

This is the Famous Book of Sībawayh on
Naḥw ‘Grammar’ and its Name is
*ʔal-kitāb*¹ ‘The Book’²

Solomon Sara, S.J. (Posthumously)
Georgetown University

Chapter 71. This is a chapter on what erects of
ʔasmāʔ that have been derived from *ʔafʔāl* in the
manner of erecting the *fiʔl* ‘action’ whether you
queried or did not query

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.171-172, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 143, Haruwn vol.1.
p.340–342)

(I. 71. P. 143. L. 3) And that is as in your saying *ʔa-gāʔiman* ‘are you standing’ when people have sat down and *ʔa-gāʔidan* ‘are you sitting down’ when the travelers have gone. Similarly, if you wanted this meaning and you did not query you say *gāʔidan ʔalima ʔal-lāhu wa gad sāra ʔal-rakbu* ‘sitting down, God knows, and the travelers have gone’ and *gāʔiman gad ʔalima ʔal-lāhu wa gad gaʔada ʔal-nāsu* ‘standing, God knows, and people have sat down’. That is because he saw a man in the state of standing up or in the circumstance of sitting down and he wanted to alert him. It is as though he expressed it by his saying *ʔa-taguwwu gāʔiman* ‘do you stand by standing up’ and *ʔa-tagʔudu gāʔidan* ‘do you sit by sitting down’ but he deleted and did without, due to what he sees of the circumstances, and the *ʔism* ‘name’ became a substitute for the expression of the *fiʔl* ‘action’, so it followed the course of the *masʔdar* ‘origin’ in this location. And an example of that is *ʔāʔiḏan bi-ʔal-lāhi mim šarrihā* ‘taking refuge in God from its evil’; it is as though he saw something that is to be avoided/guarded against so he became in his soul one in the circumstance of avoiding it until he got the status (L. 10) of the one who saw him in the circumstance of *giyām wa guʔuwḏ* ‘standing up or sitting down’, because he sees himself in that state. So he said *ʔāʔiḏan bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘taking refuge in God’ as though he was saying *ʔaʔuwḏu bi-ʔal-lāhi ʔāʔiḏan bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘I take refuge in God by taking refuge in God’, but he deleted the *fiʔl* ‘action’ because it is a *badalun* ‘substitute’ for his saying *ʔaʔuwḏu bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘I take refuge in God’. So this followed the course of *ʔiyāḏan bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘taking refuge in God’.

هذا كتاب سيبويه
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٧١) هذا باب ما ينتصب من الأسماء التي
أخذت من الأفعال انتصاب الفعل، استفهمت
أو لم تستفهم

وذلك قولك قائماً وقد فعَدَ الناس، وأقاعداً وقد سارَ
الركب. وكذلك (س ٥) إن أردت هذا المعنى ولم
تستفهم، تقول: قاعداً عليم الله وقد سارَ الركب، قائماً
قد عليم الله وقد فعَدَ الناس. وذلك أنه رأى رجلاً في
حال قيام أو حال قعود فأراد أن ينبهه، فكأنه لفظ
بقوله: أتقوم قائماً، وأتعود قاعداً، ولكنه حذف
استغناءً بما يرى من الحال، وصار الاسم بدلاً من
اللفظ بالفعل، فجري مجرى المصدر في هذا الموضع.
ومثل ذلك عائداً بالله من شرها، كأنه رأى شيئاً يتقى
فصار عند نفسه في حال استعاذة، حتى صار بمنزلة
(س ١٠) الذي رآه في حال قيام وقعود، لأنه يرى
نفسه في تلك الحال، فقال: عائداً بالله، كأنه قال: أعودُ
بالله عائداً بالله، ولكنه حذف الفعل لأنه بدل من قوله:
أعودُ بالله، فصار هذا يجري ها هنا مجرى عياداً بالله.

¹ Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

² Simon Mauck and Mohammad Alhawary reviewed early drafts of the translation.

There are some of them who say *ṣāḥibūn bi-ḥal-lāhi* ‘taking refuge in God’. If you remember anything from this chapter, the *fiʿl* ‘action’ is *muṭʿatʿasʿilun* ‘connected’ in the state of your remembrance and you work in confirming it for yourself or for someone in the circumstance of your remembering him, just as you do in the chapter on *saḡyan* ‘by way of watering’ and *ḥamdan* ‘by way of thanking’ and whatever is like it if you were to remember anything of it in the circumstance of *tazgiyatīn* ‘urging’ (L. 15) and *ḥabāt* ‘confirmation’. You made *ṣāḥibūn bi-ḥal-lāhi* ‘taking refuge in God’ in cases of the *badal* ‘substitution’ and *ḥidmār* ‘implication’ follow the course of the *masʿdar* ‘origin’, just as *ḥaniyān* ‘pleasantly’ was of the status of the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ in what I have mentioned to you. And the poet Ṣabdu ḥal-lah bin ḥal-ḥārie ḥal-sahmiyyu said: (*basīyʿ*)³

ḥalḥig ṣaḍābaka bi-ḥal-gawmi ḥal-laḍiyna ṭʿayaw
Wa ṣāḥibūn bika ḥan yaḥluw fa-yuṭʿuwniy
 ‘Connect your torture to the people that have oppressed
 And taking refuge in you that they rise and oppress me’

And like it is: (*wāfir*)⁴

ḥarāka gamaṣṭa masḥalatan wa ḥirsʿan
Wa ḥinda ḥal-ḥaggi ḥahḥāran ḥunānā
 ‘I see that you have called for your own right keenly
 And in case of others’ rights a moaner and groaner’

(L. 20) It is as though he said *tazaḥara ḥahiyran* ‘he groaned a groan’ and *taḥinnu ḥaniynā* ‘you moan a moan’ and then he placed it in place of *ḥanta ḥinda ḥal-ḥaggi ḥahkaḍā* ‘you are at the time of justice [others’ rights over you] in this way’.

ومنهم من يقول: عائذُ بالله. وإذا ذكرت شيئاً من هذا
 الباب فالفعلُ مُتَّصِلٌ في حالِ ذِكْرِكَ وأنتَ تعملُ في
 تثبيته لك أو لغيرك في حالِ ذِكْرِكَ إيَّاه، كما كنتَ في
 بابِ سَقِيًّا وحمداً وما أشبَّهه، إذا ذكرتَ شيئاً منه في
 حالِ تَرْجِيَةِ (س ١٥) وإثباتٍ، وأجريتَ عائذاً بالله في
 البَدَلِ والإضمارِ مَجْرَى المَصْدَرِ، كما كان هَنيئاً بمنزلة
 المصدرِ فيما ذكرتَ لك. وقال الشاعر، وهو عبد الله بن
 الحارث السَّهْمِيُّ: (بسيط)

أَلْحَقْ عَذَابَكَ بِالقَوْمِ الَّذِينَ طَعَوْا
 وعائذاً بِكَ أَنْ يعلُوا فيطغوني

ومثله: (وافر)

أراك جمعتَ مسألةً وجرصاً
 وعند الحقِّ زحاراً أنا

(س ٢٠) كأنه قال: تزحزح زحيراً وتئنُّ أنيناً، ثمَّ وَصَعَهُ
 مكان هذا؛ أي: أنتَ عند الحقِّ هكذا.

3 The meter of *basīyʿ* is *mustafʿilu fāʿilun mustafʿilun faʿilun* (twice).

4 The meter of *wāfir* is *mufāʿalatun mufāʿalatun faʿuwlun* (twice).

Chapter 72. This is a chapter in which the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ that are not derived from the *fiʔl* ‘action’ follow the course of the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ that are derived from the *fiʔl* ‘action’

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.172-174, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 143-146, Haruwn vol.1. p.343-348)

(I. 71. P. 144. L. 1) And that is as in your saying *ʔa-tamiymiyyan marratan wa gaysiyyan ʔuxrā* ‘are you a tamiymiy one time and a gaysiy another’.⁵ This is so because you saw a man in a state of *talawwunin* ‘colorful acting’ and *tanaggulin* ‘changing’ so you said *ʔa-tamiymiyyan marratan wa gaysiyyan ʔuxrā* ‘are you a tamiymiy one time and a gaysiy another’. It is as though you said *ʔa-tahawwalu tamiymiyyan marratan wa gaysiyyan ʔuxrā* ‘I change into a tamiymiy one time and a gaysiy another’. You, in this circumstance, work to ascertain this for him and he is in the circumstance of *talawwunin wa tanaggulin* ‘colorful acting and changing’. He does not ask him for guidance on a matter he is ignorant about so that he will make him understand and tell him about it, (L. 5) but he rebukes him for that. Some Arabs have related to us that a man from baniy ʔasad took a nap on the day of Gabalata and he was faced with a one-eyed camel that he took as a bad omen, so he said, *O bani ʔasad ʔaʔwara wa ḏā nābin* ‘one-eyed and with a canine’. He did not want advice from them so they will report to him about its one-eyedness and its health, but he brought it to their attention as though he said *ʔa-tastagbiluwna ʔaʔwara wa ḏā nābi* ‘do you welcome a one-eyed one with a canine?’ Welcoming, in the circumstance of his bringing it to their attention, was a fact just as you ascertained the *talawwun wa tanaggul* ‘colorful acting and changing’ in the first circumstance. He wanted to confirm to them about the one-eyed one so they would avoid it. Of that is the saying of the poet: (t^ʔawiyl)⁶

(L. 10) *ʔa-fiy ʔal-silmi ʔaʔyāran gafāʔan wa ʔilḏ^ʔatan*
Wa fiy ʔal-ḥarbi ʔaʔbāha ʔal-nisāʔi ʔal-ʔawāriki
‘Are there in peace time jackasses, dried up and crude,
And in war time the likes of menstruating women’

That is *tanaggaluwna wa talawwanuwna* ‘you change and act differently’, one time this way and another time this other way. And he said: (basiy^ʔ)⁷

⁵ These are the names of tribes.

⁶ The meter of t^ʔawiyl is *faʔuwulun mafāhiylun* (four times).

⁷ The meter of basiy^ʔ is *mustaʔsilun fāʔilun mustaʔsilun faʔilun* (twice).

(٧٢) هذا بابٌ ما جرى من الأسماء التي لم
تؤخذ من الفعل مجرى الأسماء التي أخذت

من الفعل

(م ١. ب ٧٢. ص ١٤٣. س ٢١) وذلك قولك
أتميمياً مرةً وقيسياً أخرى وإنما هذا أنك رأيت رجلاً في
حال تلونٍ وتنقلٍ فقلت: أتميمياً مرةً وقيسياً أخرى،
كانت قلت: أتحولُ تميمياً مرةً وقيسياً أخرى. فانت في
هذه الحال تعمل في تثبيت هذا له وهو عندك في تلك
الحال في تلونٍ وتنقلٍ، وليس يسأله مسترشداً عن أمرٍ
هو جاهلٌ به ليفهمه إياه ويخبره عنه، (س ٥) ولكنه
ويخه بذلك. وحدثنا بعض العرب أن رجلاً من بني
أسدٍ قال يومَ جبلةٍ واستقبله بعيرٌ أعورٌ فتطير منه،
فقال: يا بني أسدٍ أعورٌ وذا نابٍ! فلم يرد أن
يسترشدهم ليخبروه عن عوره وصحته، ولكنه نبههم،
كأنه قال: أتستقبلون أعورٌ وذا نابٍ! فالاستقبال في
حال تنبيهه إياهم كان واقعاً كما كان التلونُ والتنقلُ
عندك ثابتين في الحال الأول، وأراد أن يثبت لهم
الأعور ليحذروه. ومثل ذلك قول الشاعر: (طويل)

(س ١٠) أفي السلم أعياراً جفأً وغلظةً

وفي الحرب أشباه النساء العوارك

أي تنقلون وتلونون مرةً كذا ومرةً كذا. وقال: (بسيط)

ʔa-fiy ʔal-walāʔimi ʔawlādan li-wāhidatin
Wa fiy ʔal-ʕiyādati ʔawlādan li-ʕallāti
 ‘Are you children of one mother in your banquets
 And when visiting the sick, children of many mothers’

As to the saying of the poet: (wāfir)⁸

ʔa-ʕabdan halla fiy ʕuʕabā ʔariyban
 ‘Did a slave settle in Shuʕabā a stranger’

(L. 15) it is of two aspects: as a *nidāʔ* ‘vocative’ and on the basis that he saw it in a state of pride and boldness. So he said *ʔa-ʕabdan* ‘are you a slave’ that is, do you boast for being a slave just as he said *ʔa-tamiymiyyan marratan* ‘a tamiyimi at one time’. If you were to predicate in this chapter according to this definition, you would erect also, just as you erected in the state of the predicate the *ʔism* ‘name’ that is derived from the *fiʕl* ‘action’, and that is as in your saying: *tamiymiyyan gad ʕalima ʔal-lāhu marratan wa ʕaysiyyan ʔuxrā* ‘a tamiyimi, God knows, one time and a ʕaysi another’. You did not want to inform the people of a matter that they did not know about; rather, you wanted to insult him with that. So it became *badalan* ‘a substitute’ for your expression *ʔatatammamu marratan wa tatagayyasu ʔuxrā* ‘I change into a tamiymazied one time and you a ʕaysizied another’, and do you depart and have this welcomed you (L. 20) and you move around and act differently. So this became like that just as *turban wa gandalan* ‘dust and stone’ became a substitute for the expression for *taribta wa gandalta* ‘you became earth and stone’ if these were spoken with. If you were to exemplify on the basis of what you erected *ʔal-ʔaʕyār wa ʔal-ʔaʕwara* ‘the jackasses and the one-eyed’ in the substitution for the expression you would say: *ʔa-taʕayyaruwna marratan wa ʔataʕawwaruwna* ‘would be becoming jackasses one time, and one-eyed’, if you were to clarify its meaning. It is because you make it follow the course of what has a *fiʕl* ‘action’ for its expression (P. 145) and it may flow in the course of the *fiʕl* ‘action’ and do its work, but it would be better if you were to clarify it with what is spoken with if it were not to change the meaning of the discourse. This manner is similar, but you leave out what is good about the *fiʕl* ‘action’ that does not contradict the meaning. As to His saying, the Glorious and the Powerful, *balā ʕādiriyna* (Sūrah LXXV:4) ‘yes we are able’ it is based on the *fiʕl* ‘action’ that is expressed as though he said *balā nagmaʕuhā ʕādiriyna* ‘yes, to gather them, we are able’. Yuwnis told us about this.

أَفِي الْوَلَائِمِ أَوْلَادًا لِوَأَحِدَةٍ
 وَفِي الْعِيَادَةِ أَوْلَادًا لِعَلَّاتٍ

وَأَمَّا قَوْلُ الشَّاعِرِ: (وَافِر)

أَعْبَدًا حَلَّ فِي شُعْبَى غَرِيبًا

(س ١٥) فيكونُ على وجهين: على النداء، وعلى أنه رآه في حال افتخار واجترأ، فقال: أَعْبَدًا؛ أي: أَتَفَخَّرُ عبداً، كما قال: أَمْتِمِيًّا مَرَّةً. وَإِنْ أَخْبَرْتَ فِي هَذَا الْبَابِ عَلَى هَذَا الْحَدِّ نَصَبْتَ أَيْضاً كَمَا نَصَبْتَ فِي حَالِ الْخَبْرِ الْأِسْمَ الَّذِي أَخَذَ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ، وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ: تَمِيْمِيًّا قَدْ عَلِمَ اللَّهُ مَرَّةً وَفَيْسِيًّا أُخْرَى. فَلَمْ تُرِدْ أَنْ تُخْبِرَ الْقَوْمَ بِأَمْرٍ قَدْ جَهَلُوهُ، وَلَكِنَّكَ أَرَدْتَ أَنْ تَشْتِمَهُ بِذَلِكَ، فَصَارَ بَدَلًا مِنْ اللَّفْظِ بِقَوْلِكَ: أَتَمَّمْتُ مَرَّةً وَتَتَفَيْسُ أُخْرَى، وَأَتَمَّضُونَ وَقَدْ اسْتَقْبَلَكُمْ هَذَا، (س ٢٠) وَتَنْقَلُونَ وَتَلَوْتُونَ، فَصَارَ هَذَا كَهَذَا، كَمَا كَانَ تُرْبِيًّا وَجَنْدَلًا بَدَلًا مِنَ اللَّفْظِ بِتَرْبَيْتَ وَجَنْدَلْتَ لَوْ تَكَلَّمْتَ بِهَا. وَلَوْ مَثَلْتَ مَا نَصَبْتَ عَلَيْهِ الْأَعْيَارَ وَالْأَعْوَرَ فِي الْبَدَلِ مِنَ اللَّفْظِ لَقُلْتَ: أَتَعَبَّرُونَ مَرَّةً، وَأَتَعَوَّرُونَ إِذَا أَوْضَحْتَ مَعْنَاهُ، لِأَنَّكَ إِنَّمَا تُجْرِيهِ مَجْرَى مَا لَهُ فِعْلٌ مِنْ لَفْظِهِ، (ص ١٤٥) وَقَدْ يَجْرِي مَجْرَى الْفِعْلِ وَيَعْمَلُ عَمَلَهُ، وَلَكِنَّهُ كَانَ أَحْسَنَ أَنْ تَوَضَّحَهُ بِمَا يُتَكَلَّمُ بِهِ إِذَا كَانَ لَا يَغَيِّرُ مَعْنَى الْحَدِيثِ. وَكَذَلِكَ هَذَا النَّحْوُ وَلَكِنَّهُ يُتْرَكُ اسْتِغْنَاءً بِمَا يَحْسُنُ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي لَا يَنْقُضُ الْمَعْنَى. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُهُ جَلَّ وَعَزَّ: {بَلَى قَادِرِينَ}، فَهُوَ عَلَى الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي أَظْهَرَ، كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: بَلَى نَجْمَعُهَا قَادِرِينَ. حَدَّثَنَا بِذَلِكَ يُونُسُ.

8 The meter of wāfir is *mufāʕalatun mufāʕalatun faʕuwulun* (twice).

Regarding the saying of farazdaq: (t^ʿawiyl)⁹

(L. 5) *ʕalā ḥalfatin lā ʔaštīmu ʔa-dahra musliman*
Wa lā xāriḡan min fiyya zuwru kalāmi

‘On an oath I took, I do not cuss a Muslim ever
Nor coming out of my mouth false speech’

he wanted *wa lā yaxrugu fiymā ʔastagbilu* ‘and nothing comes out of what I face’ as though he said *wa lā yaxrugu xuruwgan* ‘he does not go out by way of leaving’. Don’t you see him mentioning *ʕāhadtu* ‘I promised’ in the line that is before it, as he said:

ʔa-lam taraniy ʕāhadtu rabbiy wa ʔinnaniy
La-bayna ritāḡin gāʔiman wa magāmi

‘Didn’t you see that I promised my God as
I stood between the door of Ka’ba and Ibrahīm’s shrine’

If he were to relate it to the fact that he negated something that is in it and he did not want to relate it to *ʕāhadtu* ‘I promised’, it would be permitted. To this (L. 10) surface ʕiysa went from what we are shown, because he was not relating it to *ʕāhadtu* ‘I promised’. If you were to say *mā ʔanta ʔilla gāʔimun wa gāʕidun* ‘you are nothing except standing and sitting’ and *ʔanta tamiymiyyun marratan wa gaysiyyun ʔuxrā* ‘you are tamiymiy one time and gaysiy another’ and *ʔinniy ʕāʔiḡun bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘I am returning to God/I take refuge in God’, it is raised. If he were to say *huwa ʔaʕwaru wa ḡuw nābin* ‘he is one-eyed and with a canine’, he raised. All this has nothing in it but *raʕf* ‘raising’, because it is built on the first *ʔism* ‘a name’ and the other is the first so it followed it. Yuwnis claimed that there are Arabs who say *ʕāʔiḡun bi-ʔal-lāh* ‘taking refuge in God’, that is *ʔana ʕāʔiḡun bi-ʔal-lāhi* ‘I take refuge in God’ as though it has the status of *ʔal-ḡamdu li-lāh* ‘praise be to God’ and whatever is like that. Al-Khalīl claimed that if a man were to say *ʔa-tamiymiyyun* ‘are a tamiymiy’ (L. 15) and he wants *ʔanta* ‘you’, he would be correct. The *nas^b* ‘erecting’ here is the surface form, because it is the location where the *ʔism* ‘name’ follows the expression of the *fiʕl* ‘action’, so it is selected, just as before it the *mas^ʕādir* ‘origins’ are selected that are not *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’. *Raʕf* ‘raising’ is good, since it is what is talked about and queried about. If he were to say *ʔaʕwaru wa ḡuw nābin* ‘one-eyed and with a canine’ he would be correct. Yuwnis claimed that they say: *ʕāʔiḡun bi-ʔal-lāh* ‘taking refuge in God’. If he were to express this implied one, it could not be except the *raʕf* ‘raising’, since raising is permitted while you imply.

9 The meter of t^ʿawiyl is *faʕuwlun mafāʕiylun* (four times).

وأما قوله وهو الفرزدق: (طويل)

(س ٥) على حَلْفَةٍ لَا أَشْتِيْمُ الدَّهْرَ مُسْلِمًا

وَلَا خَارِجًا مِنْ فِي زُورٍ كَلَامٍ

فإنها أرادَ ولا يخرج فيما أستقبل، كأنه قال: ولا يخرج خروجاً. ألا تراه ذكّر عاهدت في البيت الذي قبله فقال:

ألم ترني عاهدت ربّي وإنني

لبيّن رتاج قائماً ومقام

ولو حملة على أنّه نفى شيئاً هو فيه ولم يرد أن يحمله على عاهدت لجاز. وإلى هذا (س ١٠) الوجه كان يذهب عيسى فيما نرى، لأنه لم يكن يحمله على عاهدت. فإذا قلت: ما أنت إلا قائم وقاعد، وأنت تميمي مرةً وقيسي أخرى، وإنني عائد بالله، ارتفع. ولو قال: هو أعور وذو ناب، لرفع. هذا كله ليس فيه إلا الرفع، لأنّه مبني على الاسم الأوّل، والآخر هو الأوّل فجرى عليه. وزعم يونس أنّ من العرب من يقول: عائد بالله؛ أي: أنا عائد بالله، كأنه أمرٌ قد وقع بمنزلة الحمد لله وما أشبه ذلك. وزعم الخليل أنّ رجلاً لو قال: أتميمي (س ١٥) يريد أنت ويضميرها لأصاب. وإنما كان النصب ها هنا الوجه، لأنّه موضع يكون الاسم فيه معاقباً للفظ بالفعل، فاختر فيه كما يختار فيما مضى من المصادر التي في غير الأسماء. والرفع جيّد لأنه المحدث عنه والمستفهم. ولو قال: أعور وذو ناب، كان مُصيّباً. وزعم يونس أنّهم يقولون: عائد بالله. فإن أظهر هذا المضمّر لم يكن إلا الرفع، إذ جاز الرفع وأنت تُضمّر،

And it is permitted for you that you based the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ on it, and it is different from his saying *ʔanta sayrun sayrun* ‘you are walking, walking’. It is not (L 20) permitted where they express other than it. Just as if he were to express the *fiʿl* ‘action’ that is the *badal* ‘substitute’ for it, it cannot be but *nasʿban* ‘erect’, just as it is not permitted that you imply after the *rāfiʿ* ‘the one raising’ *nāsʿib* ‘the erecting’. Similarly, you do not imply after the expression (P. 146) and the *mubtadaʿ* ‘initial’ and the *fiʿl* ‘action’, each act by itself in this chapter. One does not intrude on its counterpart.

وجاز لك أن تحمل عليه المصدر، وهو غيره في قوله:
 أنت سَيْرٌ سَيْرٌ، فَلَمْ (س ٢٠) يَجْزُ حيث أظهرَ عندهم
 غيره، كما أنه لو أظهرَ الفعلَ الذي هو بدلٌ منه لم يكن
 إلا نصباً. فكما لم يجز في الإضمار أن تُضمِرَ بعد الرفع
 ناصباً، كذلك لم تُضمِرَ بعد الإظهار، (ص ١٤٦)
 وصارَ المبتدأُ والفعلُ يعملُ كلُّ واحدٍ منهما على حِدَةٍ
 في هذا الباب لا يدخلُ واحدٌ على صاحبه.

Chapter 73. This is a chapter in which the *mas'āʔdir* 'origins' that occur as *muθannan* 'duals' on the basis of the implication of a *fiʕl* 'action' whose expression has been left out

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.174-176, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 146-147; Haruwn vol.1. p.348-352)

(I. P. 146. L. 3) And that is as in your saying: *hanānayka* 'your mercies-d/have pity'. It is as though he said: *taḥannunan baʕda taḥannunin* 'mercy after mercy'. It is as though *yastarḥimuhu li-yarḥamahu* 'he begs for mercy from him so he would have mercy on him', but they deleted the (L. 5) *fiʕl* 'action' because it became *badalan* 'a substitute' for it. This does not occur in the *muθannan* 'dual' except in the state of *ʔid'āfah* 'annexion', just as *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi* 'praise be to God' and *maʕāda ʔal-lāhi* 'take refuge in God' do not occur except in annexion. So *hanānayka* 'your mercies-d' does not inflect just as *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi* 'praise be to God' does not inflect and similar ones. The poet t'arafatu ʔibn ʔal-ʕabd said: (t'awiyl)¹⁰

ʔabā mundirin ʔafnayta fa-stabgi baʕd' anā
hanānayka baʕd'u ʔal-ʕarri ʔahwanu min baʕd'i

'Father of Munthir, you ruined so keep some of us
your mercies-d some evil is easier than other'

ʔal-Khalīl claimed that the meaning of dualizing is that he wanted *taḥannunan baʕda taḥannunin* 'having mercy after having mercy'. It is as though he said that whenever you are giving mercy (L. 10) and goodness, do not discontinue but connect them with the rest of your mercy. An example of that is *labbayka wa saʕdayka* 'your calls-d/I am at your service and your happiness/I am here to wish you happiness'. We heard from the Arabs who say *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi wa hanānayhi* 'praise be to God and his mercies-d'. It is as though he said *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi wa ʔistirḥāman* 'praise be to God and mercy seeking', just as he said: *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi wa rayḥānahu* 'praise be to God and his generosity' he wants *ʔistirzāgahu* 'giving him self sufficiency'. As for your saying *labbayka wa saʕdayka* 'your calls-d/I am at your service and your happiness/I am here to wish you happiness', he erected this like he erected *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi* 'praise be to God'. It also has the status of your saying if you were to report: *samʕan wa tāʕatan* 'at your command/listening and obeying' except *labbayka* 'I am at your service' does not inflect just as *subḥāna ʔal-lāhi* 'praise be to God' and *ʕamraka ʔal-lāha* 'God give you long life' and *giʕdaka ʔal-lāha* 'God give you a dwelling' do not inflect.

10 The meter of t'awiyl is *faʕuwulun mafāʕiyulun* (four times).

(٧٣) بَابُ مَا يَجِيءُ مِنَ الْمَصَادِرِ مُثْنِيًّا مُتَّصِبًا
عَلَى إِضْمَارِ الْفِعْلِ الْمَتْرُوكِ إِظْهَارُهُ

(م ١. ب ٧٣. ص ١٤٦. س ٣) وذلك قولك
حَنَانِيكَ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ تَحْنُنًا بَعْدَ تَحْنُنٍ، كَأَنَّهُ يَسْتَرْجِمُهُ لِيَرْحَمَهُ،
وَلَكِنِّهِمْ حَذَفُوا (س ٥) الْفِعْلَ لِأَنَّهُ صَارَ بَدَلًا مِنْهُ. وَلَا
يَكُونُ هَذَا مُثْنِيًّا إِلَّا فِي حَالِ إِضَافَةٍ، كَمَا لَمْ يَكُنْ سُبْحَانَ
اللَّهِ، وَمَعَاذَ اللَّهِ إِلَّا مُضَافَيْنِ، فَحَنَانِيكَ لَا تَتَّصِرُفُ، كَمَا
لَمْ تَتَّصِرُفْ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَمَا أَشْبَهَ ذَلِكَ. قَالَ الشَّاعِرُ،
وَهُوَ طَرْفَةُ بِنِ الْعَبْدِ: (طويل)

أَبَا مُنْذِرٍ أَفْنَيْتَ فَاسْتَبَقِي بَعْضَنَا

حَنَانِيكَ بَعْضُ الشَّرِّ أَهْوَنُ مِنْ بَعْضِ

وَزَعِمَ الْخَلِيلُ أَنَّ مَعْنَى التَّثْنِيَةِ أَنَّهُ أَرَادَ تَحْنُنًا بَعْدَ تَحْنُنٍ،
كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: كَلِّمًا كُنْتُ فِي رَحْمَةٍ (س ١٠) وَخَيْرٍ مِنْكَ فَلَا
يَنْقَطِعَنَّ وَلِيَكُنَّ مَوْصُولًا بِأَخْرَجَ مِنْ رَحْمَتِكَ. وَمِثْلُ
ذَلِكَ: لَبَّيْكَ وَسَعْدَيْكَ. وَسَمِعْنَا مِنَ الْعَرَبِ مَنْ يَقُولُ:
سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَحَنَانِيهِ، كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ
وَاسْتِرْحَامًا، كَمَا قَالَ: سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَرَيْحَانَهُ يَرِيدُ،
وَاسْتِرْزَاقَهُ. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُكَ لَبَّيْكَ وَسَعْدَيْكَ فَانْتَصَبَ هَذَا
كَمَا انْتَصَبَ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ، وَهُوَ أَيْضًا بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ: إِذَا
أَخْبَرْتَ: سَمْعًا وَطَاعَةً، إِلَّا أَنَّ لَبَّيْكَ لَا تَتَّصِرُفُ كَمَا أَنَّ
سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ، وَعَمْرُكَ اللَّهُ وَقَعْدَكَ اللَّهُ لَا تَتَّصِرُفُ

There are some of the Arabs who say (L. 15) *samṣun wa t'āṣatun* 'listening and obeying/at your command', that is, my command is *samṣun wa t'āṣatun* 'listening and obeying'. This has the status of (t'awiyl).¹¹

Fa-gālat hanānu mā ḡatā bika hāhunā
'And she said, mercy, what brought you here'

Just as he said *salāmun* 'peace' and the thing on the basis of which *hanānun* 'mercy', *samṣun* 'listening/hearing' and *t'āṣatun* 'obedience' are raised is not used, just as the thing on the basis of which *labbayka* and *subhāna ḡal-lāhi* are erected is not used. If he were to say *samṣan wa t'āṣatan* 'hearing and obeying', he is speaking of the carrying out of *ḡal-samṣa wa ḡal-t'āṣata* 'the hearing and obeying' just as he said *ḡamdan wa ṣukran* 'praise and thanks' according to this explanation. An example of that is *ḡadārayka* 'be on guard'. It is as though he said that (L. 20) from you there will be *ḡadārun baṣḡa ḡadārin* 'warning after warning'. It is as though he wanted by his saying *labbayka and saṣḡdayka* 'a response after a response'. It is as though he says *kullamā ḡagabtuka fiy ḡamrin* 'whenever I responded to you in a matter by way of a response'. It is as though this dualizing is with greater certainty. And like it, (P. 147) except that it may be *ḡālan* 'a circumstance' in which the *fiṣl* 'action' occurred, is the saying of the poet ṣabdu baniy ḡal-ḡaṣḡāsi: (t'awiyl)¹²

ḡiḡā ṣugga burdun ṣugga bi-ḡal-burdi miḡluhu
Dawālayka ḡatta laysa li-ḡal-burdi lābisu

'If a garment got ripped, a similar rip in a garment like it
And so on until there is no wearer for the garment'

That is, *mudāwalataka* 'your alternation' and *mudāwalatan laka* 'an alternation with you'. If he so wished it can be *ḡālan* 'a circumstance'. And like it also is: (ragaz)¹³

D'arban ḡāḡā ḡ'ayka wa t'aṣnan waxḡā
'Striking this piece by piece and cutting and stabbing'

(L. 5) The meaning of the dualization of *dawālika* is that it is a *fiṣl* 'action' of two subjects, because if *dāwaltu* 'I interact' then from each one of us there is a *fiṣl* 'action'; similarly is *ḡadāḡayka* 'your cutting quickly-d' is as though he is saying *ḡadān baṣḡa ḡadāin* 'one cutting quickly after another' from all aspects. And if he so wished, he related it to the fact that the *fiṣl* 'action' made 'a cutting quickly' occur after 'a cutting quickly' so he erected it as a *ḡāl* 'circumstance'.

11 The meter of t'awiyl is *faṣuwluṣ mafāṣiyulun* (four times).

12 The meter of t'awiyl is *faṣuwluṣ mafāṣiyulun* (four times).

13 The meter of ragaz is *mustafṣilun* (six times).

ومن العرب من يقول: (س ١٥) سَمْعٌ وَطَاعَةٌ؛ أَي:
أَمْرِي سَمْعٌ وَطَاعَةٌ بِمَنْزِلَةِ: (طويل)

فَقَالَتْ حَنَانٌ مَا أَتَيْتُ بِكَ هَاهُنَا

وكما قال: سَلَامٌ. والذي يَرْتَفِعُ عَلَيْهِ حَنَانٌ وَسَمْعٌ
وَطَاعَةٌ غَيْرٌ مُسْتَعْمَلٌ، كَمَا أَنَّ الَّذِي يَنْتَصِبُ عَلَيْهِ لَيْتِيكَ
وَسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ غَيْرٌ مُسْتَعْمَلٌ. وَإِذَا قَالَ: سَمْعًا وَطَاعَةً
فَهُوَ فِي تَرْجِيَةِ السَّمْعِ وَالطَّاعَةِ، كَمَا قَالَ: حَمْدًا وَشُكْرًا،
عَلَى هَذَا التَّفْسِيرِ. وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ: حَذَارِيكَ، كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ:
لَيْكُنْ (س ٢٠) مِنْكَ حَذَرٌ بَعْدَ حَذَرٍ، كَمَا أَنَّهُ أَرَادَ
بِقَوْلِهِ: لَيْتِيكَ وَسَعْدِيكَ: إِجَابَةً بَعْدَ إِجَابَةٍ، كَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ:
كُلَّمَا أَجَبْتُكَ فِي أَمْرٍ فَأَنَا فِي الْأَمْرِ الْآخِرِ مُجِيبٌ، وَكَأَنَّ
هَذِهِ التَّنْبِيَةَ أَشَدُّ تَوْكِيدًا. وَمِثْلُهُ (س ١٤٧) إِلَّا أَنَّهُ قَدْ
يَكُونُ حَالًا وَقَعَ عَلَيْهِ الْفِعْلُ، قَوْلُ الشَّاعِرِ، وَهُوَ عَبْدُ
بَنِي الْحَسْحَاسِ: (طويل)

إِذَا شُقَّ بُرْدٌ شُقَّ بِالْبُرْدِ مِثْلُهُ

دَوَالِيكَ حَتَّى لَيْسَ لِلْبُرْدِ لَابِسٌ

أَي: مَدَاوَلَتِكَ وَمَدَاوَلَةٌ لَكَ. وَإِنْ شَاءَ كَانَ حَالًا.
وَمِثْلُهُ أَيْضًا: (رجز)

صَرَبًا هَذَاذِيكَ وَطَعْنَا وَخَصْنَا

(س ٥) وَمَعْنَى تَنْبِيَةِ دَوَالِيكَ أَنَّهُ فِعْلٌ مِنْ اثْنَيْنِ، لِأَنِّي
إِذَا دَاوَلْتُ فَمِنْ كُلِّ وَاحِدٍ مَنَّا فِعْلٌ. وَكَذَلِكَ هَذَاذِيكَ،
كَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ: هَذَا بَعْدَ هَذَا مِنْ كُلِّ وَجْهِ. وَإِنْ شَاءَ حَمَلَهُ
عَلَى أَنَّ الْفِعْلَ وَقَعَ هَذَا بَعْدَ هَذَا، فَنَصَبَهُ عَلَى الْحَالِ.

Yuwnis claimed that *labbayk* ‘I am at your service’ is a single *ʔism* ‘name’ but it came with this expression in *ʔidʔāfah* ‘annexion’ like your saying *ʔalayka* ‘against you’. ʔal-Khalīl claimed that it is a dualization with the status of *ḥawālayka* ‘your surroundings/circumstances-d), because we heard them saying *ḥananun* ‘mercy/tenderness’ and some of the Arabs say *labbi* ‘make a wish’ so he makes it follow the course of *ʔamsi* ‘yesterday’ and *ʔāgi* ‘caw like a crow’ and its location is *nasʔbun* ‘erecting’. (L. 10) And *ḥawālayka* ‘your surroundings-d’ has the status of *ḥanānayka* ‘your mercies/tenderness-d’ and you don’t need in this case to make it singular, because if you were to express the *ʔism* ‘name’ you would show that it does not have the status of *ʔalayka* ‘against you’ and *ʔilayka* ‘towards you/for you’ because you don’t say *labbā zaydin* and *saʔdā zaydin*. They may say *ḥawālayka* ‘your circumstance’, so they made it singular just as they said *ḥanānun* ‘tenderness’. He said (ragaz)¹⁴

ʔa-hadamuw baytaka lā ʔabā lakā

Wa ḥasibuw ʔannaka lā ʔaxā lakā

Wa ʔanā ʔamšiy ʔal-dāʔala ḥawālakā

‘Did they destroy your house, you have no father

And they reckoned that you have no brother
And I walk lumbering around you’

(L. 15) And he said: (mutagārib)¹⁵

Daʔawtu li-mā nābaniy miswaran

Fa-labbā fa-labbay yaday miswari

‘I called Miswar to what has befallen me

He responded with both hands of miswar’

If it were with the status of *ʔalā* ‘on’, he would have said *fa-labbā yaday miswar* because you say *ʔalā zaydin* ‘on Zaid/against Zaid’, if you were to express the name of the *ʔism*.

وزعم يونس أن لَيْتِكَ اسمٌ واحدٌ ولكنّه جاء على هذا
اللفظ في الإضافة، كقولك: عَلَيْكَ. وزعم الخليل أنّها
ثنائيةٌ بمنزلة حَوَالَيْكَ، لأنّنا سَمِعْنَاهُمْ يَقُولُونَ: حَنَانٌ.
وبعض العرب يقول: لَبَّ فَيُجْرِيهِ مُجْرَى أَمْسٍ وَغَائِقِ،
ولكنّ موضعه نصبٌ. (س ١٠) وَحَوَالَيْكَ بمنزلة
حَنَانَيْكَ. ولستَ تحتاج في هذا الباب إلى أن تُفْرِدَ،
لأنّك إذا أظهرت الاسمَ تبيّن أنه ليس بمنزلة عَلَيْكَ
وإِلَيْكَ، لأنّك لا تقول: لَبِّي زَيْدٍ، وَسَعْدَى زَيْدٍ. وقد
قالوا: حَوَالِكَ فَأفْرِدُوا، كما قالوا: حَنَانٌ. قال: (رجز)
أَهْدَمُوا بَيْتَكَ لَا أَبَا لَكَ

وَحَسِبُوا أَنَّكَ لَا أَحَا لَكَ

وَأَنَا أَمْشِي الدَّالِّي حَوَالِكَ

وقال: (مقارب)

دَعَوْتُ لِمَا نَابَنِي مَسُورًا

فَلَبِّي فَلَبِّي يَدَي مَسُورٍ

فَلَوْ كَانَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ عَلَيِّ لَقَالَ: فَلَبِّي يَدَي مَسُورٍ، لِأَنَّكَ
تقول: عَلَي زَيْدٍ، إِذَا أَظْهَرْتَ الْاسْمَ.

14 The meter of ragaz is *mustaffīlun* (six times).

15 The meter of mutagarib is *faʔuwlun faʔuwlun faʔuwlun faʔuwlun* (twice).

Chapter 74. This is a chapter on *ḍikr* ‘recalling’ the meaning of *labbayka wa saʿadayka* ‘at your service-d and to your happiness-d’ and what *ʔuštugā* ‘they are derived’ from

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.176-177, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 147-148; Haruwn vol.1. p.352-354)

(I. 74. P. 147, L. 18) That was mentioned to show you the *wagh* ‘surface form’ of its *nas^b* ‘erecting’ just as the meaning of *subhāna* ‘praise’ was recollected. ʔabuww ʔal-xat^tʔāb related to us that it is said to the man who continues with a thing (L. 20) and does not part with it, nor is it plucked from him. *gad ʔalabba fulānun ʕalā kaḏā wa kaḏā* ‘so and so is used to such and such’ and *gad ʔasʕada fulānun fulānan ʕalā ʔamrihi wa sāʕadahu* ‘so and so cheered up someone about his affair and helped him’. *ʔilbāb wa-musāʕadah* ‘getting used to and helping’ are coming close and following through. If one gets used to a thing, then it does not abandon him, and if it cheered him up (P. 148) then he pursues it. It is as though a man were to say to another man *yā fulān* ‘you, so and so’ and he said *labbayka wa saʕadayka* ‘at your service and pleasure’. He has indeed said *gurban minka wa mutābaʕatan* ‘in closeness to you and following you’. This is an exemplification even if it is not used in speech, just as *barāʔata ʔal-lāhi* ‘innocence of God’ is an exemplification of *subhāna ʔal-lāhi* ‘praise be to God’ and it is not used. Similarly, if he were to say *labbayka wa saʕadayka* ‘at your service and pleasure’ he means by that God, the powerful and glorious. It is as though he said: *ʔay rabbi lā ʔanʔā ʕanka fīy šayʔin taʔmuruniy bihi* ‘yes Lord, I would not put at distance from you anything that you command me’. If he were to do that, then he has become close to God with his desire. As for his saying (L. 5) *wasāʕdayka* ‘and your pleasure’, it is as though he is saying: I am following up on your orders and your followers, not deviating from them. If he were to do that, then he followed up, obeyed and complied. We were led to explain *labbayka wa saʕadayka* ‘at your service and pleasure’ to clarify by its means the surface form of their *nas^b* ‘erecting’ because they do not have the status of *sagyan* ‘by way of watering’ and *raʕyan* ‘by way of pasturing’ and *ḥamdan* ‘by way of praising’ and whatever is like them. Don’t see that you say to an enquirer about the explanation of *sagyan wa ḥamdan* ‘by way of watering and praising’ that it is *sagāka ʔal-lāhu sagyan* ‘may God give you water by way of watering’ and *ʔaḥmuadu ʔal-lāhu ḥamdan* ‘I praise God with praising’. You say *ḥamdan* ‘praising’ as a substitute for *ʔaḥmadu* ‘I praise’ and *sagyan* ‘watering’ as a substitute for *sagāka ʔal-lāhu* ‘may God give you water’. You are not able to say:

(٧٤) بَابُ ذِكْرِ مَعْنَى لَبَّيْكَ وَسَعْدَيْكَ
وما اشتقاً منه

وإنما ذكّر ليبيّن لك وجه نصبه كما ذكّر معنى سبحان الله. حدّثنا أبو الخطاب أنّه يُقال للرجل المدّوم على الشيء لا (س ٢٠) يُفارقُه ولا يُقلعُ عنه: قد ألب فلانٌ على كذا وكذا. ويُقال: قد أسعد فلانٌ فلاناً على أمره وساعده، فالإلبابُ والمساعدةُ دُتو ومُتَابَعَةٌ. إذا ألب على الشيء فهو لا يفارقه، وإذا أسعده (ص ١٧٨) فقد تابَعه. فكانه إذا قال الرجلُ للرجل: يا فلان، فقال: لبيك وسعديك، فقد قال: قُرباً منك ومُتَابَعَةً لك. فهذا تمثيلٌ وإن كان لا يُستعمل في الكلام، كما كان براءة الله تمثيلاً لسبحان الله ولم يُستعمل. وكذلك إذا قال: لبيك وسعديك، يعني بذلك الله عزّ وجلّ، فكانه قال: أي ربّ لا أنأى عنك في شيء تأمرني به. فإذا فعل ذلك فقد تقرب إلى الله بهواه. وأمّا قوله: (س ٥) وسعديك، فكانه يقول: أنا مُتَابِعٌ أمرك وأولياءك غيرٍ مُخَالِفٍ. فإذا فعل ذلك فقد تابَع وأطاع وطاع. وإنما حمّلنا على تفسير لبيك وسعديك لِنوضح به وجه نصبهما، لأنهما ليسا بمنزلة سقياً ورعيّاً وحمداً وما أشبه هذا. ألا ترى أنّك تقول للسائل عن تفسير سقياً وحمداً: إنّما هو سقاك الله سقياً، وأحمدُ الله حمداً، وتقول: حمداً بدّل من أحمد، وسقياً بدّل من سقاك الله. ولا تستطيع أن تقول:

ʔulibbuka labban ‘I serve by way of serving’ and *ʔusʔiduka saʔdan* ‘I make you rejoice by way of rejoicing’, nor do you say *saʔdan* ‘by way of rejoicing’ as a substitute for (L. 10) *ʔusʔidu* ‘he who pleases’ nor *labban* ‘beckoning’ as a substitute for *ʔulibbu* ‘he beckoned’. When that is not the case, look for something in other than its expression whose meaning is *barāʔata ʔal-lāhi* ‘innocence of God’ when I mentioned it, to show the meaning of *subhāna ʔal-lāhi*. So, I looked for that for *labbayka wa saʔdayka* ‘at your service and pleasure’ and to the expression from which they are derived, since they would not, with reference to it with the status of *ʔal-hamd* ‘the praise’ and *ʔal-saʔiy* ‘the watering’ in their two *fiʔl* ‘actions’ nor will they be inflected with their inflections. Their meaning is *ʔal-gurb* ‘nearness’ and *mutābaʔah* ‘following up’. So I exemplified in them the *nasʔb* ‘erecting’ in *saʔdayka wa labbayka* ‘your pleasure and service’ just as I exemplified with *barāʔah* ‘innocence’ the *nasʔb* ‘erecting’ in *subhāna ʔal-lāhi* ‘praise be to God’. An example of that is your exemplification of *ʔuffatan wa tuffatan* ‘ugh and phew’. If you were queried about them you say *natnan* ‘foul’ because (L. 15) their two meanings by themselves are one, like your exemplification of *bahran* ‘destruction’ with *tabban* ‘evil’ and *dafran* ‘shove’ with *natnan* ‘foul’. As for their saying *sabbaḥa*, *labbā* and *ʔaffafa*, he wanted to inform you that he had pronounced *subhāna ʔal-lāhi* and *labbayka* and *ʔuffa* so this became with the status of his saying *daʔdaʔa* ‘rock’ and *baʔbaʔa* ‘to say I forsake my father and mother for you’ if you were to hear him pronounce *daʔ* ‘let’ and his saying *biʔabiy* ‘with my father’. What leads to that is his saying *hallala* if he were to say *lā ʔilāha ʔilla ʔal-lāh* ‘there is no deity but God’. I mentioned *hallala* and its likes so you would say that they were pronounced this way. If this were with the status of *kallamtuhu mina ʔal-kalām* ‘I spoke to him some speech’, then *subhāna ʔal-lāhi* and *labba*, and *saʔada* would be inflectable *masʔadir* ‘origins’ and used in the *garr* ‘pull’ and *raʔʔ* ‘raise’ (L. 20) and *nasʔb* ‘erect’ and the *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* ‘ʔal-’, but *sabbaḥtu* ‘I praised’ and *labbaytu* ‘I beckoned’ have the status of *hallaltu* and *daʔdaʔtu* if he were to say *daʔ* ‘let’ and *lā ʔilāha ʔilla ʔal-lāh* ‘there is no deity but God’.

أَلَيْكَ لَبًّا، وَأُسْعِدُكَ سَعْدًا، وَلَا تَقُولُ: سَعْدًا بَدَلُ (س) (١٠) مِنْ أُسْعِدُ وَلَا لَبًّا بَدَلُ مِنْ أَلْبُ. فَلَمَّا لَمْ يَكُنْ ذَاكَ فِيهِ التَّمَسُّ لَهُ شَيْءٌ مِنْ غَيْرِ لَفْظِهِ مَعْنَاهُ بَرَاءَةٌ لِلَّهِ حِينَ ذَكَرْنَاهَا لِأَبْيْنٍ مَعْنَى سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ. فَالْتَمَسْتُ ذَلِكَ لِلْبَيْتِ وَسَعْدَيْكَ وَلِلْفِظِ الَّذِي اشْتَقَّ مِنْهُ، إِذْ لَمْ يَكُنْ فِيهِ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْحَمْدِ وَالسَّقْيِ فِي فِعْلِهِمَا. وَلَا يَتَصَرَّفَانِ تَصَرُّفَهَا. فَمَعْنَاهُمَا الْقُرْبُ وَالْمُتَابَعَةُ، فَمَثَلْتُ بِهِمَا النَّصَبَ فِي سَعْدَيْكَ وَلَيْتِكَ، كَمَا مَثَلْتُ بِبَرَاءَةِ النَّصَبِ فِي سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ. وَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ تَمْثِيلُكَ: أَفَّهٌ وَتَفَّهٌ، إِذَا سُبِّحَتْ عَنْهُمَا تَقُولُ: نَتَنَّا لِأَنَّ (س) (١٥) مَعْنَاهُمَا وَحَدَّهُمَا وَاحِدًا، مِثْلُ تَمْثِيلِكَ بَهْرًا بَيْتًا، وَدَفْرًا بَيْتًا. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُهُمْ: سَبَّحَ وَلَسَى وَأَفَّفَ، فَإِنَّمَا أَرَادَ أَنْ يُجَبِّرَكَ أَنَّهُ قَدْ لَفَّظَ بِسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَبَلَيْتِكَ وَبِأَفَّ، فَصَارَ هَذَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِهِ: قَدْ دَعَدَعَ وَقَدْ بَابًا، إِذَا سَمِعْتَهُ يَلْفِظُ بَدَعَ وَقَوْلِهِ: بِأَبِي. وَيَدُلُّكَ عَلَى ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُمْ: هَلَّلَ، إِذَا قَالَ: لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ. وَإِنَّمَا ذَكَرْتُ هَلَّلَ وَمَا أَشْبَهَهُ لِتَقُولَ قَدْ لَفَّظَ بِهِذَا. وَلَوْ كَانَ هَذَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ كَلِمَتِهِ مِنَ الْكَلَامِ، لَكَانَ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَكَبَّ وَسَعَدَ مَصَادِرَ مُسْتَعْمَلَةً مُتَصَرِّفَةً فِي الْجَرِّ وَالرَّفْعِ (س) (٢٠) وَالنَّصَبِ وَالْأَلْفِ وَاللَّامِ، وَلَكِنْ سَبَّحْتُ وَكَبَيْتُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ هَلَّلْتُ وَدَعَدَعْتُ، إِذَا قَالَ: دَعَّ وَلَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ.

Chapter 75. This is a chapter in which the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ that is likened to it is erected based on the *ʔidʿmār* ‘implication’ of the *fīʿl* ‘action’ whose expression has been left out

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.177-181, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 149-151; Haruwn vol.1. p.355-361)

(I. 75. P. 149. L. 1) And that is as in your saying *marartu bihi fa-ʔiḏā lahu sʿawtun sʿawta ḥimārin* ‘I passed by him and behold he had a voice, the voice of a jackass’ and *marartu bihi fa-ʔiḏā lahu sʿurāxun sʿurāxa ʔal-əaklā* ‘I passed by him and behold he had a scream, the scream of widows’. The poet ʔal-nābiyah ʔal-ḏubyāniyy said: (basiy¹⁶)¹⁶

Maḡḏuwfatin bi-daxiysi ʔal-naḥdʿi bāziluhā
Lahu sʿarifun sʿariyfa ʔal-ḡaʿwi fi-ʔal-masadi

‘She tosses off the thick flesh in her maturity
It has the grinding sound, the grinding of rope on its spool’

(L. 5) and: (tʿawiyl)¹⁷

Lahā baʿda ʔisnādi ʔal-kaliymi wa hadʔihi
Wa rannati man yabkiy ʔiḏā kāna bākiyā
Hadiyrun hadiyra ʔal-əawri yanfuḏʿu raʔsahu
Yaḏubbu bi-rawgayhi ʔal-kilāba ʔal-dʿawāriyā

‘It has, after the wounded reclines and quietes down,
The moan of one crying if he was crying
Roar, the roar of a bull tossing its head
He chases away with his horns the menacing dogs’

He erected this, because you passed by it in the circumstances of *tasʿwiyt* ‘shouting’ and you did not want to make the last one a *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’ for the first or a *badal* ‘substitute’ for it. But when you said it has a *sʿawt* ‘sound’, it became known that there was *ʕamalun* ‘an action’ there, so your saying *lahu sʿawtun* ‘it has a sound’ has the status of (L. 10) your saying *fa-ʔiḏā huwa yusʿawwitu* ‘and behold he was making a sound’, so you related the second to the meaning. This is similar in *nasʿb* ‘erecting’, not in meaning, to the saying of the Powerful and Glorious, *wa ḡāʕilu ʔal-layli sakanan wa ʔal-ʕamsa wa ʔal-ḡamara ḡusbānan* (Sūrah VI:96) ‘He is maker of the night for rest and the sun and the moon for the reckoning of time’, for when he said *ḡāʕilu ʔal-layli* ‘maker of the night’, the reader knew that it is with the meaning of *ḡaʕala* ‘he made’ so it became as though he said *ḡaʕala ʔal-layla sakanan* ‘he made the night for rest’ and he related the second to the meaning.

(٧٥) بَابُ مَا يَنْتَصِبُ فِيهِ الْمَصْدَرُ الْمُشَبَّهُ بِهِ عَلَى
إِضْمَارِ الْفِعْلِ الْمَتْرُوكِ إِظْهَارُهُ

(م ١. ب ٧٥. ص ١٤٩. س ١) وذلك قولك مررتُ
به فإذا له صوتٌ صوتٌ حِمَارٍ ومررتُ به فإذا له صُراخٌ
صُراخٌ التَّكَلِّي. وقال الشاعر، وهو النابغة الذبياني:
(بسيط)

مَقْدُوفَةٌ بِدَخِيسِ النَّخْضِ بَارِئُهَا
لَهُ صَرِيفٌ صَرِيفٌ الْقَعْوِ بِالْمَسَدِ
(س ٥) وقال: (طويل)

لَهَا بَعْدَ إِسْنَادِ الْكَلِيمِ وَهَدْيِهِ
وَرْتَةٌ مَن يَبْكِي إِذَا كَانَ بَاكِيًا
هَدِيرٌ هَدِيرِ الثَّوْرِ يَنْفُضُ رَأْسَهُ
يَذُبُّ بِرُوقِيهِ الْكِلَابَ الصَّوَارِيَا

فإنما انتصب هذا لأنك مررت به في حال تصويت، ولم
تُرد أن تجعل الآخر صفةً للأول وبدلاً منه. ولكنك لما
قلت له: صوتٌ، علم أنه قد كان ثم عملاً، فصار
قولك له: صوتٌ بمنزلة (س ١٠) قولك: فإذا هو
يُصَوِّتُ، فحملت الثاني على المعنى. وهذا شبيه في
النصب لا في المعنى بقوله عز وجل: {وَجَاعَلُ اللَّيْلِ
سَكَنًا وَالشَّمْسَ وَالْقَمَرَ حُسْبَانًا}، لأنه حين قال:
جَاعَلُ اللَّيْلِ، فقد علم القارئ أنه على معنى جَعَلَ
فصار كأنه قال: وجَعَلَ اللَّيْلَ سَكَنًا، وحمل الثاني على
المعنى.

16 The meter of basiy¹⁶ is *mustafsilun fāʕilun mustabʕilun fāʕilun* (twice).

17 The meter of tʿawiyl is *faʕuwulun mafāʕiyulun* (four times).

Similarly, *lahu s'awtun* 'he/it has a voice/sound'; it is as though he said *fa-ʔiḏā huwa yus'awwitu* 'as if he is producing a sound', so he related it to the meaning and he erected it as though he made a mistake after his saying *lahu s'awtun* 'he has a sound' with *yus'awwitu s'awta ʔal-ḥimāri* 'he sounds with the sound of the jackass', namely he begins with or produces a *s'awta ḥimārin* 'sound of a jackass' but he (L. 15) deleted this because it became 'he has a sound' as a substitute for it. If you were to say *marartu bihi fa-ʔiḏā huwa yus'awwitu s'awta ʔal-ḥimāri* 'I passed by him and behold he was producing a sound, the sound of a jackass', it is based on the *fiʔl* 'action' not *ḥāl* 'circumstance'. If you were to say *s'awta ḥimārin* 'sound of a jackass' you took away the *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* 'ʔal-' on the basis of your implying *fiʔlan baʕda ʔal-fiʔl ʔal-muḏʕhari* 'an action after the expressed action' and you make the sound of the jackass an example of it that brings out the sound or *ḥālan* 'circumstance' just as when you said *fa-ʔiḏā lahu s'awtun* 'behold he has a sound'. If you so wished, you connected to it *yus'awwitu* 'he is making a sound' and you made *ʔal-ʕāmila* 'the operator' in it as in your saying (P. 150) *yaḏhabu ḏahāban* 'he goes by way of going/he takes a walk'. An example of that is *marartu bihi fa-ʔiḏā lahu daʕṣun daʕṣaka ʔal-d' aʕiyfa* 'I passed by him and behold he had a shove, your shove of a weakling'. An example of that is also *marartu bihi fa-ʔiḏā lahu daggun daggaka bi-ʔal-minḥāzi ḥabba ʔal-fulfuli* 'I passed by him and behold he had a pounding, your pounding in the pestle the kernels of pepper'. It shows you that if you said *fa-ʔiḏā lahu s'awtun s'awta ḥimārin* 'if he were to have a sound, the sound of a jackass' you have implied a *fiʔl* 'action' after *lahu s'awtun* 'he has a sound'. And *s'awta ḥimārin* 'sound of a jackass' is erected on the basis that it is *miḏālun* 'a model' or *ḥālun* 'a circumstance' to indicate that a *fiʔl* 'action' is introduced. If you were to express the *fiʔl* 'action' that the *masʕdar* 'origin' is not a *badal* 'substitute' for (L. 5), you would need another *fiʔl* 'action' that you imply. Of that is the saying of the poet: (ragaz)¹⁸

ʔiḏā raʔatniy sagatʕat ʔabsʕāruhā

Daʔba bikārin šāyahat bikāruhā

'If she saw me her gaze dropped

Like the custom of young females passing by young males'

It occurs in other than in *ḥāl* 'circumstance'. If you so wish, it occurs with an implied *fiʔl* 'action' as though you said *tadʔabu* 'she is accustomed'. It can also be *maʕuwlan* 'an acted-upon' and *ḥālan* 'circumstance', just as it can be other than *ḥāl* 'circumstance'.

فكذلك له صوتٌ، فكأنه قال: فإذا هو يُصَوِّتُ، فَحَمَلَهُ عَلَى الْمَعْنَى فَنَصَبَهُ، كَأَنَّهُ تَوَهَّمَ بَعْدَ قَوْلِهِ لَهُ صَوْتُ: يُصَوِّتُ صَوْتَ الْحَمَارِ أَوْ يُبْدِيهِ، أَوْ يُخْرِجُهُ صَوْتَ حَمَارٍ، وَلَكِنَّهُ (س ١٥) حَذَفَ هَذَا لِأَنَّهُ صَارَ "لَهُ صَوْتُ" بَدَلًا مِنْهُ. فَإِذَا قُلْتَ: مَرَرْتُ بِهِ فَإِذَا هُوَ يُصَوِّتُ صَوْتَ الْحَمَارِ فَعَلَى الْفِعْلِ غَيْرِ حَالٍ. فَإِنْ قُلْتَ: صَوْتَ حَمَارٍ، فَأَلْقَيْتَ الْأَلْفَ وَاللَّامَ فَعَلَى إِضْمَارِكَ فَعَلًا بَعْدَ الْفِعْلِ الْمُظَهَّرِ، وَتَجْعَلُ صَوْتَ حَمَارٍ مِثَالًا عَلَيْهِ يَخْرُجُ الصَّوْتُ أَوْ حَالًا. كَمَا أَرَدْتَ ذَلِكَ حِينَ قُلْتَ: فَإِذَا لَهُ صَوْتُ. وَإِنْ شِئْتَ أَوْصَلْتَ إِلَيْهِ يُصَوِّتُ، فَجَعَلْتَهُ الْعَامِلَ فِيهِ، كَقَوْلِكَ: (ص ١٥٠) يَذْهَبُ ذَهَابًا. وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ: مَرَرْتُ بِهِ فَإِذَا لَهُ دَفْعٌ دَفْعَكَ الضَّعِيفَ. وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ أَيْضًا: مَرَرْتُ بِهِ فَإِذَا لَهُ دَقٌّ دَقَّكَ بِالْمِنْحَازِ حَبِّ الْفُلْفُلِ. وَيَدُلُّكَ عَلَى أَنَّكَ إِذَا قُلْتَ: فَإِذَا لَهُ صَوْتُ صَوْتَ حَمَارٍ، فَقَدْ أَضْمَرْتَ فَعَلًا بَعْدَ "لَهُ صَوْتُ"، وَصَوْتَ حَمَارٍ انْتَصَبَ عَلَى أَنَّهُ مِثَالٌ أَوْ حَالٌ يَخْرُجُ عَلَيْهِ الْفِعْلُ أَنَّكَ إِذَا أَظْهَرْتَ الْفِعْلَ الَّذِي لَا يَكُونُ الْمَصْدَرُ بَدَلًا مِنْهُ (س ٥) احْتَجَجْتَ إِلَى فِعْلِ آخَرَ تُضْمِرُهُ. فَمِنْ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُ الشَّاعِرِ: (رَجَز)

إِذَا رَأَيْتَنِي سَقَطَتْ أَبْصَارُهَا

دَأْبَ بَكَارٍ شَائِحَتْ بِكَارِهَا

ويكون على غير الحال، وإن شئت بفعل مضمير، كأنك قلت تدأب، فيكون أيضاً مفعولاً وحالاً، كما يكون غير حال.

18 The meter of ragaz is *mustaffilun* (six times).

What may not be a *hālan* ‘circumstance’ but may be based on the *fiʿl* ‘action’ is the saying of the poet: (ragaz)¹⁹

Lawwahāhā min baʿdi budnin wa sanag
Tadʿmiyraka ʔal-sābīga yuʿwā li-lsabag

‘He made it thuin after fatness and overeating
The dangerous thinning of the betting horses’

(L. 10) If you so wished, it can be based on *ʔadʿmarahā* ‘he thinned it/made it skinny’ and if you so wished it can be based on *lawwahāhā* ‘he thinned it/made it skinny’ because *talwiyhahu* ‘his thinning’ is “thinning” and like it is: (ragaz)²⁰

Nāgin ʿawāhu ʔal-ʔaynu mimma wagafā
Tʿayyā ʔal-layālī zulafan fa-zulafā
Samāwata ʔal-hilālī ḥattā ʔihgawgafā

‘A speedster worn out by fast pace
The enfolding of the nights one after another
Like the heaven’s crescent twisted over’

It is permitted for you to imply another *fiʿl* ‘action’, just as you implied after *lahu sʿawtun* ‘he had a sound’. What points you to this is that if you were to express (L. 15) a *fiʿl* ‘action’, it is not permitted that the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ be *maʿfūwlan ʿalayhi* ‘an acted-upon based on it’ and have the status of *lahu sʿawtun* ‘he has a voice’. And that is as in the saying of ʔabuw kabiyri ʔal-huḍaliyy: (ragaz)²¹

Mā ʔin yamassu ʔal-ʔardʿa ʔillā mankibun
Minu wa ḥarfū ʔal-sāgi ʿayyā ʔal-mihmali

‘Nothing of him touches the ground except the torso
and the edges of his legs like the fold of the scabbard’

Mā ʔin yamassu ʔal-ʔardʿa ‘what touches the ground’ became with the status of *lahu ʿayyun* ‘he has a fold/empty stomach’ because if he mentioned *ḍā* ‘that’ it became known that it is *ʿayyān* ‘two folds/with empty stomach’. It may be introduced in *sʿawta ḥimārin* ‘sound of the jackass’ or *ʔinnamā ʔanta šurba ʔal-ʔibili* ‘you are a drink of the camels’ if it is represented by his saying *ʔinnamā ʔanta šurban* ‘you are indeed a drink’. What was *maʿrifah* ‘definite’, it is not a (P. 151) *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ and it cannot be except *maʿfūwlan* ‘an acted-upon’ and the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ has a share in it.

فما لا يكون حالاً ويكون على الفعل قول الشاعر:
(رجز)

لَوَحَهَا مِنْ بَعْدِ بُدْنٍ وَسَنَقٍ
تَضْمِيرُكَ السَّابِقِ يُطَوِّى لِّلسَّبَقِ

(س ١٠) وَإِنْ شِئْتَ كَانَ عَلَى: أَضْمَرَهَا، وَإِنْ شِئْتَ
كَانَ عَلَى: لَوَحَهَا، لِأَنَّ تَلْوِيحَهُ تَضْمِيرٌ وَمِثْلُهُ: (رجز)

نَاجٍ طَوَاهُ الْأَيْنُ مِمَّا وَجَفَا
طَيِّ اللَّيَالِي زُلْفًا فَزُلْفَا
سَهَاوَةَ الْهَلَالِ حَتَّى أَحْقَوْقَفَا

وقد يجوز أن تُضْمِرَ فعلاً آخر كما أضمرت بعد "له صوت"، يدلُّك على ذلك أنك لو أظهرت (س ١٥) فعلاً لا يجوز أن يكون المصدرُ مفعولاً عليه صار بمنزلة: له صوت، وذلك قوله، وهو أبو كبير الهذلي:
(رجز)

مَا إِنْ يَمَسُّ الْأَرْضَ إِلَّا مَنَكِبٌ
مِنْهُ وَحَرَفُ السَّاقِ طَيِّ الْمَحْمَلِ

صار "ما إن يمسُّ الأرض" بمنزلة "له طي" لأنه إذا ذكر ذا عُرف أنه طَيَّانٌ. وقد يدخل في "صوت حمار":
إنما أنت شرب الإبل إذا مُثِّلَ بقوله: إنَّما أنت شرباً.
فما كان معرفة لم يكن (ص ١٥١) حالاً ولم يكن إلا مفعولاً وتشرکه النكرة.

19 The meter of ragaz is *mustafʿilun* (six times).

20 The meter of ragaz is *mustafʿilun* (six times).

21 The meter of ragaz is *mustafʿilun* (six times).

If you so wished, you made it *hālan* ‘a circumstance’ on which the matter is concerned and, that is, making it similar to the first. What points you to that is that if you were to introduce *miōla* ‘like’ here it would be acceptable and it would be *nas^b* ‘erect’. If you were to take out *miōla* ‘like’, the *mas^ddar* ‘origin’ which is *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ would be instead of *miōlin* ‘like’, because it is *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ like it. The introduction of *miōlin* ‘like’ shows you that it is *tašbiyh* ‘likening’. If you were to say *fa-ḡiḡā huwa yus^aawwitu s^aawta ḡimārin* ‘behold he is making a sound, sound of a jackass’, if you so wished, *nas^babta* ‘you erected’ on the basis that it is a *miōālun* ‘proverb’ according to which (L. 5) the *s^aawt* ‘sound’ occurred’. If you so wished *nas^babta* ‘you erected’ on the basis of what we here explained, and it was not a *hāl* ‘circumstance’. This was a response to his saying *ḡalā ḡayyiy ḡālin* ‘under any circumstance’ and *kayfa* ‘how’ and similar ones. It is as though *kayfa wagaḡa ḡal-ḡamru* ‘how did it happen’ was said to him, or he made the addressee with the status of the one who said that, so he wanted to answer *kayfa wagaḡa ḡal-ḡamru* ‘how did it happen’ and on the basis of a *miōāl* ‘proverb’. So he erected and it occurred in it and on the basis of it. What was before it, namely the *fiḡl* ‘action’, operated on it. If it were *maḡrifatan* ‘definite’ it would not be *hālan* ‘a circumstance’, and it would be based on an expressed *fiḡl* ‘action’, if it was permitted for it to operate on it, or based on something implied, and if the expressed is not permitted as it erects as in *t^aayya ḡal-miḡmali* ‘the fold of the scabbard’, not based on (L. 10) *yamussu* ‘it touches’. If you so wished, you said: *lahu s^aawtun s^aawtu ḡimārin* ‘he has a sound, the sound of a jackass’ and *lahu s^aawtun xuwāru ḡawrin* ‘he has the sound of the moo of bull’, and that is if you made it a *s^aifah* ‘descriptive’ for the *s^aawt* ‘sound’ and it does not occur as a *fiḡl* ‘action’ nor its implication. If it was a *maḡrifah* ‘definite’, it is not permitted that it be a *s^aifah* ‘descriptive’ to *nakirah* ‘an indefinite’ just as it is not a *hāl* ‘circumstance’. You shall find this clarified in its chapter, God willing. ḡal-Khalīl claimed that *lahu s^aawtun s^aawtu ḡal-ḡimāri* ‘he has a sound, the sound of a jackass’ is permitted, because it is a likening/comparison. Hence it is acceptable that you describe it with a *nakirah* ‘indefinite’. ḡal-Khalīl claimed that it is permitted for a man to say *ḡāḡā ḡagulun ḡaxuw zaydin* ‘this is a man, a brother of Zaid’ if you want to liken/compare him to the brother of Zaid. This is *ḡabiyḡun daḡiyf* ‘unacceptable and weak’. (L. 15) It is not permitted except in the location of necessity. If this were permitted you would say *ḡāḡā ḡas^aiyrun ḡal-t^aawiyl* ‘this is short, the tall’ when you want *miōlu* ‘like’ the tall one. This is not permitted, just as it is unacceptable that the *maḡrifah* ‘definite’ be *hālan* ‘a circumstance’ like the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ except in poetry.

وإن شئت جعلته حالاً عليه وقع الأمر، وهو تشبيهه
للأول. يَدُلُّكَ على ذلك أنك لو أدخلت "مِثْل" هاهنا
كان حسناً وكان نصباً، فإذا أخرجت "مِثْل" قام
المصدرُ النكرةُ مقامَ مِثْلٍ، لأنَّه مثله نكرةٌ. فدخولُ مِثْلٍ
يَدُلُّكَ على أنه تشبيهٌ. فإذا قلتَ: فإذا هو يصوتُ
صوتَ حِمَارٍ، فإن شئتَ نصبتَ على أنه مِثَالٌ وقع (س)
(٥٩) عليه الصوتُ، وإن شئتَ نصبتَ على ما فسرنا
وكان غير حال، وكأنَّ هذا جوابٌ لقوله: على أيِّ حالٍ
وكيف ومثله. وكأنَّه قيل له: كيف وقع الأمر، أو جعلَ
المخاطَبَ بمنزلة مَنْ قال ذلك، فأراد أن يبيِّن كيف
وقع الأمرُ وعلى أيِّ مِثَالٍ، فانتصبَ وهو مَوْفُوعٌ فيه
وعليه، وعومِلَ فيه ما قبله وهو الفعلُ. وإذا كان معرفةً
لم يكن حالاً وكان على فِعْلٍ مُظْهِرٍ إن جاز أن يَعْمَلَ
فيه، أو على مُضْمَرٍ إن لم يجزِ المُظْهِرُ، كما يَنْتَصِبُ "طِيَّ
المِحْمَلِ" على غير (س ١٠) "يَمَسُّ". وإن شئتَ قلتَ:
له صوتٌ صوتُ حِمَارٍ، وله صوتٌ خُوَارٌ ثَوْرٍ، وذلك
إذا جعلته صفةً للصوتِ ولم يرد فعلاً ولا إضماره. وإن
كان معرفةً لم يجزِ أن يكون صفةً لنكرة كما لا يكون
حالاً. وسترى هذا مبيناً في بابِه إن شاء الله. وزعم
الخليل أنه يجوز: له صوتٌ صوتُ الحِمَارِ لأنه تشبيهٌ،
فوينُ ثمَّ حَسَنَ أن تصف به النكرة. وزعم الخليل أنه
يجوزُ أن يقولَ الرجلُ: هذا رَجُلٌ أخو زيد، إذا أردتَ
أن تشبِّهه بأخي زيد. وهذا قبيحٌ ضعيفٌ (س ١٥) لا
يجوزُ إلَّا في موضع الاضطرار، ولو جاز هذا لقلتَ:
هذا قصيرٌ الطويلُ، تريد: مثلُ الطويلِ. فلم يجز هذا كما
قبح أن تكون المعرفةُ حالاً كالنكرة إلا في الشُّعرِ.

It is even more unacceptable with *s'ifah* 'a descriptive', because you contradict what you have spoken. So it does not co-occur with it in the *hal* 'circumstance', just as it departs from it in the *s'ifah* 'descriptive'. This will be clarified in its chapter, as God, the most High, wills.

وهو في الصِّفَةِ أَقْبَحُ لِأَنَّكَ تَنْقُضُ مَا تَكَلَّمْتَ بِهِ، فَلَمْ
تُجَامِعْهُ فِي الْحَالِ، كَمَا فَارَقَهُ فِي الصِّفَةِ. وَيُبَيِّنُ لَكَ فِي بَابِهِ
إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى.