The Quranic Consonantal Text: Morphology

أَمَّا أَهْلُ الْحِجَازِ فَيَقُولُونَ ﴿ذَلِكَ﴾ بِاللَّامِ وَبِهِ جَاءَ الْكِتَابُ فِي كُلِّ الْقُرْآنِ

AL-FARRĀʾ, *Kitāb fih Luġāt al-Qurʾān*

4.1 Introduction

In the previous section we have shown that when looking to answer the question what the language of the Quran is, the reading traditions fail to give a consistent answer. They are linguistically diverse, none of them look like natural language, and they must be considered to be a concerted effort to beautify the recitation of the Quran through the use of exotic linguistic features from a variety of different dialects, augmented with completely innovative forms that do not seem to have been part of anyone's natural speech. These reading traditions take shape with the eponymous readers, and it is difficult to see further back than these readers through internal reflection.

However, there is a source of the Quran that carries linguistic information that does go back to the very first decades of Islam: the written text itself. In recent years it has become clear that virtually every early Quranic manuscript that we have access to today goes back to a single archetypal copy (Cook 2004; Sinai 2014a; 2014b; van Putten 2019c). The dating of these manuscripts is so early that a date much later than the date attributed to it by the Islamic tradition (that is, during the reign of ʿUṭmān b. ʿAffān, 644–656 CE) is quite difficult to envision. This primary source, while written in a highly defective script still carries a lot of linguistic information that we can likewise date back to this early period: the spelling is not random, but forms a clear system. This orthography must be seen as an important source of linguistic data, and its frequent deviations from the later standard Classical Arabic orthography can give us important insights into the nature of the language and how it differs from Classical Arabic. Moreover, as the Quran is a rhymed text, we receive a unique insight into some phonological features of the language which are not easily recoverable from other texts from this period, such as the early Islamic papyri.

In a series of papers, I have already explored what the QCT can tell us about the phonology and nominal morphology of Quranic Arabic (van Putten forthcoming; 2017a; 2017b; 2018; 2019b; van Putten and Stokes 2018). What has not yet been explored, however, is the historical linguistic affiliation of Quranic Arabic. What morphological and phonological isoglosses does Quranic Arabic have? And how does it relate to pre-Islamic Arabic varieties as found in the epigraphic record and dialects as reported by the Arab grammarians?

Throughout modern Arabist literature, we find many statements that suggest that the Quran was written in a kind of mixed dialect, drawing freely from different dialects—much in the way as the Arabic poetry. The idea that the Quran was written in a mixed dialect seems to ultimately originate from the medieval Islamic tradition, but received its modern articulation in Chaim Rabin's monumental work on the Ancient West Arabian dialects where he stated with some confidence that the Quran was composed in the 'poetic koine' (Rabin 1951, 3 f.).¹ Rabin admits that the form of the poetic koiné used in the Hijaz may have had a local pronunciation, primarily, having lost the glottal stop as reflected in the orthography (Rabin 1951, 4 f.). However he tells us that "in morphology, on the other hand, an almost complete conformity with the 'Arabiyya' could be achieved" (Rabin 1951, 4). The claim then, is that morphologically we should be able to see that the text of the Quran adheres to the 'Classical Arabic' speech norms as opposed to the local dialect of the Hijaz.

This chapter will examine the morphological features of Quranic Arabic as reflected in the QCT, while the next chapter will tackle its phonological features. These features will be compared against the reports of the Arab grammarians as well as the linguistic data found in epigraphic pre-Islamic Arabic. From this discussion it will become clear that whenever the QCT allows us to identify linguistic features it almost universally agrees with what the Arab grammarians attributed to the dialect of the Hijaz, and as such Quranic Arabic should be understood as a reflex of a Hijazi Arabic vernacular and not "Classical Arabic". Moreover, frequently we will see that a large amount of the relevant isoglosses visible in the epigraphic record clearly point away from a northern origin, and on occasion give clear evidence that the isoglosses present in the QCT are an innovation typical for Hijazi Arabic.

In Al-Jallad's (2020b) revolutionary work on the Damascus Psalm fragment, he already listed several morphological features which appear to form unique Hijazi innovations in comparison to forms of Old Arabic found in Northern

1 Rabin (1955, 24) credits Fleisch (1947, 97–101), and Blachère (1947, 159–169) for coming to this conclusion independently from him that the Quran was composed in the poetic *koiné*. Neither author is much more informative as to what this elusive poetic *koiné* entails.

varieties such as Safaitic, Hismaic and Nabataean Arabic. These isoglosses occur in Quranic Arabic as well, and as such, the language of the Damascus Psalm fragment and the Quranic Arabic are closely related to each other. Some of the isoglosses that can be identified as Hijazi innovations from the epigraphic record are also identified as typically Hijazi isoglosses by the Arab grammarians, and there are yet other isoglosses identified by the Arab grammarians for which not as much evidence has been found in the epigraphic record yet. In the following section we will look at morphological isoglosses present in Quranic Arabic as can be gleaned from the QCT which can either be compared to the epigraphic record, or those reported by Sībawayh and al-Farrāʾ (or both). Whenever relevant, I will also cite the discussion of isoglosses that are discussed by Rabin (1951).

4.2 The *ʔalla*- Base Relative Pronoun

Quranic Arabic forms its relative pronoun on a base *ʔalla*- followed by deictic elements *ʔalla-dī*, *ʔalla-tī*, *ʔalla-dīn* etc. This form is innovative in relation to the ancient Semitic relative pronoun *dū*, a relative pronoun which continued to exist in Quranic Arabic with a more restricted possessive meaning ‘possessor of ...’, e.g. ذوا فضل / *dū faḍl* / ‘possessor of favour’. This innovation is also acknowledged by Rabin (1951, 154).

The *d*-base relative pronoun is the one that should likely be reconstructed for Proto-Semitic and is cognate to the Aramaic relative pronoun, e.g. Nabataean Aramaic ܕܝ/ܕܝ (Cantineau 1978, 61), Biblical Aramaic ܕܝ (Rosenthal 1961, 21 f.) and Gəʿəz *zä*. It is the relative pronoun found in the Northern epigraphic varieties of Old Arabic: Safaitic (m. *d*, f.sg. *dʔ*, *dt*, *d* (?) pl. *dw*, see Al-Jallad 2015, 85–88), and the one that seems to be attested in the Nabataean Arabic of the Namārah inscription: ܕܘ ܐܫܪܐ ܐܠܬܗܓ / *dū ʔasara al-tāg* / ‘who bound the crown’, (Rabin 1951, 205; Cantineau 1978, 49), cf. also the theonym ܕܘܫܪܐ / *dū šārā* / ‘the one of the Šarā mountain’ (Cantineau 1978, 80).

The earliest attestation of the *ʔalla*-base relative pronoun seems to be JSLih 384, an Old Arabic inscription in the Northern Hijaz, in the Dadanitic script, which has the feminine relative pronoun spelled *ʔt*, presumably to be read /*ʔal-latī*/. See Müller (1982) and Macdonald (2000, 49) who identify the use of the *ʔalla*-base in this inscription as an Arabic isogloss, and see Al-Jallad (2015, 13, n. 17; 2018b, 8 f.; 2020b, 60) who identifies it as a specifically Old Hijazi isogloss within Arabic.

While the *ʔalla*-base is quite clearly an innovation and seems to have its origins in the Hijaz, by the time the grammarians start discussing the lin-

guistic variation of Arabic, it seems to have become extremely dominant. Neither Sībawayh nor al-Farrāʾ consider any other relative pronouns.² A few later grammarians attribute archaic forms of the relative pronoun to Yemeni dialects who used *ḍī* (Rabin 1951, 39) and the Ṭayyīʾ who used *ḍū* (Rabin 1951, 204f.).

4.3 The Distal Demonstrative Expansion with *-l(i)-* in *ḍālīka*, *tilka* and *hunālīka*

A typical feature of Quranic Arabic is the exclusive use of the distal demonstratives that have an additional element *-l(i)-* between the demonstrative element and the addressee agreement suffix *-ka/-kum* etc. Thus, in the QCT we find ذَٰلِكَ and تَٰلِكَ and never forms like ذَاكَ *dāka* and تِكا *tika* or تَاكَ *tāka*. The latter forms are reported for Classical Arabic (Wright 1896, § 342; Fischer 2002, § 275a), and especially *dāka* occasionally occurs in poetry and Classical Arabic prose (often co-occurring besides *ḍālīka*).

The difference between these two pronouns is widely identified as a Hijazi isogloss already in the time of al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt*, 11), who recognizes the exclusive use of the *ḍālīka* form as typical for the Quran and attributes it to the Hijaz, while the people of Najd among the Qays, ʿasad, Tamīm and Rabiʿah use *dāka*. As far as can be gleaned from the fragmentary pre-Islamic data, it seems that the archaic forms without the *-l(i)-* insertion were original to the northern Old Arabic varieties, and that *-l(i)-* extension is a Hijazi innovation (Al-Jallad 2020b, 61f.). *tk* as a feminine distal demonstrative appears to be attested in a single Safaitic inscription (Al-Jallad 2015, 84).

While Rabin (1951, 154) recognizes the identification of the *-l(i)-* extension as Hijazi, he remains skeptical of this identification because some Western Arabs have sayings and poems attributed to them that use *dāka* as well. He is also suspicious of the claim because Arab grammarians that claim this to be a Hijazi feature tend to cite the Quran as evidence for this, as it exclusively has *-li-* extension. This seems to me to be the wrong conclusion based on the facts available.

First, as *ḍālīka* is the innovative form and *dāka* the original, the fact that an archaic form is used by Western Arabs—assuming this attribution is valid—is hardly an argument why *ḍālīka* is not a Hijazi feature. At most it is an argument

2 Al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt*, 12) does talk about relative pronouns however, and attributes an inflecting form of the plural to Huḍayl: nom. *alladūna* obl. *alladīna*.

that *dāka* is not an exclusively eastern feature. Just because *dāka* occurs in the Hijaz as well, does not exclude the possibility that *dālīka* is indeed a uniquely Hijazi innovation.

His second point seems to presuppose the conclusion that the Quran is composed in the poetic koine and therefore *cannot* be evidence of dialectal data, but this has not been demonstrated by him, nor by anyone else. The very fact that Al-Farrāʾ (*Luḡāt*, 11) feels the need to *explicitly* state that *dālīka* is the form that occurs in the Quran in fact highlights that this is a fact considered remarkable and distinctive of Quranic Arabic, and something that he did not consider to follow automatically from the statement that this is the Hijazi form.

In Classical Arabic prose and poetry alike *dāka* and *dālīka* co-occur, and its absence in the Quran is in fact striking, and a clear deviation from the Classical Arabic norms. The very fact that al-Farrāʾ, nor any other grammarian, feels the need to attribute all features present in Quranic readings to the Hijaz (as we saw in chapter 3), seems to confirm that the observation on the Hijazi character of *dālīka* is quite independent from the observation that it is the only form that occurs in the Quran.

To *dālīka* and *tilka*, we may also add that the distal locative demonstrative receives the *-l(i)-* expansion to form هـنالك rather than *hunāka* as a Hijazi feature (al-Farrāʾ *Luḡāt*, 47). The Tamimi *hunāka* becomes the dominant form in literary Arabic production but is absent in the QCT.

4.4 The Plural Demonstratives (hā-)ʔulāʔi/(hā-)ʔulā; ʔulāʔika/ʔulāka

Another isogloss that is attributed to the Hijaz is the shape of the plural distal demonstrative. Here al-Farrāʾ (*Luḡāt*, 12) reports ʔulāʔika for Qurayš and the people of the Hijaz, while ʔulāka is reported for Qays, Tamīm, Rabīʿah and ʔasad, ʔullāka for some of the Banū Saʿd and Tamīm, and ʔulālīka for “some of them”.³ The QCT is unambiguous in this regard as it only attests the spelling اوليك and never اولاك, and therefore it is only compatible with the Hijazi form.⁴

The proximal plural demonstrative likewise is reported by al-Farrāʾ (*Luḡāt*, 22) to have a difference between Qurayš and those that surround them who have hāʔulāʔi as opposed to Tamīm, Qays, Bakr and the common people of

3 From the context it is unclear whether Al-Farrāʾ intends “some of the Banū Saʿd and Tamīm” or “some of the Arabs”. Considering that the *-l(i)-* infix is a Hijaz feature in the singular forms, it seems probable that the latter is intended, and that it is a feature found, probably, among some Hijazis, but this is not made explicit.

4 For this isogloss see also Rabin (1951, 153, §g).

ʔasad who say *ʔulā* (spelled *أُلَى* in the edition) or *hā-ʔulā* (spelled *هَأُولَى* in the edition) with an *ʔalif maqṣūrah* (as opposed to an *ʔalif mamdūdah*). He adds that ‘some Arabs’ drop the first *ʔalif* of the word and say *hawlāʔi* and cites a piece of poetry that adduces this.⁵

The QCT does not allow us to infer with certainty the shape of the proximal deictic (although it definitely has the initial *hā-*), as both *ʔalif* and *yāʔ* can represent the *ʔalif maqṣūrah* whereas *ʔalif* can also represent *ʔalif mamdūdah*. Thus, the QCT *هولا* is consistent both with *hāʔulāʔi* and *hāʔulā*.

However, al-Farrāʔ explicitly writes the *ʔalif maqṣūrah* with a *yāʔ*, which means he likely intended the Najdi pronunciation to have been (*hā*)*ʔulē*, since the Kufans, including his teacher al-Kisāʔī, would regularly read *ʔalif maqṣūrah bi-sūrat al-yāʔ* with *ʔimālah* (see § 3.6.4.2).⁶ Since the QCT distinguishes between /*ē*/ (spelled with *yāʔ*) and /*ā*/ (spelled with *ʔalif*) the QCT would only be consistent with *hāʔulāʔi* and not with *hāʔulē*.

4.5 Proximal Deictics with Mandatory *hā-* Prefix

In the QCT all proximal deictics, be they masculine *هذا*, feminine *هذه*, plural *هولا* or locative *ههنا* are prefixed by *hā-*. This is remarkably different from what is reported from Classical Arabic where forms without *hā-* are broadly reported, e.g. masculine *dā*, feminine *dih*, *dī*, *tī* plural *ʔulā* locative *hunā*. In Classical Arabic prose especially the form *hunā*—absent in the QCT—becomes standard, while others are rare.

Al-Farrāʔ (*Luġāt*, 22) reports the addition of the *hā-* prefix as optional for the plural among eastern tribes, but mandatory in the Hijaz. Forms without *hā-* are not explicitly mentioned for singular masculine *dā* or feminine *dī*/*dih* by al-Farrāʔ, although later grammarians like al-Zamaxṣarī (*al-Mufaṣṣal*, 55) do report them. Even the locative deictic consistently has the *hā-* prefix in Quranic Arabic *ههنا* ‘here’ (Q3:154; Q5:24; Q26:146; Q69:35).

In the pre-Islamic record, we find that the Northern varieties consistently lack the addition of the *hā-* so its mandatory addition appears to be a typical

5 It is interesting to note that “dropping of the *ʔalif*” for al-Farrāʔ seems to mean that *āʔu* automatically becomes *aw*, while one might expect it to become *aʔu* instead. With this single occurrence it is difficult to decide what to make of this observation.

6 Modern mesopotamian dialects that retain a reflex of word-final *ē* as *-i* (*ħabli*) occasionally seem to treat *ʔalif mamdūdah* the same way, hence *ṣəti* ‘winter’. This seems to point to a merger of word final **-āy-* and word final **-āy-* towards *ē* before the shift of **-āy-* to *-āʔ-* took place, cf. Safaitic *šty* /*šetāy*/ ‘winter’. See on this topic also Levin (1992, especially 86 f.).

innovation of Quranic Arabic. For example, Safaitic only attests *d̥*, presumably /d̥ā/ (Al-Jallad 2015, 80), and the same is true for the late Nabataean Arabic inscription at Harran (568 CE), which clearly attests *دا المرطول* /dā al-marṭūl/ ‘this Martyrion’ (Fiema et al. 2015, 414), a feminine deictic *תִּי* without the initial *hā-* is likewise attested in the Nabataean Arabic of the Namārah inscription, e.g. *תִּי נפֿש* (328 CE) (Fiema et al. 2015, 405). Thus, while the epigraphic data does not allow an identification of this isogloss of typical for the Hijaz, it is clear that North of the Hijaz the addition of the *hā-* was not mandatory, as no attestations of it have been found so far.

4.6 Feminine Proximal Deictic *hādih*

According to Sibawayh (IV, 182) the Tamīm dialect has the feminine proximal deictic *hādī* form in context which becomes *hādih* form in pause. This is also what Rabin (1951, 152, §f) claims is the “strict Classical Arabic” form.⁷ The Hijazi dialect would have borrowed this pausal form from Classical Arabic. No argument is given why it would not be the other way around or how he envisions a spoken dialect like Hijazi would go about borrowing such a basic category as a demonstrative from a poetic register. The existence of *tī/tā* demonstratives in *ḥadīṣ*⁸ and poems does not disprove that the *hādih* form was the common form in the Hijaz—only that some archaic forms were also in use, if we would accept that poetry and *ḥadīṣ* are representative of Hijazi Arabic. The feminine proximal deictic throughout the QCT is *هذه*, which is in line with the report for Hijazi Arabic, which is said to use *hādih(t)* both in pause and context.

In the northern Old Arabic dialects evidence is found for both *tī* and *dī* but not (*hā-*)*dihī*. For example, the ancient Namārah inscription (dated 328 CE) written in Nabataean Arabic starts with *תִּי נפֿש* ‘this is the funerary monument of ...’. Safaitic seems to attest a feminine demonstrative that has an initial *d̥*, presumably /d̥ī/, rather than *t* a feminine deictic also reported by the Arab grammarians (Al-Jallad 2015, 81). The forms with final *h*—the only form found in the Quran—is currently unattested in pre-Islamic Arabic.

7 I do not understand what the category of “strict Classical Arabic” is based on. It would imply that Sibawayh’s own prose is not a representation of ‘strict Classical Arabic’, as he exclusively uses *hādihī* in context.

8 In fact, the prophetic narration that Rabin cites does not have the proximal deictic, but rather the distal deictic: *kayfa tī-kum* ‘how is that one (spoken to a plurality of addressees)?’ As prophetic narrations are not necessarily verbatim narrations, the use of *tī-kum* probably says more about the dialect of ṣāʿīṣah (who narrates this tradition), or the common link of this Hadith (which seems to be Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī) than it does about the prophet’s speech.

4.7 Loss of Barth-Ginsberg Alternation

As discussed in § 2.2.5, Sibawayh and al-Farrāʿ agree that one of the features absent in Hijazi Arabic that is present in all other dialects is the use of *i*-prefixes in the prefix conjugation of stative *faʿīla* verbs, thus they say *ʔanā ʔiʿlamu dāka* ‘I know that’ rather than the Hijazi *ʔana ʔaʿlamu dālika*.⁹

The Barth-Ginsberg alternation must certainly be reconstructed for Proto-Arabic (see § 2.2.5). Thus, the disappearance of it is a specific innovation typical of Hijazi Arabic. Indeed, there is evidence for this being a Hijazi innovation from the epigraphic record as well: Two Graeco-Arabic inscriptions from North Arabia attest verbs that unambiguously have *i*-prefixes with a stem vowel *a*: *ʔrʔw* /yirʔaw/ ‘they pastured’ (Al-Jallad and al-Manaser 2015) and *εσρρατ* /yisrat/ ‘he served in the army’ (Al-Jallad et al. 2020). There is epigraphic evidence in the Northern Hijaz of the innovative generalization of the *a*-prefixes, namely in a Greek inscription which contains the name *Ιαλης* (UJadhGr 2) (Nehmé 2018, 286 f.), identified by Ahmad Al-Jallad (personal correspondence) as representing the Arabic verbal name /yaʕlē/, rather than the expected /yīʕlē/, had Barth-Ginsberg been operative. Thus, the epigraphic record seems to confirm that the lack of Barth-Ginsberg alternation is a Hijazi isogloss, in line with the reports of the grammarians.

In the QCT it is generally difficult to find unambiguous evidence for or against the Barth-Ginsberg alternation of the prefix, because of the short vowels being unwritten. However, there are two types of verbs, identified by Sibawayh and al-Farrāʿ alike, where this dialectal difference shows up in the consonantal skeleton of the text. As they both point out, stative verbs with *I-w* and *I-ʔ* stems, in the case of the application of Barth-Ginsberg, will end up with a *yāʔ*, thus one gets *tīḡalu* ‘you fear’ and *tīʔbā* ‘you refuse’ (Sibawayh, IV, 111). In this place, the QCT provides us with evidence that Quranic Arabic follows the Hijazi innovation of not having Barth-Ginsberg alternation, as we find لا توغل /lā tawḡal/ ‘do not fear!’ (Q15:53) rather than لا تيجل **, explicitly mentioned by al-Farrāʿ (*Luḡāt*, 8) to be the expected form in the non-Hijazi dialects. For the *I-ʔ* stems, we find more evidence in the QCT that the Barth-Ginsberg alternation did not operate: ان تامنه /ʔin tāman-h/ ‘if you entrust him’ (Q3:75, twice), لا تامنا /lā tāman-nā/ ‘you do not entrust us’ (Q12:11), تاملون /tālamūn/ ‘you are

9 For this feature, see also Rabin (1951, 158, §p, q), who suggests that this feature is borrowed from North-West Semitic, rather than a shared retention. This seems to be the result of imposition of the late Classical Arabic norms which lacks this alternation, taking this standard as a stand-in for Proto-Arabic. There is no obvious reason to assume that the Classical Arabic situation is original in this case.

suffering' (Q4:104, twice), فلا تأس /fa-lā tās/ 'so do not grieve' (Q5:26, 68), ليكلا /likay-lā tāsaw/ 'in order that you do not grieve' (Q57:23), وتابى /wa-tābē/ 'but [their hearts] refuse' (Q9:8). اسى /āsē/ 'I grieve' (Q7:93), ان ادن /an ādan/ 'that I give permission' (Q7:123; Q20:71; Q26:49), امنكم /ʔāmanu-kum/ 'I entrust you' (Q12:64); لا ياب /lā yāb/ 'he should not refuse' (Q2:282, twice); فلا يامن /fa-lā yāman/ 'he does not feel secure' (Q7:99); ويابى /wa-yābē/ 'and he refuses' (Q9:32) حتى ياذن /ḥattē yādan/ 'until he permits' (Q12:80); لم ياذن /lam yādan/ 'he did not allow' (Q42:21); ان ياذن /an yādan/ 'that he permits' (Q53:26) ان يامنوكم ويامنوا قومهم /an yāmanū wa-yāmanū qawmahum/ 'that they entrust you and they entrust their people' (Q4:91); يالمونك /yālamūna/ 'you are suffering' (Q4:104).

These examples thus confirm that Quranic Arabic follows the innovative Hijazi practice of lacking the Barth-Ginsberg alternation.

4.8 Uninflected *halumma*

Rabin (1951, 162f., §z)—following al-Farrāʔ (*Luġāt*, 63) and Sībawayh (III, 529)—points out that in the Hijaz *halumma* 'come on!' was uninflected, while the Tamīm conjugated it as an imperative verb, sg.m. *halumma*, sg.f. *halummī*, du. *halummā*, pl.m. *halummū* pl.f. *halmumna*, (al-Farrāʔ reports the unexpected feminine plural forms *halummanna*, *halumunna*). In the QCT, هلم is uninflected in the two places it occurs (Q6:150; Q33:18), which in both cases has a plural addressee. The QCT therefore agrees with the Hijaz in this regard. The Hijazi form here is probably archaic, as it seems likely that this is a presentative particle *hal*¹⁰ followed by *-umma*, the same particle as the vocative suffix that one finds in *allāh-umma* 'O God!' The innovation of the Tamīm would have then been to interpret this as an imperative verb.¹¹

4.9 Imperatives and Apocopates of II=III Verbs Have the Shape vCCvC Rather Than (v)CvCC

Imperative and apocopates of geminate verbs have a metathesized form in non-Hijazi dialects (*urudd(a/u)*), whereas in the Hijaz they are un-metathesized (*urdud*) (Rabin 1951, 161f., §y). This according to Rabin (1951, 4) is one of "the few Hijazi forms [...] that appear sporadically [in the Quran]". It should be

10 Compare for example Ugaritic *hl* 'see; here is/are; now (then)' (Huehnergard 2012, 146).

11 I thank Ahmad al-Jallad for suggesting this analysis to me.

clear by now that many more Hijazi features than just the treatment of geminate verbs appear in the Quran. The claim that this form is sporadic among the readers is not in keeping with the attestations in the Quran. The unmetathesized Hijazi form is the norm. The apocopate occurs without metathesis 43 times, and the imperative 8 times. The metathesized forms never occur for the imperative, and for the apocopate there are only three, or four cases. The first is يَشَاقُ ‘opposes’ (Q59:4), while the unmetathesized form of the same verb is attested as يَشَاقُ ‘opposes’ (Q4:115). The second and third are تَضَارُ ‘suffers’ (Q2:233) and يَضَارُ ‘suffers’ (Q2:282), which do not occur in unmetathesized forms elsewhere. The last case is a bit more involved. In the Kufan and Basran codices يَرْتَدُّ ‘turns back’ (Q5:54) occurs besides يَرْتَدُّ ‘turns back’ (Q2:217) (Al-Dānī *muqniʿ*, 107), but in the Syrian and Medinan codices Q5:54 is spelled يَرْتَدُّ¹²

Rabin suggests that the Hijaz used the unmetathesized forms exclusively, while the Tamīm used the metathesized forms. This is indeed how Sibawayh (III, 529–532) reports it. However, al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt*, 36) seems to accept the possibility of metathesized forms in Hijazi dialects as he says that Hijaz and ʿAsad place the vowel *a* after metathesized final root consonants such as in *tuḍārra* while Tamīm and Qays have *tuḍārri*. The isogloss therefore seems to be that Hijazi was able to use both metathesized and unmetathesized forms whereas Tamīm used the metathesized forms exclusively. The QCT overwhelmingly has forms that are not metathesized, clearly showing this Hijazi isogloss. The metathesis found in Hijazi would appear to be a reflex of a type of assimilation across syllable boundaries that occasionally occurs in the QCT, also in other positions (see Appendix A.3.5 for a discussion).

4.10 Mā ḥiġāziyyah

The vast majority of the nominal negation using *mā* is constructed with the predicate marked with *bi-*, e.g. وَمَا هُمْ بِمُؤْمِنِينَ ‘they are not believers’ (Q2:8). Only on rare occasions is the *bi-* left out, and in those cases a disagreement is said to occur between the people of the Hijaz and Najd. This much is also admitted by al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt*, 28): “the people of the Hijaz say *mā zaydun bi-qāʾim* ‘Zayd is not standing’, and hardly ever do they drop the *bi-* from their speech,

12 It is surprising that Rabin (1951, 162) reports to not have found variants for Q5:54, as *yarta-did* is the reading of the canonical Syrian and Medinan readers, Ibn ʿāmir, Nāfiʿ and ʿabū Ġaʿfar—in accordance with their regional rasm (Ibn al-Ġazārī, § 2989).

and this is how it is in the Quran except in His speech: *mā hādā bašarā* and *mā hunna ʔummaḥātī-him*, they apply the accusative when they leave out the *bi-*. Tamīm, Qays and ʔasad (also) say it with the *bi-*, but when they remove the *bi-*, they apply the nominative.”¹³ This use of the accusative is usually known as *Mā Ḥiǧāziyyah*, whereas using the nominative is called the *Mā Tamīmiyyah*, this feature is well-known among the grammarians (see also Sībawayh, I, 57). At the time of writing, Rabin (1951, 174 ff., §p-t) seemed to lack sources that explicitly comment on the frequency of this construction, and as he points out it seems to have been quite rare. We now know that this was also recognized by Al-Farrāʔ as well. Indeed, in the QCT, only one unambiguous case of the *mā Ḥiǧāziyyah* can be discerned, namely the famous *ما هذا بشرا* “this is not a man” (Q12:31). The one other commonly cited example *ما هن أمهتهم* “they are not their mothers” (Q58:2), universally read in the Hijazi manner by the canonical readers *mā hunna ʔummaḥātī-him(ū)* (not *ʔummaḥātu-hum(ū)*)¹⁴ is ambiguous in the QCT, and could reflect both the *mā ḥiǧāziyyah* and the *mā tamīmiyyah*. Rabin tentatively supplies another option *ما منكم من احد عنه حزين* “not one of you can shield against it” (Q69:47). This one does show the Hijazi form in the QCT, but does not get commented upon by the Arab grammarians, perhaps because they took *ḥāǧizīna* as a *ḥāl*.

As pointed out by al-Farrāʔ and Rabin, all other cases of nominal negation with *mā* mark the predicate with *bi-*. The anomalous nature of *ما هذا بشرا* (Q12:31) was the reason for Ahmad al-Jallad (2020b, 68f.) to suggest that it is a grammatical anomaly included as a conscious choice in the direct speech, perhaps to give a colloquial effect to the quotation in the Quran. He likewise observes that another grammatical anomaly, the famous *ان هذان لسحران* “These two are wizards!” (Q20:63), likewise occurs in direct speech. It should be noted that, unless there is another plausible interpretation of *ما هن أمهتهم*, the use of the nominal negation with *mā* without *bi-* seems exceedingly rare, but not unique to direct speech. With the caveat that this is admitted to be a marginal feature in the Hijaz as well as that it is extremely marginal in the Quran, the grammarian data does seem to assign a Hijazi origin to the isogloss that find in the QCT.

13 *ʔahlu l-ḥiǧāzi yaqūlūna: mā zaydun bi-qāʔimin, fa-lā yakādūna yulqūna l-bāʔa min kalāmi-him, bi-dālīka ǧāʔa l-qurʔānu ʔillā qawlahū “mā hādā bašaran”; “mā hunna ʔummaḥātī-him” wa-yanšibūna ʔidā ʔalqawī l-bāʔ. tamīmun wa-qaysun wa-ʔasadan yaqūlūna bil-bāʔi, fa-ʔidā ʔarahū l-bāʔa rafafū.*

14 Although the non-canonical transmitter of ʔāšim, al-Mufaḍḍal, is said to have read this with the nominative (Ibn Muǧāhid, 628; Ibn Xālawayh, 154).

4.11 The Morphosyntax of *kāla*

Al-Farrāʾ (Maṣānī, 11, 245 f.) tells us that there is disagreement on the how the verb *kālū* ‘to allot s.th. to s.o.’ should be treated. He says that the people of the Hijaz and those that neighbour Qays treat the recipient of the allotment as a direct object, giving examples such as *qad kiltu-ka ṭaṣāman kaṭīran* ‘I have allotted to you a lot of food’, and *kilta-nī* ‘you have allotted to me’, the more regular syntax appears to be with the preposition *li-*, i.e. *kilta lī* and *kiltu laka*. As al-Farrāʾ points out himself, the QCT follows the Hijazi practice in this regard *كالوهم* ‘they allotted to them’ (Q83:3).

4.12 The Presentative *hāʾum*

Al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt*, 143 f.) reports a difference between the presentative particle *hāʾa* ‘voilà’ and how it is inflected among the people of the Hijaz in contrast to the people of Najd (Qays, Tamīm, ʾasad). The Najdi tribes treat this presentative particle morphologically as an imperative verb, whereas the Hijazi dialect seems to base its endings on the 2sg. pronominal endings where the *k* has been swapped out with ʾ for unclear reasons. Al-Farrāʾ also reports that it has reached him that some Arabs indeed have *kāf* in place of the *hamzah* giving as example *hā-ka* and *hā-ki*.

	Hijaz	Najd
m.sg.	<i>hāʾa</i>	<i>haʾ</i> or <i>hāʾa</i>
f.sg.	<i>hāʾi</i>	<i>hāʾī</i> sometimes <i>hāʾi</i>
dual	<i>hāʾumā</i>	<i>hāʾā</i>
m.pl.	<i>hāʾum</i>	<i>hāʾū</i>
f.pl.	<i>hāʾunna</i>	<i>haʾna</i>

While this presentative particle is not attested particularly often in the QCT, the one time it does show up, it clearly takes on the Hijazi morphological form *هاوم* (Q69:19).

4.13 The Use of *Zawǧ* as ‘Wife’

One of the reported differences between Hijaz as opposed to Tamīm and many of Qays and the people of Najd, according to al-Farrāʾ (*Luǧāt*, 32–33) is that *zawǧ* is a unisex word meaning both ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ depending on the context in Hijazi whereas in the east *zawǧ* is ‘husband’ and *zawǧah* is ‘wife’. The QCT clearly aligns with the Hijazi distribution, e.g. *يَا دَامُ اسْكُنْ أَنْتَ وَزَوْجُكَ الْجَنَّةَ* ‘O Adam, dwell, you and your wife, in Paradise’ (Q2:35).

4.14 Alternations between G- and C-stems

On multiple occasions al-Farrāʾ (*Luǧāt*) reports that some dialects have a C-stem where other dialects have a G-stem, with the same meaning. These are in essence lexical isoglosses, based on what kind of morphology they follow, and they allow us to compare them against what we see in the QCT. We find that whatever is reported to be the Hijazi form is the form that we find in the QCT. Verbs reported to have a C-stem in the Hijaz, and a G-stem elsewhere, are the following:

- *ʔawḥā* ‘to inspire’ (Hijaz), *waḥā* (ʔasad), p. 146. QCT: Hijazi *اوحى* (Q99:5).
- *ʔawfā* ‘to fulfill’ (Hijaz), *wafā* ‘id.’ (Najd), p. 49. QCT: Hijazi *اوفى* (Q3:76) ‘he fulfills’.

Cases where the Hijaz rather has the G-stem whereas other tribes have a C-stem are more numerous, examples of these are the following:

- *fatana* ‘to tempt’ (Hijaz), *ʔaftana* ‘id.’ (Tamīm, Rabīʿah, ʔasad, Qays), p. 57. QCT: Hijazi *فتنا* (Q29:3).
- *ḥaruma* ‘to be forbidden’, *ḥarām* pl. *ḥurum* ‘forbidden’ (Hijazi), *ʔaḥrama* ‘to be forbidden’, *muḥrim* ‘forbidden’ (ʔasad, Tamīm, Qays), p. 60 f. QCT: Hijazi *الحرام* (Q2:144).
- *ʔaṣafa* ‘to blow violently’ (Hijaz) *ʔaṣafa* (ʔasad), p. 73. QCT: Hijazi G-stem active participle *عاصف* (Q10:22; Q14:18); *عاصفه* (Q21:81); *عصفت* (Q77:2), rather than the C-stem *muṣṣif*.
- *marāḡa* ‘to release’ (Hijaz), *ʔamraḡa* (Najd), p. 108. QCT: Hijazi *مرج* (Q25:53; Q55:19).

In one case the QCT seems to have both the G- and the C-stem with the same meaning attested.

- *nakira* ‘to not know’ (Hijaz), *ʔankara* (ʔasad, Tamīm), p. 75. The QCT uses the G-stem once *نكروهم* ‘he did not know them’ (Q11:70), the C-stem usually means ‘to reject, deny’ e.g. *ينكرونها* ‘they deny it’ (Q16:83), but the active participle at least once seems to have the G-stem meaning in Q12:58 *وهم له منكرون* ‘they did not know/recognize him’.

These lexical isoglosses of verbal stem formation in the QCT therefore seem to follow the patterns as they are reported for the Hijazi dialect.

4.15 Morphological Isoglosses Not Recognized by the Grammarians

In Quranic Arabic, there are several morphological developments which based on comparative evidence with modern dialects and Old Arabic must certainly be seen as innovations typical of Quranic Arabic, yet are not recognized or discussed as isoglosses by the Arab grammarians. In these cases, whatever we find in Quranic Arabic is identical to the *ṣarabiyyah*—that which the grammarians describe as valid and eloquent Arabic. While these do not help us better classify Quranic Arabic within the context of the dialects as described by the grammarians, they occasionally do allow us to set it apart from modern dialects and attested forms of Old Arabic in the epigraphic record.

4.15.1 Ta-prefix in Prefix Conjugation of tD- and tL-stems

In Gəʕəz, the tD- and tL-stems the suffix conjugation has the shape *tä-* for the formation prefix whereas the prefix conjugation has the shape *t-*, i.e. *täqäṭṭälä*, *yəṭqäṭṭäl*. Classical Arabic has *ta-* in both forms, while most modern dialects have *t-* in both stems. It was already noted by Diem (1982) that these *t-* forms cannot be explained as the outcome of regular sound change from *ta-*, and therefore both the *ta-* and *t-* forms must have been around in Proto-Arabic. He subsequently suggests that Proto-Arabic probably had the distribution as it is attested in Gəʕəz. Since Diem's article, dialectological data has become available that shows there are dialects that generalize the *ta-* like Classical Arabic, and more importantly, that there are some rare dialects that indeed retain the alternation as it is present in Gəʕəz. See for example: Douz Arabic *tʰaššam/yithaššam* 'to be ashamed', *tʰāṣṣarak/yitṣāṣarak* 'to fight' (Ritt-Benmimoun 2014, 349–350; 355–357),¹⁵ Gulf Arabic *tagayyir/yitḡayyar* 'to change', *tiwāfag/yitwāfag* 'to help each other' (Holes 2010, 404f.) and finally in Saudi Arabic we find Ghāmid *takallam/yitkallam* 'to speak', Qauz *tikallam/yitkallam* 'to speak', Hofuf *taharrak/titharrak* (3sg.f.) 'to move' (Prochazka 1988, 40–50). From this evidence we must conclude that this alternation of the *ta-* and *t-* prefix can securely be reconstructed for Proto-Arabic. The fact that this aligns with what we find in Gəʕəz, make it clear that this allomorphy can even be reconstructed for Proto-West Semitic.

15 The ultrashort vowels ⁱ and ^a are the regular outcome of **a* in open syllables.

While the evidence is sparse, the data available suggest that Quranic Arabic underwent the same generalization as Classical Arabic. For the suffix conjugation it is clear it always has the *ta*- prefix, because it does not have a prothetic *ʔalif* to break up the CC cluster, e.g. *تقطع* 'to be severed' (Q6:94) rather than *اقطع* that one would expect for **/itqaʔʔaʕ/*. Evidence that the prefix was *ta*- in the prefix conjugation is sparser, but it can be deduced from *يتاخر* '(that) he stay behind' (Q74:37), which could only represent */yatāxxar/* or if the *hamzah* is retained in this context */yataʔaxxar/*. Had the prefix been *t*- we would have expected *يتخر* for */yataxxar/* from **yatʔaxxara*.

Thus, we can conclude that Quranic Arabic has innovated by generalizing the *ta*- prefix to both suffix and prefix conjugations. This generalization seems to have become the prestigious form early on, as any mention of a situation with *ta*-/*t*- alternation or a generalized *t*- so abundant among the modern dialects seems to be entirely absent in the descriptions of the Arab grammarians. It is thus a clear morphological innovation of Quranic Arabic compared to Proto-Arabic, but it is not explicitly attributed to the Hijaz.

4.15.2 *N-prefix in the Suffix Conjugation of N-stems*

Much like the *tD*- and *tL*-stems, the *N*-stem appears to have had a vocalized allomorph *na*- in the suffix conjugation and an unvocalized allomorph *-n*- in the prefix conjugation in Proto-Arabic. Evidence for this distribution is found in Safaitic where the lack of assimilation of the *n* in the suffix conjugation such as in *nǧdb* /naǧṣaba/ 'he was angered' clearly suggests a vocalised prefix. The form *yqtl* /yiqqatel/ 'to be killed' on the other hand appears to represent an assimilated *n*-prefix (Al-Jallad 2015, 134 ff.). The fact that this Old Arabic reflex finds a parallel outside of Arabic in, e.g. Hebrew Pf. *nip̄sal* Impf. *yippaʕel* < **na-p̄sala*, **yi-n-paʕilu* (Suchard 2019, 49 f.) suggests that Safaitic retains the Proto-Arabic situation. Quranic Arabic, like Classical Arabic and, to my knowledge, all modern dialects has generalized the unvocalized allomorph *-n*- to both stems, yielding forms such as pf. *انقلب* 'he turned' (Q22:11) impf. *ينقلب* 'he turns' (Q2:143). While the Arab grammarians do not comment on the vocalized prefix form at all, from the epigraphic record and comparative Semitic data it is clear that the Quranic Arabic form is innovative.

4.15.3 *The ʔan yafʕala Verbal Complement Construction*

Al-Jallad (2020b, 61) identifies the *ʔan yafʕala* verbal complement construction as yet another isogloss of Hijazi Arabic, in contrast to epigraphic Old Arabic. Both the language of the Quran, and the Old Hijazi of the Damascus psalm fragment form verbal complements with the particle *ʔan* followed by the subjunctive verb, where in Old Arabic of the Levant and North Arabia an infinitive

construction would be used (Al-Jallad 2015, 112f.). This seems to be a Hijazi innovation, as its earliest attestation occurs in a fragmentary Dadanitic inscription from al-Ṣulā in the Northern Hijaz (Al-Jallad 2020b, 61). However, this is an innovation that Quranic Arabic shares with Classical Arabic, and is thus not identified as a Hijazi isogloss by the grammarians.

4.15.4 *Use of the Definite Article al-*

An interesting isogloss that is not exclusive to the Hijaz, but nevertheless forms a clear linguistic isogloss in the Old Arabic linguistic record is the shape of the definite article. In the Old Arabic present in the corpus of Safaitic inscriptions the definite article is usually represented by a *h-* (presumably /haC-/), not infrequently ʿ- and only rarely by *hn-* or ʾl- (Al-Jallad 2015, 11, n. 10), and the Old Arabic of the Hismaic corpus seems to lack a definite article altogether (Al-Jallad 2018b, 12). In Nabataean Arabic, on the other hand, it is always written ʕ, suggesting an unassimilated /al-/ in all contexts. This same lack of assimilation is also found in the Arabic of the Damascus psalm fragment (Al-Jallad 2020b, 24). For Quranic Arabic, the evidence is difficult to interpret, the QCT would suggest an unassimilated article, but this might be a purely orthographic convention—as it is in Classical Arabic—adopted from the Nabataean writing system. Van Putten (2019b, 14f.) gives some not particularly binding arguments why an assimilated article before apical consonants, as in Classical Arabic, might be preferable over an unassimilated situation as found in the Damascus psalm fragment. Whatever the interpretation of the QCT in this case, that it uses the *al-* article, as opposed to the *haC-* article, the Yemeni *an-/am-* articles or a completely absent definite article certainly distinguishes it from the Old Arabic present in the northern varieties of Safaitic and Hismaic, and puts it closer to Nabataean Arabic in this regard. The early Arab grammarians, however, do not recognize this as a Hijazi isogloss at all, and rather see the *al-* article with assimilation as the only acceptable form of the *ʕarabiyyah*.

4.16 *Questionable Morphological Isoglosses*

There are a few morphological isoglosses of the Hijaz discussed by Rabin (1951) which can be deduced from the QCT where it does not agree with the reported Hijazi form. However, in these three cases, we will see that it is to be doubted whether the isogloss is to be attributed to the whole Hijaz, or to the Hijaz at all, as early sources of the grammarians give conflicting reports.

4.16.1 *The III-w Passive Participle Is maCCuww Not maCCiyy*

Al-Farrāʾ (Maṣānī, II, 169 f.) claims it is a linguistic practice of the people of the Hijaz to retain the consonant *w in passive participles of III-w stems, e.g. *marḍuwwan* rather than *marḍiyyan* ‘pleasing’. This disagrees with the QCT مرضيا (Q19:55). Rabin (1951, 161, § x) seems skeptical of this isogloss and calls it a “curious statement”. His skepticism seems warranted, because elsewhere al-Farrāʾ (Luḡāt, 92) is explicit in saying that it is only “some of the people of the Hijaz” that do this. Therefore, it does not appear to have been a general innovation found in all of the Hijaz.

This neutralization appears to be part of a more widespread neutralization of III-w and III-y in derived nominal stems. In the QCT we also see عصيم /ʕu/iṣiyyu-hum/ (Q20:66, Q26:44) as the CuCūC plural of عصا ‘rod’. Interestingly, the CuCūC verbal nouns seems to mostly keep III-w and III-y roots distinct. Thus, we see علوا /ʕuluwwā/ (Q17:4, 43; Q27:14; Q28:83) as the verbal noun of علا ‘to be high, elevated’, and عتوا /ʕutuwwā/ (Q25:21), عتو /ʕutuww/ (Q67:21) as the verbal noun of عتا ‘to be insolent’, whereas we find لريقك /li-ru/iqiyyi-ka/ (Q17:93) as the verbal noun of رقى ‘to ascend’ and مضيا /mu/iḍiyyā/ (Q36:67) as the verbal noun of مضى ‘to go away’. The Quran however exploits verbal nouns that have undergone this neutralization for the purpose of rhyme in Sūrat Maryam (Q19): عتيا /ʕu/itiyyā/ (Q19:8, 69) as an alternative verbal noun of عتا besides عتوا mentioned above, and جثيا /ḡu/iṭiyyā/ (Q19:68, 72) as the verbal noun of جثا ‘to kneel’.

4.16.2 *The Passive Participle of II-y Is maCīC Rather Than maCyūC*

A doubtful isogloss is the Tamīmī practice of using *madyūn* instead of the Hijazi *madīn* for passive participles of II-y roots (Rabin 1951, 160, §u). As Rabin points out, it is likely that the Tamīmī form is an innovative analogical formation of the passive participle, rather than the Proto-Arabic reflex, in which case Hijazi would simply have the Proto-Arabic form. The QCT indeed has the alleged Hijazi form, but contrary to Rabin’s claim, this does not occur only once in مهلا ‘poured down’ (Q73:14), but also مدينون (Q37:53), مدينين (Q56:86) ‘indebted; judged’, مكيدون ‘tricked’ (Q52:42).

Sībawayh (IV, 248) does report that ‘some Arabs’ say *mabyūʿ* ‘bought’ rather than *mabīʿ*, but he does not explicitly identify it as a non-Hijazi or Tamīmī form, nor does he identify *mabīʿ* as the Hijazi form.¹⁶ The much later grammarian Ibn

16 Some of these “Tamīmī” forms have made it into the Classical Arabic language. Fischer (2002, § 247.2) mentions *mabyūʿ* ‘sold’, which occurs besides *mabīʿ*. Wehr (1979, s.v.) also mentions *madyūn* besides *madīn* for ‘indebted’. In Classical Arabic the alleged Hijazi form is dominant.

Ġinnī (d. 392/1002) in his *Kitāb al-Muġtaṣab* (p. 3) does identify the *mabyūʿ* type as Tamīmī, but considering how late a source Ibn Ġinnī is, we should be skeptical of this attribution.

4.16.3 *Gt-stems of I-w verbs Is itazara instead of ittazara*

According to some grammarians Hijazi Arabic had *itazara* rather than *ittazara* for I-w verbs in the Gt-stem (Rabin 1951, 158f., §r). If correct, this would be an example where the QCT does not follow the Hijazi formation, cf. فاتقوا ‘so fear!’ (Q2:24) and ائسق ‘to become full’ (Q84:18). The identification seems doubtful however, as early sources give conflicting accounts. For example, al-Farrāʿ (*Luġāt*, 20) explicitly attributes the form *ittaqū* with an initial long consonant to the people of the Hijaz, while he attributes *taqū* to Tamīm and ʿasad. He makes no mention of a form *itaqū*.

4.16.4 *The Hijazi Dual Is Uninflected, Using the Nominative Form*

Rabin (1951, 156, §m) suggests that, at least in the dialect of Mecca, the dual did not inflect for case and the nominative was used in all positions. If this is correct, then Quranic Arabic disagrees with the Meccan dialect in this regard, as the dual is fully functional. However, this dialectal explanation seems to exist exclusively as a pious explanation of the problematic reading *ʔinna hādāni la-sāḥirāni* (Q20:63) (Ibn al-Ġazarī, § 3590–3591), where from a Classical Arabic grammatical perspective ʔabū ʿamr’s *hādayni* would be expected. There is, of course, no *a priori* reason to assume that the demonstrative inflected for case in Quranic Arabic; other demonstratives do not inflect for case either. It might not be that the dual in general did not inflect in Hijazi, but that it was specifically the dual demonstratives that did not. Such an interpretation seems to be implicitly suggested (and attributed to the southern Hijazi tribe Banū al-Ḥārīṭ b. Kaʿb) by al-Farrāʿ (*Luġāt*, 94) who only mentions the non-inflecting nature of *hādāni*. هذَن (Q20:63, Q22:19) is the only form of the masculine dual attested in the QCT, whereas the feminine is only attested as هَتَيْن (Q28:27), there is therefore no way to confirm that the Quranic Arabic had an inflecting dual. However, the QCT also allows for a different interpretation. While the particle *ʔinna* requires the accusative, the particle *ʔin* with the same function requires the nominative. The QCT ان هذَن لِسِحْرَن simply accommodates such a reading, and is indeed the canonical reading reported for Ḥaḥṣ ʿan ʿāšim and Ibn Kaṭīr.

Other case of *ʔin* in the function of *ʔinna* are found among several canonical readers, e.g. Q86:4 *ʔin kullu nafsin lamā ʿalayhā ḥāfiẓun* “Every soul has a guardian over it” (majority reading), as opposed to *ʔin kullu nafsin lammā ʿalayhā ḥāfiẓ* “there is no soul but has a guardian over it.” (ʿāšim, Ibn ʿāmir,

Ḥamzah, ṭabū Ġaṣṣar). Similar constructions with disagreement on *lamā* versus *lammā* are found in Q36:32 and Q43:35 (Ibn al-Ġazarī, § 3312–3313).

Whatever the explanation, the use of *ʔin* in this function, an uninflected dual deictic or even a mere mistake in the QCT—as suggested by a transmission brought by al-Farrāʾ (*Luġāt* 94 f.) in which ʔāʔiṣah supposedly proclaimed this¹⁷—this can hardly be used as evidence of an isogloss of a completely uninflecting dual in Hijazi Arabic. Note that the use of this dual is specifically used in direct speech, which Al-Jallad (2020b, 68 f.) suggests may have been a context which uses explicitly colloquial features for rhetorical effect, see section § 4.10 for more details.

4.17 The Quran Is Morphologically Hijazi

As mentioned in section § 4.1 it was Rabin's claim that, while Quranic Arabic was phonologically perhaps somewhat adapted to the local Hijazi dialect, it morphologically adhered almost completely to the poetic koiné. The problem is that Rabin—nor to my knowledge any other author—ever defines what exactly the features morphological or otherwise of this poetic koiné are.

As we have elaborated upon in chapter 2 the very category of a 'poetic koiné' as opposed to 'dialects' is not a dichotomy the Arabic grammarians operated within. In fact, whenever we find Sibawayh discussing a variety of different morphological or phonological options he frequently qualifies this with a *wa-kullun ʔarabiyy*—All is Arabic, even when these options are explicitly attributed to tribes. I think we should take these statements of the grammarians seriously. If we do not impose a dichotomy between an undefined and undescribed poetic koiné versus the dialects, and look at which dialectal features that can actually be recognized in the QCT, a rather clear picture emerges: all the morphological features attributed to the Hijaz that can be gleaned from the QCT indeed confirm that it is a Hijazi text.

It is worth appreciating just how different the view from the QCT is in comparison to what we find in the reading traditions. As I showed in chapter 3, the reading traditions are very mixed, sound laws do not operate regularly and each reading incorporates Hijazi and non-Hijazi features in a haphazard manner and in different configurations from other readers. From the readings, no real

17 Along with two examples of seemingly mistaken case in the sound masculine plural, in both cases related to the *ʔin(na)* and *lākin(na)* particles, namely *lākini r-rāsixūna* [...] *wa-l-muqīmīna* (Q4:162) and *ʔinna llaḏīna ʔāmanū wa-llaḏīna hādū wa-ṣ-ṣabiʔūna* (Q5:69), cf. the doublet of this phrase the expected case in Q22:17.

signal from any dialect can be recovered. Therefore, it is all the more striking that the QCT gives such a regular picture. This is unlikely to be a coincidence.

Whenever we are dealing with innovative features of Hijazi Arabic, where the pre-Islamic epigraphic record can give us insight into this feature, we find that likewise the northern varieties of Safaitic and Nabataean Arabic do not appear to have undergone these innovations. This lends some credibility to the comments of the grammarians that these innovations should indeed be sought in the Hijaz. The table below summarizes the isoglosses discussed so far. Some of these cases are retentions while others are innovations, but all in all the picture is clear. Thus, let me recast Rabin's quote mentioned at the top of this section, in terms of what the linguistic evidence actually brings us: As for the Quran, in morphology we find an almost complete conformity with *Hijazi Arabic* has been achieved; the few *Najdi* forms, such as the biliteral jussive and imperative of verbs med. gem. only appear sporadically.

The table below summarizes the morphological isoglosses of Quranic Arabic that have a clear tribal attribution among the Arab grammarians. As should be clear, all of them invariably agree with Quranic Arabic being a Hijazi text. The column next to it examines the presence or absence of these isoglosses in epigraphic Old Arabic such as Nabataean Arabic, Safaitic and Himaic. Whenever the epigraphic record allows us to discern this, we find that in these northern varieties said isoglosses are absent, which lends credence to the grammarian data that suggests these are Hijazi innovations.

	Grammarians	Old Arabic
<i>ʔalla</i> - base relative pronoun	All non-Ṭayyiʔ tribes	North: Absent, Hijaz: Present
Distal demonstratives with <i>-l(i)-</i>	Hijaz	Absent
pl.dist <i>ʔulāʔika</i> (not <i>ʔulāka</i>)	Hijaz	?
m.sg.prox <i>dā</i> > <i>hā-dā</i>	Hijaz	Absent
f.sg.prox (<i>hā</i>)- <i>tī/dī</i> > <i>hādih</i>	Hijaz	Absent
Loss of Barth-Ginsberg alternation	Hijaz	Absent
Uninflected <i>halumma</i>	Hijaz	?
Uncontracted II=III imperative/apocopate	Hijaz	?
<i>Mā Ḥiǧāziyyah</i>	Hijaz	?
Presentative <i>hāʔa</i> with pronominal endings	Hijaz	?
<i>Zawǧ</i> as Wife	Hijaz	?
Lexical isoglosses of G- and C-stems	Hijaz	?