III SOURCE STUDIES FOR THE IBDĀL 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[318]. Thus, e.g., in an article of AṬ where al-Aṣmaʿī 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-Aṣmaʿī 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[319]. 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 ʿUbayda 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 ʿUbayda' nor to speculate from which monograph (or scholarly oral tradition) of Abū ʿUbayda 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 Abūʾṭ-Ṭayyib[320].

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-Aṣmaʿī, al-Kisāʾī 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-Aṣmaʿī'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 ʿAbdalqādir 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.

By 'blocks' I mean the tendency of the authors, clearly visible, e.g. in IS-Y and even more so in AṬ, 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 AṬ does not show any organizing principles of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 AṬ though in the other parts of AṬ 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 ibdāls quoted in IS-Y on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī can — and must — be separated in two groups, viz. those coming (probably directly) from the ibdāl work of al-Aṣmaʿī, and those excerpted from other sources, quite possibly at least partly not al-Aṣmaʿī'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-Aṣmaʿī) does not indicate his source, we have no means of identifying it. In the field of ibdāl studies, the earliest extant work, IS-Y, is already heavily dependent on the written tradition[321]. In IS-Y, as well as in other ibdāl 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. dīwāns and their sharḥs) and contemporary (Bedouin) usage. The similarities, e.g. between al-Aṣmaʿī quotes and some extant monograph of al-Aṣmaʿī, 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 Qurʾānic 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[322].

---

[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 maǧālis 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-Aṣmaʿī is the most prominent. Anonymous articles form a clear minority.

Contrary to the study of the later ibdāl works, especially AṬ, 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-Farrā' 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:

art. 1: al-Aṣmaʿī: yuqālu ...
art. 2: wa-yuqālu ... wa-qāla baʿḍuhum ...
art. 3: wa-anshada l-Aṣmaʿī ...
art. 4: wa-anshada ...
art. 5: wa-... wa-anshada .. wa-qāla Abū ʿUbayda ...
art. 6: al-Aṣmaʿī: yuqālu ...
art. 7: wa-yuqālu ...
art. 8: ghayruhu ...

Here we see how the name of al-Aṣmaʿī is given in the first article and then repeated only when some other authority intervenes (art. 2 "qāla baʿḍuhum"; 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-Aṣmaʿī.

Similarly, e.g. in chapter VII (Ḥ—H) the first article is given on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī, in articles 2-9 he is not explicitly mentioned, but article 10 (ṣaḥal—saḥal) is introduced with "wa-qāla ghayru l-Aṣmaʿī" which makes it obvious that all the first nine articles are in fact from al-Aṣmaʿī[323].

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—abbana) is given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī, and the following 13 articles are given without explicit identification of source. Knowing the relatively unimportant role of al-Liḥyānī elsewhere in IS-Y, there is good reason to doubt whether all these article 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[324].

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[325] 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**.

Chapter of IS-Y	total number of articles	initial al-Aṣmaʿī blocks	"misplaced" al-Aṣmaʿī articles	al-Aṣmaʿī additions in other articles
I L—N	34	*10/**1**-10	—	—
II B—M	36	*7/**1**-7	—	3/9, 21, 27[326]
III M—N	14	7/**1**-2,**3**-7	1/13[327]	2/9, 10

---

[323] 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 art. 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'l-ibdāl is also included in the dissertation of El Berkawy (p. 58 ff.), but he uses IS-tahdhīb 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-tahdhīb. 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 ʿUbayda.

[327] The article 12 (ṭāma—ṭāna), given on the authority of al-Aḥmar may also belong to the "misplaced" al-Aṣmaʿī articles. On the other hand, this article is given in AṬ II:428 on the authority of al-Liḥyānī, and in Q II:89 the preceding article is given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr ash-Shaybānī. Similarly the addition to XIII:4 (wa-samiʿtu Khalafan yaqūlu...) probably comes from al-Aṣmaʿī, cf. also Q II:114 and AṬ II:127.

IV ʾ—ʿ	9	8/1-6,7-8[328]	—	—
V Ḥ—ʿ[329]	5	4/2-5	—	—
VI ʾ—H	8	6/1-6	—	—
VII Ḥ—H	11	9/1-9	—	—
VIII Ǧ—Y	11	7/1-7	—	—
IX Ǧ—Ḥ	4	*1/1	—	1/5[330]
X Ḥ—KH	11	*3/1-3	—	1/7
XI T—D	6	6/1-6	—	—
XII T—S	4	2/1-2	—	—
XIII Z—Ṣ	5	5/1-5	—	—
XIV TH—S	5	5/1-5	—	—
XV TH—DH	8	7/1-7	—	—
XVI S—SH	10	*1/1	1/10	—
XVII ʿ—GH	7	*2/1-2	—	—
XVIII Q—K	11	*3/1-3	1/9[331]	1/4
XIX R—L	11	8/1-8	—	—
XX G—K	5	4/1-4	—	—
XXI D—Ṭ	4	4/1-4	—	—
XXII Ṣ—Ṭ	2	2/1-2	—	—
XXIII Ṣ—Ḍ	11	*2/1-2	1/11	2/6, 7
XXIV TH—F	22	*6/1-3,4-6[332]	—	—
XXV KH—H	3	3/1-3	—	—
XXVI T—Ṭ	3	3/1-3	—	—
XXVII D—L	2	*__[333]	—	—
XXVIII Z—S	7	*2/1-2	—	1/3
XXIX muḍāʿaf	11	*—	1/6[334]	—
XXX ʾ—Y	18	*3/1-3	—	—

---

[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 (aḥamma—aǧamma).

[331] The last two articles (10 and 11) are anonymous. In IS-tahdhīb, p. 38 art. 10 (of IS-Y) is introduced by "al-Aṣmaʿī wa'l-Farrāʾ".

[332] The name of the authority (al-Aṣmaʿī) is accidentally missing before the first article which makes the whole block look anonymous, but the evidence given in IS-tahdhīb, p. 34 and Q II:34 make it highly probable that this chapter, too, began originally with an explicit mention of al-Aṣmaʿī. It is possible that his name was already dropped relatively early in the manuscript tradition, as, e.g. AṬ I:192 does not mention al-Aṣmaʿī in this connection.

[333] See the Additional notes.

[334] The "misplaced" article of al-Aṣmaʿī is in fact only an addition to article 2 (analysis of taqaḍḍiya).

XXXI ʾ—W	10	*4/1-4	—	—
XXXII #W—#T-	7	*—[335]	—	—
XXXIII D—DH	3	*—	—	—
XXXIV varia[336]	37	27/1,7-10,11-32	—	1/4
total	355	161	5	12
XXXV +M	8	7/1-7	—	—
XXXVI +N	7	4/1-4	—	—
total	15	11	—	—
grand total	370	172	5	12

Additional notes to the Table

Chapter V, article 1 (ḍabaḥa—ḍabaʿa): This pair is attributed to Abū ʿUbayda also in several other ibdāl works, AṬ (I:292) and Q (II:67) among others, as well as in many dictionaries (ID, p. 280[337]; Lisān VIII:13 ḌBḤ[338]), 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-tahdhīb (p. 24), Q (II:67), AṬ (I:292), Mukh. (XIII:275) and Muzhir (I:466). Why it precedes the "initial" al-Aṣmaʿī block is not clear.

Chapter XVII D—L: No authorities are given for the articles in this chapter, nor are they attributed in IS-tahdhīb (p. 46-47), AṬ (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-Aṣmaʿī'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-Aṣmaʿī blocks are in fact anonymous. Yet there is evidence in other sources that at least some of the articles do come from al-Aṣmaʿī, as, e.g. IS-Y XXXIV art. 20 (p. 144 istawthana—istawthaǧa), cf. TL XI:170: "al-Ḥarrānī ʿan Ibn as-Sikkīt ʿan-i l-Aṣmaʿī..." which shows that in the oral tradition which comes directly from Ibn as-Sikkīt (al-Ḥarrānī was one of the most faithful of his students) the article was taken as being on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī.

[337] Commentary on Qur. 100:1. Ibn Qutayba, Tafsīr gharīb al-Qurʾān II:535 reads: wa-qāla āḥarūna: aḍ-ḍabʿu waʾḍ-ḍabḥu wāḥidun fī s-sayr. yuqālu: ḍabaʿat-i n-nāqatu wa-ḍabaḥat.

[338] According to Lisān this article comes from Abū ʿUbayda'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-Aṣmaʿī, is the only one dealing with sound consonants among the last chapters as the following list shows:

XXIX ḥurūf al-muḍāʿaf
XXX ʾ—Y
XXXI ʾ—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-Aṣmaʿī's ibdāl monograph[339].

Initial al-Aṣmaʿī blocks and "misplaced" al-Aṣmaʿī articles

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

qāla Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb ibn Isḥāq as-Sikkīt: qāla l-Aṣmaʿī 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 taḥdhīb work of al-Aṣmaʿī's *K. al-Qalb waʾl-ibdāl*.

In addition to these initial blocks there are some articles given on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī elsewhere in the book. I have preferred to call them "misplaced" al-Aṣmaʿī 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-Aṣmaʿī blocks for reasons that will shortly become clear. All these "misplaced" articles belong to the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt as may be seen from a comparison of IS-Y with its collaterals[340]:

Chapter III M—N, article 13 (p. 82) duhāmiğ—duhāniğ:
> IS-taḥdhīb, p. 20; AṬ II:427; Q II:91; Mukh. XIII:284 (< Ibn as-Sikkīt!); Muzhir I:468.

Chapter XVI S—SH, article 10 (p. 110) ğuʿsūs—ğuʿshūsh:
> IS-taḥdhīb, p. 41; AṬ II:160; Q II:125-126; Mukh. XIII:278 (< Ibn as-Sikkīt!); Muzhir I:549; Ibn Ğinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 205. Also Taḥdhīb al-alfāẓ, p. 245 and Abū Ḥayyān, al-Irtishāf I:160.

---

[339] The articles of this chapter coincide with the chapter D—DH (Bāb ad-dāl waʾdh-dhāl) of Abū ʿUbayd's al-Gharīb al-muṣannaf, cf. Abdel-Tawab, Das Kitāb al-ġarīb, p. 58, Muzhir I:544-545 and above.

[340] For article 6 of chapter XXIX, cf. above, the note on the Table.

Chapter XXIII Ṣ—Ḍ art. 11 (p. 124) taṣawwa'a—taḍawwa'a[341]:
    IS-tahdhīb, p. 50; AṬ II:247; Q II:23; Mukh. XIII:279; Muzhir I:551 and
    I:564; Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 214.
Chapter XVIII Q—K, article 9 (p. 114) qurbān—kurbān:
    IS-tahdhīb, p. 37; AṬ II:355; Q II:139; Mukh. XIII:277; Muzhir I:564. Also
    Z, p. 610-611 and Tahdhīb al-alfāẓ, p. 531.

Similarly, the two anonymous articles following XVIII art. 9 are well attested; their
attribution to al-Aṣmaʿī is possible though not certain:
Chapter XVIII Q—K, article 10 (p. 114) ʿasiqa—ʿasika:
    IS-tahdhīb, p. 38; AṬ 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; AṬ II:354; Q II:139; Mukh. XIII:277; Muzhir I:564.

This dual nature of the al-Aṣmaʿī articles is probably to be interpreted to mean
that the initial blocks are from the basic source used by Ibn as-Sikkīt, i.e. the ibdāl
monograph of al-Aṣmaʿī (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-Sikkīt to supplement ibdāl material.

The 12 al-Aṣmaʿī 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 Ǧ—Ḥ:
    article 2: al-Kisāʾī: aḥamma l-amru wa-aǧamma idhā ḥāna waqtuhu
    article 4[342]: (...) wa-qāla l-Aṣmaʿī: mā kāna maʿnāhu qad ḥāna wuqūʿuhu
    fa-huwa aǧamma (...) wa-idhā qulta: ḥumma fa-huwa quddira. wa-lam
    yaʿrif [i.e. al-Aṣmaʿī] aḥammat.
Here the al-Aṣmaʿī quote refutes the identity of (a)ḥamma and aǧamma and thus rules
the case outside the phenomenon of ibdāl[343].

The provenance of the al-Aṣmaʿī articles

The overwhelming majority of the al-Aṣmaʿī 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 I L—
N can be located in the extant works of al-Aṣmaʿī[344]; in chapter II B—M only one
article can be found in the other works of al-Aṣmaʿī, viz. art. 5 (p. 71) ʿashaba—

---

[341] Or taṣawwaka—taḍawwaka; cf. below, note 511.
[342] The article is in fact only an addition to article 2.
[343] The nature of the al-Aṣmaʿī 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 rifall—rifann (p. 63) which is not found in the two recensions
of K. al-Ibil edited by Haffner. — The pair is also found in Abū ʿUbayda, K. al-Khayl, p. 112 (and in his
Maǧāz al-Qurʾān I:297) but in a radically different form.

ʿashama (K. al-Ibil, p. 78; K. ash-Shāʾ, p. 16 and 27; K. Khalq al-insān, p. 162; K al-Farq, SBAW 83, p. 248[345]); none of the articles of chapter III M—N and IV ʾ—ʿ can be found elsewhere, etc.

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-Aṣmaʿī, but we cannot locate them because the majority of these works have later disappeared.

2. The articles have come to Ibn as-Sikkīt orally as part of the lexical nawādir collected by al-Aṣmaʿī, through the mediation of al-Aṣmaʿī's students, some of whom were among Ibn as-Sikkīt's teachers, cf. above.

3. The articles come from the now lost K. al-Qalb wa'l-ibdāl of al-Aṣmaʿī.

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-Aṣmaʿī 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-Aṣmaʿī and other scholars.

The second and third solutions are not contradictory. Whether Ibn as-Sikkīt 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 isnād guaranteed the tradition and pure booklore was regarded with contempt[346]. That the initial blocks have been excerpted from, e.g. al-Aṣmaʿī's lost *K. an-Nawādir* or some work other than his monograph on the ibdāls is improbable; the comparison between the work lists of al-Aṣmaʿī and Ibn as-Sikkīt (cf. above) has shown how dependent Ibn as-Sikkīt 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-Aṣmaʿī. In view of all this there is reason to assume that the initial blocks represent the lost ibdāl work of al-Aṣmaʿī with some additions from other sources as well as, perhaps, some abbreviations and omissions.

When we examine the quantity of al-Aṣmaʿī 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-Aṣmaʿī blocks:

		Initial al-Aṣmaʿī block	Total number of ibdāls
I	L—N	10	34
II	B—M	7	36
IX	Ğ—Ḥ	1	4
X	Ḥ—KH	3	11
XVI	S—SH	1	10
XVII	ʿ—GH	2	7

---

[345] But not in the edition of S. at-Tamīmī.

[346] Cf. e.g. TL I:32-33 (al-Azharī's arguments against al-Bushtī al-Khārzangī).

XVIII	Q—K	3	11
XXIII	Ṣ—Ḍ	2	11
XXIV	TH—F	6	22
XXVII	D—L	–	2
XXVIII	Z—S	2	7
XXIX	muḍāʿaf	–	11
XXX	ʾ—Y	3	18
XXXI	ʾ—W	4	10
XXXII	#w——#t-	–	7
XXXIII	D—DH	–	3

From this list we may draw the following conclusions about al-Aṣmaʿī's ibdāl work and its relationship with IS-Y:

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

2. The grammatical ibdāls (chapters XXIX-XXXII) were only discussed in passing in al-Aṣmaʿī's monograph, and it is possible (cf. the preceding paragraph) that none of them actually comes from al-Aṣmaʿī's ibdāl work.

3. Most of the ibdāl chapters on sound consonants in which the minority of material is found in the initial al-Aṣmaʿī blocks represent cases where the ibdāls are of possible orthographical origin (i.e. may be suspected of being taṣḥīfs; Ǧ—Ḥ, Ḥ—KH, S—SH, ʿ—GH and Ṣ—Ḍ). — It should be emphasized that none of the chapters with a majority of articles in the initial al-Aṣmaʿī block fall in this cathegory.

4. Of the remaining few ibdāl chapters with a minority from al-Aṣmaʿī's ibdāl 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-Aṣmaʿī. 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 Kitāb al-Ibdāl, 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-Sikkīt.

In IS-Y, as elsewhere in the ibdāl literature, al-Liḥyānī's principal role is that of a student of al-Kisā'ī[347]. Consequently, the isnāds al-Liḥyānī, al-Kisā'ī, and al-Liḥyānī ʿan-i l-Kisā'ī 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-Liḥyānī ʿan-i l-Kisā'ī

= AṬ II:396: al-Liḥyānī wa-ghayruhu.

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

= Muzhir I:565: wa-fī l-Gharīb al-muṣannaf ʿan-i l-Kisā'ī[348].

IS-Y chapter VI ʾ—H art. 7-8 (p. 89), isnād: al-Kisā'ī

= Abū Zayd, Nawādir, p. 202 (addition by Abū'l-Ḥasan): wa-lā aʿlamu aḥadan ḥakā hādhayni l-ḥarfayn ghayrahu (referring to al-Liḥyānī).

Because the names of al-Kisā'ī and al-Liḥyānī 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	art. 17	al-Liḥyānī ʿan-i l-Kisā'ī
	art. 18	anonymous
	art. 19	yaqūlu, probably referring to the authority of art. 17[349]
	art. 21	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 22-34	anonymous[350]
Chapter II B—M	art. 12	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 13-20	anonymous
	art. 21-24	anonymous[351]
Chapter VI ʾ—H	art. 7	al-Kisā'ī
	art. 8	anonymous[352]
Chapter IX Ǧ—Ḥ	art. 2	al-Kisā'ī

---

[347] Cf. his cognomen ghulām al-Kisā'ī (e.g. Fihrist/Dodge, p. 48). Al-Azharī writes (TL I:35b): wa-qad akhadha l-Liḥyānī ʿan Abī Zayd wa-Abī ʿUbayda wa'l-Aṣmaʿī illā anna ʿumdatahu l-Kisā'ī.

[348] Muzhir I:475 (al-Liḥyānī) 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-Farrāʾ [sic!]: qultu li-aʿrābī etc.

[349] The name of al-Kisā'ī has been added to the text by the editor from IS-tahdhīb, p. 8.

[350] Whether some (or even all) of these articles belong to an "al-Kisā'ī/al-Liḥyānī -block" is unsure. The last article is given in Q II:44 on the authority of al-Liḥyānī, art. 22 (āsāl—āsān) is also given on his authority in Lisān I:146, and article 24 (irmaʿalla—irmaʿanna) most probably comes from him as art. 5 (irmaʿalla—irmaghalla) of chapter XVII ʿ—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-Liḥyānī, with a few articles between the two. This probably means that we should take articles 12-20 as an al-Kisā'ī/al-Liḥyānī -block. The last four articles (21-24) are more difficult to attribute; of all sources dependent on IS-Y, only IS-tahdhīb gives al-Liḥyānī as the source for IS-Y art. 22-24 (ghayhab—ghayham; azba—azma; ṣaʾiba—ṣaʾima = IS-tahdhīb, p. 14, 15, and 13, articles 28, 37 and 19 in this order).

[352] See Abū Zayd, Nawādir, p. 202 (addition of Abū'l-Ḥasan), quoted above.

	art. 3-4	anonymous[353]
Chapter X Ḥ—KH	art. 8	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 9-10	anonymous[354]
Chapter XVI S—SH	art. 5	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 6-8	anonymous[355]
Chapter XVII ʿ—GH	art. 5	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 6	anonymous[356]
Chapter XXIII Ṣ—Ḍ	art. 8	al-Liḥyānī
	art. 9-10	anonymous[357]
	art. 11	al-Liḥyānī[358]
Chapter XXIV TH—F	art. 10	al-Kisāʾī (via al-Farrāʾ)[359]
Chapter XXIX muḍāʿaf[360]		
Chapter XXX ʾ—Y	art. 12	(al-Liḥyānī)[361]
	art. 13	anonymous[362]
	art. 14	al-Liḥyānī ʿan-i l-Kisāʾī
	art. 15-18	anonymous[363]

[353] Article 3 (muǧāraf—muḥaraf) is given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī in K. al-Iʿtiqāb no. 50 q.v. Al-Liḥyānī did deal with the roots ǦLB and ḤLB (art. 4) as can be seen from the numerous al-Liḥyānī quotes in the respective articles of Lisān (II:313-318 and III:275-281).

[354] Article 9 is given explicitly on the authority of al-Liḥyānī in Lisān IV:318. Articles 8-10 (iṭmaḥarra—iṭmakharra; darbaḥa—darbakha; taḥawwafa—takhawwafa) are given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī in Thaʿlab, Maǧālis, p. 351-352. The anonymous article 11 (the Qurʾanic sabḥan—sabkhan, Qur. 73:7) is nowhere given on his authority; on the contrary, the article is given in Mukh. XIII:277 preceded by "ghayruhu" (i.e. other than al-Liḥyānī, 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-Liḥyānī (or al-Kisāʾī).

[356] Article 6 (baʿthara—baghthara) is found in the ibdāl literature only in IS-Y, IS-tahdhīb (p. 34), AṬ (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 ibdāl triad baḥthara—baʿthara—baghthara. This would mean that the pair in chapter XVII most probably does not belong to the al-Kisāʾī/al-Liḥyānī - block.

[357] I can adduce little external evidence to support the attribution of these two articles (p. 124 salāsil—ḍalāḍil and qabaṣa—qabaḍa) to al-Kisāʾī/al-Liḥyānī. It is true that al-Liḥyānī did discuss the root ḌLḌL but with a different meaning, see Lisān VIII:82.

[358] Article 11 (on taḍawwaʾa—taṣawwaʾa; the correction to taṣawwaka—taḍawwaka is made by the editor) consits of two parts, viz. taḍawwaʾa on the authority of al-Liḥyānī and taṣawwaʾa on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī.

[359] Article 15 (athāfī—athāthī) is further given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī in Q II:34.

[360] Article 9 (p. 135 qaṣṣaytu—QṢṢ) is given on the authority of al-Qanānī who does not belong to the direct authorities of Ibn as-Sikkīt. Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 759 gives the pair from IS (via Abū ʿAlī) and reads: "akhbaranā Abū ʿAlī ʿan Yaʿqūb qāla: qāla l-Liḥyānī: qaṣṣaytu aẓfārī...". Lisān XI:199 gives the isnād as "qāla l-Liḥyānī: ḥakā l-Qanānī". On the other hand Ibn as-Sikkīt quotes the piece in his Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq, p. 302, as "wa-ḥakā l-Farrāʾ ʿan-i l-Qanānī". Thus the evidence is not conclusive, but it is possible that the piece comes from al-Liḥyānī. — For al-Qanānī, see GAS VIII:29-30, but note also Bauer, Pflanzenbuch, p. 222. In Q II:171 al-ʿAttābī is a mistake for al-Qanānī.

[361] The attribution of art. 12 (adhriʿāt—yadhriʿāt) has been added by the editor from IS-tahdhīb, p. 55.

[362] I have been unable to find external evidence for the attribution of art. 13 (asrūʿ—yasrūʿ) to al-Kisāʾī/al-Liḥyānī.

[363] I have been unable to find external evidence for the attribution of art. 15-18 to al-Kisāʾī/al-Liḥyānī. —

Thus there are twelve articles given on the explicit authority of al-Kisā'ī and/or al-Liḥyānī in IS-Y, and probably at least the same number of implicit ones. As to al-Kisā'ī and al-Liḥyānī as ibdāl 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 taṣḥīfs (Ǧ—Ḥ; Ḥ—KH; S—SH; ʿ—GH; Ṣ—Ḍ).

Al-Farrā'

The influence of al-Farrā' in ibdāl studies is considerable. He did not write anything especially on the phenomenon but he wrote a monograph in the adjacent field of laḥn al-ʿāmma (cf. GAS VIII:123)[364]. The articles given explicitly on the authority of al-Farrā' have been written in **bold face**.

Chapter I L—N	art. **8** (addition)
	art. **13-14**, **15-16**, **20**[365]
Chapter II B—M	art. **7** (addition)
	art. **34**
Chapter VIII Ǧ—Y	art. **9-11**[366]
Chapter X Ḥ—KH	art. **11**
Chapter XII T—S	art **3-4**[367]
Chapter XVI S—SH	art. **9**
Chapter XVII ʿ—GH	art. **3-4**[368]
Chapter XVIII Q—K	art. **5-8**[369]
Chapter XXIV TH—F	art. **10-16**[370]
	art. **21** (addition)
Chapter XXX ʾ—Y	art. **4-6**[371]

Articles 8-10 are, on the contrary, attributed to al-Liḥyānī in different articles of Lisān, cf. below sub al-Farrā'.

[364] TʿA XVIII:313-314 mentions a "bāb aṣ-ṣād wa-ḍ-ḍād" 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-Farrā' is an error.

[365] For article 14 (kabn—kabl), cf. Lisān XII:20 (Ibn as-Sikkīt...ḥakāhu ʿan-i l-Farrā'); for art. 16 (dhaʾālīl—dhaʾālīn), cf. Q II:43 (al-Farrā').

[366] Articles 9-11 (p. 96 ḥaǧǧatiǧ, biǧ, wafratiǧ) are the rhyming words of one poetic fragment quoted on the authority of al-Farrā'.

[367] Articles 3-4 (p. 104 an-nātī, akyātī) are the rhyming words of one poetic fragment quoted on the authority of al-Farrā'.

[368] For art. 4 (p. 112 waʾl—waghl), cf. Lisān XV:347.

[369] Art. 6 (p. 113 qashaṭa—kashaṭa) explicitly from al-Farrā' in Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 277 (quoting Ibn as-Sikkīt); art. 7 (p. 114 qaḥaṭa—kaḥaṭa) probably also from al-Farrā', who is quoted in Ṣiḥāḥ, p. 1151 as an authority for qaḥaṭa, though without mention of kaḥaṭa. I have been unable to find external support for attributing art. 8 (114 fa-lā takhar—QHR) to al-Farrā'.

[370] Art. 11 (p. 126 thūm—fūm) is given on the authority of al-Farrā' in Lisān X:355; for art. 12 (p. 126 thurqubī—furqubī), cf. Lisān X:249 (a note on furqubī by al-Farrā').

[371] Art. 6 (p. 136 yanādīd—anādīd) is given on the authority of al-Farrā' in Tahdhīb al-alfāẓ, p. 57. Art. 5 (p. 136 yalandad—alandad) might also belong to the al-Farrā' block, although I have not found any

Chapter XXXI ʾ—W	art. 6[372]
Chapter XXXIII D—DH	art. 2-3[373]
Chapter XXXIV varia	art. 34

Abū ʿAmr ash-Shaybānī

Ash-Shaybānī is usually quoted in IS-Y (as well as in other earlier philological literature) simply as Abū ʿAmr, although his whole name is sometimes used (e.g. p. 108, 112)[374]. This may sometimes cause the risk of confusing him with Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, as in chapter XXIX, art. 5 (p. 134 lam yatasanna—SNN; see below, sub Abū ʿUbayda).

Chapter I L—N	art. 11-12
Chapter II B—M	art. 11
	art. 35 (addition)[375]
Chapter III M—N	art. 14[376]
Chapter IV ʾ—ʿ	art. 9[377]
Chapter X Ḥ—KH	art. 6-7[378]
Chapter XV TH—DH	art. 8
Chapter XVI S—SH	art. 3-4[379]
Chapter XVII ʿ—GH	art. 7
Chapter XVIII Q—K	art. 4

external evidence for its attribution to al-Farrāʾ (the word yaladd, added by the editor from Muzhir, should be deleted from this article). Articles 7-11 are given anonymously in IS-Y but it is very improbable that they belong to the al-Farrāʾ block; art. 8-10 (yarandaǧ—arandaǧ; yalanǧūǧ—alanǧūǧ; yalal—alal) are all quoted on the authority of al-Liḥyānī in Lisān (V:183, XII:240, XV:256), and there is no evidence that they come from al-Farrāʾ.

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

[373] On the authority of Khālid ibn Kulthūm (the words wa-samiʿtu have been added by the editor from IS-tahdhīb, p. 54).

[374] The editor of IS-Y has often added 'ash-Shaybānī' from other sources, mainly IS-tahdhīb 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-ḥakāhā lī Abū ʿAmr ayḍan) on the authority of Abū ʿAmr has been added by the editor from IS-tahdhīb, p. 13, and is not found in the original.

[376] Art. 9 (p. 80-81) has an addition on the authority of Abū ʿAmr on a D—DH pair (ʿadūf—ʿadhūf), cf. Chapter XXXIII art. 1.

[377] The formulation "samiʿtu Abā ʿAmr" could also refer to Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, in which case the subject would be al-Aṣmaʿī (the articles 1-8 belong to the al-Aṣmaʿī block). On the other hand, the same formulation is used, e.g. in ʿAbdalqādir al-Baghdādī, Ḥāshiya III:90, for the relations of Ibn as-Sikkīt and ash-Shaybānī. For the close relationship between Ibn as-Sikkīt and ash-Shaybānī, see also ʿAbdalqādir, Ḥāshiya I:427.

[378] For art. 7 (p. 99 ṭuḥrūr—ṭukhrūr), cf. Ṣiḥāḥ, p. 724 (< Abū ʿAmr).

[379] For article 4 (p. 109 sawdhaq—shawdhaq), cf. TL VIII:311 (explicitly from Abū ʿAmr), partly quoted also in Lisān VI:223.

Chapter XX Ǧ—K	art. **5**[380]
Chapter XXIII Ṣ—Ḍ	art. **5, 6-7**[381]
Chapter XXIV TH—F	art. **7-8, (9)**[382]
Chapter XXIX muḍāʿaf[383]	
Chapter XXXIII Ḍ—DH	art. **1**[384]
Chapter XXXIV varia	art. **33**
Chapter XXXV +M	art. **8**

Abū ʿUbayda

Abū ʿUbayda is usually quoted in IS-Y only once per chapter and not in blocks. The relatively unimportant role of Abū ʿUbayda 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**[385]**, 9, 10, 25**[386]
Chapter III M—N	art. **5** (addition)
Chapter V Ḥ—ʿ	art. **1**
Chapter X Ḥ—KH	art. **5**
Chapter XIX R—L	art. **9**[387]
Chapter XXIII Ṣ—Ḍ	art. **3**[388]
Chapter XXIV TH—F	art. **3** (addition)

[380] Art. 5 (p. 118 sahk—sahǧ) could also be taken as an addition to art. 4 (sayhūh—sayhūǧ).

[381] For art. 7 (p. 123 naṣnaṣa—naḍnaḍa), cf. TL XI:469 (< Abū ʿUbayd < Abū ʿAmr).

[382] Art. 8 (p. 125 thawhad—fawhad) is given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr in Lisān X:341. Abūʾṭ-Ṭayyib gives the pairs fināʾ—thināʾ and thawhad—fawhad in AṬ I:184 on the authority of Abū ʿAmr and al-Liḥyānī, but says about the definitions given in IS-Y on the authority of Abū ʿAmr, that they come from a third authority (wa-qāla ghayruhumā). Art. 9 (p. 126 urtha—urfa) is nowhere given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr; in TL XV:118 and XV:246 it is given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī.

[383] The Abū ʿAmr quoted in the article 5 (p. 134 lam yatasanna—SNN) of this chapter is Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, 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 ʿUbayda.

[384] Cf. also chapter III art. 9 (p. 80-81 ʿadūf—ʿadhūf addition).

[385] A major part of this long article on ruǧma—ruǧba (p. 72) comes from al-Aṣmaʿī, cf. Q II:52-53, AṬ I:44-45 (though here the text differs from IS-Y), Abū ʿUbayd, Gharīb al-ḥadīth IV:153-155, and al-Harawī, K. al-Gharībayn II:113-114 and II:396-397.

[386] Articles 26-33 do not belong to the Abū ʿUbayda articles but are to be taken as anonymous. IS-Y art. 26 (p. 75 iḍbaʾakka—iḍmaʾakka) is quoted in AṬ I:40 on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī; IS-tahdhīb, p. 14, quotes after ʿiqbā—ʿiqma (= IS-Y, art. 25) an article by al-Liḥyānī, and gives the IS-Y articles 26-33 as anonymous; Q II:54 introduces IS-Y art. 28 (p. 75 dhaʾaba—dhaʾama) with ʾqāla Yaʿqūbʾ which in al-Qālī's formulation means that no older authority was available for him to cite.

[387] Article 10 and 11 (p. 117 munqaṭir—munqaṭil and ǧiribbāna—ǧilibbāna) are to be taken as anonymous; in no other source, except IS-tahdhīb, p. 51, are they given on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda. AṬ 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 amraṭ—amlaṭ) on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda.

[388] Article 4 (p. 121-122 ḍiʾḍiʾ—ṣiʾṣiʾ) 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 ṣāfa—ḍāfa) and art. 4 and gives art. 4 explicitly on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda. AṬ II:242 follows IS-Y but Q II:22, Mukh. XIII:279 and Lisān VII:266 and VIII:6 give the pair only on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt.

Chapter XXVIII Z—S	art. 7[389]
Chapter XXIX muḍāʿaf	art. 1[390]-5[391], 8[392]
Chapter XXXI ʾ—W	art. 5
Chapter XXXIV varia	art. 4, 6, 31-32[393]

Ibn al-Aʿrābī

There are five articles and one addition in IS-Y given on the authority of Ibn al-Aʿrābī. The articles are:

Chapter XXIX muḍāʿaf   art. 10-11[394]

---

[389] In IS-tahdhīb, p. 43 — whence the author of IS-Y has added it to the text of IS-Y (p. 131) — Abū ʿUbayda is given as the authority for shāsib—shāzib (IS-Y art. 3). Despite this, the block IS-Y art. 3-6 is evidently not from Abū ʿUbayda: in AṬ II:109-112 shāzib—shāsib is given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr, and the following three without any authority; Q II:185-186 gives first IS-Y art. 4-6 on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī, after which comes IS-Y art. 3 from "ghayruhu" (similarly also in Mukh. XIII:279; azʿala—asʿala is given separately); Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 195, has only shāzib—shāsib (introduced by "wa-qāla baʿḍuhum"); in Lisān Abū ʿUbayda is given as an authority on saʿil—zaʿil (Lisān VI:270) but the passage differs from the text of IS-Y.

[390] Article 5, the Qurʾānic lam yatasanna—SNN (Qur. 2:259) is an interesting case. In IS-Y, p. 134, it is introduced by "wa-samiʿtu Abā ʿAmr yaqūlu" (the W of ʿAmr is accidentally missing; ash-Shaybānī has been added by the editor of IS-Y from IS-tahdhīb, p. 58-59). The same information is also given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr in Lisān VI:404 SNH (and anonymously also in al-Farrāʾ, Maʿānī I:172-173). This Abū ʿAmr has been identified as Abū ʿAmr ash-Shaybānī not only in IS-tahdhīb, but also in Ibn Qutayba, Tafsīr gharīb al-Qurʾān, p. 95 (whence it has been taken to al-Harawī, K. al-Gharībayn III:201). The formulation of AṬ II:459-460 seems to imply the same: "qāla Ibn as-Sikkīt: samiʿtu Abā ʿAmr yaqūlu..." (the Abū ʿAmr whom Ibn as-Sikkīt had himself the opportunity to hear is naturally Abū ʿAmr ash-Shaybānī. Cf. also Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq, p. 302!). — On the other hand, Ibn Ǧinnī writes in his Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 758: "wa-qaraʾtu ʿalā Abī ʿAlī bi-isnādihi ʿan Abī ʿUbayda qāla: samiʿtu Abā ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ yaqūlu...". The immediate source for the quotation is without doubt IS-Y. As Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ was a famous Qurʾānic scholar (and the teacher of Abū ʿUbayda), this is a more natural attribution than ash-Shaybānī. The formulation in Lisān VI:404 also supports this: "wa-rawā l-Azharī ʿan Abī ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā fī qawlihi 'lam yatasannah' qāla: qaraʾahā Abū Ǧaʿfar wa-Shayba wa-ʿĀṣim bi-ithbāti l-hāʾ (...) wa-wāfaqahum Abū ʿAmr fī 'lam yatasannah'..". This places Abū ʿAmr on a par with men of the generation of mid-8th century (and the canonical qāriʾs), a place natural to Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ (himself one of the qurrāʾ), but unsuitable to the later, and uncanonized, ash-Shaybānī. Thus it seems that the words "samiʿtu Abā ʿAmr yaqūlu" in IS-Y, p. 134, are to be taken as part of the Abū ʿUbayda 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 ʿUbayda qawlahu ǧalla wa-ʿazza 'min ḥamaʾin masnūn' ay sāʾilin, wa-llāhu aʿlam" (al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil III:67 deals with the same passages but without naming any authorities).

[391] Art. 2 (p. 133 taqaḍḍiya—QḌḌ) is given in Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 759 introduced by "akhbaranā Abū ʿAlī qāla: qāla l-Aṣmaʿī wa-Abū ʿUbayda...". IS-Y art. 3 (p. 133 mulabbī—LBB) is given as anonymous in Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 743-744. Articles 1-5 may come from Abū ʿUbayd's al-Gharīb al-muṣannaf which contains a chapter Bāb al-muḥawwal mina l-muḍāʿaf, see the list of chapter headings given in Abdel-Tawab, Das Kitāb al-ġarīb, p. 58.

[392] Art. 9 (p. 135 qaṣṣaytu—QṢṢ) is given on the authority of al-Qanānī, see above sub al-Liḥyānī.

[393] 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-tahdhīb, p. 65.

[394] Lisān IV:349 gives the shāhid verse of art. 11 (yaʾtamī for yaʾtammu) with the isnād < Thaʿlab < Ibn al-Aʿrābī.

Chapter XXXIV varia   art. 2[395]

                       art. 35-36[396]

The only Ibn al-Aʿrābī 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 Ǧ—Y, art. 7 (which belongs to the al-Aṣmaʿī block) has the following addition:

wa-anshada ʿan aʿrābī [sic!]:

ka-anna fī adhnābihinna sh-shuwwalī

min ʿabasi ṣ-ṣayfi qurūna l-iǧǧalī[397]

yurīdu: al-iyyal.

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

wa-zaʿamū anna baʿḍa l-aʿrābi kāna yunshidu: [follows the same shāhid][398]

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

wa-anshada ʿan Ibn al-Aʿrābī: [the same shāhid]

This agrees with Q II:78; Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, pp. 176-177; Ibn Ǧinnī, Mukhtaṣar, p. 29; Ṣiḥāḥ, p. 1621; Lisān I:79; and az-Zamakhsharī, al-Mufaṣṣal, p. 372, all of which give the verse on the authority of Ibn al-Aʿrābī. This may have to be interpreted to mean that AṬ 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-Aʿrābī", 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 Zayd[399], nor are

---

[395] Read also in Q II:171 ḥasākil—ḥasāfil instead of the printed ḥasākid—ḥasāfid.

[396] The two articles 35 and 36 (p. 146 tākk—fākk; qaḥr—qaḥm) belong closely together, so it seems evident that art. 36 also comes from Ibn al-Aʿrābī, though in AṬ II:84 it is given on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī, in whose K. Khalq al-insān (p. 161) it is moreover found. Art. 37 (p. 146 indāla—indāḥa) is anonymous but probably does not belong to the Ibn al-Aʿrābī block. In other sources (AṬ I:310; Lisān IV:437 and IV:445; Ṣiḥāḥ, 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-tahdhīb, p. 65, the order of the IS-Y articles 35-37 is reversed (37, 35, 36) with the name of Ibn al-Aʿrābī occurring only after the IS-Y art. 37.

[397] The verse (cf. Abūʾn-Naǧm, Dīwān 56:84) is more often found with the normal variant l-iyyalī (e.g. in Ibn as-Sikkīt's own Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq, p. 83). For the full documentation of this verse and its variants, see Abūʾn-Naǧm's Dīwān, loc.cit.

[398] Az-Zubaydī, Laḥn al-ʿāmma, p. 157 belongs to the same tradition as it reads: "wa-qāla Yaʿqūb: baʿdu l-ʿarabi yaqūlu: al-iǧǧal, fa-yubdilu l-yāʾa ǧīman. wa-anshada Abū ʿAlī: [the same shāhid]."

[399] 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-tahdhīb, 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 Ǧinnī in his Sirr aṣ-ṣināʿa, p. 183, where he writes:

> fa-ammā mā qaraʾtu ʿalā Abī ʿAlī ʿan Abī Bakr ʿan baʿḍi aṣḥābi Yaʿqūb ʿan Yaʿqūb min anna Abā Zayd qāla: [IS-Y art. 4]. qāla Abū ʿAlī: fa-nkhamaṣa nkhimāṣan. dhakarahu Abū Zayd fī Maṣādirihi: idh dhahaba waramuhu...

This K. al-Maṣādir has been lost[400] 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 ʿUbayda, al-Farrāʾ and Abū ʿAmr. As is common in Arabic philological literature of the period (cf. e.g. AṬ), 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 AṬ 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 theʾultimate authority; subject-oriented order, etc.) which could give any clues as to the immediate source of the additions. Many of these are parallelled by the articles of TL[401], but there does not seem to be any direct dependence between these works[402]; 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 ǧars—ǧarsh), 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. as-Shartūnī, 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.

[400] GAS IX:67 and IX:242. If Ibn Ǧinnī'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 Lisān IV:219.

[401] E.g. Chapter II B—M art. 14 (p. 12-13 iqtabaʿa—iqtamaʿa) = TL I:283 partly; art. 21 (p. 13 raǧama —raǧaba) = TL XI:54 (+ an explicit quote from ID, p. 466); art. 22 (p. 13 iṭmaʾanna—iṭbaʾanna) = TL XIII:198; art. 29 (p. 14 naqība—naqīma) = TL IX:199; but articles 47-49 (p. 16-17 takabkaba— takamkama; kabana—kabala; ʿaṭāmīl—ʿaṭābīl) in the same chapter are not found in TL.

[402] Neither that al-Azharī would have used a recension close to IS-tahdhīb nor that the redactor of IS-tahdhīb would have used, at least systematically, TL.

of AṬ 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 correspondances 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 aḍ-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 Abū'l-Wāziʿ'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-Biʾr* (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-Zaǧǧāǧī's K. al-Ibdāl

Contrary to the other ibdāl writers, az-Zaǧǧāǧī 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 raǧulan min fuṣaḥāʾi Rabīʿa akhbarahu annahu samiʿa kathīran min ahli Makka min fuṣaḥāʾihim yaqūlūna: yā Abdallāh yurīdūna: yā ʿAbdallāh

I have been unable to identify this Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAnbarī[403]. As the

manuscript of Z contains several coarse mistakes by the scribe[404], one might try to emend the name and to read it as al-ʿAskarī or al-ʿUkbarī. There is in fact a Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAskarī, known also as an-Nadīm, see GAS VIII:166 and Irshād IV:185[405]. According to GAS VIII:166 and VIII:99, he was a lexicographer who wrote a work on which az-Zaǧǧāǧ, az-Zaǧǧāǧī's main teacher wrote a commentary. Thus it is possible that the passage has come to az-Zaǧǧāǧī via az-Zaǧǧāǧ, possibly orally.

2. p. 468: wa'ṣ-ṣaqru wa'z-zaqru wa's-saqr. wa-akhbaranī Abū Zakarīyā ibn abī'l-Ḥurayfish al-Bāridī anna aʿrābīyayni tashāǧarā fa-qāla aḥaduhumā: saqr. wa-qāla l-ākhar: ṣaqr. fa-ḥtakamā ilā aʿrābīyin shaykhin lahumā kabīrin fa-qāla: huwa zaqr.

This person, too remains shadowy[406] and I have been unable to find any information on him. — The story itself, though told in slightly different words, is in other places[407] found on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī.

3. p. 473-474: wa-rabaktu th-tharīda wa-labaktuhu ay khalaṭṭuhu. wa-ḥaddathanī l-Māzinī qāla: qāla l-Kisāī: [continued with an anecdote with RBK]

This well-known anecdote is here given on the authority of al-Māzinī. Despite the formula ḥaddathanī, the quote cannot come directly from al-Māzinī who died in 248/869. It may instead have come orally via, e.g. Muḥammad ibn Rustam aṭ-Ṭabarī, who was a teacher of az-Zaǧǧāǧī and was known as "ghulām al-Māzinī"[408].

4. p. 623: ...wa-Isrāʾīl wa-Isrāʾīn. wa-anshada l-Farrāʾ: [a verse with ismāʿīn[409]].

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 salhab—salham[410] = ṭawīl), and several cases are not found in any lexical works, e.g. Z, p. 442 shayẓam—shayẓab = ṭawīl, or p. 607-608 sāqa—sāka 'to drive (e.g. a donkey)' (shayẓab 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 Irshād IV:185 the name is read al-ʿUkbarī but the correct al-ʿAskarī 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-Bāridī 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 isrāʾīnā, 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. Takmila VI:58a.

The first chapters of Z (p. 254-275, 428-432), which contain ibdāls of the weak letters[411], have ample parallels in Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq (esp. p. 139ff.), but the differences in order and wording[412] means that it is unlikely that Iṣlāḥ were a direct source of Z, although Iṣlāḥ's wide circulation makes it probable that az-Zaǧǧāǧī knew the book.

The main sources of AṬ

Introduction

The purpose of the present chapter is to study the *immediate* sources of AṬ, i.e. the books Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib used when compiling his work. For an evaluation and understanding of AṬ this is much more important than the mere listing of AṬ's ultimate sources, i.e. the early philologists who form the final link in the isnāds and are usually named in AṬ[413]. These immediate sources are not indicated by name in AṬ. Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has been particularly reluctant to mention his debt to his main sources: Ibn as-Sikkīt is mentioned by name only three times, Ibn Durayd is not mentioned at all.

Ibn as-Sikkīt's K. al-Qalb wa'l-ibdāl: material

Even a superficial comparison of the material of IS-Y and AṬ clearly shows that IS-Y has been the basic source of AṬ: in most chapters the articles of IS-Y are given in AṬ 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 AṬ on the first ten chapters of IS-Y (the order of the articles within the blocks is not discussed here):

	Chapter	IS-Y	AṬ
1.	L—N	1-34	= 1-37 with the exception of AṬ 3, 22, and 24. These and AṬ 38-64 are without parallels in IS-Y.
2.	B—M	1-36	= 1-42 with the exception of AṬ 5, 7, 28-31. These and AṬ 43-96 are without parallels in IS-Y.
3.	M—N	1-14	= 1-14. AṬ 15-39 are without parallels in IS-Y.
4.	ʾ—ʿ		the chapter is not preserved in the extant manuscript of AṬ.
5.	Ḥ—ʿ	1-5	= 1-4 and 7. AṬ 5-6 and 8-29 are without parallels in IS-Y.
6.	ʾ—Ḥ		the chapter is not preserved in the extant manuscript of AṬ.

[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.

[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.

[413] El Berkawy, Das Kitāb al-Ibdāl, p. 156-174, confines himself to this rather mechanical listing of the ultimate authorities. Cf. also the misguided belief of the editor of AṬ that the al-Aṣmaʿī quotes in AṬ stem directly from al-Aṣmaʿī's ibdāl work, cf. AṬ II:682.

7.	Ḥ—H	1-11	= 2-10 and 12-14. AṬ 1, 11, and 15-38 are without parallels in IS-Y.
8.	Ǧ—Y	1-11	= 1-4, 7-10 and 13-15. AṬ 5-6, 11-12 and 16-19 are without parallels in IS-Y.
9.	Ǧ—Ḥ	1-4	= 1-4. AṬ 5-11 are without parallels in IS-Y.
10.	Ḥ—KH	1-11	= 2-11 and 18. AṬ 1, 12-17 and 19-53 are without parallels in IS-Y.

This table proves beyond reasonable doubt that Abū'ṭ-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 AṬ that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib did indeed have the work at his disposal[414].

All the IS-Y words?

It should be emphasized that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has taken all the material of IS-Y into his monograph with only very few exceptions[415]. These exceptions are[416]:

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 muḍāʿaf and XXXIV varia has been dispersed among different chapters in AṬ. All the muḍāʿaf articles are found in different consonant—Y chapters of AṬ with two exceptions, viz. IS-Y art. 2 taqaḍḍiya (for taqaḍḍida, p. 133) which falls within the middle lacuna of AṬ, and IS-Y art. 9 qaṣṣaytu (for qaṣaṣtu, p. 135). The latter article is also found in Q II:171 and IS-tahdhīb, p. 59, with the same wording as in IS-Y[417], 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 AṬ (Ṣ—Y AṬ II:264 which has only one word pair). The articles of the varia chapter are also found in the corresponding chapters of AṬ except for one case, IS-Y art. 16 (p. 144) waqīdh—waqīẓ. Instead of this article in AṬ II:19 we find the pair waqīdh—waqīṭ in chapter DH—Ṭ which has exactly the same wording as the article of IS-Y. Thus it seems that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has here misread or corrected his source; the form waqīẓ is criticized, e.g. in Lisān XV:369 sub WQẒ and WQṬ by Ibn Manẓūr who prefers waqīṭ[418].

---

[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-Suyūṭī (above, pp. 72-73) who quotes AṬ 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-Ibdāl, p. 71-72, is unaware of the fact that Haffner's text is not the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt, but its later tahdhīb, he could not recognize the importance of IS-Y as the basic source of AṬ.

[416] The three lacunae of AṬ 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-ʿAttābī for IS-Y's al-Qanānī but this is a simple mistake.

[418] It may be added that the pair waqīdh—waqīẓ/waqīṭ is missing from Q, Mukh. and Muzhir but it is

3. Chapter XXXII #w——#t- (IS-Y, p. 139) consists of 7[419] articles (tuklān, turāth, tukhama, tatrā, taqwā, tuǧāh and talīd/tilād). All these pairs are also found in Q II:167, Muzhir I:464 (only tuǧāh is missing, but knowing the eclectic nature of Muzhir, its omission does not signify anything) and IS-tahdhīb, p. 62-63. Four of them are totally lacking from AṬ I:149-150, and the wording of the remaining three articles common with IS-Y differs more than is usual[420]. Thus Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 ibdāls, as only one member of the pair is in actual use, the other being mere etymological speculation there being no such words as *waqwā, *watrā and *wurāth. Yet this was probably not the reason for the omission of these words from AṬ as Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has, on the other hand, included three other cases which lack one member of the pair, viz. tukhama, tuka'a and tayqūr, in the same chapter.

4. The pair a'tada—a'adda from chapter XI of IS-Y is missing from AṬ. It is found in the other works dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhīb, 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 AṬ[421].

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 AṬ (nabīdha—nabītha; ḥadhhādh—ḥathhāth; tala'dhama—tala'thama)[422]. The other four articles are found scattered throughout the chapter TH—DH of AṬ (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 qadhama and ǧadhā). There is no obvious reason for the omission of these articles.

Summary

A comparison of AṬ with IS-Y (and not IS-tahdhīb!) shows that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has sought to include all the ibdāl material of IS-Y in his monograph. The few omissions may be simple errors on the part of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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).

---

found in IS-tahdhīb, p. 64 and Ibn Ǧinnī, Sirr aṣ-ṣinā'a, p. 228 (with waqīz), as well as, e.g. T'A XX:201b (on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt), but cf. also T'A XX:186b (waqīṭ) and Takmila IV:207b.

[419] The editor of IS-Y has added ta-llāh from IS-tahdhīb, 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-tahdhīb.

[420] AṬ also has tukala instead of tuklān in IS-Y.

[421] Yet it may be added that strictly speaking this pair does not belong to the "pure" cases of ibdāl 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'tadtu—a'dadtu).

[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 AṬ 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 AṬ, the first two chapters of IS-Y are compared below with the respective articles of AṬ.

1. Chapter L—N

The first chapter of IS-Y contains 34 articles, and the corresponding chapter of AṬ 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 AṬ which has three articles intervening in the IS-Y block, viz. AṬ art. 3 (II:384) lūb—nūb 'bee'[423]; AṬ art. 22 (II:398) azlam—aznam (with the same root as AṬ art. 20, II:397 = IS-Y art. 19 zulma—zunma); and AṬ art. 24 II:401 ultuqiʿa—untuqiʿa[424]. The order of the articles in the two work is the following[425] (the last column gives a brief summary of each article of AṬ in comparison to IS-Y):

		IS-Y	AṬ	Q	Relationship of AṬ to IS-Y
1.	hatala—hatana	1	1	3	+ grammatical forms
2.	sudūn—sudūl	2	2	4	virtually identical
3.	katala—katana	3	4	5	+ grammatical forms
					+ a quote from al-Aṣmaʿī
					– commentary to one shāhid
4.	luʿāʿa—nuʿāʿa	4	5	1	+ a new shāhid
					– commentary to one shāhid
5.	rifall—rifann	5	6	2	– two verses from the shāhid poem
6.	ṭabarzal—ṭabarzan	6	7	6	virtually identical
7.	rahdana—rahdala	7	8	7	changes in wording
					+ some additions
8.	uṣaylālan—uṣaylānan	8	9	8	+ a new shāhid
					– a quote from al-Farrā'
9.	laʿalla—laʿanna	9	10	-	changes in wording
					+ three new shāhids
10.	daḥil—daḥin	10	11	31	changes in wording
					+ a quote from Abū ʿAmr
					+ identification of one ultimate source

---

[423] Not the same word as IS-tahdhīb, p. 5 lūba—nūba 'lava field'.

[424] This article belongs to the same family as IS-Y, p. 79 umtuqiʿa—untuqiʿa, which probably explains its addition here.

[425] The 34 articles of IS-Y and their parallels in AṬ. The remaining articles of AṬ are not included in the table. The order of the articles in Q II:41-44 has been added for sake of comparison.

11. ghiryal—ghiryan	11	12	9	– a quote from al-Aṣmaʿī
12. damāl—damān	12	13	10	+ a quote from al-Aṣmaʿī
13. shathl—shathn	13	14	11	+ a new definition
14. kabl—kabn	14	15	12	+ new variants
				+ a new ḥadīth
15. atala—atana	15	16	13	– the name of the authority
				– two verses in the shāhid poem
16. dhaʾalīl—dhaʾalīn	16	17	14	virtually identical
17. maʾana—maʾala	17	18	15	slight changes in wording
18. ḥalak—ḥanak	18	19	16	changes in wording
19. zulma—zunma	19	20	17	+ grammatical forms
				+ an explanation
20. ʿunwān—ʿulwān	20	21	18	– one variant
				+ an explanation
				+ a new shāhid
21. abbala—abbana	21	23	19	different authority!
				+ four new shāhids
22. āsān—āsāl	22	25	20	+ a short definition
				+ a "lugha ukhrā"[426]
23. ʿatala—ʿatana	23	26	21	virtually identical
24. irmaʿalla—irmaʿanna	24	27	22	+ grammatical forms
25. lā bal—lā ban	25	28	23	+ new variants
26. Ismāʿīl—Ismāʿīn	26	29	24	virtually identical
27 Mīkāʾīl—Mīkāʾīn	27	32	25	virtually identical
28. Isrāfīn—Isrāfīl	28	33	26	virtually identical
29. Isrāʾīl—Isrāʾīn	29	30	27	+ a new verse to the shāhid poem
30. Sharāḥīl—Sharāḥīn	30	34	28	virtually identical
31. Ǧibrāʾīl—Ǧibrāʾīn	31	31	29	virtually identical
32. alāṣa—anāṣa	32	35	30	virtually identical
33. dhalādhil—dhanādhin	33	36	34	virtually identical
34. khāmil—khāmin	34	37	35	virtually identical[427]

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 Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 AṬ 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

---

[426] Aʿsān—aʿsāl, cf. IS-Y, p. 85 (usn—ʿusn) in another sense.

[427] In this article there is also an addition by the copyist of IS-Y (p. 69) from another manuscript.

103

which AṬ adds a new infinitive, hatanān—hatalān.

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-yuqālu: rahdanatun wa-rahdalatun wa-hiya r-rahādinu wa'r-rahādilu wa-huwa ṭuwayyirun shabīhu l-qubbarati [read so!] illā annahu laysat lahu qunzuʿa

Cf.

> AṬ art. 8 (II:389): wa-yuqālu li-ṭayrin ṣighārin tushbihu l-qanābira illā annahu lā qanāziʿa lahā: ar-rahdalu wa'r-rahdanu [continued with two additions]

Similarly also in:

> IS-Y art. 10 (p. 64-65): wa'd-daḥinu wa'd-daḥil: al-khabbu l-khabīth. wa'd-daḥinu ayḍan: al-kathīru l-laḥmi wa-yuqālu: baʿīrun diḥanna: idhā kāna ʿarīḍan kathīra l-laḥm. wa-anshada: [a shāhid]

> AṬ art. 11 (II:392-393): wa'd-daḥilu wa'd-daḥin: al-kathīru l-laḥmi mina l-ibili wa-ghayrihā. wa-qāla l-Aṣmaʿī: ad-daḥilu wa'd-daḥin: al-khabīthu [continued with an addition on the authority of Abū ʿAmr] wa-yuqālu: baʿīrun diḥannatun — bi't-tashdīd — idhā kāna kathīra l-laḥmi ʿarīḍan. qāla r-rāǧiz [continued with the same shāhid as in IS-Y].

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

5. The commentaries of the shāhids in IS-Y have been dropped by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib when they are not relevant to the ibdāl itself. That these commentaries do belong to the original work of Ibn as-Sikkīt 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 AṬ. The chapter contains 36 articles in IS-Y to which 60 other[428] 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.

		IS-Y	AṬ	Q	Relationship of AṬ to IS-Y
1.	banātu bakhr—makhr	1	10	5	– part of the definition
2.	mā'smuka—bā'smuka	2	11	6	– name of the authority
3.	arbada—armada	3	2	7	+ grammatical forms
					+ a new shāhid

---

[428] Some of these 60 articles actually duplicate the IS-Y articles, e.g. AṬ art. 50 (I:59 iṭma'anna—iṭba'anna), 55 (I:61 abida—amida), and 95 (I:73 naqība—naqīma).

					– an explanation
					– a theoretical speculation
4.	ẓa'b—ẓa'm	4	12	8	+ 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	1	11	– a ḥadīth
					+ a ḥadīth
					+ 3 examples of the use of the word[429]
8.	rağba—rağma	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 new shāhid
10.	sāsab—sāsam	10	17	1	+ a new shāhid
					+ a short note on the meaning
11.	rātib—rātim	11	18	4	– authority
					+ another form
					+ a new shāhid
12.	ṭiḥriba—ṭiḥrima	12	19	2	different authority
					+ grammatical forms
					+ a new shāhid
13.	ʿabaqa—ʿamaqa	13	20	3	slightly different wording[430]
14.	kathab—katham	14	21	14	virtually identical
15.	lāzib—lāzim	15	22	15	+ a new shāhid
16.	shamāriq—shabāriq	16	23	16	+ a grammatical form
					+ a new shāhid
17.	banāt ṭamāri—ṭabāri	17	24	17	virtually identical
18.	ʿubrī—ʿumrī	18	25	18	+ an authority
					– a related word (ḍāl) and its definition
19.	ʿağb—ʿağm	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. AṬ has here been compared with the text given in the margins of the Yeni Cami manuscript.

22. ghayhab—ghayham	22	32	22	+ an explanation
				+ another example and a shāhid to it
23. azba—azma	23	33	23	+ a new shāhid
24. ṣa'iba—ṣa'ima	24	4	24	virtually identical
25. 'iqma—'iqba	25	6	25	different authority(?)[431]
				+ a new shāhid
				+ one quote
26. iḍba'akka—iḍma'akka	26	8	26	+ name of the authority
				+ grammatical forms
27. kabaḥa—kamaḥa	27	35	27	+ grammatical forms
				– name of the authority
				– the end of the article (on kafaḥa)
28. dha'aba—dha'ama	28	36	28	+ grammatical forms
				+ variants
				+ a Qur'ānic quote
29. ra'aba—ra'ama	29	37	29	virtually identical
30. zakaba—zakama	30	38	30	+ a new shāhid
31. abida—amida	31	9	31	– a variant[432]
32. armā—arbā	32	–[433]	32	virtually identical
33. ba'kūkā'—ma'kūkā'	33	39	33	virtually identical
34. ǧardaba—ǧardama	34	40	34	– name of an authority
				– a shāhid
				– commentary to another shāhid
35. mahlan—bahlan	35	41	35	– name of an authority
36. qarhab—qarham	36	42	36	+ another meaning
				+ a new shāhid

Ibn Durayd's al-Ǧamhara

When the material of AṬ outside the IS-Y blocks is examined, we see that some of the articles show a clear tendency towards anagrammatic order[434]. Usually Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 'Ubayda, in AṬ the implicit authority seems to be al-Liḥyānī who is given explicitly in AṬ art. 3.

[432] The missing variant 'abida was probably in the now lost chapter '—'.

[433] In AṬ IS-Y art. 7 and 32 are combined in AṬ art. 1.

[434] For some reason this seems to have evaded all the former researchers of AṬ. El Berkawy, for example, writes (p. 95): »Innerhalb eines jeden Kapitels bringt Abū ṭ-Ṭayyib im allgemeinen die "ibdāl"-Paare, ohne dass sie einer bestimmten Systematik unterliegen (...). Wie beim K. al-Ibdāl ist auch hier [El Berkawy speaks about Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's K. al-Aḍdād] innerhalb der einzelnen Kapitel keine weitere Untergliederung erkennbar.« — The whole chapter "Methode der Worterklärung" (p. 142-197) suffers from the fact that El Berkawy ignores the question of the immediate sources of AṬ and confines himself to listing the ultimate authorities.

following gives a resume of the articles in chapter L—N (AṬ 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. ǦDL—ǦDN
  50. ǦLD—ǦND
  51. NFḤ—LFḤ
  52. DRKHML—DRKHMN
  53. LKHʿ—NKHʿ
  54. FKHL—FKHN
  55. LDGH—NDGH
  56. DLH—DNH
  57. RGHL—RGHN
  58. FNK—FLK
  59. ǦRYL—ǦRYN (not in anagrammatical order)
  60. HTML—HTMN (quadriliteral)
  61 FNṬS—FLṬS (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/alphabetic system[435]. One possible source comes immediately to mind, viz. Ibn Durayd's famous *al-Ǧamhara*, which was written less than half a century before AṬ and which was known in the cities of Syria in his day. A comparison of ID with the anagrammatic blocks of AṬ confirms that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has drawn very much material from Ibn Durayd's dictionary[436]. In the following the anagrammatic blocks of three chapters of AṬ are compared with ID.

1. Chapter DH—Z (AṬ II:6-12)

This chapter begins with three articles taken from IS-Y. All the other articles (AṬ 4-15) are in an anagrammatic order:

AṬ 1-3 (II:6-7) < IS-Y (art. 3 contains an addition taken from ID, p. 304)
AṬ 4 (II:7):

 wa-qālū: al-wadhwadhatu wa'l-wazwaza: al-khiffatu wa's-surʿa. wa-yuqālu: dhi'bun wadhwādhun wa-wazwāzun idhā kāna sarīʿa l-khaṭwi khafīfa l-mashy.

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

 al-wadhwadhatu wa-huwa raǧulun wadhwādh: sarīʿu l-mashy. wa-marra dh-dhi'bu yuwadhwidhu wadhwādhan idhā marra musriʿan.

---

[435] The other explanation, viz. that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib himself would have organized these articles is of course untenable, as it would leave unexplained the fact that the other parts of AṬ are not in an anagrammatic order.

[436] Similarly, ID is one of the main sources of his K. al-Itbāʿ.

and ID, p. 202 s.v. WZWZ:

> al-wazwazatu wa-hiya l-khiffatu wa's-surʿa (...) wa-raǧulun wazwāzun idhā kāna khafīfan kathīra l-ḥaraka.

AṬ 5 (II:7):

> wa'l-budhūru wa'l-buzūr: ḥibbatu ṣ-ṣaḥrā'i ǧamʿu badhrin wa-bazr. wa-yuqālu: qad badharat-i l-badhru 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib. The relevant articles in ID read:

ID, p. 303 s.v. BDHR:

> al-badhr: badhr an-nabāt.

ID, p. 307 s.v. BZR:

> wa'l-bizru maʿrūfun wa-ammā qawlu l-ʿāmma: buzūru l-baqli fa-khaṭa'un innamā huwa bizr.

AṬ 6 (II:8):

> wa-yuqālu: dhalaǧa l-mā'a fī ḥalqihi yadhliǧuhu dhalǧan wa-zalaǧahu yazliǧuhu zalǧan idhā ǧaraʿahu.

ID, p. 454 s.v. DHLǦ:

> wa-ladhaǧa l-mā'a fī ḥalqihi wa-dhalaǧahu idhā ǧaraʿahu.

The article ZLǦ (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, too[437].

AṬ 7 (II:8-9):

> wa-yuqālu: raǧulun aḥwadhīyun wa-aḥwazīyun idhā kāna ǧāddan fī amrihi.
> wa-yuqālu: ḥāza r-rāʿī ibilahu yaḥūzuhā ḥawzan wa-ḥādhahā yaḥūdhuhā ḥawdhan idhā ǧamaʿahā wa-sāqahā wa-kadhālika ḥādha l-ḥimāru utunahu.
> qāla sh-shāʿir:
> yaḥūdhuhunna wa-lahu ḥūdhīyū / kamā yaḥūdhu l-fi'ata l-kamīyū
> wa-yurwā bi'z-zāy.

ID, p. 530 s.v. ḤWZ:

> wa-raǧulun aḥwazīyun idhā kāna ǧāddan fīmā ya'khudhu fīhi min ʿamal.
> wa-ḥāza r-rāʿī ibilahu yaḥūzuhā ḥawzan idhā ǧamaʿahā wa-sāqahā wa-kadhālika l-ḥimāru idhā ḥāza utunahu. qāla l-ʿAǧǧāǧ:
> yaḥūzuhunna wa-lahu ḥūzīyū / kamā yaḥūzu l-fi'ata l-kamīyū
> wa-yurwā: wa-lahu ḥūdhīyū / kamā yaḥūdhu (...)

---

[437] Lisān V:52 contains the same pair as AṬ (dhalaǧa l-mā'a fī ḥalqihi: ǧaraʿahu wa-kadhālika zalaǧahu).

AṬ 8 (II:9):

    wa-yuqālu: khadhaqa ṭ-ṭā'iru yakhdhiqu khadhaqan wa-khazaqa yakhziqu
    khazaqan idhā dharaqa.

ID, p. 582 s.v. KHDHQ:

    khadhaqa ṭ-ṭā'iru wa-khazaqa wa-mazaqa idhā dharaqa[438].

AṬ 9 (II:9):

    wa-yuqālu li'l-kilāb: awlādu dhāri'in wa-awlādu zāri'.

ID, p. 692 s.v. DHR':

    wa-yuqālu: awlādu dhāri'in wa-awlādu zāri'in — bi'z-zāy — wa-awlādu
    wāzi'.

AṬ 10 (II:9-10):

    wa-yuqālu: dha'aqahu yadh'aquhu dha'qan wa-za'aqahu yaz'aquhu
    za'qan idhā ṣāḥa bihi wa-afza'ahu. qāla r-rāǧiz:
    yā rubba muhrin maz'ūq / muqayyalin aw maghbūq
    wa-yuqālu: mā'un dhu'āqun wa-zu'āqun idhā kāna murran.

ID, p. 697 s.v. DH'Q:

    adh-dha'qu lughatun fī z-za'q. dha'aqahu wa-za'aqahu idhā ṣāḥa bihi wa-
    afza'ahu. wa-mā'un dhu'āqun wa-zu'āqun bi-ma'nan.

ID, p. 815 s.v. Z'Q:

    (...) qāla r-rāǧiz:
    [the same shāhid]

AṬ 11 (II:10):

    wa-yuqālu: dha'aṭahu yadh'aṭuhu dha'ṭan wa-za'aṭahu yaz'aṭuhu za'ṭan
    idhā khanaqahu wa-ba'ḍuhum yaqūlu: idhā dhabaḥahu ayḍan.

ID, p. 697 s.v. DH'Ṭ:

    dha'aṭahu yadh'aṭuhu dha'ṭan idhā qatalahu qatlan waḥīyan ay sarī'an
    (...).

ID, p. 813 s.v. Z'Ṭ:

    az-za'ṭu mithlu dh-dha'ṭi sawā'. za'aṭahu wa-dha'aṭahu idhā khanaqahu
    (...).

It can be seen that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has got the pair from ID, p. 813, where the pair is
explicitly given, not from ID, p. 697, which only gives dha'aṭa. 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-yuqālu: sammun dhu'āfun wa-zu'āfun idhā kāna qātilan.

ID, p. 697 s.v. DH'F:

    adh-dha'fu wa'dh-dhu'āf: as-samm.

---

[438] This passage is also the source of khazaqa—mazaqa, AṬ I:346.

ID, p. 814 s.v. Z'F:

    wa-sammun zu'āfun wa-dhu'āfun wāḥidun ay qātil.

The pair has been taken from ID, p. 814.

AṬ 13 (II:11):

    wa-yuqālu: dhamiha yawmunā yadhmahu dhamahan wa-zamiha yazmahu zamahan idhā shtadda ḥarruhu.

ID, p. 703 s.v. DHMH:

    (...) wa-dhamiha yawmunā idhā shtadda ḥarruhu (...).

ID, p. 829 s.v. ZMH:

    az-zamah: al-ḥarru min qawlihim: zamiha yawmunā wa-dhamiha idhā shtadda ḥarruhu wa-sakanat rīḥuhu.

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

AṬ 14 (II:11-12):

    wa-qālū: al-khadh'alatu wa'l-khaz'ala: ḍarbun mina l-mashyi l-ma'īb. qāla r-rāǧiz:

    wa-sadwi riǧlin min ḍi'āfi l-arǧulī / matā urid shiddatahā tukhadh'ilī

    wa-yuqālu minhu: khadh'ala yukhadh'ilu khadh'alatan wa-khidh'ālan wa-khaz'ala yukhaz'ilu khaz'alatan wa-khiz'ālan wa-yuqālu: nāqatun bihā khaz'ālun idhā kāna bihā ḍal'un shadīd.

ID, p. 1144 s.v. KHDH-quadriliteral:

    (...) wa'l-khaz'alatu ayḍan naḥwa l-khaz'alati wa-huwa ḍarbun mina l-mashy. qāla r-rāǧiz:

    wa-naqlu riǧlin min ḍi'āfi l-arǧulī / matā urid shiddatahā takhadh'alī

    wa-tukhadh'ilī ayḍan wa-yurwā: takhaz'alī wa'dh-dhālu a'lā wa-minhu qawluhum: nāqatun bihā khaz'ālun bi-fatḥi l-khā' (..).

AṬ 15 (II:12):

    wa'l-khadharnaqu wa'l-khazarnaq: al-'ankabūt.

ID, p. 1144 s.v. KHD-quadriliteral:

    wa'l-khadarnaq [sic]: al-'aẓīmu mina l-'anākib (...) wa-yuqālu: al-khazarnaqu ayḍan 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:

    wa-khadarnaqun [sic] wa-khazarnaq: ismun min asmā'i l-'ankabūt.

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-Ǧamhara) 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 ID[439], yet they do not coincide with the text of ID. Besides the two

110

possible explanations given above, one may add the third possibility that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has added cases from his memory when coming to the respective articles in ID (i.e. when arriving at dhalaǧa in ID, p. 454, he has remembered — from other sources — zalaǧa with the same meaning).

2. Chapter TH—F (AṬ I:181-198)

Of the 35 articles of AṬ, 1-23 have been taken from IS-Y[440]. Some of the additions in the text of these articles come from ID (AṬ art. 1, I:181-182, addition from ID, p. 159; AṬ art. 2, ḥadīth (AṬ I:183 l. 1-2) added from ID, p. 428, etc.), though others come from other sources.

AṬ articles 24 (I:195 ǧu'itha—ǧu'ifa), 25 (I:195 tūthar—tūfar)[441] and 33-35 (I:198 kinthīra—kinfīra; thaḥthaḥa—faḥfaḥa; thulla thalaluhu—fulla falaluhu) are not in an anagrammatic order, nor are they from ID.

AṬ 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib from chapter TH of ID, others from chapter F:

AṬ 26 (I:195) THǦR—FǦR, cf. ID, p. 414 and 463.

AṬ 27 (I:195-196) ǦTHL—ǦFL, cf. ID, p. 415 and 487 (a long article of AṬ, compiled almost verbatim from these two articles of ID)

AṬ 28 (I:197) THDM—FDM, cf. ID, p. 420 (where the ibdāl is explicitly given; cf. also ID, p. 672)

AṬ 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 (laysa bi-thabt).

AṬ 30 (I:197) THǦR—FǦR, cf. ID, p. 414 and 462 (cf. AṬ 26). The article was probably excerpted by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib when coming to the latter article.

AṬ 31 (I:197) KFḤ—KTHḤ, cf. ID, p. 417 and 554. In the latter article of ID, there is an explicit equation of KFḤ and KTHḤ (mutaqāribāni fī l-maʿnā).

---

[439] Usually additions coming from other sources but intervening in the anagrammatic blocks do not conform with the anagrammatic order.

[440] AṬ art. 13 (I:191-192) dalafa—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: AṬ; IS-tahdhīb, p. 36; Q II:34; Mukh. XIII:286. Further it belongs to a three word block (IS-tahdhīb art. 16, 17, 18, p. 36 fahlal—thahlal; ʿafana—ʿathana; dalafa—dalatha = Q art. 22, 21, 20 = Mukh. art. 22, 21, 20).

[441] AṬ art. 24 (II:34) is also found in IS-tahdhīb, p. 36 (and in Tahdhīb al-alfāẓ, 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). AṬ art. 25 is also found in Q II:34 and Mukh. XIII:286. It is an often quoted case of ibdāl (also in, e.g. Thaʿlab, Faṣīḥ, p. 48) and also found in laḥn al-ʿāmma -works (e.g. Ibn Qutayba, Adab al-kātib, p. 413; Ibn Makkī, Tathqīf, p. 43). Ibn Hishām, Madkhal, p. 81 = Radd, p. 37, even attributes it to Ibn as-Sikkīt's K. al-Qalb wa'l-ibdāl, but this seems to be a mistake for Ibn as-Sikkīt's Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq (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-tahdhīb.

AṬ 32 (I:197) ṬTHR—ṬFR, cf. ID, p. 420 and 754. In the latter article of ID, there is an explicit equation of ṬTHR and ṬFR.

3. Chapter L—N (AṬ 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 lablaba—nabnaba) which resembles ID, p. 177[442]. The remaining articles, except for the last in the chapter, are taken from ID:

AṬ 48 (II:407) LBZ—NBZ, cf. ID, p. 334.

AṬ 49 (II:407) ĞDL—ĞDN, cf. ID, p. 449 (ID has only ğādil — there is no *ğādin in p. 451 — but the wording of the explanation coincides very closely with that of AṬ).

AṬ 50 (II:408) ĞLD—ĞND, cf. ID, p. 449 and 451.

AṬ 51 (II:408) NFḤ—LFḤ, cf. ID, p. 555 (= p. 557).

AṬ 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).

AṬ 53 (II:409) Yalkhaʿ—Yankhaʿ (nom. loc.), cf. ID, p. 613 and 614.

AṬ 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.

AṬ 55 (II:409-410) LDGH—NDGH, cf. ID, p. 670 and 671.

AṬ 56 (II:410) DLH—DNH, cf. ID, p. 682 and 686 (the ibdāl pair is explicitly given in the latter article).

AṬ 57 (II:410) RGHL—RGHN, cf. ID, p. 780.

AṬ 58 (II:410) FNK—FLK, cf. ID, p. 969 (the pair is given there explicitly s.v. FLK, but cf. also s.v. FNK).

AṬ 59 (II:411) ğiryāl—ğiryān, cf. ID, p. 1040 and 1204. The shāhid which has been added to the article of AṬ probably comes from ID, p. 1099.

AṬ 60 (II:411-412) HTML—HTMN, cf. ID, p. 1129-1130.

AṬ 61 (II:412) FNṬS—FLṬS, cf. ID, p. 1155.

AṬ 62 (II:412) LĞB—NĞB, cf. ID, p.1281[443].

AṬ 63 (II:412-413) ṬBL—ṬBN, cf. ID, p. 1302 (without the two shāhids, one of which may come from ID, p. 359).

AṬ 64 (II:413-414) BLL—BNN, not from ID.

---

[442] As AṬ art. 47 (I:406-407 siğğīl—siğğīn) 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 AṬ 46. Another possibility is of course that the ID block begins with AṬ 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 Nawādir chapter of ID.

Notes on the use of ID as source in AṬ

In some chapters of AṬ there do not seem to be any anagrammatic blocks. One of these is the chapter R—M (AṬ II:82-87) which contains 12 articles. Of these articles 3 or 4 could in theory come from ID (AṬ 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 Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib

When we compare AṬ with ID, we note that in several cases the wording of AṬ coincides with the wording of the manuscript Ṭ of ID, which, cf. R. Baʿlabakkī, Introduction to ID, p. 32, contains additions to the basic text. The manuscript Ṭ is itself a relatively modern copy, dating from 1078 A.H.[444], but it is based on an older manuscript which had been read to Ibn Khālawayhi, who may have been a co-student of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib, cf. above, and to Abū'l-ʿAlā' al-Maʿarrī. Thus it belongs to the Syrian tradition. AṬ shows that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib had a manuscript of the same family at his disposal, and also confirms that (at least many of) the additions in the manuscript Ṭ date back to the first half of the 10th century[445].

AṬ and the manuscript Ṭ of ID coincide against other manuscripts of ID at least in the following points:

AṬ I:71-72:

> wa-yuqālu: raǧulun zibirrun wa-zimirrun wa-huwa l-qawīyu sh-shadīd. qāla r-rāǧiz:
> [innī idhā ṭarfu] l-ǧabāni ḥmarrā
> wa-kāna khayru l-khaṣlatayni sh-sharrā
> [akūnu thamma] asadan zibirrā

Cf. ID, p. 1275:

> qāla: wa-yuqālu: raǧulun zibirrun wa-dhimirrun [MS-Ṭ: zimirrun] wa-huwa l-qawīyu sh-shadīd. wa-anshada [the same three verses].

AṬ I:71: The vocalization ʿasharrab—ʿasharram coincides with the manuscript Ṭ (ID, p. 1152).

AṬ 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 Ṭ (ID, p. 148).

---

[444] Baʿlabakkī, Introduction to ID, p. 32; GAS VIII:102. The manuscript Ṭ is in the Aṣafīya library, Ḥaydarābād.

[445] Note that the manuscript ʿ (Baʿlabakkī, Introduction to ID, p. 32) contains marginal notes by one of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's teachers, Abū ʿUmar az-Zāhid, but only a fragment of it is extant (pp. 1227-1282 of the edition).

AṬ I:352:

> wa-nāqatun khirmilun wa-hirmilun wa-hiya l-musinnatu l-harima. wa-nāqatun khirmilun wa-hirmilun ayḍan idhā kānat hawǧā'.

Cf. ID, p. 1269:

> wa-shātun [MS-Ṭ: nāqatun] hirmilun wa-khirmilun wa-hiya l-hawǧā'u (...)

AṬ I:363:

> (...) wa'd-dāǧinu wa'r-rāǧinu ayḍan: mā uqīma fī l-buyūti min shātin aw ṭā'irin aw naḥwihimā (...)

Cf. ID, p. 451:

> wa-ba'īrun dāǧinun idhā alifa l-makāna wa-aqāma bihi wa-kadhālika shātun dāǧin: malzūmatun [MS-Ṭ: muqīmatun] fī l-bayti (...)

For rāǧin, cf. ID, p. 467 and 1269.

Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's method of quoting ID

As we have seen, Abū'ṭ-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 (AṬ I:66) has been taken from LTM (ID, p. 410; not from LTB) which explains the place of this article within the ID block of AṬ chapter B—M.

In excerpting from ID, Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib acted rather mechanically without having later revised his work. Thus several articles of AṬ duplicate each other, the same roots may be dealt with in different articles etc. Thus, e.g. in the chapter B—F iskāb—iskāf (AṬ I:21) has been taken from ID, p. 339, but uskubba—uskuffa (AṬ I:23, i.e. only two pages later) from ID, p. 847[446]. In chapter Ḥ—KH ḥarbaṣīṣ—kharbaṣīṣ (I:277) comes from ID, p. 1116, but the same pair (with ḥarbasīs—kharbasīs) in I:281 from ID, p. 1219. Similarly, in chapter D—S marada—marasa (AṬ I:370), which is not in the ID block, is duplicated by marīd—marīs/marada—marasa 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, it 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'ṭ-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'ṭ-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 ibdāl pairs 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib overlooked the first case of this ibdāl.

its synonym taʿāqub) 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 (> AṬ I:68):

> wa-yuqālu: makhiqat ʿaynuhu idhā ʿwarrat wa-nkhasafat (...) wa-mithluhu bakhiqat ʿaynuhu.

ID, p. 1150 (> AṬ I:1-2):

> wa-yuqālu: ʿadhhaltuhu wa-ʿabhaltuhu 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:

> wa-khamamtu l-bayta akhummuhu khamman idhā kasaḥtahu. wa'l-mikhamma: al-miksaḥa. wa'l-khumāma: al-kusāḥa.

ID, p. 164:

> qamamtu l-bayta aqummuhu qamman idhā kasaḥtahu. wa'l-miqamma: al-miksaḥa. wa'l-qumāmu wa'l-qumāma: al-kusāḥatu wa'l-ǧamʿu l-qumām.

Together these articles have generated AṬ 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib. Examples:

ID, p. 449:

> wa-arḍun ǧaladun ay ṣulbatun shadīda.

ID, p. 451:

> wa'l-ǧanad: al-arḍu l-ghalīẓa.

These articles have been combined by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib to give (AṬ II:408):

> wa'l-ǧaladu wa'l-ǧanad: al-arḍu sh-shadīdatu ṣ-ṣulba.

ID, p. 613:

> wa-Yalkhaʿ: mawḍiʿun bi'l-Yaman.

ID, p. 614:

> wa-Yankhaʿ: mawḍiʿ.

These have been connected by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib in one article with an unusually scrupulous note (AṬ II:409):

> wa-qālū: Yalkhaʿ mawḍiʿun wa-baʿḍuhum yaqūlu: Yankhaʿ mawḍiʿun wa-lā aḥsabu l-ismayni illā li-mawḍiʿin wāḥid.

ID, p. 272:

> wa'l-habīǧ: alladhī lahu ǧuddatāni fī ǧanbayhi min shaʿari baṭnihi wa-ẓahrihi mustaṭīlān.

ID, p. 297:

> wa-ẓabyatun hamīǧun wa-hiya l-fatīyatu, zaʿamū, wa'l-ḥasanatu l-ǧismi

115

wa-qāla ākharūn: al-hamīǧu mina ẓ-ẓibā': al-mughzilu llatī qad hazalahā r-raḍāʿ.

Together these two articles give AṬ I:62:

wa'l-habīǧu[447] wa'l-hamīǧ: aẓ-ẓabyu lladhī lahu ǧuddatāni bayna ǧanbayhi wa-shaʿari baṭnihi mustaṭīlān.

ID, p. 1169:

wa'n-naysam: atharu ṭ-ṭarīqi d-dāris.

wa'n-naysab: aṭ-ṭarīqu l-wāḍiḥ.

These two short articles are combined to form AṬ I:71:

wa'n-naysabu wa'n-naysam: aṭ-ṭarīq.

This is all too typical of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's semantic unscrupulousness and indeed of many of his colleagues.

Worth noting also is AṬ I:360:

wa-qālū: huwa l-ḥirdawnu wa'l-ḥirdhawnu li-hādhihi d-duwaybbati l-maʿrūfa.

This article is a combination of two articles of ID, viz.:

ID, p. 501:

wa'd-dābbatu llatī tusammā l-ḥirdawn. qāla l-Aṣmaʿī: mā adrī mā ṣiḥḥatuhā fī l-ʿarabīya.

ID, p. 507:

wa'l-ḥirdhawn: duwaybbatun lā aqifu ʿalā ḥaqīqati ṣifatihā.

As this article of AṬ 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib connects two different words, the ʿarabīya of one of which is doubted by al-Aṣmaʿī and the exact meaning of the other is unknown to Ibn Durayd, and how he dismisses any problems by calling the animal "hādhihi d-duwaybbatu l-maʿrūfa".

4. A small group of ibdāls in AṬ is due to simple mistakes or misunderstandings. One case is AṬ I:214 which has inevitably been taken from ID, p. 456 and 584[448]:

AṬ I:214:

wa-yuqālu: zaraǧahu bi'r-rumḥi zarǧan wa-zarakhahu (...) idhā ṭaʿanahu bihi ṭaʿnan sarīʿan.

cf. ID, p. 456:

wa-yuqālu: zaraǧahu bi'r-rumḥi yazriǧuhu zarǧan idhā zaǧǧahu bihi wa-laysa bi'l-lughati l-ʿāliya.

and ID, p. 584:

wa-razakhahu bi'r-rumḥi yarzikhuhu razkhan idhā zaǧǧa bihi (...).

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

---

[447] The manuscript erroneously gives al-ʿabīǧ which has duly been corrected by the editor of AṬ.

[448] It belongs to a block of six articles (AṬ I:213-214) taken from ID (AṬ art. 1 aṣlaǧ—aṣlakh < ID, p. 479 and 605; AṬ art. 2 infaḍaǧa—infaḍakha < ID, p. 480 and 607(?); AṬ art. 3 ǧalaʿa—ǧalakha < ID, p. 482; AṬ art. 4 ǧadhama—khadhama < ID, p. (454 and) 582; AṬ art. 5 zaraǧa—zarakha < ID, p. (456 and) 584; AṬ art. 6 ǧafa'a—khafa'a < ID, p. 1096 and 1302).

same ghostword zarakha is found also in AṬ I:341 (zarakha—zaraqa).

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

AṬ I:325:

> wa-yuqālu: raǧulun ḥabtarun wa-habtar: idhā kāna qaṣīran.

which seems to come from

ID, p. 1110:

> wa-Ḥabtar: ismun aydan wa'l-ḥabtara: ḍa'ūlatu l-ǧismi wa-qillatuhu. raǧulun
> ḥabtarun wa-ḥubātirun wa-ḥatrab: qaṣīrun wa-aḥsabuhu maqlūban ʿan
> ḥabtar.

and

ID, p. 1111:

> wa-Habtar: mawḍiʿun 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib has omitted these reservations and presented the words with no comments on their reliability. E.g.

> ID, p. 430 laqitha > AṬ I:197.

> ID, p. 434 wathana > AṬ I:96.

> ID, p. 391 matada (wa-lā adrī mā thabtuhu) > AṬ I:142.

> ID, p. 416 ḥawthā' (wa'l-ǧawthā': ʿirq al-kabid. wa-qad qālū bi'l-ḥā'i wa-laysa bi-
> ṣaḥīḥ) > AṬ I:210 (wa-qālu: al-ǧawthā': ʿirqun fī l-kabidi wa-huwa bi'l-ǧīmi aktharu
> wa-aʿraf).

> ID, p. 510 zaraḥa > AṬ I:305.

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

AṬ I:359:

> wa-yuqālu: huwa miǧdāfu s-safīnati wa-miǧdhāfuhā wa-abā l-Aṣmaʿī illā
> bi'd-dāli ghayri l-muʿǧama. wa-yuqālu: ǧadafa ṭ-ṭā'iru wa-ǧadhafa idhā
> danā fī ṭayarānihi mina l-arḍ.

This may stem from ID, p. 448:

> (..) wa-miǧdāfu s-safīnati bi'd-dāli wa'dh-dhāli, zaʿamū, wa'd-dālu aktharu
> (...).

and ID, p. 454:

> ǧadhafa ṭ-ṭā'iru idhā asraʿa taḥrīka ǧanāḥayhi (...) wa-minhu shtiqāqu
> miǧdāfi s-safīna.

In a few cases Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has enlarged the semantic field of the ibdāl phenomenon, e.g. AṬ I:359:

> wa-yuqālu: daḥaǧtu r-raǧula (...) wa-dhaḥaǧtuhu (...) idhā saḥabtahu
> saḥban. wa-daḥaǧathu r-rīḥu wa-dhaḥaǧathu idhā ǧarrathu min mawḍiʿin
> ilā mawḍiʿ. wa-daḥaǧtu sh-shay'a wa-dhaḥaǧtuhu aydan idhā ʿaraktahu

kamā yuʿraku l-adīm.

which probably comes from ID, p. 435:

wa'd-daḫǧ: lughatun yamāniya: daḥagahu daḥgan idhā ʿarakahu kamā yuʿraku l-adīm. wa-yuqālu: dhaḥagahu dhaḥgan bi'dh-dhāli l-muʿǧamati wa-hiya aʿlā l-lughatayn.

and ID, p. 435-436:

adh-dhaḥǧu wa-huwa mithlu s-saḥǧi sawā': dhaḥagahu wa-saḥagahu bi-maʿnan wa-dhaḥagathu r-rīḥu idhā ǧarrathu min mawḍiʿin ilā mawḍiʿ.

In this case, it seems that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has rather arbitrarily added the meanings of the latter article of ID (DHḤǦ) to the former (DḤǦ); Ibn Durayd only says that dhaḥaga is the better variant of daḥaga *in the sense* = ʿaraka.

In a few intriguing cases, there are ibdāl pairs in AṬ's ibdāl blocks which definitely 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 Ṭ, cf. above). Thus there is a block of twenty articles in AṬ 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 (AṬ 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 AṬ comes from ID, p. 1117; the eight preceding articles of AṬ come, in good order, from ID, p. 500-620) and it is defined in the same way as in AṬ, viz.:

wa-nāqatun khidlib: musinnatun mustarkhiya.

It seems obvious that this article is the source for the article ḥidlib—khidlib in AṬ 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib, or whether he has added the word from his memory, has to be left open[449].

When excerpting from ID, Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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'ṭ-Ṭayyib has not excerpted the pair thalaba—qalaba which would have been found in ID, p. 262 (wa-thalabtu sh-shay'a idhā qalabtahu), the same page from which comes AṬ I:61 thalaba—thalama. Similarly, ID, p. 622 reads:

wa-yuqālu: makhkhantu l-adīma wa-ghayrahu idhā marrantahu ḥattā yalīnu wa-kadhālika maḥḥantuhu bi'l-ḥā'i wa'l-khā'i ǧamīʿan.

The pair makhkhana—marrana is not found in AṬ though the pair maḥḥana—makhkhana (excerpted from ID, p. 1292 as both the wording and the order of articles shows) is found in AṬ I:282. The list of these omissions could easily be lengthened[450].

---

[449] In fact in all likelihood, ḥidlib is a ghostword; it is not found even in the largest dictionaries (TʿA, Lisān, Takmila) nor in, e.g. the two camel books of al-Aṣmaʿī edited by Haffner.

[450] E.g. ID, p. 1297 baḥbāḥ—maḥmāḥ; ID, p. 598 aṣlaġa—aṣlaʿa; ID, 1221 muqmaʿidd—muqmaʿiṭṭ;

In a few cases the omission may have been deliberate as, e.g. the exclusion of ID, p. 697:

> qāla Abū Ḥātim: aḥsabu anna l-himyagha maqlūbu l-mīmi min bā'in min qawlihim: habagha r-raǧulu hubūghan idhā subita li'n-nawmi fa-ka'annahā hibyaghun fa-qulibat-i l-bā'u mīman li-qurbihā minhā.

This article has probably been left out of AṬ as ID does not give any actually attested word *hibyagh[451], only the resemblance of himyagh with the root HBGH.

Abū'ṭ-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 AṬ and their importance

The two works discussed above (IS-Y and ID) are the most important sources in AṬ. Statistics based on a count of the articles in the first volume of AṬ, which contains the ibdāls of B, T, TH, Ǧ, Ḥ, KH, and D, are as follows[452]:

	AṬ	from	IS-Y	ID	total
ibdāl articles	760		147	293	440
%	—		19.3	38.5	57.8%

According to this count about 60% of the articles of AṬ derive from these two sources. Yet the number is probably too low, as there are several ibdāls in AṬ 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 AṬ.

From the numerical point of view, ID is thus AṬ's main source. Yet IS-Y is still the base on which AṬ 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 AṬ

K. al-Ǧīm

In his dissertation on *K. al-Ǧīm*, W. Diem studied the later influence of ash-Shaybānī's nawādir collection[453] on lexicographical literature. After comparing K. al-

---

ID, p. 1279 ǧīzatān—ḥīzatān; ID, p. 190 ḥafḥafa—khafkhafa etc.

[451] This word is found, e.g. in TᶜA.

[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

119

Gīm with Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's *K. al-Aḍdād* with negative results (p. 102-103) Diem continues (p. 103): »In zwei anderen Werken Abū ṭ-Ṭaiyibs, dem Kitāb al-itbā' un[d] dem Kitāb al-ibdāl wird, wie eine Überprüfung der auf Šaibānī 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 Abū ʿAmr im K. al-Ibdāl zitierten "ibdāl"-Paare bzw. Belege bestätigt, dass Abū ṭ-Ṭayyib das K. al-Ǧīm benutzt und zitiert.«[454]

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

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

> wa-qāla: al-iǧāʾatu wa'l-ishāʾa: al-iḍṭirār. yuqālu: aǧāʾahu ilā kadhā wa-kadhā yuǧīʾuhu iǧāʾatan wa-ashāʾahu yushīʾuhu ishāʾatan idhā ḍṭarrahu wa-alǧaʾahu ilayhi. wa-min amthālihim: ushiʾta ʿUqaylu ilā ʿaqlika. wa-fī t-Tanzīl: fa-aǧāʾahā l-makhāḍu ilā ǧidhʿi n-nakhla. ay alǧaʾahā. wa-qāla sh-shāʿir:
>
> kaymā uʿiddahumu li-abʿada minhumū / wa-laqad yuǧāʾu ilā dhawī l-aḥqādī
>
> ay wa-laqad yulǧaʾu ilayhim. wa-qāla l-ākhar:
>
> wa-naṭʿanu in ushiʾtu ilā ṭ-ṭiʿānī
>
> ay in ulǧiʾtu ilayhi

cf. K. al-Ǧīm I:70[455]:

> wa-qāla: al-ishāʾa: al-iḍṭirār. wa-ahlu l-Ḥiǧāz yaqūlūna: al-iǧāʾa. taqūlu: mā aǧāʾaka ilā kadhā wa-kadhā ay mā ḍṭarraka ilayhi. qāla llāhu ǧalla wa-ʿazza: fa-aǧāʾahā l-makhāḍu ilā ǧidhʿi n-nakhla. wa-qāla l-Asadī:
>
> kaymā uʿiddahumu li-abʿada minhumū / wa-laqad yuǧāʾu ilā dhawī l-aḥqādī
>
> wa-qāla l-Akhṭal:
>
> wa-aṭʿanu in ushiʾtu ilā ṭ-ṭiʿānī
>
> wa-fī l-amthāl: qad ushiʾta ʿUqaylu ilā ʿaqlika ay qad ḍṭurirta ilā ʿaqlika.

2. AṬ I:201:

> Abū ʿAmr: wa-qāla: qāla l-Asʿadī: laqītu fulānan fa-tathaʾthaʾtu minhu wa-takaʾkaʾtu minhu mithluhā wa-huwa t-tathaʾthuʾu wa't-takaʾkuʾ. wa-yuqālu: raʾat-i l-ibilu sawādan fa-tathaʾthaʾat minhu wa-takaʾkaʾat minhu tathaʾthuʾan wa-takaʾkaʾat takaʾkuʾan ay hābathu.

K. al-Ǧīm I:105:

> wa-qāla l-Asʿadī: laqītu fulānan fa-tathaʾthaʾtu minhu ay hibtuhu wa-takaʾkaʾtu minhu mithluhā wa-raʾat-i l-ibilu sawādan fa-tathaʾthaʾat minhu wa-taǧahǧahat minhu ay hābathu.

---

does not make it a dictionary.

[454] El Berkawy, loc. cit., also refers to a passage in Ḥāǧǧī Khalīfa's Kashf aẓ-ẓunūn which shows that he knew and had seen the work ("Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib said: I saw [waqaftu ʿalā] a copy of it and noted that it did not begin with ǧīm").

[455] Not II:70 as in El Berkawy.

3. AṬ I:184:

(al-Liḥyānī: ghulāmun fawhadun wa-thawhadun wa-huwa t-tāmm)[456]. wa-qāla Abū ʿAmr: huwa l-ḥādiru ay-i s-samīn.

K. al-Ǧīm I:109:

wa-qāla [i.e. at-Tamīmī]: ath-thawhad: al-ghulāmu l-ḥādiru wa-huwa l-fawhad.

4. AṬ I:217:

Abū ʿAmr: wa-qāla: qāla Abūʾs-Samḥ: dhāka min ǧaḥasi fulānin wa-min daḥasi fulānin ay min makrihi wa-dahāʾihi.

K. al-Ǧīm I:123:

wa-qāla Abūʾs-Samḥ: dhālika min ǧaḥsi fulānin wa-min daḥsihi wa-huwa l-makr.

5. AṬ I:226:

Abū ʿAmr: yuqālu: arraǧa ʿalā l-qawmi taʾrīǧan wa-arrasha ʿalayhim taʾrīshan idhā ḥammala ʿalayhim wa-washā bihim.

K. al-Ǧīm I:60:

(...) wa-huwa yuʾarribu ʿalā l-qawmi idhā ḥammala ʿalayhim wa-arrasha mithluhu wa-huwa muʾarrishun wa-arraǧa wa-huwa muʾarriǧ.

6. AṬ II:478:

wa-ḥakā Abū ʿAmr: laka l-ǧazūru illā thunwāhā wa-aktharu l-kalām: thunyāhā wa-hiya r-raʾsu waʾl-akāriʿu waʾḍ-ḍarʿu waʾl-karkaratu waʾl-qalb.

K. al-Ǧīm I:110:

wa-qāla [i.e. al-Baḥrānī]: laka l-ǧazūru illā thunwāhā: ar-raʾsu waʾl-akāriʿu waʾḍ-ḍarʿu waʾl-qalbu waʾl-karkara[457].

7. AṬ II:129:

Abū ʿAmr: al-mubziqu waʾl-mubṣiq: ash-shātu llatī tadurru biʾl-labani qabla wilādihā. wa-qad abzaqat wa-abṣaqat wa-hādhihi ghanamun mabāziqu wa-mabāṣiqu wa-mabāzīqu wa-mabāṣīq.

K. al-Ǧīm I:91:

wa-qāla t-Tamīmī l-ʿAdawī: al-mubsiqu llatī yaǧīʾu labanuhā qabla nitāǧihā.

and K. al-Ǧīm I:93:

wa-qāla [i.e. al-Baḥrānī]: al-mabāṣīqu mina l-ghanami llatī taḥfalu qabla wilādihā fa-tuḥlab.

8. AṬ II:113:

Abū ʿAmr: al-mubziqu waʾl-mubsiqu mina l-ghanami llatī taḥfalu biʾl-labani qabla an taḍaʿa waʾl-ǧamīʿ: al-mabāziqu waʾl-mabāsiqu waʾl-mabāzīqu waʾl-mabāsīqu wa-qad abzaqat sh-shātu wa-absaqat.

K. al-Ǧīm I:95:

wa-qāla l-ʿUdhrī[458]: al-mubziqu wa-hiya l-mubsiqu llatī tuḥlabu qabla an taḍaʿ.

---

[456] This passage is taken from IS-Y, p. 125.

[457] The word thunwā together with thunyā can be found in K. al-Ǧīm III:15.

[458] So in the text. We should perhaps read al-ʿAdawī.

To these articles already compared by El Berkawy, we may add six more, viz.:
9. AṬ I:387:

> Abū ʿAmr: ibilun ābidatun wa-ābilatun wa-awābidu wa-awābilu ay hāmila-
> tun wa-qad abadat taʾbadu ubūdan wa-abalat taʾbalu ubūlan idhā hamalat
> [continued with a shāhid].

K. al-Ğīm I:66:

> wa-qāla Abū'l-Ghamr: qad abalat-i l-ibilu idhā hamalat wa-hiya l-hāmilatu
> wa'l-ābidatu wa'l-ābila. ammā l-hāmilatu fa-llatī taghību khimsan aw sidsan
> wa-laysa maʿahā rāʿin wa'l-ābidatu llatī tabʿudu fa-tadhhabu shahran aw
> akthara minhu wa'l-ābilatu llatī tatbaʿu l-ubula wa-hiya l-khilfatu llatī
> tanbutu fī l-kalaʾi l-yābisi baʿda ʿām[459].

10. AṬ II:237-238[460]:

> yuqālu: barshama r-raǧulu yubarshimu barshamatan wa-barhama yubarhimu
> barhamatan idhā aḥadda n-naẓara wa-huwa mubarshimun wa-mubarhimun
> wa-naẓarun barshamun wa-barham [continued with several shāhids].

K. al-Ğīm I:94:

> wa-qāla l-Hudhalī: barhama: adāma n-naẓara wa-YRSM [read: barshama]
> mithluhā.

11. AṬ I:146:

> qāla Abū ʿAmr: ath-thamūtu wa'th-thatūt: al-ʿidhyawṭ. wa-qad thamata
> yathmitu wa-thatta yathittu.

K. al-Ğīm I:110:

> wa-qāla [i.e. al-ʿUdhrī]: ath-thamūt: al-ʿidhyawṭ. thamata yathmitu wa-
> thatta yathittu mithluhu.

12. AṬ II:40:

> (al-Aṣmaʿī: al-ǧirmu wa'l-ǧismu wāḥidun wa-yuqālu: raʾaytu ǧirma l-insāni
> wa-ǧismahu). Abū ʿAmr: yuqālu: raǧulun ǧarīmun wa-ǧasīmun bi-maʿnan
> wāḥid.

K. al-Ğīm I:119:

> wa-qāla [i.e. al-Kilābī]: hādhā raǧulun ǧarīmun ay lahu ǧirmun wa-huwa
> mina l-ǧism.

13. AṬ I:10:

> yuqālu: arraba ʿalā l-qawmi wa-arrasha ʿalayhim idhā ḥammala ʿalayhim
> wa-washā bihim wa-huwa yuʾribu ʿalā l-qawmi taʾrīban wa-yuʾrishu
> taʾrīshan.

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

14. AṬ II:113:

> Abū ʿAmr: wa-azza fulānun fulānan yaʿuzzuhu wa-assahu yaʾussuhu

---

[459] Here too we have a good example of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's laxity and unscrupulous acceptance of word pairs as ibdāls: the text of K. al-Ğīm leaves us in no doubt that the words ābida and ābila 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-Ğīm (note also the absence of attribution to Abū ʿAmr).

idhā ḥarrakahu wa-huwa l-azzu wa'l-assu wa-dhālika an yuḥarrika ḥamīya-
tahu ḥattā yughḍibahu wa-yuqālu: mā zāla ya'uzzuhu ḥattā aghḍabahu wa-
ya'ussuhu mithlu dhālika.

K. al-Ǧīm I:67:

wa-qāla [i.e. an-Nahdī]: assa fulānun ʿalayya fulānan ḥattā aghḍabahu
ya'ussu mithlu azzahu 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 ǧīm). Until this point, too, *all* the ibdāl cases derivable from K. al-Ǧīm have
been adopted by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib (with the exception of a few cases which fall into the
lacunae of AṬ[461] and K. al-Ǧīm I:55 urtha—urfa, a pair which has been extracted by
Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib (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 muǧlakhidd—muṣlakhidd; I:164 ḥarada—
ḥaraka; I:167 ḥāzik—ḥāshik; I:187 ḥūla—hūla; I:188 muḥāmala—muzāmala 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 ḥabaǧa—ḥabaqa, cf. AṬ I:241 < ID, 263 and 281; K. al-
Ǧīm I:251 dafara—dafaʿa, cf. AṬ I:303 < ID, p. 501 and 634; K. al-Ǧīm I:272
musarhad—musarhaf, cf. AṬ I:381 < ID, p. 1147 and 1151[462]; K. al-Ǧīm I:274-275
daʿs—waʿs, cf. AṬ I:394 < ID, p. 1243 etc.). — In total K. al-Ǧīm contains just under
200 cases which would have been classified by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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) derived 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 arraǧa—arrasha and iǧā'a—ishā'a = K.
al-Ǧīm I:60 and I:70; and AṬ II:113 azza—assa and mubziq—mubsiq = K. al-Ǧīm
I:67 and I:95).

Thus it is evident that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib had only the initial part of K. al-Ǧīm at his
disposal[463], which is not at all surprising given the rarity of the manuscripts of K. al-
Ǧīm[464]; even an incomplete fragment of the work would have been a valuable
treasure[465].

---

[461] K. al-Ǧīm I:60 arraba—arraǧa; I:117 ǧabāǧib—ǧadāǧid; I:123 ǧurayḍa—ǧurayʿa.

[462] Note also that in K. al-Ǧīm a third word, viz. musarʿaf, would have been available to Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib
but there is no pair musarhaf—musarʿaf in AṬ.

[463] This would not contradict the information quoted by Ḥāǧǧī Khalīfa, 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.).

Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq has been used by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib as the basic source in two chapters, W—Y II (AṬ II:464-493) and W—Y III (AṬ 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:

Chapter W—Y II	AṬ	83[467]	
	taken from Iṣlāḥ	41[468]	49.4%
	taken from ID	18[469]	21.7%
	total	59	71.1%
Chapter W—Y III	AṬ	99	
	taken from Iṣlāḥ	44[470]	44.4%
	taken from ID	10[471]	10.1%
	total	54	54.5%

There are several ibdāl pairs in Iṣlāḥ[472] which have for some reason been left out of AṬ. The following pairs of Iṣlāḥ are not mentioned in AṬ:

p. 135 mawh—mayh

p. 136 ʿawǧ—ʿayǧ

p. 137 thawkh—thaykh

p. 138 ʿawr—ʿayr

p. 139 faʾā—fāʾa; ḥalā and sanā (tert. W and Y); maghrīya—maghrūwa

---

[465] The fact that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has used K. al-Ǧīm as a source for his ibdāl monograph leads us to re-evaluate also Diem's claim (Das Kitāb al-Ǧīm, p. 103, quoted above) that it was not used by him in K. al-Aḍdād and K. al-Itbāʿ, as it would be natural to assume that he used the same sources for all the three books. Without here going into further details, one may draw attention, e.g. to K. al-Ǧīm I:86 balāqiʿu salāqiʿ which is probably the source for Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's K. al-Itbāʿ, p. 60 given on the authority of Abū ʿAmr ash-Shaybānī, though there are slight differences in wording, as is typical of Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib.

[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 Kitāb al-Ibdāl, p. 127.

[467] I have counted the "alphabetic verbs" (AṬ II:481) bawwā 'to write with B' etc. as one article.

[468] Articles 1-44, except for 16 (II:469 ṭiwāl—ṭiyāl), 28 (II:473 quwwam—quyyam) and 30 (II:474 dawāwīn—dayāwīn).

[469] Articles 63-80.

[470] Articles 1-32 (except for 29 II:501 shakā W/Y), 40-42 II:505 sakhā; falā; lakhā W/Y), 48-50 (II:507 naqā; ṭahā; ǧabā W/Y), 53-54 (II:508 ṭalā; ṭamā W/Y), 61-64 (II:510 lahayāt—lahawāt; qaṭayāt—qaṭawāt; riḍawāni—riḍayāni; ḥimawāni—ḥimayāni), 99 (II:519 daghawāt—daghayāt). The article raḥayāni—raḥawāni (32) is not found in the edition of Iṣlāḥ, but it is found in at-Tibrīzī's Tahdhīb Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq I:363. AṬ shows that the article existed at least in some manuscripts of Iṣlāḥ already in the 10th century. The last 13 Iṣlāḥ articles in AṬ do not form a clear block and their attribution to Iṣlāḥ 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 Iṣlāḥ.

[471] Articles 75-84.

[472] As also in ID, e.g. p. 680 KWD from which Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib has taken the pair KWD—KYD (AṬ II:488 art. 67), but ḤWD—ḤYD is given in the same article of ID, but it is not found in AṬ.

p. 140 qanā and ʿanā (tert. W and Y)

p. 141 ṭabā, ʿalā, salā and ḥalā (tert. W and Y); nasayāni—nasawāni

Besides these 15 articles, the reason for the exclusion of which is unclear, there are other cases which have been dropped by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib on purpose. These include words which have a different morphological pattern but the same root, viz. faʿīl—faʿūl (several examples in Iṣlāḥ, p. 142-143), ḥūrān—ḥīrān (i.e. fuʿlān—fiʿlān; Iṣlāḥ, p. 138), ḥundūra—ḥindīra (Iṣlāḥ, p. 143) and ṣamakūk—ṣamakīk (Iṣlāḥ, p. 143). These articles have clearly been classified as non-ibdāls by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib, who has omitted all of them, except for a very few cases, e.g. ʿabaytharān—ʿabawtharān (Iṣlāḥ, p. 144 > AṬ II:477-478 art. 42).

Other chapters of Iṣlāḥ have not been excerpted by Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib even though there is much ibdāl material interspersed among the text, especially pp. 185-187.

The compilation of AṬ

AṬ'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 *Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq* and *K. al-Ǧīm*. 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.

Abū'ṭ-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 ibdāl letters), allows us to see in some detail how Abū'ṭ-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-ibdāl chapters) and organized it according to the ibdāl 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 Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq 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 Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib did not strive for maximal fidelity to the written source[473]. This contrasts with some later scholars, such as ʿAbdalqādir al-Baghdādī, who are very conscientious in retaining the original wording of their sources[474].

After going through his sources, Abū'ṭ-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 Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's sources[475]. 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 Quellenunter-suchungen and Abdel-Tawab's Das Kitāb al-ġarīb. 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-Ḥāshiya II:123 "intahā kalāmuhu bi-khtiṣārin yasīr").

[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 aṣ-Ṣafadī's Taṣḥīḥ.

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

Other possible sources of AṬ

It is very difficult to say anything definite about AṬ's other sources. The philologists mentioned by name in AṬ may have been quoted directly from their own works, the majority of which have later disappeared[476] 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, sharḥs, 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[477].

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

Al-Farrā' quotes in AṬ

About two thirds of the al-Farrā' quotes, excluding those whose source is otherwise known, and the al-Farrā' additions come at the end of the respective chapters of AṬ, which suggests that at least these final quotes may come from a single source, possibly a book of al-Farrā'. 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-Farrā' quotes in AṬ, without discriminating between the quotes which derive from, e.g. IS and others, with the extant works of al-Farrā' without finding matches. The list of al-Farrā's lexicographical works (GAS VIII:123-125) and the contents of the final al-Farrā' 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 AṬ 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 AṬ[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—ʿ	ibtasara—iʿtasara
I:31	Chapter B—Q	ibtasara—iqtasara
I:34	Chapter B—K	baṣīṣ—kaṣīṣ
I: 73-74	Chapter B—M	biḍḍ—miḍḍ
I:85-86	Chapter B—W	abdaʿa—awdaʿa
I:109	Chapter T—D	samt—samd
I:112	Chapter T—DH	rataḥa—radhaḥa
I:133	Chapter T—Ṭ	ghaṭmaṭa—ghaṭmaṭa
I:137	Chapter T—F	tāraka—fāraka
I:198	Chapter TH—F	thulla—fulla
I:224	Chapter Ǧ—Z	aġfala—azfala
I:237	Chapter Ǧ—ʿ	ʿurāhim—ǧurāhim
I:245	Chapter Ǧ—Q	ǧins—qins
		ǧurǧubān—qurqubān[479]
I:282	Chapter Ḥ—KH	istaḥāra—istakhāra[480]
I:291	Chapter Ḥ—Ṭ	ǧalmaḥa—ǧalṭaḥa
I:300	Chapter Ḥ—ʿ	waḥira—waʿira[481]
I:302	Chapter Ḥ—GH	waḥar—waghar
I:309	Chapter Ḥ—K	ḥazaba—kazaba
		ḥafaf—kafaf[482]
I:327	Chapter Ḥ—H	ḍaḥala—ḍahala[483]
I:352	Chapter KH—H	khirāsh—hirāsh
I:362	Chapter D—DH	daʾalān—dhaʾalān
I:385	Chapter D—K	dayyiṣ—kayyiṣ

Al-Liḥyānī quotes in AṬ

Al-Liḥyānī is often quoted in AṬ via IS-Y, but there seems to be another group of al-Liḥyānī 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): I:79; I:108; I:172; I:216; I:223; I:250; I:258-259; I:283; I:285; I:309, i.e ten quotes.

[479] Only implicitly by al-Farrā' (introduced by "wa-qāla").

[480] After this comes an article on banāt bakhr—banāt baḥr which is related to the article on banāt bakhr—banāt makhr in chapter B—M (AṬ I:41).

[481] After this comes one article which is derived from Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq, 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.

Liḥyānī block", viz. AṬ I:328 where the article on saǧīḥa—saǧīya is explicitly given on the authority of al-Liḥyānī, and the following, anonymous article sharraḥa—sharrā seems to come from him on the basis of AṬ I:285 sharraḥa—sharrara which is also given explicitly on his authority and probably belongs together with sharraḥa—sharrā. What this source could be is difficult to say.

Abū Naṣr al-Bāhilī quotes in AṬ

There are 22[484] articles in AṬ given on the authority of Abū Naṣr, all outside the IS-Y and ID blocks. As in the case of al-Farrā', these articles tend to come at the end of each chapter with similar implications, viz. that they come from a single source. The Abū Naṣr quotes are (if nothing else is indicated the articles come last in their chapter):

I:109	Chapter T—D	antagha—andagha[485]
I:144	Chapter T—K	batta—bataka
I:174	Chapter TH—S	ḥuthāla—ḥusāla[486]
I: 211	Chapter Ǧ—Ḥ	ǧāsa—ḥāsa
I:219	Chapter Ǧ—D	ǧāsa—dāsa[487]
I:232	Chapter Ǧ—Ḍ	makhaǧa—makhaḍa
I:256	Chapter Ǧ—H	ǧāsa—hāsa
I:284	Chapter Ḥ—D	ḥāsa—dāsa[488]
I:289	Chapter Ḥ—SH	faḥīḥ—fashīsh[489]
I:304	Chapter Ḥ—F	ǧaḥala—ǧafala
I:313	Chapter Ḥ—H	ḥāsa—hāsa[490]
I:388	Chapter D—L	fadagha—falagha
II:87	Chapter R—M	rass[491]—mass
II:102	Chapter R—H	ratama—hatama
II: 122	Chapter Z—SH	nakaza—nakasha
II:140	Chapter Z—ʿ	zibiqqāna—ʿibiqqāna
II:148	Chapter Z—N	zaʿaba—naʿaba[492]
II:168-169	Chapter S—SH	sarāh—sharāh
II:201	Chapter S—F	ḥusāla—ḥufāla[493]

---

[484] AṬ I:284 given ḥāsa—dāsa anonymously but its attribution to Abū 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-Farrā'.

[486] The penultimate article, the last (irth—irs) is anonymous.

[487] The penultimate article, the last (ǧuʿbūb—duʿbūb) is anonymous.

[488] Anonymous but cf. above, note 484.

[489] The penultimate article, the last (istawḥā—istawshā) is anonymous.

[490] The first (!) article of this chapter. Its curious place may depend on its belonging to a larger group of articles (ǧāsa—ḥāsa—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 (!) article of this chapter.

[493] The first (!) article of this chapter, which may be explained by its belonging to a larger family, cf.

II:209	Chapter S—M	sa'ā—ma'ā
II:223-224	Chapter SH—Ḍ	shummakhz—ḍummakhz
II:229	Chapter SH—Q	i'tanaqa—i'tanasha

It should be emphasized that the list given above catalogues *all* the Abū Naṣr quotes in AṬ, 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 AṬ is Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's (in this respect the organization of the source has no bearing on AṬ'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'ṭ-Ṭayyib 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 AṬ 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-Alfāẓ* and *K. al-Aǧnās*)[494].

The works dependent on IS-Y

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

The profound dependence of IS-tahdhīb and Q on IS-Y is also seen in the order of the chapters in these works. AṬ 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-tahdhīb, Q, and, for the sake of comparison, Z:

	IS-Y	IS-tahdhīb	Q	Z
N—L	1	1	3	29
B—M	2	2	4	7
M—N	3	3	11	31
ʾ—ʿ	4	4	10	6
ʿ—Ḥ	5	5	5	–
ʾ—H	6	6	6	5
H—Ḥ	7	7	12	32
Ǧ—Y	8	8	8	33
Ǧ—Ḥ	9	10	9	–
Ḥ—KH	10	11+12	13	13
T—D	11	34	14	9
T—S	12	23	7	15

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

[494] Note also that Abū'ṭ-Ṭayyib's teacher Abū ʿUmar az-Zāhid (= al-Warrāq) is mentioned by al-Azharī in his isnād to "Abū Naṣr ʿan-i l-Aṣmaʿī" (TL I:15).

Z—Ṣ	13	26	15	27
TH—S	14	20	16	16
TH—DH	15	21	17	12
S—SH	16	22	18	–
‘—GH	17	15	19	20
Q—K	18	18	20	24
R—L	19	33	21	23
G—K	20	19	22	–
D—Ṭ	21	29	25	10
Ṣ—Ṭ	22	30	23	–
Ṣ—Ḍ	23	32	1	–
TH—F	24	16	2	26
KH—H	25	14	24	14
T—Ṭ	26	27	26	11
D—L	27	28	27	–
Z—S	28	25	37	22
muḍā‘af	29	39	30	–
ᵓ—Y	30	36	28	3
ᵓ—W	31	37	29	2
#w—#t	32	42	–	–
D—DH	33	35	31	–
varia	34	x[495]	x[496]	x[497]
+M	35	40	–	–
+N	36	41	–	–

The first halves of IS-Y and IS-tahdhīb 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-tahdhīb 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-tahdhīb there is a marked tendency towards a phonological arrangement; e.g. the laryngeal-velar group of IS-tahdhīb chapters 4-12 (with the intervening chapters of the orthographically similar Ǧ) is continued in chapters 13-15 (KH—GH, KH—H, ‘—GH), which come only later in IS-Y. Then in IS-tahdhīb there comes a palatal group (IS-tahdhīb 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.

[495] The varia chapter of IS-Y corresponds to chapters 9 (Ǧ—KH), 13 (KH—GH), 17 (F—K), 24 (S—Ṣ), 31 (Ǧ—Ṭ), 38 (DH—Z) and 43 (varia) of IS-tahdhīb.

[496] The varia chapter of IS-Y corresponds to chapters 32-36 of Q (F—K, DH—Z, ‘—H and two varia chapters).

[497] Some of the articles of the varia chapter in IS-Y are parallelled by chapters of Z. Z has in addition the following chapters: 1 (ᵓ—W—Y), 4 (W—Y), 8 (T—D—Ṭ), 17 (Ǧ—SH), 18 (Ḍ—Z), 19 (S—Ṣ), 21 (Z—S—Ṣ), 25 (B—F), 28 (KH—GH), 30 (L—M), 34 (SH—K) and 35 (T—K).

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-tahdhīb.

Order of material within chapters

As for the order of material within the individual chapters, all the sources dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhīb, AṬ, Q, Mukh., Muzhir) more or less closely follow IS-Y. Only in AṬ are there more radical differences from IS-Y, but one cannot see any principles behind the change of order in AṬ. 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 (laʿalla—laʿanna, IS-Y, p. 64) is discussed in another chapter of Q (II:79 in chapter ʾ—ʿ together with laʿalla—laʾalla), two are related roots (IS-Y, p. 93 buḥtur—buhtur, and p. 112 baʿthara—baghthara[498]), one is in the chapter muḍāʿaf (IS-Y, p. 134 taqaḍḍiya from the root QḌḌ), and the remaining two from the varia chapter (p. 142 uṭum—uġum and p. 144 waqīdh—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: waʿā—waḥā Q II:68; infaġara—inthaġara and ṭallafa—ṭallatha Q II:35; qulla—qunna and shalla—shanna Q II:44; taṣayyafa—taḍayyafa and ġāṣa—ġāḍa Q II:23; the first verse (rhyme ʿAliġġī) of the shāhid poem of which the three following verses are given in IS-Y) Q II:77; tūfar—tūthar Q II:34[499]; ikāf—wikāf Q II:166 (actually only an addition to akafa—wakafa which is taken fron IS-Y).

Notes on the relationship of Muzhir and IS-Y

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

---

[498] There is elsewhere in Q (II:67-68) a pair baʿthara—baḥthara.

[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 (nawʿ 32 = I:460-475; nawʿ 37 = I:537-556; and nawʿ 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-Y[500]. This explains why the following ibdāls of IS-Y are missing from among those given on the authority of Ibn as-Sikkīt in Muzhir: p. 77 aym—ayn; p. 81 ṭāma—ṭāna; p. 90 madaḥa—madaha; p. 103 harata—harada; p. 125 ǧadaf—ǧadath and finā'—thinā'; p. 126 maghāfīr—maghāthīr; p. 133 taẓannaytu—taẓannantu, taqaḍḍī (for taqaḍḍuḍ) and mulabbin (from LBB); p. 135 taṣdiya (from ṢDD) and qaṣṣaytu (from QṢṢ); p. 140 ʿaduf—ʿadhuf and idraʿaffa—idhraʿaffa.

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 missing[501]; Chapter B—M (36): 17 articles missing[502]; Chapter M—N (14): two articles missing[503]; Chapter TH—F (22): 10 articles missing[504].

3. Two cases which are mere additions to other articles have been dropped by as-Suyūṭī, probably as irrelevant[505].

4. Two cases of poetic ḍarūrāt have probably been deliberately omitted by as-Suyūṭī[506].

5. Chapter Ǧ—Y of IS-Y which mainly contains morphological ibdāls has been omitted[507].

---

[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'ālīl—(dha'ālīn); ma'ala—ma'ana; zulma—zunma; āsān—āsāl; ʿatala—ʿatana; and alāṣa—anāṣa.

[502] Viz. banāt bakhr—banāt makhr; ʿashama—ʿashaba; rātim—rātib; ʿabaqa—ʿamaqa; shamāriq—shabāriq (this article is found in Muzhir I:134 and I:411 from Thaʿlab's Amālī = Maǧālis); ʿubrī—ʿumrī; dinnaba—dinnama; aṣbār—aṣmār; ṣa'iba—ṣa'ima; ʿiqma—ʿiqba; iḍba'akka—iḍma'akka; kamaḥa—kabaḥa; dha'aba—dha'ama; zakaba—zakama; abida—amida; baʿkūkā'—maʿkūkā'; ǧardaba—ǧardama.

[503] Viz. āǧim—āǧin; ḥullām—ḥullān.

[504] Viz. dafa'ī—datha'ī; arfa—artha; furqubī—thurqubī; nafī—nathī; Fahlal—Thahlal; 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; furūgh—thurūgh.

[505] Viz. IS-Y, p. 118 sahk—sahǧ (addition to the preceding sayhūk—sayhūǧ); p. 137 yadī—adī (addition to the preceding yad—ad).

[506] Viz. IS-Y, p. 84 muʿtalī in a poem for mu'talī; p. 135 ya'tamī in rhyme for ya'tammu.

[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 ḫayr—ʿayr and hibriya—ibriya[508].

IS-Y, p. 99 fāḥa—fākha[509].

IS-Y, p. 105 fazza—faṣṣa.

IS-Y, p. 137 yatn—atn and yatam—atam.

IS-Y, p. 138 wilda—ilda[510].

IS-Y, p. 139 tuġāh 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 taṣawwa'a —taḍawwa'a)[511].

Chapter varia of IS-Y in Muzhir

For some reason as-Suyūṭī has given the material of Chapter varia 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—dharaqa and zabara—dhabara = Muzhir I:559[513]; p. 143 zaḥālīf— zaḥālīq = Muzhir I:554; p. 144 maghaṣ—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-tahdhīb, AṬ, 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 taṣawwa'a – taḍawwa'a. The reading of Muzhir (I:564) would imply that *both* forms were found in the manuscript used by as-Suyūṭī ("fī l-Ibdāl li-Ibn as-Sikkīt: taṣawwaka fulānun fī khar'ihi wa-taḍawwaka bi'ṣ-ṣādi wa'ḍ-ḍādi wa-taṣawwa'a wa-taḍawwa'a bihimā wa-bi'l-hamzati badala l-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 dhu'āf—zu'āf comes from IS-Y, p. 85.

quoted in Muzhir from al-Gharīb 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-Qālī, Dhayl, p. 6).

As-Suyūṭī has omitted seven articles of the varia chapter, four of which would have also been available in Q (IS-Y, p. 142 qāb—qād = Q II:178; p. 142 uṭum—uğum; p. 144 waqīdh—waqīẓ; p. 145 tafakkana—tafakkaha = Q II:178; p. 146 multakk—multakhkh and tākk—fākk = Q II:184; p. 146 indāla—indāḥa)[514].

Besides the articles of the varia chapter, as-Suyūṭī now and then quotes other ibdāl material from Q, material that has come to Q from sources other than IS-Y. Thus we find Muzhir I:474 (harata—harada—haraṭa) = Q II:241; Muzhir I:474 (definition of ibdāl) = Q II:186; Muzhir I:542 (ğāsa—ḥāsa) = Q II:78; Muzhir I:542 (sanğ—sankh) = Q II:18; Muzhir I:547 (dağana—rağana) = Q II:199; Muzhir I:550 (sağīr—shağīr) = Q I:135; Muzhir I:551 (ṣill—ḍill); = Q II:23; Muzhir I:564 (sahaka—saḥaqa)[515] = Q II:27.

Summary

Thus we have seen how the authors of all the works which are dependent on IS-Y (IS-tahdhīb, AṬ, 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-Suyūṭī 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-tahdhīb 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-ibdāl* has to take full account of these secondary works.

---

[514] Note the following textual notes to Muzhir I:472: qirṭāq read qirṭāṭ as in IS-Y, p. 145 and Q II:184; abādīd as in Q II:177 (in IS-Y, p. 142 ʿabābīd); istawthaqa as in Q II:178 (IS-Y, p. 144 istawthana).

[515] Note that this pair deviates from the basic definition of ibdāl as there are two differing consonants. — I have not been able to locate the following pairs in Q: Muzhir I:542 (nāfiğa—nāfiḥa) and Muzhir I:555 (faṣama—qaṣama) both given on the authority of al-Qālī.