

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 76. This is a chapter in which
the *raff* ‘erect’ is selected

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.181-182, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 151-152; Haruwn vol.1.
p.361-162)

(I. P. 151. L. 19) And that is as in your saying *lahu ʕilmun ʕilmu ʔal-fuḡahāʔi* ‘he has knowledge, knowledge of the experts’ and *lahu raʔyun raʔyu ʔal-ʔusʕalāʔi* ‘he has an opinion, opinion of the founders’ (L. 20): the *raff* ‘raising’ was in the surface form because these are *xisāl* ‘qualities’ you remember in the man like *ḥilm* ‘prudence’ and *ʕaql* ‘mind’ and *fadʕl* ‘virtue’. You don’t want to say that *mararta bi-ragulin fiy ḥāli taʕallumin* ‘I passed by a man in the state of learning’ nor *tafahumin* ‘understanding’ but you wanted to mention the man by *fadʕlin fiyhi* ‘virtue, he has’ and that you make that a quality that he has attained like your saying *lahu ḥasabun ḥasabu* (P. 152) *ʔal-sʕālihiyn* ‘he has an account, account of the righteous’, because these things and their likes have become ornaments with the people and marks and on this aspect *rufiʕa ʔal-sʕawt* ‘the sound’ was raised. If you so wished, *nasʕabta* ‘you erected’ and said *lahu ʕilmun ʕilma ʔal-fuḡahāʔi* ‘he has knowledge, knowledge of the experts’. It is as though you passed by him in the state of *taʕallum* ‘learning’ and *tafagguh* ‘training’. And he is such that he has not come to completion so that he would be called *ʕālim* ‘learned/scholar’. A distinction has been made between this and the *sʕawt* ‘sound’ because the *sʕawt* ‘sound’ is *ʕilāgun* ‘a remedy’ and knowledge for them has the status of the hand, and the leg; and it leads you to that their saying (L. 5) *lahu ʕarafun* ‘he has honor’, *lahu diynun* ‘he has religion’ and *lahu fahmun* ‘he has understanding’. Even if they were to want that he would introduce himself into religion and he had not done enough that he be called *lahu diynun* ‘one who has religion’, they would rather say *yatadayyanu* ‘he is in the process of being religious’, but he is not that and *yataʕarrafu* ‘he is in the process of becoming honorable’

هذا كتاب سيبويه
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٧٦) هذا بابٌ يُختارُ فيه الرَّفْعُ

وذلك قولك له عِلْمٌ عِلْمٌ الْفُقَهَاءِ وَلَهُ رَأْيٌ رَأْيٌ الْأَصْلَاءِ (س ٢٠)، وإنما كان الرفع في هذا الوجه لأن هذه خصالاً تذكرها في الرجل كالحلم والعلم والفضل ولم ترد أن تُخبر بأنك مررت برجلٍ في حال تعلمٍ ولا تفهمٍ ولكنك أردت أن تذكر الرجل بفضله فيه وأن تجعل ذلك خصلةً قد استكملها كقولك له حسبٌ حسبٌ (ص ١٥٢) الصالحين، لأن هذه الأشياء وما يُشبهها صارت تحليةً عند الناس وعلاماتٍ وعلى هذا الوجه رُفِعَ الصوتُ. وإن شئت نصبت فقلت له عِلْمٌ عِلْمٌ الْفُقَهَاءِ، كأنك مررت به في حال تعلمٍ وتفقهٍ وكأنه لم يستكمل أن يقال له عالمٌ وإنما فرق بين هذا وبين الصوت لأن الصوت علاجٌ وأن العلم صار عندهم بمنزلة اليد والرجل. ويدلُّك على ذلك قولهم (س ٥) لَهُ شَرَفٌ وَلَهُ دِينٌ وَلَهُ فَهْمٌ، ولو أرادوا أنه يُدْخِلُ نَفْسَهُ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يَسْتَكْمِلْ أَنْ يُقَالَ لَهُ دِينٌ لَقَالُوا يَتَدَيَّنُ وَلَيْسَ بِذَلِكَ وَيَتَشَرَّفُ

¹ Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

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

and he does not have honor; and *yatafahhamu* ‘he is in the process of understanding’, but he does not have understanding. So if this *lafḍ* ‘expression’ is for those who have not completed what was not a remedy, *nasḥ* ‘erecting’ was far from their saying *lahu ʿilmun ʿilmu ḥal-fuḡahāʿi* ‘he has knowledge, knowledge of the experts’. If he were to say *lahu sʿawtun sʿawta ḥal-ḥimāri* ‘he has a sound, sound of the jackass’, he reported that he passed by him and he was sounding the sound of a jackass. If he were to say *lahu ʿilmun ʿilmu ḥal-fuḡahāʿi* ‘he has knowledge, knowledge of the experts’, he is reporting on what has settled in him before his seeing him and before his hearing (L. 10) from him; or he saw learning and he realized the goodness of learning on the basis of what he has of knowledge. He did not want to report that he had begun with the remedy of knowledge in the circumstance of his meeting him, because this is not used for praising, but the praising is that he report on what has settled in him and not report that the more exemplary thing in him was the learning at the time of his meeting him.

وليس له شرفٌ ويتفهمٌ وليس له فهمٌ. فلما كان هذا اللفظُ للذين لم يستكملوا ما كان غير علاجٍ بعد النَّصبِ في قولهم له علمٌ علمُ الفقهاءِ. وإذا قال له صوتٌ صوتَ حمارةٍ، فإنما أخبر أنه مرَّ به وهو يصوتُ صوتَ حمارةٍ. وإذا قال له علمٌ علمُ الفقهاءِ، فهو يُخبرُ عما قد استقرَّ فيه قبل رؤيته وقبل سَمْعِهِ (س ١٠) منه، أو رآه يتعلمُ فاستدلَّ بحُسنِ تعلُّمِهِ على ما عنده من العلمِ ولم يرد أن يُخبرَ أنه إنما بدأ في علاجِ العلمِ في حالِ لُفْيِهِ إِيَّاهِ لأنَّ هذا ليس مما يُثنى به وإنما الثناءُ في هذا الموضعِ أن يُخبرَ بما استقرَّ فيه ولا يُخبرَ أن أمثالَ شيءٍ كان منه التعلُّمُ في حالِ لِقائِهِ.

Chapter 77. This is a Chapter in which the *raff* ‘erect’ is selected if *ḍakarta* ‘you mentioned’ the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ that is the *ḥilāgan* ‘remedy’, and that is if the last is the first

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.182-183, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 152-153; Haruwn vol.1. p.363-364)

(I. P. 152. L. 13) And that is as in your saying *lahu sʿawtun sʿawtun ḥasanun* ‘he has a sound/voice, a nice sound/voice’. You mention the *sʿawt* ‘voice’ *tawkiydan* ‘by way of confirmation’. You did (L. 15) want to relate it to the *fiʿl* ‘action’ when it was a *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’ and the other was the first. Just as you said *mā ʔanta ʔillā gāʔimun wa gāʔidun* ‘you are nothing except standing and sitting’. You related the last one to *ʔanta* ‘you’, when the last one was the first. An example of that is *lahu sʿawtun ʔayyumā sʿawtin* ‘he has a voice, whatever kind of voice’ and *lahu sʿawtun miəlu sʿawti ʔal-ḥimāri* ‘he has a voice, like the sound of a jackass’, because *ʔayyu* ‘whatever kind’ and *miəlu* ‘like’ are always *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’. If you were to say *ʔayyumā sʿawtin* ‘whatever kind of sound’ it is as though you said *lahu sʿawtun ḥasanun giddan* ‘he has a very nice voice’. And like it is *hāḍā ragulun šabiyhun bi-ḍāka* ‘this is a man comparable to that’. So *ʔayyu* and *miəlu* are the first; and *raff* ‘raising’ in this is better because you mentioned *ʔisman* ‘a name’ and it is acceptable that this *kalām* ‘speech’ be about him. So it was related to it, just as your saying *hāḍā ragulun miəluka* ‘this is a man like you’, *hāḍā ragulun ḥasanun* ‘this is a nice man’ and *hāḍā ragulun ʔayyumā ragulin* ‘this is a man, whatever kind of a man’. As to *lahu sʿawtun sʿawtu ḥimārin* ‘he has a sound/voice, sound/voice of a jackass’, you already knew that the sound of the jackass was not the first sound but you were permitted *raffuḥu* ‘to raise it’ due to the *saʕat* ‘expansiveness’ of speech, just as it was permitted (P. 153) for you to say *mā ʔanta ʔillā sayrun* ‘you are nothing except walking’. And those who say *sʿawtu ḥimārin* ‘sound of a jackass’ selected this just like they selected *mā ʔanta ʔillā sayran* ‘you are nothing except walking’. Since the other/second was not the first, they related it to its *fiʿl* ‘action’, not wanting to make it of the *ʔism* ‘name’ that is not of it, just as they did not want to say *mā ʔanta ʔillā sayrun* ‘you are nothing except walking’. If the other/second one is not the first, then they related it to its *fiʿl* ‘action’ so it became *lahu sʿawtun sʿawtu ḥimārin* ‘he has a sound/voice, the sound/voice of a jackass’. It becomes erect due to an implied *fiʿl* ‘action’

(٧٧) هذا باب ما يُختار فيه الرَّفْعُ إذا ذكرت
المصدر الذي يكون علاجاً وذلك إذا كان
الآخر هو الأوّل

وذلك قولك له صَوْتُ صَوْتُ حَسَنٌ. وإِنَّمَا ذكرت
الصوتَ توكيداً ولم (س ١٥) تُرد أن تحمله على الفعل
لما كان صفةً وكان الآخر هو الأوّل كما قلت ما أنت إلا
قائمٌ وقاعدٌ، حملت الآخرَ على أنتَ لما كان الآخرُ هو
الأوّل. ومثل ذلك له صَوْتُ أَيُّما صوتٍ، وله صوتٌ
مِثْلُ صوتِ الحمارِ، لأنَّ أَيُّ والمِثْلُ صفةٌ أبداً. وإذا قلتَ
أَيُّما صوتٍ، فكأنَّكَ قلتَ له صوتٌ حسنٌ جدّاً، وهذا
صوتٌ شبيهٌ بذلك، فأَيُّ ومِثْلُ هما الأوّل. فالرفعُ في هذا
أحسنٌ لأنَّكَ ذكرتَ اسماً يحسنُ أن يكون هذا الكلامُ
منه فحُمِلَ عليه كقولك هذا (س ٢٠) رَجُلٌ مِثْلُكَ،
وهذا رَجُلٌ حَسَنٌ، وهذا رَجُلٌ أَيُّما رَجُلٍ. وأمّا له
صوتٌ صوتٌ حمارٍ فقد علمتَ أن صوتَ حمارٍ ليس
بالصوتِ الأوّلِ وإِنَّمَا جازَ لك رفعه على سعةِ الكلامِ
كما جازَ (ص ١٥٣) لك أن تقول ما أنتَ إلا سَيْرٌ
وكان الذين يقولون صوتَ حمارٍ اختاروا هذا كما
اختاروا ما أنتَ إلا سيراً إذ لم يكن الآخرُ هو الأوّل
فحملوه على فِعْلِهِ كراهةً أن يجعلوه من الاسمِ الذي
ليس به كما كرهوا أن يقولوا ما أنتَ إلا سَيْرٌ إذا لم يكن
الآخرُ هو الأوّل فحملوه على فعله فصار له صوتٌ
صوتٌ حمارٍ يَتَّصِبُ على فِعْلٍ مُضْمَرٍ

as your implication (L 5) of the previous one on the implied *fiʿl* ‘action’. If you were to say *lahu sʿawtun ʔayyamā sʿawtin* ‘he has a voice, whatever kind of a voice’ or *miθla sʿawti ʔal-ħimari* ‘like the sound of a jackass’ or *lahu sʿawtun sʿawtan ħasanan* ‘he has a voice, a nice voice’ it is permitted. ʔal-Khalīl claimed that; and the claim is strengthened, because Yuwnis and ʕiysā both claimed that ruʔbah used to recite this line with *nasʿb* ‘erecting’: (ragaz)³

Fiyha zdihāfun ʔayyama zdihāfi

‘There is in it belittling [of the minds], what belittling!’

He related it to the *fiʿl* ‘action’ that erects *sʿawta ħimārin* ‘sound of a jackass’, because that action, if it were to be expressed, would erect what was a *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’ (L. 10) and what was not a *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’, because there is no *ʔism* ‘name’ to which the *sʿifāt* ‘descriptives’ are related. Don’t you see that, if he were to say *miθla tadʿmiyrika* ‘like your implication’ or *miθla daʔbi bikārin* ‘like the custom of the female camels’, he erected. So when they also implied it in other than the first, they implied it in what could be the first, as though he said *tazdahifu ʔayyamā ʔizdihāfin* ‘it belittles the minds, what belittling’; but he deleted it, because *lahu ʔizdihāfun* ‘he has belittling’ became a *badal* ‘substitute’ for the *fiʿl* ‘action’.

كانتصاب تضميرك (س ٥) السابق على الفعل
المضمر. وإن قلت له صوتٌ أيها صوتٌ أو مثل صوتِ
الحمارِ أو له صوتٌ صوتاً حسناً جاز. زعم ذلك الخليل
ويُقوي ذلك أن يونس وعيسى جميعاً زعموا أن رؤبة كان
يُنشد هذا البيت نصباً: (رجز)

فيها ازدهافٌ أيها ازدهافِ

فحمله على الفعل الذي ينصب صوتَ حمارٍ لأن ذلك
الفعل لو ظهرَ نصَبَ ما كان صفةً (س ١٠) وما كان
غيرَ صفةٍ لأنه ليس باسمٍ تُحمَلُ عليه الصفاتُ. ألا
ترى أنه لو قال مثل تضميرك أو مثل دأبٍ بكارٍ نصَبَ
فلما أضمره فيها يكونُ غيرَ الأوّلِ أضمره أيضاً فيما
يكون هو الأوّلِ كأنه قال تزدهفُ أيها ازدهافِ ولكنه
حذفه لأن له ازدهافٌ قد صار بدلاً من الفعلِ.

3 The meter of ragaz is: *mustafīlun* (six times).

Chapter 78. This is a Chapter in which the *raff* ‘erect’ is the *wagh* ‘surface form’

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.182-183, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 153-154; Haruwn vol.1. p.365-366)

(I. P. 153. L. 13) And that is as in your saying *hāḏā sʿawtun sʿawtu ḥimārin* ‘this is a sound, sound of a jackass’ because you don’t mention a *fāṣil* ‘actor’ and because the second one is the first where you said *hāḏā* ‘this’. The *sʿawt* ‘sound’ is *hāḏā* ‘this’ then you said *huwa sʿawtu* (L. 15) *ḥimārin* ‘it is a sound of a jackass’ because you heard a bray so there is no doubt in *raffīhi* ‘its raising’; and if you were also to liken, it is still *raff* ‘raising’, because you did not mention a *fāṣil* ‘actor’ to act it out, rather you began with it as the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ are begun with, so you said *hāḏā* ‘this’ then you built a thing on it, which is *huwa* ‘he’ so it became like his saying *hāḏā ragulun ragulu ḥarbin* ‘this is a man, a man of war’. If you were to say *lahu sʿawtun* ‘he has a sound’ then the one with the *lām* [l] is the *fāṣil* ‘actor’ and the other is not with it. When you built the beginning of the *kalām* ‘speech’ like the building of *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’, its end was to be considered like the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’, which is more acceptable and better. It became like your saying *hāḏā raʔsun raʔsu ḥimārin* ‘this is a head, head of a jackass’ and *hāḏā ragulun ʔaxu ḥarbin* ‘this is a man, brother of war’ if you wanted the similarity. (L. 20) Similarly based on it is *ʕalayhi nawḥun nawḥu ʔal-ḥamāmi* ‘on him there is a cooing, cooing of pigeons’, with something that is not a *sʿifah* ‘descriptive’, because the *hāʔ* [h] in *ʕalayhi* ‘on him’ is not a *fāṣil* ‘actor’. Just if you were to say *fiyhā ragulun* ‘there is a man in it’, it is not a *fāṣil* ‘actor’ doing anything to the man. When it occurred according to the pattern of *ʔal-ʔasmāʔ* ‘the names’, (P. 154) the *raff* ‘raising’ was the *wagh* ‘surface form’. If you were to say *lahunna nawḥun nawḥa ʔal-ḥamāmi* ‘they have a cooing, cooing of pigeons’ then it is *nasʿb* ‘erect’ because the *hāʔ* [h] is the *fāṣilah* ‘actor’. What shows you that is that the *raff* ‘raising’ in *hāḏā* ‘this’ and *ʕalayhi* ‘on him’ is better because if you were to say *hāḏā* ‘this’ and *ʕalayhi* ‘on him’ you do not want to say *marartu bi-hāḏihi ʔal-ʔasmāʔi tafʕalu fiʕlan* ‘I passed by these names doing a deed’. Rather you made *ʕalayhi* ‘on it’ a location for *nawḥ* ‘cooing’ and *hāḏā* ‘this’ is built on it. If you were to erect, it would be a *wagh* ‘a surface form’, because if he were to say *hāḏā sʿawtun* ‘this is a sound’, *hāḏā nawḥun* ‘this is cooing’, or *ʕalayhi* (L. 5) *nawḥun* ‘there is cooing on him’,

(٧٨) هذا باب ما الرفع فيه الوجه

(م ١ . ب ٧٨ . ص ١٥٣ . س ١٣) وذلك قولك هذا صوت صوت حمار لأنك لم تذكر فاعلاً ولأن الآخر هو الأول حيث قلت هذا، فالصوت هو هذا ثم قلت هو صوت (س ١٥) حمار لأنك سمعت لها فلا شك في رفعه، وإن شبهت أيضاً فهو رفع لأنك لم تذكر فاعلاً يفعلُه وإنما ابتدأته كما بُتدأ الأسماء فقلت هذا ثم بنيت عليه شيئاً هو هو فصار كقولِه هذا رجل رجل حرب. فإذا قلت له صوت فالذي في اللام هو الفاعل وليس الآخر به، فلما بنيت أول الكلام كبناء الأسماء كان آخره أن يجعل كالأسماء أحسن وأجود فصار كقولك هذا رأس رأس حمار، وهذا رجل أخو حرب إذا أردت الشبه. (س ٢٠) ومن ذلك عليه نوح نوح الحمام على غير صفة، لأن الهاء في عليه ليست بالفاعل، كما أنك إذا قلت فيها رجل فلهاء ليست بفاعل فعل بالرجل شيئاً. فلما جاء على مثال الأسماء (ص ١٥٤) كان الرفع الوجه. وإن قلت له نوح نوح الحمام فالنصب لأن الهاء هي الفاعلة. يدلُّك على ذلك أن الرفع في هذا وفي عليه أحسن لأنك إذا قلت هذا أو عليه فأنت لا تريد أن تقول مررت بهذه الأسماء تفعل فعلاً، ولكنك جعلت عليه موضعاً للنوح وهذا مبنيٌّ عليه نفسه. ولو نصبت كان وجهاً لأنه إذا قال هذا صوت أو هذا نوح أو عليه (س ٥) نوح

it is known that with the *nawḥ* ‘cooing’ and *sʿawt* ‘sound’ were *fāʿilayn* ‘two actors’ . He related it to the meaning as he said: (tʿawiyl)⁴ (cf ch. 56)

فقد عَلِمَ أَنَّ مَعَ النَّوْحِ وَالصَّوْتِ فَاعِلَيْنِ فَحَمَلَهُ عَلَى
المعنى، كما قال: (طويل)

Li-yubka yaziydu dʿārīʿun li-xusʿuwmatin
Wa muxtabiʿun mim mā tuʿiyḥu tʿ-tʿawāʿiḥu
‘Let Yaziyd be mourned appealing to his adversaries
And confused by the falling of calamities’.

لِيُبَكَ يَزِيدُ ضَارِعٌ خُصُومَةٍ
وَمُخْتَبِطٌ مِمَّا تُطِيحُ الطَّوَائِحُ

4 The meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʿuwlun mafāʿiylun* (four times).

Chapter 79. This is a Chapter in which there is nothing except *rafi* ‘raising’

(٧٩) هَذَا بَابٌ لَا يَكُونُ فِيهِ إِلَّا الرَّفْعُ

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.183, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 154; Haruwn vol.1. p.366)

(I. P. 154. L. 7) And that is as in your saying *lahu yadun yadu ʔal-ʕawri* ‘he has a hand, hand of a bull’ and *lahu raʔsun raʔsu ʔal-ħimāri* ‘he has a head, head of a jackass’, because this is an *ʔism* ‘name’ and it is not misunderstood that the man is making *yadan* ‘a hand’ nor *riglan* ‘a leg’ and it is not a *fiʔl* ‘action’.

(م ١ . ب ٧٩ . ص ١٥٤ . س ٧) وذلك قولك له يَدُ
يَدُ الثَّوْرِ، وَكُهُ رَأْسُ رَأْسِ الْحِمَارِ، لِأَنَّ هَذَا اسْمٌ وَلَا
يَتَوَهَّمُ عَلَى الرَّجُلِ أَنَّهُ يَصْنَعُ يَدًا وَلَا رِجْلًا وَلَا
يَفْعَلُ.

Chapter 80. This is a Chapter in which there is nothing except *rafi* 'raising'

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.184, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 154; Haruwn vol.1. p.366-367)

(I. P. 154. L. 9) And that is as in your saying *s'awtuhu s'awtu himārin* 'his sound/voice is the sound/voice of a jackass', its signaling is your implication of the previous one, and *wagdi bihā wagdu ḡal-ḡaklā* 'my grief for her is the grief of the mother who lost her child', because this is *ḡibtidāḡun* 'initializing' and what is built on an *ḡibtidāḡ* 'initial' has the status of an *ḡibtidāḡ* 'initial'. Don't you see that you say *zaydun ḡaxuwka* 'Zaid is your brother'? Its raising is like the raising of Zaid, always. When he began with it, he was in need of what is after it. It was not made *badalan* 'a substitute' for the expression with *yus'awwitu* 'he sounds', and it became like the *ḡasmāḡ* 'names'. The poet, muzāhim ḡal-ḡugayliyy, said: (t'awiyl)⁵

Wagdiy bi-hā wagdu l-mud'illi baḡiyrahu
Bi-naxlata lam taḡi'if ḡalayhi l-ḡawāt'ifu

'My grief for her is the grief of the one who lost his camel
In Naxlata that is not showered with sentiments'

(L. 15) Similarly, if you were to say *marartu bihi fa-s'awtuhu s'awtu himārin* 'I passed by him and his sound/voice is the sound/voice of a jackass'. If he were to say *fa-ḡiḡa sawtuhu* 'behold his voice' he wants the *wagh* 'surface form' that one keeps silent on. *Nas'b* 'erecting' was introduced to it, because he implies what later he dispensed with.

(٨٠) هذا باب لا يكون فيه إلا الرفع

(م ١٠١ ب ٨٠ ص ١٥٤ س ٩) وذلك قولك صوتُه صوتُ حمارٍ، وتلويحُه تضميرك (س ١٠) السابق، ووجدي بها وجدُ الشكلى، لأن هذا ابتداءً فالذي يُبنى على الابتداءِ بمنزلةِ الابتداءِ. ألا ترى أنك تقولُ زيدٌ أخوك، فارتفاعه كارتفاعِ زيدٍ أبداً. فلما ابتدأه وكان محتاجاً إلى ما بعده لم يُجعلَ بدلاً من اللفظِ بِصوتٍ وصارَ كالأسماء. قال الشاعرُ، وهو مُزاحمُ العقيليِّ:
(طويل)

وَجَدِي بِهَا وَجْدُ الْمُضِلِّ بَعِيرُهُ

بِنَخْلَةٍ لَمْ تَعْطِفْ عَلَيْهِ الْعَوَاطِفُ

(س ١٥) وكذلك لو قلتَ مررتُ به فصوتهُ صوتُ حمارٍ. فإن قالَ فإذا صوتُه يريدُ الوجهَ الذي يُسكتُ عليه دخلةُ نَصْبٍ لأنَّه يُضمرُ بعدُ ما يَسْتغني عنه.

⁵ The meter of t'awiyl is: *faḡuwulun mafāḡiylun* (four times).