REFUTING THE ALLEGED TRANSMISSION OF GREEK GRAMMATICAL CONCEPTS INTO ARABIC GRAMMAR

Solehah Haji Yaacob[*]

The First Encounter with Ancient Greek Thinking

The first contact of Greek and Arabic grammar was probably made in Alexandria (Egypt) and Antioch (Syria) since both cities were renowned Hellenistic centers of education and learning (C.H.M. Versteegh, 1977:1-2). However, not all historical scholars agree on this matter, and the question whether Arabic language and thought have been directly influenced by their ancient Greek counterpart is still debated. The modern historian Ahmad Amin in his book *Ôuha al-Islam* (1969) mentions that the renowned linguist and translator Hunayn Ibn Ishaq (260H / 873 C.E.) (J. Ruska, 1980:134) went to Rome to learn Greek and later returned to Basrah to learn from Khalil (Amin Ahmad, 1978: v.1:313). This idea is strongly supported by Mustafa Nazif who states that Khalil was visited by Hunayn to study Arabic (1978:vol.1:313). Modern historians assert that in the ninth century C.E. Arabic scholarship was influenced by Greek science and thought. Bustani, for example, was known to be very competent in Greek, and Khalil influenced by Aristotelian ideas, especially by the concept of cause and effect (Mahdi al-Makhzumi,1986:68). Mustafa Sadiq Raf`iy suggests that Arabic phonetic signs such as the *harakat* did not originate from Arabia but from Syria which was governed by the Byzantines who had introduced small *harakat* signs as reading aids in the text of the Bible (K. Brockelmann, 1968:vol.1:105).

* Dr. Solehah Yaacob is a lecturer at Department of Arabic Language and Literature, International Islamic University Malaysia

When we examine the historical stages by which Greek became a *lingua franca*, we find that simultaneously the Aramaic dialect of Syria was developing into an independent language in its own right (Versteegh, 1977:1-2). Other reports suggest that the Persians built the school of Jundishapur near Kufa which soon became a `refugee school` for those who had run away from other institutions like Alexandria and Antioch because of their "heretical opinions" (1977:2). Jundishapur disseminated the ideas of Greek philosophy in Mesopotamia, and major Greek texts were directly translated into Syrian and Persian. It is evident here that Jundishapur played a major part in disseminating Greek culture and learning in the East.

Due to this influence, theological speculation was introduced into Muslim scholarship with the *Mu`tazilite* debate on the Qur`an, the problem of free will and the doctrine concerning the attributes of Allah (1977:2). It was also believed that Hellenistic universities not only taught Greek philosophy but also Greek language, the most important medium of teaching and a compulsory subject for every student of philosophy (1977:3). Greek language and grammar exercised a profound influence upon the Syriac dialect in the form of many loan words, the system vowel-signs and even the literary style (1977:3). Obviously, this process became important after the Arab invasion of Greater Syria (*bilād al-shām*) after which Syriac translations of Geek works were rendered into Arabic (1977:15). New ideas and concepts passed through these translations into the language of administration, such as the tax register in Damascus (1977:17). Moreover, in the late 10th / 4th century, Hamzah al-Isfahani (d. 961 C.E.) had access to Greek historical material and incorporated it directly at the court of Isfahan (1977:18).

The medieval linguist and historian A. Merx (G. Troupeau,1993: vol.VII:913), author of *Historia Artis Grammaticae Apud Syros* tried to relate the dependence of Arabic grammar on the logic of the appearance of declension, the division of words into three parts of speech, the distinction of three tenses and the notions of `arf and *hal* (C.H.M. Verstegh,1977:8). Merx also argued that the influence of Greek linguistics on Arabic occurred after the introduction of Greek logic which was discussed by the *Mu`tazilites* (1977:16).

The above examples suggests that Greek thinking influenced Arabic language used in the development of the judicial process during the time of the *Mu`tazilites*, especially in logic. However, the early historians argued that the influence of Greek on Arabic had begun much earlier, namely with the establishment of Hellenistic institutions which translated Greek philosophy and literature into vernaculars such as Syriac. Thus, Syriac acted as the intermediary between Greek and Arabic. The earliest leading translators at that time such as Hunayn Ibn Ishaq and Yahya Ibn Bitriq were native speakers of Syriac. Damascus had became a center of Greek language under the Byzantines during the third, fourth and fifth century (William Wright, 1998:Vol.2:470) in which the language was officially used at court and in administration.

The Formal Development of Greek Grammar

Present knowledge of pre-Socratic thought and the early rhetoricians is very fragmentary and solely derived from secondary sources. Since the end of the sixth century B.C.E. philosophers in Ionia and elsewhere studied astronomy, physics, mathematics, ethics, metaphysics and linguistics (R.H.Robin, 1990:16). The major contributions of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.), probably the most

remarkable intellect in antiquity – covered almost all the fields of human knowledge (1990:16). The Stoic school founded by Zeno (c. 300 B.C.E.) gave rise to linguistic studies, and the function of language in the Stoic system can be summarized in the sequence of the impression, second the mind making use of speech and then expresses the experience produced by the impression in words (1990:18). The Stoics formalized the dichotomy between form and meaning, distinguishing in language `the signifier` and the `signified`. It is to be noted that they promulgated a theory of syntax or sentence structure based on the analysis of the different types of predicates available in the Greek verbal system e.g. transitive and intransitive (1990:18).

The Stoic school was founded by Zeno who had been a bilingual speaker whose native language had been a Semitic language. Up to this period, linguistics had developed according to philosophical concepts which concentrated on logic. We are aware that Aristotle summed up his concept of language at the beginning of his *De Interpretatione* in which he interpreted speech as a representation of the experiences of the mind and writing the representation of speech (1990:22). Obviously Aristotelian and Stoic concepts of language differed. The Stoic concept was based on anomaly which became the dominant theme in language, while Aristotle favoured analogy which concentrated on linguistic questions for the purposes of literary criticism and objective standards of correctness. Both divisions were exaggerated by the rivalry of Alexandria and Pergamum under Macedonian rule, whereby Alexandria was dominated by the analogists and Pergamum by the anomalists (1990:23).

Greek grammatical tradition was formulated by authors beginning with Dionysios Thrax (ca. 170 – ca. 90 B.C.E.) whose

Tekhne Grammatike (Art of Grammar) was translated at an early date into Syriac[1] (Baumstark, 1968: 116-7). This version has been challenged recently and the opinion prevails that the first systematic grammars were written after Dionysios` death in 90 B.C.E. and that the *Tekhne Grammatike* actually belonged to a later epoch[2] (V. Law, 2003: 55). However, there is evidence of Greek grammars from the first century C.E. onwards in the form of fragments of grammars preserved on papyrus rolls excavated in Egypt[3], and a few complete treatises. One of the earliest grammatical fragments so far discovered dates from the first century. The full text goes as follows:

> *A meaning utterance (logos) is a prose collocation of word*
> *forms (lexis) revealing a complete thought. Its parts are*
> *nine: proper noun, common noun, participle, pronoun,*
> *article, verb, preposition, adverb, conjunction. The proper*
> *noun is a word form which signifies the individual nature*
> *of an object or concept, without tense but with cases, such*
> *as `Homer`, `Paris`. The common noun is a word form*

---

1   According to the Nestorian tradition by Joseph of Ahwaz who died before 580 C.E.

2   Even during the Middle Ages many Byzantine scholars doubted the authenticity of the *Tekhne Grammatike*, and the question was reopened in modern times by the Italian scholar Vincenzo Di Benedetto who published an extensive study on the subject in 1957-8. Today, five chapters are considered genuine in which Dionysios outlines the discipline of grammatical study, then discusses reading aloud, accents, punctuation and the genre of rhapsody. It is the rest of the work which is disputed. The remaining chapters look like a self-contained grammar of a type common in both Greece and Rome in late Antiquity, starting with chapters on the smaller linguistics units – the *gramma* (letter/speech – sound), syllable and word – and then on each word class: noun, verb (and conjugation), participle, article, pronoun, preposition, adverb, conjunction. The arguments are of two kinds, internal (based on evidence from the text of the grammar itself) and external: 1) The program set out in the opening paragraph is not followed after chapter 5; 2) The first five chapters have almost no connection with the rest of the work suggesting that they were added later as a kind of introduction to an existing self-contained grammar; 3) There are significant discrepancies between the doctrine ascribed to Dionysios Thrax by early sources and that of the *Tekhne Grammatike*; 4) The only passages quoted from the *Tekhne Grammatike* by writers earlier than the fourth century come from the five chapters; 5) The earliest copies of the *Tekhne Grammatike* date from the fifth century; 6) The extant Greek grammars dating from the first to fourth centuries are not based upon the *Tekhne Grammatike*, but show the kind of fluctuation and experimentation that was characteristic of grammar in the better-documented Roman world before it was given definitive form in the mid-fourth century by Donatus (Vivien Law, 2003: 56).

3   Which by that time was part of the Hellenistic cultural sphere.

which applies to many objects, without person or tense, such as `poet`, `person`. The participle is a word form which takes articles and cases, and shows distinctions of tense, such as `saying`, `known`. Hence it is called `participle`, in that it participle, in that it participates in aspects of both noun and verb. The pronoun is a word form used demonstratively instead of the noun, assigning order to the person, such as `I`, `he`. The article is a word form with case which is placed before or after another word inflected for case and shows distinctions of gender, as in[4] ho, he, to `the`[5]. The verb is a word form showing activity or receiving action with tense and person, such as `I write`, `it is being written`[6]. The preposition is an uninflected word form which stands before the word classes in composition. These are the prepositions: ana `up to`, kata `down to`, dia `through`, meta `after`, para `beside`, anti `against`, amphi `around`, huper `over`, apo `from`, peri `about`, en `in`, eis `into`, pro `before`, pros `toward`. The adverb is an uninflected word form which is placed before or after the verb and not compounded with it, signifying quantity, quality, time, place, negation, agreement, probihition, exhortation, interrogation, exclamation, comparison or doubt. Indicating quantity: `frequently`, `rarely. Quality: `well`, `nicely. Time: `now`. Prohibition: me[7]. Exhortation: `what!`, `encore!`. Interrogation: `where?`. Exclamation: `if only`[8]. Comparison: `like`. Doubt: `pretty much`,

---

4   In nominative case

5   cf. German der, die, das.

6   These are single-word forms in Greek: lego, graphetai.

7   The negative particle used in negative commands.

8   cf. Spanish ojala.

> `perhaps`. *The conjunction is a word form linking the parts*
> *of discourse. It is used with copulative, disjunctive, causal,*
> *rational, interrogative, hyphothetical, or expletive force.*
> *The following conjunctions are copulative: `but`, `on the*
> *one hand`, `both... and`, `and`, `...as also`, `and also`...*
> *Disjunctive* (P.Yale, 1979: 49-52).

The work is kept extremely concise and centers on a series of definitions of the parts of speech. The word classes are discussed one by one. It appears similar to Aristotle idea of category in which "uncombined utterances which denote uncombined ideas necessarily denote one of ten things either substance or quantity or quality or relation or where or when or position or to have or doing or being acted upon" (Charles E. Butterworth, 1983, p.30). We observe the Stoic[9] concern for the distinction between *logos* and *lexis* in the opening of the definition when each of the word classes listed is described as a *lexis* focusing attention on its formal properties which was the major concern of earlier poets and orators. The definitions included both semantic and formal elements which constituted the starting point in the progress of understanding Aristotle's categories in the part of speech.

The Opponents of a Greek Influence on Arabic Grammar

In the first place we must direct our attention to the origin of Arabic linguistics in order to demonstrate which elements in this phase were the result of a direct contact between Arabic grammarians

---

9   After Aristotle countless thinkers took up the task of working through the wealth of ideas inherited from Athens. Work of two kinds lay before them: systematizations and elaborations of the originally often concisely expressed and sketchily developed ideas. Amongst the people who participated in this activity were the members of the most famous philosophical school in the ancient world, founded by Zeno of Citium in the third century BC, and based as much in Asia Minor (modern Turkey) as in Greece. The Stoics grew in numbers and reputation, even counting a Roman emperor, Marcus Aurelius (121-180 C.E.), amongst their later adherents (Vivien Law, 2003:38).

and Hellenistic culture in many of the conquered territories. From the ninth to the eleventh century, a Greek-Arabic translation movement took place in the Muslim world. According to Professor Dimitri Gutas (1998:i) almost all scientific and philosophical secular Greek works were available by the end of the tenth century. The translations covered such diverse topics as astrology, alchemy, physics, mathematics, medicine and philosophy. He also explored the social, political and ideological factors operative in the early Abbasid society that occasioned and sustained the translation movement. He retraced the legacy of the translation movement in Islamic lands and abroad suggesting a direct link with the ninth-century classical revival in Byzantium. Gutas provided a stimulating, erudite and well-documented analysis of this key movement in the transmission of ancient Greek culture to the Arab World.

However, to analyze the influence of Greek language on Arabic grammar specifically, we need to focus on the influence of the concept and system of the grammar itself and not merely acknowledge its existence on a general level. Even though Merx (*Historia artis grammarticae apud syros*) tried to prove the dependence of Arabic grammar on Greek logic, he used mainly terminology resemblance. His most important arguments were: 1) the notion of declension (*irab*); 2) the division of words into three parts of speech; 3) the distinction of two genders; 4) the distinction of three tenses; 5) local and temporal adverbs (*zarf*); 6) condition (*hal*). It is questionable whether his arguments prove the influence Greek grammar and not rather the influence of Greek logic. Greek grammar was after all based on logic and a semantic approach as recorded in Aristotle's 'Category`. It is also questionable to relate the above idea to the text of the *Tekhne Grammatike* by Dionysios Thrax since the authenticity of the manuscript itself is doubtful.[10]

---

10   Discussed earlier in the article.

In order to understand that Arabic grammar evolved completely independently from Greek and was not influenced by it, we shall direct our attention to the research done by those who have strictly opposed the notion of Greek influence. The linguist and philosopher J. Weiss stressed the high level of consistency and regularity of Arabic grammar and vigorously opposed any idea of Greek and Latin influence. Weiss argues as follows:

> *"Handelt es sich gar wie bei der Grammatik und Philosophie um ein wissenschaftliches System, so erscheint von vorherein der Versuch, auf Grund blosser gelegentlicher Übereinstimmugen eine Beeinflussung nachzuweisen, als ein sehr wenig aussichtreiches Beginnen, insofern die zahlreichen Divergenzen die eventuelle Beweiskraft der Kongruenzen grundlich paralysieren; denn man darf nicht ubersehen, dass ein System ein Ganzes darstellt, und dass es psycholigisch ganz unwarscheinlich ist, dass ein einzelner Begriff daraus wie ein erratischer Block gewandert sein soll, ohne Spuren sogar seiner nachsten Nachbarschaft mitzunehmen".*
> (Weiss, 1910: 389-90).

(If the case is, that just like with grammar and philosophy it is a scientific system, the attempt to prove an influence on the basis of occasional similarities seems to be little successful in as far as the many differences paralyse the conclusiveness of congruences substantially, as we should not overlook that a system represents an entity, and that it is psychologically totally unlikely that a single term out of it should have wandered like an erratic block without taking traces of its next proximity with it.)[11]

---

11   Translation by Dr. Anke Bouzenita from department of Fiqh and Usul Fiqh, International Islamic University Malaysia.

Weiss noted that it is methodologically wrong to judge the influence of Greek and Latin on Arabic grammar based on one isolated term, since every term is part of a complicated system, without which it is meaningless (C.H. Versteegh, 1977:12). Weiss followed comprehensive ideas and gave a balanced judgment. We can assume that the Arabic phonetic signs comprising of *lommah*, *fathah* and *kasrah* have its origins in older languages such as Syrian, Hebrew, Persian and Sanskrit but the micro system of Arabic grammar has to have been developed by the Arabs themselves, especially in confirmation of *Ñamil ma'nawī* in subject, predicate and present tense. The Basrah School of linguists believes the *Ñamil ma'nawī* concept of *rafa'* in subject and present tense to be the *ibtida'*. We believe this feature is not evident in many other languages because this *rafa'* indicates that it is free from an intruder such as *nāṣob* or *jārr*. Otherwise, the accusative (*nāṣob*) and generative (*jārr*) are called *al-āmil al-lafzī* which could change the case form or declension. We should not forget that in Arabic the invisible governor or element zero in ideas of *al-Ñamil* called *al-ishtighāl*. We cannot find exactly where the governor of the sentence is. In contrast, the governee appears very clearly, for example in *Zaydan larabtuhū* (Zayd that I had beaten him) *Zaydan* becomes the governee whereas the governor of the sentence is *larabtuhū* which is the precedent of the sentence and diasappears according to the Basran School. Otherwise, another group of Arab grammarians called the Kufan School believe that the governor of the sentence is *larabtu* after *Zaydan* because *laraba* comes from *fiÑil mutaÑaddī* (transitive verb). However, we do not want to dwell on their squabbles; what we have to point out here is that in Arabic grammar according to the Basran School there exists an invisible *al-ÑÓmil al-muqaddam*.

Webelieve there are differences between the national varieties of Arabic, with the Qur'Én as its model and Arabic grammar based on a written standard. It is possible that historians of Arabic are not always aware of these differences. Thus, they treat the Arabic language and Arabic grammar in the same manner. Actually from our analysis the situation is totally different. We cannot deny that the Arabic language has been influenced by other languages which in turn were strongly influenced by Greek, like Assyrian, Syrian, Persian and Sanskrit. The influences are clearly seen in that we find many loan words from other languages such as Greek (Ahmad Amin,1969:vol.3:267) (*Fasafah, Geografiah, Zaburūd, Zamrūd, Yaqūt*); Sanskrit (1969:vol.3:267) (*Zanābil, Kapūr, Babghāk, Khaizurān, Filfīl, Ahlīlāj*); Assyrian (MagÊd Khair BÊk, 1992:25-26) (*Akhū, 'Ummatun, Tişhū, Zabū,ilÉ, Qarbun, Malākū*) and Syrian (Aramaic dialects) (*Ābā, Shama', Hablā*). There were even some pronouns similar to Aramaic such as *'Anā 'īnu* which means *'Anā* in Arabic and *'Ant Anta* which means *Anta Antuma.*

Nevertheless, there was a system which contrasts with the original Arabic grammar system and called `*Lughah Akalūnī al-Barāghīthū*` where one governor governs two governees. This phenomenon had been found in use by the tribe of *al-Ţhai* and *Azdī as-Shanū'ah* (As-Sayūţī, n.d.:514). In the case of *TanāzuÑ*, on the other hand, two governors govern one governee as in Ñamrū Ibn al-Ķais`s verse:

*"Walau anna mÉ asÑÉ li adnÉ maÑÊÎatin * kafÉnÊ walam aïlob ķalÊlun minal al-mÉlÊ"*

One of the strictest rules in Arabic syntactic theory is precisely that one governor can never govern more than one element at the same time, for instance in the verse quoted above the words *kafÉnÊ* and *walam aïlob* are *al-ÑÂmils*. He didn`t say *ķalÊlan* but *ķalÊlun*

with *ìommah* meant it is belong to *kafÉnÊ* nor *walam aïlob*. This verse indicates that Arabic was not influenced by Greek thinking at the time that ÑAmrū Ibn al-Ḳais introduced the system of *al-ÑĀmil* accidentally. This point has been supported by Versteegh who says: "We do not assert that Arabic linguistic thinking was a copy of Greek grammar, but we do believe that the instruction of Greek grammar was the model and the starting point for Arabic grammar"(1977:15).

A differing opinion on the independence of Arabic from Greek grammar was expressed by H. Fleisch who wrote:

> *"Des influences grecques sont a signaler: la speculation grammatical arabe a emprunte des concepts initiaux a la science grecque, non pas a la grammaire grecque, mais a la logique aristoteliciene`, and: `Cecireduit beucoup l`influence grecque; munis des ces concepts initiaux aristoteliciens, que la simple ambiance a pu leur fournir, les grammairiens arabes ont travaille avec leur mentalite arabe; la description des categories grammaticales est arabe; l`agencement en un system est arabe, si bien qu`on peut dire que, de toutes les sciences islamiques. La grammaire est peut-etre celle qui a le moins subi d`influences exterieures et est restee la plus purement arabe".* (Fleisch.H., 1961:23, 25)

(Greek influence is to be indicated: Arabic grammatical speculation has borrowed initial concepts from Greek science not from Greek grammar but rather from Aristotelian logic; and this reduces very much the Greek influence armed with these initial Aristotelian concepts which the simple atmosphere was able to provide them with. The Arabic grammarians have worked with

their Arabic mentality; the description of grammatical categories is Arabic, the ordering or insertion into a system is Arabic, so may say that, of all the Islamic sciences, the grammar is may be the one which has been the least subordinate to exterior influences and has remained the purest.)[12]

He refuted the influence of Greek grammar on Arabic grammatical theory but agreed that it certainly was influenced by Aristotelian logic since most of the Arab Grammarians were emphasizing on conceptual issues. Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani for example engaged a lot in semantic and conceptual meanings, but to say that his ideas were all derived from Aristotelian logic would be umjustified. According to Jurjani, the relationship between syntax and semantics has not been effectively clarified within the framework of traditional Arabic grammatical theory. In his commentary (see Jurjani, *Dalā'il al-I'jāz*, 1960, p.66-67) he differentiated between meaning and form in a sentence. This concept is presented not to linguists but theologians (*mu`tazilah*) in impressing them with the need to study not only theology but also grammar and literary theory in order to improve their understanding of the inimitability of the Qur'an. In this case, the concept of *nazm* combines three aspects, namely 1) *lafza hāmil*, 2) *ma'na bihi qā'im*, 3) *ribād lahuma nāzim*. This statement shows the intellectual capacity of Jurjani. He further argued that one could not arrive at the proper meaning if not constructed with *lafaz* and *rabat* in order to produce a *nazm*. In other words, those who achieve true eloquence (*fasāhah*) will not produce a coherent sentence unless they combine the group of words according to their concurrence followed by the meaning. Starting from here, we know that he focused more on the system of *nazm* and

12   Trans. by Dr.Anke Bouzenita

movement among the words after their combination. This means that the production of eloquence does not solely depend on the use of separate words to produce meaning. In his major contribution to the discussion about the `ijaz al-Qur'an he concentrated on *ma`ani* (meanings) and *lafz* (expression). Both concepts have been subject to debate between logicians and grammarians. According to logicians, the meanings are the logical ideas that were signified by the expressions. Otherwise the grammarians concentrated on the functions of the words. According to him, *ma'na* (meaning) was what determined the quality of style, and it would be absurd to attribute qualities of eloquence to an expression as such. He says:

> *"Know that whenever you look into this (corruption of taste and language) you find that it has only one cause, namely their view about the expression and the fact that they assign to the expression attributes (...) without properly distinguishing between those attributes that they assign to them because of something that belongs to its meaning".*
>
> (al-Jurjani, *Dalā'il al-I'jāz*, p.256).

`Ilm al-bayān according to him is "the knowledge of the expression of one meaning in different ways, by referring to it more or less clearly, which serves to avoid mistakes in the application of speech to the full expression of what one wishes to say." (see Kees Versteegh, *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought*, 111, 1997, p. 124) This implies that the science of *bayān* is the final touch to conveying information and cannot be separated from the science of meaning. In other words, the discussion on the introduction of semantic elements needs to be related to the technicality of grammatical aspects. In this sense the ideas of Jurjani were an expression of the feeling of dissatisfaction with the way linguistics was developing, whereby as far as he is concerned, his *Dalā'il al-I'jāz* contains remarks which

may be interpreted as criticism of Arab traditional grammarians of the relation between word order and meaning. This view was shared by Ibn Mada` who complained of the useless morphological exercises and theoretical discussions that had nothing to do with the living language (see Ibn Mada`, *Al-raddu` ala Nuhāh*, p.78).

This does not mean that the system of `irab is not equipped with the necessary elements to develop the idea of linguistics in Arabic. Rather, the idea needs to be supported by other elements such as meaning in a semantic concept. In other words, we need to synthesize the concepts as formulated by the logicians and the grammarians.

We can conclude that the special meaning of *nazm* exists when the meaning is quoted after the process of entering *siyāq* 'such as *mubtada`* existed cause of *khabar*. For example, *al-muntaliqu Zaydun* means 'the one who leaves is Zayd', while in *Zaydun al-muntaliqu* Zayd is the one who leaves. i.e. *fā'il* (agent) existed cause of the *fi`l* (verb), and so on. Accordingly, we can say that the originality of Jurjani as a rhetorician is evident as he links his view on meaning as the determining factor in the quality of a text to a linguist dimension by considering it not in isolation but always as it is realized within a coherent text composition or cohesion or *nazm*. This is a key notion of both the *Dalā'il al-I'jāz* and *Asrār al-Balāgah*[13]. In both works he attempted to define the principle in linguistic terms (Versteegh, 1997, p.119).

To support the above idea, we shall add some remarks on the system which show that the concept of meaning is powerful via the concept of *i`rāb* and *`āmil*. The first example is [14]

---

13   Both of the primary works of Jurjani.

14   Al-Munafiqun: 10.

[الصالحين من والكرف أصدق قريب اجل الى أخرتنيلو] the word
`وأكن` *wa'kun sukūn* by the thinking of شرطيتوهم *tawahhum*[15]
shartī (Sibawayh, *al-Kitāb*, 3/117)[16] indicates for تمني *tamanni*
and *al-ʿāmil* of *shartī* is not in speech (*lafaz*) but in the conceptual
thinking (or *maʿnawi*) which أصدق إلى عطف *ʿtuf* on *fa usaddiqa*
فأصدق [17] where it is accusative and not *sukūn*. This idea had been
supported by al-Zamakshari who said that it resembled *in akhartani*
usodiq wa'kun `وأكن` `أصدق أخرتني إن`. The researcher assumes
`الإعرابية الحركةتخلف` `wa'kun` a *sukūn* cause of
وألكن *takhallaf al-harakah al-ʿirabiyah* (Tamam Hasan, *Al-lughah*
al-ʿarabiyyah, maʿnahā wa mabnahā, pp 204 – 205).

The second example is the accusative cause by the removal
of genitive *jar al-nazuʿ ʿala al-khafid* which means the removal of
the genitive is a result of accusative on the governee or *maʿmūl*.
According to Ibn Malik (see Ibn ʿAqil, *Sharh Ibn ʿAqil*, 1998, p.19),
the accusative case on the governee (*maʿmūl*) which is caused by
the removal of the genitive in speech (*lafz*). whereas in thinking
(*maʿnawi*) it is based on the meaning (*al-tadamu al-ijābi*)(Tamam
Hasan, p.222) such as the Qurʾanic quote
[لميقاتنا رجلا سبعين قومه موسى واختار] [18]. *Ikhtāra* is the
governor of the governee '*qawmahu*', in thinking called *al-mafʿūl bi*
lafzih, it is because the real governor of it is *min* which is genitive
being removed from the *āyah*. However, there is another opinion
in its declension or *iʿrāb* such as the view of al-Akhfash as-Saghir[19].

---

15 *Tawahhum* is a synonym for *idmar* or *taqdir*, which is a central concept of Sibawayhʾs analysis.

16 Showing the meaning of sentence cannot be took for granted.

17 The reading of Jumhur as an accusative.

18 Al-Aʿraf:155.

19 Ali bin Sulayman al-Bagdadi

He said "to remove the genitive is not a must, but it permissible to avoid an ambigious situation, as in *"baraitu al-qalama as-sikkina"* where the original form is *"baraitu al-qalama bisikkini"*. *'Baraitu'* is the governor (*'āmil*), *'al-qalama'* the governee (*maf'ūl*) of *'baraitu'* and *'al-sikkina'* the governee (*ma'mūl*) of the removed original governor in the genitive. Sibawayh (Sibawayh, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1 p.73) did not agree here since the cause of the removal of the genitive was the preceding verb becoming a governor. This opinion is supported by Abu Hayyan (Abu Hayan, *al-Bahr al-Muhīt*, vol.4 , p. 297). The word *'ikhtāra'* governs the two governees (*maf ūlān*) because it is a transitive verb (*fi'l muta'addi*).

The third example is *al-'atuf 'ala al-mahalli* whereby the understanding of meaning (*al-'athr al-maknawi*) is according to the implicit item (Karim, Abdullah Ahmad Jaad, *at-Tawahhum 'inda an-Nuhah*, p.161) according to the Qur'anic example:

[أَلْطَهِرَ وَلَا ثَلَثَ مِن أَصْغَرَ وَلَا السَّماءِفِي وَلَالْأَرْطِفِي نَرَة دِثْقِلَ مِن رِبْكَ عَنْ يَعْزِبُ وَمَا]²⁰

The accusatives of *'asghar'* and *'akbar'* are *mansubani* and not genuinely based on the principle *mamnū' 'an al-sarf*. Originally, they should be used with a genitive term *jār*. An accusative here is called being conjuncted by place or situation (*al-mahalla*) and not by *i'rāb* as a speech. *'Mā'* is a negative type in speech, otherwise in the original text it is nominative case in thinking or *raf' maknawi* because it is subject of a verb. The subject of the verb is the doer of the action expressed by the verb and must follow the verb (Ibn Hisyam, *al-Mughni al-Labīb*, vol. 1, p. 268).

---

20   Yunus: 6.

The fourth example is *al-ittiṣāl wa-inqiṭā` bi-sabab al-ma'na*. i.e. connection or disconnection because of meaning, as in the Qur'anic verse[21] [ ما مهلهبنم ملع الإ ُعابتا نظلا ] . The disconnection of *al-`amal* based on the seven permissible ways of recitation (*al-qirā'āt al-sab'ah*) which is '*ittibā`a*' in the accusative case would imply allowing for speculation (*zann*) in contrast to definitive knowledge (`*ilm*)[22]. Otherwise, '*ittibā`u*' in the nominative case as recited by the tribe of the Banu Tamim means knowledge or `*ilm* and does not imply *zann* as in the reading allowing the accusative case. This is so because '`*illa*' is a disconnector between governor and '*ittibā`a*'. In the original text ' *ititbā`a*' disconnects with '*min `ilmin*' where it is subject in the nominative case. '`*Ilmin*' is a subject being put into genitive after the preposition '*min*' as a *mu'akkidah* for *ittibā`a al-zann*.

From the above analysis, it has become clear that grammar (*nahw*) investigates the syntactic relation between the words of an utterance. These examples are basically concerned with the function of case endings in the sentence. The kinship between grammar and eloquence (*balāgah*) is thus self-explanatory. In expressing the realm of meanings (*ma`āni*), grammar is concerned with the means of making the utterances express the desired meaning with utmost exactitude through a number of syntactical devices such as conjunction and disconjunction and also the relation between subject and predicate (see Ramzi Balbaki, *Grammarians and Grammatical Theory in the Medieval Arabic Tradition*, 2004, p.9). In other words, the concept of Arabic thinking in grammar is not isolated. Rather, the concept of grammar has been included in the concept of semantics. Thus, without the expression of a desired the meaning, the concept of understanding the meaning cannot be produced. Actually, more

---

21   An-Nisa`: 157.

22   See the opinion of Zamakhshari and Ibn Athiyah in *al-Bahr al-Muhit*, vol. 3, p.406.

studies are needed on the relationship between grammar and meaning to further clarify this relation, especially in terminology. At a practical level, much of the confusion and inefficiency in teaching Arabic grammar could be avoided if some of the non-functional topics of *nahw* were substituted by those subjects of *balāgah* which focus on the relation between form and meaning.

M.G. Carter denied any Hellenistic influence in the following words: "*I hope the following pages that the evidence adduced by the Hellenists on the point reached by Arabic grammar in the crucial period of the eight century should be rejected, because it is applied* hysteron proteron, *because it is based on a dubious interpretation of the grammar of the later period, and because it is contradicted by the* kitab itself"[23](Carter, 1972:3). According to him, Greek influence has to be ruled out because of lack of evidence. There is no reference to suggest foreign influences in the indigenous accounts of the earliest Arabic grammarians[24].

He adds: "The most obvious weakness of the Greek hypothesis is that it has never been confronted with Arabic grammar itself or rather, that the Hellenists have never defined the kind of Arabic grammar itself or rather, that the Hellenists have never defined the kind of grammar which they claim was borrowed from Greek" (1972:5). Then, he stresses that "it will be necessary to show that the *Kitāb* is the first grammatical work in the Arabic language" (1972:5). He believed that every form of linguistic study preceding Sibawayh i.e. the period of orthographical innovations and the period of the group of *nahwiyyun* had been the work of amateurs.

---

23 The Origins of Arabic Grammar, translation of Les origins de la grammaire arabe, Revue des Etudes Islamiques 40 (Paris, 1972), pp 69-97, translation by Philip Simpson. Copyright 2006 Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

24 Ibid, p.3

Sibawayh was the first real grammarians in his *Kitāb*, he brilliantly undertook to assemble the linguistic facts, which form part of social system into a *juridical* corpus. His purpose was the description of linguistic behavior, a normative grammar as reference for later grammarians.

Carter asserts that the grammar in Sibawayh's *Kitab* clearly unrelated to the Greek system based on logic when he says "I have already alluded to the fact that there was no term for `grammar` in Sibawaihi`s time, and I outlined the stages whereby the word *nahw* ultimately acquired this technical sense" (1972:12). He also highlighted that Sibawayh and Aristotle have very different interest in *harf* which was identical with the Greek *fone asemos* but defined from a totally different point of view. Aristotle says that the particle has a definite function but no specific meaning while for Sibawayh the *harf* has a some kind of meaning (*jā`a li ma`nan*) but no specific function (1972:15). In order to ensure the grammar of Sibawahi was original at that time of Sibawayh `s activities there existed an abstract legal system set up by Islamic lawyers in order to analyze laws and traditions. This proves that Sibawayh didn`t need any abstract Greco-Hellenistic theory for his grammatical system. This is why it will never be possible to prove the dependence of Arabic grammar on Greek by referring simply to the division of the parts of speech where there are eight parts of speech in Greek while Arabic grammar has only two or three if we include *harf* (1972:17).

In order to support that Arabic grammar was influenced by Islamic Law, Carter presents two important points, firstly a series of already existing terms for the categories and phenomena of the Arabic language, secondly a set of operational functional terms borrowed from the legal system. He adduces four important terminological arguments, namely the use of moral criteria in

grammar 'hassan' (good), 'qabīh' (bad) (Carter, 1972, 1973 :83, 147-50), secondly the *qiyas* as a juridical method (Carter, 1972:84), thirdly the terminology of *mawdi*, etc. derived from the study of law (Carter, 1972:84-5, 1973;147-8), and fourthly numerous linguistic terms with a juridical connotation (e.g. 'shart' (condition), 'iwad' (compensation), 'badal' (replacement), 'hadd' (limitation), 'hujjah' (argument), 'niyyah' (intention)) (Carter, 1972:86).

Carter points out that there were many contacts between lawyers and grammarians. Sibawayh himself had started his as a student of law, and lawyers often needed the help of grammarians for the explanation of linguistic subtleties in legal texts. He concluded that if it can be pruned that the science of law furnished the example for Sibawayh`s theory of speech, the Greek hypothesis has lost its raison d`etre. In his view the Greek hypothesis is a priori improbable because of the complete silence in Arabic sources concerning any dependency on Greek examples, and more, Greek grammar is of a completely different character.

However, we cannot base a spontaneous linguistic corpus on Sibawayh alone because he himself acknowledged many authorities in his book, such as Abū al-Aswād al-Du`alī, Yūnus bin Habīb, Khalīl, Abū Amrū, Kisā`ī and Farrā` who aided in collecting the linguistic corpus. This kind of information shows us that Sibawayh duly acknowledged the contribution of others. It is possible that as a supporter of the theory of *nahw* in Arabic he molded his theory according to his own understanding of Arab life of his time. Carter`s observations of the relations between grammar and law in the Islamic World are certainly very plausible. In addition, Versteegh agreed with Carter that grammar is a linguistic system in its own right (1977: 15).

In order to prove that Sibawayh's ideas were related to legal Islamic concepts, Ibn al-Anbari (1998:1-15) stated that the methodological approach used by the jurists was followed by the Arabic grammarians. His argument was supported by Imam Jamaluddin al-Asnawi (1984:342) who realized that the concept of *usūl al-fiqh* and the concept of Arabic grammar were coming from the same root, since the concept of *qiyās* was adopted in Arabic grammar as `qiyās al-nahwi`. Mahmud Nihlah (1987:24) expressed that "the *usūl al-nahw* and its branches are similar with the concept of *usūl al-fiqh* and its branches" meaning that both concepts are taken from the same system, the same root of knowledge. In order to refute Greek influence on Arabic grammar he believed it a grave error to attribute the beginnings of Arabic grammar to conservatism or simple intellectual curiosity. The proponents of the theory of a Hellenistic influence were equally mistaken when they assume that all abstract thought had to be developed in Greek style because the essential principles of Islamic law had already been established at the time of Sibawayh (Ibid, p.21).

G. Troupeau[25] refuted the statement by Merx[26] (G.Troupeau, 1981:1) with the words[27] " *I have made the point that it is unlikely that Sibawayh, who died circa 796 a.d., would have known the logic of Aristotle and been influenced by it, and this for two reasons: the first being that the Hermeneutics and the poetics were not translated into Arabic until approximately a century after the death of Sibawayhi; the Hermeneutics by*

---

25 "The work of Aristotle, having been translated first into Syriac and then into Arabic, was familiar in Muslim intellectual circles, as early as the ninth century. Futhermore, certain orientalists, in the study of the origins of Arabic grammar, have concluded that the first grammarians were influenced by Aristotlian logic, from which they would have borrowed fundamental grammatical concepts, in particular the well-known division of the '*partes orationis*' The logic of Ibn al-Muqaffa` and The origins of Arabic Grammar

26 See *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*, Lipsiae 1889, p.137-53.

27 See G.Troupeau, *Lexique-Index du Kitab de Sibawayhi*,Paris 1976, p.12-13

Ishaq Ibn Hunayn (d. 910), the poetics by Matta Ibn Yunus (d. 940). The second reason is that the grammatical terms used by these two translators, with a few exceptions, either do not exist in the work of Sibawayhi or differ significantly from the terms which he employs, as may be observed from the following list"[28]. The very different terminology of the grammatical terms employed by `Abdallah Ibn al-Muqaffa` in his epitome of the *Hermeneutics* – when compared with the terms utilized by Sibawayh – differ almost entirely, for example the verb identified as '*harf*' by Ibn al-Muqaffa` and by Sibawayh as '*fi`l*', similarily addition (A) called '*lahq*' while (S) called absent, adjective (A) called '*lasiqa*' while (S) called '*na`t*', and finality (A) called '*ghaya*' while (S) called absent (1981:3). These observations lead us to accept that there exists no conformity between Arabic grammatical terminology and the terminology of Greek logic. In addition, the parts of speech in Greek grammar has eight categories while the division parts of speech in Arabic grammar are divided into three which points to the fact that they have nothing to do with Aristotelian logic.

Beginning with the contact of Hellenistic thinking with Arabic culture we have accepted the influence of Greek institutions of learning in the East. However, the transmission of Greek grammatical concepts into Arabic grammar is very questionable and needs to be modified. Dionysios Thrax' *Tekhne Grammatike* cannot be regarded a valid starting point in this matter and as such needs no further consideration. Weiss, Fleisch, Carter and Troupeau had their own reasons to oppose the influence of Greek grammar. Weiss used a methodological approach to the system of language itself and concluded that previous studies in favor of a Greek influence had been too selective and therefore produced no

---

28   Words 1)Letter :Ibn Ishaq called ustuquss, Sibawayh called harf, 2)Syllable: Ibn Ishaq called iqtidab, Ibn Matta called maqta`, Sibawayh called absent, 3)Conjunction: IbIs. called ribat, Sib. called harf `atof, 4)Article: IbI. called wasila, Sib. called absent, 5)Verb: IbI. and Matta called kalima, Sib. called fi`il.

valid results. Fleisch acknowledged the influence of Greek thought in the field of Aristotelian logic. However, Aristotelian logic was more applied in the fields of philosophy and sciences than in the study of grammar[29].

Carter also argued that Arabic grammatical theory was free from any Greek influence because it was firmly based on Islamic source texts such as the Qur'an and as such shared the same roots with Islamic legal theory. Several linguists support the understanding that the concept of *nahw* in Arabic grammar originated from Islamic Law. Sibawayh introduced the ideas of Arabic grammar through the four accepted legal schools and their shared concepts of *'wājib'*, *'mubāh'*, *'sunnah'* and *'harām'* which is complementary to the grammatical concepts of *'wājib'*, *'jawāz'*, *'shādh'* and *'mamnū`'*.

Troupeau has shown that the differences of terminology used by Sibawayh and the translators of Aristotle's *Hermeneutics* and *Poetics*. In conclusion, the concept of Arabic grammar has originated from Islamic Law and not by the transmission of Hellenistic grammatical concepts. Arabic grammatical theory was never exposed to Hellenistic thinking and developed in complete independence of it. Textual evidence of an alleged influence is lacking. Nevertheless, the Hellenistic institutions established in the East certainly did play an important role in the spread of Greek ideas in other disciplines.

---

29   As mentioned by Gutas Dimitri on page 3 of the article.

References:

1. Amin, Ahmad, 1978, *Duha al-Islam*, DBP: Kuala Lumpur.

2. Andalusi, Abu Hayan, 2001, *al-Bahr al-Muhit*, vol.4, 1ˢᵗ edit., Darul al-Kutub al-`ilmiah: Beirut.

3. As-Sayūṭī, (n.d.) *HamaÑ al-HawāmiÑ Sharhu JāmiÑ al-Jawāmi° Fī ÑIlmi al-ÑArabiah*, Beirut: Dār al-MaÑrifah.

4. Baalbaki, Ramzi ,2004, *Grammarians and Grammatical Theory in the Medieval Arabic Tradition*, Ashgate:USA.

5. Baumstark, A., 1968, Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, Bonn, 1968

6. Butterworth, Charles E., 1983, Averroes` *Middle Commentaries on Aristotle`s Categories and De Interpretatione*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey.

7. C.H.M. Versteegh, (1977) *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking*, Leiden: E.J.Brill.

8. Carter, The Origins of Arabic Grammar, translation of Les origins de la grammaire arabe, Revue des Etudes Islamiques 40 (Paris, 1972), pp 69-97, translation by Philip Simpson. Copyright 2006 Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

9. Dimitri,Gutas, (1998) *Greek Thought Arabic Culture –The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad an Early `Abbasid Society*, London: Routledge.

10. Fleisch.H., 1961, Traite` de philologie arabe, Vol. 1, Beyrouth.

11.   G.Troupeau, `Nahw` (1993) The Encylopaedia of Islam, Vol.
        V11: -3, 8,14 -18.

12.   G.Troupeau, 1981, The Logic of Ibn al-Muqaffa` and The
        Origins of Arabic Grammar, translation of La logique d`Ibn
        al-Muqaffa` et les origins de la grammaire arabe', Arabica
        xxviii (Leiden, 1981) pp. 242-50. translation by Philip
        Simpson. Copyright 2006 Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

13.   Hasan, Tamam, n.d., *al-lughah al-Arabiyah Ma`naha wa
        Mabnaha*, Darul As-Saqaafah: Morocco.

14.   Ibn `Aqil, 1998, *Sharh Ibn `Aqil*, vol. 1. Darul al-Fikr: Beirut.

15.   Ibn al-Anbārī (ed.) (1967) *Nuzhatul Alibā`*, Cairo: Maktabāt
        Nahĺah.

16.   J.Ruska, (1980) `Hunain Ibn Ishāq`, Dā'ratul al-MaÑārif al-
        Islāmiyyah, Cairo: Dār al-Fikr, vol 8:134.

17.   Jamaluddin al-Asnawi (1984) *al-Kaukib al-durri*, edt.Hassan
        `aud, Jordan: dar al-Ammar.

18.   Jurjani , Abdul Qahir, 1960, *Dala`il Ñejaz*, edit. by Sayid
        Muhammad Rashid Redha, Maktabah Muhammad Ali
        Subaih wa Aulaad: Cairo.

19.   Karim, Abdullah Ahmad Jaad, 2001, *at-Tawahhum Inda an-
        Nuhah*, Maktabatul al-Adab: Cairo.

20.   Law , Vivien, 1997, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early
        Middle Ages*, Longman:London.

21.   Law , Vivien, 2003, *The History of Linguistics in Europe*

From Plato to 1600, Cambridge University Press: United Kingdom.

22. Magīd Khair Bīk (1992) *al-Lughah al-ÑArabiah: Jazūruhā Intishāruhā, Ta'sīruhā Fī al-Sharqi wal-Gharb,* Damascus: Dār as-SaÑduddīn.

23. P.yale (1979) The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt, ed. Alfons Wouters Brussels:Paleis der Academien.

24. Mahmud Nihlah(1987) *Usul an-nahwi al-`arabi,* Beirut: dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiah

25. R.H.Robin, 1990, A Short History of Linguistics, Longman: New York.

26. Sibawayh,1999, *al-Kitab,* Darul al-Kutub al-`Ilmiah: Beirut.

27. Versteegh, Kees 1997, *Landmarks in linguistic thought 111,* Routledge: London.

28. Weiss,1910, Die arabische Nationalgrammatik und die Lateiner, ZDMG.

29. William Wright (1998) `Syriac Literature` The New Encyclopaedia of Britannica Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., vol 2:470.