On the morphology of the word *tawriya* according to al-Ṣafadī

(d. 764/1363):

Between Bašrans and Kūfans

Luca Rizzo

The starting-point for this article is the statement made by al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363) that the Arabic word *tawriya* has the original form (*ašl*) *wawriya*, corresponding to the pattern (*wazn*) *tafiša*, in which the first radical *wāw* has been replaced by the segment */t/. I aim to shed light on this derivation postulated by al-Ṣafadī by investigating the major sources of grammatical, morphological, and etymological studies which were then available to him. I analyse the sources chronologically to arrive at a better understanding of developments in morphology in the period from the first authors to al-Ṣafadī’s contemporaries. I show that al-Ṣafadī was influenced by the disquisitions of the two main schools of Arabic thought on grammar: those of Bašra and Kūfa. He was influenced in particular regarding the question of how to attribute the patterns to some words like *tawrāt*, with the Bašran grammarians positing that it is *fawšala*, and those belonging to the Kūfa school maintaining that it is according to the pattern *tafiša*. Moreover, and precisely because some scholars assume that *tawriya* and *tawrāt* have a common etymology, al-Ṣafadī postulates that, besides having the same root, they also share the same original form, meaning that both words underwent the same phonological and morphological mutations.
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1. Introduction

My analysis here is part of a broader project that investigates a figure of speech that underwent its greatest development in the Arabic literature of the Ayyubid and Mamluk eras: *tawriya* (double entendre). *Tawriya* consists in the use of a homonymous/polysemic word expressing at least two meanings, only one of which is intended by the speaker. The importance of this figure in pre-modern literature is shown by the many texts on poetics and stylistics that discuss in more or less detail the theoretical principles on which this figure is based, and that collect those loci probantes that illustrate
the various categories and subdivisions of which this rhetorical device is composed. One of the most important such texts is *Faḍḍ al-ḥiṭām ʿan al-tawriya wa-l-istiḥḍām* by Ḥalil b. Aybak al-Šafādi (d. 764/1363), which is a treatise devoted entirely to this figure. A classic example of treatise-cum-anthology,¹ the text consists of an introduction, two premises (*muqaddima*),² a supplement (*tatimma*), and a conclusion (*natiğa*) where al-Šafādi gathers together his choice of poems. The treatise has been studied by Bonebakker (1966), who was the first scholar to present the contents of al-Šafādi’s work, to place the work within the Arabic literary landscape, and to describe how al-Šafādi’s predecessors introduced the notion of *tawriya*, and how his successors then developed the notion further.

The main interest of scholars in the study of *tawriya* has focused on the one hand on how *tawriya* developed over time to become an integral part of *ʿilm al-bādiʿ* (figures of speech) and therefore of canonical tripartite Arabic eloquence (*ʿilm al-balāğa*),³ and on the other on how its diffusion in literature mirrors an evolution in literary sentiment, which itself reflects social and political changes. However, I am not concerned with these issues here, and refer to the studies already available, in particular Bonebakker (1966; 2012), and Rizzo (2018; forthcoming). I am mainly concerned instead with the implications of the few lines in al-Šafādi’s treatise that introduce his first premise (*muqaddima*).

Here, al-Šafādi approaches the question of the morphology (*taṣrīf*) and derivation (*ištiqāq*) of the word *tawriya*, arguing that its original form was *wawriya*, with *tawriya* being the result of changes at the morphological level. When I first read this, I wondered why al-Šafādi had undertaken such an analysis, and could not understand his argument. It is therefore worth spending some effort to understand al-Šafādi’s view. I will do so by studying the relevant sources on morphology to clarify what may seem to an Arabist a gross error, since the word *tawriya* is nothing but the *nomen verbi* of the augmented form

---

¹ On anthologies in the Mamluk era, their specificity as a genre, the characteristics of the different types of anthologies, and a classification of the main authors and works, see Bauer (2003; 2007a). Obviously, al-Šafādi is not the only author who discussed *tawriya* in detail. There are many authors who contributed in different ways to the theoretical standardisation of this figure. For a list and analysis of the sources, see Bonebakker (1966), Rizzo (2018; forthcoming).

² *Muqaddima* is not meant here as an introduction to a work. Rather, it should be understood as a premise to a conclusion, as in a logical syllogism. This is explained because the structure of the work is of a treatise-cum-anthology, where the two premises and the supplement are the theoretical background of which the final conclusion, i.e. the anthology of poetry, is the practical result, and through which those poems can be understood and appreciated.

³ *ʿilm al-balāğa* is often translated as ‘rhetoric.’ Although not false in principle, this translation can nevertheless lead to a terminological confusion with the Greek-Latin rhetorical art, an art that will not be received within the balāğa, but will enter the Arabic tradition by the name of ḥatāba; see Larcher (2014). It should be emphasised that balāğa in its tripartite canonical form is essentially a pragmatic discipline in which the communication needs and the techniques with which to express them are linked to and dependent on the purpose of the speaker and the consequent adaptation to the conditions of the context of enunciation. See Ghersetti (1998), Bauer (2007b), Larcher (2009; 2013).
faʿala—yufaʿilu—tafʿil applied to the triliteral root w r y, and therefore to the doubly weak verb warrā—yuwarri—tawриya, where the nomen verbi assumes the pattern taʿīla, and not taʿīl, precisely because it is a third-weak-consonant verb, like, for example, rabbā—yurabbi—tarbiya. I do not want to see this as a simple oversight on al-Ṣafādi’s part, and nor to accuse him of being ignorant of the basic rules of verbal morphology, and therefore propose to give chronological order to and investigate the sources available to al-Ṣafādi. Doing so will demonstrate how he drew his arguments from the two Arabic grammatical traditions, the Kūfān and the Başrān,4 and combined them into a whole – albeit one that is not entirely convincing.

2. Al-Ṣafādi and his sources

Al-Ṣafādi (Faḍḍ 63) opens the first muqaddima by analysing the derivational morphology and the etymology of the word tawriya. Bonebakker (1966) does not address the first of these, i.e. the morphology and substitution of segments that al-Ṣafādi argues affects the word tawriya. Specifically,

4 When speaking of the grammatical schools of Başra and Kūfa, one refers to the two traditions of grammatical studies that characterised the development of Arabic grammatical theory especially after Sibawayh’s Kitāb. The source par excellence regarding the contrast between the two schools is undoubtedly Ibn al-Anbārī’s (d. 577/1181) al-Inṣāf fi masāʾil al-ḥilāf, a work that lists 121 grammatical and syntactic issues where the contrast between the two schools is most evident, and that clarifies the arguments made by grammarians in each tradition. If we wanted to summarise the essential traits that differentiate these two schools and their different methodologies, we could resort to the famous dichotomy qiyās vs. samāʿ. On the one hand, the Başrān school is seen as deriving general laws from particular cases based on analogical reasoning (qiyās), while on the other the Kūfān school is seen as favouring the empirical datum, the datum collected by informants (samāʿ), which becomes a rule by virtue of its own attested use, even if it represents an anomalous case (ṣāḏd).

To this simplified view of the two schools, Carter (1999) replies that they were distinguished in terms of induction (istiq̱āṣ), the concept underlying both approaches. This convincing hypothesis is based on the fact that analogical reasoning, the foundation of the Başrān school, is applied to the linguistic material collected, to the living language of the informants. However, if the act of collecting new data cannot be stopped, with even anomalous cases becoming part of the basis on which to apply the induction, then the very hold of analogical reasoning as a method for deriving general rules from particular cases fails, since special cases can always be admitted, at least according to the Kūfān view. This is why, Carter continues, closing the admissible corpus was the only way to base a grammatical theory on a certain and immutable set of data from which applicable rules could be derived inductively.

On the other hand, Bernards (1997: 93-98) argues that there was a real methodological distinction between the two schools only at the turn of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, and that belonging to a school should be seen more in terms of the social aspect of geographical origin and of academic lineage, above all for the concept of transmitted authority and the weight that it has in justifying certain theoretical constructs.

al-Ṣafadi maintains that the pattern of the word tawriya is ta[fa]ila, where we can see a mutation of the first segment of the pattern: the original form is not tawriya but *wawriya, a substitution comparable to the words *wawlaḏ > tawlaḏ, *wurāṯ > turāṯ, and *wawsiyā > tawsīya. Al-Ṣafadi does not comment on or explain his argument, which makes us reflect on the morphological change in a word that we would all have classified as a maṣdar issued from the second augmented form fāʿala. Let us proceed in order, starting first of all with al-Ṣafadi’s statement:

Know that the original form (aṣl) of tawriya is *wawriya, since the first wāw has been substituted with tāʾ. This phenomenon is frequent in the language of the Arabs, e.g. they said tawlaḏ [instead of] *wawlaḏ, turāṯ, whose original form is *wurāṯ, and tawsīya, whose original form is *wawsiyā, for the radical (mādā) of the first is w l ġ, of the second w r t, and of the third w ṣ y. Its pattern (wazn) is ta[fa]ila like tabsīra, takrima, and taḍkira. (al-Ṣafadi, Faḍḍ 63)

No other scholar before al-Ṣafadi had argued that *wawriya was the original form of the word tawriya. To understand al-Ṣafadi’s theory better, we should consider the two pillars on which it is based. First, the segment /t/ is a substitution for the first radical letter of the word: wāw; second, the pattern of the word is ta[fa]ila. The first is dubious to an Arabist ear, and seems to contradict the second, which, if true, would invalidate the first. To understand better what this morphological change is and how it applies to particular words with a weak letter as first and last radical letter, we should provide a brief overview of the phenomenon of ibdāl al-ḥurāf (letter substitution).⁶

Sibawayhi (d. ca. 180/769) was the first grammarian to mention the ibdāl or bada as a morphological phenomenon involving the substitution of a segment in given words, writing the following in his Kitāb:

Sometimes, they substituted the wāw with tāʾ when the first is vowelled ‘u’ in the way I have already described, for the letter tāʾ is one of the letters of augmentation (ḥurāf al-ziyāda), and the substitution is like that of hamza. In this case, the substitution with tāʾ is not a general rule (laysa bi-muṭṭarid); therefore, they say: turāṯ, being derived from waritā, 

---

⁶ Since the words that al-Ṣafadi uses to exemplify substitution and mutation are quoted only to show a morphological change and not for their meanings, I do not translate them.

⁷ This is the case of ibdāl called grammatical ibdāl; on this, see El Berkawi (1981: 27–48), Bohas and Guillaume (1984: 223–267), Hämeen-Anttila (2007). Ibn al-Sikkit (d. 244/858) devoted a whole work to the issues of qalb and ibdāl, which, however, is less informative for this investigation than the other sources I discuss (Qalb 62–63). On the other hand, the lexical ibdāl “refers to phonologically and semantically related doublets, triplets, or longer series in the lexicon” (Hämeen-Anttila 2007: 280). See also Hämeen-Anttila (1993).
as well as anā is derived from wanaytu, for the woman has been made indolent, as well as ahad is derived from wāḥid, aṣām from wāṣam whereas they said aṣām in that way, for they substituted the initial wāw vowelled ‘u’ or ‘i’ with hamza. Likewise, al-tuḥama, for it is derived from al-waḥama; al-tuka’a, for it is derived from tawakka’tu; al-tuklān, for it is derived from tawakkaltu; and al-tuḡāh, for it is derived from wāḡahtu. [...] Sometimes, when two wāws have met, they substituted [one of them] with tāʾ, as they did with tāʾ in the above-mentioned examples. This substitution is not a general rule and it is not as frequent as when the wāw is vowelled ‘u’, for the wāw is vowelled ‘a.’ It is compared, thus, with the wāw in waḥad. On the other hand, it is not as frequent, and it could have been substituted anyway despite its rare occurrence as is the case with tawlāq, about which al-Ḥajjālīl d. ca. 160-175/776-791] affirmed that [its pattern] is faw’al and they substituted the wāw with tāʾ. He stated that faw’al is more suitable than taf’al, since taf’al as a noun hardly ever occurs in the language, while faw’al is frequent. Among them, someone says dawlaq meaning tawlāq, which means the place where you enter. [...] You say taw’ida and yaw’id in forming the pattern taf’ila and yaf’il from wa’a’dtu, when they are nouns and not a verb, as you say maw’dī and mawrika. Both yāʾ and tāʾ are in the place of this mīm, and the wāw did not disappear as it did in the verb. It is also not suppressed in maw’id because in it there is no cause [for its suppression] as there is in ya’ida. This is due to the fact that it is a noun, and their saying tawdiya, tawsī’a, and tawṣiyya demonstrates to you that the wāw remains unchanged. (Sibawayhi, Kitāb 2: 392-394)

In this extract, Sibawayhi is highlighting the fact that substituting the first radical letter wāw is not a general rule (gayr bi-muṭṭarīd), and it is usually applied when wāw is vowelled ‘u,’ whilst it is less frequent when wāw is vowelled ‘a,’ hamza being preferred in this case. Moreover, when the pattern applied to a root with a weak first radical letter is a pattern expressing a noun, the semivowel wāw is not suppressed, as it is, in contrast, in the conjugation of the verb muḍārī.

Al-Ṣirāfī’s (d. 368/979) Šarḥ Kitāb Sibawayhi explains Sibawayhi’s comments regarding the fact that morphological changes differ depending on the type of word – be it a noun or a verb:

About what he said on the pattern taf’ila: taw’ida and taw’id, he meant the difference between taw’id and taw’ida as two nouns or two verbs. For, when you conjugate the verb from the root al-wa’d according to the patterns taf’il and yaf’il, you say ta’id and ya’id, as per the case which we have explained about the fall of this wāw in the verb and its being restored. There [you see] the whole original form, in the falling of wāw in the verb ta’id, that the original form of ya’id is *yaw’id. The wāw is between a yāʾ and a vowel ‘i’ this is heavy (taqīl) and the verb is also heavy, making the wāw fall. Then, the rest follows the yāʾ: ta’idu, ya’idu, and a’idu.

When you form a noun, the noun is lighter (ahaff) than the verb, and the presence of a wāw in a noun between a yāʾ and a vowel ‘i’ is lighter than its presence between them in a verb.
Their words tawsiʿa and tawdiya witness the difference between the noun and the verb; if it were in a verb, you would have said tasiʿu and tadī. (al-Sirāfī, Ṣaḥḥ 5: 225)

Al-Sirāfī’s commentary on Sibawayhi’s words explains why the first radical letter wāw falls in the muḍārī paradigm of verbs, contrasting the conjugation of verbs with that of nouns. The verb is ṭaqqīl (heavy), as is the consonant yāʾ and the vowel ‘ī’ between which the wāw is found. This is why the wāw falls in the third-person singular, with mutation occurring in the other persons, too: *yawʾid > yaʾīd, *tawʾid > taʾīd, *awʾid > aʾīd (cf. al-Mubarrad, Muqṭādaḍ 1:126). This is not applicable if the pattern is applied to express a noun instead of a verb, since the noun is lighter (aḥaff) than the verb; and, even if the letter immediately after the wāw is vowelled ‘i,’ it does not entail the fall of the semivowel, e.g. w s ʿ > tawsiʿa (tafʿila). If we apply this reasoning to the word tawriya, then the segment /t/ is not a substitution for a first radical wāw, which, in the case of a verb, would have fallen; but tawriya being a noun, it is spelled out in the word, for /t/ is but a segment of the pattern, added to the radical letters to derive a nomen verbi. This seems to contradict openly what al-Ṣafadī maintains, since for him the segment /t/ is a substitution for the first radical wāw, while the wāw which is spelled out in the word is nothing but an augmentation letter.

How, then, can we explain the fact that al-Ṣafadī states that tawriya has as its pattern tafʿila, but explains the presence of the segment /t/ at its beginning as a substitution of the letter wāw, while Sibawayhi assigns the pattern fawʿal instead of tafʿīl/tafʿila to the most common words undergoing this iḥdāl? Our first impression is of a misunderstanding on al-Ṣafadī’s part, but is this really so? I will now try to answer this question by focusing on some aspects of the substitution (iḥdāl), the compensation (ʿiwaḍ), and the specific nature of the patterns tafʿila and fawʿal.

We can find some help in interpreting al-Ṣafadī’s statement by looking at the words of al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898-9), who states in his al-Kitāb al-kāmil that this substitution has fundamentally phonetic motives:

The wāw can be turned into tāʾ when there is no tāʾ after it, for example turāṭ from warīṭtu, tuḡāḥ from al-waḡh, and tukaʿ. This has been done because of the aversion to the wāw being vowelled ‘u.’ The nearest to the wāw of the letters of augmentation and substitution (ḥurūf al-zawāʾid wa-l-badāl) is the tāʾ. Thus, it has been turned into it, and it can be turned into it as a substitution also when the vowel is not ‘u,’ for example: ‘this is atqā than this’ and ‘I hit him until I made him fall’ (atkāʿtu-hu).’ When after the wāw there is the tāʾ of the iftaʿala

7 The radical letters of atqā are w q y, while those of atkaʿu are w k ʿ.
pattern, the way is the mutation (qalb) to obtain the assimilation (idğām). (al-Mubarrad, Kāmil 1:100; cf. Muqtadab 1:102-103; 1:129)

Al-Mubarrad lays down two conditions for substituting wāw with tāʾ: when it is not followed by another segment /t/, and when the substituted wāw is vowelled ‘u,’ to avoid the segment /wu/. For al-Mubarrad, tāʾ is chosen as a substitution for wāw because this letter is among the ḥurūf al-zawāʾid, which has the point of articulation closer to wāw. This example helps us to understand why such a substitution occurs in some words, and where it is considered mandatory or just admissible and actualised only in some variants. The case of tawriya does not pertain to the phonetic substitution case of /wu/ > /tu/, but, as al-Mubarrad points out, this change can also occur when the vowel of the wāw is ‘a.’ This seems to be the case with tawriya if we believe al-Ṣafadī’s words. However, al-Mubarrad adds that in this case the substitution of wāw is more common with hamza:

If it were said to you ‘build the pattern fawʿal from the root waʿada,’ you would have said awʿad, being its original form *wawʿad, because wāw is from the original form, and after it there is the wāw of fawʿal, then you turn the first into hamza, as I have described to you already. (al-Mubarrad, Muqtadab 1:131-32)

In these two passages, we deduce that the substitution /w/ > /t/ is a general rule when the wāw is vowelled ‘u.’ However, when the wāw is vowelled ‘a,’ the general rule suggests a substitution with hamza, as we have seen in the previous passage from Sibawayhi’s Kitāb. In this case, the pattern of the word under examination plays an important role in distinguishing whether the segment at the beginning of the word is part of the root or not. In the word tawriya, the augmentation letter is certainly tāʾ, which is part of the pattern of the nomen verbi, while wāw is the first radical letter of the word. Why, then, does al-Ṣafadī claim that /t/ is but a substitution for an original wāw? Does he consider it to be an augmentation letter or part of the radical? And if the pattern were not tafīla?

To investigate this topic, I will turn to Ibn Ānnī (d. 392/1002), who explains the difference between the use of the letter tāʾ as a radical and as an augmentation letter:

Another thing shows that in the word tawʿam the augmentation is the wāw and not the tāʾ. This is because the pattern fawʿal is more frequent in speech than tafʿal. Do you not see that the category kawtar, ġawhar, qarsawa, hawqal, and kawkab is more frequent than the category taʿlab? What is more frequent is considered the general rule. (Ibn Ānnī, Munṣif 119)
Ibn Ğinni then continues with a more specific account of the use of tāʾ as a substitution for a first radical letter wāw:

Abū ‘Uṭmān’ said: “With this they substituted the wāw with tāʾ when after it there is no tāʾ. So, they said: atlağa yatliğu, atka’a yutki’u, this is atqâ than this, and taqiyya. Their original forms are awlaq and awk̚a’ since they are derived from tawallaqtu and tawakka’tu, atqâ is derived from waqaytu as well as taqiyya, whose pattern is fa’ila, but they substituted the wāw with tāʾ since it was lighter to them.”

Abū l-Fatḥ said: “He says, if they had substituted the wāw with tāʾ in these places where there is no tāʾ after the wāw, it is because it is more suitable for their purpose of lightening. So that they substitute it with tāʾ in the category ifta’altu, assimilating the substituted tāʾ to that of the pattern ifta’ala, and believing that its change of state better accords with the preceding vowels.”

Abū ‘Uṭmān said: “al-Ḥalil maintains that his speech

Gaining a hiding place among the thorny trees (?)

it is the pattern faw’al from walaqltu and not from ta’al, for ta’al is rare in nouns, while faw’al is frequent. However, it is known that, if there was a wāw in its original form, it must be turned into hamza lest two wāws meet at the beginning of the word. Therefore, wāw is substituted with tāʾ for the frequency of its use instead of wāw in the category of walaqla, e.g. when they said atlağa, mutliği, and this is atlaq than this. This use has not been gathered except from the reliable authorities.”

Abū l-Fatḥ said: “He says, if they substituted already the wāw with tāʾ in atlağa, mutliği, and atlaq – that if they had brought for it, then elision (haft) and not mutation (qalb) would be obligatory for them – so [that means that] its substitution with tāʾ is more appropriate in each letter corresponding to this category in which the mutation is a general rule, for if they had not substituted it with tāʾ, they would have had to substitute it with hamza. It is tawlaq, for if it were not substituted with tāʾ, it would have been mandatory to say awlaq because of the meeting of two wāws.” (Ibn Ğinni, Munṣif 207-208; cf. Taṣrīf 34-36)

---

8 Abū ‘Uṭmān Bakr b. Muḥammad al-Māzini, who probably died between 223-249/847-863, is the author of the Kitāb al-taṣrīf. Ibn Ğinni’s al-Munṣif is a commentary on this.
9 The variant منْتَجَاً من عضوات تَولَوْجاً is more convincing. The attribution of this verse is not unanimous. In some sources, such as al-Sahāwi (Ṣifr 333), Lisān al-ʿarab and Tāq al-ʿarūs, s. v. wālā, it is attributed to Ḥarir as a ḥālā against the poet al-Baṭīt; others have no attribution, as in al-Sirāf (Ṣahr 5: 223), Ibn al-Anbārī (Asrār 23). The hemistich cannot be found in Ḥarir (Dīwān).
In these examples, we understand that the pattern of the word with its specific vowels influences the morphological changes that occur to the radical letters when assuming a specific pattern. In particular, although the general rule sees the substitution of the first wāw vowelled ‘a’ with hamza, the linguistic evidence and different variants (luqāṭ) show a category of words in which tāʾ is preferred to hamza as a substitute for wāw. These words are built according to the pattern fawʿal, which is a pattern used for nouns and which is more common than the patterns tafʿal and tafʿil. But it is also a pattern that is not at first sight connected with the word tawriya. Or is it?

To my knowledge, Ibn Ğinnī was also the first author to quote a word formed from the root w r y as an example of substitution of the first wāw with tāʾ: the word tawrāt. And he does so when discussing the word’s derivation, which he sees as being Arabic in origin:

As a substitution instead of wāw: it is substituted with tāʾ as a proper substitution when wāw is the first radical letter, for example: tuqāḥ according to the pattern fuʿāl from al-waḥḥ, turāṭ according to the pattern fuʿāl from warīta, and taqīyya according to the pattern faʿīla from waqaytu, and like this taqwa, from the same root, according to the pattern faʿlā, as well as tuqāṭ according to the pattern fuʿāl.

Tawrāt for us is [built] according to the pattern fawʿala from wariya l-zand (the fire stick produced fire), its original form being *wawraya. The first wāw has been substituted with tāʾ. This is due to the fact that, if they had not substituted it with tāʾ, it would have been mandatory to substitute it with hamza because of the meeting of two wāws at the beginning of the word. The same applies to tawlaq, according to the pattern fawʿal from walağa—yaliğu, as it is the rule for these two letters, its original form being *wawlaq.

On the other hand, for the school of Baghdad,10 tawrāt and tawlaq are based on the pattern tafʿal, but it is better to refer to them as fawʿal because of the frequency of fawʿal and the scarcity of tafʿal in speech. The same applies to tuḥama, whose original form is *wuḥama because it is fuʿala from al-waḥhama, tukaʾa because it is fuʿala from tawakkaʾtu, tukān being fuʿlān from tawakkaltu, and tayqūr is fayʿ āl from al-waqqār. (Ibn Ğinnī, Sirr 1:145-146)

Ibn Ğinnī mentions tawrāt as an example of substitution of wāw according to the pattern fawʿala applied to the root w r y.11 Some later sources do not bring new perspectives to this discussion. By way of example, I quote al-Zamahšariʾs (d. 538/1144) Mufaṣṣal, in which he does not add any particular

---

10 Ibn Ğinnī is the only author who attributes this approach to the school of Baghdad.

explanation, limiting himself instead to listing the same words that had already appeared in previous sources:

The letters wāw, yāʾ, sīn, sād, and bāʾ are substituted with tāʾ. It substitutes the wāw when it is first radical, as in ittāʿada and atlaġa-hu. The Poet said:

रङब राम मन बनी ठुलु * मालू मङ्गलें * फ़िर फ़िर फ़िर । । । ।

Such a marksman of the banū Ṭuʿal introduces his hands in the lurking-places

and tuğāh, tayqūr, tuklān, tuka, tuḥama, taqiyya, taqwā, tatrā, tawrāt,13 tawlaḡ, turāṯ, tilād. (al-Zamaḥšarī, Mufaṣṣal 175)14

No more explanations are given in Ibn al-Ḥāǧib’s (d. 646/1249) al-Īḍāḥ (2:415), which takes into account neither the word tawrāt nor the word tawriya. This is the same in Ibn ‘Uṣfür’s (d. 669/1270) al-Mumtiʿ (254-256) and al-Muqarrib (536), while al-Astarābāḏī (d. 686-688/1287-1289) in Šarḥ Šafīyat Ibn al-Ḥāǧib stresses the fact that wāw is substituted with tāʾ because of their point of articulation:

I say: Know that tāʾ is close to wāw on its point of articulation (maḏraḡ), since tāʾ is an alveolar consonant (min uṣūl al-ṭanāyā)15 and wāw a labial (min al-šafatayn), and they have

12 Imruʿ al-Qays (Dīwān 123), also quoted in Åkesson (2001: 351).
13 In another edition of the Mufaṣṣal (ed. Imil Badīʿ Yaʿqūb. Bayrūt: Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmīyya, 1999), the editor reads tawriya instead of tawrāt. This could be a misinterpretation of the Koranic writing for tawrāt.
14 Ibn Yaʿīš (Šarḥ 2: 1381) provides a short explanation in accordance with Ibn Ġinnī: “They called tawrāt one of the revealed books, the tāʾ in it is a substitution for the wāw, its original form being *wawrāt [based on the pattern] sawʿala derived from warā l-zand.” Åkesson (2001: 351) comments on a similar passage in Ibn Masʿūd, quoting al-Zamaḥšarī’s and Ibn Yaʿīš’ commentaries without, however, listing the word tawrāt.
15 Fleisch (1949-1950: 230-231) points out that al-Ḥalil calls this consonant niṭʿiya, i.e. post-alveolar.
the *hams*\(^{16}\) in common. The tā’ is a frequent substitution for wāw; however, it is not a general rule unless in the category *ifa’ala*.\(^{17}\)

It happens [in some words], for example turāṣ, tuqāḥ, tawlaṭ, tatrā – from al-muwāṭara, tulaḥ, tuka’ā, taqwa – from waqaytu, and tawrāt, which is considered by the Basran school to be formed according to the pattern *faw’al* derived from *warā l-zand* – like tawlaẓ – being God’s book light. On the other hand, the Kūfan school considers them *taf’al* and *taf’al*.\(^{18}\) The first is more appropriate, for *faw’al* is more frequent than *taf’al*. (Al-Astarāḇāḏī, Ṣaḥḥ 3: 80-82)

How has this overview helped us understand better al-Šafādi’s statement that the original form of *tawriya* is *wawriya*, and that the segment /t/ is nothing but a substitution (*ibdāl*) for the first /w/? To claim that the statement was only a mistake is misleading.

Starting from the fact that both *tawriya* and *tawrāt* share – at least for certain Arab philologists – the same etymology, I posit that this close connection underlies al-Šafādi’s view and in a sense justifies it. First, al-Šafādi continues in the same chapter his attempt to demonstrate that the original radical letters of *tawriya* are in fact two: wāw and rā’. Combining them with *alif* and not yā’, he claims to have proven that the six possible letter combinations convey a similar meaning: ‘the shifting [from a meaning] of hiding and concealment to a meaning of clarity and visibility’ (*al-intiqāl min al-satr wa-l-ḥafā’ ilā ma’nā l-wudāḥ wa-l-zuhūr;* al-Šafādi, *Fadḍ* 63-66; Bonebakker 1966: 74-75).\(^{19}\) In particular, when

---

\(^{16}\) Arab grammarians distinguish between letters *majhūra* and *mahmūsa*, i.e. the manner of articulation. Cantineau (1946: 117-118) maintains that for Arab grammarians “la corrélation *mahmūsa-majhūra* correspond à une corrélation de pression, les *majhūra* étant des consonnes *pressées*, à forte tension des organes au point d’articulation et non soufflées, tandis que les *mahmūsa* sont des consonnes *non pressées*, à faible tension des organes et accompagnées d’un souffle.” Fleisch (1949-1950: 233-237) replies to this analysis by arguing that “les dénominations *majhūra*, *mahmūsa*, en elles-mêmes se réfèrent à la voix : *étouffées*, *pressées* et non à une modalité du travail articulatoire.” (Fleisch 1949-1950: 233). See also Fleisch (1961: 219-223). We should note, however, that tā’ is *mahmūsa*, but wāw is *majhūra*. See Fleisch (1949-1950: 228-229); and, for an in-depth analysis of the issue in Ibn Ğinnī’s thought, see Bakall (1982: 129-139).

\(^{17}\) To turn wāw into tā’ when the pattern is *ifa’ala* is a general rule: “When they saw that their outcome is to change it (i.e. wāw) according to the change in the conditions of what precedes it, they turned it into tā’ because it is a strong letter, which does not change with a change in the conditions of what precedes it. Moreover, it is near to the point of articulation of wāw and in it there is a *hams* compatible with the being *lin* of wāw (i.e. soft letter, wāw and yā’) to harmonise its pronunciation with the pronunciation after it. Therefore, it is assimilated and pronounced all at once” (Ibn Ya’īs, Ṣaḥḥ 2: 1380-1381). See also Ėkessson (2001: 229).

\(^{18}\) We should note that Ibn al-Anbārī (*Inṣāf*) does not mention this different morphological analysis of the word *tawrāt*.

\(^{19}\) The principle according to which the meaning of the root expressed by its consonants is still expressed even if its components are transposed, and therefore the conclusion that there is a semantic link that unites all the words with the same consonants, even if in a different order, is a theory developed by Ibn Ğinnī (*Iḥṣāṣ* 2: 133-139). This theory, called *al-ʾistiqāq al-akbar* (the greater derivation), is in contrast to *al-ʾistiqāq al-ʾasgar* (the smaller derivation), which is, so to say, the set of morphological forms and derivations that are used and understood by people to convey a meaning from a given root. For a discussion of Ibn Ğinnī’s theories on *ʾistiqāq*, see Mehiri (1973: 239-267, in particular 252-257).
discussing the combination \( w r \), he cites the word \( tawrāt \), providing the same explanation that we have already seen in Ibn Ğinnī, Ibn Ya'īš, and al-Astarābāḏī. Second, if we look at the Koranic commentaries, we find that the word \( tawrāt \) seems to have undergone a change that modified its original form. The question of its etymology remains open in Koranic commentaries, being located between acceptance of its foreign origin and the desire to see it as being derived from an Arabic root. An enlightening example of this attitude is found in the work of the great grammarian of his time, Abū Ḥayyān al-Ǧarnāṭī (d. 745/1344), who outlines all the hypotheses on the etymology of \( tawrāt \):

\[ \text{Tawrāt is a Hebraic noun, which the grammarians forced into an Arabic derivation (ištiqāq) and pattern. This was done after the grammarians had established that the [rules of Arabic] derivation do not apply to foreign nouns, and nor does the pattern apply, forcing an Arabic derivation.} \]

There are two theories on the derivation of \( tawrāt \). The first [sees it as being derived] from \( wariya l-zand \), i.e. when [the fire stick] has been struck and the fire appeared from it, as if the \( tawrāt \) were a light against error. This derivation is the saying of the majority. Abū Fid Muʿarrajī al-Sadūsī [d. 195/810] was of the opinion that it is derived from \( warrā \), as it has been transmitted that [the Prophet] "When he wanted to go on a journey, he concealed it

An interesting study of how modern phonological, morphological, and phonotactic theories can be applied to Ibn Ğinnī’s theory is Grande (2003), who, starting from Ibn Ğinnī’s postulates and comparing them with modern studies on the Matrix and Etymon Model (on this model, see Bohas 2007) showed that it is already possible to identify in the thought of the Arab grammarian the overcoming of the assumed schema of the Arabic triliteral root – already questioned by Larcher (1999). Specifically, he shows that the proto-historical root in the Arabic language is nothing more than a biconsonantal-vowel root whose structure is \( C_aC_i \), i.e. consonant–vowel ‘a’–consonant, and that the shift from this proto-historical to the historical root took place in three stages: 1. Vowel transference, 2. Insertion of \( hamza \), and 3. Metathesis, obtaining as a final result the historical root \( C_iC_aC_i \).

Versteegh (1985) and Carter (1991) point out that, although Ibn Ğinnī was among the most renowned grammarians of the Arabic tradition, the theory of \( al-ištiqāq al-akbar \) did not find many adherents. One such adherent, though, was al-Šafāḍī, for whom this way of proceeding is not limited only to \( Faṣd \) 63-66. As Goldziher (1872: 592-595) explains, he supports the theory of greater derivation and applies it uniformly in his writings. For example, in the work \( al-Šuʿūr bi-l-ʿūr \) devoted to one-eyed people, al-Šafāḍī explores the different meanings that the root ‘ \( w r \) expresses in its various transpositions, arguing that the common meaning of ‘being feared’ (\( tāhawuf; Šuʿūr 41-52 \); similarly, in \( Ğinnī al-ğinās \), he explores the different transpositions of the root ‘ \( g n s \), arguing that the common meaning of all the transpositions is ‘the association of something to what resembles it’ (\( indinām al-ṣay’ \) \( lā mā yuṣākūlu-hu; Ğinnī 26-29 \). In another anthology, devoted to blind people, \( Nakt al-himyān fi nukat al-umyān \), he reduces the root signifier to the letters ‘ and \( m \), and demonstrates that, with the occasional addition of one or more letters based on the words attested in the lexicon, they all express in their different transpositions a meaning that can be traced back to ‘becoming hidden and concealed’ (\( al-ištiqāq wa-l-iḥtīfā \); Himyān 6-12). There is a need for an in-depth study of how al-Šafāḍī employs \( al-ištiqāq al-akbar \) in his works, how he borrowed from Ibn Ğinnī’s theory, how this process is a fundamental part of the treatise-cum-anthology genre in his output, and how he uses this approach to support his thesis.
with something else” (kāna Ḱārā ḏurā ṣafaran ḡawrā bi-ǧayrī-ḥū)20 because most of the tawrāt is an allusion (tawwiḥ).

As for its pattern, al-Ḥalil, Sibawayhi, and the other grammarians of the Başran school were of the opinion that its pattern is faw’ala, in which tā‘ is a substitution for wāw, as it has been substituted in tawlaq, whose original form is its pattern *wawlaq, for they are derived from warā and ṣalaq, and they are like ḡawqala. On the other hand, al-Farrāʾ [d. 207/822] was of the opinion that its pattern is taʾīla, like taʾwṣiyā, since the vowel ‘i’ of the ‘āyn has been substituted with ‘a’ and the letter yā’ with alif, as they said: nāṣiya and ǧāriya, becoming nāṣā and ġārā. Likewise, taʾwṣiyā > tawṣā is permitted but not attested, said al-Zaḡḡāq [d. 311/923]. Some of the Kūfān grammarians believed that its pattern is taʾīla, the ‘āyn vowelled ‘a,’ derived from ‘i kindled (waraytu) for you my fire sticks;’ the imāla in the word tawrāt is possible [...]

Al-Zamaḥṣarī said:21 “Tawrāt and ḫināl are two foreign nouns, whose derivation has been forced [to derive from] al-warā and al-naqjāl, while their patterns are taʾī(v)l and ḫifāl. This is true only if we consider them Arabic.” What he said is true, except that a correction should be made in his speech about taʾī(v)l: he did not mention that for the Başran school its pattern is faw’ala, and did not indicate whether the ‘āyn was vowelled ‘a’ or ‘i.”22 (Abū Ḥayıyān, Tafsīr 2: 386-387)

These sources shed light on al-Ṣafādi’s statement about the etymology and derivational morphology of the word tawriya.

3. Conclusions

What conclusions can we draw from this overview of the sources available to al-Ṣafādi? We can posit no definitive answer, but can nonetheless advance the hypothesis that he merged morphological theory with etymological theory, based on the (pseudo-)common root of the words tawriya and tawrāt. To explain this, I propose the following hypothesis: convinced that the two words tawriya and tawrāt are connected, al-Ṣafādi gives a similar morphological derivation that binds these words. As we have seen in Abū Ḥayıyān’s commentary, he argues that tawrāt is foreign in origin (al-Ṣafādi, Faḍḍ 64). However, he also considers the Arabic derivation, embracing the Başran view that tawrāt underwent a letter substitution that transformed the original form *wawriya, according to the pattern faw’ala, into

---

21 See al-Zamaḥṣarī (Kaṣāfī 1: 526).
tawrāt. This point should be stressed because al-Ṣafādī does not affirm that the original form is *wawrāt. Instead, he says *wawriya (Faddāl 63, 64). This, in my opinion, is a connection to the tradition of Koranic commentaries, which report not only the Başrān view, but also the Kūfan view represented by al-Farrāʾ, who argued that tawrāt has as its pattern tafīla and that it underwent a mutation of the vowel ‘i’ of the second radical letter in ‘a,’ entailing a mutation of the letter yāʾ in alif: *tawriyat > *tawrayat > tawrāt.

This is all the more plausible if we look at the examples that al-Ṣafādī gives. He quotes the word tawsīya (Faddāl 63), saying that its original form is *wawsıyə, which is the same word used in Abû Ḥayyān’s commentary in describing al-Farrāʾ’s opinion: *wawsıyə > tawsīya > tawṣaya > tawṣā. It is plausible that al-Ṣafādī mixed these two morphological and etymological views. For, he maintains on the one hand that the original form of tawriya is *wawriya, as could be justified if we adopt the Başrān position, which explains the change as a letter substitution (ibdāl al-hurūf); and on the other that tawriya’s pattern is tafīla, like the words tabṣira, etc., thereby adopting the Kūfan position, which entails the change ‘i’ > ‘a’, and therefore yāʾ > alif. It is but a short step to claim that *wawriya > *tawriya > *tawraya > tawrāt.

The hypothesis that al-Ṣafādī mixed the two theories – Başrān and Kūfan – is in my opinion justified if we look at the explanations provided by Arab philologists on the pattern of the verbal noun of the augmented verb faʿala, to which tawriya belongs: warrà—yuwarri—tawriya. In their opinion, the morphological mutation occurring in the word tawriya is not a letter substitution (ibdāl), but a compensation (ʿiwaḍ). According to Ibn Yaʾīš,

The commentator said: “The substitution is that you place one segment instead of another. It can be necessary or discretionary and approvable. They distinguished between substitution (badal) and the compensation (ʿiwaḍ). They said: what substitutes is more suitable than what has been substituted, and what compensates [is more suitable] than what has been compensated. This is why it stands in its place, for example the tāʾ in tuḥama and tukaʾa, or the hāʾ in haraqtu. This and the like are what is called substitution (badal) and not compensation (ʿiwaḍ), for compensation is when you place one segment instead of another, but in a different position, such as the tāʾ (t) in ʿida (عدة) and zina (زينة), and the hamza in ibn (أبن) and ʿism (اسم).”23 (Ibn Yaʾīš, Šarḥ 2: 1356)

According to this analysis, both the segment /t/ at the beginning and /k/ at the end of the word tawriya are not a substitution but a compensation for another segment which has been elided. This can be explained because the pattern tafīl is not an original form of the nomen verbi, which is fiʿāl. An example can be found in Ibn Ǧinnīʾ’s words:

Among them, the tāʾ in tafīl is a compensation for the first ‘ayn in fiʿāl and it is a letter of augmentation (zāʾda). It is a requisite that the compensation is a letter of augmentation, too, because [to change] a letter of augmentation with another letter of augmentation is more similar to the original; therefore, the first ‘ayn [i.e. second radical] in qīṭṭāʾ is the letter of augmentation, for tāʾ in taqīṭī is the compensation thereof. As it is the case with the ḥāʾ (ṣ/ṣ) of the nomen verbi tafīla, which is a compensation for the yāʾ in tafīl. The two of them are letters of augmentation. (Ibn Činni, Ḥaṣāʾiṣ 3:69)

In his words, Ibn Činni posits that the segment /t/ in the pattern tafīl is a compensation for the first ‘ayn of the original form fiʿāl, which is an additional letter to the primary root fʿl. The same reasoning applies to the final segment /s/, which is a compensation for the long vowel ‘ī, concerning the nomina verbi derived from verbs with a weak third consonant.

It follows that, in the view of Arab philologists, the word tawriya is neither a case of ibdāl al-ḥurūf, and nor is it to do with the (forced) Arabic derivation of the word tawrāt, for its original form cannot be *wawriya. Instead, we face a common case of double compensation, which affects the verbal nouns issued from a weak-third-rooted verb. In other words, the first radical letter wāw in the word tawriya has not been substituted, nor is the wāw an augmentation letter according to the pattern of the word. Thus, it is not a case of ibdāl al-ḥurūf.
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