## This is the Famous Book of Sībawayh on *naħw* <sup>1</sup> 'Grammar' and its Name is *ʔal-kitāb* 'The Book'

Solomon Sara, S.J. Georgetown University

## Chapter 7. This is a Chapter on what ši?r 'Poetry' yaħtamilu 'tolerates'

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.8, Derenbourg vol.1. p.7, Haruwn vol.1. p.26)<sup>2</sup>

(I:7; L.19) Know that it is permissible in poetry what is not permissible in  $kal\bar{a}m$  'speech',  $s^{\varsigma}arf$  'to inflect' what (L.20)  $l\bar{a}$   $yans^{\varsigma}arifu$  'does not inflect'.  $yu\check{s}abbihuwnahu$  'they make it look like' what is inflectable in  $7asm\bar{a}7$  'names', because they are names, as they are names; and  $\hbar a\delta f$  'deleting' what  $l\bar{a}$   $yu\hbar\delta afu$  'is not deletable',  $yu\check{s}abbihuwnahu$  'they make it look like' what has been deleted and used as  $ma\hbar\delta uwf$  'deleted', as  $7al-\Im gg\bar{a}g$  said:  $(Ragaz)^3$ 

Gawāt<sup>î</sup>inan makkata min wur**G**i **?al-ħamā** 

'The greenish doves are dwellers of Makka'

(**I:8; L. 1**) He intends *?al-hamām* 'the doves'<sup>4</sup>. As Xufāf Ibn Nudbah ?al-Sulamiy said: (kāmil)<sup>5</sup>

ka-nawāhi riyši  $\hbar$ amāmatin nagdiyyatin wa masa $\hbar$ ti bi-l-li $\theta\theta$ atayni  $\Re$ as fa  $\Re$ al- $\Re$ idi doves and you dusted your two gums with antimony.'

(He intends *ka-nawāħiy*) Just as he said:(Ragaz)<sup>6</sup>

dārun li-su\dā ?iðhi min hawākā

'This is the house of su\da who is the one you loved.'

(he intends ?ið hiyā)

(L. 5) And he said:  $(w\bar{a}fir)^7$ 

qat<sup>î</sup>irtu bi-muns<sup>î</sup>uliy fiy ya îmalātin

dawāmiy ?al-?**aydi** yaxbit<sup>°</sup>na ?al-sariyħā

'I wielded my sword in the noble she-camel, while

Their bleeding limbs hit the ground rapped in skin.'

(he intends -?aydiy)

# هذا كتاب سيبويه المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

## (٧) هذا باب ما يَحْتمِل الشعرُ

(ص٧. س ١٩) اعلم أنه يجوز في الشعر ما لا يجوز في الكلام من صرف ما لا ينصرف يشبّهونه بما ينصرف من الأسماء لأنها أسماء وحذف ما لا يُحذف يشبّهونه بما قد حُذف واستعمل محذوفا كما قال العجّاج (رجز)

قُوا طِناً مكَّةُ من ورُقِ الحَمي

(ص ٨) يريد الحَمام وكما قال خُفاف بن نُدْبَة السُّلْمي (كامل) كنَواح ريش حَمامة نَجْديّة ومسحْت باللِتَيْن عَصْفَ اللاِثْمِدِ

وكما قال (رجز)

دار ً لسُعدَى إذ و من هُواكا

(س. ٥) وقال (و افر)

قَطِرتُ بمُنْصلِي في يَعْملاتِ دَو امِي الأَيْدِ يَخْبطن السَّريحاً

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>This translation is based on Derenbourg's edition of *?al-kitāb*. All chapter, page and line numbers refer to this edition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Meter of ragaz is: *mustaf?ilun* (6 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>This is a case of deletion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Meter of kāmil is: *mutafā ilun* (6 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Meter of ragaz is: *mustaf?ilun* (6 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Meter of wfir is: *mufā Salatun mufā Salatun fa Suwlun* (2 times).

as Naggāšiy said:(t<sup>5</sup>awiyl)<sup>8</sup>

falastu bi-ʔātiyhi wa-lā ʔastat siy suhu

wa-lāki ʔasqiniy ʔin kāna mā ʔuka ðā fad si
'I am not coming nor am I able to do so
but give me to drink if your water is abundant.'
(He intends wa-lākin)

As Mālik Ibn Xuraymin ?al-Hamadāniy said: (t<sup>°</sup>awiyl)<sup>9</sup>

(L.10) fa-ʔin yaku γαθθαη ʔaw samiynan fa-ʔinaniy saʔagʕalu ʕaynayhi li-nafsihi maĠnaʕā
'If it were skinny or fat I would make his very eyes become his persuaders.'

(he intends *li-nafsihiy*)

?al-?a\sā said: (kāmil)10

wa-?axuw ?al-yawāni matā yaša? yas rimnahu wa-yakunna ?a sdā?an bu sayda widādi 'The lover of chaste women when he wishes to contact them, they would cut him off and become enemies after a brief friendship'

(he intends *?al-yawāniy*)

Sometimes they lengthen such as  $mas\bar{a}gid$  'mosques' and  $man\bar{a}bir$  'pulpits' to become  $mas\bar{a}giyd$  and  $man\bar{a}biyr$ . They liken them to what is pluralized on other than its singular in speech. As Farazdag said: (basiyt<sup>5</sup>)<sup>11</sup>

(L.15) tanfiy yadāhā ?al-hasā fiy kulli hāgiratin  $nafya ?al-danāniyri tansādu ?al-s^sayāriyfi$  'her front legs toss up the pebbles in the noonday heat, as the hands of the money lenders toss up the coins.' (he intends  $s^sayārifiy$ )<sup>12</sup>

وكما قال النجاشي (طويل) فلست بآتيه و لا أستطيعُه و لاكِ أسْقِني إن كان ماؤك ذا فَضلْ

وكما قال مالك بن خُريه الهمداني (طويل) (س. ١٠) فإن يَكُ عَثًا أو سَميناً فإنّني سأجْعَلُ عينيه لنفسه مَقْنَعَا

> وقال الأعشى (كامل) وأخو الغوان متى يشأ يصرمننه ويكن أعداء بعيد وداد

وربما مَدوا مثل مساجد ومنابر فيقولون مساجيد ومنابير شبهوه بما جُمع على غير واحده في الكلام كما قال الفرزدق (بسيط)

(س.٥٠) تَثْفي يداها الحَصنى في كلّ هاجرة نَقْىَ الدَّنانيرِ تَنقادُ الصياريفِ

وقد يبلغون بالمعتل الأصل فيقولون رادد في رادد في رادد وضننوا في ضنوا ومررتم بجواري قبل قال قعنب بن أم صاحب (بسيط)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Meter of  $t^{\gamma}$ awiyl is:  $fa \gamma uwlun mafa \gamma iylun$  (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Meter of t<sup>5</sup>awiyl is: fa Suwlun mafā Siylun (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Meter of kāmil is: *mutafā ilun* (6 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>§</sup> is: *mustaf§ilun fā§ilun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>This is a case of addition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>5</sup> is: *mustafSilun fāSilun* (4 times).

mahlan ʔaʕāðila Gad garrabti min xuluGiy ʔanniy ʔaguwdu li-ʔaGwāmin waʔin dʿaninu 'slow down, fault finder-ess, you experienced my generous character As I am generous to even those who are stingy with me.'

(he intends  $d^{5}$  annuw)<sup>14</sup>

Some of the Arabs make the word heavy when they pause on it. They do not make it heavy in the annexed form. If it were in poetry (L. 20) they would make it flow in the annexed form as in its state in the pause. For example, *sabsabban* 'flowing" and *kalkallan* 'breast', because they may make it heavy in the pause, and therefore they confirm it in the annexed form, just as they confirm it in deletion, as in his saying to convince himself, but he deleted it in the pause. Ru?bah said: (ragaz)<sup>15</sup>

d<sup>°</sup>axmun yuħibbu ʔal-xuluGa ʔal-ʔad<sup>°</sup>xammā<sup>16</sup>
'The great loves the greatest in spirit'

(I:9; L. 1) It is recited with both with break '[i]' of the *hamzah* '[?]' or with an open '[a]'. Some of them said  $7al-d^5ixamm\bar{a}$  'with a break '[i]' of  $d^5\bar{a}d$  '[ $d^5$ ]'. And he gave as an example to convince himself, that is:  $7al-šamm\bar{a}x$ : (wāfir)<sup>17</sup>

lahu zagalun ka-ʔannahu s<sup>ˆ</sup>awtu ħādin
ʔiðā t<sup>ˆ</sup>alaba ʔal-wasiyGata ʔaw zamiyru
'he has a soft voice like the voice of a nightingale,
or the sound of the oboe, when he calls his female mate.'
(he intends ka-ʔannahuw)

ħand<sup>s</sup>alah bin Fātik said: (t<sup>s</sup>awiyl)<sup>18</sup>

(1. 5) wa-ʔayGana ʔanna ʔal-xayla ʔin taltabis bihi
yakun li-fasiyli ʔal-naxli baʔdahu ʔābiru
'He believes even if he is killed,
the palm seedlings will become full grown, that is his progeny.'
(He intends baʔdahuw)

A man from Bāhilah said: (basiyt<sup>5</sup>)<sup>1920</sup>

<sup>14</sup>This is a case of expansion of the form.
<sup>15</sup>Meter of ragaz is: *mustaf iun* (6 times).

مَهْلاً أعاذلَ قد جَرّبتِ من خُلُقِى أنّى أَجُودُ لأقوامِ وإن ضننِثُوا

ومن العرب من يثقل الكلمة إذا وقف عليها ولا يثقلها في الوصل فإذا كان في الشعر (س. ٢٠) فهم يُجرونه في الوصل على حاله في الوقف نحو سَبْسَبًا وكَلْكَلاً لأنهم قد يثقلونه في الوقف فأثبتوه في الوصل كما اثبتوا الحذف في قوله لنفسه مقنعا وإنما حذفه في الوقف. قال روبة (رجز)

ضَخْمُ يُحِبُّ الخُمُقَ الأَضْخَمَّا

(ص. ٩) يُروى بكسر الهمزة وفتحها وقال بعضهم الضِّخَما بكسر الضاد وقال أيضا في مثل لنفسه مقنعا وهو الشمّاخ (وافر)

له زَجَلٌ كأنه صوتُ حادٍ إذا طلب الوسيقة أو زَميرُ

وقال حنظلة بن فاتك (طويل)

(س.٥) و أَيْقَنَ أَنَّ الْخَيْلَ إِن تُلْتَبِس بِهُ يَكُنْ لْفُسِيلِ النَّخْلِ بِعِدَه آبِرُ

وقال رجل من باهلة (بسيط)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>The doubling of the [mm] in final position is a case of making it heavy at pause.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>Meter of wāfir is: mufāsalatun mufāsalatun fasuwlun (2 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>Meter of  $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathfrak{l}}$  awiyl is:  $fa\mathfrak{l}$  whun  $maf\overline{a}\mathfrak{l}$  iylun (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>5</sup> is: *mustaf5ilun fā5ilun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>Meter of t<sup>s</sup>awiyl is: *fasuwlun mafāsiylun* (4 times).

?au musbaru ?al-ð ahri yunbiy san waliyyatihi
mā hagga rabbuhu fiy ?al-dunyā wa-lā ?i stamarā
'The camel with furry back signals by its saddle that
its owner neither made the major nor the minor hagg.'
(he intens rabbuhuw)

?al-?asšā said: (tsawiyl)<sup>21</sup>

wa mā **la-hu** min magdin taliydin wa mā **la-hu** mina ?al-riyħi fad  $^{5}$ lun  $^{22}$  lā ?al-ganuwbu wa lā ?al-s  $^{5}$ abā 'He does not have an ancient nor glorified past, neither has he any luck from either the southern or eastern winds.'

(He intends la-huw)

(L.10) and he said:  $(basiyt^{9})^{23}$ 

baynāhu fiy dāri s<sup>s</sup>idGin Gad ?aGāma bihā ħiynan yu Sallilunā wa-mā nu Salliluhu 'While he lived for a while in the house of righteousness where he entertained us, but we did not entertain him.'

(He means baynā huwa)

They tolerate Gubħa 'ugliness' in speech so that they put it in other than its place, just because it is mustagimun 'straightforward' and there is no deficiency in it, and from that, the saying of:

?ibn ?abi Rabiy \text{\gamma}ah: (t \text{\gamma}awiyl)^{24}

s<sup>s</sup>adadti fa-7at<sup>s</sup>walti 7al-s<sup>s</sup>uduwda wa-**Galla mā** wis ālun sala t<sup>s</sup>uwli 7al-s<sup>s</sup>uduwdi yaduwmu
'you prevented me from keeping in touch with you, it is rare that a union lasts over a long prevention.'

(L. 15) In speech it is *qalla mā yaduwmu wis*  $^{5}$ *ālun* 'it is rare that a union **lasts**.' And they put what does not occur in speech, except as  $\delta^{5}$  arfan 'envelope of time', in place of names other than it, and that is the saying of Marrār Ibn Sulāma ?al- $^{5}$ ugaliy ( $^{5}$ awiyl)<sup>26</sup>

walā yant<sup>s</sup>igu ?al-faħšā?a man kāna minhumu

?iða galasuw min-nā wa-lā **min siwā?ina** 

'No one among them utters foul speech

If they associate with us nor with others than us'

(he intends min siwā?ina = min basd ina)<sup>27</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Meter of  $t^{\eta}$  awiyl is:  $fa^{\eta}$  whun  $maf\bar{a}^{\eta}$  iylun (4 times).

أو مُعْبَرُ الظَّهْرِ يُبْنى عن وليّنه ما حجّ ربُّه في الدنيا و لا اعْتَمَرَ ا

وقال الأعشى (طويل)

وما له من مجدٍ تليدٍ وما له من الريح فَضل ٌ لا الجَنوب ُ و لاالصبّا

> (س. ١٠) وقال (بسيط) بيناه في دار صدق قد أقام بها حيناً يُعلَّلنا وما نُعلِّلُهُ

ويحتملون قبح الكلام حتى يضعوه في غير موضعه لأنه مستقيم ليس فيه نقص فمن ذلك قول عمر بن أبي ربيعة (طويل)

صددت فأطولت الصنُّدود وقلَّ ما وصالٌ على طولِ الصدود يدومُ

(س. ٥٠) وإنما الكلام قلَّ ما يَدوم وصالُ وجعلوا ما لا يَجري في الكلام إلا ظرفا بمنزلة غيره من الأسماء وذلك قول المرّار بن سلامة العجلى (طويل)

و لا يَنْطِقُ الفحشاءَ من كان منهمُ إذا جلسوا منّا و لا من سوائنا

 $<sup>^{22}</sup>$ Būlāq edition has  $\hbar a \delta^{5} \delta^{5} u n$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>§</sup> is: *mustaf§ilun fā§ilun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>Meter of t<sup>s</sup>awiyl is: *faSuwlun mafāSiylun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>This is a case of item re-arrangement in the sequence.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>Meter of t<sup>5</sup>awiyl is: *fa Swlun mafā Siylun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>This is a case of a substitution of an equivalent lexical item.

?asšā said (tsawiyl)<sup>28</sup>

وقال الأعشى (طويل)

wa mā qas adat min ?ard ihā li-sawā?ika 'and she did not head towards her land except you'
(He means li-sawa?ika = li-ba d ika)

وما قصدت من أرضها لسوائكا

(L. 20) Xit<sup>5</sup>ām ?al-Mugāši \$\text{i} said: (ragaz)^{30}

(س. ٢٠) وقال خطام المُجاشِعي (رجز)

was<sup>†</sup>āliyātin **ka-ka-mā** yu?aθfayn

وصالياتٍ ككما يُؤَتْقَيْنْ

'and the cook-ware is like common-ware.' (he means  $ka-ka-maa = ka-mi\theta li$ )

They did that because the meaning  $saw\bar{a}$ ? 'similarly' becomes the meaning of  $\gamma ayr$  'other', and the meaning of  $k\bar{a}f$  'as' has the meaning of  $mi\theta l$  'like', and there is nothing that they are forced to do (I: 10; L. 1) except that they try to give it a different form. What is permitted in poetry is more than what I mention to you here, because this is the place for sentences, and we shall explain that, God willing.

فعلوا ذلك لان معنى سَواء معنى غير ومعنى غير ومعنى الكاف معنى مثل وليس شيء يُضطر ون إليه (ص. ١٠) إلا وهم يحاولون به وجها وما يجوز في الشعر أكثر من أن اذكره لك هاهنا لان هذا موضع جُمَلٍ وسنبيّن ذلك فيما يَستقبل إن شاء الله.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>Meter of t<sup>s</sup>awiyl is: *faswlun mafāsiylun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>Boulaq has *?ahlihā* (I:13; L. 3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>Meter of ragaz is: *mustaf?ilun* (6 times).

### Chapter 8. This is a Chapter on 7al- $f\bar{a}$ ?il 'the actor' $(1)^{31}$

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.13, Derenbourg vol.1. p.10, Haruwn vol.1. p.33)

(I:10; L.3) This is a chapter on  $?al-f\bar{a}$ ?il 'the actor'<sup>32</sup> whose fi?l 'action'<sup>33</sup> does not yata addahu 'transitivizes it' to maf uwl 'an acted-upon'34, and ?al-maf?uwl 'the acted-upon' to which no fi?l 'action' of fa?il 'an actor' has transitivized, nor whose fist 'action' has transitivized another mafsuwl 'acted-upon', and the case of what of ?asmā? ?al-fā iliyn 'names of the actors' and ?asmā? ?al-mafā?uliyn 'names of the acted-upons' does the work of fist 'action' (L.5) that transitivizes mafsuwl 'an acted-upon', the case of the  $mas^{5}\bar{a}dir$  'roots' that do that work, and the case of what flows of the  $s^{\gamma}ifat$  'descriptives' that do not attain enough of the power to be like ?asmā? ?al-fā?iliyn 'names of the actors' and ?asmā? ?al-mafā?iliyn 'names of the acted-upons', that flow in the channel of fisl ?al-mutasaddiy 'the transitive action' to a mafsuwl 'an acted-upon' in magrāhā 'their channels' and the case of what is made to flow in the channel of ?al-fi?l 'the action' but it is not fisl 'an action' and is not empowered with its power, and the case of what flows of ?al-?asmā? 'the names', that do not have the power 35 of ?asmā? ?al-fā?iliyn 'names of the actors', which I have mentioned to you, nor  $7al-s^{5}ifat$  'the descriptives' that are from the  $laf\delta^{\circ}$  'expression' of the  $?ahd\bar{a}\theta$  'events' of  $?asm\bar{a}?$  'names', and for whose events there are examples for what  $mad^{5}\bar{a}$  'has passed', and what has not passed, and they are the ones that do not attain that (L.10) they be of the power like ?asmā? ?al-fā siliyn 'names of the actors' and ?asmā? ?al-mafā?iliyn 'names of the acted-upons', of which you require what you require of fisl ?al-mutasaddiy 'the transitive action' to mafsuwl 'an actedupon' in its channel. They do not have the power of ?asmā? ?al-fā siliyn 'the names of the actors' that I mentioned to you, nor of these  $s^{\hat{i}}ifat$ 'descriptives'. In addition, that which flows in its channel and is not fisl 'an action' does not have the power of the fist 'action'.

## (٨) هذا باب الفاعل

(ص. ۱۰. س.۳) هذا باب الفاعل الذي لم بَتعدّه فعله إلى مفعول و المفعول الذي لم بَتعدّ البه فِعْلُ فاعلِ ولا تعدَّى فعله إلى مفعول آخـر َ ومـا بَعْمَـلُ مـن أسـماء الفاعلـبنَ و المفعولينَ عَمَلَ الفعل (س ٥) الذي يتعدّي إلى مفعول وما بُعمل من المصادر ذلك العملَ وما يجري من الصفات التي لم تبلغ أن تكون في القوة كأسماء الفاعلين والمفعولين التي تجري مجري الفعل المتعدى إلى مفعول مجراها وما أجرى مُجرى الفعل وليس بفعل ولم يَقو َ قو تَّه وما جرى من الأسماء التي ليست لها قوة أسماء الفاعلين التي ذكريتُ ولا الصفاتِ التي هي من لفظ أحداث الأسماء وبكون لأحداثها أمثلة لما مضي وما لم يَمض وهي التي لم تبلغ أن (س. ١٠) تكون في القوة كأسماء الفاعلين والمفعولين التي تريد بها ما تريد بالفعل المتعدّى إلى مفعول مجر اها وليست لها قوة أسماء الفاعلين التي ذكرت ولا هذه الصفات كما أنه لا يقوى قوة الفعل ما جرى مجر اه و لبس بفعل ِ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>This is the first of group of chapters that deals with the  $\operatorname{Sal-fa}\operatorname{Sil}$  'the actor'. This chapter, however, is a mere listing of topics that deal with  $\operatorname{Pal-fa}\operatorname{Sil}$  that will be touched upon in subsequent chapters but without giving the details of any one of them

 $<sup>^{32}</sup>$ ?al- $f\bar{a}$ ?il 'the actor/subject' is *mohammadun* in the following sentence: kataba mohammadun?al- $kit\bar{a}ba$  'Mohammad wrote the book'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup>fi?l 'action/verb' is *kataba* in the following sentence: *kataba mohammadun ?al-kitāba* 'Mohammad wrote the book'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup>mafīuwl 'acted-upon/object' is ?al-kitāba in the following sentence: kataba mohammadun ?al-kitāba 'Mohammad wrote the book'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup>Bulaq edition does not include this last phrase in the text.

<sup>18</sup> 

### Chapter 9. This is a Chapter on the $f\bar{a}$ ?il 'actor' (2)

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.14, Derenbourg vol.1. p.10, Haruwn vol.1. p.33)

(I:10; L.13) This is a chapter on 7al- $f\bar{a}$   $\hat{\imath}il$  'the actor' whose fi  $\hat{\imath}l$  'action' does not yata  $\hat{\imath}addahu$  'transitivize it' to maf  $\hat{\imath}uwl$  'an actedupon', and  $\hat{\imath}al$ -maf  $\hat{\imath}uwl$  'the acted-upon' to which no fi  $\hat{\imath}l$  'action' of  $f\bar{a}$   $\hat{\imath}il$  'an actor' has transitivized, nor whose fi  $\hat{\imath}l$  'action' has transitivized to another maf  $\hat{\imath}uwl$  'acted-upon'.

?al-fā?il 'the actor' and ?al- maf?uwl 'the acted-upon' in this case are the same. (L. 15) ?al-maf?uwl 'the acted-upon' yartafi?u 'rises' just as ?al-fā?il 'the actor' rises<sup>36</sup>, because you do not engage the action with anything else, and you dedicated it to it<sup>37</sup>, just as you did with ?al-fā?il 'the actor'. As for ?al-fā?il 'the actor' whose fi?l 'action' does not yata add hu 'transitivizes it' as in your saying: ðahaba zaydun 'Zaid left.' and galasa Samrun 'Samr sat down', and the mafsuwl 'acted-upon' whose fisl 'action' does not yata saddahu 'transitivize it', nor does fist 'action' of ?al-fāsil 'the actor' yata f add  $\sim hu$  'transitivize' to it, as in your saying  $d^{f}$  uriba zaydun 'Zaid got struck.'38 and yud rabu Samrun 'Samr gets struck.' The  $7asm\bar{a}$ ? 'names' that are talked about and the examples are evidence for what has passed, and what has not passed from what was about names, which is ?al-ðahābu 'the going', ?alguluwsu 'the sitting', and ?al-d arbu 'the striking'. The examples are not events, nor are they out of which (L. 20) the events come, which are the names.

## (٩) هذا باب الفاعل

(س. ١٠) هذا باب الفاعل الذي لم يَتعدّه فعله إلى مفعول والمفعول الذي لم يَتعدّ إليه فعله إلى مفعول آخر فعله إلى مفعول آخر

فالفاعل والمفعول في هذا سواء يرتفع (س. ١٥) المفعول كما يرتفع الفاعل الأنك لم تشغل الفعل بغيره وفر عبه له كما فعلت ذلك بالفاعل. فأما الفاعل الذي لا يتعداه فعله فقولك ذهب زيد وجلس عمرو والمفعول الذي لم يتعده فعله ولم يتعد أليه فعل فاعل فقولك ضرب زيد ويضرب عمرو. فالأسماء المحدث عنها والأمثلة دليلة على ما مضى وما لم يمض من المحدث به عن الأسماء وهو الدهاب والجلوس والضرب وليست الأمثلة بالأحداث وهي السماء.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup>There is an equivalency drawn here between the  $f\bar{a}$ ?il and the maf?uwl in that both are raised and show their identical inflection which is the [-u-n].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup>*Pal-mafYuwl* 'the acted-upon' is intended here as in  $d^{\gamma}$ uriba zaydun 'Zaid got struck' given below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup>There is a parallelism between the two structures of  $d^{5}$  araba zaydun and of  $d^{5}$  uriba zaydun in the relation of the  $f\bar{a}$ ?il and the maf?uwl to their fi?l. It is a relationship of raising, marked/inflected with [-u-n], and not requiring the action to transitivize another maf?uwl.

# Chapter 10. This is a Chapter on fāsil 'actor' whose fisl 'action' yatasadāhu 'transitivizes it' to mafsuwl 'an acted-upon' (3)

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.14, Derenbourg vol.1. p.10, Haruwn vol.1. p.33)

(I:10, L.21) That is as your saying d<sup>5</sup>araba Sabdu ?al-lāhi zaydan 'Abdulla struck Zaid'. Abdullah ?irtafa sa 'rose' here, as it rose in ðahaba 'he went'39. You engaged d'araba 'he struck' with it as you engaged ðahaba 'he went' with it. (I:11; L. 1) Zaid ?intas faba 'became erect' because it is maf *suwl bihi* 'a direct acted-upon', to which the action of the actor transitivizes. If you were to make the maffuwl 'acted-upon' precede and make the  $f\bar{a}$ ?il 'actor' follow, the expression will flow as it flowed in the first case, as in your saying  $d^{5}$  araba Zaydan a Sabdu a Cal-lāhi 'Abdulla struck Zavd / Zavd is the one Abdulla struck'40, because you wanted to precede what you had wanted to follow. You did not want to engage the fisl 'action' with what is before it<sup>41</sup>, even if it were delayed in the utterance<sup>42</sup>. Hence, by definition, in pronunciation, the actor needs to be put forward. That is very good Arabic and in abundance. It is as though they put forward that (L. 5) whose bayān 'declaration' is the most important for them, and they are more careful about its bayān 'declaration', even though both of them are important to them and concern them. Know that the fist 'action' that does not transitivize beyond the  $f\bar{a}sil$  'actor', it reaches to the name of the event from which it was taken, because it is mentioned only to refer to the event. Don't you see that in your saying Gad ðahaba 'he has gone.' is equal to saying: Gad kāna minhu ðihābun 'there was a going by him.' But if you said d<sup>5</sup>araba 5abdu 7al-lāhi `Abdullah struck', it is not clear whether Zayd or Samr is the mafSuwl 'acted-upon', nor does it refer to s<sup>r</sup>inf 'a class', as ðahaba 'he went' may refer to s<sup>r</sup>inf 'a class', which is ðahāb 'going', and that in your saying ðahaba Sabdu ?allāhi ?al-ðahāba ?al-šadiyda 'Abdulla went the vigorous going', and Gasada Gisdatah (L. 10) suw?in 'He sat in an evil sitting', and Gasada gasatayni 'He sat for two sittings'. When it worked on the event, it worked on one and two iterations of it, and what was a type of it. Examples of that are Ga?ada ?al-Gurfus a? 'He sat on his heels', ?ištamala ?als<sup>s</sup>ammā?a 'He crouched bundled up', and ragasa ?al-gahgara 'He retreated', because it is a type of its action from which it is taken. It reaches over to zamān 'time', as when you say ðahaba 'he went', because it is constructed for what passed and what has not

# (١٠) هذا باب الفاعل الذي يتعدّاه فعله إلى مفعولٍ

و ذلك قولك ضَر بَ عبدُ الله زيدا فعبدُ الله ارتفع هاهنا كما ارتفع في ذهَبَ وشغَلتَ ضرب به كما شغلت به ضرب و انتصب (ص. ١١) زيدٌ لأنه مفعولٌ به تَعدّى البه فَعِلُ الفاعِلِ و إن قدّمتَ المفعولَ و أخّر تَ الفاعل جري اللفظُ كما جري في الأول و ذلك قولك ضررب زيدا عبد الله لأنك إنما أر دت به مُؤخَّر ا ما أر دت به مقدَّماً ولم تر د أن تَشْغُلَ الفعلَ بأوَّلَ منه و ان كان مؤخَّر ا في اللفظ فمن ثم كان حدُّ اللفظ فيه أن يكون الفاعلَ مقدَّما وهو عربي جيد كثير كأنهم إنما يقدِّمون (س. ٥) الذي بيانُه أهمُّ لهم وهم ببيانه أغنى وان كانا جميعا يُهمّانِهم ويَعنِيانِهم و اعلم أن الفعل الذي لا يَتعدّي الفاعلَ بَتعدّى إلى اسم الحَدثان الذي أخذ منه لأنه إنما يُذكر ليدل على الحدَث ألا ترى أن " قو لك قد ذهَبَ بمنزلة قو لك قد كان منه دَهابٌ و إذا قلت ضربَ عيدُ الله لم بَستين أنّ المفعول زيدٌ أو عمرو ولا يَدل على صنف كما أنّ ذهَبَ قد دلّ على صنف و هو الذهاب و ذلك قو لك ذهَب عبدُ الله الذهابَ الشديدَ و قَعَدَ قِعْدةَ (س. ١٠) سو ءِ و قَعدَ قَعدتينِ لمّا عَمِلَ في الحدث عمل في المررّة منه و المرتنين وما يكون ضرباً منه فمن ذلك فَعدَ القَر فَصناءَ و اشتمل الصمّاءَ و ر جَعَ القَهْقَر ع لأنه ضربٌ من فعله الذي أخذ منه ويتعدى إلى الزمان نحو قولك دَهَبَ لأنه بُني لما مضيي منه و ما لم

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup>As in the example *ðahaba zayd-u-n* 'Zaid left'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup>The order of the constituents has become  $fi \mathcal{L} + maf \mathcal{L} wl + f \bar{a} \mathcal{L} il$  with the  $maf \mathcal{L} wl$  and  $f \bar{a} \mathcal{L} il$  exchanging places, but they are properly marked with [-un] for  $f \bar{a} \mathcal{L} il$  and [-an] for  $maf \mathcal{L} wl$  in the new sequence.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup>That is *Zaydan before Sabdu Pal-lāhi* i.e. the *mafSuwl* before the *fāSil*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup>That is *Sabdu Pal-lāhi* comes after *Zaydan*, i.e. the *fāSil* comes after he *mafSuwl*.

passed. If he said *ðahaba* ' he went', that is evidence that the event occurred in the past zamān 'time'. If he were to say sa-yaðhabu 'he will go', that is evidence that it will occur in what is coming of zamān 'time'. Consequently, there is in it evidence for what passed and what has not passed, just as there is in it an indication (L. 15) of the occurrence of the event. Examples of that are in your saying Gasada šahrayn 'He stayed (for) two months' and sa-yagsudu šahrayn 'He will stay (for) two months', and you say *ðahabtu ʔamsi* 'I went vesterday' and sa-ʔaðhabu yadan 'I will go tomorrow'. If you so wish you need not make them d<sup>5</sup> arfan 'envelope (of time)'. That is permitted in everything to do with names for zamān 'time', just as it is permissible in everything to do with the names of events. This fisl 'action' transitivizes whatever is derived from its expression, to the name of the makān 'place' and to the makān 'place'. Because if he said, *dahaba* 'he went', or Gasada 'he sat', it becomes known that there is for the action makānan 'a location', even if he does not mention it, just as it is known that it was *ðahāb* 'a going', and that is in your saying ðahabtu ?al-maðhaba ?al-ba iyda I took the far out path/I went to the far away place', galastu maglisan hasanan 'I sat at a nice sitting/gathering'. Gasadtu magsadan (L. 20) kariyman 'I stayed a pleasant stay' Ga adtu ?al-makāna ?al-laði ra?ayta 'I stayed at the place that you saw', *ðahabtu waghan mina ?al-wuguwhi* 'I went in one of the directions' Some of them have said *ðahabtu ʔal-šāma* 'I went (to) Syria'. He likened it to the mubham 'abstact' as if it were makānan 'a place' in which the makān 'place' and the maðhab 'direction' falls on it. This is  $\check{s}\bar{a}\check{o}\check{o}un$  'exceptional' because there is nothing in  $\check{o}ahaba$  'he went' that is a direction to Syria, and in it there is no indication to the place and the direction. ðahabtu ?al-šāma 'I went (to) Syria' is like daxaltu ?al-bayta 'I entered the house' and like that is the saying of: Sā\idata Ibn Gwayya. (kāmil)<sup>43</sup>

ladnun bihazzi ?al-kaffi ya ſsilu matnuhu fiyhi kamā ʕasala ʔal-t ʿariyGa ʔal-θa ʕlabu. 'The spear jerks in his hand as the fox darts on the road.'

(I:12; L. 1) It reaches to what is *wagtan* 'instant' in places, just as it reaches to what is *wagtan* 'instant' in *?azminah* 'times', because it is *wagtun* 'an instant' that occurs in places, without its being specific to one place. Similarly, is *wavtan* 'an instant' in the *?azmān* 'times' without being specific to *zamān* 'a time' by itself.

بمض فإذا قال دُهَبَ فهو دلبل على أنّ الحدث فيما مضي من الزمان وإذا قال سيَدْهَبُ فهو دليل على انه يكون فيما يستقبل من الزمان ففيه بيان ما مضى وما لم يمض منه كما أنّ فيه آستِدلالاً (س.١٥) على وقوع الحدث وذلك قولك قعد شهرين و سيقعُد شهر ين و تقول ذهبتُ أَمْس و سأذهَبُ غدا فان شئت لم تجعلهما ظر فا فهو بجوز في كلّ شيء من أسماء الزمان كما جاز في كل شيء من أسماء الحدث ويتعدّى هذا إلى كل ما اشتُق من لفظه اسما للمكان والي المكان لأنه إذا قال ذهب أو قعد عُلم أنّ للحدث مكانا وإن لم يَذكر ه كما عُلم انه قد كان ذهاتٌ و ذلك قو لك دُهنتُ المذهبَ البعيدَ و جَلَستُ مجلساً حسنا و قَعدتٌ مقعداً (س. ٢٠ ) كريما وقعدتُّ المكانَ الذي رأيتَ وذهبتُ وجهاً من الوجوه وقد قال بعضيهم ذهبت الشامَ شبّهه بالمبهَم إذ كان مكانا يقع عليه المكان والمذهب وهذا شادٌّ لأنّه ليس في ذهب دليلٌ على الشام وفيه دليلٌ على المذهبِ و المكان و مثلُ ذهبت الشام دخلتُ البيتَ ومثل ذلك قول ساعدة بن جُويّة (کامل)

> لَدْنُ بِهَرِّ الكَفِّ يَعْسِلُ مَثْثُهُ فيه كما عَسَلَ الطريقَ الثَعْلَبُ

(ص. ١٢) ويَتعدى إلى ما كان وقتا في الأماكن كما يتعدى إلى ما كان وقتا في الأرمنة لأنه وقت يقع في الأماكن ولا يُختص به مكان واحد كما أن ذاك وقت في الأزمان لا يُختص به زمن بعينه

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup>Meter of kāmil is: *mutafā ilun* (6 times).

When it has the status of wagt 'an instant' in time, it becomes like it, because you can do with ?amākin 'places' what you do with *?azminah* 'times', even if they were stronger in that. Similarly, it should have been so, since it occurred in what is farther, like *ðahaba* ?al-šāma.' He went to Syria'. (L. 5) In your saying ðahabtu firsaxayni 'I went two parasangs', sirtu miylayin 'I walked two miles', just as you say *ðahabtu šahrayin* 'I went (for) two months', sirtu yawmayn 'I walked for two days'. It was, however, made stronger in the case of zamān 'time', because fist 'action' is constructed on what has passed of it, and what has not passed. In it, there is an indication of the fist 'action', when it occurred, just as there is in it an indication that the mas fdar 'root' had occurred, which is  $7al-\hbar ada\theta$  'the event'. Places do not have an action constructed for them<sup>44</sup>. Nor are places the sources from which the examples are taken. Places are for people and their like and are closer to them. Don't you see that they single them out with names like Zaid and Samr in their saying Makka, Somān and their likes. There is xilagun 'features' in them that is not for every makān 'place' nor in it, (L. 10) like ?al-gabal 'the moutain', ?al-wādiy 'the valley', ?al-baħr 'the sea', but ?al-dahr 'the epoch/age' is not so. Places have  $gu\theta\theta ah$ 'body', but dahr 'age' is the passage of night and day, and therefore it is closer to the fist 'action'.

فلما صيار بمنزلة الوقت في الزمن كان مثله لأنك قد تَقْعَل بالأماكن ما تقعل بالأز منة وان كان أقوى في ذلك وكذلك كان ينبغي أن يكون إذ صار ً فيما هو أبعدٌ نحو ذهبَ الشامَ (س ٥) و هو قولك ذهبتُ فر سخبن و سر تُ میلین کما تقول ذهبتٔ شهرین و سر تُ يومين وإنما جُعِل في الزمان أقوى لان الفعلَ بُني لما مضي منه وما لم بمض ففيه بيانُ الفعل متى وقع كما أنّ فيه بيانا انه قد وقع المصدر وهو الحددث والأماكن لم يُبن َ لماً فعلٌ ولبست الأماكن بمصادر أخِدَ منها الأمثلة فالأماكن إلى الأناسيّ ونحوهم اقرب ألا ترى أنهم يَختصرنها بأسماء كزيد وعمر و في قولهم مكَّةُ وعُمانُ ونحوُهما ويكون فيها خِلْقٌ لا تكون لكلّ مكان و لا (س. ۱۰) فيه كالجبل والوادي والبحر و الدهر ُ ليس كذلك و الأماكنُ لها جُنَّةٌ و إنما الدهر مُضِيٌّ الليلِ والنهار فهو إلى الفعل

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup>There is no indication/implication of place as there is indication/implication of time within the fi?1.

#### Chapter 11. This is a Chapter on ?al-fā?il 'the actor' (4)

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.16, Derenbourg vol.1. p.12, Haruwn vol.1. p.37)

(I:12; L. 12) This is a chapter on *?al-fā?il* 'the actor' whose action transitivizes *maf?uwlayn* 'two acted-upons'

If you wish you may limit yourself to the first *maf Γuwl* 'acted-upon', and if you wish, it may transitivize the second just as it transitivized the first. Example of that is in your saying *ʔa Γ τ Γ a Γ abdu ʔal-lāhi zaydan dirhaman* 'Abdullah gave Zaid a dirham' *f a Γ abdu ʔal-lāhi zaydan dirhaman* 'Abdullah gave Zaid a dirham' *f a Γ abdu ʔal-θiyāba ʔal-giyāda* 'I clothed Bishr (with) fine clothes'. Further examples are *ʔixtartu ʔal-rigāla Γ abda ʔa-lāhi* 'I chose (among) the men Γabdullah'. A similar example is the saying (L. 15) of the Almighty and the Glorious *wa-xtāra muwsa Gawmahu sab Γiyna ragulan limiy Gātina* 'Moses chose seventy men (from) among his people for our meeting place' (sura 7:154), *sammaytuhu zaydan* 'I named him Zayd', *kannaytu zaydan ʔabā Γabdi ʔal-lāhi* 'I nicknamed Zayd, father of Γabdullah', *da Γawtuhu zaydan* 'I called him Zayd', if you want, *da Γawtuhu* 'I called him' to be the same as *sammaytuhu* 'naming him'. You meant to call for a matter that does not transitivize more than one *maf Γuwl* 'acted-upon'. An example is the saying of the poet, (bas Γiyt) '46

?astaɣfiru ?al-lāha ðanban lastu muħs fiyahu rabba ?al-Sibādi ?ilayhi ?al-waghu wa-?al-Samalu 'I ask God's forgiveness for the faults I can not count. Lord of worshipers for His sake we turn and toil.'

Samr Ibn MaSdiy Kariba ?al-Zubaydiyy said:(basiyt<sup>S</sup>)<sup>47</sup>
(L. 20) *?amartuka ?al-xayra fafSal mā ?umirta bihi*faGad taraktuka ðā mālin wa ðā našabi.

'I ordered you to do good, so do what you were ordered to, I have left you a man of wealth and property'.

These actions have been separated, and they are actions that are connected to huruwf ?al-?id āfah 'particles of annexion'. You say, ?ixtartu fulānan min ?al-rigāli 'I selected so-and-so from (among) the men', sammaytuhu bi-fulānin 'I named him with such-and-so.' Just as you say ?arraftuhu bi-hāðihi ?al-?alāmah 'I made him known with this sign'. ?awd āħtuhu bi-hā 'I clarified him by-means-of it'. ?astayfiru ?al-lāha min ðālika 'I beg God's forgiveness for that'.

# (۱۱) هذا باب الفاعل الذي يتعدّاه فعله الذي المعدّاء فعله

فإن شئت اقتصرت على المفعول الأول وإن شئت تعدّى إلى الثاني كما تعدّى إلى الأول وذلك قولك أعطى عبد الله زيدا در هما وكسوت بشرا الثياب الجياد ومن ذلك اخترت الرجال عبد الله ومثل ذلك قوله (س. ١٠) عز وجل و اخْتَار مُوسى قوْمَهُ سَبْعِين رَجُلا لِمِيقَاتِنَا وسمّيتُه زيدا وكنيْت زيدا أبا عبد الله ودعوتُه زيدا إذا أردت دَعَوْتُهُ التي عبد الله ودعوتُه زيدا إذا أردت دَعَوْتُهُ التي تجرى مجرى سمّيْتُهُ وان عنيت الدُّعاء إلى أمر لم يجاوز مفعولا واحدا ومنه قول الشاعر (بسيط)

أسْتغفِرُ الله دَنْباً لستُ مُحْصِنَهُ ربَّ العِبادِ إليه الوَجْهُ والعَمَلُ

وقال عمرو معدي كَربَ الزُّبيديِّ (بسيط) أمَر ْثُكَ الخيرَ فاڤعَلْ ما أُمِر ْتَ به فقد تركثُك ذا مالٍ وذا نَشَبِ

و إنما قُصِلَ هذا أنها أفعالٌ تُوصلَلُ بحروفِ الإضافةِ فتقولُ اخترتُ فلانا من الرِّجالِ وسميتُه بفلان كما تقول عرّفتُه بهذه العلامة وأوضحتُه بها وأستغفِرُ الله من ذلك

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup>If one were to limit onself to one *mafʔuwl* instead of two, the one would say *?uʕt²iya zaydun dirhaman* 'Zayd was given a dirham'. Instead of *?aʕt²a ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi zaydan dirhaman* 'Abdullah gave Zayd a dirham'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>γ</sup> is: *mustafγilun fāγilun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>5</sup> is: *mustaf5ilun fā5ilun* (4 times).

When they deleted the particle of garr 'pull'<sup>48</sup>, the action came into operation. An example of that is the saying of: Mutalammis:  $(basiyt^{5})^{49}$ 

?ālaytu ħabba ?al-Sirāgi ?al-dahra ?at Samuhu wa-l-ħabbu ya?kuluhu fiy ?al-garyati ?al-suwsu 'Your swore that I will eat not the grain of Iraq, The worms eat the grain in the village.

(I:13; L. 1) He wants to say *Sala habbi* 'concerning the grain', and just as you say nubbi?tu zaydan 'I was told (of) Zayd'. He means by that to say San zaydin 'about Zayd'. Here San 'about' and Sala 'on' do not have the same status as  $b\bar{a}$ ? 'with', as in His saying  $kaf\bar{a}$  **bi**-l-l $\bar{a}hi$  šahiydan 'suffices with God as a witness', and laysa bi-zaydin 'he is not Zayd', because San 'about', and Sala 'on' are not treated that way nor with min 'from', necessarily. Pastayfiru Pal-lāha ðanban 'I ask God forgiveness for a sin'. ?amartuka ?al-xayra 'I enjoined you good', are not frequent in the speech of all of them, only some of them use them. As for sammaytu 'I named', and kannaytu 'I nicknamed', the  $b\bar{a}$ ? [b-] precedes it in the same manner as it precedes Sarraftu 'I introduced'. You say (L. 5) Sarraftuhu zaydan 'I introduced him (to) Zayd'. Then you say Sarraftuhu bi-zaydin 'I introduced him to Zayd'. This is different than that meaning. It enters sammaytu, kannaytu 'I named, I nicknamed' in the same measure as it enters Sarraftuhu bi-zayd 'I introduced him to Zayd'. These particles' original usage was as particles of  $7id^{5}\bar{a}fah$  'annexion'. Not every action is treated in this manner. Nor is it the case that every action transitivizes beyond the actor, nor does every action transitivize to maffuwlayn 'two acted-upons'. In this, is the saying of Farazdav: (t<sup>5</sup>awiyl)<sup>50</sup>

minnā ?al-laðiy ?uxtiyra ?al-rigāla samāħatan waguwdan iðā habba ?al-riyāħu ?al-za ſāzi ſu 'Among us the most generous and good men were chosen in drought the stormy winds blow'.

(L. 15) Farazdag also said:  $(t^{\varsigma}awiyl)^{51}$ 

nubbi?tu Sabd**a** ?al-lāhi **bi**-l-gawwi ?as bahat kirāman mawāliyha la?iyman s amiymuha 'I was told the tribe of Sabdullah has changed, Her slaves became noble, her free mean'.

فلما حذفوا حرف الجر عمل الفعل ومن ذلك قول المتلمس (بسيط)

آليتُ حبَّ العِراقِ الدَّهْرَ أطعمُهُ والحبُّ يأكُلُه في القَرْية السُّوسُ

(ص ١٣) پريد على حبّ العراق كما تقول نُبْئت زيدا يقول ذاك أي عن زيد وليست عن وعلى هاهنا بمنزلة الباء في قوله كفي بالله شَهِيداً وليس بزيد لأن عن وعلى لا يُفعَلُ بهما ذلك و لا يمن في الواجب وليست أستغفِر ُ الله ذنبا و أمر ثك الخبر َ أكثر َ في كلامهم جميعا وإنما يتكلم بها بعضهم وأما سمّبت وكنبت فإنما دخلتها الباء على حد ما دخلتْ في عرّفتُ تقول (س.٥) عرّفتهُ زيداً ثم نقول عرقته بزيد فهو سوى ذلك المعنى فإنما تدخل في سمّيت وكنيت على حدّ ما دخلت في عرقه بزيد فهذه الحروف كان أصلها في الاستعمال بحروف الإضافة وليس كلّ الفعل بُفعل به هذا كما انه ليس كلّ فعل بتعدي الفاعلَ و لا بتعدي إلى مفعو لبن ومنه قول الفرزدق (طويل)

> منّا الذي اختير الرِّجالَ سَماحَةٌ وَجُوداً إذا هَبَّ الرِّياحُ الزَّعازِعُ

> > وقال الفرزدق أيضا (طويل)

نُبّئتُ عبدَ اللهِ بالجَوِّ أصبَحَتْ كِر اماً مَو الِيها لئِيماً صميمُها

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup>Samples of particles of *garr* are bi-, min-.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup>Meter of basiyt<sup>§</sup> is: *mustaf§ilun fā§ilun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup>Meter for t<sup>5</sup>awiyl is: *fa Suwlun mafā Siylun* (4 times).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup>Meter of T<sup>5</sup>awiyl is: *fa Suwlun mafā Siylun* (4 times).

### Chapter 12. This is a Chapter on ?al-fa?il 'the actor (5)

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.18, Derenbourg vol.1. p.13, Haruwn vol.1. p.39)

(I:13; L. 12) This is a chapter on ?al-fā?il 'the actor' whose actions transitivize maf *Sulayn* 'two acted-upons', but you may not reduce it to one of the two maffulayn 'acted-upons' without the other, and that in your saving: ħasiba Sabdu Pal-lāhi zavdan bakran 'Abdullāh reckoned Zavd (to be) Bakr', and  $\delta^{\varsigma}$ anna  $\gamma$ amrun  $\gamma$ alidan  $\gamma$ abāka ' $\gamma$ amr thought Khalid (to be) your father', xāla Sabdu Pal-lāhi zaydan Paxāka 'Sabdullah imagined Zayd (to be) your brother', and examples like those are ra?a Sabd ?al-lāhi zaydan s<sup>5</sup>āhibanā 'Sabdullah saw Zayd our friend', and wagad Sabu Pal $l\bar{a}hi$  (L.15) zaydan  $\delta\bar{a}$  ?al- $\hbar if\bar{a}d^{\delta}i$  'Sabdullah found Zayd (to be) a holder of the bandage'. You are forbidden here from reducing them to one of the maf Suwlayn 'two acted-upons', because you wanted to clarify what became of the state of the first maffuwl 'acted-upon', whether it was certain or doubtful. You mentioned the first to inform that the one you are adding to it is the one that is settled with you who he is. You mentioned  $\delta^{5}$  anantu 'I thought /I presumed', and similar ones, in order to make the xabar 'news/predicate' of the first maf?uwl 'acted-upon' certain or doubtful. You did not wish to make the first one doubtful, or to rely on it for certitude. Examples of that are *Salimtu zaydan Pal-ð Sariyfa* 'I knew Zayd (to be) the charmer', and zasama sabdu ?al-lāhi zaydan ?axāka 'Sabdu-l-lah claimed Zayd (to be) your brother'. If you said ra Saytu 'I saw<sup>52</sup>, and you intended the seeing (L. 20) of the eye, or wagadtu 'I found', you intended to find what is lost. Then it is the same as  $d^{5}$  arabtu 'I hit'. What you meant by wagadtu 'I found', was Salimtu 'I learned', and by ra?avtu 'I saw', that same thing. Don't you see that it is possible for a blind person to say ra?aytu zaydan ?al-s<sup>5</sup>āliħa 'I saw Zayd the righteous'. And it is possible for *Salimtu* 'I learned', to be in place of *Saraftu* 'I knew'. You are looking for no more than the knowledge of the first. Examples of that are the sayings of the Exalted, wa-lagad Salimtum Pal-laðiyna ?istadaw (I:14; L. 1) minkum fiy ?al-sabti 'and well you knew those among you who transgressed on the sabbath' (Sura 2:65), and the Glorious Lord said wa-?āxariyna min duwnihim lā taslamuwnahum ?al-lāhu va slamuhum 'and others than them you don't know, God knows them'. They are here in the status *Saraftu* 'I knew', just as the employment of ra?aytu 'I saw', has two uses. As for ð<sup>s</sup>anantu ðāka 'I presumed that', it is permissible to end on it with silence, because you say  $\delta^{5}$  anantu 'I presumed', you restrict yourself in the manner you say  $\delta$  ahabtu 'I went'.

## 

وليس لك أن تَقتصِر على احد المفعولين دون الآخر وذلك قولك حسب عبد الله زيداً بكراً وظنَّ عمرو خالدا أباك وخالَ عبد الله زيدا أخاك ومثل ذلك رأى عبدُ الله زيدا صاحبنا ووجد عبد (س٥١) الله زيدا ذا الحِفاظ و إنما منعك أن تقتصر على احد المفعولين هاهنا انك إنّما أردتَّ أن تبيِّن ما استقر عندك من حال المفعول الأول يقينا كان أو شكّا وذكرت الأولَ لـثعلِم الـذي تُضبِفُ إليه ما استَقر "له عندك مَن هو فإنما ذكرت ظننت ونحو ولتجعل خبر المفعول الأول يقينا أو شكّا ولم ترد أن تجعل الأول فيه الشكُّ أو تَعتمدَ عليه بالتبقُّن ومثل ذلك علمتُ زيدا الظريفَ وزعمَ عبدُ الله زيدا أخاك فان قلت ر أبتُ فأر دتَّ رؤبة (س ٢٠) العين أو وجدتُ فأردتَ وجدانَ الضالَّةِ فهو بمنز لة ضربت ولكنك إنما تربد بوجدت عَلِمْتُ وبر أيتُ ذلك أيضا ألا ترى انه يجوز للأعْمَى أن بقول رأبتُ زبدا الصَّالحَ وقد يكون علمتُ بمنزلة عرفتُ لا تريد إلَّا عِلْمَ الأوَّل فمن ذلك قولِه تعالى وَلَقَدْ عَلِمْتُمُ الَّذِينَ اعْتَدَوْا (ص ٤١) مِنكمْ في السَّبْتِ وقال سبحانه و آخَرينَ مِنْ دُونِهِمْ لا تَعْلَمُونَهُم اللهُ يَعْلَمُهُم فهي هاهنا بمنزلة عرفت كما كانت رأيت على وجهين وأما ظننت ذاك فإنما جاز السكوت عليه لأنك تقول ظننت فتقتصير كما تقول ذهيتُ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup>There is a difference being drawn here in the use of ra?a as an action with one maf?uwl 'acted-upon' or maf?uwlayn 'two acted-upons'.

You then put it to work on  $?al-\delta^{\varsigma}ann$  'presumption' in the same manner that you put  $\delta ahabtu$  'I went' to work in  $?al-\delta ah\bar{a}b$  'the going'. That one in this place is  $?al-\delta^{\varsigma}ann$  'presumption', as though you said  $\delta^{\varsigma}anantu$   $\delta \bar{a}ka$   $?al-\delta^{\varsigma}anna$  'I presumed that presumption'. In the same manner, xiltu 'I imagined', and  $\hbar asibtu$  'I reckoned''. This demonstrates to you that it is  $?al-\delta^{\varsigma}ann$  'the presumption'. In the same manner, if you were to say: xiltu zaydan 'I was imagined Zayd', and  $?ur\bar{a}$  zaydan 'I am shown Zayd', it is not permissible. You say  $\delta^{\varsigma}anantu$  bihi 'I presumed him/I had an opinion on him', as you said nazaltu bi-hi, nazaltu  $\varsigma alayhi$  'I came to live with him', even if  $b\bar{a}$ ? [b-] is extra in its status as in the verse the Almighty  $kaf\bar{a}$  bi  $?al-l\bar{a}hi$  'he had sufficiency in God', it is not possible to pause on it. It is as if you said  $\delta^{\varsigma}anantu$  fiy  $?al-d\bar{a}ri$  'I presumed in the house' and similarly,  $\varsigma akaktu$  fiy-hi 'I doubted him'.

ثم تُعمِله في الظن كما تُعْمِل ذهبتُ في الذهاب فذاك هاهنا هو الظن كأنك قلت ظننت ذاك الظن وكذلك خلت وحسبت ويدلك على انه (س.٥) الظن اللك لو قلت خلت زيدا وأرى زيدا لم يجز وتقول ظننت به جعلته موضع ظنّك كما قلت نزلت به ونزلت عليه ولو كانتِ الباء زائدة بمنزلتها في قوله عز وجل كفى بالله لم يجز السّكت عليها فكأنك قلت ظننت في الدار ومثله عليها فكأنك قلت ظننت في الدار ومثله شككت فيه

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup>There is a parallel drawn here between  $\delta^{\varsigma}$  anantu 'presumed' and  $\delta$  ahabtu 'I left' in the sense that when the utterance is limited to them without a maf  $\varsigma$  uwl being considered they are similar and focus on the mas  $\varsigma$  sādir like  $\delta^{\varsigma}$  ann and  $\delta$  ahāb.

### Chapter 13. This is a Chapter on ?al-fa?il 'the actor' (6)

(Būlāq vol. 1. P.19, Derenbourg vol.1. p.14, Haruwn vol.1. p.41)

(I:14; L. 8) 1This is a chapter on ?al-fā?il 'the actor' whose action transitivizes three *maf\text{\text{\text{uwliyn}}}\text{ 'acted-upons'. You are not permitted}* to reduce them to one of the three *maffuwliyn* 'acted-upons' without the three, because here *?al-maf?uwl* 'the acted-upon' is like *?al-fā?il* the actor of the first case that is before it in meaning. (L. 10) And that is in your saying ?ara ?al-lāhu zaydan bušran ?abāka 'God showed Zayd Bushr to be your father', and nabbaātu Samran zaydan ?abā fulā~nin 'I told Samr Zayd (is) the father of so-andso<sup>54</sup>, and ?aslama ?al-lāhu zaydan samran xayran minka 'God told Zaid Amr (is) a better one than you'55. Know that these actions if they transitivized the limit of what I told you of mafsuwliyn 'the acted-upons', there would be no maffuwl 'acted-upon' after that. They have transitivized all that the action can transitivize which does not transitivize beyond the actor; and that is in your saying,  $7a \Re^{5}a$ *Sabdu ?al-lāhi zaydan ?al-māla ?iSt<sup>S</sup>ā?an gamiylan* 'Sabdul ?al-lāh gave Zayd the money, a graceful giving', saragtu Sabda ?al-lāhi ?al-θawba ?al-laylata 'I stole Sabdu-l-lah's garment this tonight<sup>156</sup>. Do not make it  $d^{5}$  arfan 'an envelope (of time)', but as you say  $y\bar{a}$ sāri**Ga** ?al-laylati zayd**an** ?al-θawb**a** 'You thief of the night, stealing Zaid's garment'. You did not make it  $d^{5}arf$  'an envelope (of time)'. You say ?aslamtu (L. 15) hāðā zaydan gā?iman ?al-silma ?alvagiyna ?islāman 'I informed this one Zaid (to be) standing, with certain knowledge'. ?adxala ?al-lāhu zaydan ?al-mudxala ?alkariyma ?idxālan 'God ushered Zaid into the noble gate definitely', because when these actions reached their limit, they have the status of what is not transitive.

# (١٣) هذا باب الفاعل الذي يتعدّاه فعله الذي الله فعله الله فعله الله فعولين الله فعولين الله فعولين الله فعله الله فعولين الله فعله الله

ولا يجوز لك أن تقتصر على مفعولٍ منهم و احد دون الـثلاثة لانّ المفعـول هاهـنا كالفاعل في الباب الأول الذي قبله في (س. ١٠) المعنى و ذلك قولك أركى اللهُ زبدا بشر ا أباك ونبّات عمر ازبدا أبا فلان وأعْلَمَ اللهُ زيداً عمر اخبراً منك واعلم أن هذه الأفعال إذا انتهت إلى ما ذكرت لك من المفعولينَ فلم بكن بعد ذلك متعدِّي تَعدَّت إلى جميع ما تَعدّى إليه الفعلُ الذي لا يتتعدّى الفاعلَ وذلك قولك أعطى عبدُ الله زيدا المالَ إعطاءً حميلاً و سر قتُ عيدَ الله الثويَ الليلة لا تُحعله ظر فا ولكن كما تقول با سارق اللبلة زبدا الثوبَ لم تجعلها ظرفا وتقول أعلمتُ (س. ١٥) هذا زيدا قائما العلمَ اليقينَ إعلاماً وأدخل الله زيدا المُدْخَلَ الكريمَ إدخالا لأنها لما انتهت صارت بمنزلة ما لا بتعدي

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup>In these structures the third  $maf \mathfrak{F} uwl$  is a predicate to the second  $mf \mathfrak{F} uwl$  and thus it can not be left out. In other words, the second and third  $maf \overline{a} \mathfrak{F} iyl$  form a predication structure of their own..

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup>Similar to the previous chapter the actions of these actors require three mafa iyl 'acted upons' with the added form that is doubly transitive. For example going from ra?a and falima to fara and falima, and with the same restriction of retaining the mafa iyl.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup>?al-laylata 'this night' is considered a third maf?uwl and not an envelope of time. This is legitimate by what Sībawayh called si?at ?al-kalām 'the expansiveness / latitude in speech'.