

Adoption of the tri-radical root system among Iberian Exegetes, acceptance and rejection. The case of Moses ibn Chiquitilla

Daniel E. M. Isaac*

Université de Strasbourg

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5731-4543>

This article looks at the role of formal grammatical analysis in the writings of Moses ibn Chiquitilla; tracing the adoption of trilateralism among grammarians in Iberia. One of the enduring difficulties of recounting a history of the major developments in the study of Hebrew grammar is the patchwork nature of the material available. With the availability of the Firkovitch collection at the Russian National Library (RNL), source material from the 11th-century grammarian, translator, and exegete, Moses ibn Chiquitilla, is now available. Of what little survives of Ibn Chiquitilla's writings, a large portion of his biblical commentary on Psalms is preserved in one manuscript, Evr-Arab. I 3583 alongside smaller portions belonging to other libraries. In this article, I trace the development of debates among grammarians as portrayed in the writings of Ibn Chiquitilla. I reach the conclusion that among the circles of grammarians in Saragossa in the 11th and 12th centuries, Ibn Chiquitilla tends towards the opinions of Judah Ḥayyūj, accepting the theoretical underpinnings of his system of grammar. He rejects any exceptions to the triradical roots including the biradicalism of Ibn Naǧrela and Ibn ʿEzra.

KEYWORDS: Ibn Chiquitilla; Hebrew; Judaeo-Arabic; Judaism; Bible, Ḥayyūj.

ADOPCIÓN DEL TRILITERALISMO ENTRE LOS EXEGETAS IBÉRICOS, ACEPTACIÓN Y RECHAZO. EL CASO DE MOISÉS IBN CHIQUITILLA.— Este artículo examina el papel del análisis gramatical formal en los escritos de Moisés ibn Chiquitilla rastreando la adopción del trilateralismo entre los gramáticos de la Península Ibérica. Una de las dificultades constantes a la hora de abordar la historia de los principales avances en el estudio de la gramática hebrea es el carácter fragmentario del material disponible. La colección Firkovitch de la Biblioteca Nacional Rusa (RNL) permite ahora el acceso a fuentes del gramático, traductor y exégeta del siglo XI, Moisés ibn Chiquitilla. De lo poco que se conserva de su obra, destaca una gran parte de su comentario bíblico a Salmos en el manuscrito RNL Evr-Arab. I 3583, junto con otros fragmentos más pequeños custodiados en otras bibliotecas. En este artículo rastreo el desarrollo de los debates entre los gramáticos tal y como aparecen

* danielisaac99@gmail.com

retratados en los escritos de Ibn Chiquitilla. Llego a la conclusión de que entre los círculos de gramáticos de Zaragoza de los siglos XI-XII, Ibn Chiquitilla se inclina por las opiniones de Judá Ḥayyūj, aceptando los fundamentos teóricos de su sistema gramatical y rechazando cualquier excepción a las raíces trirradicales, incluido el birradicalismo de Ibn Naǧrela e Ibn ‘Ezra.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Ibn Chiquitilla; hebreo; judeo-árabe; judaísmo; Biblia; Ḥayyūj.

One of the enduring difficulties of recounting a history of the major developments in the study of Hebrew grammar is the patchwork nature of the material available. With the availability of the Firkovitch collection at the Russian National Library (RNL) a transformation of what is known to scholars has taken place in the past thirty years. In this article, we consider one example of previously unavailable material, that of the 11th-century translator and exegete Moses ibn Chiquitilla.¹ Little survives about the life of Moses ben Samuel Ha-Kohen ibn Chiquitilla beyond his place of birth, Cordova,² an approximate date for his birth, around the beginning of the 11th century, and that he migrated to Saragossa.³ We may add to this that Ibn Chiquitilla’s younger contemporary, Judah ibn Bal‘am (c. second half of the 11th century) appears nowhere

¹ Daniel Elan Menahem ISAAC, *Héros de l’armée et guerrier: une analyse critique du commentaire de Moïse Ibn Chiquitilla sur le livre des Psaumes* (Strasbourg: PhD, 2023) pp. 10-12 and José MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Mosheh ben Shemu’el ha-Kohen ibn Chiquitilla, el traductor», *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 51 (2002), pp. 119-157; «Allusions to Christian Sources in A Manuscript of Ibn Giqatila’s Commentary on Psalms», in *Eastern Christians and their written heritage: manuscripts, scribes and context*, eds. Juan P. Monferrer Sala, Herman G. B. Teule and Sofia Torallas Tovar, vol. 14 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), pp. 245-263.

² John William NUTT, *Two treatises on verbs containing feeble and double letters, by R. Jehuda Ḥayug; translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic, by R. Moses Gīkatilia; to which is added the Treatise on punctuation by the same author; translated by Aben Ezra: edited from Bodleian mss. with an English translation* (Leipzig: Oskar Leiner, 1870) pp. Heb. 2-3, pp. Eng. 2-3.

³ Moses ibn ‘Ezra (died after 1138) reports in *al-Muḥāḍara* that he moved from Cordoba to Saragossa: משה בן גקטילה אלקרטבי חם אלסרקסט [Moses Ibn Chiquitilla, the Cordoban, thereafter Saragossan]; Abraham HALKIN, *Muḥāḍarah wa-l-Mudhākarah Liber Discussionis et Commemorationis* (Jerusalem: Hoṣa’at Mekiṣe Nirdamim, 1975) p. 68; Montserrat ABUMALHAM MAS, *Kitāb al-muḥāḍara wal-muḍākara* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985) p. 63.

in Ibn Chiquitilla's commentary on Psalms, but does claim in his commentary on Jos. 10:2 to have either met or corresponded with Ibn Chiquitilla.⁴ This would date the end of Ibn Chiquitilla's life prior to the end of the 11th century. Of Ibn Chiquitilla's few surviving works,⁵ the largest original work is about two-thirds of his biblical commentary on Psalms, preserved mostly in one manuscript, RNL Evr-Arab. I 3583, with smaller portions found in other libraries.⁶ In this essay, we reconstruct Ibn Chiquitilla's opinion on the subject of triradicalism. Where relevant, we cross-reference his view with secondary evidence preserved in the writings of Menaḥem ibn Saruq, Dunaš ibn Labrāt, Judah Ḥayyūj (ca. 945-1000),⁷ Jonah ibn Janāḥ (b. 985/990)⁸ and Abraham ibn 'Ezra (born 1089/1092 to died 1164-1167).⁹

⁴ Samuel POZNAŃSKI, *Arabischer Commentar zum Buche Josua von Abū Jaḥhā (R Jehūda ibn Bal'ām)* (Frankfurt am Main: J. Kauffmann, 1903) p. 17. Ibn Bal'ām was alive in 1085, having left his native Seville for Toledo, J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Ibn Balaam, Judah (Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā) ben Samuel», in *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 4, Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor) (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 464-465. On the pronunciation of his name, as either Bil'am, Bal'am or Bal'ām, Nehemya ALLONY, «Ibn al-'ama, alias (Ibn) Balaam-Philologist, Exegetes Poet, Halakhist and Controversialist», in *Studies in Jewish religious and intellectual history: presented to Alexander Altmann on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, S. Stein and R. Loewe (eds.) (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, published in association with the Institute of Jewish Studies, 1979), pp. 35-52; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Allusions to Christian Sources in A Manuscript of Ibn Gīqatela's Commentary on Psalms», p. 246, n.4.

⁵ For further information about his life and works, D. E. M. ISAAC, *Héros de l'armée et guerrier* pp. 14-16.

⁶ RNL Evr-Arab. I 3583. (119 folios), Cambridge T-S Ar 21.23, Cambridge T-S Ar. 1c3, JTS ENA 2464.45, British Library OR 5562 D Sch. 6856 folios 53-54, JTS ENA 2819.2, JTS ENA 2934.29-30 and Oxford heb e 99.43. For a full description of each manuscript and their publication (in part); D. E. M. ISAAC, *Héros de l'armée et guerrier* pp. 10-12.

⁷ J. W. NUTT, *Two treatises* pp. 2-3. On Ḥayyūj's life and his biography; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Ḥayyūj, Judah (Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā) ben David al-Fāsi», in *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 2, Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor) (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 387-390.

⁸ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Ibn Janāḥ, Jonah (Abū 'l-Walīd Marwān)», in *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 2, Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor) (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 500-503.

⁹ Josefina RODRÍGUEZ ARRIBAS, «Ibn Ezra, Abraham (Abū Iṣḥāq)», in *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 2, Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor) (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 475-478.

Ibn Chiquitilla belongs to the Western Grammatical Tradition¹⁰ which includes the discovery of universal triradicalism by Judah Ḥayyūj (ca. 945-1000).¹¹ By the time Ibn Chiquitilla wrote his commentary on Psalms, Ḥayyūj had completed a more sophisticated description of the Hebrew verbal system which superseded those of Menahem ibn Saruq (c. 910/20-970)¹² and Dunaš ibn Labrāt (b. 920-5 d. 985).¹³ Ḥayyūj established the theoretical basis for the triradical system, with its strong and weak letters,¹⁴ and the process of elision and compensation for those roots containing weak letters. This methodology was accepted by Jonah ibn Janāḥ, notwithstanding the rearrangement of the classification of verbal forms and details of individual entries.¹⁵ Therefore, disputes might reflect differences in the schematisation of the Hebrew verbal system by Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ¹⁶ and how their immediate successors interpreted them.¹⁷ However, for the purpose of this article, disagreement between Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ is of secondary importance to placing Ibn Chiquitilla within the Western Grammatical Tradition.

¹⁰ On this term; Geoffrey KHAN, «The early eastern tradition of Hebrew grammar», in *Hebrew Scholarship and the Medieval World*, ed. Nicholas R. M. DE LANGE (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 77-92.

¹¹ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Morphology Versus Meaning: Biblical Mixed Roots and Andalusī Hebrew Lexicographical Theories», in *A Universal Art: Hebrew Grammar Across Disciplines and Faiths*, eds. Nadia Vidro, Irene E. Zweip and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, vol. 15 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), pp. 34-58; Ilan EL DAR, «Ḥayyūj's Grammatical Analysis», *Lěšonenu la'am* 54.2-4 (1990), pp. 169-181.

¹² J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Ibn Sarūq, Menahem», in Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor), *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 541-544.

¹³ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Dunash ben Labraṭ ha-Levi», in Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor), *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 98-102.

¹⁴ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «El Opúsculo sobre la Normativa Vocálica (*Kitāb Šurūt al-Naqṭ*) de Ḥayyūy (Edición y Traducción)», *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 54 (2005), pp. 185-230; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», *Revue des études juives* 173.3-4 (2014), pp. 325-359: 329 n. 10.

¹⁵ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», p. 337.

¹⁶ Jonathan VARDI, «Between Shemuel Ha-Nagid and the Poets of Zaragoza», *Tarbiz* 84.3 (2016), pp. 437-467 and D. E. M. ISAAC, *Héros de l'armée et guerrier* p. 145.

¹⁷ Apart from Samuel ibn Nagrela, we do not know who were their students or successors.

The pre-Ḥayyūjian system is known as the ‘minimalist conception of the root’ and begins the process towards triradicalism in Iberia. It was already in use in *Sefer 'Okla wě-'Okla* and applied by Menaḥem ibn Saruq in his dictionary.¹⁸ He identifies the semanteme (similar to Greek and Latin) made up of the radicals that are retained throughout all morphological forms of the word.¹⁹ Thus, in his dictionary, *Maḥberet*, roots are listed with either one, two, or three radicals.²⁰ Where a triradical root contains one or more weak letters, Menaḥem groups them according to their meanings. For example, in his *Maḥberet*, he states:

¹⁸ This legacy is comprised of the following texts: Ángel SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Maḥberet Menaḥem ben Saruq* (Granada: Universidad de Granada; Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1986); Á. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Těšubot de Dunaš ben Labraṭ* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1980); Santiago BENAVENTE ROBLES and Á. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Těšubot de los Discípulos de Měnaḥem contra Dunaš Ben Labraṭ* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1986); María Encarnación VARELA MORENO, *Těšubot de Yehudi ben Šešet: edición traducción y comentario* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1981); Robert SCHRÖTER, *Těšubot Dunaš ha-Levi ben Labraṭ 'al rabbi Sa'adyah Gaon. Kritik des Dunaš ben Labraṭ über einzelne Stellen aus Saadia's arabischer Uebersetzung des A.T. und aus dessen grammatischen Schriften, Schlettersche Buchhandlung* (Breslau: H. Skutsch, 1866). However, see Raaya HAZON, «Book of corrects: Responsa of Adonijah against RASAG: identification of the author of the responsa and additional chapters», in *Mas'at aharon: linguistic studies presented to Aron Dotan*, Moshe Bar-Asher and Chaim E. Cohen (eds.) (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 2009), p. 289. On the limited awareness of Še'adyah's grammatical works among Iberians see Aron DOTAN, *The Awakening of Word Lore: From the Masora to the Beginnings of Hebrew Lexicography* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2005) pp. 66-75, 83-88, 89-90.

¹⁹ This can be seen in the *Sefer 'Okla wě-'Okla* or *al-Masora al-Kābira* (8th – 9th c.); J. MARTÍNEZ-DELGADO, «From Bible to Lexicography Through the Masora in Al-Andalus: The Use of the *Sefer 'Okla wě-'Okla* among the First Andalusī Hebrew Philologists», in *Sacred text: explorations in lexicography*, Juan Pedro Monferrer-Sala and Ángel Urban (eds.) (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009), p. 168. On the current state of Masoretic studies, Elvira MARTÍN CONTRERAS, «The Current State of Masoretic Studies», *Sefarad* 73:2 (2013), pp. 433-458.

²⁰ Hananel MIRSKY, *The Linguistic Theory of Menaḥem Ben Saruq* (Jerusalem: Mekhon Ben-Tsevi le-ḥeqer qehilot Yiśra'el ba-Mizraḥ, 2018), pp. 93-94; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», p. 328. For his influence on Ḥayyūj, Ibn Janāḥ and Ibn Chiquitilla; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «El uso del “Maḥberet” entre los principales filólogos hebreos de Alandalús (siglos X-XI)», *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 59 (2010), pp. 135-165; Aron DOTAN, *The Awakening of Word Lore* pp. 69-71.

lě-haTTōt (Lam. 3:35), *laTTeH* (Deut. 24:17), *ha-maTTīm* (Ps. 125:5), *naTTīf* (Ps. 119:112), *haT* (Prov. 22:17), *noTēh* (Job. 9:8), *nēTēh* (Ex. 8:2), *niTTāyū* (Num. 24:6).

ט. להטות משפט גבר (איכה ג:לה) לא תטה משפט (דברים כד:יז) והמטיים עקלקלותם (תהלים קכה:ה) נטיתי לבי (תהלים קיט:קיב) הט אונג (משלי כב:ז) נוטה שמים לבדו (איוב ט:ט) נטה את מטך (שמות ח:א) ננחלים נטיי (במדבר כד:י)²¹

Since no consistent form includes all three letters of the triradical root N-Ṭ-H, Menaḥem reduces the above group of words (which share the sense “*extend, incline, bend, spread out, stretch out*”) under the single letter Ṭ (*Teṭ*). In the period following, Dunaš ibn Labrāṭ writes his own responsa against Menaḥem’s method. His main contribution to the development of triradicalism was to increase the number of strong radicals to a minimum of two.²² Only when a break with the ‘minimalist’ conception of the root is achieved by the adoption of the *fa’ala* paradigm does triradicalism begin in earnest. The next stage in the development of triradicalism is a series of responsa by the disciples of Menaḥem and Dunaš. Included among Menaḥem’s disciples who write responsa against Dunaš ibn Labrāṭ is Judah b. David Ḥayyūj.²³

Ḥayyūj’s breakthrough leads to a systematic description of the appearance and disappearance of weak radical letters in *Kitāb al-’Af’āl Dawāt Ḥurūf al-Līn wa-Dawāt Ḥurūf al-Miṭlayn* and *Kitāb al-Tanqīt*.²⁴

²¹ Á. SAENZ-BADILLOS, *Maḥberet* p. 75*:17-19.

²² Amir GAASH, «More on the Term Po‘al in Dunash ben Labraṭ’s Criticism of Menaḥem ben Saruq», *Lěšonénu* 80.4 (2018), pp. 499-500, nos. 12, 15; Á. SÁENZ-BADILLOS and Judit TARGARONA BORRÁS, *La academia rabinica de Córdoba, (Siglos X-XII): gramáticos hebreos de al-Andalus*, (Barcelona: Herder, 2016) p. 49.

²³ A. GAASH, «Terms Denoting Action Nouns in Dunash ben Labraṭ’s Criticism of Menaḥem ben Saruq», *Lěšonénu* 80.1-2 (2018), p. 199; A. GAASH, «The Responsa (Teshuvot) of Menaḥem’s Disciples against Dunash: Who Authored Which Responsa, and Was Ḥayyūj One of the Disciples?», *Lěšonénu* 81.1-4 (2019), pp. 297-318. For a responsa authored by Ḥayyūj; A. GAASH, «The Responsa (Teshuvot) of Menaḥem’s Disciples against Dunash», pp. 313-315. On Ḥayyūj’s contribution, J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «El Opúsculo sobre la Normativa Vocálica», pp. 185-230; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «Secularization Through Arabicization: The Revival of the Hebrew Language in Al-Andalus», in *Jarhsbuch Des Simon-Dubnow Instituts*, Dan Diner (ed.), vol. 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2013), pp. 299-317; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», p. 329 n. 12.

²⁴ MORRIS JASTROW JR., *The Weak and Geminative Verbs in Hebrew Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1897); J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, *El libro de Ḥayyūj: (versión original árabe del siglo X)* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2004); Daniel SIVAN and Ali

In these works, Ḥayyūj uses *qiyās* [analogy] to arrange words based on a “comparison of two basic forms with agreement over their meaning.”²⁵ Where one of these two basic forms [*sing. ’ašl*] diverges from the strong verb, Ḥayyūj compares it to the paradigmatic form and describes the process of divergences.²⁶ The key terms are *al-Sākin al-Layyin* [latent quiescent],²⁷ and *al-ḥurūf al-līn wa-l-madd* [weak letters and lengthening] and an *’ašl* [underlying or basic form].²⁸ One such example is the set of radicals ’ (*alef*), W (*Waw*) and Y (*Yod*), which quiesce, but are compensated for by a lengthened vowel. When this happens, Ḥayyūj calls it *’idgām* [assimilation] and *ta’wīḏ* [compensation].²⁹ For examples

WATED, *Three Treatises on Hebrew Grammar by R. Judah Ḥayyuj. A New Critical Edition of the Arabic Text with a Modern Hebrew Translation* (Beersheba: Ben Gurion University, 2012). For a summary of the history of grammatical studies in this period, Aharon MAMAN, «The Flourishing School: Judah Ḥayyūj, Jonah Ibn Janāh, Moses Ibn Chiquitilla and Judah Ibn Bal’am», in *Hebrew Bible, Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Magne Sæbø, Christianus Brekelmans, Menahem Haran, Michael Fishbane, Jean Louis Ska and Peter Machinist (eds.) (Göttinge: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 468-476.

²⁵ A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lēšonit šel rabbi Yēhudah Ḥayyūj’s mebe’ad lē-munaḥaw bi-mqoram ha-’arabi u-bē-tirgumam ha-’ibri* (Haifa: Hawadī, 1994) pp. 12-13. This view is already found in *Maḥberet*. He states (SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Maḥberet*, p. 287*):

Fifth; *’aYēFā* (Prov. 25:25),... *Yi’aFū* (Is. 40:30). Meaning exhausted.

החמישית מים קרים על גפשי עיפה (משלי כה:ה)... ויעפו נערים
ויגשו (ישעיה מ:ל) ענין יגיעה מלמ.

²⁶ A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lēšonit* p. 3; Roger J. KAPLAN, *A critical study of the philological methods of Yehuda ben David (Ḥayyūj)* (New York University, PhD, 1992), pp. 58-63; R. J. KAPLAN, «Derivational Processes: Underlying Forms and Analogies in Ḥayyūj’s Linguistic Works», *AJS Review* 20.2 (1995), pp. 313-332.

²⁷ One example of Ḥayyūj’s theory and contribution to the development of triradicalism is found in Responsa §4 of the Disciples of Menahem, in which he discusses vowel length. For a discussion of his view see, Richard C. STEINER, «Vowel Length in Hebrew: description of theories from Hyronimus to Rabbi Judah Ha-Levi, in light of religious Polemics», *Meḥqarim Bēlašon* 8 (2001), pp. 203-228.

²⁸ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», p. 329.

²⁹ D. SIVAN, «Biblical Hebrew Roots and Quiescent According to Judah Ḥayyuj’s Grammatical Works», *Hebrew Union College Annual* 6 (1989), pp. 115-127; A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lēšonit* pp. 18, 22; Gedeon GOLDENBERG, «*’Al ha-šoken he-ḥalaq wē-ḥašoreš ha-’ibri*», *Lēšonenu* 44.4 (1980), pp. 288-289; A. MAMAN and Ephraim BEN-PORAT, *Kitāb al-Nuṭaf: R. Yehuda Ḥayyūj’s Philological Commentary to the Book of Prophets in ’Alī. Ibn Suleymān’s Compendium*, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2012), pp. 312-314.

that lack any obvious analogy, Ḥayyūj treats them as *musta 'mil* [customary usage] of the speakers.³⁰ When a fixed usage is under determined, Ḥayyūj calls it *'iṭrād* [irregular].³¹ With this framework of analysis, Ḥayyūj seemingly ends the search for a satisfactory description for the disappearance of weak radicals in Hebrew.

A long silence follows the appearance of Ḥayyūj's works, either because the concepts were being assimilated and transmitted, or due to the difficult circumstances caused by the Great Upheaval, *al-fitan al-kubrā* (July 1013).³² It was only with the appearance of Ibn Janāḥ's *al-Mustalḥaq* that intensive philological disputes return.³³ Despite the size and scope of Ibn Janāḥ's contribution to Hebrew philology, his comments on triradicalism are either refinement or modification of Ḥayyūj's theory.³⁴

Even with a general consensus between the two leading figures of the period, Ḥayyūj and Ibn Janāḥ, a questioning of universal triradicalism persists. The issue is a difficulty that Ḥayyūj has in describing why weak medial roots oscillate between W and Y (and occasionally *'alef*) depending on their morphological form.³⁵ He states:

³⁰ A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lěšonit* p. 13; (*Luma'*, 96, 8-9 and 325, 6 = *Ha-Riqma*, 114, 12-13 n. 7 and 340, 2 n. 1).

³¹ A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lěšonit* p. 14. Furthermore, he describes two additional forms of *Sākin*; for a letter that is missing a vowel like all other letters, *ne(')darī* (Ex. 15:6), which is called *al-Sākin al-Zāhir* [manifest quiescent] and *al-Sākin al-Ḳāfī* [invisible quiescent]. A. WATED, *Mišnato ha-lěšonit* p. 14.

³² The city was besieged by the Berber troops of prince Sulaymān ibn al-Ḥakam, in July 1013, Evariste LÉVI-PROVENÇAL, *Histoire de l'Espagne Musulmane*, 3 vols. (Paris, Leiden: G.P. Maisonneuve, E.J. Brill, 1950), vol. 2 pp. 138, 281 n. 4, 293 n. 3.

³³ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», p. 330, and J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, *Kitāb Al-mustalḥaq by Ibn Ġanāḥ of Cordoba: A Critical Edition, with an English Translation, Based on All the Known Judaeo-Arabic Manuscripts*. (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

³⁴ J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «An Anonymous Book on Hebrew Verbs», pp. 325-359. For a description of his wide-ranging contributions; A. MAMAN, «The Flourishing School», pp. 468-476; A. MAMAN, «Ibn Janāḥ Between Philosophy and Grammar», *Lěšonénu* 65 (2008), pp. 351-359; David TĒNÉ and A. MAMAN, *Syntactic issues in R. Yona Ibn Janāḥ's Kitāb al-Tanqīḥ (The Grammar book)*, (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2016).

³⁵ R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study* p. 308.

And it is not my intention in bring together (in one category) these medial weak verbs to distinguish those with *waw* or *yod*, for that is not distinguishable in most of them, since they substitute for each other in the conjugation and occupy the same place in their forms. So it is my intention to define the place of the latent quiescent and to draw attention to the fact that it is the middle radical whether *waw* or *yod*, for I am perfectly aware that the latent quiescent that is in *qām* [“rose up”] is the medial radical, but I am not perfectly aware if it is *waw* or *yod*.³⁶

וליס גרצ'י פי תאליף הדה אלפעאל אלינה אלעין
תמיז ד'ואת אלואו מן ד'ואת אליא אד' לא ימתאו ד'לך פי
גלהא לאבתדאל אחדהמא מן אלכרי פי אלחצריף
ואחתיאזאה מוצ'עהא פי אלחפעיל לכן גרצ'י תעריף
מוצ'ע אלסאכן אללין ואלתנביה עלי אנה עין אלפעל ווא
כאן ד'לך אלסאכן או יא פאני אדרי דראיה צחיחה און
אלסאכן אללין אלדי פי קם הו עין אלפעל ולא אדרי
דראיה צחיחה אן כאן וואו פי או יא³⁷

Ḥayyūj describes all forms of the *Pi'el*, *Hif'il*, *Hof'al* and *Nif'al* stems as analogous to the paradigmatic strong root, except for the *Pa'al* stem.³⁸ On this final stem, Ḥayyūj fails to establish any underlying criteria for classifying the medial weak letter as either a W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*).

In response to this difficulty, Abraham ibn 'Ezra informs us both he and Samuel ibn Naḡrela (b. 993 died after 1056)³⁹ supported biradicalism for this group. He states in *Ṣaḥot*:⁴⁰

³⁶ R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study* p. 308.

³⁷ R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study* pp. 122-123.

³⁸ *Pi'el* and *Pu'al* verbs behave like strong verb, with the medial radical becoming Y (*Yod*). No *Hitpa'el* form is attested in this pattern in biblical Hebrew, though Ḥayyūj accepts it theoretically as *Hitpi'il*, R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study*, p. 307.

³⁹ Esperanza ALFONSO, «Ibn Naghrella, Samuel (Abū Ibrāhim Ismā'īl) ben Joseph ha-Nagid», in *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World*, vol. 4, Norman A. Stillman (Executive Editor) (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 525-528; ROSS BRANN, *Power in the Portrayal: Representation of Jews and Muslims in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Islamic Spain*, (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002) p. 24.

⁴⁰ Almost nothing survives of his grammatical writings, though citations have been gathered by Maaravi PEREZ, «Quotations from “Kitāb al-Istighnā” by R. Shmuel Han-nagid in an Anonymous Commentary on the Book of Psalms», *An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 12 (2002), pp. 241-287.

Rabbi Samuel the Prince of blessed memory said that the root of *Qām* and others have two visible radicals, and a quiescent, which is also a radical. My opinion is very similar to his opinion.

ויאמר רבי שמואל הנגיד ז"ל כי עיקר קם וחבריו שני
אותיות נראים ואת נח נעלם גם הוא עיקר, ודעתי קרובה
מאד אל דעתו⁴¹

He repeats this statement in *Šafa Bērura*:

Rabbi Samuel the Prince of blessed memory said that the root of *Qām* has two radicals, and a quiescent between. He did not say whether it was ' (*alef*), W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*).

ויאמר רבי שמואל הנגיד ז"ל כי שורש קם שנים
אותיות ונחה נעלם ביניהם ולא נאמר עליו שהוא אל"ף
ולא וי"ו ולא יו"ד⁴²

What exactly is the difference of opinion between Ibn 'Ezra and Ibn Nağrela? In answering this question, the issue rests upon what Ibn 'Ezra means when he uses the Hebrew term *ōḏ*. It can stand for both a consonant and a graphic sign. According to Goldenberg, Ibn Nağrela means that there is no fixed radical for roots whose middle signs are either an ' (*alef*), W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*). Rather, he views them as graphic signs marking the long vowel, "*phonemically nothing*" [Heb. *naḥ* = Ar. *sākin*], meaning such roots' middle graphic sign (*ōḏ*) shifts between either ' (*alef*), W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*) according to its morphological form.⁴³

L. Charlap understands Goldenberg's view on hollow roots as presented in the previous paragraph in the same manner in an article written in English. She describes them as follows, «Shemuel HaNagid thought "ע" forms comprised three radicals, although one of the root radicals is not represented by a letter of the Hebrew alphabet but merely by another graphic sign».⁴⁴ Her choice of language, 'three radicals,' reflects the confusing problem of Ibn 'Ezra's language but I believe her point is the same as what I describe in the above paragraph found in her more detailed Hebrew study of Ibn 'Ezra's grammatical views.

⁴¹ Luba CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Linguistic System*, (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University, 1999) p. 73 and p. 73 n. 17.

⁴² L. CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Linguistic System* p. 73.

⁴³ G. GOLDENBERG, «'al ha-šoken he-ḥalaq wē-hašoreš ha-'ibri», p. 290; L. CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Linguistic System* p. 75.

⁴⁴ L. CHARLAP, «Another View on Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Contribution to Medieval Hebrew Grammar», *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001), pp. 67-80: 78.

Ibn ‘Ezra differs from Ibn Naġrela in that he adopts bi-radicalism unequivocally. He states:

I shall only say that its root contains *qof* and *mem* and a “hidden quiescent” in between, which is **absolutely not a letter** (Moznayim, 41b) רק אומר כי שורשו [קם] קו"ף ומ"ם ונוה בעלם ביניהם ואיננו אות כלל⁴⁵

Goldenberg interprets Ibn ‘Ezra’s view as following the ancient practice of the early Arabic dictionaries, which numbers the ‘radicals (Heb. *’ōṭ*) to the exclusion of the *nāḥ ha-ne‘ēlam* (*quiescent sign*), ‘ (*alef*), W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*).⁴⁶ Ibn ‘Ezra’s choice of language distinguishes between radicals, *’ōṭ* and graphic signs, *’ōṭ ne‘ēlam* (*quiescent sign*).⁴⁷ Charlap accepts Goldenberg’s observations that Ibn ‘Ezra adopted early Arabic dictionary (“the ancients” in Ibn ‘Ezra) practices, but is uncertain if that alone was the reason for his adoption of biradicals. Instead, she links it to Ibn ‘Ezra’s fidelity to the view that the active participle of two radicals is the genuine embodiment of the root. She suggests the following:

... it appears to us, that it caused him to cling to his view that the biconsonantal participle is the true embodiment of the root. Our opinion relies upon the words of Ibn Ezra; “the ancient assesses each word of the verbs according to the perfect third masculine singular ... it is correct to assess it by the active participle Pō‘ēL as it is always strong.”⁴⁸

Charlap concludes that Ibn ‘Ezra’s difference of opinion stems from his identification of the basic form of a word as coming from the singular active participle *Pō‘ēL*. When a medial radical of a root is either an ‘ (*alef*), W (*Waw*) or a Y (*Yod*), as in *Qiyam* or *Dayyān*, Ibn ‘Ezra views the root as genuinely biradical⁴⁹ and ‘proves’ this as on rare oc-

⁴⁵ L. CHARLAP, «Another View on Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra’s Contribution to Medieval Hebrew Grammar», p. 78.

⁴⁶ G. GOLDBERG, «‘al ha-šoken he-ḥalaq wě-ḥašoreš ha-‘ibri», p. 290.

⁴⁷ Goldenberg points out that such a fine distinguish was not always well understood by subsequent scholars. G. GOLDBERG, «‘al ha-šoken he-ḥalaq wě-ḥašoreš ha-‘ibri», p. 291.

⁴⁸ L. CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra’s Linguistic System* p. 75.

⁴⁹ L. CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra’s Linguistic System* pp. 75-76.

casions biliteral forms retain the missing ' (*'alef*) in the written text, as in *Qā{'}m* (Hos. 10:14).⁵⁰ Charlap writes,

Ibn-Ezra thought that since the *Naḥ Ne'elam* does not exist in all verb inflections ... the vowel after the first consonant of the root should not be considered a *Naḥ Ne'elam*.⁵¹

Charlap concludes that Ibn 'Ezra accepted *Ḥayyūj*'s triradicalism, but viewed the above group of verbs as consisting of two radicals.

Turning to Ibn Chiquitilla's opinion, no pronouncement in favour trilateralism is found in what remains of his works. Where he uses deductive reasoning to explain a divergent morphological form, he adopts *Ḥayyūj*'s use of a "quiescent letter" [Ar. *al-Sākin al-Layyin*] to explain its elision – an approach which presumes familiarity on the part of the reader with *Ḥayyūj*'s theory. Therefore, evidence for Ibn Chiquitilla's view can only be found in Ibn 'Ezra's grammatical works. In *Šafa Bērura*, Ibn 'Ezra states that Ibn Chiquitilla followed the triradical view of weak medial letters.

Rabbi Moses ibn Chiquitilla the Kohen, the Spaniard, of blessed memory said: I will provide a proof that no verb can have less than three radicals because of omission and elision. If two of these letters were from the elided like N (*Nun*), or one of them (is elided) and the second from a quiescent letter, if the verb comprised of only two radicals, then it would not exist, like (the radical) N-Ṭ-H, of which it says *al-taṬ* (Ps. 27:9).

ויאמר ר משה הכהן הספרדי נ"ע: אני אתן ראיה
גמורה שלא יתכן להיות פועל פחות משלשה אותיות:
בעבור החסרון ושיהיו נעדרים. הנה אם היו שנים
מהנעדרים כמו הנ"ן או האחד מהם והשני מאותיות הנה,
הנה אם היה המפעל משני אותיות לא ימצא, כמו נטה,
אמרו אל-תט (תהלים כז:ט).⁵²

At the heart of Ibn Chiquitilla's support for triradicalism is his rejection of *Menaḥem*'s theory of *semanteme*. Ibn Chiquitilla imagines a theoretical word comprising two radicals made up of a N (*Nun*) and one

⁵⁰ L. CHARLAP, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Linguistic System* p. 71.

⁵¹ L. CHARLAP, «Another View on Rabbi Abraham Ibn-Ezra's Contribution to Medieval Hebrew Grammar», p. 78.

⁵² Enrique RUIZ-GONZÁLEZ and Á. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Šafah bērurah: la lengua escogida* (Córdoba: Ediciones el Almendro, 2004) p. 32*.

of the weak letters (or two weak letters). If this word were to behave like N-Ṭ-H, then according to Menahem's theory of semanteme, it would disappear. No such word exists, which is why Ibn 'Ezra cites this argument as *reductio ad absurdum*. Even so, it demonstrates Ibn Chiquitilla's adherence to universal triradicalism.⁵³

Elsewhere, in *Ṣaḥot* this point is repeated, with Ibn 'Ezra rejecting Ibn Chiquitilla's argument as *reductio ad absurdum*. He states that:

Also, Rabbi Moses ibn Chiquitilla Ha-Kohen, the Spaniard said: it is incorrect that the word (entirely) elides. Neither an ' (*'alef*) followed by ' (*'alef*), nor an ' (*'alef*) with a H (*He*) occur. Nor is it possible for an ' (*'alef*) with either a W (*Waw*) or a Y (*Yod*) to occur at the end of (a word), for the reason I have already explained. Likewise, H (*He*) at the beginning (of a word) never elides as its inflection is the same as all the other letters, which do not permit (compensation by) prolongation. So too W (*Waw*) is never found as the initial radical. Neither is Y (*Yod*) found with Y (*Yod*), ' (*'alef*) or H (*He*), except with a *Mappiq*. That is the name of the Exalted and the Awful.

גם אשר אמר ר' משה הכהן הספרדי ז"ל שתהיה המלה נעדרה לא דבר נכונה כי אלף עם אלף לא נמצא ולא אלף עם הא ולהיותו עם וו או יוד לא יתכן בעבור שלא ימצא אחד מהם שורש בסוף, בעבור הסיבה שהזכרתי וכן הא בתחלה לא יהיה נעדר כי דרכו בכל האותיות, כי איננו מאותיות המשך והנה גם וו לא ימצא בתחלה שורש גם לא נמצא יוד עם יוד ולא עם אלף ולא עם הא רק במפיק, והוא שם הנכבד והנורא.⁵⁴

Ibn 'Ezra criticises the argument *ad absurdum* imagined by Ibn Chiquitilla, which implies a rejection of words composed of less than three radicals. Unfortunately, no such argument survives from Ibn Chiquitilla's writings. However, there is enough proof for his accep-

⁵³ Ibn Chiquitilla does not comment on this verse in Psalms, as such we cannot add to González and Sáenz-Badillos' original statement that «we do not know where Ibn Chiquitilla refers to this topic, reducing the question to absurdity» E. RUIZ-GONZÁLEZ and Á. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, *Śafah bērurah: la lengua escogida*, p. 162, n. 285. However, the discussion is actually found in Ḥayyūj, in which he analyses the compensation of this root, A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 198-199.

⁵⁴ Mordechai S. GOODMAN, *Sefer Ṣaḥot*, (Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 2016) p. 153; Carlos DEL VALLE RODRIGUEZ, *Sefer Ṣaḥot de Abraham Ibn 'Ezra*, (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia, 1977) p. 341.

tance of Ḥayyūj's thesis. The nominal form *'aRešēT* (Ps. 21:3) in his Psalm commentary is analysed using the Ḥayyūjian model of quiescent letters and compensation by vowel lengthening.⁵⁵ He writes that:

Evr.-Arab. I 3583, 31r.

"O Lord, the king rejoices in Your strength" יי בעוד ישמה מלך (תהלים כא:ב) ראינו מן יג'על אלף וארשת שפתינו (תהלים כא:ג) אצליה ואנא ארי אצ'אפתהא אלי כרשיון כורש מלך פרס (עזרא ג:ז) ויכון מענאהא עהדא אי מא עהד בה אלי אלנאס כנת אנת אלמת'בת לה והו קבל אלנא'אפה ארשה ואצלה ארשיה פלמא חד'פת אללאם לאלתקאידה בהא אלת'אנייה צארת חרכתהא [31] ב [פי אלעין קבלהא וצארת חרכתה אלעין פי אלפא פלמא אנצ'אפת בדל האוהא באלתהא ואעלית בנייה אלכלמה פצאר עלי מת'אל מלחמה מלחמת עטרה עטרת.

"O Lord, the king rejoices in Your strength" (Ps. 21:2) we have seen an opinion of one who includes the ' (*'alef*) of *"The request of his lips ('aRešēT)"* (Ps. 21:3) as its root.⁵⁶ However, I am of the opinion it is related (to the form *RiŠYōn*), as in *"in accord with the authorisation (RiŠYōn) granted them by King Cyrus of Persia"* (*'Ezra 3:7*) and its meaning is *'a pact*'; as in what he authorised the people, You granted it. Before annexation it is *'iRašā*, with its underlying form [*'aʃl*] *'iRašīYā*. Now, the third radical elides on account of its coming together with the feminine H (*He*), transferring its vowel to the second radical which precedes it. The second radical's vowel transfers to the first radical. After annexation, the H (*He*) is replaced by a *T* (*Taw*) and is like the patterns, *milḥamā*, *milḥemet* (and) *'aṭarā*, *'aṭeret*.

⁵⁵ This example was first discussed by Martínez-Delgado in an article in Spanish. It is reproduced here as evidence for Ibn Chiquitilla's application of Ḥayyūj's thesis to nominals and as a direct reaction to all non-triliteral theories; J. MARTÍNEZ DELGADO, «El Comentario a Salmos de Mošeh Ibn Chiquitilla», *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 52 (2003), pp. 201-241: 217-218 n. 60.

⁵⁶ A possible reference to Ibn Qurayš's opinion in his *Risāla*. Ibn Qurayš lists ארשת (*'aRešēT*) as under *'-R-Š-T*, Dan BECKER, *The Risāla of Judah Ben Quraysh: A Critical Edition*, (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1984) pp. 132-133. So too Menahem Mahberet p. 63* Line 15. However, Ibn Janāḥ includes *'aRešēT* under the root under *'-R-Š*, Adolf NEUBAUER, *The Book of Hebrew Roots by Abu 'L-Walid Marwan Ibn Janah, Called Rabbi Jónah*, (repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968) p. 66, 27 = Wilhelm BACHER, *Sepher Haschoraschim: Wurzelwörterbuch der hebräischen Sprache/von Abulwalid Merwan Ibn Ganah (R. Jona) aus dem Arabischen in's Hebräische übersetzt von Jehuda Ibn Tibbon*, (Berlin: M'Kize Nirdamim, 1896) p. 47. Ibn Chiquitilla could have learned of it from Ibn Janāḥ, although why he would hide the name of his main rival, as it weakens his argument is a mystery.

The description he offers relies on Hayyūj's theory of *al-Sākin al-Layyin*, 'idgām [assimilation], *ta'wīḏ* [compensation] and *badal* [substitution] although only the final term is used in his analysis.⁵⁷ Ibn Chiquitilla describes the process of elision and compensation. First, the weak letter Y (*Yod*) elides, 'iRašīYā. This he identifies as its 'ašl [underlying form]. Thereafter, he describes the vocalic changes in which each vowel moves 'backwards;' 'iRašīYā > 'iRašīā > 'aRšā > 'aRšāT > 'aRešēT. Even though this example does not discuss second medial weak roots, it demonstrates that his method of analysis shares Hayyūj's theoretical foundations and the verisimilitude of Ibn 'Ezra's claim that Ibn Chiquitilla is an exponent of triradicalism.

On the topic of weak medial radicals, Ibn Chiquitilla's opinion can be inferred from remarks found in another example in his commentary. It offers little advancement on Hayyūj's opinion that the medial weak letter can be either a W (*Waw*) or Y (*Yod*). He writes that:

Evr.-Arab 3583 I, 43v.

"Those who look (*QowēY*) to the Lord they shall inherit the land" (Ps. 37:9)

may point to (the form) *QaWā-YiQWēH* and it may point to the light form.

Likewise, "*QowēY*" (Ps. 37:9) may point to *QaYā-YiQYēH* with a Y (*Yod*) replacing the W (*Waw*).

וקוי ייי המה יירשו ארץ (תהלים לו:ט) דאל' עלי קוה
יקוה והו דאל' עלי אלכ'פ'יך כמא דל וקוי ייי (תהלים לו:ט) עלי
קוה יקוה מבדלא יאוה ואו.

Ibn Chiquitilla follows Hayyūj and places words deriving from the Q-W-H alongside other examples from this group of words.⁵⁸ The difficulty, however, is that the perfect form *Qowē{Y}* is doubly weak containing a W (*Waw*) and Y (*Yod*). Ibn Chiquitilla uses this opportunity to explain Hayyūj's reasoning by demonstrating how two underlying forms create the surface form *QowēY*. In the perfect form, the weak letter W (*Waw*) appears on the surface as *QaWā*, yielding a theoretical pattern

⁵⁷ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 291-292 and Ibn 'Ezra (*ad. loc*) all share Ibn Chiquitilla's view, but undoubtedly it is Hayyūj who provides the theoretical foundations. The meaning is also shared by Sē'adyah's *tafsīr* to Psalms, Joseph QAFIḤ, *Tēhillīm Rabbenu Sē'adyah ben Yosef al-Fayūmī*, (2nd ed. Kiryat Ono: Mekhon Mishnat ha-Rambam, 2009) p. 86.

⁵⁸ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 280-281.

YiQWēH in the imperfect form.⁵⁹ However, the participle form, *QowēY* is also analogous to the weak third radicals forms like *BōNēH/BōNYēh**.⁶⁰ These are discussed by Ḥayyūj in his section on weak third letter roots. He states:

They [final weak verbs] are unusually difficult and their conjugation is hidden from most (philologists) because of their defectiveness and deletion. Sometimes there is compensation for this deletion and sometimes there is no compensation for it. The evidence and proof for this defectiveness and deletion are the verb returns to its root and its returning to its place of derivation. And at this time its deletion becomes clear and its defectiveness is seen.⁶¹

פאנהא איצ'א בעידה אלגור כפייה אלתצריף לכתרה
אעתלאהא ונקצאנהא ורבמא עוצ'ת מן דלך אלנקצאן ורבמא
לא תעוץ' מה'ה ואקאמה אלדליל ואלברהאן עלי דלך
אלאעתלאל ואלנקצאן ברד אלפעל אליא אצלה וצרפה אלי
מוצ'ע אשתקאקה פחיניד יתצ'ה נקצאנה' ויט'הר אעתלאה.⁶²

Ḥayyūj acknowledges the difficulty identifying the root of weak third radicals, an absence of compensation for all words and examples of a word not returning to its underlying root form. In the above passage *'i'tilāl* [defectiveness] describes the overall condition of the final weak verb, whilst *naqš* [deletion] describes the actual loss of the final radical.⁶³ Although Ḥayyūj identifies a weak third radical letter as having a final radical H (*He*) and not a Y (*Yod*), this seems to be because he determines the radicals based on the third masculine singular *Pa'al* stem, as B-N-H. However, words whose roots are weak third radical and belonging to the *Pa'al* all undergo transformation, substitution and deletions of the H (*He*) in all inflections except the third person masculine singular. This

⁵⁹ In the imperfect form, weak medial radical of the *Pa'al* stem have a latent quiescent, which is compensate by vowel lengthening. Furthermore, because the latent medial radical W (*Waw*) is lacking, the vowel of the preformative marker must lengthen from a *Ī* (*Hiriq*) to a *Ā* (*Qamaš*); R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study*, p. 313-314 and Nasir BASAL, «The Concept of Compensation (*'iwaḍ/ta'wīḍ*) as Used by Yehuda Hayyuj in Comparison with Sībawayhi», *Journal of Semitic Studies* 44.2 (1999), pp. 227-243.

⁶⁰ * represents a theoretical form.

⁶¹ R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study* p. 329.

⁶² D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* p. 187.

⁶³ R. J. KAPLAN, *A critical study* p. 331.

means *most* of the time they reveal the existence of an elided Y (*Yod*), as in *BōNēH/BōNYēh**. Ibn Chiquitilla applies this logic to *QowēY* demonstrating the elision of the final radical H (*He*); the result is the medial radical is a Y (*Yod*) and the underlying form, *QaYā-YiQYēH**.

The ambiguity displayed in the above examples is repeated again for the next set of examples by Ḥayyūj. For *yēRīBāy* (Ps. 35:1) several words have a shared meaning, but their underlying pattern matches either the initial radical Y (*Yod*) or medial radical Y (*Yod*). I present Ḥayyūj's opinion followed by that of Ibn Chiquitilla.

Under the root R-Y-B, Ḥayyūj offers the following explanation.

RīBā-yēRīBāy (Ps. 35:1). It is also said of *YēRīBāy* that it is transposed; the quiescent Y (*Yod*) of *RīBā* is the medial radical (but) transposes in *YīRīBāy* to the third radical. Also, *YēRīBēk* (Is. 49:25), *PēLīTay*, *SēRīDay* and *Šē'īRay*. It is possible they are two underlying forms R-Y-B and Y-R-B. They are both said with similar sounds and shared meanings.

רִיבָה יִי אֵת יְרִיבִי (תהלים לה:א) קִיל אִיצ'א פִי יְרִיבִי אִנֵּה מִקְלוֹב אֵלִיא אִלְטִאכֵן אִלְתִּי פִי רִיבָה עֵין צִאֲרַת פִּי יְרִיבִי וְכִדְלִךְ וְאֵת יְרִיבָה (יִשְׁעִיהוּ מִטֹּב) פִּלִּיטִי שְׂרִידִי צִעִירִי. וְיִמְכֵן אֵן יִכֹּנֵא אִצְלֵין רִיב יִרֵב וְאִנְמֵא קִילֵא מֵעֵא לְתִקְאָרֵב אִלְלִפְט' וְאִתְפִּאק אִלְמַעֲנִי⁶⁴

Ḥayyūj offers two underlying orders to the roots based on similar pronunciation and shared meaning. He describes the transposing of the initial radical Y (*Yod*) with the medial radical R (*Reš*), R-Y-B for Y-R-B, with the medial Y (*Yod*) of *RīBā* receiving a *ta'wīd* [compensation] in the form of the lengthened medial radical. Elsewhere, Ḥayyūj repeats this argument for two underlying orders to the root. He writes that:

It is said that *YēŠībēnī* (II Sam. 15:8) is inverted. The Y (*Yod*) of *YēŠībēnī* is the medial radical inverted with the initial radical.

וְקִיל אֵן יְשׁוֹב וְיִשְׁבִּינִי יִי (שְׁמוֹאֵל ב טו:ח) מִקְלוֹב אֵלִיא אִלְתִּי פִי יִשְׁבִּינִי עֵין קִלְבַּת פִּי יְשׁוֹב פִּא⁶⁵

⁶⁴ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 170-171. Ibn Janāh passes no additional comments on this root, listing under R-W-B; W. BACHER, *The Book of Hebrew Roots* p. 669 = Wilhelm BACHER, *Sepher Haschoraschim* p. 472. Ibn 'Ezra prefers two different roots, *ad. loc.*

⁶⁵ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 176-177.

Yēšṭḥbēnī (II Sam. 15:8) matches the underlying order of the root Š-Y-B, whereas *yašōḇ* matches the order Y-Š-B.⁶⁶

Both solutions are proposed for *yēṭṭīḇ* (Num. 10:32). Ḥayyūj writes that:

Yēṭṭīḇ (Num. 10:32): it (*Yod*) is an inverted quiescent letter, which is the medial radical of *ṭōḇ* and the initial radical of *Yēṭṭīḇ*. It may come from two underlying forms, either Ṭ-W-B or Y-Ṭ-B, on account of their similar sound and shared meaning.

והיה הטוב ההוא אשר יטיב יי לנו (במדבר י:לב) אנה מקלוב אלסאכן אללין אלדי פי הטוב עין הוא פי יטיב פא וימכן אן יכונא אצלין טוב יטב ואנמא מעא לתקארב לפצה'מא ואתפאק מענאהמא.⁶⁷

Ḥayyūj declares Y-Ṭ-B as the root of *yēṭṭīḇ* on the grounds that it is similar in sound and has the same meaning as *ṭōḇ*, in which the quiescent Y (*Yod*) appears as the medial root letter.⁶⁸ He concludes there are two underlying orders to the root, Ṭ-W-B and Y-Ṭ-B. This point is repeated in Jer. 42:10; he states:

It is said that *šōḇ* (Jer. 42:10) is inverted; the quiescent (letter) which is after the T (*Taw*) of *tēšēḇū* is inverted as the medial radical in *šōḇ*

וקיל אן כי אם שוב תשובו מקלוב אלסאכן אללין אלדי בעד אלתא פי תשובו אנקלב פי שוב עינא⁶⁹

He adopts the inverted solution Y-Š-B for *šōḇ* (Jer. 42:10), though he lists it under the root Š-Y-B. Finally, Ḥayyūj adopts two underlying orders to the root, B-W-Š and Y-B-Š. He states:

⁶⁶ Ibn Janāḥ adopts this view; A. NEUBAUER, *The Book of Hebrew Roots* p. 707 = W. BACHER, *Sepher Haschoraschim* p. 501. Ibn 'Ezra repeats this view in his commentary on Ps. 35:1, *ad. loc.*

⁶⁷ Other texts follow the Masoretic text found in printed versions of the Bible have בייטיב; D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises*, pp. 140-141 and p. 141 n. 502.

⁶⁸ Ibn Janāḥ adopts this view; A. NEUBAUER, *The Book of Hebrew Roots* p. 261 = W. BACHER, *Sepher Haschoraschim*, p. 179.

⁶⁹ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises* pp. 90-91.

It is said that *YēḂōšū* (Jer. 6:15) is quiescent as the medial radical of *YēḂōš* is inverted with the initial radical of *YiḂōšū*; the initial radical is between the Y (*Yod*) of the imperfect and the B (*Bet*). Where this is not so, then *YēḂōšū* would be written with a *Ā* (*Qamaṣ*) like others. This is permitted in language. It is also possible they are two roots, B-W-Š or Y-B-Š, as the words are pronounced similarly and their meaning identical.

קיל פי גם בוש לא יבושו (ירמיהו ו:טו) אן אלסאכן אללין אלדי הו עין פי יבוש אנקלב פאא פי יבושו לאן בין יא אלסאקבאל ואלבא סאכן הו פא אלפעל ולולא דלך לכאן יבושו בקמץ גדול מתל אצחאבה והד'א קול ממכן ג'אין פי אללגאת . וקד ימכן אן יכונא אצלין בוש יבש ואנמא קילא מעא לאן לפטהמא מתקארב ומענאמא מתפק⁷⁰

Ibn Chiquitilla's translation of *Kitāb ḥurūf al-Līn*, reproduced the same view with some clarificatory differences. For *YēRīḂay*, Ibn Chiquitilla writes that:

It is said of *YēRīḂay* (Ps. 35:1) that the medial radical Y (*Yod*) of *RīḂā* inverts to become the initial radical in *YēRīḂay*. Also, *YēRīḂēk* (Is. 49:25) is analogous to it (*YēRīḂay*) as are *YēRīḂay*, *SēRīḂay* and *PēLīḂay*. They may be two roots R-W-B and Y-R-B, as I said Ṭ-W-B/Y-Ṭ-B and B-W-Š/Y-B-Š.

ריבה יי את יריבי (תהלים לה:א) נאמר ביריבי שהוא הפוך היוד שהוא עין הפועל בריבה נהפכה לפא הפועל ביריבי . וכמהו ואת יריבך אנכי אריב (ישעיהו מט:כה). וחבירי שרידי פליטין ויתכן שיהיו שני עקרים רוב ירב כמו שאמרתי ייטיב בוש יבש⁷¹

Ibn Chiquitilla reiterates two underlying orders to the root.⁷² Elsewhere, for *YēŠīḂenī*, no additional material is found in the Nutt edition. Ibn Chiquitilla translates:

It is said *YēŠīḂenī* (II Sam. 15:8) switches the place of the second medial radical, Y (*Yod*), in *YēŠīḂenī* with the first radical of *YaŠōḂ*.

ונאמר כי אם ישוב ישיבני ה' (שמואל ב טז:ח) הפוך היוד אשר ביישיבני עין נאמרה בישוב פא:⁷³

⁷⁰ D. SIVAN and A. WATED, *Three Treatises*, pp. 130-131.

⁷¹ J. W. NUTT, *Two treatises*, p. Heb. 55, p. Eng. 65. All translations of Nutt's Hebrew edition are my own.

⁷² I checked both Sivan and Wated's additions and Jastrow, and found them to be identical.

⁷³ J. W. NUTT, *Two treatises*, p. Heb. 57, p. Eng. 67.

Nor does Ibn Chiquitilla modify Ḥayyūj's language when he translates his remarks for the roots Ṭ-Y-B/ Y-Ṭ-B⁷⁴ and B-Y-Š/Y-B-Š.⁷⁵

Ḥayyūj, too, offers both explanations in the version of *Kitāb al-Nuṭaf* published by Basal. It states:

ŠōB TēŠēB (Jer. 42:10): The underlying form is *ŠēB*. *ŠēB* may be either an imperative or infinitive like *RēD*, from *YaRaD* and *Šē* from *YaŠā*. *ŠōB* may be inverted. The initial Y (*Yod*) of *YaŠaB* is the medial radical of *ŠōB*.

אם שוב תשובו: וכאן אלאצל פיה אם שב תשובו ויכון שב
אמר ומצדר מתל רד מן נרד וצא מן נצא. וקד ימכן אן יכון שוב
מקלוב אליא אלדי פי ישב פא יכון פי שוב עינא⁷⁶

So too in the version of *Kitāb al-Nuṭaf*, produced by 'Alī ibn al-Sulaymān. It states:

TēŠēB (Jer. 42:10); the underlying form of *ŠēB TēŠēB*. *ŠēB* may be an infinitive like *RēD* from *YaRaD* (Ex. 19:18 etc). *ŠōB* may be inverted. The initial Y (*Yod*) of *YaŠaB* is the medial radical of *ŠōB*.

אם שוב תשובו (ירמיהו מב:י) אלאצל פיה אם שב תשובו
(ירמיה) ויכון שב מצדר מתל רד מן נרד (שמות יט:יח) וכול
וימכן אן יכון שוב מקלוב אליא אלדי פי ישב פא יכון פי שוב
עינא.⁷⁷

In conclusion, Ḥayyūj considers both the inverted and non-inverted orders as valid because their pronunciation and meaning are the same. However, Ibn Chiquitilla writes that:

⁷⁴ John William NUTT, *Two treatises*, p. Heb. 46, p. Eng. 54.

⁷⁵ J. W. NUTT, *Two treatises*, p. Heb. 43, p. Eng. 54. Also, the root 'Y-P/Y-'-P appears with the alternative explanation in the Arabic and Hebrew versions respectively, A. WATED, *Three Treatises*, pp. 80-81; J. W. NUTT, *Two treatises*, p. Heb. 51, p. Eng. 60.

⁷⁶ N. BASAL, *Kitāb Al-Nuṭaf by Judah Ḥayyūj*, (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2001) pp. 198-199.

⁷⁷ A. MAMAN and E. BEN-PORAT, *Kitāb al-Nuṭaf: R. Yehuda Ḥayyūj's Philological Commentary to The Book of Prophets in 'Ali Ibn Suleymān's Compendium* pp. 254-255.

Evr.-Arab. I 3583, 40v.

“*My adversaries (yĕRīBāy)*” (Ps. 35:1) means ‘*quarrel*.’ The Y (*Yod*) is paragogical [Ar. *mazīda*], as ... in “*All existence (yĕQūm)*” (Gen. 7:23), “*will not yield its produce (yĕBūLa)*” (Deut. 11:17) as opposed to “*The mountains yield (BūL) him produce,*” (Job 40:20).

יריבֵי (תהלים לה:א) יעני כ'צומה ויאזה מזידה כמה א[...]
 פי את כל היקום (בראשית ז:כג) לא תתן את יבולה (דברים
 יא:ז) עלי כי בול הרים ישאו לו (איוב מ:כ).

Ibn Chiquitilla identifies *yĕRīBāy* as a medial weak root analogous to other words from this type of root - *yĕQūm* (Gen. 7:23) and *yĕBūLa* (Deut. 11:17).⁷⁸ As such, the Y (*Yod*) of *yĕRīBāy* is a nominal prefix [Ar. *mazīda*], extraneous to the root, which is R-Y-B.⁷⁹ Ibn Chiquitilla rejects Ḥayyūj’s explanation of *yĕRīBāy* as belonging to two underlying orders of the roots. Quite why he disagreed is unclear. It is not because he rejects the limitations and difficulties Ḥayyūj found when trying to outline the underlying form of weak medial roots. One must conclude that

⁷⁸ Gesenius and BDB list it as a masculine noun meaning “*opponent, adversary*”; Francis BROWN, Samuel R. DRIVER and Charles A. BRIGGS, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, (Reprint, Hendrickson Publishers, 1906) p. 937; Wilhelm GESENIUS, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, E. Kautzsch (eds.), A. E. Cowley (trans.) (Reprint, Dover Publications, 2006) p. 85d.

⁷⁹ Implied by his proof text, Ibn Chiquitilla excludes the Y (*Yod*) of *yĕBūLa* from the root. This form and meaning match Ibn ‘Ezra’s comments in his commentary on Is. 44:19 about Ibn Chiquitilla; Jair HAAS, *R. Abraham Ibn Ezra’s Commentary on Isaiah 40-66* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2020) p. 133. Also, see his translation of Job; W. BACHER, «Targum ‘arabi ‘al sefer ‘iyob ‘im bē’ur ‘arabi le-mošeh ben šemu’el ha-kohen ha-niqra ben Chiquitilla», in *Festschrift zu Ehren des Dr. A. Harkavy aus Anlass seines am 20. November 1905 vollendeten*, D. Günzburg and I. Markon (eds.) (Budapest: 1909), p. 50. In his commentary on Lev. 26:4, Ibn ‘Ezra, however, was uncertain whether the Y (*Yod*) of *yĕBūLa* belonged to the root; Asher WEIZER, *Commentaires de la Torah d’Abraham Ibn Ezra d’après les manuscrits et les premiers imprimés, Lévitique, Nombres, Deutéronome*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1977) p. 100. However, he takes a definitive stance in his commentary on Job. 40:20. Menahem attributes the verse to the same meaning in *Maḥberet* p. 84*. Sē’adyah also explains it in this manner; J. QAFIḤ, ‘*iyob ‘im Targum u-feruḥ ha-Gaon rabbenu ben Yosef fayūmī*’, (Jerusalem: Ha-wa‘ad lē-ḥoša’at sifre RS”G, 1973) pp. 200-201; Lenn E. GOODMAN, *The Book of Theodicy: Translation and Commentary on the Book of Job by Saadiah Ben Joseph al-Fayūmī*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) p. 403. Ibn Janāḥ also lists it under the root B-W-L, with the meaning ‘*branch*’; A. NEUBAUER, *The Book of Hebrew Roots* p. 86 = W. BACHER, *Sepher Haschoraschim* p. 59.

it is a localised issue unless further research yields a different conclusion. Ḥayyūj and Ibn Chiquitilla's remarks are summarised below:

Root	Verse	MIJ Psalm	<i>al-Līn</i>	Ibn Chiquitilla Translation of <i>al-Līn</i>	Al-Nutaf	Al-Nutaf ('Alī)
<i>YēRīBāy</i>	Ps. 35:1	R-Y-B	R-Y-B or Y-R-B	R-Y-B or Y-R-B		
<i>YēŠībēnī</i>	II Sam. 15:8		Š-Y-B and Y-Š-B	Y-Š-B or Š-Y-B		
<i>YēTīB</i>	Num. 10:32		T-W-B or Y-T-B	T-W-B or Y-T-B		
<i>ŠōB</i>	Jer. 42:10		Š-Y-B and Y-Š-B	Y-Š-B or Š-Y-B	Y-Š-B or Š-Y-B	Y-Š-B or Š-Y-B
<i>BōŠ</i>			B-W-Š/Y-B-Š	B-W-Š/Y-B-Š		
<i>Yi'aFū</i>			'-Y-P/Y-'-P	'-Y-P		

In summary, the investigation of the primary evidence found in Ibn Chiquitilla confirms him as a supporter of triradicalism. He adopts both the position of Ḥayyūj that hollow roots are triradical and also the theoretical underpinnings for explaining why. He shares nothing of the view of Ibn Nağrela and Ibn 'Ezra, confirming what Ibn 'Ezra informs us about him in his various grammatical works as Ibn Chiquitilla's view. Where he differs from Ḥayyūj, it reflects his preference for one explanation over another and is not a metatheoretical disagreement.

Submitted: 30/05/2023

Accepted: 20/09/2023