



HAL
open science

Suprasegmental Critearia in Mediaeval Arabic Grammar

Manuel Sartori

► **To cite this version:**

Manuel Sartori. Suprasegmental Critearia in Mediaeval Arabic Grammar. The Foundations of Arabic Linguistics V. Kitāb Sibawayhi The Critical Theory, E. J. Brill, pp.198-222, 2022, 10.1163/9789004389694_016 . hal-02141823v2

HAL Id: hal-02141823

<https://hal.science/hal-02141823v2>

Submitted on 22 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Suprasegmental Criteria in Medieval Arabic Grammar*

Manuel Sartori

Introduction

“What’s the difference between *badal* and ‘*atf bayān*?’¹ Here is a student’s question, quite legitimate, but which, interestingly enough, does not have an immediate answer, which seems to signal its “problematic” nature. The crux of the problem lies, in short, in how to tell them apart and account for the differences between ‘*atf bayān* on the one hand and *badal* on the other hand.

So let’s pose the problem as it stands to the attentive reader: what is the difference between *muḥammad* of *al-ṣalātu wa-l-salāmu ‘alā nabīyyihi muḥammadin* and ‘*umar* of ‘*aqsama bi-llāhi ‘abū ḥafṣin ‘umar* (< ‘*umarū*’), the first being categorized by Arabic grammar as *badal* and the second as ‘*atf bayān*? What are the criteria for distinguishing what seems to be exactly the same, as will be shown in the following two examples borrowed from Ibn Ğinnī (d. 392/1002) in his *Luma‘ fi al-‘arabiyya*:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| (1) | <i>qāma</i> | <i>‘aḥūka</i> | <i>zaydun</i> | (Ibn Ğinnī <i>Luma‘</i> 144) |
| | to-stand-up.PAST | brother.NOM.-you | zayd.NOM. | |

categorized as *badal*

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| (2) | <i>qāma</i> | <i>‘aḥūka</i> | <i>muḥammadun</i> | (Ibn Ğinnī <i>Luma‘</i> 148) |
| | to-stand-up.PAST | brother.NOM.-you | muḥammad.NOM. | |

categorized as ‘*atf bayān*

These two structures are, from a written point of view, strictly identical and yet categorized differently to the point that even a grammarian and logician like Raḍī al-Dīn al-‘Astarābādī (d. 688/1289) comes to write this:

* Revised and expanded version of “La différence entre *badal* et ‘*atf bayān*. Mutisme et surdit  des grammairres de l’arabe ?” published in French in *Al-Qanṭara* (2018).

1 In the rest of this article I will keep the terms *badal* (permutative), *mubdal minhu* (that for which the *badal* is substituted), ‘*atf al-bayān* (explanatory apposition), but sometimes also those of *ṣifa* (qualification), *na‘t* (adjective) and *tawkīd* (corroboration) in transcription to simplify the translation. I will also keep the translation of the examples.

2 The pausal form is here necessitated by rhyme since it is a *raġaz* by ‘Abū al-Ġaḥḥāf Ru‘ba b. ‘Abd al-‘Aġġāġ b. Ru‘ba al-Tamīmī al-Sa‘dī (d. 145/762).

I say: so far, no obvious difference has appeared to me between the *badal* of the whole for the whole and the ‘*atf al-bayān*, and I believe that ‘*atf al-bayān* is nothing but *badal*, as this is obvious in Sībawayhi’s remark, since he does not mention the ‘*atf al-bayān*, but says: “as to substituting the definite expression for the indefinite expression, like *marartu bi-rağulin ‘abdi l-llāhi* ‘I passed by a man ‘Abd Allāh’, it is as if someone has asked: *bi-man mararta* ‘by whom did you pass?’ or that [the speaker] has imagined that it was said to him and that consequently, he puts in its place what is more defined than it [the indefinite expression]”. (‘*aqūlu wa-’anā ’ilā al-’āna lam yazhar li farq ġalī bayn badal al-kull min al-kull wa-bayn ‘atf al-bayān bal lā ’arā ‘atf al-bayān ’illā al-badal ka-mā huwa zāhir kalām Sībawayhi fa-’innahu lam yadkur ‘atf al-bayān bal qāla “ammā badal al-ma’rifā min al-nakira fa-naḥwa “marartu bi-rağulin ‘abdi l-llāhi” ka-’annahu qāla “bi-man mararta” ’aw zanna ’annahu yuqālu lahu dālika fa-’abdala makānahu mā huwa ’a’rafminhu”*,’Astarābādī ŠK II, 397; Sībawayhi *Kitāb* II, 12 and Sībawayhi *Kitāb*(3) II, 14, *hādā bāb badal al-ma’rifā min al-nakira wa-l-ma’rifā min al-ma’rifā*)

The fact that even such a distinguished grammarian and logician as ‘Astarābādī was confused by the problem suggests that it was unusually difficult, and indeed we find similar confusion in the works of other Arab grammarians. As we shall show, some of them reduce this difference to merely inflectional or, at best, pragmatic criteria, while others invoke an entirely different criterion, one which is more hinted at than explicitly stated. The latter approach has been largely overlooked in Western treatments of the phenomenon, which rely heavily on the traditional formal analysis, thereby increasing the need to rescue it from neglect.

1 The Traditional Approach

1.1 *The Reasons for This Embarrassment*

Let us recall briefly that the two types under study, *badal* and ‘*atf bayān*, belong to the generic category known as *tawābi‘* that is to say to the class of appositives. In the terms of traditional Arabic grammar, these appositives are five in number: *ṣifa* (or *na‘t*), adjectival qualification; *ta’kīd* (or *tawkīd*), corroboration; *badal*, permutation; ‘*atf bayān*, explanatory apposition; and ‘*atf nasaq*, coordination (cf. Ġalāyīnī *Ġāmi‘* III, 169–190). Even if the last of these, unlike the first four, is not a juxtaposition, we can distinguish in each of them at least a categorized term as *tābi‘*, that is to say an appositive, and preceding

it, its *matbūʿ*, that is to say the term which is followed by the appositive, the *tābiʿ* following (generally) in declension its *matbūʿ*.

If the *ʿatf al-bayān* does not have subdivisions, the same is not true for the *badal* as stated by ʿAstarābādī in the quote above. The *badal* is subdivided into four types,³ respectively *badal al-kull min al-kull* (substitution of the whole for the whole); *badal al-baʿd min al-kull* (substitution of the part for the whole); *badal al-ištimāl* (inclusive substitution); *al-badal al-mubāyin* (the contradictory substitution), itself subdivided into three sub-types which are *badal al-ġalaṭ* (substitution of error), *badal al-nisyān* (substitution of oversight) and *badal al-ʿidrāb* (substitution of retractation, cf. Ġalāyīnī *Ġāmiʿ* III, 179–180 and Yaʿqūb 2006: IV, 88).⁴

According to Talmon, the *ʿatf al-bayān* would be a syntactic innovation (maybe we should rather say conceptual) which was introduced by Sībawayhi (d. 180/796?), who granted it a degree of autonomy approaching that of a *ṣifa* (cf. Talmon 1981: 279). According to an Arab grammarian, Ibn Barhān al-ʿUkbarī (d. 456/1064), the *ʿatf al-bayān* actually seems to be problematic since he writes in his *Šarḥ al-Lumaʿ*:

Know, concerning the *ʿatf al-bayān*, that few grammarians know it, that Sībawayhi mentioned it only incidentally in some sections [...], and that he has not reserved for it any chapter. (*wa-ʿlam ʿanna ʿatf al-bayān lā yaʿrifuhu⁵ kaṭīr min al-naḥwiyyīn wa-ʿinna-mā dakarahū Sībawayhi ʿarīḍan fi mawāḍiʿ [...]* *wa-lam yufrid lahu bāban*, Ibn Barhān al-ʿUkbarī *ŠL* I, 236)

A later grammarian, Baṭālyawsī (d. 521/1127), even points out the three features of *ʿatf al-bayān* which account for its “strangeness among grammarians”

3 One of the first to mention them is Mubarrad (d. 285/898 or 286/899) (cf. Mubarrad *Muqtaḍab* I, 66–68 and IV, 528–530).

4 The translations given here to these terms are that of Carter (cf. Širbīnī *Nūr* 474). I will only note that for ʿAstarābādī *al-badal al-mubāyin* is, in fact, *al-badal al-ġalaṭ* and that under this latter, he distinguishes, in the order stated here, the types of *ġalaṭ ṣariḥ muḥaqqaq* (substitution of a real error) then of *ġalaṭ nisyān* (substitution of oversight) and then finally of *ġalaṭ badāʿ* (substitution of second thought) (cf. ʿAstarābādī *ŠK* II, 403–404). On his side, Wright reduces to two the sub-types of the *badal al-ġalaṭ*, subsuming *badal al-ʿidrāb* (the permutative of retractation) with *badal al-badāʿ* (the substitution of a new opinion, something one would like to substitute for the original statement), and subsuming under only one category *badal al-ġalaṭ wa-l-nisyān* (the permutative of error and forgetfulness, cf. Wright 1996: II, 286).

5 The text gives *yā-hā-rā-fā* that could be read *yahrifu* “to praise excessively” (cf. Wehr 1994: 1026a), but which does not make sense here. It is presumably a typo, *hā* and *ʿayn* being side by side on a keyboard.

(*ġarābatihā 'inda al-naḥwiyyīna*, Baṭalyawsī *Rasā'il* 206): the vocative (*nidā'*), the vague terms (*mubhamāt*), that is to say the demonstratives (*'asmā' al-'išāra*), and the active participle (*ism al-fā'il*).⁶

By cross-reading the presentations made by traditional Arab grammars, the *'atf al-bayān* represents, in fact, an intersection between *šifa* and *badal*, with which it shares some characteristics, but from which it is distinguished by others. This is why a grammarian like Baṭalyawsī devotes a study, in his *Rasā'il*, to the difference between *na't*, *'atf bayān* and *badal* (cf. Baṭalyawsī *Rasā'il* 195–226). As such, one of the best presentations, although not free from controversy, of the *'atf al-bayān* between *šifa* and *badal* is that of Ibn Ya'īš (d. 643/1245) in his commentary on Zamaḥṣarī's *Mufaṣṣal* (d. 538/1144, cf. Ibn Ya'īš *ŠM* II, 272–274).

However, none of the grammarians (ancient or modern) clearly explains the distinction that can be made between *badal* and *'atf bayān*, which may help us to understand the circumspection of 'Astarābādī in the matter. What is important to bear in mind at this stage is that among the four types of *badal*, the *'atf al-bayān* would be confused with the *badal* of the whole for the whole. It is at least what grammarians say when they indicate that this equivalence is true under two conditions (*yaqūlu al-nuḥāt 'inna kull mā ṣaluḥa 'an yakūna 'atf bayān ġāza 'an yakūna badalan bi-šarṭayn*, Ya'qūb 2006: VI, 422, cf. also Howell 1880: I, 481).⁷

What should also be kept in mind is that the *'atf al-bayān*, representing an intersection between *badal* and *šifa*, obviously poses problems for grammarians to define it precisely. As Esseezy says about the appositives, “the syntactic and semantic boundaries among these subclasses were not always drawn sharply [...], leading to instances where syntactic ambiguity becomes inevitable, as in *ḍarabtu 'abā 'abdillāhi zaydan* 'I hit 'Abū 'Abdallāh, Zayd', which is bound to be construed either as *'atf bayān* 'explicative coordinating' or as *badal*” (Esseezy 2006: 124–125). Owens specifies indeed that “apparently grammarians found it difficult to define it clearly” (Owens 1990: 59).

However, there remains a question which should not be left unanswered, especially since some grammarians, as we will see, provide an implicit solution that must be made explicit: how to distinguish between (1) and (2) above?

6 These considerations being once again only inflectional, and therefore more than suspicious in a language where the inflection by means of short vowels is not marked (cf. below, fn. 9), I will not deal with it here.

7 The two conditions in question here are that 1. the *tābi'* can take the place of the *matbū'* and thus that the operator on the *matbū'* can apply to the *tābi'* and 2. that no semantic impossibility results from the commutation of the two. The first of the two belongs precisely to the pragmatic criteria discussed by the grammarians (cf. below).

While Western Arabists do occasionally provide an explanation, albeit rarely,⁸ our goal must be to focus on the view of the Arab grammarians, since we are here dealing with the *Foundations of Arab Linguistics*.

1.2 *Traditional Criteria of Distinction between ‘atf bayān and badal*

Let us first sum up very briefly the traditional criteria applied by the Arab grammarians to distinguish between *‘atf bayān* and *badal*.

As for the differences between the two, the fact is that, when consulting ancient grammarians, there are at least two criteria of distinction between *badal* and *‘atf bayān*, those criteria being widespread among ancient grammarians. The first one pertains to the linguistic belief in a consistent *‘irāb*, the difference made between the two from Mubarrad onwards being linked to inflection within the framework of the vocative, since he says that the *badal* is inflected in the nominative while the *‘atf al-bayān* is to the accusative (cf. Mubarrad *Muqtaḍab* IV, 468 and 475). That is also what Ibn al-Sarrāġ (d. 316/929) clearly states:

The difference between the *‘atf al-bayān* and the *badal* is that the implicit value (*taqdīr*) of the *‘atf al-bayān* is that of the appositive adjective of the first noun while the implicit value of the *badal* is to replace the first [term], and you say in the framework of the vocative when you want to use the *‘atf al-bayān*: *yā ‘aḥānā zaydan* by putting on the accusative with *tanwīn* since it is not the vocative element, and if you wish to use the *badal* you say: *yā ‘aḥānā zaydu*. (*wa-l-farq bayn ‘atf al-bayān wa-l-badal ‘anna ‘atf al-bayān taqdīruhu al-na‘t al-tābi‘ li-l-ism al-‘awwal wa-l-badal taqdīruhu ‘an yūḍa‘a mawḍi‘ al-‘awwal wa-taqūlu fī al-nidā’ ‘idā ‘aradta ‘atf al-bayān “yā ‘aḥānā zaydan” fa-tanṣubu wa-tunawwinu li-‘annahu ġayr munādā fa-‘in ‘aradta al-badal qulta “yā ‘aḥānā zaydu”*, Ibn al-Sarrāġ *‘Uṣūl* I, 432)⁹

Ibn al-Dahhān al-Baġdādī (d. 569/1174) sums this up very briefly in his comment on *‘atf al-bayān*: “it is recognized within the vocative explicitly and

8 This is particularly the case of Larcher who indicates, following the Arab grammarians, that the *badal* represents the essential term compared to the *mubdal minhu* which is the accessory one (cf. Larcher 2017:35). For the details of the treatment of the *badal* and the *‘atf al-bayān* by the Arabists, cf. Sartori 2018a:552-558.

9 He also speaks about it in the context of the vocative (*nidā’*), cf. Ibn al-Sarrāġ *‘Uṣūl* I, 300–302 and I, 327–328; cf. also II, 78–79; II, 116; II, 134–135). Ibn al-Sarrāġ indicates that the categories of *badal* and *‘atf bayān* are the terminologies of the so-called grammarians of Basra (cf. Ibn al-Sarrāġ *‘Uṣūl* I, 328).

elsewhere implicitly” (*yu‘rafu fī al-nidā’ lafẓan wa-fī ġayrihi taqḍīran*, Ibn al-Dahhān al-Baġdādī *Šarḥ* 544).

However, these inflections do not appear in written Arabic with its scriptio defectiva, nor is inflection prominent in conventional pronunciation, where pausal forms predominate.¹⁰ The appeal to inflection which is commonly made by the grammarians therefore has little explanatory value.

The second criterion raised by the grammarians is, in fact, twofold, invoking two pragmatic features which are discussed by Arab grammarians of all periods. The first concerns the *badal* and is linked to the speaker’s intention: on him depends the fact that the *badal*, because being in a relation of *stricto sensu* referential uniqueness with its *mubdal minhu*, is conceived as the essential term while the term to which it is apposed is only as an accessory one; the second concerns the *‘atf al-bayān* and again points to the speaker’s intention: on him depends the restriction of the extension of the term to which the *‘atf al-bayān* is apposed and, correlatively, the precision of its intension.¹¹ The *‘atf al-bayān* is then not an essential term, but rather, as with adjectival qualification generally, only an accessory term and, like it, is not in a relation of strictly referential uniqueness with the term to which it is apposed¹², unlike the *badal*.

However, there are grammarians whose enquiries go beyond these two criteria, challenging and extending both the distributional/inflectional and the semantic/pragmatic approach. As I shall show below, they introduce another criterion, this time of suprasegmental nature, arising from the fusion of the pragmatic and the syntactic approach...

10 The pausal form is the default ending both in mediaeval and contemporary Classical Arabic, to which we may add that the full inflectional system of three cases is not found with every class of word—many have only two inflections, and others are invariable (e.g. *mūsā*, *īsā*), or the inflections may be masked by suffixes (e.g. *kitābī*) or obscured by orthographical ambiguities. Even Qur’anic Arabic can be seen to be “without desinential inflection, and that this syntactically irrelevant inflection was introduced for prosodic reasons, linked to the changing recitation of the Qur’ān (*taġwīd*)” (Larcher 2021:37). In effect, overt inflection is the exception (only in the case of the “six nouns”, cf. Sartori 2010 and Sartori 2018b:69) rather than the rule, and for a language known for inflection, this reduces to very few cases where it is actually performed!

11 “Intension” and “extension” are borrowed from Logic: “l’extension d’un terme est l’ensemble des référents qu’un terme est susceptible de dénoter en langue [...]. L’intension (ou, plus traditionnellement, la compréhension) d’un terme correspond aux aspects pertinents de son contenu notionnel qui conditionnent ses emplois référentiels et qui rendent compte de ses relations avec les autres termes de la langue” (Riegel et al. 2004:179–180).

12 Suyūfī (d. 911/1505) even states very clearly that “the explanatory apposition only exists after a multireferential [noun]” (*‘atf al-bayān lā yakūnu ‘illā ba’d muštarak*, Suyūfī *‘Ašbāh* III, 218).

2 A New Criterion of Suprasegmental Nature

The authors who follow do not abandon the presentation of *badal* as being the essential term and its *mubdal minhu* as the accessory one. Similarly, they still present the *'atf al-bayān* as a generally better-known element, clarifying the term to which it is associated, by restricting its extension. They even point to the inflectional criterion to distinguish between the two. However, those grammarians add something interesting that transcends the various branches of indigenous Arabic grammar and is therefore not specific to any one branch. In this section we introduce a syntactic criterion, that of repetition, resumption, or independence (i.e. beginning a new sentence), this last having the morphological consequence that by starting a new sentence a pausal ending appears on the preceding element..

2.1 *Repetition (takrīr, takrār or tašdīd)*

2.1.1 *Tašdīd*

I will begin with the most prevalent criterion among ancient grammarians, namely that of *repetition* which one finds in their works in the forms of *takrīr*, and more marginally *takrār* or *tašdīd*. It is with the latter that I will start this section since Ibn Ğinnī begins by defining the *badal* as “following the course of the *tawkīd* in [factual] assertion and doubling” (*al-badal yağrī mağrā al-tawkīd fi al-taḥqīq wa-l-tašdīd*, Ibn Ğinnī *Luma'* 144), which he is visibly the first to do so by using the term *tašdīd*. What needs to be understood here is actually twofold: *badal* and *mubdal minhu* being in a referential uniqueness relationship, it thus amounts to saying the same thing twice, both in intention and intension.

That is confirmed by Ibn al-Ḥabbāz (d. 637/1239), commentator of Ibn Ğinnī's *Luma'*. Like Ibn Ğinnī before him, he indicates about the *badal* that it follows the course of the *tawkīd* in [factual] assertion and doubling (*al-taḥqīq wa-l-tašdīd*) and specifies the meaning of *tašdīd*:

It is because when you say *qāma 'aḥūka zaydun* then the *badal* and the *mubdal minhu* are two expressions referring to a single meaning, so it is like you said *qāma 'aḥūka 'aḥūka*. (*fa-li-'annaka 'idā qulta qāma 'aḥūka zaydun fa-l-badal wa-l-mubdal minhu 'ābiratāni 'an ma'nā wāḥid fa-ka-'annaka qulta qāma 'aḥūka 'aḥūka*, Ibn al-Ḥabbāz *Tawğīh* 275)

But this is also equivalent to *repeating*, *qāma 'aḥūka zaydun* amounting to saying *qāma 'aḥūka qāma zaydun*, which Bāqūlī (d. 543/1148) and Ibn al-Faḥḥār (d. 754/1353) will express very clearly (cf. below).

2.1.2 *Takrīr*

As for ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Ġurġānī (d. 471/1078), even though he does not expressly address the difference between *‘atf bayān* and *badal*, he still has an interesting observation to make about the latter:

Know that the *badal* virtually repeats the operator as it was before, so when you say *marartu bi-qawmika tultayhim* then *tultayhim* is in the genitive because of the preposition as if you had said *bi-tultayhim* [...]. The *badal* virtually repeats the operator only because the *mubdal minhu* is neglected in favor of the *badal* [...] and this is not the case with the *ṣifa* since when you say *ġā’anī zaydun al-ẓarīfu* then *zayd* is not virtually neglected, but rather both [terms] follow the course of the single noun. (*i’lam ‘anna al-badal fī ḥukm takrīr al-‘āmil ka-mā taqaddama fa-‘idā qulta “marartu bi-qawmika tultayhim” kāna tultayhim maġrūran bi-ḥarf ġarr ḥattā ka-‘annaka qulta “bi-tultayhim” [...] wa-‘inna-mā kāna al-badal fī ḥukm takrīr al-‘āmil li-‘aġl ‘anna al-badal yutraku ‘ilayhi al-mubdal minhu [...] wa-laysa ka-dālika al-ṣifa li-‘annaka ‘idā qulta “ġā’anī zaydun al-ẓarīfu” lam yakun zaydun fī ḥukm al-matrūk bal kānā ġāriyayni maġrā ism wāḥid*, Ġurġānī *MŠĪ* II, 929)

What Ġurġānī adds in contrast to his predecessors is the *takrīr* element contained in the *badal* that, if we are to believe ‘Uṣmūnī (d. ca. 900/1495) used by Vernier (cf. Vernier 1891: II, 176), the grammarians of the so-called school of Kufa partly called *takrīr*. Compared with the *takrīr*, which visibly presupposes a pause, he presents the case of the adjective (which we know the *‘atfal-bayān* is close to) which, on the contrary, implies a lack of pause, that is to say a link, which is implied by its comparison with the single noun (*ism wāḥid*).

Baṭalyawsī, in the section which he devotes to the difference between *na‘t*, *badal* and *‘atfal-bayān*, specifies four of them, the third of which being:

that one supposes with the *badal* a reiteration of the operator, as if it belonged to another sentence, whereas one does not suppose that with the *‘atfal-bayān* which is on the contrary in this respect like the adjective. (*‘anna al-badal [...] yuqaddaru ma‘ahu ‘i‘ādat al-‘āmil wa-ka-‘annahu min ġumla ‘uḥrā wa-‘atfal-bayān lā yuqaddaru fīhi dālika bal huwa fī ḥādā al-waġḥ ka-l-na‘t*, Baṭalyawsī *Rasā’il* 204)

Thus Baṭalyawsī indicates both the element of repetition contained in the *badal* and, as a result, that the latter is then “as if it belonged to another sentence”. By this reference to “another sentence”, this author then indicates very clearly that the *badal* is preceded by a pause, which will be later on

confirmed by Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī (cf. below) who replaces *ǧumla* with his own term *kalām* “utterance”.¹³

Despite what has been said, especially by Talmon, noting that Zamaḥṣārī, like others, was only going by a pragmatic feature (the speaker’s premeditation, cf. Talmon 1981: 291), ‘Abū al-Qāsim still devotes a section to the *independence* of the *badal*, an independence which he links to the concept of repetition when he says:

And what indicates its independent character is that it may be judged as having its operator repeated. (*wa-l-laḍī yadullu ‘alā kawnihi mustaqillan ‘annahu fi ḥukm takrīr al-‘āmil*, Zamaḥṣārī *Mufaṣṣal* 155)

This independent character (*mustaqill*) of the *badal* is thus seen to be closely related to repetition, and therefore implying the existence of a pause that precedes it.

Bāqūlī, known as Ğāmi‘ al-‘ulūm, specifies the same thing speaking also of “repetition”. He does it a first time for the *badal*, for which he says that the operator is repeated and that, implicitly, the *badal* belongs to another sentence (*li-‘anna al-‘āmil mukarrar fi al-badal wa-l-badal fi al-taqdīr min ǧumla ‘uḥrā*, Ğāmi‘ al-‘ulūm *Kitāb šarḥ al-Luma‘ fi al-naḥw* 256). He gives for it as an example *zaydun dahaba ‘amrun ‘aḥūhu* that he paraphrases *zaydun dahaba ‘amrun dahaba ‘aḥūhu* (cf. Ğāmi‘ al-‘ulūm *Kitāb šarḥ al-Luma‘ fi al-naḥw* 257).

He once again addresses this aspect of repetition at the level of the *‘atf al-bayān*, clearly indicating that, unlike the *badal*, no such repetition is found with *‘atf al-bayān*:

The *‘atf al-bayān* resembles the *šifa* in that it is an appositive of the first [term] and that it clarifies it, except that it is not derived from the verb, unlike the *šifa*. It resembles the *badal* in its form, except that it differs from it because the *badal* is implicitly in the repetition of the operator, and that is unlike it [*‘atf al-bayān*]. This is manifest in the chapter of the vocative: when you say *yā ‘aḥānā zaydan* “o our brother Zayd!”, if you treat *zayd* as a *‘atf bayān*, you put the accusative since you make it replace *‘aḥānā*, and if you treat it as a *badal*, you suppose a repetition of *yā* and you say *yā ‘aḥānā zaydu* “o our brother, Zayd!”, as if you said [*yā ‘aḥānā*] *yā zaydu*. (*‘atf al-bayān yušbihu al-šifa fi kawnihi tab‘an li-l-‘awwal wa-*

13 The sentences can indeed be segmented but also linked (or bound) (cf. below fn. 17) as is the case in subordinated constructions such as *yuridu ‘an yatakallama* “he wants to speak” whereas the linguistic *kalām* (which one can render by ‘utterance’ or ‘speech’) “is bounded by silence” (Carter 2017:151 and cf. 148–149 for possible translations of *kalām*).

mubayyinān lahu 'illā 'annahu layṣa bi-muštaqq min al-fi'l bi-ḥilāf al-ṣifa wa-yuṣbiḥu fi al-laḥẓ al-badal 'illā 'annahu yufāriquhu min ḥaytu 'anna al-badal fi taqdīr takrīr al-'āmil wa-hādā bi-ḥilāfihi wa-yatabayyanu dālīka fi bāb al-nidā' 'idā qulta "yā 'aḥānā zaydan" 'in ḡa'alta "zaydan" 'atf bayān naṣabta li-'annaka 'aqamtahu maqām "aḥānā" wa-'in ḡa'alta badalan qaddarta takrīr "yā" fa-qulta "yā 'aḥānā zaydu" ka-'annaka qulta "yā zaydu", Ğāmi' al-'ulūm Kitāb šarḥ al-Luma' fi al-naḥw 261)

In his great commentary on the *Mufaṣṣal* Ibn Ya'īš repeats the elements of *badal* by Zamahšarī, who, like other grammarians, emphasizes its syntactic independence and connects it with repetition, for which Ibn Ya'īš then provides crystal clear examples:

When you say *marartu bi-'aḥīka zaydin*, it is implicitly [saying] *marartu bi-'aḥīka bi-zaydin*, and when you say *ra'aytu 'aḥāka zaydan*, its implicit meaning is *ra'aytu 'aḥāka ra'aytu zaydan*. ('*idā qulta "marartu bi-'aḥīka zaydin" taqdīruhu "marartu bi-'aḥīka bi-zaydin" wa-'idā qulta "ra'aytu 'aḥāka zaydan" fa-taqdīruhu "ra'aytu 'aḥāka ra'aytu zaydan"*, Ibn Ya'īš *ŠM* II, 264)

Ibn al-Ḥāḡib (d. 646/1249) also discusses the difference between the two and likewise connects it to the *takrīr*: “the *badal* is considered as the repetition in all of its cases” (*al-badal fi ḥukm al-takrīr fi ḡāmi' amṭālihi*, Ibn al-Ḥāḡib *Idāḥ* I, 431).

As for the *badal*, Ibn 'Uṣfūr (d. 669/1271) also notes the feature of repetition since he says:

When you say *qāma zaydun 'aḥūka* [...] it is as you said *qāma 'aḥūka* having retracted what you first said, *zayd* [...] and [...] what indicates this is the repetition of the operator with the *badal* as in *marartu bi-zaydin bi-'aḥīka*. Allah the Almighty said (...) (Q. 7/75, cf. below). ('*idā qulta "qāma zaydun 'aḥūka" [...] fa-ka-'annaka qulta "qāma 'aḥūka" fa-'aḍrabta 'an qawlika 'awwalan "zayd" [...] wa-[...] alladī yadullu 'alā dālīka takrīr al-'āmil ma'a al-badal fi naḥw "marartu bi-zaydin bi-'aḥīka" qāla allāh ta'ālā* (...), Ibn 'Uṣfūr *ŠĜ* I, 251)

Ibn Hišām al-'Anṣārī (d. 761/1360), in his *Sabīl al-hudā*, deals with the two (cf. Goguyer 1887: 342ff. for the '*atf al-bayān* and 358–361 for the *badal*). He even addresses the difference between the two (cf. Goguyer 1887: 344–346). He expressly takes into account only pragmatic and semantic aspects, but still specifies:

De tout nom dont on peut dire qu'il est adjoind expositif, servant à élucider ou particulariser, on peut dire aussi qu'il est permutatif de tout en tout, servant à fixer et corroborer le sens, parce qu'il se trouve en effet comme si le régissant était répété pour lui. À cette règle les uns font une exception, les autres deux, d'autres même davantage, mais toutes se trouvent comprises dans l'expression que j'ai employée : « *s'il n'est pas impossible de lui faire remplacer son antécédent.* » (Goguyer 1887: 345)

Further on *takrūr*, cf. also 'Ušmūnī and Ḥuḍarī (d. 1287/1870) ('Ušmūnī *Manhağ* II, 435 and Ḥuḍarī *Hāšīya* II, 159).

2.1.3 *Takrār*

Ibn 'Ušfūr, but this time in his *Muqarrib*, deals again with the two types of appositives (cf. Ibn 'Ušfūr *Muqarrib* 321–326 for the *badal* and 327–328 for the '*atf al-bayān*'), and, in the section devoted to the latter, he explains the difference between '*atf bayān*' and *badal*, by expressly connecting it with the criterion of *takrār al-āmil* (repetition of the operator):

The difference between it [*'atf al-bayān*] and the *badal* is that you do not intend to reject the first [term] with the '*atf al-bayān*' as you do with the *badal* [...] because the purpose of the *badal* is to repeat the operator [...] and that is not allowed in the case of the '*atf al-bayān*' because no repetition is intended here. (*wa-l-farq baynahu ['atf al-bayān] wa-bayn al-badal 'annaka lā tanwī bi-l-'awwal al-ṭarḥ fī 'atf al-bayān ka-mā taf'alu fī al-badal [...] li-'anna al-badal fī niyyat takrār al-āmil [...] wa-dālika lā yağūzu [fī] 'atf al-bayān li-'annahu laysa fī niyyat takrār al-āmil*, Ibn 'Ušfūr *Muqarrib* 327)

We find this use of *takrār* instead of *takrūr* among others in Ibn al-Faḥḥār, commentator of Zağğāğī's *Ğumal* (d. 337/949), who, although he sets out the five kinds of appositives, does not deal with the '*atf al-bayān*' (cf. Ibn al-Faḥḥār ŠĜ and Ibn al-Faḥḥār ŠĜ(2)). As for the *badal*, he immediately indicates in the definition the aspect of repetition:

The *badal* is the appositive whose implicit value is the repetition of the operator, so, when you say *qāma zaydun 'aḥūka* it has the implicit value of *qāma zaydun qāma 'aḥūka*. (*al-badal huwa al-tābi' alā taqdīr takrār al-āmil fa-'idā qulta "qāma zaydun 'aḥūka" fa-'innahu fī taqdīr "qāma zaydun qāma 'aḥūka"*, Ibn al-Faḥḥār ŠĜ I, 190)

Ibn ‘Aqīl finally (d. 769/1367) states that substitution (*badal*) occurs in the intention of repeating the operator (*al-badal ‘alā niyyat takrār al-‘amil*, Ibn ‘Aqīl ŠA II, 59).

One last element to note is that this dimension is not totally ignored among Arabists. Wright, for example, for whom ‘*atf bayān* can be regarded as functioning in a similar way to the adjectival qualifier, *šifa*, “This apposition is equivalent to the use of *wa-huwa*, *wa-hiya*, etc. (e.g. *ğā’anī ‘aḥūka wa-huwa zaydun*)” (Wright 1996: II, 287), which is basically approaching the solution by making of it a link of concomitant nature to be distinguished from the *badal* where there is a recommencing and therefore a break.

2.2 *Resumption (isti’nāf) and Independence (istiqlāl)*

Regarding the distinction between *badal* and ‘*atf bayān*, the other distinguishing criterion that one can identify from reading the ancient grammarians, though it is less prominent than *takrār*, is that of *isti’nāf*, that is to say *resumption*¹⁴ as well as that of *istiqlāl*, that is to say *independence*.

I will start with Ibn Ğinnī, who, when he writes about the ‘*atf al-bayān* “You say *qāma ‘aḥūka muḥammadun* as you say *qāma ‘aḥūka al-ẓarīfu*” (*taqūlu “qāma ‘aḥūka muḥammadun” ka-qawlika “qāma ‘aḥūka al-ẓarīfu*”, Ibn Ğinnī *Luma’* 148), significantly chooses the formulation *ka-qawlika* “as if you were saying”. Could this be the trace of the fact that the apposed element and its ‘*atf bayān* must be pronounced as one does in the case of a *mawṣūf* and its *šifa*, that is to say in one breath, as a single noun (*ism wāḥid*, cf. ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Ĝurġānī above)? Such an idea cannot be ruled out, in view of the importance of the word *as* here,¹⁵ especially in the light of what follows.

The first among the grammarians to be perfectly explicit on this subject is, it seems, Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī who precisely links *takrār* and *isti’nāf*. About the *badal* he says indeed immediately this: “the *badal* is one of the appositives except that it has originally the implicit value of two sentences: when you say *ḍarabtu zaydan ra’sahu* the base is *ḍarabtu zaydan ḍarabtu ra’sahu*” (*al-badal ‘aḥad al-tawābi’ ‘illā ‘annahu fi taqdīr ġumlatayn fi al-‘aṣl ‘idā qulta “ḍarabtu*

14 For this term in Farrā’ (d. 207/822), cf. Kasher 2014 and also Larcher 2013:195, but also Kinberg 1996: 28–32 and notably his definition of *ist’anāfa*: “to begin (a new unit which is: 1. Separated in pronunciation from the preceding unit” (1996:29) as well as the statement of Farrā’: *wa-qawluhu “wa-mā ‘arsalnā min rasūlin ‘illā bi-lisāni qawmihi li-yubayyina lahum” ... tumma qāla ‘azza wa-ğalla “fa-yuḍillu -llāhu man yašā’u” fa-ruḥi’a li-’anna al-niyya fihi al-isti’nāf lā al-‘atf ‘alā ma qablahu* (1996:30) where, here at least, Farrā’ clearly contrasts ‘*atf* with *isti’nāf*. In this paper, therefore, *resumption* will denote a new start, implying a pause before it.

15 It has the same importance elsewhere, notably for Durkheim when he says that we must treat social facts as things (cf. Durkheim 1988:77 and 120; Pouillon 1987:112 for French and Durkheim 1982:35 and 69 for English).

zaydan ra'sahu” *fa-l-’aṣl* “*ḍarabtu zaydan ḍarabtu ra'sahu*”, Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī *ŠL* I, 229). But further on, this time about the ‘*atfal-bayān*, he says:

If you ask: why you did not treat this section of the appositives as a *badal*, we will say that the adjectival qualifier is directly joined in the utterance to the qualified element, that it is not considered as a new utterance and that the same is true of the situation of the ‘*atfal-bayān*. Also, when you say *qāma hādā zaydun* “this one Zayd got up” by constructing the utterance on the mention of *zayd*¹⁶ and not disassociating it from *hādā*, it is a ‘*atfal-bayān*. If you make of it [utterance] a new one, as if you said *qāma hādā qāma zaydun* “this one got up, Zayd got up”, it is then a *badal*. (*fa-’in qulta hallā ḡa’alta hādā al-faṣl min al-tawābi’ badalan qulnā ’inna al-ṣifa yubnā lahā al-kalām ’alā ḍikr bayān muttaṣil fi al-mawṣūf wa-laysat fi taqdīr kalām musta’naf wa-ka-ḍālika manzilat ’atfal-bayān fa-’idā qulta “qāma hādā zaydun” wa-banayta al-kalām ’alā ḍikr zayd wa-lam taḡ’alhu munqaṭi’an min “hādā” fa-huwa ’atf al-bayān wa-’in ḡa’altahu musta’nafan wa-ka-’annaka qulta “qāma hādā qāma zaydun” fa-huwa badal*, Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī *ŠL* I, 235)

Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī could not be clearer, his recourse to *muttaṣil* on the one hand, to *musta’naf* and *munqaṭi’* on the other hand, the first referring to ‘*atfal-bayān* and the second to *badal*, leaving no doubt about his concept of the difference between these two types of appositions: in addition to the traditional criteria already mentioned,¹⁷ he adds one, suprasegmental in nature, which takes into account pronunciation in juncture or segmentation!¹⁸ This confirms, in my opinion, the reading of Ibn Ġinnī’s *as*, that is to say that an *ism* and its *ṣifa* are said in one breath.

This criterion of resumption, in the express form of *isti’nāf*, is then found in particular in Ibn ‘Uṣfūr who, in the section devoted to the *badal*, writes: “the *badal* is in the intention of a resumption of an operator, and when you say

16 That is, with the intention of saying *zayd*.

17 Note that he does not reject the traditional views, and nothing prevents him from contrasting the two structures purely in terms of their inflection: “*yā hādā zaydun* do you not see that the *tanwīn* of *zaydun* indicates that it is not a *badal* and against that you say *yā ’ayyuhā al-raḡulu zaydu* where *zaydu* is a *badal* of ‘*ayy* and for that is indeclinable in *u* without bearing any *tanwīn*?” (*yā hādā zaydun ’a-lā tarā ’anna tanwīn zaydun qad dalla ’alā ’annahu laysa bi-badal wa-’alā hādā taqūlu yā ’ayyuhā al-raḡulu zaydu fa-zaydu [...]* *yakūnu badalan min ’ayyū fa-li-ḍālika kāna mabniyyan ’alā al-ḍamm ḡayr munawwan*, Ibn Barhān al-‘Ukbarī *ŠL* I, 236).

18 This distinction is taken from the Swiss linguist Charles Bally (1865–1947) (cf. Bally 1965) and, for grammar and linguistics of Arabic, from Larcher (cf. especially Larcher 2008 and Larcher 2017).

qāma zaydun 'aḥūka the implicit value is that of *qāma 'aḥūka*” (*al-badal fi niyyat isti'nāf 'āmil fa-'idā qulta “qāma zaydun 'aḥūka” fa-l-taqdīr “qāma 'aḥūka”*, Ibn 'Uṣfūr *Muqarrib* 321). What must be understood here, as elsewhere, is thus that *qāma zaydun 'aḥūka* is equivalent to *qāma zaydun qāma 'aḥūka* (cf. above, Bāqūlī and Ibn al-Faḥḥār).

This element of resumption (*isti'nāf*), linked to that of repetition (*takrīr*), implies the recognition of a pause, exemplified by the existence of “two sentences”, which Ibn al-Dahhān al-Baḡdādī expresses very well when, as before him Bāqūlī, he clearly indicates that *badal* and *'atf bayān* contrast with each other in the feature of repetition, where again the “two sentences” are mentioned:

Know that the *badal* and the element to which it is apposed are implicitly in two sentences, which is not the case of the qualifier and the qualified element (*ṣifa* and *mawṣūf*), nor of the corroborative and the corroborated element, nor of the *'atf al-bayān* and what precedes it. What confirms this to you is that the operator on the second element appears overtly in the words of the Almighty *qāla l-mala'u l-laḍīna -stakbarū min qawmihi li-l-laḍīna -stud'ifū li-man 'āmana minhum* (Q. 7/75) “Said the Council of those of his people who waxed proud to those that were abased, to those of them who believed” (Arberry 1955: 180).¹⁹ The overt expression of the *lām* indicates the correctness of our position. (*i'lam 'anna al-badal wa-l-mubdal minhu fi taqdīr ḡumlatayn wa-laysa al-ṣifa wa-l-mawṣūf wa-l-ta'kīd wa-l-mu'akkad wa-'atf al-bayān wa-mā qablahu ka-dālika wa-yu'akkidu dālika 'indaka 'anna 'iḥār al-'āmil fi al-tānī qad ḡā'a fi qawlihi ta'ālā “qāla l-mala'u l-laḍīna -stakbarū min qawmihi li-l-laḍīna -stud'ifū li-man 'āmana minhum” fa-'iḥār al-lām yadullu 'alā ṣiḥḥat mā dahabnā 'ilayhi*, Ibn al-Dahhān al-Baḡdādī *Ḡurra* II, 817)

He then has a contrastive definition that is very interesting:

Know that the purpose of the appositive is either to [syntactically] complete the antecedent or not. The one that does not complete the first is the element coordinated by a coordinating particle. The one that completes the first is either in the implicit value of two sentences or in that of a single sentence. The one that is in the implicit value of two sentences is the *badal* [...] and the one that is in the implicit value of a single sentence is of two types [...] the first is the *tawkīd* and the second

19 “The chiefs among his people who were puffed up with pride, said unto those who were esteemed weak, *namely* unto those who believed among them” (Sale 1877:124).

is the *ʿatf al-bayān*. (*iʿlam ʿanna al-tābiʿ ʿimmā ʿan yakūna mukammilan li-l-ʿawwal wa-ʿimmā ʿallā yakūna mukamillan lahu fa-l-ladī lā yakūnu mukammilan li-l-ʿawwal huwa al-maʿtūf bi-ḥarf al-ʿatf wa-l-ladī yakūnu mukammilan li-l-ʿawwal huwa ʿimmā ʿan yakūna fi taqdīr ḡumlatayn ʿaw fi taqdīr ḡumla wāḥida fa-l-ladī yakūnu fi taqdīr ḡumlatayn huwa al-badal [...] wa-l-ladī yakūnu fi taqdīr ḡumla wāḥida ʿalā ḍarbayn [...] fa-l-ʿawwal al-tawkīd wa-l-tānī ʿatf al-bayān*, Ibn al-Dahhān al-Baḡdādī *Gurra* II, 854)

We find here, once again through the mention of “two sentences” (*badal*), as opposed to “single sentence” (*ʿatf bayān*), the element of repetition, therefore of pause... This reference to “two sentences” is found later, explicitly in ʿUṣmūnī who contrasts *badal* and *ʿatf bayān* according to eight criteria, the last could not be clearer: “[the *ʿatf al-bayān*] has not the implicit value of another sentence, unlike the *badal*” (*ʿannahu laysa fi al-taqdīr min ḡumla ʿuhrā bi-ḥilāf al-badal*, ʿUṣmūnī *Manhaǧ* II, 414).

This resumption is then linked to the independence of the *badal* from the *mubdal minhu*, unlike the relationship of dependence that exists between the *ʿatf al-bayān* and its *maʿtūf*. On these, I already indicated that they were obviously to be considered as a single noun (*ism wāḥid*, cf. above ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Ġurġānī) and as *muttaṣil* (cf. above Ibn Barhān al-ʿUkbarī). As for the independent relationship, it is apparently Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274) who speaks of it first. Indeed, he writes concerning the *badal* that it is “like an independent element” (*ka-mustaqill*, Ibn Mālik *ŠKŠ* I, 579). Elsewhere, he further specifies that the *badal* is “the independent appositive because of the virtual requirement of the operator” (*al-tābiʿ al-mustaqill bi-muqtaḍā al-ʿāmil taqdīran*, Ibn Mālik *Tashīl* 172), which he says also in his own commentary on this book (cf. Ibn Mālik *ŠT* III, 186–188 for the *ʿatf al-bayān* and III, 189–201 for the *badal*).

It is, however, Ibn ʿAqīl who seems to be the first to link the *maṣdar istiqlāl* to the *badal*, writing about *ʿatf al-bayān* that it is: “the non-derived appositive similar to the qualifier in clarifying its antecedent and in its lack of [syntactic] independence” (*al-tābiʿ al-ġāmid al-mušbih li-l-ṣifa fi ʿiḍāḥ matbūʿihi wa-ʿadam istiqlālihi*, Ibn ʿAqīl *ŠA* II, 57) where he addresses both the aspect of restriction of the extension (through *ʿiḍāḥ*) and where the non-independence that the *ʿatf al-bayān* shares with the qualifier contrasts indeed with the *badal* which, in turn, is conceived as independent.²⁰

Finally, ʿAstarābādī, surprisingly, says he does not understand the difference between the total *badal* and the *ʿatf al-bayān*. This said, he, however, recognizes in the *badal* its *resumptive* quality, though without using the term,

20 A later author holds the same view (cf. Ḥuḍarī *Hāšiya* II, 159).

since he gives two examples going in this direction. The first is taken from the Qurʾān and shows the *badal* intervening after a *fāṣila*, that is to say in the verse following the one in which the *mubdal minhu* is located: *wa-ʾinnaka la-tahdī ʾilā širāṭin mustaqīmīn / širāṭi l-llāhi*, Q. 42/52–53, “And thou, surely thou shalt guide unto a straight path – the path of God” (Arberry 1955: 198).²¹

The second is equally clear: “*marartu bi-qawmin ʿabdi l-llāhi wa-zaydin wa-ḥālidīn* and the nominative is good, that is to say ‘these are ʿAbd Allāh, Zayd and Ḥālid’” (*marartu bi-qawmin ʿabdi l-llāhi wa-zaydin wa-ḥālidīn wa-l-raḡ ǧayyid ʾay hum ʿabdu l-llāhi wa-zaydun wa-ḥālidun*, ʿAstarābādī ŠK II, 397). Thus ʿAstarābādī indicates here that the *badal* can follow the inflection of the *mubdal minhu*, but that it can also be in nominative by implying making a new start, which is neither more nor less than a resumption, which nowadays would be shown by the punctuation, as follows: “I went through a group of men: ʿAbd Allāh, Zayd and Ḥālid” where the colon serves to indicate a (strong) segmentation and therefore a pause.

3 Segmentation vs Juncture

So we see that many medieval Arab grammarians, when it comes to dealing with the *badal*, address the issue of *takrīr* (marginally *takrār* or *tašdīd*), in connection with *istiʿnāf* and *istiqlāl*. The *takrīr* we are talking about is syntactic, non-morphological, and not unknown to Sībawayhi himself, since we find it twice in the *Kitāb* (Derenbourg’s edition in I, 433 l. 11 and II, 152 l. 2, cf. Troupeau 1976: 182). More interestingly, one of the two occurrences of *takrīr* in the *Kitāb* is specifically related to the *badal*:

You say *marartu bi-zaydin ibni ʿamrin* when you do not make of *al-ibn* a qualification but you make of it a *badal* or a *takrīr* like *ʾaǧmaʿīna*. (*wa-taqūlu “marartu bi-zaydin ibni ʿamrin” ʾidā lam taǧʿal “al-ibn” wašfan wa-lākinnaka taǧʿaluhu badalan ʾaw takrīran ka-ʾaǧmaʿīna*, Sībawayhi *Kitāb*(2) II, 152 l. 2 = Sībawayhi *Kitāb* III, 566)

In the same way, it is interesting to note that of the three mentions in the *Kitāb* of the verb *istaʿnafa* in a syntactical meaning (cf. Troupeau 1976: 35), one is once more directly related to our topic. Indeed, at the very place of the single occurrence of the term *ʿatfal-bayān* in his *Kitāb*, Sībawayhi presents something that will, with rare exceptions as we have seen, be forgotten over time, and this element is in fact of suprasegmental nature: it is neither more nor less than the

²¹ “and thou shalt surely direct *them* in to the right way, the way of God” (Sale 1877:397).

taking into account of a pause, marked by the *isti'nāf*. Making the difference between the *'atfal-bayān* and something that is not categorized at this point in the text as *badal*, Sibawayhi writes:

As for what Ru'ba says, it is the fact that he made of *naṣran* a *'atfal-bayān* and he put it in the accusative as if he had said *yā zaydu zaydan*. As to what 'Abū 'Amr says, it is as if he had started the vocative again [i.e. *yā zaydu yā zaydu l-ṭawīlu*]. (*wa-'ammā qawl ru'ba fa-'alā 'annahu ga'ala "naṣran" 'atfal-bayān wa-naṣabahu ka-'annahu 'alā qawlihi "yā zaydun zaydan" wa-'ammā qawl 'abī 'amr fa-ka-'annahu ista'nafa al-nidā', Sibawayhi Kitāb II, 187*)

Nevertheless, the author of the *Kitāb* indicates for one case that it can be a *badal* or a *'atfal-bayān*, which shows that he does not really have the idea of the segmentation by *isti'nāf*... (cf. Sibawayhi *Kitāb II, 191*).²²

This correlation is, however, quite relevant, as Larcher recalls it:

Especially remarkable is the case of “disjunction” called “resumption” (*isti'nāf*), because the second clause is to be understood as a response (*jawāb*) to an implicit question (*su'āl*) suggested by the first, as in the following verse: *qāla lī kayfa 'anta qultu 'alīlū/saharun dā'imun wa-ḥuznun ṭawīlū* (“How are you?” he asked me. ‘Unwell! Permanent insomnia and prolonged melancholy!’ I replied”); *saharun dā'imun wa-ḥuznu ṭawīlū* responds in fact to a question like *mā bāluka 'alīlan* (“What maladies do you have?”) or else *mā sababu 'illatika* (“What is the cause of your malady?”). We see, from these few examples, that if “conjunction” is defined as a *syntactic* coordination, then “disjunction” could be interpreted as a *semantic* coordination, in the sense of Bally (1965): the two disjoint clauses are in the semantic relation of topic to comment and the comment implicitly makes reference to the topic: “He is dead (and, because he is dead,) may Allah take pity on him!”; “(They say that they do nothing but mock, but) it is Allah who mocks them; [I am] sick; (you are going to ask me from what): from permanent insomnia and prolonged melancholy.” (Larcher 2013: 195)

22 *Fa-hādīhi al-'asmā' al-mubhama 'idā fassartahā taṣīru bi-manzila "ay" ka-'annaka 'idā 'aradta 'an tufassrahā la yağuz laka 'an taqifa 'alayhā wa-'innamā qulta "yā hādā dā l-ğumma" li-'anna "dā l-ğumma" lā tūṣafu bihi al-'asmā' al-mubhama 'innamā yakūnu badal 'aw 'atfan 'alā al-ism.*

The term “response” indeed implies that of “discourse’s resumption” and therefore of segmentation. On the contrary, in the case of the *ʿatf al-bayān*, the juncture seems so strong that Talmon notes among the distinctions to be made between *ṣifa* and *ʿatf* (and thus *ʿatf al-bayān*) that the *ṣifa* can follow an implicit *ʿaʿnī* (“I mean”), which is impossible in the case of the *ʿatf* (cf. Talmon 1981: 287, fn. 14).²³

Conclusion

In his *Syntaxe de l’arabe classique*, Pierre Larcher indicates that “the one thing missing element from traditional Arabic grammar is intonation” (Larcher 2017: 97).²⁴ We have just seen that this is true concerning the difference between *ʿatf bayān* and *badal al-kull min al-kull*, where the main element taken into account is of pragmatic nature. However, as I have just shown, the suprasegmental aspect can still be identified, and join a dichotomy which, once we have it in mind, we can no longer leave out of account: the distinction between segmentation and juncture.

If a grammarian and logician like ʿAstarābādī is doubtful about the distinction between *badal al-kull* and *ʿatf bayān*, it is because at the written level, a fortiori at a time when punctuation did not exist, both can only be distinguished orally, and this is the strength of Ibn Barhān al-ʿUkbarī who was the first to go beyond a literary analysis and frankly integrates the rhythm of speech in his reflexion.

But make no mistake, in the perspective of the Arabic grammatical tradition, as elsewhere, this suprasegmental criterion is in fact conditioned by the semantic and pragmatic criterion and is therefore secondary to it: as for the *badal*, it is because there is a referential uniqueness which makes the *tābiʿ* the primary element (semantic and pragmatic criterion) that there is *takrīr*, therefore *istiʿnāf*, that is to say pause and therefore segmentation (suprasegmental criterion); as for the *ʿatf al-bayān*, it is because there is a referential multiplicity (semantic and pragmatic criterion) that *matbūʿ* and *tābiʿ* are considered as a single noun (*ism wāḥid*) and as linked (*muttaṣil*) and that therefore no pause is made possible between the two, indicating then a juncture (suprasegmental criterion). This second criterion would, therefore, come (the addressee ignoring for example whether what is referred to is unique or multiple) to highlight objectively the semantic and pragmatic criterion which remains only subjective.

²³ He refers to Sībawayhi *Kitāb(2)* I, 265 l. 5 where nevertheless the verb *ʿaʿnī* is not present.

²⁴ “L’intonation est la grande absente de la grammaire arabe traditionnelle”.

Without giving into precursorism, we still have to note that the description made by these medieval Arab grammarians can indeed match what contemporary linguists of French²⁵ say when they distinguish between close apposition (*apposition liée*) and loose apposition (*apposition détachée*). Indeed, in French grammar, among expansions of the noun (also called its modifiers) including the attributive adjective, the construct state, etc., Riegel et al. indicate that they “have with the noun two types of relationships” (Riegel et al. 2004: 179,²⁶ also cf. 150) depending on whether these modifiers do restrict or not the extension of the noun. The first category includes the attributive adjective and among the second ones, which they generically call appositives “because non-restrictive modifiers are often separated from the rest of the utterance by intonation or by a pause, and in standard writing by a comma” (Riegel et al. 2004: 150).²⁷ These modifiers are then said to be “in detached position” (*en position détachée*, cf. Neveu 1998 and Caddéo 2000), a position that is “manifested in writing by the frame between two commas and orally by pauses (and sometimes by a ‘bracketed’ melody)” (Riegel et al. 2004: 190).²⁸ In the second category, the authors note that the appositive and its antecedent are in a relationship of referential uniqueness, which they illustrate with the example *Paris, la capitale de la France*, where “it is undeniable that the two defined expressions refer to the same reality” (Riegel et al. 2004: 190²⁹).³⁰

25 Being French, the author of these lines naturally refers to French grammar and linguistics.

26 “entretiennent avec le nom deux types de relations”.

27 “parce que les modificateurs non restrictifs sont souvent séparés du reste de l'énoncé par l'intonation ou par une pause, et dans l'écrit standard par une virgule”.

28 “matérialisée à l'écrit par l'encadrement entre deux virgules et à l'oral par des pauses (et parfois par une mélodie “parenthétique”)). We can add here an example from Yusuf Idris in his short story *Rihla* where he writes *kay 'uḥissa 'annī [...] wa-'annī 'aš'uru bi-l-'amān, 'aḥlā wa-'a'dab wa-'amta' 'amān* “so that I feel [...] that I know the peace, the most beautiful, pleasant and delightful peace”. Here, the presence of a comma is the manifestation in the written expression of the pause between the *mubdal minhu* and the *badal*.

29 “il est indéniable que les deux expressions définies désignent la même réalité”.

30 Paradigmatically, it is a matter of distinguishing 1) *at the G20 summit, President Obama and President Putin met...* where “President”, in an international context, is a multiple referent from 2) *during his trip to the Lot (French area), the President, Macron, declared...* where “President”, in a national context, is a unique referent. It could also explain what Mejdell points out when dealing with the pronunciation of demonstratives without juncture. According to her, pronunciations like *hāḍihi 'al-madīna*, that is to say without the elision of “the *hamzat al-waṣl* of the article on the head noun following” (Mejdell 2006:212–213), would reflect “the search for the right expression, *le bon mot* to be the head noun” (Mejdell 2006:221). This said, this nonjuncture could also make of the head noun a *badal*, then to be read as *this, the town* for example. I wish here to warmly thank Michael G. Carter for this reference as well as for his reading of this article, drastically approving its English, and also to our colleague, Emilie Coulon.

Even if, in French (or other languages like English or Swedish for example), things are not so clear-cut (cf. Rioul 1983, Lindqvist 2013 and Lindqvist 2015), we will recognize in the non-restrictive modifiers the description of the Arabic *badal al-kull min al-kull*, not only because of its explicit description by the medieval grammarians who make it an element in a relationship of referential uniqueness with the term to which it is apposed, but also because of their use of *takrīr* and *isti'nāf* which effectively imply their separation from the term to which they are apposed through starting again and the associated pause.

We will then recognize in the first category, that of restrictive modifiers, those features which *'atf al-bayān* shares with the *ṣifa*, that is to say the adjective, namely its function of restricting the extension of the noun, the *'atf al-bayān* being the most often described as *'aḥaṣṣ min al-'awwal*, as *'ašhar al-ismayn* (cf. Ğurġānī ŠĜ 277, Zamaḥṣarī 'Unmūdaġ 20), and *'a'raf minhu* (cf. Ğurġānī ŠĜ 277), but which also shares with the *ṣifa* the feature of not being orally separated from the term to which it is apposed.

In grammatical traditions like the French one for instance, this recognition of the double status of the apposition as either close or loose only manifests itself during 16th century (cf. Neveu 1998: 20). So here, again without giving in to precursorism, we have, in Arabic grammar, the early trace of a distinction between these two types of apposition, according to the same semantic and pragmatic criteria and with therefore the same suprasegmental consequences.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- 'Astarābādī, ŠK = Rađī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-'Astarābādī, *Šarḥ Kāfiyat Ibn al-Ḥāġib*. Ed. by 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 5 vol., 1419/1998.
- Baṭalyawsī, *Rasā'il* = 'Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Sīd al-Baṭalyawsī, *Rasā'il fi al-luġa*. Ed. by Walīd Muḥammad al-Sarāqabī. Al-Riyāq: Markaz al-Malik Fayṣal li-l-buḥūṭ wa-l-dirāsāt al-'islāmiyya, 1428/2007.
- Ġalāyīnī, *Ġāmi'* = Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad Salīm al-Ġalāyīnī, *Ġāmi' al-durūs al-'arabiyya*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Mun'im Ḥalīl 'Ibrāhīm. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1421/2000.
- Ġāmi' al-'ulūm, *Kitāb šarḥ al-Luma' fi al-naḥw* = 'Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī al-'Ašfahānī al-Bāqūlī al-ma'rūf bi-Ġāmi' al-'ulūm, *Kitāb šarḥ al-Luma' fi al-naḥw*. Ed. by Muḥammad Ḥalīl Murād al-Ḥarbī. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1428/2007.

- Ğurğānī, *MŠī* = 'Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Ğurğānī, *Kitāb al-Muqtaṣid fī šarḥ al-Īdāḥ*. Ed. by Kāzim Baḥr al-Marğān. Bağdād: Manšūrāt wizārat al-ṭaqāfa wa-l-'ilām, 2 vol., 1402/1982.
- Ğurğānī, *ŠĠ* = 'Abū Bakr 'Abd al-Qāhir b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Ğurğānī, *Šarḥ al-Ğumal fī al-naḥw*. Ed. by Ḥalil 'Abd al-Qādir 'Īsā. Bayrūt & 'Ammān: Dār Ibn Ḥazm & al-Dār al-'uṭmāniyya, 10th ed., 1432/2011.
- Ḥuḍarī, *Hāšiya* = Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā al-Ḥuḍarī, *Hāšiyat al-Ḥuḍarī 'alā šarḥ Ibn 'Aqil 'alā 'Alfyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by Turkī Farḥān al-Muṣṭafā. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 5th ed., 2 vol., 1434/2013.
- Ibn al-Dahhān al-Bağdādī, *Ğurra* = 'Abū Muḥammad Sa'īd b. al-Mubārak b. 'Alī al-'Anṣārī al-ma'rūf bi-Ibn al-Dahhān al-Bağdādī, *al-Ğurra fī šarḥ al-Luma' min 'awwal bāb 'inna wa-'aḥawātihā 'ilā 'āḥir bāb al-'atf*. Ed. by Farīd 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Zāmil al-Sulaym. Al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-tadmuriyya, 2 vol., 2011.
- Ibn al-Dahhān al-Bağdādī, *Šarḥ* = 'Abū Muḥammad Sa'īd b. al-Mubārak b. 'Alī al-'Anṣārī al-ma'rūf bi-Ibn al-Dahhān al-Bağdādī, *Šarḥ al-durūs fī al-naḥw*. Ed. by 'Ibrāhīm Muḥammad 'Aḥmad al-'Idkāwī. Al-Qāhira: Maṭba'at al-'amāna, 1411/1991.
- Ibn al-Faḥḥār, *ŠĠ* = 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. 'Aḥmad Ibn al-Faḥḥār, *Šarḥ al-Ğumal*. Ed. by Raw'a Muḥammad Nāğī. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2 vol., 1434/2013.
- Ibn al-Faḥḥār, *ŠĠ(2)* = 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. 'Aḥmad Ibn al-Faḥḥār, *Šarḥ al-Ğumal*. Ed. by Ḥammād b. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Ṭamālī. s.l.: s.n., 3 vol., 1410/1989.
- Ibn al-Ḥabbāz, *Tawğīḥ* = Šams al-Dīn 'Abū al-'Abbās 'Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Aḥmad al-ma'rūf bi-Ibn al-Ḥabbāz al-'Irbilī al-Mawṣilī al-Naḥwī al-Ḍarīr, *Tawğīḥ al-Luma'*. Ed. by Fāyiz Zakī Muḥammad Diyāb. Al-Qāhira: Dār al-salām, 2nd ed., 1428/2007.
- Ibn al-Ḥāğīb, *Īdāḥ* = Ğamāl al-Dīn 'Abū 'Amr 'Uṭmān b. 'Umar b. 'Abī Bakr b. Yūnus Ibn al-Ḥāğīb al-Miṣrī al-Dimašqī al-Mālikī, *al-Īdāḥ fī šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*. Ed. by 'Ibrāhīm Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh. Dimašq: Dār Sa'd al-Dīn, 3rd ed., 1431/2010.
- Ibn al-Sarrāğ, *Uṣūl* = 'Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Sarī b. Sahl Ibn al-Sarrāğ al-Bağdādī, *al-'Uṣūl fī al-naḥw*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Uṭmān. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat al-ṭaqāfa al-dīniyya, 2 vol., 1430/2009.
- Ibn 'Aqīl, *ŠA* = Bahā' al-Dīn 'Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Qurašī al-Hāšimī al-'Aqīlī al-Hamdānī al-Miṣrī Ibn 'Aqīl, *Šarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā 'Alfyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 7th ed., 2 vol., 1431/2010.
- Ibn Barhān al-'Ukbarī, *ŠL* = 'Abū al-Qāsim 'Abd al-Wāḥid b. 'Alī al-'Asadī Ibn Barhān al-'Ukbarī, *Šarḥ al-Luma'*. Ed. by Fā'iz Fāris. Al-Kuwayt: al-Silsila al-turāṭiyya, 2 vol., 1404/1984.
- Ibn Ğinnī, *Luma'* = 'Abū al-Faḥḥ 'Uṭmān b. Ğinnī al-Mawṣilī, *al-Luma' fī al-'arabiyya*. Ed. by Ḥāmid al-Mu'min. Bayrūt: 'Ālam al-kutub & Maktabat al-nahḍa al-'arabiyya, 2nd ed., 1405/1985.

- Ibn Mālik, *ŠKŠ* = Ğamāl al-Dīn 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭā'ī al-Ġayyānī al-'Andalusī Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya suivi de al-Kāfiya al-šāfiya*. Ed. by 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwaḍ & 'Ādil 'Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawġūd. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2nd ed., 2 vol., 1431/2010.
- Ibn Mālik, *ŠT* = Ğamāl al-Dīn 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭā'ī al-Ġayyānī al-'Andalusī Ibn Mālik, *Šarḥ al-Tashīl: Tashīl al-fawā'id wa-takmil al-maqāšid*. Ed. by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā & Ṭariq Fathī al-Sayyid. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2nd ed., 3 vol., 1430/2009.
- Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl* = Ğamāl al-Dīn 'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭā'ī al-Ġayyānī al-'Andalusī Ibn Mālik, *Tashīl al-fawā'id wa-takmil al-maqāšid*. Ed. by Muḥammad Kāmil Barakāt. s.l.: Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī, 1386/1967.
- Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Muqarrib* = 'Alī b. al-Mu'min b. Muḥammad 'Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ḥaḍramī al-'Iṣbīlī Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *al-Muqarrib wa-ma'ahu Muṭul al-Muqarrib*. Ed. by 'Ādil 'Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawġūd & 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwaḍ. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1418/1998.
- Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *ŠĠ* = 'Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. al-Mu'min b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaḍramī al-'Iṣbīlī Ibn 'Uṣfūr, *Šarḥ Ğumal al-Zaġġāġī*. Ed. by Fawwāz al-Ša'ār & 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 3 vol., 1419/1998.
- Ibn Ya'īš, *ŠM* = Muwaffaq al-Dīn 'Abū al-Baqā' Ya'īš b. 'Alī b. Ya'īš b. 'Abī al-Sarāyā Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-'Asadī al-Ḥalabī Ibn Ya'īš, *Šarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal li-l-Zamahšari*. Ed. by 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 2nd ed. 6 vol., 1432/2011.
- Mubarrad, *Muqtaḍab* = 'Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Yazid b. 'Abd al-'Akbar al-Ṭumālī al-'Azdī al-Mubarrad, *al-Muqtaḍab*. Ed. by Ḥasan Ḥamad & 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 5 parts in 3 vol., 1420/1999.
- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb* = 'Abū Bišr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*. Ed. by 'Imīl Badī' Ya'qūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 5 vol., 1420/1999.
- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb(2)* = 'Abū Bišr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar Sībawayhi, *Le livre de Sībawaihi. Traité de grammaire arabe par Siboûya, dit Sībawaihi*. Ed. by Hartwig Derenbourg. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 2 vol., 1881-1889, reprint Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2 vol., 1970.
- Sībawayhi, *Kitāb(3)* = 'Abū Bišr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qunbur Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*. Ed. by 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn. Al-Qāhira: Maktabat al-ḥānġī, 3rd ed., 5 vol., 1408/1988.
- Širbīnī, *Nūr* = Šams al-Dīn al-Ḥaṭīb Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad al-Širbīnī, *Nūr al-saġġyya fi ḥall 'alfāz al-'Aġurrūmiyya*. Ed. by Sayyid Šaltūt al-Šāfi'ī. Ġadda: Dār al-minḥāġ, 1429/2008.
- Suyūṭī, *Ašbāh* = Ğalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. Sābiq al-Dīn Ḥaḍr al-Ḥuḍayrī al-Šāfi'ī al-'Asyūṭī al-mašhūr bi-l-Suyūṭī, *al-'Ašbāh wa-l-naẓā'ir fi al-naḥw*. Ed. by 'Abd al-'Āl Sālim Mukarram. Bayrūt: Mu'assasat al-risāla, 9 vol., 1407/1987.

- ʿUšmūnī, *Manhağ* = Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā al-ʿUšmūnī, *Šarḥ al-ʿUšmūnī ʿalā ʿAlfiyyat Ibn Mālik al-musammā Manhağ al-sālik ʿilā ʿAlfiyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Bayrūt: Dār al-kitāb al-ʿarabī, 3 vol., 1375/1955.
- Zamaḥṣarī, *Mufaṣṣal* = Ğār Allāh ʿAbū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-Ḥawārizmī al-Zamaḥṣarī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī ṣanʿat al-ʿrāb*. Ed. by ʿImīl Badī Yaʿqūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 1420/1999.
- Zamaḥṣarī, *ʿUnmūdağ* = Ğār Allāh ʿAbū al-Qāsim Maḥmūd b. ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-Ḥawārizmī al-Zamaḥṣarī, *al-ʿUnmūdağ fī al-naḥw*. Ed. by Sāmī b. Muḥammad al-Mansūr. s.l.: s.n., 1420/1999.

Secondary Sources

- Arberry, Arthur John. 1955. *The Koran Interpreted*. London & New York: George Allen & Unwin LTD & The Macmillan Company.
- Bally, Charles. 1965 [1944]. *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*. Berne: A. Francke. 4th ed [1st edition 1932, 2nd edition Berne: Francke].
- Caddéo, Sandrine. 2000. “L’aposition : analyse syntaxique de l’aposition nominale détachée dans divers registres de la langue parlée et de l’écrit en français contemporain”. PhD dissertation. Université de Provence (Aix-Marseille I).
- Carter, Michael G. 2016. *Sībawayhi’s Principles. Arabic Grammar and Law in Early Islamic Thought*. Atlanta, G.: Lockwood Press.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1982. *The Rules of Sociological Method*, edited with an Introduction by Steven Lukes, translated by W. D. Halls. New York: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1988 [1894/1895²]. *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*. Paris: Flammarion, coll. “Champs”.
- Esseesy, Mohsen. 2006. “Apposition”. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, I, ed. by Kees Versteegh et al., 123–126. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Goguyer, Antonin. 1887. *La pluie de rosée. Étanchement de la soif. Traité de flexion et de syntaxe par Ibnu Hijām*. Leiden: Brill.
- Howell, Mortimer Sloper. 1880-1911. *A Grammar of the Classical Arabic Language. Translated and compiled from the works of the most approved native or naturalized authorities*. Allahabad: s.n., 2 vol.
- Kasher, Almog. 2014. “The Term and Concept of *Isti’nāf* in al-Farrā’s Qur’ānic Commentary and the Early Development of Arabic Grammatical Tradition”. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 51. 341–352.
- Kinberg, Naphtali. 1996. *A Lexicon of al-Farrā’s Terminology in his Qur’ān Commentary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, coll. “Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1 The Near and Middle East” 23.
- Larcher, Pierre. 2008. “Les « complexes de phrases » de l’arabe classique”. *Kervan. Rivista internazionale di studii afroasiatici* 6. 29–45.

- Larcher, Pierre. 2013. "Arabic Linguistic Tradition II. Pragmatics". *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*, ed. by Jonathan Owens, 185–212. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larcher, Pierre. 2017. *Syntaxe de l'arabe classique*. Aix-en-Provence: Presses Universitaires de Provence.
- Larcher, Pierre. 2021. "Une rime « cachée » dans Cor. 23, 12-14? Histoire du texte et histoire de la langue". *Arabica* 67/1. 36–50.
- Lindqvist, Karin. 2013. "Apposition détachée ou liée? Étude contrastive français-suédois sur des combinaisons de Npr et de Nc". *Revue Romane. Langue et littérature* 48/2. 254–283.
- Lindqvist, Karin. 2015. "Sur le rôle du nom commun dans le choix entre les appositions des trois types « le président Obama », « Obama, le président » et « le président, Obama » en français et en suédois". *Festival Romanistica*, ed. by Gunnel Engwall & Lars Fant, 273–290. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press.
- Mejdell, Gunvor. 2006. *Mixed Styles in Spoken Arabic in Egypt. Somewhere between order and chaos*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, coll. "Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics" 48.
- Neveu, Franck. 1998. *Études sur l'apposition: Aspects du détachement nominale et adjectival en français contemporain, dans un corpus de textes de J.-P. Sartre*. Paris: Honoré Champion, coll. "Grammaire et Linguistique".
- Owens, Jonathan. 1990. *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and standardization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pouillon, Jean. 1987. "L'œuvre de Claude Lévi-Strauss". *Race et histoire*, 87–127. Paris: Gallimard, coll. "Folio/Essais", réédition Unesco 1952.
- Riegel, Martin et al. 2004 [1994]. *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: P.U.F., coll. "Quadrige", 3rd ed.
- Rioul, René. 1983. "Les appositions dans la grammaire française". *L'information grammaticale* 18. 21–29.
- Sale, George. 1877. *The Koran: or, Alcoran of Mohammed with explanatory notes. Various readings from Savary's version of the Koran; and a preliminary discourse on the religion and political condition of the Arabs before the days of Mohammed*. Londres: William Tegg and Co.
- Sartori, Manuel. 2010. "Les « six noms » : grammaire arabe et pudibonderie". *Linguistique arabe*, ed. by Henda Dhaoui and Antonella Ghersetti. *Synergies Monde arabe* 7. 35–45.
- Sartori, Manuel. 2018a. "La différence entre *badal* et *ʿatf al-bayān*. Mutisme et surdité des grammaires de l'arabe?". *La lengua árabe a través de la historia. Perspectivas diacrónicas*, ed. by Ignacio Ferrando. *Al-Qanṭara* 39/2. 581–620.
- Sartori, Manuel. 2018b. "La flexion désinentielle et l'arabe. État de la question et discussion d'arguments récents". *Case and Mood Endings in Semitic Languages – Myth or Reality? Désinences casuelles et modales dans les langues sémitiques – mythe*

- ou réalité ?*, ed. by Lutz Edzard *et al.*, 68–94. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, coll. “Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes” 113.
- Talmon, Rafael. 1981. “ʿAtf: An inquiry into the History of a Syntactic Category”. *Arabica* 28/2-3. 278–292.
- Troupeau, Gérard. 1976. *Lexique-index du Kitāb de Sībawayhi*. Paris: Klincksieck, coll. “Études arabes et islamiques”.
- Vernier, Donat S.J. 1891. *Grammaire arabe composée d'après les sources primitives*. Beyrouth: Imprimerie catholique, 2 vol.
- Wehr, Hans. 1994 [1979]. *Arabic-English Dictionary*. Urbana, Illinois: Spoken Language Services. J. Milton Cowan. 4e éd., édition revue et augmentée.
- Wright, William. 1996 [1896-1898 [1859-1862]]. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Translated from the German of Caspari and edited with numerous additions and corrections. Third edition revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje with a preface and addenda et corrigenda by Pierre Cachia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2 vol., reprint Librairie du Liban.
- Yaʿqūb, ʿImīl Badīʿ. 2006. *Mawsūʿat ʿulūm al-luġa al-ʿarabiyya*. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya, 10 vol.