of the sources of IS-Y will focus on the names of the authorities quoted in the monograph. As most of them date back no more than one generation earlier than Ibn as-Sikkīt, who moreover studied directly under many of them (see above), it seems advisable to take the “isnāds” (which in almost all cases consists of only one name) at their face value: a piece quoted from, e.g., al-Farrāʾ most probably comes either directly from him (or his book) or through one generation of intermediators, i.e. via one of his students.

When he quotes several articles one after another on the same authority, especially when there are no intervening additions from other sources embedded in the article, Ibn as-Sikkīt does not repeat the name of his informant. This means that in the text there are blocks of articles of which only the first is explicitly given on someone’s authority, the others being quoted without any mention of authority, yet coming from the same source as the first article. When there is an intervening addition on some other authority, the main authority is often repeated. The analysis of the first 8 articles of chapter III M—N (p. 77-80) will elucidate this. The authorities given are:

| Article | Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>al-Ašma’ī: yuqālu...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>wa-yuqālu... wa-qāla baʿduhum...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>wa-anshada l-Ašmaʾī...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>wa-anshada...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>wa-... wa-anshada... wa-qāla Abū ʿUbayda...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>al-Ašmaʾī: yuqālu...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>wa-yuqālu...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ghayruhu...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see how the name of al-Ašmaʾī is given in the first article and then repeated only when some other authority intervenes (art. 2 “qāla baʿduhum”; art. 5 “wa-qāla Abū ʿUbayda”). After the last article of the block (art. 7) the next is introduced by “ghayruhu”, a formulation which can only be understood if art. 7 is not taken as anonymous (though it is simply introduced by “wa-yuqālu”), but as coming from al-Ašmaʾī.

Similarly, e.g. in chapter VII (H—H) the first article is given on the authority of al-Ašmaʾī, in articles 2-9 he is not explicitly mentioned, but article 10 (ṣahal—ṣahal) is introduced with “wa-qāla ghayru l-Ašmaʾī” which makes it obvious that all the first nine articles are in fact from al-Ašmaʾī.
Yet there are some problems connected with the attribution of these anonymous articles; in several cases it may be a question of genuinely anonymous articles, and it is often impossible to draw a line between the implicitly attributed articles and the real anonyma. Thus, e.g. in chapter I (L—N) the 21st article (abbala—abbanan) is given on the authority of al-Lihyānī, and the following 13 articles are given without explicit identification of source. Knowing the relatively unimportant role of al-Lihyānī elsewhere in IS-Y, there is good reason to doubt whether all these articles really come from him. In these cases, a comparison with the parallel tradition may sometimes help with the attribution.

In the following each of the direct authorities of Ibn as-Sikkīt quoted in IS-Y is discussed in decreasing order of numerical importance.

Al-Aṣmaʿī

By far the most important of Ibn as-Sikkīt's authorities in his ibdāl monograph is al-Aṣmaʿī, from whom come almost half of the articles as well as several additions to the remaining articles, as the following table shows. — It should be emphasized here that the problem of the quote blocks causes some uncertainty as to the exact number of al-Aṣmaʿī, as well as other, quotes. Yet this does not affect the overall picture; whether the exact number of articles derived from al-Aṣmaʿī is about 180, as the table below claims, or somewhat lower, around 150, is of no great consequence. In any case, al-Aṣmaʿī is seen to be the main source for Ibn as-Sikkīt. — In cases where the initial al-Aṣmaʿī block consists of less than half of the articles of the chapter, an asterisk (*) is placed before the number in the second column. The explicit al-Aṣmaʿī articles are written in bold face.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter of IS-Y</th>
<th>total number of articles</th>
<th>initial al-Aṣmaʿī blocks</th>
<th>misplaced al-Aṣmaʿī articles</th>
<th>al-Aṣmaʿī additions in other articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I L—N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10/1—10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/9, 21, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B—M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7/1—7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III M—N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7/1—2, 3—7</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

322 There are also other indications that the "anonymous" members of one block are in reality quoted on someone's authority. Thus there are, e.g. personal verbs referring to informants in the seemingly anonymous articles, e.g. XIII. 1 (al-Aṣmaʿī), art. 2 (wa-yuqālu) but art. 3 (qāla: wa-samiʿtu Khalafan yaqūlu) — the third article also coming from al-Aṣmaʿī.

324 A study of the sources of Ibn as-Sikkīt's K. al-Qalb wa'll-ibdāl is also included in the dissertation of El Berkawy (p. 58 ff.), but he uses IS-tadhīb as the basis of his study. Moreover, and what is more serious, he confines himself to simply listing the explicitly mentioned authorities without dealing with the seemingly anonymous quotes, which form the major part of both IS-Y and IS-tadhīb. Thus he counts only 73 cases of al-Aṣmaʿī quotes (p. 58) which is only about 40% of their real number in IS-Y.

325 For the terms "initial al-Aṣmaʿī block" and "misplaced al-Aṣmaʿī articles" see below.

326 For the addition in art. 8, see below sub Abū 'Ubayda.

327 The article 12 (tāma—tāna), given on the authority of al-Abmar may also belong to the "misplaced" al-Aṣmaʿī articles. On the other hand, this article is given in AT II:428 on the authority of al-Lihyānī, and in Q II:89 the preceding article is given on the authority of Abū 'Amr ash-Shaybānī. Similarly the addition to XIII:4 (wa-samiʿtu Khalafan yaqūlu...) probably comes from al-Aṣmaʿī, cf. also Q II:114 and AT II:127.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/1-6,7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/2-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6/1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9/1-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*1/1</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*3/1-3</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*1/1</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*2/1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*3/1-3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8/1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*2/1-2</td>
<td>1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>*6/1-3,4,6</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*3/1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*2/1-2</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>muğā'af</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*—</td>
<td>1/334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*3/1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

328 For art. 9 (usn—ʿusn), see below sub Abū ʿAmr.
329 See also the Additional notes to the Table.
330 Actually only an addition to art. 2 (ablamma—ağamma).
331 The last two articles (10 and 11) are anonymous. In IS-tahdhiib, p. 38 art. 10 (of IS-Y) is introduced
by “al-Aṣmaʾ waʾl-Farrāʾ”.
332 The name of the authority (al-Aṣmaʾ) is accidentally missing before the first article which makes the
whole block look anonymous, but the evidence given in IS-tahdhiib, p. 34 and Q II:34 make it highly
probable that this chapter, too, began originally with an explicit mention of al-Aṣmaʾ. It is possible that
his name was already dropped relatively early in the manuscript tradition, as, e.g. AT I:192 does not
mention al-Aṣmaʾ in this connection.
333 See the Additional notes.
334 The “misplaced” article of al-Aṣmaʾ is in fact only an addition to article 2 (analysis of taqaddiya).
Chapter V, article 1 (dababa—daba'a): This pair is attributed to Abū 'Ubayda also in several other ibdāl works, AT (1:292) and Q (II:67) among others, as well as in many dictionaries (ID, p. 280337; Lisān VIII:13 DBH338), so it is evident that the article is not attributed to him in IS-Y by accident. That the article belongs to the original IS and to its present place at the beginning of the chapter is shown by the order of the articles in IS-tahdīb (p. 24), Q (II:67), AT (I:292), Mukh. (XIII:275) and Muzhir (I:466). Why it precedes the “initial” al-Asma'ī block is not clear.

Chapter XVII D—L: No authorities are given for the articles in this chapter, nor are they attributed in IS-tahdīb (p. 46-47), AT (I:385-386), Muzhir (I:467) and Q (II:156). In Q they are given on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt only, which means that no authority was given in the copy of IS used by al-Qālī, who would otherwise have given (only) this ultimate authority without mentioning Ibn as-Sikkīt.

Chapter XXXIII D—DH: The place of this chapter towards the end of the book is an important proof of the significance of al-Asma'ī's ibdāl work for IS-Y, where all the chapters of ibdāls of sound consonants come first, whereas the other chapters

335 No authorities are given in this chapter.

336 In this chapter the articles are organized according to the ibdāl letters, not according to the authorities, and it is very probable that at least some of the anonymous articles which have tentatively been considered as belonging to the al-Asma'ī blocks are in fact anonymous. Yet there is evidence in other sources that at least some of the articles do come from al-Asma'ī, as, e.g. IS-Y XXXIV art. 20 (p. 144 istawthana—istawthāga), cf. TL XI:170: “al-Harrānī ‘an Ibn as-Sikkīt ‘an-i l-Asma'ī...” which shows that in the oral tradition which comes directly from Ibn as-Sikkīt (al-Harrānī was one of the most faithful of his students) the article was taken as being on the authority of al-Asma'ī.


338 According to Lisān this article comes from Abū 'Ubayda's K. al-Khayl, but I am unable to find the passage in the printed editions of the work.
which are of marginal importance to the phenomenon of (lexical) ibdāl are collected at the end of the book together with the varia chapter. Chapter XXXIII, which has no articles on the authority of al-ʿAṣmaʾī, is the only one dealing with sound consonants among the last chapters as the following list shows:

- XXIX ʿūrūf al-muḍāʿ af
- XXX ʿ—are Y
- XXXI ʿ—are W
- XXXII #w—#t-
- XXXIII D—DH
- XXXIV varia
- XXXV +M
- XXXVI +N

The only reason for the late place of chapter XXXIII seems to be the fact that it did not have an equivalent in the work on which IS-Y was based, viz. al-ʿAṣmaʾī's ibdāl monograph.

Initial al-ʿAṣmaʾī blocks and “misplaced” al-ʿAṣmaʾī articles

Besides the numerical importance of the al-ʿAṣmaʾī articles, his significance to Ibn as-Sikkit is also evident in the fact that almost all chapters begin with a block of al-ʿAṣmaʾī articles. This impression is heightened by the formulation before the start of the work (p. 61):

> qāla Abū Yusuf Yaʿqūb ibn Isḥāq as-Sikkit: qāla l-ʿAṣmaʾī ʿAbdalmalik ibn Qurayb:

His prominent place in the first lines of the book hints at his importance, and we could even speak of IS-Y as a tahdīb work of al-ʿAṣmaʾī’s *K. al-Qalb wa'L-ībāl*.

In addition to these initial blocks there are some articles given on the authority of al-ʿAṣmaʾī elsewhere in the book. I have preferred to call them “misplaced” al-ʿAṣmaʾī articles though without intending to imply that the present place of these articles is by any means caused by accident; they are separated from the initial al-ʿAṣmaʾī blocks for reasons that will shortly become clear. All these “misplaced” articles belong to the original work of Ibn as-Sikkit as may be seen from a comparison of IS-Y with its collaterals.

Chapter III M—N, article 13 (p. 82) duhāmiġ—duhāniğ:

- IS-tahdīb, p. 20; AT II:427; Q II:91; Mukh. XIII:284 (< Ibn as-Sikkit!); Muzhir I:468.

Chapter XVI S—SH, article 10 (p. 110) ǧūʿsūs—ǧūʿshūṣ:


---

339 The articles of this chapter coincide with the chapter D—DH (Bāḥ ad-dāl waʿdhw-dhāl) of Abū ʿUbayd’s al-Ghāfīb al-muṣannaf, cf. Abdel-Tawab, Das Kitāb al-ʿgarb, p. 58, Muzhir I:544–545 and above.

340 For article 6 of chapter XXIX, cf. above, the note on the Table.
Chapter XXIII §—D art. 11 (p. 124) tašawwaa’a—taḍawwaa’a341:
IS-tahdhīb, p. 50; AT II:247; Q II:23; Mukh. XIII:279; Muzhir I:551 and I:564; Ibn Ğinnî, Sirr as-šinā’ta, p. 214.

Chapter XVIII Q—K, article 9 (p. 114) qurban—kurbān:
IS-tahdhīb, p. 37; AT II:355; Q II:139; Mukh. XIII:277; Muzhir I:564. Also Z, p. 610-611 and Tahdhīb al-alfāz, p. 531.

Similarly, the two anonymous articles following XVIII art. 9 are well attested; their attribution to al-Âsma‘ī is possible though not certain:

Chapter XVII Q—K, article 10 (p. 114) ‘asiga—‘asiga:
IS-tahdhīb, p. 38; AT II:354; Q II:139; Mukh. XIII:277; Muzhir I:564.

Chapter XVIII Q—K, article 11 (p. 114) aqhabu—akhabu:
IS-tahdhīb, p. 38; AT II:354; Q II:139; Mukh. XIII:277; Muzhir I:564.

This dual nature of the al-Âsma‘ī articles is probably to be interpreted to mean that the initial blocks are from the basic source used by Ibn as-Sikkit, i.e. the ibdāl monograph of al-Âsma‘ī (see the following chapter), whereas the other, “misplaced” articles come, as do the articles given on other authorities, from other sources, written or oral, excerpted by Ibn as-Sikkit to supplement ibdāl material.

The 12 al-Âsma‘ī additions in other articles, cf. the Table above, also come from other sources. It should be emphasized that these additions do not usually contain ibdāl pairs, but only notes on one member of the pair. Many of the additions give different meanings to the members of the ibdāl pair, thus refuting the article as an ibdāl. So, e.g. in chapter IX Ğ—H:

article 2: al-Kisā‘: aḥamma l-amrū wa-aḡamma idhā ḥānā waqūthu
article 4342: (...)

Here the al-Âsma‘ī quote refutes the identity of (a)ḥamma and aḡamma and thus rules the case outside the phenomenon of ibdāl343.

The provenance of the al-Âsma‘ī articles

The overwhelming majority of the al-Âsma‘ī articles (as well as of the other articles) cannot be traced to a written source. Thus, e.g. none of the 10 articles in chapter II L—N can be located in the extant works of al-Âsma‘ī344; in chapter II B—M only one article can be found in the other works of al-Âsma‘ī, viz. art. 5 (p. 71) ‘ashaba—

341 Or tašawwaka—taḍawwaka; cf. below, note 511.
342 The article is in fact only an addition to article 2.
343 The nature of the al-Âsma‘ī additions has been overlooked by the editor of IS-Y who has added words to produce ibdāl pairs in the additions, sometimes basing himself on the equally misguided “corrections” by the redactor of IS-tahdhīb. As an example one may mention p. 74b ll. 1-4, where the additions by the editor should be deleted.
344 A case worth singling out is article 5 rifāl—rifān (p. 63) which is not found in the two recensions of K. al-ibl edited by Haffner. — The pair is also found in Abū ‘Ubayda, K. al-Khayl, p. 112 (and in his Mağāz al-Qurān I:297) but in a radically different form.
This leaves us with three possible solutions to the question of the origin of these articles, viz.:

1. The articles come from various works of al-Asma't, but we cannot locate them because the majority of these works have later disappeared.

2. The articles have come to Ibn as-Sikkît orally as part of the lexical nawâdir collected by al-Asma't, through the mediation of al-Asma't's students, some of whom were among Ibn as-Sikkît's teachers, cf. above.

3. The articles come from the now lost K. al-Qalb wa-l-ibdãl of al-Asma't.

The first of these explanations is almost definitely ruled out by the study of the order of the articles in IS-Y: there is a clear difference between the initial al-Asma't blocks in each chapter and the "misplaced" articles. This can be understood only if we postulate a single source for the initial blocks, to which material has been added from the other works of al-Asma't and other scholars.

The second and third solutions are not contradictory. Whether Ibn as-Sikkît received the initial blocks orally or in a written form is of no great consequence bearing in mind the semi-oral character of all 9th century learning when only a sound isnâd guaranteed the tradition and pure booklore was regarded with contempt. That the initial blocks have been excerpted from, e.g. al-Asma't's lost K. an-Nawâdir or some work other than his monograph on the ibdãls is improbable; the comparison between the work lists of al-Asma't and Ibn as-Sikkît (cf. above) has shown how dependent Ibn as-Sikkît was on his indirect teacher, and the evidence points to the conclusion that most of his works in the field of lexicography (excluding the works concentrating on the morphology of the words) have to be considered as mere elaborations of the respective works of al-Asma't. In view of all this there is reason to assume that the initial blocks represent the lost ibdãl work of al-Asma't with some additions from other sources as well as, perhaps, some abbreviations and omissions.

When we examine the quantity of al-Asma't articles in each chapter, we see that in most chapters the majority of the material comes from him. Only in the following chapters does less than half of the material belong to the initial al-Asma't blocks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial al-Asma't block</th>
<th>Total number of ibdãls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I L—N</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B—M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Ğ—Ḫ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X H—KH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI S—SH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII Ğ—GH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

345 But not in the edition of S. at-Tâmîmî.
346 Cf. e.g. TL 1:32-33 (al-Azhari's arguments against al-Bushti al-Khârzanî).
From this list we may draw the following conclusions about al-Âṣma’î’s ibdâl work and its relationship with IS-Y:

1. At the end of the book (excluding the two final, non-ibdâl chapters) the material of the chapters seems to have been collected from other sources, which indicates that Ibn as-Sikkît used the ibdâl work of al-Âṣma’î as a starting point for his monograph, and appended other material at the end. It follows from this that the initial al-Âṣma’î blocks in the last chapters (esp. XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI) may not in fact come from the K. al-Qalb wa’l-ibdâl of al-Âṣma’î.

2. The grammatical ibdâls (chapters XXIX-XXXII) were only discussed in passing in al-Âṣma’î’s monograph, and it is possible (cf. the preceding paragraph) that none of them actually comes from al-Âṣma’î’s ibdâl work.

3. Most of the ibdâl chapters on sound consonants in which the minority of material is found in the initial al-Âṣma’î blocks represent cases where the ibdâls are of possible orthographical origin (i.e. may be suspected of being tašhîfs; Č—H, H—KH, S—SH, ‘—GH and S—D). It should be emphasized that none of the chapters with a majority of articles in the initial al-Âṣma’î block fall in this category.

4. Of the remaining few ibdâl chapters with a minority from al-Âṣma’î’s ibdâl work, three (I L—N; II B—M; XXIV TH—F) are the longest in the whole book (having 34, 36 and 22 articles, respectively).

Other sources of IS-Y

More than half of the material in IS-Y comes from sources other than al-Âṣma’î. A comparison of the articles given on other authorities with the (few extant) books by these philologists has not shown any remarkable similarities (cf. also El Berkawy, Das Kitâb al-Ibdâl, p. 58–61) between them and the articles of IS-Y. Whether the articles come from class-room tradition or whether they have been excerpted from written sources remains unclear. In the following chapters I have tried to establish which articles come from each of the philologists who (or whose works) seem to have been the direct sources of Ibn as-Sikkît.
In IS-Y, as elsewhere in the ibdāl literature, al-Lihyānī’s principal role is that of a student of al-Kisāṭī. Consequently, the isnāds al-Lihyānī, al-Kisāṭī, and al-Lihyānī ‘an-i al-Kisāṭī vary rather indiscriminately in different ibdāl works, cf. e.g. the following cases:

**IS-Y chapter I L—N, art. 17 (p. 66), isnād: al-Lihyānī ‘an-i l-Kisāṭī**

= AṬ II:396: al-Lihyānī wa-ghayrulu.

**IS-Y chapter I L—N, art. 18 (p. 66-67; implicitly the same isnād as in art. 17)**


**IS-Y chapter VI >H art. 7-8 (p. 89), isnād: al-Kisāṭī al-Lihyānī ‘an-i l-Kisāṭī**


Because the names of al-Kisāṭī and al-Lihyānī have been largely interchangeable in the ibdāl literature, they are dealt with together here. They are quoted in the following chapters:

**Chapter I L—N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>Isnād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>al-Lihyānī ‘an-i l-Kisāṭī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>yaqūlu, probably referring to the authority of art. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>al-Lihyānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-34</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter II B—M**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>Isnād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>al-Lihyānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter VI >H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>Isnād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>al-Kisāṭī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter IX Ğ—H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>Isnād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>al-Kisāṭī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


348 Muzhir I:475 (al-Lihyānī) is taken from Q II:43-44 where the isnād belongs to the preceding article (= IS-Y art. 17). Lisān III:295 reads: qāla Yaʿqūb: qāla l-Fanāʾ (sic!): qulnī l-irrābi etc.

349 The name of al-Kisāṭī has been added to the text by the editor from IS-tahdhdīb, p. 8.

350 Whether some (or even all) of these articles belong to an “al-Kisāṭī/al-Lihyānī”-block is uncertain. The last article is given in Q II:44 on the authority of al-Lihyānī, art. 22 (āṣāl—āṣān) is also given on his authority in Lisān I:146, and article 24 (irma‘alla—irma‘anna) most probably comes from him as art. 5 (irma‘alla—irma‘agallah) of chapter XVII ‘—GH is given explicitly on his authority, and the three forms probably belong to the same triad.

351 In Q the articles 12-13 (Q II:52) and 14-20 (Q II:53) form two different blocks, both of which have been given on the authority of al-Lihyānī, with a few articles between the two. This probably means that we should take articles 12-20 as an al-Kisāṭī/al-Lihyānī-block. The last four articles (21-24) are more difficult to attribute; of all sources dependent on IS-Y, only IS-tahdhdīb gives al-Lihyānī as the source for IS-Y art. 22-24 (ghayhab—ghayham; azba—azma; sa‘iba—sa‘ima = IS-tahdhdīb, p. 14, 15, and 13, articles 28, 37 and 19 in this order).

Chapter X Ḥ—KH  
art. 3-4 anonymous353  
art. 8 al-Lihyânî  

Chapter XVI S—SH  
art. 9-10 anonymous354  
art. 5 al-Lihyânî  

Chapter XVII ʿ—GH  
art. 5 al-Lihyânî  
art. 6 anonymous355  

Chapter XXIII ʿ—D  
art. 8 al-Lihyânî  
art. 9-10 anonymous356  
art. 11 al-Lihyânî358

Chapter XXIV TH—F  
art. 10 al-KisãT (via al-Farrâ')359

Chapter XXIX muṣāʿaf360

Chapter XXX ʿ—Y  
art. 12 (al-Lihyânî)361  
art. 13 anonymous362  
art. 14 al-Lihyânî ʿan-i l-KisãT  
art. 15-18 anonymous363

353 Article 3 (muʿğrâf—muḥārâf) is given on the authority of al-Lihyânî in K. al-ʿiṯāqâb no. 50 q.v. Al-Lihyânî did deal with the roots ĠLB and HLB (art. 4) as can be seen from the numerous al-Lihyânî quotes in the respective articles of Lisân (II:313-318 and III:275-281).

354 Article 9 is given explicitly on the authority of al-Lihyânî in Lisân IV:318. Articles 8-10 (iṭmaḥârâa—iṭmakharra; darbâṣa—darbâkha; taḥâwawfaa-taḥâwawfaa) are given on the authority of al-Lihyânî in Thaʿlab, Maʿğâlis, p. 351-352. The anonymous article 11 (the Qurʾānic sabḥan—sabkhan, Qur. 73:7) is nowhere given on his authority; on the contrary, the article is given in Mukh. XIII:277 preceded by "ghayruruḥu" (i.e. other than al-Lihyânî, the preceding block being given on his authority).

355 I have been unable to find any evidence to support the attribution of these three articles to al-Lihyânî (or al-KisãT).

356 Article 6 (baʿthara—baghthara) is found in the ibdâl literature only in IS-Y, IS-tahdîb (p. 34). AT (II:300) and Muzhir (I:553). Its counterpart baḥthara—baʿthara is given anonymously in IS-Y (p. 86) and the two pairs probably belong together, forming an ibdâl triad baḥthara—baʿthara—baghthara. This would mean that the pair in chapter XVII most probably does not belong to the al-Lihyânî block.

357 I can adduce little external evidence to support the attribution of these two articles (p. 124 salâṣil—dalâṣil and qabaṣa—qabaḍa) to al-KisãT/ al-Lihyânî. It is true that al-Lihyânî did discuss the root DDL in X:199 but with a different meaning, see Lisân VIII:82.

358 Article 11 (on taḍâwwaʿa—taṣawwaʿa; the correction to taṣawwâka—taḍawwâka made by the editor) consists of two parts, viz. taḍâwwaʿaʾ on the authority of al-Lihyânî and taṣawwaʿaʾ on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī.

359 Article 10 (aṭṭâfī—aṭṭâḥī) is further given on the authority of al-Lihyânî in Q II:34.

360 Article 9 (p. 135 qaṣṣâṣyū—Qâṣṣyū) is given on the authority of al-Qanâni who does not belong to the direct authorities of Ibn as-Sikkît. Ibn Ǧînîš, Sirr as-ṣînâʾaʾa, p. 759 gives the pair from IS (via Abû ʿAlî) and reads: "aṭṭâfâna Abû ʿAlî ‘an Yaʿqûb qâla: qâla l-Lihyânî: qaṣṣâṣyū azfâri...". Lisân XI:199 gives the isnâd as "qâla l-Lihyânî: haḵâ l-Qanâni". On the other hand Ibn as-Sikkît quotes the piece in his Lîlāb al-manṭiq, p. 302, as "wa-ḥaḵâ l-Farrâʾ ʿan-i l-Qanâni". Thus the evidence is not conclusive, but it is possible that the piece comes from al-Lihyânî. — For al-Qanâni, see GAS VIII:29-30, but note also Bauer, Pflanzenbuch, p. 222. In Q II:171 al-ʿAttâfî is a mistake for al-Qanâni.

361 The attribution of art. 12 (adḥrīʾ-āt—yadḥrīʾ-āt) has been added by the editor from IS-tahdîb, p. 55.

362 I have been unable to find external evidence for the attribution of art. 13 (asrūʾ—yaṣrūʾ) to al-KisãT/al-Lihyânî.

363 I have been unable to find external evidence for the attribution of art. 15-18 to al-KisãT/al-Lihyânî.
Thus there are twelve articles given on the explicit authority of al-Kisâl and/or al-Lihyânî in IS-Y, and probably at least the same number of implicit ones. As to al-Kisâl and al-Lihyânî as ibdâl authorities, it may be noted that if we exclude the articles of the first two chapters, most of the articles quoted on their authority are cases of potential taṣbifs (Ḡ→H; H→KH; S→SH; ‘→GH; Ș→D).

Al-Farrâ’

The influence of al-Farrâ’ in ibdâl studies is considerable. He did not write anything especially on the phenomenon but he wrote a monograph in the adjacent field of laḥn al-‘āmma (cf. GAS VIII:123). The articles given explicitly on the authority of al-Farrâ’ have been written in bold face.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I L—N</td>
<td>8 (addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B—M</td>
<td>13-14, 15-16, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Ġ—Y</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X H—KH</td>
<td>7 (addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII T—S</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI S—SH</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII ‘—GH</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII Q—K</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV TH—F</td>
<td>10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX ’—Y</td>
<td>21 (addition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Articles 8-10 are, on the contrary, attributed to al-Lihyânî in different articles of Lisân, cf. below sub al-Farrâ’.

364 This XVIII:313-314 mentions a “bāb as-ṣād waḍ-dād” which might seem to be a chapter of this work but the evidence of TL V:159 and V:163 (quoted above, p. 35) leads one to think that the attribution of this piece to al-Farrâ’ is an error.

365 For article 14 (kabn—kabl), cf. Lisân XII:20 (Ibn as-Sikht...bakâhu ‘an-i l-Farrâ’); for art. 16 (da‘alabil—da‘aliln), cf. Q II:43 (al-Farrâ’).

366 Articles 9-11 (p. 96 hağgatiğ, big, wafratîğ) are the rhyming words of one poetic fragment quoted on the authority of al-Farrâ’.

367 Articles 3-4 (p. 104 an-nâfî, akîyîf) are the rhyming words of one poetic fragment quoted on the authority of al-Farrâ’.

368 For art. 4 (p. 112 waghl), cf. Lisân XV:347.

369 Art. 6 (p. 113 qashâta—kašâta) explicitly from al-Farrâ’ in Ibn Ghinnî, Sîr as-ṣinâ’a, p. 277 (quoting Ibn as-Sikht); art. 7 (p. 114 qabata—kafta) probably also from al-Farrâ’, who is quoted in Sihhâ, p. 1151 as an authority for qâfta, though without mention of kafta. I have been unable to find external support for attributing art. 8 (114 fa-lâ takhar—QHR) to al-Farrâ’.

370 Art. 11 (p. 126 thûm—fûm) is given on the authority of al-Farrâ’ in Lisân X:355; for art. 12 (p. 126 furqubî—furqubî), cf. Lisân X:249 (a note on furqubî by al-Farrâ’).

371 Art. 6 (p. 136 alandad—alandad) might also belong to the al-Farrâ’ block, although I have not found any
Abū 'Amr ash-Shaybânî

Ash-Shaybânî is usually quoted in IS-Y (as well as in other earlier philological literature) simply as Abū 'Amr, although his whole name is sometimes used (e.g. p. 108, 112). This may sometimes cause the risk of confusing him with Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alá', as in chapter XXIX, art. 5 (p. 134 lam yatasanna—SNN; see below, sub Abū 'Ubayda).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV varia</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abū 'Amr ash-Shaybânî

Abū 'Amr ash-Shaybânî is usually quoted in IS-Y (as well as in other earlier philological literature) simply as Abū 'Amr, although his whole name is sometimes used (e.g. p. 108, 112). This may sometimes cause the risk of confusing him with Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alá', as in chapter XXIX, art. 5 (p. 134 lam yatasanna—SNN; see below, sub Abū 'Ubayda).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>35 (addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>14, 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X M</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X H</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV TH</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI S</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII Q</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

372 The name of the authority has been added by the editor from IS-tahdhib, p. 57. Q II:167, which is usually faithful to IS-Y, simply reads ghaynahu (i.e. other than Abū 'Ubayda). Articles 7-10 are anonymous but it would be overly hasty to attribute any of them to al-Farrá‘ as the attribution of art. 6 (p. 138 abaha—wabaha) is all but clear.

373 On the authority of Khalid ibn Kulthüm (the words wa-sama’tu have been added by the editor from IS-tahdhib, p. 54).

374 The editor of IS-Y has often added ‘ash-Shaybânî’ from other sources, mainly IS-tahdhib and Q. (e.g. p. 113, 118) to the text. All these unfounded additions should be deleted.

375 The addition in art. 14 (p. 73 wa-hakähahu Abū ‘Amr aydan) on the authority of Abū ‘Amr has been added by the editor from IS-tahdhib, p. 13, and is not found in the original.

376 Art. 9 (p. 80-81) has an addition on the authority of Abū ‘Amr on a D—DH pair (‘adār—‘adhāf), cf. Chapter XXXIII art. 1.

377 The formulation ‘samaatu Abū ‘Amr’ could also refer to Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alá’, in which case the subject would be al-‘Asma‘ī (the articles 1-8 belong to the al-‘Asma‘ī block). On the other hand, the same formulation is used, e.g. in ‘Abdalqâdir al-Baghðâdi, Ḥāshiya III:90, for the relations of Ibn as-Sikkït and ash-Shaybânî. For the close relationship between Ibn as-Sikkït and ash-Shaybânî, see also ‘Abdalqâdir, Ḥāshiya I:427.


379 For article 4 (p. 109 sawdhaqah—shawdhaqah), cf. TL VIII:311 (explicitly from Abū ‘Amr), partly quoted also in Lisân VI:223.
Abū 'Ubayda

Abū 'Ubayda is usually quoted in IS-Y only once per chapter and not in blocks. The relatively unimportant role of Abū 'Ubayda does not lend support to the theory that he wrote a monograph on the subject (see above pp. 12-13).

Chapter II B—M  art. 8, 9, 10, 25
Chapter III M—N  art. 5 (addition)
Chapter V H—'  art. 1
Chapter X H—KH  art. 5
Chapter XIX R—L  art. 9
Chapter XXXI S—D  art. 3
Chapter XXIV TH—F  art. 3 (addition)

380 Art. 5 (p. 118 sahk—sahg) could also be taken as an addition to art. 4 (sayhū—sayhū).
381 For art. 7 (p. 123 naṣnaša—naṇḍa), cf. TL XI:469 (< Abū 'Ubayd < Abū 'Amr).
382 Art. 8 (p. 125 thawhad—fawhad) is given on the authority of Abū 'Amr in Lisān X:341. Abū'Yaṣayyīb gives the pairs fisnī—thinī and thawhad—fawhad in AT I:184 on the authority of Abū 'Amr and al-Līhānī, but says about the definitions given in IS-Y on the authority of Abū 'Amr, that they come from a third authority (wa-qāla ghayrumā). Art. 9 (p. 126 urtha—urfa) is nowhere given on the authority of Abū 'Amr; in TL XV:118 and XV:246 it is given on the authority of al-Līhānī.
383 The Abū 'Amr quoted in the article 5 (p. 134 lam yatasanna—SNN) of this chapter is Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Ali', not ash-Shaybānī — the name ash-Shaybānī has been added by the editor of IS-Y from IS-tahdhīb, p. 58-59 — cf. below sub Abū 'Ubayda.
384 Cf. also chapter III art. 9 (p. 80-81 'adāf—'adhāf addition).
386 Articles 26-33 do not belong to the Abū 'Ubayda articles but are to be taken as anonymous. IS-Y art. 26 (p. 75 ḫuṣba—'ațma) is quoted in AT I:40 on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī, IS-tahdhīb, p. 14, quotes after ‘iqba—‘iqba (= IS-Y, art. 25) an article by al-Lībīn, and gives the IS-Y articles 26-33 as anonymous; Q II:54 introduces IS-Y art. 28 (p. 75 ḫuṣba—‘ațma) with ‘qāla Ya'qūb which in al-Qālī's formulation means that no older authority was available for him to cite.
387 Article 10 and 11 (p. 117 munqatīr—munqaṭīl and ḡiribbāna—‘gilībbāna) are to be taken as anonymous; in no other source, except IS-tahdhīb, p. 51, are they given on the authority of Abū 'Ubayd. AT II:64 gives all three articles (IS-Y 9-11) as anonymous, Q II:146 and Mukh. XIII:278 reverse the order of the articles and give only the last (= IS-Y art. 9, p. 117 amraṣ—amlaṣ) on the authority of Abū 'Ubayd.
388 Article 4 (p. 121-122 di'ī—‘ilī) seems more probably to be anonymous, though the evidence is here inconclusive: IS-tahdhīb, p. 49, reverses the order of IS-Y art. 3 (p. 121 ṣaṣīf—‘ṣafə) and art. 4 and gives art. 4 explicitly on the authority of Abū 'Ubayd. AT II:242 follows IS-Y but Q II:22, Mukh. XIII:279 and Lisān VII:266 and VII:6 give the pair only on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt.
There are five articles and one addition in IS-Y given on the authority of Ibn al-Aʿrābī. The articles are:

- Chapter XXIX muḍāʿaf
- Chapter XXXIV varia

In IS-tahdīb, p. 43 — whence the author of IS-Y has added it to the text of IS-Y (p. 131) — Abū ‘Ubayda is given as the authority for šāsib—šāsib (IS-Y art. 3). Despite this, the block IS-Y art. 3-6 is evidently not from Abū ‘Ubayda: in AT II:109-112 šāsib—šāsib is given on the authority of Abū ‘Amr, and the following three without any authority; Q II:185-186 gives first IS-Y art. 4-6 on the authority of al-Asmaʾī, after which comes IS-Y art. 3 from “ghayrulū” (similarly also in Mukh. XII:279; az-alā—as-alā is given separately); Ibn Ṣināʾī, Sīr as-ṣīnāʾ, p. 195, has only šāsib—šāsib (introduced by “wa-qāla ba’dahu”) in Lisān Abū ‘Ubayda is given as an authority on saʿīl—zaʾīl (Lisān VI:270) but the passage differs from the text of IS-Y.

Article 5, the Qurʾānic lam yatasannā—SNN (Qur. 2:259) is an interesting case. In IS-Y, p. 134, it is introduced by “wa-samīʾtu Abū ‘Amr yaqūlū” (the W of ‘Amr is accidentally missing; ash-Shaybānī has been added by the editor of IS-Y from IS-tahdīb, p. 58-59). The same information is also given on the authority of Abū ‘Amr in Lisān VI:404 SNN (and anonymously also in al-Farrāʾī, Maʿānī I:172-173). This Abū ‘Amr has been identified as Abū ‘Amr ash-Shaybānī not only in IS-tahdīb, but also in Ibn Qutayba, Tafsīr gharb al-Qurʾān, p. 95 (whence it has been taken to al-Harawi, K. al-Gharibayn III:201). The formulation of AT II:459-460 seems to imply the same: “qāla Ibn as-Sikkīt: samīʾtu Abū ‘Amr yaqūlū...” (the Abū ‘Amr whom Ibn as-Sikkīt had himself the opportunity to hear is naturally Abū ‘Amr ash-Shaybānī. Cf. also Islāh al-mantiq, p. 302!). — On the other hand, Ibn Ṣināʾī writes in his Sīr as-ṣīnāʾ, p. 758: “wa-qaraʾtu alā Abī ‘Ali bi-ḥṣārawī “an Abī ‘Ubayda qāla: samīʾtu Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ yaqūlū...”. The immediate source for the quotation is without doubt IS-Y. As Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ was a famous Qurʾānic scholar (and the teacher of Abū ‘Ubayda), this is a more natural attribution than ash-Shaybānī. The formulation in Lisān VI:404 also supports this: “wa-rāwā l-ḥṣārawī “an Abī ʿAbbās Ahmad ibn Yahyā flī qawlihi lam yatasannā qāla: qaraʾahā Abī Ġafar wa-ṣayba wa-ʿAṣir bi-ḥṣārawtā l-ḥāʾ...” (wa-wafqāhumu Abū ‘Amr fi ḫīl yatasannā...”). This places Abū ‘Amr on a par with men of the generation of mid-8th century (and the canonical qāris), a place natural to Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ (himself one of the qurāʾīs), but unsuitable to the later, and uncanonized, ash-Shaybānī. Thus it seems that the words “samīʾtu Abū ‘Amr yaqūlū” in IS-Y, p. 134, are to be taken as part of the Abū ‘Ubayda quote and as referring to Ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, and the contrary opinions of the Mediaeval scholars mentioned above as errors. — Note also ID, p. 135: “wa-fassara Abū ‘Ubayda qawlahu ḡallā wa-ʿażza “min ḥamāʾin masnūn” ay ṣallān, wa-ḥallū aʿlam” (al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil III:67 deals with the same passages but without naming any authorities).

Art. 2 (p. 133 taqaddiyya—QDD) is given in Ibn Ṣināʾī, Sīr as-ṣīnāʾ, p. 759 introduced by “akhabārān Abī ‘Ali qāla: qāla l-ʿAsmaʾī wa-Abā ‘Ubayda...”. IS-Y art. 3 (p. 133 mulabbī—LBB) is given as anonymous in Sīr as-ṣīnāʾ, p. 743-744. Articles 1-5 may come from Abū ‘Ubayda’s Gharb al-muṣannaf which contains a chapter Bāb al-muḥājirnna mina l-muḍāʿaf, see the list of chapter headings given in Abdel-Tawab, Das Kitāb al-ḡarīb, p. 58.

Art. 9 (p. 135 qaṣṣaytū—QSS) is given on the authority of al-Qanānī, see above sub al-Lihyānī.

The word “qāla” before art. 32 (p. 146 zūr—zūn), which would formally mean that the article belongs together with art. 31, has been added by the editor of IS-Y from IS-tahdīb, p. 65.

Lisān IV:349 gives the shāhid verse of art. 11 (yaʿtamī for yaʿtamμu) with the isnād < Thaʿlab < Ibn al-Aʿrābī.
Chapter XXXIV varia

The only Ibn al-A'rabī addition in IS-Y is of particular interest as it seems to contain a mistake which may throw some light on the early, and otherwise undocumented, manuscript tradition of IS. In chapter VIII Ğ—Y, art. 7 (which belongs to the al-Āṣma’ī block) has the following addition:

\[
\text{wa-anshada ‘an a’rābī [sic!]:}
\]

\[
\text{ka-anna fī adhmābihinna sh-shuwwalī}
\]

\[
\text{min ‘abasi š-ṣayfi qurrāna l-iğgālī²³²⁷}
\]

\[
yūrfdu: al-iyyal.
\]

A similar formulation is also found in AT I:259 which reads:

\[
\text{wa-zā‘amū anna ba‘da l-a’rābī kāna yunshidu: [follows the same shāhid]²³³⁸}
\]

In IS-tadhdīb, p. 29, we have instead:

\[
\text{wa-anshada ‘an Ibn al-A’rābī: [the same shāhid]}
\]

This agrees with Q II:78; Ibn Ğinnī, Sīr r-ṣ-sīnā‘a, pp. 176-177; Ibn Ğinnī, Mukhtaṣar, p. 29; Sīhā, p. 1621; Lisān I:79; and az-Zamakhsarī, al-Muṣafṣal, p. 372, all of which give the verse on the authority of Ibn al-A’rabī. This may have to be interpreted to mean that AT and IS-Y belong to the same part of the tradition (both deriving from the same manuscript family of IS), if we consider “from a Bedouin” to be a mistake for “from Ibn al-A’rabī”, which is the more widely circulating variant.

Abū Zayd

Ibn as-Sikkīt has included two ibdāl articles (and two other articles in Chapter XXXVI +N, art. 5-6) in IS-Y plus one addition on the authority of Abū Zayd. These are:

- Chapter X Ḥ—KH; art. 4
- Chapter XVI S—SH; art. 2
- Chapter XVIII Q—K; art. 4 (addition)

None of these articles can be traced to the extant works of Abū Zayd²³³⁹, nor are

²³²⁷ Read also in Q II:171 ḥasākil—ḥasāfî instead of the printed ḥasākil—ḥasāfīd.

²³²⁸ The two articles 35 and 36 (p. 146 tākk—fākk; qahr—qahm) belong closely together, so it seems evident that art. 36 also comes from Ibn al-A’rabī, though in AT II:84 it is given on the authority of al-Āṣma’ī, in whose K. Khalq al-insān (p. 161) it is moreover found. Art. 37 (p. 146 ḍindāla—iḍāba) is anonymous but probably does not belong to the Ibn al-A’rabī block. In other sources (AT I:310; Lisān IV:437 and IV:445; Sīhā, p. 1700) the article is given as anonymous (and it is missing from Q, which only has, Q II:184, articles 35-36), and in IS-tadhdīb, p. 65, the order of the IS-Y articles 35-37 is reversed (37, 35, 36) with the name of Ibn al-A’rabī occurring only after the IS-Y art. 37.

²³²⁹ The verse (cf. Abūn-Naḡm, Dīwān 56:84) is more often found with the normal variant l-iyyall (e.g. in Ibn as-Sikkīt’s own Iṣlah al-manṭiq, p. 83). For the full documentation of this verse and its variants, see Abūn-Naḡm’s Dīwān, loc.cit.

²³³⁸ Az-Zubaydī, Lahn al-’āmma, p. 157 belongs to the same tradition as it reads: “wa-qāla Ya’qūb: ba‘du l-arabī yagūlu: al-iğgālī, fa-yubdīlu l-yal a’fīman. wa-anshada Abū ‘Ali: [the same shāhid].”

²³³⁹ El Berkawy, Das Kitāb al-ibdāl, p. 59, in his study of the sources of what he thinks is the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt, viz. IS-tadhdīb, traces three articles to Abū Zayd’s an-Nawādir. Of these three only
the other lexicographical works of use in discovering the origin of these quotations with one exception: this being chapter X art. 4, the probable source of which is given by Ibn Ginni in his Sirr as-ṣīnā‘a, p. 183, where he writes:

fa-ammā mā qara‘tu ‘alā Abī ‘Ali ‘an Abī Bakr ‘an ba’di aṣḥābi Ya‘qūb
‘an Ya‘qūb min anna Abā Zayd qāla: [IS-Y art. 4]. qāla Abū ‘Ali: fa-

This K. al-Maṣādir has been lost⁴๐๐ so that it is not possible to verify whether the article of IS-Y comes from K. al-Maṣādir (directly or indirectly), as seems to me probable, or whether Abū Zayd only dealt with the same word from a different point of view in K. al-Maṣādir.

The sources of the additions in IS-tahdhīb

IS-tahdhīb contains 185 new ibdāl articles and several additions to the articles of IS-Y. In most of the new articles the redactor has supplied an authority, the commonest being Abū ‘Ubayda, al-Farrā’ and Abū ‘Amr. As is common in Arabic philological literature of the period (cf. e.g. AT), the immediate source of the quotation is usually not given. Apart from the five quotes of ID which have been discussed earlier, see p. 38, I have been unable to identify any of these immediate sources, though some articles of IS-tahdhīb find parallels in other philological literature (e.g. IS-tahdhīb, p. 8 āsān—āsāl has the same additions as AT L—N art. 23, part of which comes from ID, p. 1086).

The order of the additional articles does not follow any particular scheme (alphabetic, phonetic, anagrammatic; order according to the ultimate authority; subject-oriented order, etc.) which could give any clues as to the immediate source of the additions. Many of these are paralleled by the articles of TL⁴๐๑, but there does not seem to be any direct dependence between these works⁴๐๒; instead they may have used the same common sources. That IS-tahdhīb is not directly dependent on TL is made probable by the following considerations:

1. There is no common order in the articles of IS-tahdhīb and TL (cf. the relations

one, viz. Chapter XVI art. 2 (p. 109 ġars—ġarah), is of interest to us here as the other two are not found in IS-Y. El Berkawy compares XVI:2 with an-Nawādir, p. 213 (= ed. aš-Šartūnī, p. 34), but the comparison is misguided as the passages have only a faint resemblance. The same holds true for the two IS-tahdhīb passages and their comparison with an-Nawādir.

⁴๐๐ GAS IX:67 and IX:242. If Ibn Ginni’s attribution is correct, we should add this passage to the meagre list of quotations of K. al-Maṣādir known to Sezgin. — The passage is also given, without reference to K. al-Maṣādir, in Lisan IV:219.

⁴๐๑ E.g. Chapter II B—M art. 14 (p. 12-13 iqtaba‘a—iqtama‘a) = TL I:283 partially; art. 21 (p. 13 rağama —rağaba) = TL XI:54 (+ an explicit quote from ID, p. 466); art. 22 (p. 13 iṭma‘anna—iṭba‘anna) = TL XIII:198; art. 29 (p. 14 naqība—naqīma) = TL IX:199; but articles 47-49 (p. 16-17 takakkaba—takakkama; kabana—kabala; ‘atāmil—‘atābil) in the same chapter are not found in TL.

⁴๐๒ Neither that al-Azhārī would have used a recension close to IS-tahdhīb nor that the redactor of IS-tahdhīb would have used, at least systematically, TL.
of AT and ID).
2. Several articles of IS-tahdhīb are not found in TL.
3. The exact wording of TL and IS-tahdhīb often differs, though in some cases it also coincides.
4. Had the redactor of IS-tahdhīb excerpted from TL, he would have found far more material to add to his work as TL is very rich in ibdāls.

It is possible that the additions are, at least partly, based on the oral tradition received in the class-room, and that the final redactor has not gone through any additional sources systematically excerpting them for ibdāls, which would explain why one cannot find any systematic correspondences between IS-tahdhīb and other works.

The sources of K. al-Iʿtiqāb

It is difficult to say much about the sources of K. al-Iʿtiqāb due to the fragmentary character of the work and the fact that the overwhelming majority of the early lexical works written in Iran have disappeared (esp. the loss of the works of Abū Saʿīd ad-Ḍarīr, Shamir ibn Ḥamdawayhi and an-Naḍr ibn Shumayl, together with the thorny question of the date and provenance of the various parts of K. al-ʿAyn).

It is obvious that a major part of K. al-Iʿtiqāb was based on material directly derived from Bedouin informants, and thus it lacks a written source. Also the few biographical facts known about Abū Turāb (no. 352-357, discussed also above) indicate that the scholarly oral tradition played an important role in ninth century Iran, Abū Saʿīd being the link which connected Abū Turāb to the traditions of Syria and Iraq.

Of Abū Turāb's written sources the now lost works of Abū Saʿīd and Shamir which we know Abū Turāb read with their authors (Abū Turāb no. 355) and which consequently were probably used by him in K. al-Iʿtiqāb can be mentioned. It is also likely that Abūl-Wāzi‘s, now lost, Nawādir al-aʿrāb was used by him (cf. Abū Turāb no. 353). The only extant work which might have been among his direct sources is Ibn al-Aʿrābī's K. al-Bīr (cf. no. 158 and my notes thereto), although it is equally possible that the work was quoted by Abū Turāb through some work of Shamir or Abū Saʿīd.

The sources of az-Zaḡgāḡī's K. al-Ibdāl

Contrary to the other ibdāl writers, az-Zaḡgāḡī gives authorities or sources for his articles very sparingly. In fact, he names an authority in only four cases, and in each the authority is given for a story or a verse, not for the ibdāl per se. These four cases are:

1. p. 439: wa-dhakara Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAnbarī anna rağulan min fuṣahāʾī Rabiʿa akhbarahu annahu samʿa kathīrīn min aḥli Makka min fuṣahāʾīhim yaqulūna: yā Abdallāh yurīdūna: yā ʿAbdallāh I have been unable to identify this Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAnbarī. As the
manuscript of Z contains several coarse mistakes by the scribe, one might try to emend the name and to read it as al-'Askari or al-'Ukbari. There is in fact a Muḥammad ibn Yahyā al-'Askari, known also as an-Nadīm, see GAS VIII:166 and Iršād IV:185. According to GAS VIII:166 and VIII:99, he was a lexicographer who wrote a work on which az-Zāġgāġī, az-Zāġgāġī's main teacher wrote a commentary. Thus it is possible that the passage has come to az-Zāġgāġī via az-Zāġgāġī, possibly orally.


This person, too remains shadowy and I have been unable to find any information on him. — The story itself, though told in slightly different words, is in other places found on the authority of al-Ašmaʿī.

3. p. 473-474: wa-rabaktu th-tharīda wa-labaktu hu kay khalāṭaltlu. wa-ḥaddathanī l-Māzini qāla: qāla 1-Kisā: [continued with an anecdote with RBK]

This well-known anecdote is here given on the authority of al-Māzini. Despite the formula ḥaddāthani, the quote cannot come directly from al-Māzini who died in 248/869. It may instead have come orally via, e.g. Muḥammad ibn Rustam at-Ṭabarī, who was a teacher of az-Zāġgāġī and was known as “ghulām al-Māzini”.

4. p. 623: ...wa-Isrāʾîl wa-Isrāʾîn. wa-anshada l-Farrāʾ: [a verse with ḵismāʾIn409].

These are the only authorities explicitly named in the book.

The sources for Z's material are difficult to specify as there are no visible blocks nor any organizing principle to help us identify them. Some of the articles contain well known ibdāl cases, but a comparison with other ibdāl books where these are quoted on the authority of the earlier philologists does not show any preference for one or more philologists. In addition, much of Z's material is not known from other ibdāl works (e.g. Z, p. 442 salḥab—salḥam = ṭawīl), and several cases are not found in any lexical works, e.g. Z, p. 442 shayzam—shayżab = ṭawīl, or p. 607-608 sāqa—sāka 'to drive (e.g. a donkey)' (shayzab and sāka are not found in any other sources as far as I know).

403 Not found in GAS VIII or IX, GAL, nor in the biographical lexicons or the Index of Lisān. The editor of Z has carefully avoided commenting on this person.
404 See the editor's Introduction.
405 In Iršād IV:185 the name is read al-'Ukbari but the correct al-'Askari is given as the name of one of his ancestors in I:57.
406 The editor of Z here gives a note to the effect that al-Bāridi is unknown to him, too.
407 E.g. Muzhir I:263.
408 Cf. the Introduction to Z, p. 242.
409 This is a mistake (either in the edition or in the manuscript) for isrāʾînā, cf. e.g. IS-Y, p. 68 and the works dependent on IS-Y.
410 For salham, which is missing from almost all dictionaries, cf. e.g. Takmilā VI:58a.
The first chapters of Z (p. 254-275, 428-432), which contain ibdâls of the weak letters\textsuperscript{411}, have ample parallels in İslâh al-mantîq (esp. p. 139ff.), but the differences in order and wording\textsuperscript{412} means that it is unlikely that İslâh were a direct source of Z, although İslâh's wide circulation makes it probable that az-Zağâgî knew the book.

The main sources of AT

\textit{Introduction}

The purpose of the present chapter is to study the \textit{immediate} sources of AT, i.e. the books Abû't-Tayyib used when compiling his work. For an evaluation and understanding of AT this is much more important than the mere listing of AT's ultimate sources, i.e. the early philologists who form the final link in the isnâds and are usually named in AT\textsuperscript{413}. These immediate sources are not indicated by name in AT. Abû't-Tayyib has been particularly reluctant to mention his debt to his main sources: Ibn as-Sikkît is mentioned by name only three times, Ibn Durayd is not mentioned at all.

\textit{Ibn as-Sikkît's K. al-Qalb wa'l-ibdâl: material}

Even a superficial comparison of the material of IS-Y and AT clearly shows that IS-Y has been the basic source of AT: in most chapters the articles of IS-Y are given in AT first, though often in a different order, and only after that come the articles derived from other sources. Cf. e.g. the following table which shows the dependence of the respective chapters of AT on the first ten chapters of IS-Y (the order of the articles within the blocks is not discussed here):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>IS-Y</th>
<th>AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. L—N</td>
<td>1-34</td>
<td>= 1-37 with the exception of AT 3, 22, and 24. These and AT 38-64 are without parallels in IS-Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. B—M</td>
<td>1-36</td>
<td>= 1-42 with the exception of AT 5, 7, 28-31. These and AT 43-96 are without parallels in IS-Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. M—N</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>= 1-14. AT 15-39 are without parallels in IS-Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. '—c</td>
<td>the chapter is not preserved in the extant manuscript of AT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. H—c</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>= 1-4 and 7. AT 5-6 and 8-29 are without parallels in IS-Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. '—H</td>
<td>the chapter is not preserved in the extant manuscript of AT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{411} Most of these are morphological variants (variation in morpheme type; tertiae vs. mediae infirmae, etc.) or differences in the vocalization of the long vowels.

\textsuperscript{412} On the other hand, one should bear in mind that the conciseness of the articles in both works makes a comparison in many cases less than satisfactory.

\textsuperscript{413} El Berkawy, Das Kitâb al-ibdâl, p. 156-174, confines himself to this rather mechanical listing of the ultimate authorities. Cf. also the misguided belief of the editor of AT that the al-Asma'î quotes in AT stem directly from al-Asma'î's ibdâl work. cf. AT II:682.
7. H—H  1-11 = 2-10 and 12-14. AT 1, 11, and 15-38 are without parallels in IS-Y.
8. G—Y  1-11 = 1-4, 7-10 and 13-15. AT 5-6, 11-12 and 16-19 are without parallels in IS-Y.
9. G—H  1-4 = 1-4. AT 5-11 are without parallels in IS-Y.
10. H—KH  1-11 = 2-11 and 18. AT 1, 12-17 and 19-53 are without parallels in IS-Y.

This table proves beyond reasonable doubt that Abū'l-Ṭayyib wrote his compilatory work using Ibn as-Sikkīt's ibdāl monograph as a basis: the coincidences in the order of the articles are too remarkable to be due to, e.g. the use of common sources. Moreover, we know from the few explicit mentions of Ibn as-Sikkīt in AT that Abū'l-Ṭayyib did indeed have the work at his disposal414.

*All the IS-Y words?*

It should be emphasized that Abū'l-Ṭayyib has taken all the material of IS-Y into his monograph with only very few exceptions415. These exceptions are416:

1. The two chapters on words with a M or N extension (chapters XXXV and XXXVI) do not contain ibdāl material and accordingly they have not been used.

2. The material in the chapters XXIX muḍā‘af and XXXIV varia has been dispersed among different chapters in AT. All the muḍā‘af articles are found in different consonant—Y chapters of AT with two exceptions, viz. IS-Y art. 2 taqaḍdiya (for taqaḍḍida, p. 133) which falls within the middle lacuna of AT, and IS-Y art. 9 qaṣṣaytu (for qaṣṣatu, p. 135). The latter article is also found in Q II:171 and IS-tahdhib, p. 59, with the same wording as in IS-Y417, and can thus safely be taken to belong to the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt. There is no obvious explanation for its omission from the corresponding chapter of AT (§—Y AT II:264 which has only one word pair). The articles of the varia chapter are also found in the corresponding chapters of AT except for one case, IS-Y art. 16 (p. 144) waqīdha—waqīţ. Instead of this article in AT II:19 we find the pair waqīdha—waqīţ in chapter DH—T which has exactly the same wording as the article of IS-Y. Thus it seems that Abū'l-Ṭayyib has here misread or corrected his source; the form waqīţ is criticized, e.g. in Lisān XV:369 sub WQZ and WQT by Ibn Manzūr who prefers waqīţ418.

414 Note that explicit quotations from some book do not by themselves prove that the book was in fact used by the author. Cf. e.g. the case of as-Suyūtī (above, pp. 72-73) who quotes AT explicitly, yet he probably did not have the book at his disposal, the quote coming from intermediate sources.
415 As El Berkawy, Das Kitāb al-İbdal, p. 71-72, is unaware of the fact that Haffner's text is not the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt, but its later tahdhib, he could not recognize the importance of IS-Y as the basic source of AT.
416 The three lacunae of AT make the comparison of these parts with IS-Y impossible, and they have been left outside discussion.
417 The printed text of Q reads al-‘Attāfi for IS-Y's al-Qanāfi but this is a simple mistake.
418 It may be added that the pair waqīdha—waqīţ/waqīţ is missing from Q, Mukh. and Muzhir but it is
3. Chapter XXXII #w—#t- (IS-Y, p. 139) consists of 7419 articles (tukhama, turâth, tukhama, tattâ, taswâ, tuğâh and tali'd/tarîd). All these pairs are also found in Q II:167, Muzhir I:464 (only tuğâh is missing, but knowing the eclectic nature of Muzhir, its omission does not signify anything) and IS-tahdhib, p. 62-63. Four of them are totally lacking from AT I:149-150, and the wording of the remaining three articles common with IS-Y differs more than is usual420. Thus Abûl-Tayyib has either deliberately omitted this chapter, dropped it accidentally or he has had a defective copy of IS at his disposal. It should be noted that the particular chapter violates one of the main rules for ibdâls, as only one member of the pair is in actual use, the other being mere etymological speculation there being no such words as *waqâwâ, *watrâ and *wurâth. Yet this was probably not the reason for the omission of these words from AT as Abûl-Tayyib has, on the other hand, included three other cases which lack one member of the pair, viz. tukhama, tuka'a and tayqûr, in the same chapter.

4. The pair a'tada—a'adda from chapter XI of IS-Y is missing from AT. It is found in the other works dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhib, p. 53-54; Q II:112; Mukh. XIII:280; Muzhir I:464) so that it does belong to the original IS. There is no obvious reason for its omission from AT421.

5. The last and most interesting case of omission is the chapter XV TH—DH of IS-Y (p. 108). Three of the seven articles of this chapter have been left out of AT (nabidhâ—nabîtha; hadhâdhâ—thalâhâth; talâ'dhama—talâ'thama)422. The other four articles are found scattered throughout the chapter TH—DH of AT (art. 2, 4, 8, 12, I:160, I:161, I:163) and not as a block as the IS-Y articles usually are. Their wording differs, too, more than usual (esp. in the articles on qadhamma and ǧadhâ). There is no obvious reason for the omission of these articles.

Summary

A comparison of AT with IS-Y (and not IS-tahdhib!) shows that Abûl-Tayyib has sought to include all the ibdâl material of IS-Y in his monograph. The few omissions may be simple errors on the part of Abûl-Tayyib or he may have had a slightly defective copy of IS at his disposal. In some cases the omission may moreover have been deliberate (chapter #w—#t- and a'tada—a'adda).

---

419 The editor of IS-Y has added ta'llâh from IS-tahdhib, but it should be deleted from the edition as the parallel tradition shows unequivocally that it is simply an addition by the redactor of IS-tahdhib.
420 AT also has tukala instead of tuklân in IS-Y.
421 Yet it may be added that strictly speaking this pair does not belong to the “pure” cases of ibdâl because a'adda is a med. gem. verb and differs in most of its forms from a'tada, coinciding only in some perfect forms (a'tadu—a'addu).
422 That these words do belong to the original IS is shown by the parallel tradition (Q II:119-120; Mukh. XIII:280; Muzh. I:464-465).
The text within the articles taken from IS-Y

In AT the articles derived from IS-Y do not slavishly copy their source but the coincidences are remarkable enough to show that the source of these articles is IS-Y. To elucidate the relationship in the order and material of the articles of IS-Y and AT, the first two chapters of IS-Y are compared below with the respective articles of AT.

1. Chapter L—N

The first chapter of IS-Y contains 34 articles, and the corresponding chapter of AT has these 34 articles together with 30 other, thus totalling 64. The articles which the two works have in common are presented in almost the same order. These articles come at the beginning of the chapter of AT which has three articles intervening in the IS-Y block, viz. AT art. 3 (II:384) lub—nūb ʾbee; AT art. 22 (II:398) azlam—aznam (with the same root as AT art. 20, II:397 = IS-Y art. 19 zulma—zunma); and AT art. 24 II:401 uluqiʾa—untuqiʾa. The order of the articles in the two work is the following (the last column gives a brief summary of each article of AT in comparison to IS-Y):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS-Y</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Relationship of AT to IS-Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>hatala—hatana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>sudūn—sudūl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>katala—katana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>luʿāʾa—nuʿāʾa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>rifall—rifann</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ṣṭabarzal—ṭabarzan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>rahdana—rahdala</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>uṣaylālan—uṣaylānan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>laʿalla—laʿanna</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>daḥil—daḥin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

423 Not the same word as IS-tahdhib, p. 5 luba—nūba 'lava field'.
424 This article belongs to the same family as IS-Y, p. 79 umtuqiʾa—untuqiʾa, which probably explains its addition here.
425 The 34 articles of IS-Y and their parallels in AT. The remaining articles of AT are not included in the table. The order of the articles in Q II:41–44 has been added for sake of comparison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. ghiryal—ghiryan</th>
<th>11 12 9</th>
<th>- a quote from al-Aṣmaʿī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. damal—damân</td>
<td>12 13 10</td>
<td>+ a quote from al-Aṣmaʿī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. shathl—shathn</td>
<td>13 14 11</td>
<td>+ a new definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. kabl—kabn</td>
<td>14 15 12</td>
<td>+ new variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ a new ḥadīth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. atala—atana</td>
<td>15 16 13</td>
<td>- the name of the authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- two verses in the shāhid poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. dhaʿālīl—dhaʿālin</td>
<td>16 17 14</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. maʿana—maʿala</td>
<td>17 18 15</td>
<td>slight changes in wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ḥalak—banak</td>
<td>18 19 16</td>
<td>changes in wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. zulma—zunma</td>
<td>19 20 17</td>
<td>+ grammatical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ an explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ṭunwân—ṭulwân</td>
<td>20 21 18</td>
<td>- one variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ an explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ a new shāhid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. abbala—abbana</td>
<td>21 23 19</td>
<td>different authority!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ four new shāhids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. āsân—āsāl</td>
<td>22 25 20</td>
<td>+ a short definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ a “lugha ukhrā”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 'atala—'atana</td>
<td>23 26 21</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. īrmaʿalla—īrmaʿanna</td>
<td>24 27 22</td>
<td>+ grammatical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. lā bal—lā ban</td>
<td>25 28 23</td>
<td>+ new variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Iṣmāʿīl—Iṣmāʿīn</td>
<td>26 29 24</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Mīkāṭīn—Mīkāṭīn</td>
<td>27 32 25</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Iṣrāʿīl—Iṣrāʿīl</td>
<td>28 33 26</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Iṣrāʿīl—Iṣrāʿīl</td>
<td>29 30 27</td>
<td>+ a new verse to the shāhid poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sharāḥīl—Sharāḥīn</td>
<td>30 34 28</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ǧibrāʾīl—Ǧibrāʾīn</td>
<td>31 31 29</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. ālāṣa—anāṣa</td>
<td>32 35 30</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. dhalādḥīl—dhanādḥīn</td>
<td>33 36 34</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. khāmil—khāmin</td>
<td>34 37 35</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, the order of the articles is virtually identical in the two works (and in Q). This in itself would be an adequate basis for assuming that Abūʾl-Tayyib has used IS-Y as a source, but the grounds for this hypothesis are further strengthened by a comparison of the contents of the individual articles. The following gives a summary of their relationship:

1. In about 13 articles the wording is either identical or nearly so.
2. Many of the additions of AT are simply new forms of the paradigm; e.g. IS-Y art. 1 gives hatana, tahtinu, tahtān and huttan (and the respective forms with L), to

\[\text{A'sān—a'sāl, cf. IS-Y, p. 85 (usn—'usn) in another sense.}\]

\[\text{In this article there is also an addition by the copyist of IS-Y (p. 69) from another manuscript.}\]
which AT adds a new infinitive, hatanãn—hatalãn.

3. When the wording of the articles has been changed, the information given is usually still the same, e.g.

IS-Y art. 7 (p. 64): wa-yuqâlu: râhâdinatun wa-râhâdilatun wa-huwa tâwayyirun shâfîhu 1-lâqbarati [read so!]
illã annahu laysat lahu qunzu’a

Cf.

AT art. 8 (II:389): wa-yuqâlu li-tâyryn šâfîhun tushbihu l-qanãbira illã annahu lâ qanãzi’a lahã: ar-râhâdilatun wa-r-râhâdinu [continued with two additions]

Similarly also in:

IS-Y art. 10 (p. 64-65): wa’d-daḥinu wa’d-daḥil: al-khabbu–khabîth. wa’d-daḥinu aydan: al-kathîru l-laḥmi wa-yuqâlu: ba’îrun diḥanna: idhã kâna ‘ariḍân kathîra l-laḥm wa-anshada: [a shâhid]

qâla r-râţîz [continued with the same shâhid as in IS-Y].

4. Most of the new material in AT consists of new quotes, shâhid verses, etc., i.e. material that can easily be added later from other sources to an already prepared article, as the reductor of IS-tahdîhb has also done.

5. The commentaries of the shâhids in IS-Y have been dropped by Abu’T-Ṭayyib when they are not relevant to the ibdîl itself. That these commentaries do belong to the original work of Ibn as-Sikkît is shown by the parallel tradition (e.g. IS-Y art. 3, p. 62 = Q II:42-43; IS-Y art. 4, p. 62-63 = Q II:41 etc.).

2. Chapter B—M

For the sake of comparison, the second chapter of IS-Y (B—M) is given below alongside AT. The chapter contains 36 articles in IS-Y to which 60 other428 articles are added, which brings the total up to 96 articles. The order of the articles differs in this chapter more than in the first chapter discussed above. A comparison of any other chapter of IS-Y would give similar results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS-Y</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Relationship of AT to IS-Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. banâtu bakhΓ—mahkhr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. mâ’smuka—bâ’smuka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. arbada—armada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ a new shâhid

428 Some of these 60 articles actually duplicate the IS-Y articles, e.g. AT art. 50 (I:59 itma’anna—iba‘anna), 55 (I:61 abida—amida), and 95 (I:73 naqîba—naqîma).
4. ẓa'b—ẓa'm 4 12 8 - an explanation
         - a theoretical speculation
         + identification of the poet
         + a gloss to a word in the shāhid
5. ʿashaba—ʿashama 5 13 9 slight changes in wording
         + another definition
         + a shāhid
6. qaḥba—qaḥma 6 14 10 + a shāhid
         + one grammatical form
7. arbā—armā 7 11 - a ḥadīth
         + a ḥadīth
         + 3 examples of the use of the word
8. raḡba—raḡma 8 15 12 different authority, order changed
         - an explanation and a long passage
         + grammatical forms
         + a new shāhid
9. sammada—sabbada 9 16 13 changes in wording
         - a definition
         + a quote from Abū ʿUbayda
         + a shāhid
10. sāsab—sāsam 10 17 1 + a new shāhid
11. rātib—rātim 11 18 4 - authority
         + another form
         + a new shāhid
12. tihribā—tihrima 12 19 2 different authority
         + grammatical forms
         + a new shāhid
13. ʿabaqa—ʿamaqa 13 20 3 slightly different wording
14. kathab—katham 14 21 14 virtually identical
15. läzib—lāzim 15 22 15 + a new shāhid
16. shamāriq—shabāriq 16 23 16 + a grammatical form
         + a new shāhid
17. banāt ʿamārī—tabāri 17 24 17 virtually identical
18. ʿubri—ʿumrī 18 25 18 + an authority
         - a related word (ḏāl) and its definition
19. ʿağb—ʿaḡm 19 3 19 + an authority
20. dinnaba—dinnama 20 26 21 + an authority
21. aṣbār—aṣmār 21 27 20 - the name of the authority in one quote

---

429 One of these is the same as is given in IS-Y art. 32.
430 Most of this article is missing from the Yeni Cami manuscript (p. 73) but it has been added there to the margin by the copyist from another manuscript which has preserved the original, as the parallel tradition shows. AT has here been compared with the text given in the margins of the Yeni Cami manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ghayhab-ghayham</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+ an explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>azba-azma</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+ another example and a shāhid to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>șa'iba-șa'ima</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+ a new shāhid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'iqma-'iqba</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idba'akka-idma'akka</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>different authority(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kababa-kamaþa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ a new shāhid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h̄abal- h̄ama</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+ one quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra'aba-ra'ama</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+ name of the authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakaba-zakama</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+ grammatical forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abida-amida</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+ a new shāhid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>armã-arbã</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>– a variant(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba'kūkã'-ma'kūkã'</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>virtually identical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qardaba-qardama</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+ grammatical forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahlan-bahlan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+ variants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qarhab-qarham</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+ a Qur'ānic quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ibn Durayd's al-Čamhara**

When the material of AT outside the IS-Y blocks is examined, we see that some of the articles show a clear tendency towards anagrammatic order(?)431. Usually Abūʾt-Tayyib first gives the articles taken from IS-Y in one block, and then adds other articles, the majority of which being in anagrammatic order. To take but one example, the

---

431 In IS-Y the explicitly given authority is Abū ʿUbayda, in AT the implicit authority seems to be al-Libyant who is given explicitly in AT art. 3.
432 The missing variant ʿabida was probably in the now lost chapter ʿ—ʿ.
433 In AT IS-Y art. 7 and 32 are combined in AT art. 1.
434 For some reason this seems to have evaded all the former researchers of AT. El Berkawy, for example, writes (p. 95): «Inhaltes eines jeden Kapitels bringt Abū ʿt-Tayyib im allgemeinen die "ḥdāl"-Paare, ohne dass sie einer bestimmten Systematik unterliegen (...). Wie beim K. al-ḥdāl ist auch hier [El Berkawy speaks about Abūʾt-Tayyib's K. al-Addād] innerhalb der einzelnen Kapitel keine weitere Untergliederung erkennbar.» — The whole chapter "Methoden der Worterklärung" (p. 142-197) suffers from the fact that El Berkawy ignores the question of the immediate sources of AT and confines himself to listing the ultimate authorities.
following gives a resume of the articles in chapter L—N (AT II:382-414):

1-37  IS-Y block (except art. 3, 22, 24 on which cf. above)
38-47  articles in no obvious order
48-61  articles in anagrammatic order, viz.:

48. LBZ—NBZ
49. GDL—GDN
50. GLD—GDND
51. NFH—LFH
52. DRKHML—DRKHMN
53. LKH—NKH
54. FKHL—FKHN
55. LDGH—NDGH
56. DLH—DNH
57. RGHL—RGHN
58. FNK—FLK
59. GRYL—GRYN (not in anagrammatical order)
60. HTML—HTMN (quadriliteral)
61 FNVS—FLTS (quadriliteral)

62-64 articles in no obvious order

This table shows that these articles have been taken from a source which is organized according to the anagrammatic/alphabetical system. One possible source comes immediately to mind, viz. Ibn Durayd's famous al-Ǧamhara, which was written less than half a century before AT and which was known in the cities of Syria in his day. A comparison of ID with the anagrammatic blocks of AT confirms that Abūʾl-Ṭayyib has drawn very much material from Ibn Durayd's dictionary. In the following the anagrammatic blocks of three chapters of AT are compared with ID.

1. Chapter DH—Z (AT II:6-12)

This chapter begins with three articles taken from IS-Y. All the other articles (AT 4-15) are in an anagrammatic order:
AT 1-3 (II:6-7) < IS-Y (art. 3 contains an addition taken from ID, p. 304)
AT 4 (II:7):

wa-qālū: al-wadhwadhatu wa’l-wazwaza: al-khiffatu wa’l-sur’a. wa-
yuqālu: dhi’bun wadhwādhun wa-wazwāzun idhā kāna sarf’a l-khāṭwi
khafīfa l-mashy.

Cf. ID, p. 195 s.v. WDHWDH:

al-wadhwadhatu wa-huwa raḡulun wadhwādh: sarf’u l-mashy, wa-marra

dh-dhi’bu yuwadhwidhu wadhwādhun idhā marra musri’ān.

The other explanation, viz. that Abūʾl-Ṭayyib himself would have organized these articles is of course untenable, as it would leave unexplained the fact that the other parts of AT are not in an anagrammatic order.

Similarly, ID is one of the main sources of his K. al-Īrbāʿ.
and ID, p. 202 s.v. WZWZ:

al-wazwazatu wa-hiyya l-khiffatu wa’s-sur’e (…) wa-ra’ulun wazwazun idhā kānā khaffan kathīfa l-ḥaraka.

AṬ 5 (II:7):

wal-budḥūru wal-buzūr: ḥibbatu ṣ-ṣaḥrā’i ḍam‘u badhrin wa-bazr. wa-
yuqālū: qad badharat-i l-badhr wa-bazarat-i l-bazr.

This is one of the very few problematic articles in the anagrammatic blocks as it does not have clear parallels in ID. It is possible that it is an addition from some other source — in which case its correct place in the anagrammatic system would call for an explanation — or it may come from a marginal note in the manuscript of ID used by Abū’t-Ṭayyib. The relevant articles in ID read:

ID, p. 303 s.v. BDHR:

al-badhr: badhr an-nabāt.

ID, p. 307 s.v. BZR:

wal-bizr wa‘rūfun wa-ammā qawlū l-‘āmma: buzūru l-baqli fa-khaṭa’un
innamā huwa birz.

AṬ 6 (II:8):

wa-yuqālū: dhalaqa l-mā’a fī ḥalqihī yadhliḥu dhalğan wa-zalağahu
yazliḥu zağan idhā ḡara‘ahu.

ID, p. 454 s.v. DHLG:

wa-ladhafa l-mā’a fī ḥalqihī wa-dhalaḥahu idhā ḡara‘ahu.

The article ZLB (ID, p. 472) does not contain any relevant information and the same considerations that were proposed in the preceding case of the article hold true for this article, too437.

AṬ 7 (II:8-9):

wa-yuqālū: raqulun aḥwadḥiyun wa-aḥwaziyyun idhā kānā ḡaḍdan fī amrihi.

wa-yuqālū: ḥaţa r-rā‘i ibilahu yaḥāzuhā ḡawzan wa-ḥādhaḥā yaḥūdhuḥā ḡawdhан idhā ġama‘ahā wa-ṣaqaḥā wa-kaḫdālika ḡādha l-ḥīmārū ṭunahu.

qāla sh-shā‘ir:

yaḥūdhuḥunna wa-lahu ṭūdḥiyū / kamā yaḥūdhu l-ff’ata l-kaẖīfū
wa-yurwā bi‘z-zāy.

ID, p. 530 s.v. HWZ:

wa-ra’ulun aḥwaziyyun idhā kānā ḡaḍdan fīmā ya’khdhuhu fīhi min ‘amal.

wa-ḥaţa r-rā‘i ibilahu yaḥāzuhā ḡawzan idhā ġama‘ahā wa-ṣaqaḥā wa-
kaḫdālika l-ḥīmārū idhā ḡaţa ṭunahu. qāla l-‘Aḡgāgh:

yaḥūzuhunna wa-lahu ṭūzīyū / kamā yaḥūzū l-ff’ata l-kaẖīfū
wa-yurwā: wa-lahu ṭūdḥiyū / kamā yaḥūdhu (...)

437 Lisān V:52 contains the same pair as AṬ (dhalaqa l-mā’a fī ḥalqihī: ḡara‘ahu wa-kaḫdālika zalağahu).
AṬ 8 (II:9):
wa-yuqâlu: khadhaqa t-ţâ‘iru yakhdhiqu khadhaqan wa-khazaqa yakhziqu khazaqan idhâ dharaqa.
ID, p. 582 s.v. KHDHQ:
khadhaqa t-ţâ‘iru wa-khazaqa wa-mazaqa idhâ dharaqa 438.

AṬ 9 (II:9):
wa-yuqâlu li‘l-kilâb: awlâdu dhâri‘in wa-awlâdu zâri‘.
ID, p. 692 s.v. DHR:
wa-yuqâlu: awlâdu dhâri‘in wa-awlâdu zâri‘in — bi‘z-zây — wa-awlâdu wâzi‘.

AṬ 10 (II:9-10):
wa-yuqâlu: dha‘aqahu yadh‘aqahu dha‘qan wa-za‘aqahu yaz‘aqahu za‘qan idhâ šâha bihi wa-afza‘ahu. qâla r-râgiz:
yâ rubba muhrin maz‘ûq / muqayyalin aw maghîq
wa-yuqâlu: ma‘un dhu‘aqun wa-zu‘aqun idhâ kâna murran.
ID, p. 697 s.v. DH‘Q:
adh-dha‘qu lughatun fî z-za‘q. dha‘aqahu wa-za‘aqahu idhâ šâha bihi wa-afza‘ahu. wa-ma‘un dhu‘aqun wa-zu‘aqun bi-ma‘nan.
ID, p. 815 s.v. Z‘Q:
(...) qâla r-râgiz:
the same shâhid

AṬ 11 (II:10):
ID, p. 697 s.v. DH‘T:
dha‘atahu yadh‘atuhu dha‘tan idhâ qatalahu qatlan waﬁyân ay sarî‘an
(...). 
ID, p. 813 s.v. Z‘T:
az-Za‘tu mithlu dh-dha‘ti sawâ‘. za‘atahu wa-dha‘atahu idhâ khanaqahu
(...).
It can be seen that Abû‘l-Ţayyib has got the pair from ID, p. 813, where the pair is explicitly given, not from ID, p. 697, which only gives dha‘ata. This explains why the pair is placed after DH‘Q—Z‘Q which comes later in the anagrammatic system but which has been excerpted from ID, p. 697.

AṬ 12 (II:11):
wa-yuqâlu: sammun dhu‘āfun wa-zu‘āfun idhâ kâna qâtilan.
ID, p. 697 s.v. DH‘F:
438 This passage is also the source of khazaqa—mazaqa, AṬ I:346.
The pair has been taken from ID, p. 814.

AṬ 13 (II:11):
wa-yuqālū: dhamiha yawmunā yadhmuḥu dhamahan wa-zamiha yazmahū zamahan idhā shtadda ḥarruḥu.

ID, p. 703 s.v. DHMH:
(...) wa-dhamiha yawmunā idhā shtadda ḥarruḥu (...).

ID, p. 829 s.v. ZM:
az-zamah: al-ḥarrū min qawlihim: zamīha yawmunā wa-dhamiha idhā shtadda ḥarruḥu wa-sakanat riḥuḥu.

The pair has been taken from ID, p. 829.

AṬ 14 (II:11-12):
wa-qaḥā: al-khādha' alatu wa'l-khāzha' ḍala: ḍarbar mina l-mashyi l-ma'īb. qāla r-rāğiz:
wa-sadwi riḡîn ḍi'āfī 1-argūlī / matā urid shiddatahā tukhādha'īlī
wa-yuqālū minhu: khadh'āla yuhkhadh'īlu khadh'ālātan wa-khāz'āla yuhkaz'īlu khaz'ālātan wa-khīz'ālātan wa-yuqālū: nāqatun bihā khāz'ālūn idhā kāna bihā ḏal'un shadīd.

ID, p. 1144 s.v. KHDH-quadriliteral:
(...) wa'l-khāz'ālatu aydān nahu l-khāz'alāti wa-huwa darbun mina l-mashy. qaḥā r-rāğiz:
wa-naqļī ḍi'āfī l-argūlī / matā urid shiddatahā takhādha'ālī
wa-tukhādha'īlī aydān wa-yurwā: takhāz'ālī wa'dh-dhālū a'īlā wa-minhu qaḥlūhum: nāqatun bihā khāz'ālūn bi-fathi l-khā' (..).

AṬ 15 (II:12):
wāl-khādharnaq wa'l-khazarnaq: al-ʿankabūt.

ID, p. 1144 s.v. KHD-quadriliteral:
wāl-khādanaq [sic]: al-ʿażīmu mina l-'anākib (...) wa-yuqālū: al-khazarnaq aydan bi'z-zāy.

Note that this pair is given in ID before the preceding article, though on the same page. This makes it possible that the pair has been excerpted from ID, p. 1185 s.v. KH quinquiliterals:
wāl-khādanaq [sic] wa-khazarnaq: ismūn min aṣmā'I l-ʿankabūt.

Thus we see that the whole chapter has been taken from ID except for art. 1-3 (which are taken from IS-Y) though the name of Ibn Durayd (or al-ʿamhara) is not once mentioned in this chapter nor indeed in the whole AṬ. Articles 5 and 6 present some difficulties; they come in anagrammatic order which makes it probable that they come from ID439, yet they do not coincide with the text of ID. Besides the two
possible explanations given above, one may add the third possibility that Abū-l-Tayyib has added cases from his memory when coming to the respective articles in ID (i.e. when arriving at dhalāğa in ID, p. 454, he has remembered — from other sources — zalağa with the same meaning).

2. Chapter TH—F (AT I:181-198)

Of the 35 articles of AT, 1-23 have been taken from IS-Y. Some of the additions in the text of these articles come from ID (AT art. 1, I:181-182, addition from ID, p. 159; AT art. 2, hadīth (AT I:183 I. 1-2) added from ID, p. 428, etc.), though others come from other sources.

AT articles 24 (I:195 ǧu’itha—ǧu’ifa), 25 (I:195 tūthar—tūfar) and 33-35 (I:198 kinthira—kinfra; thāththa—fahfaḥa; thulla thalaluḥu—fulla falaluḥu) are not in an anagrammatic order, nor are they from ID.

AT articles 26-32 are in an anagrammatic order if we take into account the fact that some of the articles have been excerpted by Abū-l-Tayyib from chapter TH of ID, others from chapter F:

AT 27 (I:195-196) ĞTHL—ǦFL, cf. ID, p. 415 and 487 (a long article of AT, compiled almost verbatim from these two articles of ID)
AT 28 (I:197) THDM—FDM, cf. ID, p. 420 (where the ibdāl is explicitly given; cf. also ID, p. 672)
AT 29 (I:197) LQTH—LQF, cf. ID, p. 430 and 966. Neither of the ID articles mentions the VIII stem so this is an addition from some other source. Note that according to ID, p. 430 laqitha is questionable (layṣa bi-thabt).
AT 30 (I:197) THGR—FGR, cf. ID, p. 414 and 462 (cf. AT 26). The article was probably excerpted by Abū-l-Tayyib when coming to the latter article.
AT 31 (I:197) KFH—KTHH, cf. ID, p. 417 and 554. In the latter article of ID, there is an explicit equation of KFH and KTHH (mutaqāribānī fī l-ma’nā).

439 Usually additions coming from other sources but intervening in the anagrammatic blocks do not conform with the anagrammatic order.
440 AT art. 13 (I:191-192) dalāfa—dalatha is actually missing from the Yeni Cami manuscript, but this is obviously one of the rare instances of textual corruptions therein. The article is found in almost all the parallel tradition of IS-Y: AT; IS-tahdhib, p. 36; Q II:34; Mukh. XIII:286. Further it belongs to a three word block (IS-tahdhib art. 16, 17, 18, p. 36 fahalal—thalhal; ‘afana—‘athana; dalafa—dalatha = Q art. 22, 21, 20 = Mukh. Art. 22, 21, 20).
441 AT art. 24 (II:34) is also found in IS-tahdhib, p. 36 (and in Tahdhib al-alfāz, p. 181; Z, p. 617), but it seems to be an addition by the redactor, not an omission in the Yeni Cami manuscript, as it is not found in the other works dependent on IS-Y (Q, Mukh., Muzhir). AT art. 25 is also found in Q II:34 and Mukh. XIII:286. It is an often quoted case of idbāl (also in, e.g. Tha’lab, Fāṣbl, p. 48) and also found in laḥn al-alma’—works (e.g. Ibn Qutayba, Adab al-kāthib, p. 413; Ibn Makkī, Tahqīqī, p. 43). Ibn Hishām, Madkhal, p. 81 = Radd, p. 37, even attributes it to Ibn as-Sikkīt’s K. al-Qalīb wa’l-idbāl, but this seems to be a mistake for Ibn as-Sikkīt’s Islāḥ al-mantiq (p. 327), if we do not postulate that Ibn Hishām had at his disposal a copy of IS belonging to the same family as IS-tahdhib.
AT 32 (I:197) TTHR—TFR, cf. ID, p. 420 and 754. In the latter article of ID, there is an explicit equation of TTHR and TFR.

3. Chapter L—N (AT II:382–414)

The chapter contains 64 ibdāl articles. Of these 1-37 (except for 3, 22, 24) are taken from IS-Y. Articles 38-47 are not in an anagrammatic source, and, as a comparison with the respective articles of ID shows, not from ID with the possible exception of art. 46 (II:406 lablab—nabnaba) which resembles ID, p. 177442. The remaining articles, except for the last in the chapter, are taken from ID:

AT 49 (II:407) GDL—GDN, cf. ID, p. 449 (ID has only ḡādil — there is no ḡādin in p. 451 — but the wording of the explanation coincides very closely with that of AT).
AT 52 (II:408–409) DRKHML—DRKHMN seems to be an interpolation. A small part of the article coincides with ID, p. 1227 (but note that its place here implies that this is not the source for the quote, as the article should in that case come after art. 61 < ID, p. 1155).
AT 53 (II:409) Yalkha’—Yankha (nom. loc.), cf. ID, p. 613 and 614.
AT 54 (II:409) FKHL—FKHN, cf. ID, p. 617. The article of ID has only tafakhkhala (with no tafakhkhana) but the wording in both books closely coincides.
AT 56 (II:410) DLH—DNH, cf. ID, p. 682 and 686 (the ibdāl pair is explicitly given in the latter article).
AT 57 (II:410) RGHL—RGHN, cf. ID, p. 780.
AT 58 (II:410) FNK—FLK, cf. ID, p. 969 (the pair is given there explicitly s.v. FLK, but cf. also s.v. FNK).
AT 59 (II:411) ġiryāl—ġirīyān, cf. ID, p. 1040 and 1204. The shāhid which has been added to the article of AT probably comes from ID, p. 1099.
AT 61 (II:412) FNTS—FLTS, cf. ID, p. 1155.
AT 63 (II:412-413) TBL—TBN, cf. ID, p. 1302 (without the two shāhids, one of which may come from ID, p. 359).
AT 64 (II:413-414) BLL—BNN, not from ID.

442 As AT art. 47 (I:406-407 sīğīl—sīğīn) does not seem to be taken from ID (although it partly coincides with ID, p. 1192), it is very probable that the ID block does not begin with AT 46. Another possibility is of course that the ID block begins with AT art. 46, then there is one addition (art. 47) before the main part of the block.

443 This and the following pair, which are not in anagrammatic order, come from the Nawādīr chapter of ID.
Notes on the use of ID as source in AT

In some chapters of AT there do not seem to be any anagrammatic blocks. One of these is the chapter R-M (AT II:82-87) which contains 12 articles. Of these articles 3 or 4 could in theory come from ID (AT art. 4, II:84, RKD—MKD, cf. ID, p. 637 and 679; art. 7, II:85, DWR—DWM, cf. ID, p. 684; art. 8, II:86, RHK—MHK, cf. ID, p. 800 and 984; perhaps also art. 11, II:86, KHYR—KHYM, cf. ID, p. 594 and 622), but as they do not form a coherent block, it seems inadvisable to consider them to be taken from ID; due to the traditional character of Arabic lexicography, the same information may be found in several sources, and it requires further proofs to name the specific work which has been the source for another.

Excursus: the manuscript of ID used by Abü't-Ṭayyib

When we compare AT with ID, we note that in several cases the wording of AT coincides with the wording of the manuscript T of ID, which, cf. R. Ba‘labakkî, Introduction to ID, p. 32, contains additions to the basic text. The manuscript T is itself a relatively modern copy, dating from 1078 A.H.\(^4\), but it is based on an older manuscript which had been read to Ibn Khâlawayhi, who may have been a co-student of Abü't-Ṭayyib, cf. above, and to Abûl-‘Alâ‘ al-Ma‘arrî. Thus it belongs to the Syrian tradition. AT shows that Abû’t-Ṭayyib had a manuscript of the same family at his disposal, and also confirms that (at least many of) the additions in the manuscript T date back to the first half of the 10th century\(^5\).

AT and the manuscript T of ID coincide against other manuscripts of ID at least in the following points:

AT I:71-72:
wa-yuqâlu: raḵulun zibirrun wa-zimirrun wa-huwa l-qawûyu sh-shadîd. qâla r-râgiz:
[innî idhâ ṭarfu] l-ḡabâni ḥmarrâ
wa-kâna khayru l-khašlataynî sh-sharrâ
[akûnu thamma] asadan zibrirā

Cf. ID, p. 1275:
qâla: wa-yuqâlu: raḵulun zibirrun wa-dhimirrun [MS-T: zimirrun] wa-huwa l-qawûyu sh-shadîd. wa-anshada [the same three verses].

AT I:71: The vocalization ‘asharrab—‘asharram coincides with the manuscript T (ID, p. 1152).

AT I:73-74 is not in itself taken from ID, but a part of it which probably is an addition from ID coincides with the text of the manuscript T (ID, p. 148).

\(^4\) Ba‘labakkî, Introduction to ID, p. 32; GAS VIII:102. The manuscript T is in the Aṣaﬁya library, Haydarabâd.

\(^5\) Note that the manuscript T (Ba‘labakkî, Introduction to ID, p. 32) contains marginal notes by one of Abû’t-Ṭayyib’s teachers, Abû ‘Umar az-Zâhid, but only a fragment of it is extant (pp. 1227-1282 of the edition).
Abū‘T-Ṭayyib’s method of quoting ID

As we have seen, Abū‘T-Ṭayyib went through ID page by page, excerpting all those words which form an ibdāl pair. As he has sometimes noted these pairs only when coming upon the latter (in anagrammatic order) member of the pair, the anagrammatic order within ID-blocks is somewhat confused. Thus, e.g. the pair lataba-latama (AT I:61) has been taken from LTM (ID, p. 410; not from LTB) which explains the place of this article within the ID block of AT chapter B—M.

In excerpting from ID, Abū‘T-Ṭayyib acted rather mechanically without having later revised his work. Thus several articles of AT duplicate each other, the same roots may be dealt with in different articles etc. Thus, e.g. in the chapter B—F iskāb—iskāb (AT I:21) has been taken from ID, p. 339, but uskubba—uskuffa (AT I:23, i.e. only two pages later) from ID, p. 847. In chapter H—KH ḥarbaṣīs—kharbaṣīs (I:277) comes from ID, p. 1116, but the same pair (with ḥarbaṣīs—kharbasīs) in I:281 from ID, p. 1219. Similarly, in chapter D—S marada—marasa (AT I:370), which is not in the ID block, is duplicated by marād—marās, marās—marās (AT I:371) in the ID block (< ID, p. 640 and 721), and though the former article does not contain anything that is not found in the latter, has been allowed to remain in the text. There are also many cases where the IS-Y and ID blocks contain duplicates. — On the other hand, it has to be remembered that in many cases the articles contain additions from other sources, which indicates that although he did not revise his work later, Abū‘T-Ṭayyib did at least amplify it with additions from other sources. These additions are still of an unsystematic character, rather haphazard additions of shāhid verses, ḥadīths, etc., which are in most cases very hard to trace with certainty to any one source.

When excerpting from ID, Abū‘T-Ṭayyib has collected both word pairs explicitly defined as synonyms (falling thus within the category of ibdāls) in ID and pairs unconnected in ID. These pairs can be grouped as follows:

1. Words given as ibdāls in ID. — Ibn Durayd seldom used the word ibdāl (or

---

446 The pair is also explicitly found in ID, p. 339, but the order of the articles proves that Abū‘T-Ṭayyib overlooked the first case of this ibdāl.
its synonym ta‘āqub) but often in one article he defines two words which differ only in one consonant, which in practice equals to an ibdāl pair, as synonyms. Thus we find, e.g.:

ID, p. 619 (> AT I:68):
wa-yuqālu: makhiqat ‘aynuhu idhā ‘warrat wa-nkhasafat (...) wa-mithluluh bakhqiqat ‘aynuhu.

ID, p. 1150 (> AT I:1-2):
wa-yuqālu: ‘adhhaltuhu wa-‘abhaltuhu idhā taraktahu wa-sawmahu.

2. Word pairs which are not explicitly connected by Ibn Durayd nor given in the same article, but the meaning of which is identically defined in two different articles of ID, or the definitions of which differ in only minor easily neglected details. Thus, e.g.:

ID, p. 108:

ID, p. 164:

Together these articles have generated AT I:341.

3. Word pairs whose definitions in ID sometimes differ considerably. In a minority of these cases, it seems that the words have rather arbitrarily been linked by Abū’l-Ṭayyib. Examples:

ID, p. 449:
wa-arḍun ǧaladun ay șulbatun shadīda.

ID, p. 451:
wa’l-Šanad: al-ardu l-ghalIza.

These articles have been combined by Abu’l-Ṭayyib to give (AT II:408):
wa’l-ğaladu wa’l-șanad: al-ardu sh-shadīdatu š-șulba.

ID, p. 613:
wā-Yalkha‘: mawdi‘un bi’l-Yaman.

ID, p. 614:
wā-Yankha‘: mawdi‘.

These have been connected by Abū’l-Ṭayyib in one article with an unusually scrupulous note (AT II:409):

ID, p. 272:
wā’l-habiš: alladhī lahu ǧuddatāni fi ǧanbayhi min sha‘ari baṭnihi wa-zahrihi mustaṭīlān.

ID, p. 297:
wā-žabyatun hamīgūn wa-ḥiya l-fatīyatu, za‘amū, wa’l-ḥasanatu l-ǧismi
Together these two articles give AŢ I:62:

wa-l-habīgū\(^\text{447}\) wa-l-hamīg: az-ţabyu lladhī lahu șuddatānī bayna șanbayhi wa-sha’ari batnīhi mustaţfīlān.

This is all too typical of Abū’-Ţayyib’s semantic unscrupulousness and indeed of many of his colleagues.

Worth noting also is AŢ I:360:

wa-qālū: huwa l-șirdawnu wa-l-șirdhawnu li-hādhihi d-duwaybbatī l-‘arabīya.

As this article of AŢ undoubtedly comes from ID — it belongs in the middle of a block of 12 articles taken from ID — it is interesting to see how Abū’-Ţayyib connects two different words, the ‘arabīya of one of which is doubted by al-Asma’ī and the exact meaning of the other is unknown to Ibn Durayd, and how he dismisses any problems by calling the animal “hādhihi d-duwaybbatī l-‘arabīya”.

4. A small group of ibdāls in AŢ is due to simple mistakes or misunderstandings. One case is AŢ I:214 which has inevitably been taken from ID, p. 456 and 584\(^\text{448}\):

AŢ I:214:

wa-yuqālu: zarağahu bi’r-rumhi zarğan wa-zarakhahu (...) idhā ta’anahu bihi ta’nan sarī’an.

cf. ID, p. 456:

wa-yuqālu: zarağahu bi’r-rumhi yazrīğuḥu zarğan idhā zağğahu bihi wa-laysa bi’l-lughati l-‘aliya.

and ID, p. 584:

wa-razakhahu bi’r-rumhī yarzikhahu razkhan idhā zağğa bihi (...).

There is no zarakha in ID (nor in the other dictionaries, except Takmila II:147, addition), and it is clear that Abū’-Ţayyib has mispunctuated the word zarakha. The

\(^{447}\) The manuscript erroneously gives al-‘abīq which has duly been corrected by the editor of AŢ.

\(^{448}\) It belongs to a block of six articles (AŢ I:213-214) taken from ID (AŢ art. 1 șaľāq-șaľākh < ID, p. 479 and 605; AŢ art. 2 infađağa—infađakhah < ID, p. 480 and 607(?); AŢ art. 3 șāla’a—șalakhah < ID, p. 482; AŢ art. 4 șaddhama—kḥadhamah < ID, p. (454 and) 582; AŢ art. 5 șarağ—a-zarakha < ID, p. (456 and) 584; AŢ art. 6 șafa’a—khaṭa’a < ID, p. 1096 and 1302).
same ghostword zarakha is found also in AT I:341 (zarakha—zaraqa).

Note also the mispunctuation of khadarnaq (read khadharnaq by Abū'l-Tayyib < ID, p. 1144 and 1185), quoted above. Also the pair ḥabtar—habtar (AT I:325) seems to be caused by careless reading of two articles of ID:

AT I:325:

wa-yuqālu: rağulun ḥabtarun wa-habtar: idhā kāna qaṣīran.

which seems to come from

ID, p. 1110:

wa-Ḥabtar: ismun aydan wa'l-ḥabtarana: ḍa'ūlatu l-ġismi wa-qillatuahu. rağulun ḥabtarun wa-ḥubātirun wa-ḥatr: qaṣīrun wa-aḥṣabuhu maqlūban ‘an ḥabtar.

and

ID, p. 1111:

wa-Ḥabtar: mawḍī‘un mithla ḥabtar: sawā’.

There are also many cases where Ibn Durayd says that the word he is discussing is uncertain (usually: “wa-laysa bi-thabt”). In most of these cases Abū'l-Tayyib has omitted these reservations and presented the words with no comments on their reliability. E.g.

ID, p. 430 laqītha > AT I:197.
ID, p. 434 wathana > AT I:96.
ID, p. 391 matada (wa-lā adri mā thabtuhu) > AT I:142.
ID, p. 510 zarāḥa > AT I:305.

In several cases Abū'l-Tayyib seems to have speculatively derived new words from a root attested in ID and added these to his work. E.g.

AT I:359:

wa-yuqālu: huwa miṣdāfu s-safināti wa-miğdhāfuhā wa-abā l-Aṣma‘i illā bi'd-dāli ghayri l-muqgamā. wa-yuqālu: ḡadhafa t-tā’iru wa-ḡadhafā idhā danā fi ẓayarānīhi mina l-arḍ.

This may stem from ID, p. 448:

(...) wa-miṣdāfu s-safinati bi'd-dāli wa'dh-dhāli, za'amū, wa'd-dālu aktharu (...) 
and ID, p. 454:

ḡadhafa t-tā’iru idhā asra‘a tahrika ḡanāḥayhi (...) wa-minhu shiqāqu miğḍāfi s-saffina.

In a few cases Abū'l-Tayyib has enlarged the semantic field of the ibdāl phenomenon, e.g. AT I:359:

wa-yuqālu: dāḥaqtu r-raḡula (...) wa-dhahāqthuhu (...) idhā saḥabahu saḥban, wa-dāḥaqatu r-rīfu wa-dhahāqthu idhā garrathu min mawḍī‘in ilā mawḍī‘. wa-dāḥaqtu sh-shay‘a wa-dhahāqthu aydan idhā 'araktahu
kamā yu‘raku l-adim. 
which probably comes from ID, p. 435: 

wa’d-dahī: lughatun yamaniya: dhaḥaḥahu daḥgān idhā ‘arakahu kamā 
Yu‘raku l-adim. wa-yuqālu: dhaḥaḥahu dhaḥgān bi’dh-dhilī l-mu‘gamati 
wa-hiya a’lā l-lughatayn. 

and ID, p. 435-436: 

adh-dhaḥgū wa-huwa mithlu s-saḥāsī sawā‘: dhaḥaḥahu wa-saahasahhu bi-
ma‘nan wa-dhaḥāgathu r-rīḥu idhā ḡarrathu min mawdi‘in ilā mawdi‘. 
In this case, it seems that Abū‘t-Tayyib has rather arbitrarily added the meanings of 
the latter article of ID (DHHG) to the former (DHG); Ibn Durayd only says that dhaḥaḥa 
is the better variant of dhaḥaḥa in the sense = ‘araka. 

In a few intriguing cases, there are ibdāl pairs in AT’s ibdāl blocks which definiti-
ately appear to come from ID (the exact wording of the definitions; order of articles 
taken from ID, etc.), but of which only one member is in reality found in ID (including 
the additions of the manuscript T, cf. above). Thus there is a block of twenty articles in 
AT I:271-279 which seem to come from ID: they are found exactly in the same order 
in ID with identical or very similar wording. At first glance, the only exception is the 
article on ḥidlib—khidlib (AT I:277) which reads: 

wa-yuqālu: nāqatun ḥidlibun wa-khidlibun wa-hiya l-musinnatu l-
mustarkhiya. 
The word ḥidlib is not found in ID, but we find khidlib in ID, p. 1116, i.e. exactly in the 
place where we would suppose to find it (the following article of AT comes from ID, 
p. 1117; the eight preceding articles of AT come, in good order, from ID, p. 500-620) 
and it is defined in the same way as in AT, viz.: 

wa-nāqatun khidlib: musinnatun mustarkhiya. 
It seems obvious that this article is the source for the article ḥidlib—khidlib in AT 
despite the fact that only khidlib is found in ID. Whether the source for ḥidlib is a 
 marginal note (or addition in matn) in the ID manuscript used by Abū‘t-Tayyib, or 
whether he has added the word from his memory, has to be left open449. 

When excerpting from ID, Abū‘t-Tayyib has also omitted relevant material. This 
seems to have been accidental, as he is usually interested in collecting as much 
material as possible. Thus Abū‘t-Tayyib has not excerpted the pair thalaba—qalaba 
which would have been found in ID, p. 262 (wa-thalabtu sh-shay’a idhā qalbatahu), 
the same page from which comes AT I:61 thalaba—thalama. Similarly, ID, p. 622 
reads: 

wa-yuqālu: makhkhantu l-adima wa-ghayrahu idhā marrantahu ḥattā yalīnu 
wa-kadhālika māḥhantuhu bi‘l-hā’i wa‘l-khā’i gāmi‘an. 
The pair makhkhana—marrana is not found in AT though the pair maḥḥana— 
makhkhana (excerpted from ID, p. 1292 as both the wording and the order of articles 
shows) is found in AT I:282. The list of these omissions could easily be lengthened450. 

449 In fact in all likelihood, ḥidlib is a ghostword; it is not found even in the largest dictionaries (T‘A, 
Liṣān, Takmilah) nor in, e.g. the two camel books of al-ʿAṣma‘i edited by Haffner. 
450 E.g. ID, p. 1297 bāb bāḥ-ḥānā—mahmāḥ; ID, p. 598 ašla‘a—ašla‘a; ID, 1221 muqma‘idd—muqma‘iṭṭ;
In a few cases the omission may have been deliberate as, e.g. the exclusion of
ID, p. 697:
qāla Abū Ḥātim: ahsabu anna l-himyagha maqlūbu l-mīmi min bā'īn min
qawlihim: habagha r-raḡul huğuyan iḏhā subita līn-nawmi fa-ka'annahā
hibyaghun fa-quilibat-i l-bā'u mīman li-qurbihā minhā.
This article has probably been left out of AT as ID does not give any actually
tested word *hibyagh451, only the resemblance of himyagh with the root HBGH.
Abū'ī-Ṭayyib often extends the ID articles (as well as the IS-Y articles) with new
shāhid verses etc., and he also often adds authorities to anonymous articles.

The two main sources of AT and their importance

The two works discussed above (IS-Y and ID) are the most important sources in AT.
Statistics based on a count of the articles in the first volume of AT, which contains the
ibdāls of B, T, TH, Ġ, H, KH, and D, are as follows452:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT from</th>
<th>IS-Y</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ibdāl articles</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this count about 60% of the articles of AT derive from these two sources.
Yet the number is probably too low, as there are several ibdāls in AT which could be
from ID, but which cannot be proved to be so (by order of articles or exact wording)
and these have been excluded from the statistics. If these were included, it would
raise the percentage of ID articles by up to 10%, thus totalling nearly half of the
articles of AT.

From the numerical point of view, ID is thus AT's main source. Yet IS-Y is still
the base on which AT has been built. IS-Y has been excerpted first as is evident from
the initial position of the IS-Y blocks as well as from the fact that pairs found both in
IS-Y and ID are usually taken from IS-Y and that there are only seldom duplicated
articles (one from IS-Y, the other from ID) and not a single case when the article has
been taken from ID, and not from IS-Y.

The other sources of AT

K. al-Ǧīm

In his dissertation on K. al-Ǧīm, W. Diem studied the later influence of ash-
Shaybānī’s nawādir collection453 on lexicographical literature. After comparing K. al-

---

451 This word is found, e.g. in T'A.
452 The chapters on W—Y have another main source (see below) and the statistics do not concern them.
453 For some reason K. al-Ǧīm is usually called a dictionary, which is very misleading; as a dictionary it
would have been a fiasco, as a nawādir collection it is well organized and easier to use than, e.g. Abū
Zayd's collection. The fact that it is organized according to the first radical of the word under discussion
Grm with Abü’t-Ṭayyib’s K. al-Ḍādād with negative results (p. 102-103) Diem continues (p. 103): »In zwei anderen Werken Abū Ṭ-Ṭayyibs, dem Kitāb al-ibdāl, wird, wie eine Überprüfung der auf Saibānī zurückgehenden Zitaten ergab, das Kitāb al-Ǧīm nicht zitiert.«

El Berkawy on the other hand wrote in his dissertation 13 years later (p. 161): »Eine nähere Überprüfung der von Abā (Amr K. al-Ḍāl) zitierten “ibdāl’-Paare, wie eine Überprüfung der auf Saibānī zurückgehenden Zitate ergab, das Kitāb al-Ǧīm benutzt und zitiert.«

El Berkawy adduces evidence for his claim by comparing 8 passages of AT with the respective articles of K. al-Ǧīm. These are:

1. AT I:226-228 (the preceding article has been given on the authority of Abū ‘Amr, cf. below no. 5):

wa-qāla: al-iḡā’atu wa’l-ishā’a: al-iḏṭirār. yuqālu: aḡā’ahu ilā kadhā wa-kadhā yuḡ’uḥu iḡā’atan wa-ashā’ahu yushī‘uhu isḥā’atan idhā ḥjarrahu wa-alḡā’ahu ilayhi. wa-min amthālihim: ushi’ta ʿUgaylu ilā ʿaqlika. wa-fī t-Tanzil: fa-aḡā’ahā l-makhādū ilā ḡidh‘ī n-nakhla. ay alḡā’ahā. wa-qāla sh-shā’ir:

- kaymā u’iddahumū li-ab’ada minhumū / wa-laqad yuḡā’u ilā dhawī l-aḥqādī
- ay wa-laqad yuḡā’u ilayhim. wa-qāla l-ākhar:
- wa-naṭ‘anu in ushi’tu ilā ʿt-ṭā’īnī
- ay in ulḏītu ilayhi

cf. K. al-Ǧīm I:70:

wa-qāla: al-ishā’a: al-iḏṭirār. wa-ahlu l-Ḥīḡāz yaqūlūna: al-iḡā’a. taqūlu: mā aḡā’aka ilā kadhā wa-kadhā ay mā ḥjarra ilayhi. qāla llāhu ǧalla wa-ʿazza: fa-aḡā’ahā l-makhādū ilā ḡidh‘ī n-nakhla. wa-qāla l-Asādī:

- kaymā u’iddahumū li-ab’ada minhumū / wa-laqad yuḡā’u ilā dhawī l-aḥqādī

wa-qāla l-Akḥal:

- wa-at‘anu in ushi’tu ilā ʿt-ṭā’īnī
- wa-fī l-amthāl: qad ushi’ta ʿUgaylu ilā ʿaqlika ay qad ḍṭurīta ilā ʿaqlika.

2. AT I:201:

Abū ‘Amr: wa-qāla: qāla l-Asādī: laqīṭu fulānān fa-tatha’ata’tu minhu wa-taka’ka’u minhu mithlūhā wa-huwa t-tatha’thu’u wa-t-taka’ku’. wa-yuqūlu: ra’at-i l-ibīlu sawādān fa-tatha’ata’at minhu wa-taka’ka’at minhu tatha’thu’an wa-taka’ka’at taka’ku’an ay hābathu.

K. al-Ǧīm I:105:

wa-qāla l-Asādī: laqīṭu fulānān fa-tatha’ata’tu minhu ay hibṭu hu wa-taka’ka’u minhu mithlūhā wa-ra’at-i l-ibīlu sawādān fa-tatha’ata’at minhu wa-taḡahāhahat minhu ay hābathu.

does not make it a dictionary.

454 El Berkawy, loc. cit., also refers to a passage in Ḥāḍīq Khalifās Kashf az-żunūn which shows that he knew and had seen the work (“Abū’t-Ṭayyib said: I saw [waqāfu ‘alā] a copy of it and noted that it did not begin with Ǧīm”).

455 Not II:70 as in El Berkawy.
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3. AT I:184:

K. al-Ĝîm I:109:
wa-qâla [i.e. at-Tamîmî]: ath-thawhad: al-ghulâmu l-hādiru wa-huwa l-fawhad.

4. AT I:217:
Abû ‘Amr: wa-qâla: qâla Abû’s-Samîh: dhâka min ġaḥasi fulânin wa-min daḥasi fulânin ay min makríhi wa-dahâ’îhi.

K. al-Ĝîm I:123:
wa-qâla Abû’s-Samîh: dhâlika min ġahsi fulânin wa-min daḥsihi wa-huwa l-makr.

5. AT I:226:

K. al-Ĝîm I:60:
(...) wa-huwa yu’arribu ‘alâ l-qawmi idhâ ġaḥmâla ‘alayhim wa-arrrasha mithluhu wa-huwa mu’arrishun wa-arrrâga wa-huwa mu’arriģ.

6. AT II:478:
wa-ḥakâ Abû ‘Amr: laka l-ĝazûru illâ thunwâhâ wa-aktharu l-kâlâm: thunyâhâ wa-hiya r-ra’asu wa’l-akârî ‘u wa’d-qrâ’u wa’l-karkaratu wa’l-qalb.

K. al-Ĝîm I:110:
wa-qâla [i.e. al-Bâhrânî]: laka l-ĝazûru illâ thunwâhâ: ar-ra’asu wa’l-akârî ‘u wa’d-qrâ’u wa’l-qalbu wa’l-karkara⁴⁵⁷.

7. AT II:129:

K. al-Ĝîm I:91:
wa-qâla t-Tamîmî l-‘Adawi: al-mubsiqu llatî yağ’u labanuhâ qabla nitâğihâ. and K. al-Ĝîm I:93:
wa-qâla [i.e. al-Bâhrânî]: al-mabâșîqui mina l-ghanami llatî tahfalu qabla wilâdihâ fa-tuḥlab.

8. AT II:113:

K. al-Ĝîm I:95:
wa-qâla l-‘Udhîr⁴⁵⁸: al-mubsiqu wa-hiya l-mubsiqu llatî tuḥlabu qabla an ta’da’a.

⁴⁵⁶ This passage is taken from IS-Y, p. 125.
⁴⁵⁷ The word thunwâ together with thunyâ can be found in K. al-Ĝîm III:15.
⁴⁵⁸ So in the text. We should perhaps read al-‘Adawi.
To these articles already compared by El Berkawy, we may add six more, viz.:

9. AT I:387:

Abū 'Amr: ibilun ābidatun wa-ābilatun wa-awābilu ay hāmilatun wa-qad abadat ta'badu ubūdan wa-ābalat ta'balu ubūlan idhā hamalat [continued with a shāhid].

K. al-Ǧīm I:66:


10. AT II:237-238460:

yuqālu: barshama r-raṣlu yubarshimu barshamatan wa-barhama yubarhimu barhamatun idhā ahadda n-naqara wa-huwa mubaṣṣimun wa-mubarhimun wa-nazarun barshamun wa-barham [continued with several shāhids].

K. al-Ǧīm I:94:


11. AT I:146:


K. al-Ǧīm I:110:

wa-qāla [i.e. al-‘Udhri]: ath-thamūt: al-‘idhyawt. thamata yathmitu wa-thatta yathitū mithlūhū.

12. AT II:40:


K. al-Ǧīm I:119:

wa-qāla [i.e. al-Kilābī]: hādhā raḥulun ġarīmun ay lahu ġirmun wa-huwa mina l-ġism.

13. AT I:10:


K. al-Ǧīm I:60, quoted above sub no. 5.

14. AT II:113:

Abū ‘Amr: wa-azza fulānun fulānān ya‘uzzuhu wa-assahu ya‘ussuhu

459 Here too we have a good example of Abū‘-Tayyib’s laxity and unscrupulous acceptance of word pairs as ibdāls: the text of K. al-Ǧīm leaves us in no doubt that the words ābīda and ābīla are not synonyms and thus not an ibdāl pair.— Cf. also below no. 11 and 12.

460 This is a very dubious case, and it probably does not come from K. al-Ǧīm (note also the absence of attribution to Abū ‘Amr).
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idhā ḥarrakahu wa-huwa l-azzu wa'l-assu wa-dhālika an yuḥarrika hamīya-tahū ḥattā yughdībahu wa-γuqālū: mā zāla ya'uzzuhu ḥattā aghdābahu wa-
yau'ssuhi mithlu dhālika.

K. al-Ǧīm I:67:

wa-qāla [i.e. an-Nahdi]: assa fulūnun ʿalayya fulūnun ḥattā aghdābahu
ya'ussu mithlu azzaθahu ya'uzzuhu.

At first glance this evidence appears very convincing and unproblematic; the
slight changes in wording are no more drastic than in the articles taken into AṬ from
IS-Y or ID and the provenance of all the 14 articles quoted above is otherwise
unknown. Yet there is one curious and interesting point to be made: all the articles of
AṬ which derive from K. al-Ǧīm — the list given above is exhaustive — come from
the first 70 pages of the printed edition of K. al-Ǧīm: the first comes from I:60 (chapter
alif; note that the text begins from I:51) and the last from I:123 (in the middle of
chapter ġīm). Until this point, too, all the ibdāl cases derivable from K. al-Ǧīm have
been adopted by Abūṭ-Tayyib (with the exception of a few cases which fall into the
lacunae of AṬ461 and K. al-Ǧīm I:55 urtha—urfa, a pair which has been extracted by
Abūṭ-Tayyib (AṬ I:186) from its basic source IS-Y (p. 126).

After K. al-Ǧīm I:123 the situation changes radically: the ibdāl pairs of K. al-Ǧīm
are either not found at all in AṬ (e.g. I:130 muğlakhid—muğlakhid; I:164 ḥarada—
ḥaraka; I:167 ḥāzīk—ḥāshīk; I:187 ḥūla—ḥūla; I:188 muḥāmala—muẓāmala etc.) or
they can be shown (by an analysis into blocks or by wording) to derive from the other
sources (e.g. K. al-Ǧīm I:190 ḥabaqa—ḥabaqa, cf. AṬ I:241 < ID, 263 and 281; K. al-
musarḥad—musārha, cf. AṬ I:381 < ID, p. 1147 and 1151462; K. al-Ǧīm I:274-275
da’s—wa’s, cf. AṬ I:394 < ID, p. 1243 etc.). — In total K. al-Ǧīm contains just under
200 cases which would have been classified by Abūṭ-Tayyib as ibdāls. Of these about
two thirds are not found in AṬ, and the others, excepting the cases discussed above,
are from other sources.

Further proof for the fact that Abūṭ-Tayyib did excerpt from the beginning of K.
al-Ǧīm for his ibdāl monograph comes from the fact that in the two chapters (Ǧ—SH
and Z—S) where there are more than one article (in fact two) derivable from K. al-Ǧīm,
these articles follow each other (i.e. they form a mini-block) in the same order in
which they are found in K. al-Ǧīm (AṬ I:226 arraga—arrasha and iğī’a—ishī’a = K.
al-Ǧīm I:60 and I:70; and AṬ II:113 azza—assa and muḥṣiq—muḥṣiq = K. al-Ǧīm
I:67 and I:95).

Thus it is evident that Abūṭ-Tayyib had only the initial part of K. al-Ǧīm at his
disposal463, which is not at all surprising given the rarity of the manuscripts of K. al-
Ǧīm464; even an incomplete fragment of the work would have been a valuable
treasure465.

462 Note also that in K. al-Ǧīm a third word, viz. muṣarʿaf, would have been available to Abūṭ-Tayyib
but there is no pair musarha—muṣarʿaf in AṬ.
463 This would not contradict the information quoted by Ḥāǧī Khālija, cf. above note 454.
464 Cf. Diem, Das Kitāb al-Ǧīm, p. 12-13 and GAS VIII:121-122. Only one manuscript (which consists
of two different fragments) has been preserved. The unicum was copied in Iraq around 1000 (Diem, loc.
cit.).
Ibn as-Sikkît's Islâh al-mantîq

Islâh al-mantîq has been used by Abû'T-Tayyib as the basic source in two chapters, W—Y II (AT II:464-493) and W—Y III (AT II:494-520)466, neither of which is discussed in IS-Y. ID has been excerpted for these two chapter, too, as in the other chapters. The numbers of the articles coming from these two sources are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter W—Y II</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>taken from Islâh</th>
<th>taken from ID</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83467</td>
<td>41468</td>
<td>18469</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter W—Y III</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>taken from Islâh</th>
<th>taken from ID</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>44470</td>
<td>10471</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several ibdâl pairs in Islâh472 which have for some reason been left out of AT. The following pairs of Islâh are not mentioned in AT:

- p. 135 mawh—mayh
- p. 136 'awg—'ayg
- p. 137 thawkh—thaykh
- p. 138 'awr—'ayr
- p. 139 fa'a—fa'a; halâ and sanâ (terr. W and Y); maghriya—maghrûwa

465 The fact that Abû'T-Tayyib has used K. al-Ğûm as a source for his ibdâl monograph leads us to re-evaluate also Diem's claim (Das Kitâb al-Gim, p. 103, quoted above) that it was not used by him in K. al-Adîd and K. al-lbâ'. as it would be natural to assume that he used the same sources for all the three books.

466 I.e. W—Y variation as the second and third radicals. — This source was summarily noted but not further studied by El Berkawy, Das Kitâb al-Adîd, p. 127.

467 I have counted the "alphabetical verbs" (AT II:481) bawwâ to write with B' etc. as one article.

468 Articles 1-44, except for 16 (II:469 tiwar—tiyâl), 28 (II:473 quwwam—quyyam) and 30 (II:474 dawâwîn—dawâwîn).

469 Articles 63-80.

470 Articles 1-32 (except for 29 II:501 shakâ W/Y), 40-42 II:505 sakhtâ; fallâ; lakhâ W/Y), 48-50 (II:507 naqâ; tâhâ; gâbâ W/Y), 53-54 (II:508 tâlâ; jamâ W/Y), 61-64 (II:510 lâhâât—lahâât; qâqâyât—qâqâyât; ridâwâni—ridâwâni; bimawâni—bimawâni), 99 (II:519 daghâwât—daghâwât). The article rahâwâni—rahâwâni (32) is not found in the edition of Islâh, but it is found in at-Tibrizî's Tahdhib Islâh al-mantîq I:363. AT shows that the article existed at least in some manuscripts of Islâh already in the 10th century. The last 13 Islâh articles in AT do not form a clear block and their attribution to Islâh is thus uncertain.

There are also a few other articles in this chapter (viz. 34-35, 45, 47, 55, 86-88) which resemble the respective articles in Islâh.

471 Articles 75-84.

472 As also in ID, e.g. p. 680 KWD from which Abû'T-Tayyib has taken the pair KWD—KYD (AT II:488 art. 67), but HWD—HYD is given in the same article of ID, but it is not found in AT.
p. 140 qanã and ‘anã (tert. W and Y)

p. 141 tabã, ‘alã, salã and žãlã (tert. W and Y); nasawãni—nasawãni

Besides these 15 articles, the reason for the exclusion of which is unclear, there are other cases which have been dropped by Abú‘l-Ṭayyib on purpose. These include words which have a different morphological pattern but the same root, viz. fa‘ñl—fa‘ñl (several examples in İslâh, p. 142-143), hûrãn—hûrân (i.e. fu‘lân—fi‘lân; İslâh, p. 138), hûndûra—hûndira (İslâh, p. 143) and şamakûk—şamâkîk (İslâh, p. 143).

These articles have clearly been classified as non-ibdâl by Abû‘l-Ṭayyib, who has omitted all of them, except for a very few cases, e.g. ‘abaytharân—‘abawtharân (İslâh, p. 144 > AT II:477-478 art. 42).

Other chapters of İslâh have not been excerpted by Abû‘l-Ṭayyib even though there is much ibdâl material interspersed among the text, especially pp. 185-187.

The compilation of AT

AT’s two main sources (IS-Y and ID) give almost two thirds of his material, to which may be added the few articles derived from İslâh al-manîq and K. al-Ğim. For the remaining third an extant written source cannot be named, though there are some vague indications as to the possible sources which are studied below.

Abû‘l-Ṭayyib’s habit of quoting his sources in blocks, i.e. to give the articles derived from one source in one place (naturally within the system of chapters arranged according to the ibdâl letters), allows us to see in some detail how Abû‘l-Ṭayyib worked. We see that he has first excerpted from IS-Y, or in fact he has copied all its material (with the exception of the two non-ibdâl chapters) and organized it according to the ibdâl pairs. Then he has gone through ID, page by page, adding new material to the end of each chapter. In the chapters W—Y II and W—Y III he has similarly used İslâh al-manîq as his basic source.

The analysis of the sources leaves no doubt about the written character of his sources; they are definitely not part of the scholarly oral tradition. Yet the “inaccuracies” in quoting show that Abû‘l-Ṭayyib did not strive for maximal fidelity to the written source473. This contrasts with some later scholars, such as ‘Abdalqâdir al-Baghdâdî, who are very conscientious in retaining the original wording of their sources474.

After going through his sources, Abû‘l-Ṭayyib has not polished his work; articles have remained which duplicate each other, nor has he tried to give any overall organization to his work: every block has retained the order it had in Abû‘l-Ṭayyib’s sources475. The slackness of his work in this aspect need not mean that it is in any

473 For discussions on the nature of the written vs. oral tradition, see Werkmeister’s Quellenuntersuchungen and Abdel-Tawas’ Das Kitáb al-ɣarlîb. In both, the inaccuracies of the written tradition have been given too much attention. The latter work is duly criticized by Sezgin GAS VIII:83.

474 Cf. e.g. that he usually gives a separate note when he has deviated from the wording of his sources (e.g. al-Ḫâshiyya II:123 “intahâ kalâmûhun bi-khitṣârîn yasîr”).

475 The ID blocks very closely follow the order in which the articles were found in ID, the IS-Y blocks
way unfinished, although one should remember the sudden death of the author in the Byzantine attack of 962. Still, the final polishing of a work was by no means the rule in the Mediaeval scholarly world as can be seen, e.g. from the final version of ʿAsh-Safadī’s Taṣḥīḥ.

Although the articles have not been organized nor the duplicates removed, Abuʾl-Ṭayyib has made additions in the articles derived from different sources.

Other possible sources of AT

It is very difficult to say anything definite about AT’s other sources. The philologists mentioned by name in AT may have been quoted directly from their own works, the majority of which have later disappeared or indirectly through other works as the case of the IS-Y and ID articles gives cause to believe. What is problematic is that the unidentified quotes do not form any clear blocks with some kind of organizing principles (ultimate authority; semantic or morphological aspects; alphabetic or phonetic).

It is possibly that this signifies that the remaining articles have been collected from a large number of sources (lexical monographs, sharhs, etc.), each giving only a few ibdāls. In this case it is almost impossible to do more than to point to a possible source for each quotation.

In the following, some groups of quotations in AT are studied separately. It should be mentioned here that those quotations whose source has been identified (i.e. IS-Y, ID, ʿIṣlāḥ al-manṭiq, K. al-Ǧīm) are naturally left out of the discussion.

Al-Farrāʾ quotes in AT

About two thirds of the al-Farrāʾ quotes, excluding those whose source is otherwise known, and the al-Farrāʾ additions come at the end of the respective chapters of AT, which suggests that at least these final quotes may come from a single source, possibly a book of al-Farrāʾ. Otherwise, the concentration of these quotes at the end of the chapters would call for some other explanation. The theory that there was one source, excerpted later than IS-Y and ID, would explain this tendency.

El Berkawy (p. 165) has compared all the al-Farrāʾ quotes in AT, without discriminating between the quotes which derive from, e.g. IS and others, with the extant works of al-Farrāʾ without finding matches. The list of al-Farrāʾ’s lexicographical works (GAS VIII:123-125) and the contents of the final al-Farrāʾ quotes do not point to any probable source among his own works; as a possible source, e.g. his K. an-Nawādir or his monograph on the laḥn al-ʿāmma may of course be mentioned.

on the other hand have sometimes been rearranged, though one cannot detect any system behind these occasional reorganizations.

476 El Berkawy, Das Kitāb al-Ibdāl, p. 156 ff. has compared the quotes of AT with the extant monographs of the ultimate authorities with meagre results.

477 This falls outside the scope of the present study and would find a better place in a critical apparatus of a re-edition of K. al-Ibdāl.
The following gives a complete list of these final al-Farrā’ quotes in the first volume of the edition of AT \(^{478}\) (the list includes a few cases where the al-Farrā’ quote comes as last but one. These are indicated in the notes):

| I:17-18 | Chapter B—*> ibtasara—i’tasara |
| I:31 | Chapter B—Q ibtasara—iqtasara |
| I:34 | Chapter B—K başiş—kaşiş |
| I:73-74 | Chapter B—M bîdî—mîdî |
| I:85-86 | Chapter B—W abda‘a—awda‘a |
| I:109 | Chapter T—D samt—samd |
| I:112 | Chapter T—DH rataḥa—radhaḥa |
| I:133 | Chapter T—T ghatmaṭa—ghatmaṭa |
| I:137 | Chapter T—F târaka—fâraka |
| I:198 | Chapter TH—F thulla—fulla |
| I:224 | Chapter Š—Z aţfala—azfala |
| I:237 | Chapter G—< ʻurâhim—ţurâhim |
| I:245 | Chapter G—Q ḡins—qins |
| | ɏurţubân—qurţubân \(^{479}\) |
| | istahâra—istakhâra \(^{480}\) |
| I:291 | Chapter H—T ṣalmaṭa—qalṭaḥa |
| I:300 | Chapter H— F wâhira—wa’ira \(^{481}\) |
| I:302 | Chapter H—GH wâhar—waghhar |
| I:309 | Chapter H—K ḥazaba—kaţaba |
| I:327 | Chapter H—H ḍāhala—daḥala \(^{483}\) |
| I:352 | Chapter KH—H khirâsh—hirâsh |
| I:362 | Chapter D—DH da’alân—da’alân |
| I:385 | Chapter D—K dayyis—kayyis |

Al-Lihyâni quotes in AT

Al-Lihyâni is often quoted in AT via IS-Y, but there seems to be another group of al-Lihyâni quotes between the IS-Y and ID blocks or, if there is no IS-Y block in the chapter, before the ID block. The position of these articles between the two blocks seems to lend them some coherence, and this may have to be interpreted as meaning that they have a common source. There also seems to be one case of a mini-“al-

\(^{478}\) The non-final al-Farrā’ quotes in the first volume are (again excluding those of known provenance):


\(^{479}\) Only implicitly by al-Farrā’ (introduced by “wa-qāla”).

\(^{480}\) After this comes an article on banat bakhr—banat bahr which is related to the article on banat bakhr—banat makhr in chapter B—M (AT I:41).

\(^{481}\) After this comes one article which is derived from Islâh al-mantiq, p. 137.

\(^{482}\) This article is anonymous and its attribution to al-Farrā’ is very uncertain.

\(^{483}\) After this two anonymous articles follow and they may be taken as implicit al-Farrā’ quotes.
Liwyâni block", viz. AṬ I:328 where the article on sağîha—sağîya is explicitly given on the authority of al-Liwyâni, and the following, anonymous article sharraha—sharrâ seems to come from him on the basis of AṬ I:285 sharraha—sharrara which is also given explicitly on his authority and probably belongs together with sharraha—sharrâ. What this source could be is difficult to say.

Abû Naṣr al-Bâhilî quotes in AṬ

There are 22484 articles in AṬ given on the authority of Abû Naṣr, all outside the IS-Y and ID blocks. As in the case of al-Farrâ', these articles tend to come at the end of each chapter with similar implications, viz. that they come from a single source. The Abû Naṣr quotes are (if nothing else is indicated the articles come last in their chapter):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I:109</td>
<td>T—D</td>
<td>antagha—andagha485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:144</td>
<td>T—K</td>
<td>batta—bataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:174</td>
<td>TH—S</td>
<td>ḥuthāla—husāla486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:211</td>
<td>Ḡ—H</td>
<td>ḡāsa—hāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:219</td>
<td>Ḡ—D</td>
<td>ḡāsa—dāsa487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:232</td>
<td>Ḡ—D</td>
<td>makhāga—makhāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:256</td>
<td>Ḡ—H</td>
<td>ḡāsa—hāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:284</td>
<td>Ḥ—D</td>
<td>ḥāsa—dāsa488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:289</td>
<td>Ḥ—SH</td>
<td>faḥīḥ—fashīsh489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:304</td>
<td>Ḥ—F</td>
<td>ḡaḥala—ḡafala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:313</td>
<td>Ḥ—H</td>
<td>ḥāsa—hāsa490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:388</td>
<td>D—L</td>
<td>fadagha—falagha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:87</td>
<td>R—M</td>
<td>rass491—mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:102</td>
<td>R—H</td>
<td>ratama—hatama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:122</td>
<td>Z—SH</td>
<td>nakaza—nakasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:140</td>
<td>Z—c</td>
<td>zibiqqāna—‘ibiqqāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:148</td>
<td>Z—N</td>
<td>za‘aba—na‘aba492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:168-169</td>
<td>S—SH</td>
<td>sarāh—sharāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II:201</td>
<td>S—F</td>
<td>ḥusāla—hufāla493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

484 AṬ I:284 given ḥāsa—dāsa anonymously but its attribution to Abû Naṣr is evident on the basis of the other articles of the same group, cf. below.
485 The penultimate article, the last comes from al-Farrâ'.
486 The penultimate article, the last (īrb—irs) is anonymous.
487 The penultimate article, the last (gū’būb—du‘būb) is anonymous.
488 Anonymous but cf. above, note 484.
489 The penultimate article, the last (istawḥā—istawshā) is anonymous.
490 The first (1) article of this chapter. Its curious place may depend on its belonging to a larger group of articles (ḡāsa—bāsa—dāsa—hāsa); for some reason in AṬ these have a slight tendency to come early in the respective chapter.
491 Read so!
492 The first (1) article of this chapter.
493 The first (1) article of this chapter, which may be explained by its belonging to a larger family, cf.
It should be emphasized that the list given above catalogues all the Abū Naṣr quotes in AT, i.e. there are no explicit Abū Naṣr quotes in the last 300 pages of the book. This curious detail calls for explanation: as the order of chapters in AT is Abū't-Tayyib’s (in this respect the organization of the source has no bearing on AT’s order), one cannot explain this by assuming that the original sources were defective (as this would explain the phenomenon only if the source, too, were organized according to the ibdāl letters) nor that Abū’t-Tayyib for some reason stopped using it as his source after II:229 (as it seems that he has added articles to the respective chapters of AT in the order in which they come in the original source).

The articles themselves do not give any hints as to their probable source. Among Abū Naṣr’s lost lexicographical works (listed in GAS VIII:88-89) there are several which could have been the source of these articles (especially K. al-Alfāz and K. al-Aḡnās)⁴⁹⁴.

The works dependent on IS-Y

The order of chapters (IS-Y, IS-tahdhib and Q)

The profound dependence of IS-tahdhib and Q on IS-Y is also seen in the order of the chapters in these works. AT and Muzhir have reorganized the chapters according to an overall system of their own, and they are not examined here.

The following gives the list of chapters in IS-Y, IS-tahdhib, Q, and, for the sake of comparison, Z:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS-Y</th>
<th>IS-tahdhib</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N—L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B—M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M—N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ—H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻ—H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H—H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ġ—Y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ġ—H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H—KH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11+12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T—D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T—S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

above note 490. — The third ibdāl pair belonging to the same family, viz. ḥuthāla—ḥufala AT I:194, has been taken from IS-Y, 125.

⁴⁹⁴Note also that Abū’t-Tayyib’s teacher Abū ‘Umar az-Zāhid (= al-Warrāq) is mentioned by al-Aẓhari in his isnād to “Abū Naṣr ‘an-i I-Asma’ī” (TL I:15).
The first halves of IS-Y and IS-tahdhib are in more or less identical order. The latter halves differ widely and have relatively few similarities, e.g. IS-Y chapters 14-16 = IS-tahdhib chapters 21-23. In IS-Y the chapters are very loose organized according to some phonological and orthographical principles. In the latter half of IS-tahdhib there is a marked tendency towards a phonological arrangement; e.g. the laryngeal-velar group of IS-tahdhib chapters 4-12 (with the intervening chapters of the orthographically similar Ġ) is continued in chapters 13-15 (KH—GH, KH—H, ‘—GH), which come only later in IS-Y. Then in IS-tahdhib there comes a palatal group (IS-tahdhib chapters 17-19 with the intervening, orthographically similar chapter 16), an interdental/fricative group (chapters 20-21), a sibilant group (chapters 22-26), and a dental/plosive group (chapters 27-32).

In Q the ibdāl chapters are interspersed within other material in II:22-186 (34 chapters). The latter half of the chapters follows the order of the chapters in IS-Y (e.g.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z—S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH—S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH—DH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S—SH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—GH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q—K</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R—L</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G—K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D—T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S—T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S—D</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH—F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH—H</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T—T</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D—L</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z—S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mudāʾaf</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ—Y</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ—W</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#w—#t</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D—DH</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>x495</td>
<td>x496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The varia chapter of IS-Y corresponds to chapters 9 (Ḡ—KH), 13 (KH—GH), 17 (F—K), 24 (S—S), 31 (Ḡ—T), 38 (DH—Z) and 43 (varia) of IS-tahdhib.

495 Some of the articles of the varia chapter in IS-Y are paralleled by chapters of Z. Z has in addition the following chapters: 1 (ʾ—W—Y), 4 (W—Y), 8 (T—D—T), 17 (Ḡ—SH), 18 (D—Z), 19 (S—S), 21 (Z—S—S), 25 (B—F), 28 (KH—GH), 30 (L—M), 34 (SH—K) and 35 (T—K).

497 The varia chapter of IS-Y corresponds to chapters 32-36 of Q (F—K, DH—Z, ʿ—H and two varia chapters).
IS-Y chapters 10-11 = Q chapters 13-14 and IS-Y chapters 13-20 = Q chapters 15-22. In the first half there are more differences, although there are many pairs of chapters in Q which are in the same order as in IS-Y. In the cases where the order of the chapters in Q differs from that of IS-Y neither organizing principles can be detected, nor is there any similarity with, e.g. IS-tahdhib.

Order of material within chapters

As for the order of material within the individual chapters, all the sources dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhib, AT, Q, Mukh., Muzhir) more or less closely follow IS-Y. Only in AT are there more radical differences from IS-Y, but one cannot see any principles behind the change of order in AT. No two sources dependent on IS-Y show any remarkable similarities between themselves, which means that we cannot build, e.g. any theories as to the manuscript families of IS on the basis of the parallel tradition. It also demonstrates that all these sources (with the notable exception of Mukh. which depends on Q) derive their material directly from IS, not through some other work belonging to the parallel tradition of IS.

Notes on the relationship of Q and IS-Y

A close comparison of IS-Y with Q reveals that al-Qālī has endeavored to include all the articles of IS-Y in his work and that he has added very little material from other sources to the ibdāl chapters of al-Amālī. There are in fact only six articles of IS-Y which are missing from the corresponding ibdāl chapters of Q. One of these (la‘alla–la‘anna, IS-Y, p. 64) is discussed in another chapter of Q (II:79 in chapter 3—c together with la‘alla–la‘alla), two are related roots (IS-Y, p. 93 buḥtur–buhtur, and p. 112 ba‘thara–baghtbara498), one is in the chapter muḍā’af (IS-Y, p. 134 taqaddiya from the root QDD), and the remaining two from the varia chapter (p. 142 uţum—uţum and p. 144 waqīḍh—waqīẓ).

The few articles added by al-Qālī from other sources to the ibdāl chapters tend to come at the end of these chapters, although there are also others in the middle of the chapters. The additions are: wa‘ā—waḥā Q II:68; infağara—infağara and taţaţa taţallatha Q II:35; qulla—quilla and shalla—shanna Q II:44; taşayyafa—taşayyafa and ḡāsa—ḡāda Q II:23; the first verse (rhyme ‘Alīgī) of the shāhid poem of which the three following verses are given in IS-Y) Q II:77; tūfar–tūfar Q II:34499; ikāf—wikāf Q II:166 (actually only an addition to akafa—wakafa which is taken from IS-Y).

Notes on the relationship of Muzhir and IS-Y

Of the sources drawing directly on IS-Y (AT, Q, Muzhir) only Muzhir is eclectic and

498 There is elsewhere in Q (II:67-68) a pair ba‘thara—baţhara.
499 On the same page there is the pair dalatha—dalafa which is accidentally missing from the Yeni Cami manuscript, cf. above.
selective in its material, which is due to the fact that it is an introduction to linguistic science and deals relatively briefly with all aspects of language.

For practical reasons, as-Suyūṭī has divided the ibdāl material taken from IS-Y, see above, p. 76, into three chapters (naw' 32 = I:460-475; naw' 37 = I:537-556; and naw' 38 = I:556-566). IS-Y is the main source of ibdāls for as-Suyūṭī (for a list of his other sources, cf. above, pp. 76-77) and he has included almost all of its material into his compendium with the following exception:

1. The ibdāl chapter of Abū ʿUbayd's al-Gharīb al-muṣannaf has been excerpted before IS-Y, and the material common to both works has usually been omitted from the articles taken from IS-Y500. This explains why the following ibdāls of IS-Y are missing from those given on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt in Muzhir: p. 77 ayn—ayn; p. 81 ṭāma—ṭāna; p. 90 madāha—madāha; p. 103 harāta—harāta; p. 125 ḡadaf—ḡadath and finā—thinā; p. 126 maghāfir—maghāṭhir; p. 133 taqaddantu—taqaddantu, taqadāfī (for taqaddāfīd) and mulabbin (from LBB); p. 135 taṣdiyya (from SDD) and qaṣṣaytu (from QSS); p. 140 ‘adāf—‘adhāf and idrā‘affa—idhra‘affa.

2. Some of the longest chapters of IS-Y have been deliberately abbreviated by as-Suyūṭī (who also always shortens the individual articles to a minimal length) in order to make them fit the encyclopaedic character of his work. Thus one finds the four largest chapters of IS-Y (excluding the varia chapter) abbreviated in the following way (in brackets the total number of articles in IS-Y): Chapter L—N (34): 7 articles missing501; Chapter B—M (36): 17 articles missing502; Chapter M—N (14): two articles missing503; Chapter TH—F (22): 10 articles missing504.

3. Two cases which are mere additions to other articles have been dropped by as-Suyūṭī, probably as irrelevant505.

4. Two cases of poetic ẓaḥrāt have probably been deliberately omitted by as-Suyūṭī506.

5. Chapter Ǧ—Y of IS-Y which mainly contains morphological ibdāls has been omitted507.

500 Sometimes, though, they duplicate each other, cf. e.g. Muzhir I:461 (three cases of L—N from al-Gharīb al-muṣannaf) and Muzhir I:565 (the same cases from IS-Y).
501 Viz. atana—atala; dha‘āla—dha‘āla; ma‘ala—ma‘ana; zulma—zunma; āsān—āsān; ʿatala—atana; and ālāṣa—ālāṣa.
502 Viz. banāt bakhra—banāt makhr; ʾashama—ʾashaba; rāṭim—rāṭib; ʿabaqa—ʿamaqa; shamāriq—shabāriq (this article is found in Muzhir I:134 and I:411 from Thālab's Amāll = Maqālīs); ʿurmat—ʿumrā; dinnaba—dinnama; āšbār—āšmār; ʿaiba—ṣa‘ima; ʿiqma—ʿiqba; idba‘akka—iddma‘akka; kamaiba—kabaiba; dha‘aba—dha‘ama; zakaba—zakama; abida—amida; ba‘kūkā—ma‘kūkā; ʿardaba—ʿardama.
503 Viz. ʾağīm—ʾağīn; bulūm—bullūm.
504 Viz. dafla—daffa; arfa—arfa; furqūb—furqūb; nafs—nafs; Fahlah—Thalhah; ʿafana—ʿathana; dalafa—dalatha (this article is accidentally missing from the Yeni Cami manuscript, but the parallel tradition shows that it belongs to the original IS); fumma—thumma; nukāf—nukāth; furāgh—furāgh.
505 Viz. IS-Y, p. 118 saḥk—saḥk (addition to the preceding sayhūk—sayhūg); p. 137 yādī—adī (addition to the preceding yādī—adī).
506 Viz. IS-Y, p. 84 muˈtālī in a poem for muˈtālī; p. 135 yaˈtāmī in rhyme for yaˈtāmū.
507 Muzhir II:88 briefly deals with the Ǧ—Y ibdāl but there is no indication that this passage comes from IS-Y.
6. Chapter Varia has been taken to Muzhir from Q, cf. below. Besides these cases excluded for specific reasons, there are only a handful of articles which have been omitted by as-Suyūṭī for no obvious reason. These are:

- IS-Y, p. 88 hayr—ayr and hibriya—ibriya\(^508\).
- IS-Y, p. 99 ḥāfa—fakha\(^509\).
- IS-Y, p. 138 wilda—ildā\(^510\).
- IS-Y, p. 139 ṭuğāḥ from the root WGH.

On the other hand Muzhir (I:564 and I:551) has one addition among the articles from IS which is not found in IS-Y, viz. taṣawwaka—taḍawwaka (besides taṣawwaa’a—taḍawwa’a)\(^511\).

*Chapter varia of IS-Y in Muzhir*

For some reason as-Suyūṭī has given the material of this chapter of IS-Y from Q, not directly from IS-Y\(^512\). Only six of the articles of this chapter of IS-Y are attributed in Muzhir to Ibn as-Sikkīt (p. 141 ḥasīfa—ḥasīka and ḥasāfil—ḥasākil = Muzhir I:468; p. 141 zaraqa—dharqa and zabara—dhabara = Muzhir I:559\(^513\); p. 143 zaḥālīf—zaḥālīq = Muzhir I:554; p. 144 magḥas—ma’aṣ = Muzhir I:553-554). In the last-mentioned case as-Suyūṭī moreover first quotes Q (II:178) and mentions Ibn as-Sikkīt only as a second opinion. In the other five cases, too, the articles would have been available in Q (II:171, II:172; II:178).

All the other articles are given in Muzhir explicitly on the authority of al-Qālī (Muzhir I:472 = Q II:184, 177-178; Muzhir I:547 = Q II:178) except for the articles

\(^{508}\) The omission of these pairs may partly be explained by the fact that there is a little lacuna in this place in the Yeni Cami manuscript which makes the latter pair incomprehensible (the pairs do belong to the original IS as is shown by the parallel tradition). If he used a manuscript related in this point to the Yeni Cami manuscript, as-Suyūṭī did not find the latter pair at all in his source.

\(^{509}\) This pair has been taken into Muzhir from ID (Muzhir I:544). As IS-Y was excerpted by as-Suyūṭī before ID, it is clear that as-Suyūṭī did not exclude this pair on purpose. Either it was missing from the copy of IS at his disposal or this was a simple error by as-Suyūṭī.

\(^{510}\) This article is found in Muzhir I:472 in the middle of articles taken from Q II:177-178 (this article and the following two, abaha—wabaha and khamra—ghamra, are on the other hand, not from Q).

\(^{511}\) There is some confusion in this article; almost the whole parallel tradition of IS-Y (IS-tahdhib, AT, Q) reads here taṣawwaka—taḍawwaka, a reading which has been included in the text of IS-Y by the editor. The Yeni Cami manuscript, though, has taṣawwaa’a—taḍawwa’a. The reading of Muzhir (I:564) would imply that both forms were found in the manuscript used by as-Suyūṭī (“fi l-ḥbāl li-Ibn as-Sikkīt: taṣawwaka fulānun fi khāriji ṭaṣawwaka bīṣ-ṣādī wā’-ṣādī ṭaṣawwaa’a wa-taṣawwaa’a biḥimā wa-bīṭ-hamzati ṭadāla 1-kāf”), though it is quite possible that the formulation of Muzhir is here inexact, and that one of the pair (probably that with hamza) is in fact derived from some other source.

\(^{512}\) This naturally raises the question as to whether all the articles came via Q. This, though, is not the case as can be seen, e.g. from the fact that the order of the articles in the three works, e.g. the first five articles of IS-Y Chapter L - N (p. 61-63), come in the same order in Muzhir I:565 but differently in Q II:41-42 etc.

\(^{513}\) On the same page of Muzhir duḥāf—zuḥāf comes from IS-Y, p. 85.
quoted in Muzhir from al-Gharib al-muṣannaf (Muzhir I:461-462). Three articles which do not belong to the varia chapter of IS-Y have for some reason intruded into Muzhir I:472, viz. ilda—wilda, abahtu—wabahtu and ghamra—khamra, and their provenance is somewhat hazy, although they may come from Q (Q II:166 and 167; al-Qâlî, Dhayl, p. 6).

As-Suyûti has omitted seven articles of the varia chapter, four of which would have also been available in Q (IS-Y, p. 142 qab—qad = Q II:178; p. 142 uţum—uţum; p. 144 waqîdh—waqîz; p. 145 tafakkana—tafakkaha = Q II:178; p. 146 multakk—multakhkh and tâkk—fâkk = Q II:184; p. 146 indâla—indâha)514.

Besides the articles of the varia chapter, as-Suyûti now and then quotes other ibdâl material from Q, material that has come to Q from sources other than IS-Y. Thus we find Muzhir I:474 (harata—harada—harafa) = Q II:241; Muzhir I:474 (definition of ibdâl) = Q II:186; Muzhir I:542 (gâsa—hâsa) = Q II:78; Muzhir I:542 (saŋ—sankh) = Q II:18; Muzhir I:547 (daŋana—raŋana) = Q II:199; Muzhir I:550 (saŋîr—shaŋîr) = Q I:135; Muzhir I:551 (šill—šill) = Q II:23; Muzhir I:564 (saŋaš—aŋaša)515 = Q II:27.

Summary

Thus we have seen how the authors of all the works which are dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhîb, AT, Q, Mukh. and Muzhir) endeavour to include all the material of IS-Y in their works, with little interest in selecting the material; only as-Suyûti makes deliberate abbreviations. This almost canonical position of IS-Y, which can also be seen in the relationship of IS-Y and the great dictionaries has earlier (e.g. in the study of El Berkawy) gone unnoticed as IS-tahdhîb was used as the basis of comparison.

This being the case, these works may be used to represent the different manuscripts of IS, which is a welcome addition to the scanty number of existing manuscripts of the work itself. Any critical edition of K. al-Qalb wa'l-ibdâl has to take full account of these secondary works.

514 Note the following textual notes to Muzhir I:472: qîrrâq read qîrrat as in IS-Y, p. 145 and Q II:184; ābâdi as in Q II:177 (in IS-Y, p. 142 ‘abâbi); āstawthaqa as in Q II:178 (IS-Y, p. 144 āstawthana).

515 Note that this pair deviates from the basic definition of ibdâl as there are two differing consonants. — I have not been able to locate the following pairs in Q: Muzhir I:542 (nâfiša—nâfiša) and Muzhir I:555 (fašama—qâšama) both given on the authority of al-Qâlî.
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