

This is the Famous Book of Sībawayh on *naḥw*¹ 'Grammar' and its Name is *ḥal-kitāb* 'The Book'

Solomon Sara, S.J.
Georgetown University

هذا كتاب سيوييه المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

Chapter 21. This is a Chapter on the *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' in *laysa* 'is not' and *kāna* 'he was'² (Bulaq vol. 1. P. 35, Derenbourg vol.1. p.27, Haruwn vol.1. p. 69)

(٢١) هذا باب الإضمار في ليس وكان كالإضمار في إن

It is similar to the *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' in *ḥinna* 'indeed'. If you said *ḥinna-hu man ya ḥinā na ḥihi* 'It is a fact, whoever visits us we visit him' and *ḥinna-hu ḥamatu ḥal-lāhi ḍāhibatun* 'It is a fact, the maidservant of God is going.' As a consequence of that, some of the Arabs say *laysa xalaḡa ḥal-lāhu mi ḥlahu* 'God did not create one like him.' If there had not been *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' in it, it is not permitted for you to mention the *fi ḥ* 'action' and not make it operate on *ḥism* 'a name'. Rather, there is *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' in it like there is in *ḥinna-hu* 'it is a fact'. We shall show the status of this *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' and how it is, God willing. The poet ḥumayd ḥal-ḥarḡat³ said: (Basiy⁴)
(I. Ch. 21. P. 27. L. 5)

bātuw wa gullatunā ḥal-sihriyzu baynahumu
ka ḥanna ḥaḍ'fārahum fiyhā ḥal-sakākiynu⁴
fa ḥas'baḥuw wa ḥal-nawa ḥāliy mu ḥarrasihim
wa laysa kulla ḥal-nawa tulḡiy ḥal-masākiynu

'They stayed the night, with our basket of dates between them
As if their nails worked them like knives
They arose in the morning with pits scattered around them
Just as the poor do not dispose of all the pits.'

If *kull* 'all' were governed by *laysa* 'is not' with no *ḥid'mār* 'implicitness' in it, that would not be except with *raḥḥ* 'raise' of *kull* 'all', but *ḥintas'aba* 'it got erected' due to *tulḡiy* 'dispose of'. It is not permitted that you *taḥmila* 'relate' *ḥal-masākiynu* 'the poor' to *laysa* 'is not' when *taḡaddamat* 'it is pre-positioned', so you made the item on which the other action works follow the first one, and this is not good.

إذا قلت إنه من يأتينا تأته وإته أمة الله ذاهبة.
فمن ذلك قول بعض العرب ليس خلق الله
مثله فلو لا أن فيه إضماراً لم يجز أن تذكر
الفعل ولم تُعمله في اسم ولكن فيه الإضمار
مثل ما في إن وسوف نبين حال هذا
الإضمار وكيف هو إن شاء الله. قال الشاعر
وهو حميد الأرقط: [بسيط]

بأثوا وجئنا السهريز بينهم
كان أظفارهم فيها السكاكين

فأصبحوا والنوى عالي معرسهم
وليس كل النوى لتقي المساكين

فلو كان كل على ليس لا إضمار فيه لم يكن
إلا الرفع في كل ولكنّه انتصب على لتقي.
ولا يجوز أن تحمل المساكين على ليس وقد
تقدمت فجعلت الذي يعمل فيه الفعل الآخر
يلي الأول وهذا لا يحسن.

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

²Thanks go to professor Mohammad Alhawary for looking over these chapters and making stylistic and substantive recommendations.

³The meter for *basiy⁴* is: mustaf'ilun fā'ilun mustaf'ilun fa'ilun (twice).

⁴This line of poetry is not included in Buwlaq edition.

If you were to say *kānat zaydan ḡal-ḡumma taḡxuḡu. ḡaw taḡxuḡu ḡal-ḡummā* 'the fever Zaid struck, or fever struck' it is not (I. Ch. 21. P. 27. L. 10) permitted, and it is *ḡabiyḡ* 'bad'. An example of that is *ḡid^fmār* 'implicitness' that some poets, ḡal-ḡugayr, of whom we heard from people whose Arabic is trustworthy say: (t^fawiyl)⁵

ḡiḡā muttu kāna ḡal-nāsu s^finfāni šāmitun
wa ḡāxaru muḡnin bi-ḡal-laḡi kuntu ḡas^fna ḡu

'If I were to die, people will fall into two classes,
one gloating my demise, the other praising what I was doing.'

He implied it in *kāna*. Some of the Arabs say *kāna ḡanta xayrun minhu* 'you were better than him'; it is as though he said *ḡinna-hu ḡanta xayrun minhu* 'It is a fact, you are better than him'. A similar example is *kāda taziyḡu ḡuluwbu fariyḡin minhum* 'It-was-about-to-be, to turn away the hearts of a group of them.' This explanation is permitted because its meaning is *kādat ḡuluwbu fariyḡin minhum taziyḡu* 'It-is-about-to-be, the hearts of a group of them were turned away.' It is as you say *mā kāna ḡal-t^fiybu ḡilla ḡal-misku* 'The perfume was no other than musk.' on the application of *mā kāna ḡal-ḡamru ḡal-t^fiybu ḡilla ḡal-misku* 'the matter of perfume was no other except musk.' This is permitted if (I. Ch. 21. P. 27. L. 15) its meaning is *mā ḡal-t^fiybu ḡilla ḡal-misku* 'The perfume was no other than musk.' The poet Hiḡān the brother of ḡiy-ḡal-rummati said: (Basiyt)⁶

ḡiya ḡal-ḡifāḡu li-dāḡi law ḡ^fafirtu bi-hā
wa laysa min-hā ḡifāḡu ḡal-dāḡi mabḡuwlu

'She is the cure for my illness if I were to gain her
But she is not attempting to cure me of my illness'

This is not allowed with *mā* 'not' in the language of the people of ḡal-hijāz because it does not include *ḡid^fmār* 'implicitness'. It is not permitted for you to say *mā zaydan ḡabdu-lāhi d^fariban* 'it is not Zaid Abdulah is hitting', and *mā zaydan ḡanā ḡātilun* 'it is not Zaid I am killing', because it is not straight forward, just as it is not straight forward to *tuḡaddim* 'pre-position' with *kāna* 'he was' and *laysa* 'he is not' what the other will work on.

⁵The meter for *t^fawiyl* is: faḡuwlun mafāḡiylun faḡuwlun mafāḡiylun (twice).

⁶The meter for *basiyt*^f is: mustafḡilun fāḡilun mustafḡilun faḡilun (twice)

لو قلتَ كانتَ زيداً الحمى تأخذُ أو تأخذُ
الحمى لم يجرز وكان قبيحاً. ومثلُ ذلك قول
بعض الشعراء العجيز سمعناه ممن يوثق
بعربيته: [طويل]

إذا مُتُّ كانَ الناسُ صِنْفانِ شامِتُ

وآخرُ مُننٍ بالذي كنتُ أصنَعُ

أضمر فيها. وقال بعضهم كانَ أنتَ خيرٌ منه
كأنه قال إنه أنتَ خيرٌ منه. ومثله كادَ تزيغُ
قلوبُ فريقٍ منهمُ وجرز هذا التفسيرُ لأن
معناه كادتُ قلوبُ فريقٍ منهمُ تزيغُ كما قلتُ
ما كانَ الطيبُ إلا المسكُ على إعمالٍ ما كان
الأمرُ الطيبُ إلا المسكُ فجرز هذا إذ كان
معناه ما الطيبُ إلا المسكُ. وقال الشاعر
وهو هشامُ أخو ذي الرمة: [بسيط]

هي الشفاءُ لِدائي لو ظفرتُ بها

وليس منها شفاءُ الداءِ مَبْدولُ

ولا يجوز ذافي ما في لغة أهل الحجاز
لأنه لا يكون فيه إضمارٌ. ولا يجوز أن تقول
ما زيداً عبدُ الله ضارباً وما زيداً أنا قاتلاً
لأنه لا يستقيم كما لم يستقم ان تُقدِّمَ في كان
وليس ما يَعْمَلُ فيه الآخرُ.

If *rafaṣta* 'you raise' the predicate where it is *ḥasan* 'correct' in the language of Tamiym, is like your saying (I. Ch. 21. P. 27. L.20) *ʔammā zaydan fa-ʔanā dʔāribun* 'As for Zaid, I am hitting.' It is as though you did not mention *ʔamma* 'as for', as though you did not mention *mā* 'not', and as though you said *zaydan ʔanā dʔāribun* 'I am hitting Zaid'. Muzāhim ʔal-ṣuḡayli said: (tʔawiy)ʔ

wa ḡāluw ta ʔarraḡhā ʔal-manāzila min minan
wa mā kulla man wāfā minan ʔanā ʔārifu

'They said: 'Look for her in the encampments in Mina'
 But not every one that comes to Mina do I know'

(I. Ch. 21. P. 28. L. 1) Some of them say:

wa mā kullu man wāfā minan ʔanā ʔārifu
 'Not every one that comes to Mina do I know'

He followed the *ḥijāz* dialect and then raised *kull* 'all' as though he said *mā laysa ʔabdu-ʔal-lāhi ʔanā ʔārifun* 'it is not Abdulah whom I know'. He implied the *hāʔ* '[hu] him' in *ʔārif* 'know-er'. The surface is *ʔārifu-hu* 'knower of him' where *ʔārif* does not act on *kull* 'all', and this is better than pre-positioning and post-positioning, since they leave out this *hāʔ* '[hu] him' a great deal in their speech and poetry. That does not occur in their speech and almost never occurs in poetry. You shall see that, God willing.

⁷The meter for *tʔawiy* is: *faṣuwlun mafāṣiylun faṣuwlun mafāṣiylun* (twice).

فإن رفعتَ الخبرَ حيثَ حَسُنَ حَمَلُهُ عَلَى
 اللُّغَةِ التَّمِيمِيَّةِ كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ أَمَا زَيْدًا فَأَنَا ضَارِبٌ
 كَأَنَّكَ لَمْ تَذْكَرْ أَمَّا وَكَأَنَّكَ لَمْ تَذْكَرْ مَا وَكَأَنَّكَ
 قُلْتَ زَيْدًا أَنَا ضَارِبٌ. وَقَالَ مُزَاخِمُ الْعُقَيْلِيِّ:
 [طويل]

وَقَالُوا تَعْرِفُهَا الْمَنَازِلَ مِنْ مَنَى

وَمَا كُلُّ مَنْ وَاقَى مَنَى أَنَا عَارِفٌ

وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ: [طويل]

وَمَا كُلُّ مَنْ وَاقَى مَنَى أَنَا عَارِفٌ

لَزِمَ اللُّغَةَ الْحِجَازِيَّةَ فَرَفَعَ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ لَيْسَ عَبْدُ
 اللَّهِ أَنَا عَارِفٌ فَأَضْمَرَ الْهَاءَ فِي عَارِفٍ وَكَانَ
 الْوَجْهُ عَارِفُهُ حَيْثُ لَمْ يُعْمَلْ عَارِفٌ فِي كُلِّ
 وَكَانَ هَذَا أَحْسَنَ مِنَ التَّقْدِيمِ وَالتَّأخِيرِ لِأَنَّهُمْ
 قَدْ يَدْعُونَ هَذِهِ الْهَاءَ فِي كَلَامِهِمْ وَفِي الشَّعْرِ
 كَثِيرًا وَذَلِكَ لَيْسَ فِي شَيْءٍ مِنْ كَلَامِهِمْ وَلَا
 يَكَادُ يَكُونُ فِي شَعْرِهِ وَسُئِرَى ذَلِكَ إِنْ شَاءَ
 اللَّهُ.

Chapter 22. This is a Chapter on what does the Work of *fi* ʔ 'an action' but does not follow the path of an action nor *tamakkana* 'is inflectable' with *tamakkunahu* 'its inflectability'

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 37, Derenbourg vol.1. p.28, Haruwn vol.1. p. 72)

That is like your saying *mā ʔaḥsana sabda ʔal-lāhi* 'How refined Abdullah is'.⁸ ʔal-Khalīl claims that this is in place of your saying *šayḥun ʔaḥsana sabda ʔal-lāhi* 'Something refined Abdulah', and supplied it with the meaning of *taḥḡub* 'wonder/surprise'. This is *tamḡiy* 'an exemplification' that is not spoken, nor is it permitted to pre-position 'Abdullah' nor post-position *mā* 'taḥḡub marker', nor remove any item from its place. You are not able to re-express it like *mā yuḥsinu* *'How refining is', nor anything (I. Ch. 22. P. 28. L. 10) that is proper to *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' except this. Its construction is ever from this: *fa ʔala, fa ʔila, fa ʔula* and *ʔafʔala*. This is because they did not want *yatasʔarraḡ* 'it to be inflectable', they set for it one *miḡāl* 'example/pattern' to follow.⁹ This is like what is not inflectable from *fi* ʔ 'action', e.g. *lāta* 'not', *mā* 'not'. Even if it were from *ḥasuna* 'It became fine', *karuma* 'it became noble' and *ʔaḡa* 'he gave'. As they say *ʔaḡdalun* 'muscular' and made it *ḡism* 'a name' even though it is from *gaḡl* 'strong limb' and it followed the path of *ʔafʔalun* 'shiver'. Their making of *mā* 'taḥḡub marker' by itself *ḡism* 'a name' is equivalent to the saying of Arabs *ḡinniy mim-mā ʔan ʔasʔna ʔa* 'I am from what I make', that is *mina ʔal-ʔamri ʔan ʔasʔna ʔa* 'it is a fact that I make'. He made *mā* 'what/whatever' (Ch. 22. P. 28. L. 15) alone *ḡism* 'a name'. An example of that is *ʔasaltuhu ʔaslan ni ʔḡimā* 'I washed him a luxuriant wash', that is *ni ʔma ʔal-ʔaslu* 'luxury of the wash'. You say *mā kāna ʔaḡsana zaydan* 'There is no one finer than Zaid!'. You mentioned *kāna* 'he was' to show that it was in what has passed.

(٢٢) هذا باب ما يَعْمَلُ عَمَلَ الْفِعْلِ ولم يَجْرِ مجرى الفعل ولم يَتَمَكَّنْ تَمَكَّنَهُ

وذلك قولك ما أَحْسَنَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ. زعم الخليل أنه بمنزلة قولك: شيءٌ أَحْسَنَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ ودَخَلَهُ معنَى التَعْجُبِ. وهذا تمثيلٌ ولا يُتَكَلَّمُ بِهِ. ولا يجوز أن تُقَدِّمَ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ وتُؤَخِّرَ ما ولا تزيّل شيئاً (س. ١٠) عن موضعه ولا تقول فيه ما يُحْسِنُ ولا شيئاً مما يكون في الأفعال سوى هذا. وبناءؤه أبدأ من فَعَلَ وفَعِلَ وفَعُلَ وأفَعَلَ هذا لأنهم لم يريدوا أن يتصرف فجعّلوا له مثلاً واحداً يَجْرِي عَلَيْهِ فَشَبَّهَ هذا بما ليس من الفعل نحو لات وما. وإن كان من حَسُنَ وكرُمَ وأعطى كما قالوا أُجِدَلُ فجعّلوه اسماً وإن كان من الجَدَلُ وأجْرِي مُجْرِي أَفْكَلٍ. ونظير جعلهم ما وحدّها اسماً قولُ العرب: إني ممّا أن أصنع أي من الأمر أن أصنع فجعّل ما (س. ١٥) وحدّها اسماً. ومثّل ذلك غَسَلْتُهُ غَسَلًا نِعْمًا أي نِعَمَ الغَسَلِ وتقول ما كان احسن زيدا فتذكر كان لتدلّ أنّه فيما مضى.

⁸*mā* in this context is a marker for *taḥḡub* 'wonder' which is always *mansʔuwb* 'erect'

⁹The *taḥḡub* form of the *fi* ʔ 'action' is limited to these basic forms and does not extend to all the possible inflectional forms of the *fi* ʔ.

Chapter 23. This is a Chapter on *fāṣilayn* 'two actors' and *mafṣuwayn* 'two acted-upons' Each of which acts on its *fāṣil* 'actor' like the one that acts on it and the like

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 37, Derenbourg vol.1. p.28, Haruwn vol.1. p. 73)

(I. Ch. 23. P. 28. L. 23). This is in your saying *d'arabtu wa d'arabaniy zaydan* 'I hit and Zaid hit me' and *d'arabani wa d'arabtu zaydan* 'He hit me and I hit Zaid'. *taḥmulu* 'you relate' the *ḥism* 'name' to the *fiṣl* 'action' that follows it. The *ṣāmil* 'operator' in the expression is one of the actions, but in the *maṣnā* 'meaning' (I. Ch. 23. P. 29. L. 1) it is understood that the first one has occurred, but that *raḥṣ* 'raising' and *nasḥb* 'erecting' do not affect one name, but rather the one that follows it has priority due to its proximity, and it does not contradict any meaning. The *muxāṭab* 'addressee' understands that the first is related to Zaid just like *xaššantu bisḥadrihi wa sḥadri zaydin* 'I roughened up his chest and the chest of Zaid', is the surface of speech where the *garr* 'pull' does not contradict the meaning, and *bāʔ* '[bi-] with' is closer to it than the *fiṣl* 'action', they equalized between the two of them in the matter of *garr* 'pulling' just as both would be equal in *nasḥb* 'erecting'. What supports accrediting (I. Ch. 23. P. 29. L. 5) such knowledge to the *muxāṭab* 'addressee' is the saying of the Most Powerful and the Most Exalted *wa-lōākiriyna ḥal-lāha kaḥiṣṣiran wa-lōākiriātī wa-lḥāfiḍiyna furuwgahum wa-lḥāfiḍiātī* 'The invocators and the invocatresses of God in abundance, and the protectors and the protectresses of their chastity' (Sūra XXXIII:35)¹⁰, the last one does not affect what the first one has affected and it dispenses with it. An example of that is *wa naxlasu wa natruku man yafguruka* 'We eradicate and banish whoever blows you up'. Stronger cases of *ḥistiḡnāʔ* 'omission' than this occur in poetry, and that in the saying of: Gays bin al-Xatḥiyim: (Munsariḥ)¹¹

*naḥnu bimā ḥindanā wa ḥanta bimā
ḥindaka rādḥin wa ḥal-raḥyu muxtalifu*

'We, with what we have, and you, with what
you have are satisfied, but the opinion varies'

(٢٣) هذا باب الفاعلين والمفعولين

الذين كل واحد منهما يفعلُ بفاعله مثل الذي يفعلُ به وما كان نحو ذلك وهو قولك: ضربتُ وضربتني زيدٌ وضربني وضربتُ زيداً تحمل الاسم على الفعل الذي يليه. فالعامل في اللفظ أحد الفعلين وأما في المعنى فقد (ص ٢٩. س ١) يُعلم أن الأول قد وقع إلبا أنه لا يعملُ في اسمٍ واحدٍ رفعٌ ونصبٌ. وإنما كان الذي يليه أولى لقرب جواره وأنه لا ينقضُ معنى وأن المخاطبَ قد عرّف أن الأول قد وقع بزيد كما كان خشنتُ بصدرة وصدر زيد وجه الكلام حيث كان الجرّ لا ينقضُ معنى وكانت الباء أقرب إليه من الفعل سووا بينهما في الجرّ كما يستويان في النصب. ومما يقوى ترك (س ٥) نحو هذا لعلم المخاطب قوله عز وجل: "والدّٰكرين الله كثيرًا والدّٰكرات والحافظين فروجهم والحافظات" فلم يعمل الآخر فيما عمل فيه الأول استغناء عنه ومثل ذلك: ونخلعُ ونتركُ من يفجرك. وجاء في الشعر من الاستغناء أشد من هذا وذلك قول قيس بن الخطيم: (منسرح)

نَحْنُ بِمَا عِنْدَنَا وَأَنْتَ بِمَا

عِنْدَكَ رَاضٍ وَالرَّأْيُ مُخْتَلِفٌ

¹⁰These verses reverse of the canonical reading order: *wa-lḥāfiḍiyna furuwgahum wa-lḥāfiḍiātī wa-lōākiriyna ḥal-lāha kaḥiṣṣiran wa-lōākiriātī*

¹¹The meter for munsariḥ is: mustaffilun fāṣilātun muftāṣilun (twice).

(I. Ch. 23. P. 29. L. 10) d^ʿābiʔu ʔal-Burjumiyy said:
(t^ʿawiyl)¹²

fa-man yaku ʔamsa bi-ʔal-madiynati raḥluhu
fa ʔinni wa ʔayyāran biḥā la yariybu
'Whoever has his place in the city, stayed the night,
As for me and my horse Qayyār, we are strangers in it.'

'Ibn ʔaḥmar said: (t^ʿawiyl)¹³

ramāniy bi-ʔamrin kuntu minhu wa wālidīy
bariyʔan wa min ʔagli ʔal-t^ʿawīyyiy ramāniy
'He accused me of a matter of which I, and my father,
Are innocent, for the sake of the well of
t^ʿawīyyi, he accused me'

He put in place of the *xabar* 'predicate' the singular expression, because he understands that the *muxāʿab* 'addressee' will be guided by it, (I. Ch. 23. P. 29. L.1 5) that the others have the same *s^ʿifah* 'description'. The first omission case is better because he did not put the *wāhidan* 'singular' in place of the *gamʿ* 'plural', nor the plural in place of the singular. An example is the saying of Farazdaq: (kāmīl)¹⁴

ʔinniy d^ʿamintu liman ʔatāniy mā ganā
wa ʔabāfa-kāna wa kuntu ʔayra ʔaduwrī
'I reassured whoever had done me injury
and denied it, neither was he nor I a deceiver.'

He omitted so that the first has a predicate supplied by the other with the understanding of the *muxāʿab* 'addressee' that the first is involved in that. If you were not going to relate speech to the other you would say *d^ʿarabtu wa d^ʿarabuwniy ʔawmaka* 'I hit your kin and they hit me'. Their speech is rather *d^ʿarabtu* (I. Ch. 23. P. 29. L. 20) *wa d^ʿarabaniy ʔawmuka* 'I hit, and your kin hit me'. If you were to say *d^ʿarabaniy* 'he hit me', there is no way for the first, because you do not say *d^ʿarabaniy* 'he hit me' and you make the *mud^ʿmar* 'implied' plural. If you were to operate the first you would say *marartu wa marra biy bi-zaydin* 'I passed by, and passed by me Zayd'. This *ʔabuḥa* 'is ugly'. They have given the priority to the closer one, as it does not contradict the meaning.

¹²The meter for *t^ʿawiyl* is: faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun (twice).

¹³The meter for *t^ʿawiyl* is: faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun faʔuwulun mafāʔiylun (twice).

¹⁴The meter for *kāmīl* is: mutafāʔilan (six times).

(س. ١٠) وقال ضابئ البرجومي: (طويل)

فمن يك أمسى بالمدينة رحله
فإني وقتيأراً بها لغريب

وقال ابن أحرر: (طويل)

رمانى بأمر كنت منه ووآلدي
بريئاً ومن أجل الطوي رمانى

فوضع في موضع الخبر لفظ الواحد لأنه قد
علم أن المخاطب سيستدل به على أن
(س. ١٥) الآخرين في هذه الصفة. والأول
أجود لأنه لم يضع واحداً في موضع جمع
ولا جمعاً في موضع واحد. ومثله قول
الفرزدق: (كامل)

إني ضمنت لمن أتاني ما جنى
وأبى فكان وكنت غير غدور

ترك أن يكون للأول خبر استغناءً بالآخر
لعلم المخاطب أن الأول قد دخل في ذلك.
ولو لم تحمل الكلام على الآخر لقلت
ضربت وضربوني قومك وإنما كلامهم
ضربت (س. ٢٠) وضربني قومك. وإذا
قلت ضربني لم يكن سبيلاً للأول لأنك لا
تقول ضربني وأنت تجعل المضمراً جميعاً
ولو عملت الأول لقلت مررت ومر بي
بزيد. وإنما قبح هذا أنهم قد جعلوا الأقرب
أولى إذ لم يفض معنى.

The poet, Farazdaq, said: (t^ʿawiyl)¹⁵

wa lakinna nisʿfan law sababtu wa sabbaniy
banuw ʿabdi šamsi min manāfin wa hāšimi
 'It is, however, fair if I were to cuss and
 Banuw Šams were to cuss me, the folks from
 Manāf and Hāšim'

(I. Ch. 23. P. 30. L. 1) t^ʿufayl ʿal-ʿanawiyy said: (t^ʿawiyl)

wa kumtan mudammātan ka ʿanna mutuwnahā
gara fawḡahā wa ʿistaš ʿarat lawna muḏhabi
 'Maroon and deep-red ones, as if flowed on their pelt
 and made their banner the color of gold.'

A man of Bāhilah said: (kāmil)¹⁶

wa laḡad ʿara ta ʿana bihi sayfānatun
tusʿbi ʿal-ḥaliyima wa mi ʿluhā ʿasʿbāhu
 'I see, indeed, a slender one living in it
 She rejuvenates the wise and like slender one
 did rejuvenate the wise'

(I. Ch. 23. P. 30. L. 5) The first *fi ʿl* 'action' in all this is used for meaning, not used for expression, and the other is used for meaning and expression. If you were to say *dʿarabtu wa dʿarabuwni ḡawmaka* 'I hit your kin and they hit me' you *nasʿabta* 'erected', except in the saying of one who says *ʿakaluwniy ʿal-barāyiy ʿu* 'The lice ate me up', or *taḥmiluhu* 'you relate it' to *badal* 'a substitute', and you replace the *mudʿmar* 'implied'. It is as if you were to say *dʿdarabtu wa dʿarabaniy nāsun banuw fulān* 'I hit and people of such-and-so hit me'. According to this definition you say *dʿarabtu wa dʿarabaniy ʿabdu ʿal-lāhi* 'I hit and 'Abdulah hit me.' *tudʿmiru* 'you imply' in *dʿarabaniy* 'he hit me' as you implied in *dʿarabuwniy* 'they hit me'. If you were to say *dʿarabaniy wa dʿarabtuhum ḡawmuka* 'He hit me and I hit your kin. *rafa ʿta* 'you raised' because you engaged the other so you implied in it. It is as though you said (I. Ch. 23. P. 30. L. 10) *dʿarabaniy ḡawmuka wa dʿarabtuhum* 'your kin hit me, and I hit them.' by *taḡdiym* 'prepositioning' and *taḥxiyr* 'post-positioning', unless you were to form a replacement here as you did for *rafa* 'raise'. If you were to do that,

¹⁵The meter for *tʿawiyl* is: faʿuwlun mafāʿiyilun faʿuwlun mafāʿiyilun (twice).

¹⁶The meter for *kāmil* is: mutafāʿilan (six times).

قال الشاعر وهو الفرزدق: (طويل)

ولكنّ نصفاً لو سببتُ وسبّيتي
 بنو عبد شمس من منافٍ وهاشم

(ص. ٣٠) وقال طفيل الغنوي: (طويل)

وكمتاً مدمماً كأنّ متوتها
 جرى فوقها واستشعرت لون مذهب

وقال رجلٌ من باهلة: (كامل)

ولقد أرى نعى به سيفانة
 نصابي الحليم ومثلها أصباه

(س. ٥) فالفعل الأول في كلّ هذا مُعمَلٌ في المعنى وغير مُعمَلٍ في اللفظ والآخر مُعمَلٌ في اللفظ والمعنى. فإن قلت ضربتُ وضربوني قومك نصبتُ إلّا في قول من قال أكلوني البراغيثُ أو تحمله على البدل فتجعله بدلاً من المضمّر كأنك قلت ضربتُ وضربني ناسٌ بنو فلان. وعلى هذا الحدّ تقول: ضربتُ وضربني عبدُ الله تُضمّرُ في ضربني كما أضمرتُ في ضربوني. وإن قلت ضربني وضربتهم قومك رفعتُ لأنك شغلتُ الآخر فأضمرتُ فيه كأنك قلت (س. ١٠) ضربني قومك وضربتهم على التقديم والتأخير إلّا أن تجعل ههنا البدل كما جعلته في الرفع. فإن فعلت ذلك

there would be no choice, but to use *d'arabuwniy* 'they hit me' because you imply the plural in it. Ibn ʿAbi Rabiya said: (tʿawiy) ¹⁷

ʾiḏa hiya lam tastak bi-ṣuwdi ʾarākatin
tunuxxila fa ʾistākat bihi ṣuwdu ʾiṣḥili
 'If she does not use 'Arakah' a wood
 The wood of Ishil is chosen for her to use'

because there was implication at the end of the utterance.
 Marrār ʿal-ʿAsadiyy said: (wāfir) ¹⁸ (I. Ch. 23. P. 30. L. 15)

faradda ʾala ʾal-fuʾadi hawan ʾamiydan
wa suw ʾila law yubiynu lanā ʾal-suʾālā
wa ʾad na ʾna bihā wa nara ʾusʾuwan
bihā ya ʾadnanā ʾal-xuruda ʾal-xidālā
 'The house replied to the heart
 As if it answered the question for us
 We lived in it for a long time and see us
 Chase the chaste and the plump ones'

ʿAbu ʿal-Xatʿāb told us on the authority of his poet. If you say *d'arabuwniy wa d'arabtuhum ʾawmaka* 'They hit me, and I hit them, your kin', you made *ʾawmaka* 'your kin' a *badal* 'substitute' for *-hum* 'them', because *fi ʾl* 'an action' must have *fāʾil* 'an actor', and the actor here is a *gamāʾah* 'plural', and the *d'amiyr* 'pronoun/IMPLIED' of the plural is *wāw* '-uw'. Similarly you say *d'arabuwni wa d'arabtu ʾawmaka* 'they hit me and I hit your kin', you employed the other. It is necessary that the first have *d'amiyr* 'pronoun/IMPLIED' for the actor, because (I. Ch. 23. P. 30. L. 20) an action is not without an actor. You say *d'arabtu wa d'arabani ʾawmaka* 'I hit and your kin hit me' you do not include in the first *hm* '[hum] them' because an action may be without *mafʾuwl* 'an acted-upon', but an action is not without an actor. As to the saying of ʿimriʿu ʿal-Gays (tʿawiy) ¹⁹

ʾalaw ʾanna mā ʾas ʾā li ʾadna ma ʾiṣṣatin
kafāni wa lam ʾatʾlub ʾaliylun mina ʾal-māli
 'If I were to seek after the least existence
 Little -I don't want riches- would be sufficient for me.'

¹⁷The meter for *tʿawiy* is: faṣuwlun mafāʾiyulun faṣuwlun mafāʾiyulun (twice).

¹⁸The meter for *wāfir* is: mufāʾalatun mufāʾalatun faṣuwlun.

¹⁹The meter for *tʿawiy* is: faṣuwlun mafāʾiyulun faṣuwlun mafāʾiyulun (twice).

لم يكن بدّ من ضربوني لأنك تُضمّر فيه
 الجمع. قال عمر بن أبي ربيعة: (طويل)

إذا هي لم تستك بعود أراكه
 نُخَلّ فاستأكت به عود إسحل

لأنه أضمّر في آخر الكلام. وقال المرّار الأسيدي:
 (وافر) (س. ١٥)

فردّ على الفؤاد هوى عميداً
 وسؤئل لو يبين لنا السؤالا
 وقد نغنى بها ونرى عصوراً
 بها يقنّدننا الخرد الخدالا

حدثنا به ابو الخطاب عن شاعره وإذا قلت
 ضربوني وضربتهم قومك جعلت قومك بدلاً
 من هم لأن الفعل لا بدّ له من فاعل والفاعل
 ههنا جماعة وضمير الجماعة الواو. وكذلك
 تقول ضربوني وضربت قومك إذا أعملت
 الآخر فلا بدّ في الأوّل من ضمير الفاعل
 لأنّ (س. ٢٠) الفعل لا يخلو من فاعل.
 فإنما قلت: ضربت وضربني قومك فلم
 تجعل في الأوّل الهاء والميم لأنّ الفعل قد
 يكون بغير مفعول ولا يكون الفعل بغير
 فاعل. واما قول امرئ القيس: (طويل)

قلو أنّ ما أسعى لأدنى معيشة
 كفاني ولم أطلب قليل من المال

(I. Ch. 23. P. 31. L. 1) *rafaṣa* 'he raised' because he did not make the *ḡaliyl* 'little' what is wanted, but what is wanted was riches and he made 'the little' sufficient. If he were not to want that and he *nasʿaba* 'erected', it would corrupt the meaning.

It is permissible *dʿarabtu wa dʿarabaniy zaydan* 'I hit Zaid and he hit me', because some of them say *mata raṭayta ṭaw ḡulta zaydan muntʿaliḡan* 'when did you see or say Zaid (is) leaving' but on the surface it is *mata raṭayta ṭaw ḡulta zaydun muntʿaliḡun* 'When did you see or say Zaid (is) leaving'. Similar to that is the option *dʿarabaniy wa dʿarabtu ḡawmuka* 'Your kin hit me and I hit (them)', the surface is for you to say *dʿarabuniy wa dʿarabtu ḡawmaka* 'They hit me and I hit your kin', (I. Ch. 23. P. 31. L. 5) so you relate to the other. If you were to say *dʿarabaniy wa dʿarabtu ḡawmaka* 'He/They hit me, and I hit your kin' is permissible, but it is *ḡabiyḥ* 'ugly/bad' to make the expressions *kalwāḥad* 'in the singular'. As you say *huwa ṭaḥsanu ṭal-fityāni wa ṭaḡmaluhu* 'He is the nicest of youths and handsomest'. *ṭakramu baniyhi wa ṭanbaluhu* 'He is the most generous of his sons and most noble'. That is necessary, because an action is not without a *marfuwṣ* 'raised' *mudʿmar* 'pronominal/implicit' or *muḍʿhar* 'explicit' for names. It is as though you said to exemplify it: *dʿarabaniy min ḡamma wa dʿarabtu ḡawmaka* 'Someone from there hit me and I hit your kin'. To leave that out is superior and better for the explanation that is to come after it, hence *man* 'someone' was implied in that. This is a *radīyʿ* 'bad' analogy and it includes in your saying *ṭasʿḥābuka ḡalasa* 'your comrades sat(ms)' you imply something that is (I. Ch. 23. P. 31. L. 10) singular in the expressed form. Their saying *huwa ṭadʿrafu ṭal-fityāni wa ṭaḡmaluhu* 'He is the most elegant of the youths and the handsomest one', can not be used as a pattern. Don't you see if you were to say, when you meant plural, *ḥāḍā ṭulāmu ṭal-ḡawmi wa sʿāḥibuhu* 'This is a son from the tribe and his friend' it is not good.

(ص. ٣١) فَإِنَّمَا رَفَعَ لِأَنَّهُ لَمْ يَجْعَلِ الْقَلِيلَ مَطْلُوبًا وَإِنَّمَا كَانَ الْمَطْلُوبُ عِنْدَهُ الْمَلِكُ وَجَعَلَ الْقَلِيلَ كَافِيًا وَلَوْ لَمْ يُرَدِّ ذَلِكَ وَنَصَبَ فَسَدَّ الْمَعْنَى.

وقد يجوز ضربتُ وضربني زيداً لأن بعضهم قد يقول: متى رأيتَ أو قلتَ زيداً منطلقاً والوجه متى رأيتَ أو قلتَ زيداً منطلقاً. ومثل ذلك في الجواز ضربتني وضربتُ قومك والوجه أن تقول: ضربوني وضربتُ قومك (س. ٥) فتحمله على الآخر. فإن قلت: ضربتني وضربتُ قومك فجائر وهو قبيحٌ أن تجعل اللفظ كالواحد كما تقول: هو أحسنُ الفتيان وأجمله وأكرمُ بنيهِ وأنبله. ولا بد من هذا لأنه لا يخلو الفعل من مضمرٍ أو مظهرٍ مرفوعٍ من الأسماء كأنك قلتَ إذا مثلته ضربتني من ثم وضربتُ قومك. وترك ذلك أجود وأحسنُ للفتيان الذي يجيء بعده فأضمر من لذلك. وهذا رديءٌ في القياس يدخل فيه أن يقول أصحابك جلسَ فئضمر شيئاً يكون في اللفظ (س. ١٠) واحداً. فقولهم: هو أظرفُ الفتيان وأجمله لا يقاس عليه ألا ترى أنك لو قلتَ وأنت تريد الجماعة: هذا غلامُ القوم وصاحبُهُ لم يحسن.

Chapter 24. This is a Chapter in which the *ḥism* 'name' is built on the *fi* *ḥ* 'action' whether *Guddima* 'pre-positioned' or *ḥuxxira* 'post-positioned', and in which the *fi* *ḥ* 'action' is built on the '*ḥism*' name.

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 41, Derenbourg vol.1. p.31, Haruwn vol.1. p. 80)

(I. Ch. 24. P. 31 L. 12) If you were to build the *ḥism* 'name' on it, you would say *d'arabtu zaydan* 'I hit Zaid'. That is the *ḥadd* 'definition' because you want to operate it and to relate the *ḥism* 'name' to it just as the *ḥadd* 'definition' in *d'araba zaydun samran* 'Zaid hit `Amr', where Zaid is the first with which (I. Ch. 24. P. 31 L. 15) you engage the *fi* *ḥ* 'action' in the same way if it were to work on it. If *Gaddamta* 'you preposition' the *ḥism* 'name', it is very good Arabic, just as that was good Arabic, and that is in your saying *zaydan d'arabtu* 'Zaid, I hit'. Here, the attention and care with *taḥdiym* 'prepositioning' and *taḥiyr* 'postpositioning' is equal to its like in *d'araba zaydun samran* 'Zaid hit `Amr', and *d'araba samran zaydun* 'Amr (is the one) Zaid hit'. If you built the action on the name you say *zaydun d'arabtuḥu* 'Zaid, I hit him', you accompanied it with an obligatory *ḥā?* '[hu] him'. You intend by your statement *mabniyyun salayhi ḥal-fi* 'the action is built on it', that it is in the position of *munt'aliḡ* 'leaving' in your saying *ṣabdu ḥal-lāhi mut'aliqun* 'Abdullah (is) leaving'. It is in the place of this, which was built on the first and raised by it. You said *ṣabdu* (I. Ch. 24. P. 31 L. 20) *ḥal-lāhi* 'Abdullah', by drawing attention to it, then you built the action on it, and *rafaṣṭahu* 'you raised it' for being initial. An example of that is the saying of the Most Powerful and Most Exalted God *wa ḥammā ṥamuwdu fa-hadaynāḥum* 'and as for Thamoud, we have guided them'. [Sūrah XLI:17]. It is good that the action be built on the name where it is supplied with the *mud'amar* 'pronominal/implicit' and engaged with it, without which it would not be good, because you do not engage it with anything. If you so wish you say *zaydan d'arabtuḥu* 'Zaid, I hit him', its *nas'b* 'erection' (I. Ch. 24. P. 32. L. 1) depends on the *ḥid'māri* 'implication' of an action. This is its explanation. It is as though you said *d'arabtu zaydan d'arabtuḥu* 'I hit Zaid, I hit him', except that they do not make explicit this action, being satisfied with its explanation. The *ḥism* 'name' here is built on this implied one. The case of leaving out the explicitness of the action here is like leaving out the explicitness in the place where implication is pre-positioned, as you shall see, God willing.

(٢٤) هذا باب ما يكون فيه الاسم مبنياً
فَدَمَّ أو أَخْرَجَ على الفعل

وما يكون فيه الفعل مبنياً على الاسم فإذا بنيت الاسم عليه قلت: ضربت زيدا وهو الحدُّ لأتلك تريد أن تُعْمَلَهُ وتَحْمَلَ عليه الاسم كما كان الحدُّ ضَرْبَ زيدٍ عمراً حيث كان زيدٌ أوَّلَ ما تَشْغَلُ به (س. ١٥) الفعل. وكذلك هذا إذا كان يَعْمَلُ فيه. وإن قَدِمَتِ الاسمَ فهو عربيٌّ جيّدٌ كما كان ذلك عربيّاً جيّداً وذلك قولك: زيدا ضربتُ والاهتمامُ والعنايةُ هنا في التقديم والتأخير سواءً مثله في ضَرْبَ زيدٍ عمراً وضَرْبَ عمراً زيدا. وإذا بنيت الفعلَ على الاسم قلت: زيدٌ ضربته فلزمته الهاء. وإنما تريد بقولك مبنياً على الفعل أته في موضع منطلق إذا قلت: عبدُ الله منطلقٌ فهو في موضع هذا الذي بُنِيَ على الأوَّلِ وارتفع به فإنما قلت عبدَ (س. ٢٠) الله فنبتته ثم بنيت عليه الفعلَ ورفعته بالابتداء. ومثُلُ ذلك قوله عزَّ وجلَّ وأما تَمُودُ فَهَدَيْتَاهُمْ وإنما حَسُنَ أن يُبْنَى الفعلُ على الاسم حيث كان مُعْمَلًا في المُضْمَرِ وشغَلتَهُ به ولولا ذلك لم يحسنُ لأتلك لم تَشْغَلْه بشيء. وإن شئتَ قلت: زيدا ضربته وإنما نصبتُه (ص. ٣٢) على إضمار فعلٍ هذا تفسيره كأنك قلت ضربتُ زيدا ضربته إنا أنهم لا يُظهرون هذا الفعلَ هنا استغناءً بتفسيره. فالاسمُ ها هنا مبنياً على هذا المُضْمَرِ. ومثُلُ تركِ إظهار الفعلِ ها هنا تركُ الإظهار في الموضع الذي يُقَدَّمُ فيه الإضمارُ وستراه إن شاء الله.

Some of them have recited *wa ḡammā ṡamuwda fa-hadaynāhum* 'As for Thamoud, we have guided them' [Sura XLI:17]. They chanted this verse in two versions, in *nas^fb* 'erect' and *raf^f* 'raise'. (I. Ch. 24. P. 32. L. 5) Buṣr ibnu ḡabiy ḡāzim said: (mutaḡārib)²⁰

fa ḡamma tamiymun tamiymu bnu murrin
fa-ḡalfāhumu ḡal-ḡawmu rawba niyāmā
'As for Tamiym, It is Tamiym Bin Murr
People are accustomed to them being in stupor or asleep'

like the saying of ḡiy ḡal-Rummah (t^fawiyl)²¹

ḡidā ḡibnu ḡabiy muwsa bilālun bala ḡtihi
faḡāma bifa ḡsin bayna wis^flayki ḡāziru
'If you arrive at Ibn Abi Musa Bilal, O my camel
May he take his ax to split you limbs'

nas^fb 'erect' is frequent in Arabic, but *raf^f* 'raise' is better, because if he wanted to make it operative, then the closer to that is in saying *d^farabtu* (I. Ch. 24. P. 32. L. 10) *zaydan* 'I hit Zaid' and *zaydan d^farabtu* 'Zaid, I hit' where the action does not operate on the *mud^fmar* 'implied' nor does it get involved in this involvement at a distance. All this is part of their speech. And exemplification of that is *zaydan ḡuṡ^fiytu* 'Zaid, I was given' *ḡuṡ^fiytu zaydan* 'I was given Zaid', and *zaydun ḡuṡ^fiytuhu* 'Zaid, I was given him'. Because *ḡuṡ^fiytu* 'I was given' is in the status of *d^furibtu* 'I was hit', and the *maṡ^fuwl* 'acted-upon' that has the status of *fāḡil* 'actor' has been shown in the beginning of the book. If you say *zaydun marartu bihi* 'Zaid, I passed by him' it is even farther than *nas^fb* 'erect' because the *mud^fmir* 'implied' has left the action and the action has been added to it with a *bā^f* '[bi-] by', and the action does not reach it in the *lafḡ^f* 'pronunciation'. It has become as in your saying *zaydun laḡiytu ḡaxāhu* 'Zaid, I met his brother'. (I. Ch. 24. P. 32. L. 15) If you so wish you say *zaydan marartu bihi* 'Zaid, I passed by him' wishing to explain what *mud^fmaran* 'is implied' as though you said, if you were to exemplify, *ḡaḡaltu zaydan ḡala t^fariyḡiy marartu bihi* 'that by placing Zaid along my path, I pass by him'. However, this first one is not explicit as I mentioned to you. If you say *zaydun laḡiytu ḡaxāhu* 'Zaid, I met his brother', it is just like that.

²⁰The meter for mutaḡārib is: faḡuwlum faḡuwlun faḡuwlun faḡuwl (twice).

²¹The meter for t^fawiyl is: faḡuwlun maḡāḡilun (four times).

وقد قرأ بعضهم: وأما ثمود فهديناهم .
وأنشدوا هذا البيت على وجهين على النصب
والرفع قال (س. ٥) بشر بن أبي خازم:
(مقارب)

فأما تميم تميم بن مر
فألقاهم القوم روي نياما

ومثله قول ذي الرمة: (طويل)

إذا ابن أبي موسى بلال بلغته
فقام بفأس بين وصلتك جازر

والنصب عربي كثير والرفع أجود لأنه إذا
أراد الإعمال فأقرب إلى ذلك أن يقول:
ضربت (س. ١٠) زيدا وزيدا ضربت ولا
يعمل الفعل في مضمراً ولا يتناول به هذا
المتناول البعيد. وكل هذا من كلامهم. ومثل
ذلك زيدا أعطيت وأعطيت زيدا وزيدا
أعطيته لأن أعطيت بمنزلة ضربت. وقد
بين المفعول الذي هو بمنزلة الفاعل في أول
الكتاب. فإن قلت: زيد مررت به فهو من
النصب أبعد من ذلك لأن المضمراً قد خرج
من الفعل وأضيف الفعل إليه بالباء ولم
يوصل إليه الفعل في اللفظ فصار كقولك:
زيد لقيت أخاه. وإن (س. ١٥) شئت قلت
زيداً مررت به تريد أن تُفسر به مضمراً
كأنك قلت إذا مثلت ذلك: جعلت زيدا على
طريقي مررت به ولكنه لا يظهر هذا الأول
لما ذكرت لك. وإذا قلت: زيد لقيت أخاه فهو
كذلك

If you wish *nas'abta* 'you erected', because if it were to occur due to something caused by it, it is as though it occurred because of it. The proof for that is that a man says *ḥahanta zaydan bi ḥhānatika ḥaxāhu* 'You offended Zaid by you offending his brother', and *ḥakramtahu bi ḥkrāmika ḥaxāhu* 'You honored him by you honoring his brother'. This style is frequent in their speech. A person says *ḥinnama ḥa ḥ'aytu zaydan* 'I have indeed presented Zaid', he means *limakāni zaydin ḥa ḥ'aytu* (I. Ch. 24. P. 32. L. 20) *fulānan* 'At Zaid's place I was presented someone'. If you erect *zaydan la ḥiytu ḥaxāhu* 'Zaid, I met his brother'; this is like saying *lābastu zaydan la ḥiytu ḥaxāhu* 'I confused/socialized with Zaid, I met his brother'. This is an exemplification; it is not used in speech. This followed that which followed your statement *ḥakramtu zaydan* 'I honored Zaid', but the effect reached to other than it. *raff* 'raise' is better and superior because closer to that is to say *marartu bi-zaydin wa la ḥiytu ḥaxā samrin* 'I passed by Zaid, and I met the brother of Amr'. An example of this building on the action, and building action on it is *ḥayyuhum* 'any of them', and that in their saying *ḥayyahum tara ya ḥtiyka* (I. Ch. 24. P. 33. L. 1) 'Do you see any one of them will visit you' and *ḥayyuhum tarahu ya ḥtiyka* 'who one of them, you see him, will visit you'. Erect is based on what I mentioned to you, because it is as saying *ḥayyahum tara tarahu ya ḥtika* 'whoever of them you see, you see him coming to visit you'. It is just like 'Zaid' in this chapter, and it differs from it in many things that shall be explained, God willing.

وإن شئت نصبتَ لأته إذا وقع على شيء من سببه فكأنه قد وقع به. والدليلُ على ذلك أن الرجلَ يقولُ أهنتُ زيداً بإهانتك أخاه وأكرمتُه بإكرامك أخاه. وهذا النحو في كلامهم كثيرٌ يقولُ الرجلُ إنما أعطيتُ زيداً وإنما يريدُ لمكان زيدٍ أعطيتُ (س. ٢٠) فلاناً. وإذا نصبتَ زيداً لقيتُ أخاه فكأنه قال: لابسْتُ زيداً لقيتُ أخاه. وهذا تمثيلٌ ولا يُتَّكلم به فجرى هذا على ما جرى عليه قولك أكرمتُ زيداً وإنما وصلتِ الأثرُ إلى غيره. والرفعُ في هذا أحسنُ وأجود لأنَّ أقربَ إلى ذلك أن تقول: مررتُ بزيدٍ ولقيتُ أخاه عمرو. ومثلُ هذا في البناء على الفعل وبناء الفعل عليه أيهم وذلك قولهم: أيهم ترَ يأتك (ص. ٣٣) وأيهم تره يأتك. والنصبُ على ما ذكرتُ لك لأنه كأنه قال: أيهم ترَ تره يأتك فهو مثلُ زيدٍ في هذا الباب. وقد يفارقه في أشياء كثيرةٍ سنبيِّنُ إن شاء الله.

Chapter 25. This is a Chapter on what flows of what is *d'arfan*

'an envelope of time/place' in this Channel

(Bulaq vol. 1. P. 41, Derenbourg vol.1. p.31, Haruwn vol.1. p. 80)

(I. Ch. 25. P. 33. L. 3) And that is in your saying *yawmu ḡal-gumṣati ḡalḡāka fiyhi* 'Friday, on which I shall meet you', *ḡaḡallu yawmin lā ḡalḡāka fiyhi* 'it is less than a day, on which I have not met you', *ḡaḡallu yawmin lā ḡas'uwmuw fiyhi* 'it is a lost day, on which I have not fasted', *xat'iyyatū yawmin lā ḡas'iydu fiyhi* 'it is the sin of a day, on which I have not hunted', *makānukum ḡumtu* (I. Ch. 25. P. 33. L. 5) *fiyhi* 'Your place, I lived in it'. These *ḡaḡruf*'words' *turtafaḡu* 'are raised' for being *ḡbtidā?*'initial', like the raising of *ṣabdu ṣal-lāhi* 'Abdulah', and what followed it is built on it, like the building of *fiḡl* 'an action' on the first *ḡism* 'name'. It is like your saying *yawmu ḡal-gumṣati mubārakun* 'Friday (is) blessed', and *makānukum ḡasanun* 'Your place (is) good'. The *fiḡl* 'action' came in place of this. However, this became like this other one, when *ḡid'mār* 'implication' of *yawm* 'day' and *makān* 'place' occurred in the other. It departed from being *d'arf* 'envelope of time/place', just as it departs if you say *yawmu ḡal-gumṣati mubārakun* 'Friday (is) blessed'. If you say *yawmu ḡal-gumṣati s'umtuhu* 'Friday, I fasted it', then *s'umtuhu* 'I fasted it' is in place of *mubārakun* 'blessed' where the *mud'mar* 'implied' is the first, just as the *mubārakun* 'blessed' is the first. The *nas'b* 'erect' is introduced (I. Ch. 25. P. 33. L. 10) just as it is introduced to the first name. In that, it is also permitted *yawma ḡal-gumṣati ḡātiyka fiyhi wa ḡas'uwmu fiyhi* 'Friday, on which I am visiting you and in which I am fasting'. Just as it is permitted in your saying *ṣabda ḡal-lāhi marartu bihi* 'Abdalah, I passed by him'. It is like he said *ḡalḡāka yawma ḡal-gumṣati* 'I will meet you friday'. He erected it because it is *d'arf* 'an envelope of time'. Then he explained and said *ḡalḡāka fiyhi* 'I will meet you on it.' If he so wished he could have *nasabahu* 'erected it' on the action itself, just as the action that does not cross over to an acted-upon *ḡaḡmala* 'operates' on it. All that is good Arabic. He erected it because it is an envelope of time/place for an action he implied. It is as though he said *yawma ḡal-gumṣati ḡalḡāka* 'On friday, I will meet you'. The 'erect' in *yawma ḡal-gumṣati s'umtuhu wa yawma ḡal-gumṣati sirtuhu* 'Friday, I fasted it, and friday, I walked it' are like your saying *ṣabdu ḡal-lāhi d'arabtuhu* 'Abdallah, I hit him',

(٢٥) هذا باب ما يجري مما يكون ظرفاً هذا المجرى

وذلك قولك يوم الجمعة ألقاك فيه وأقل يوم لا ألقاك فيه وأقل يوم لا أصوم فيه وخطيئة يوم لا أصيد فيه ومكانكم قمت (س. ٥) فيه. فصارت هذه الأحرف ترتفع بالابتداء كارتفاع عبد الله وصار ما بعدها مبنياً عليها كبناء الفعل على الاسم الأول فكأنك قلت: يوم الجمعة مبارك ومكانكم حسن وصار الفعل في موضع هذا. وإنما صار هذا كهذا حين صار في الآخر إضمار اليوم والمكان فخرج من أن يكون ظرفاً كما يخرج إذا قلت: يوم الجمعة مبارك فإذا قلت: يوم الجمعة صمته فصمته في موضع مبارك حيث كان المضممر هو الأول كما كان المبارك هو الأول. ويدخل النصب فيه (س. ١٠) كما دخل في الاسم الأول ويجوز في ذلك يوم الجمعة أتيتك فيه وأصوم فيه كما جاز في قولك: عبد الله مررت به كأنه قال: ألقاك يوم الجمعة فنصبه لأنه ظرف ثم فسّر فقال ألقاك فيه. وإن شاء نصبه على الفعل نفسه كما عمل فيه الفعل الذي لا يتعدى إلى مفعول كل ذلك عربي جيد. أو نصبه لأنه ظرف لفعل أضمره وكأنه قال: يوم الجمعة ألقاك. والنصب في: يوم الجمعة صمته ويوم الجمعة سيرته مثله في قولك: عبد الله ضربته

except if he so wished (**I. Ch. 25. P. 33. L. 15**) he could have erected it because it is an envelope of time, and if he so wished he could have made the action operate on it as he made it operate on Abdallah, since it can be an envelope of time/place and other than an envelope of time/place. In speech, it is not good to built the action on the name without mentioning the mark of implication of the first until you depart from the *lafḍ*^f 'expression' of the operation of the first, and from the status of building the name on it, and engage it with other than the first until it is prohibited from operating on it. It may, however, be permissible in poetry, but it is weak in speech. The poet ʿabuw ʿal-Nagm ʿal-ṣigliyy said: (Rajaz)²² (**I. Ch. 25. P. 33. L. 20**)

ʿad ʿasʿbaḥat ʿummu ʿal-xiyāri tadda ṣiy
ṣalayya ḍanban kulluhu lam ʿasʿna ṣi
 ʿummu ʿal-Xiyār started accusing me
 Of crimes, all of which I did not commit'

This is weak and it has the same status as in non-poetry, because *nasʿb* 'erect' does not *yaksiru* 'break' the meter of the verse, nor does omission of the expression *hā?* '[hu] it' vetiate it. It is as though he said *kulluhu ʿayru masʿnuw ṣin* 'all of it was not committed'. ʿimruʿu ʿal-Gays said: (mutaḡārib)²³

faʿaḡbaltu zaḥfan ṣala ʿal-rukbatayni
faḡawbun ṣalayya wa ḡawbun ʿagurr
 'I approached crawling on my two knees
 A garment on me and a garment I drag'

(**I. Ch. 25. P. 34. L. 1**) ʿal-Namir bin Tawlab said, and we heard Arabs singing it: (Mutaḡārib)²⁴

fa yawmun ṣalaynā wa yawmun lanā
wa yawmun nusāʿu wa yawmun nusar
 'A day against us and a day for us
 We are hurt one day, gladdened on another'

They mean *nusāʿu fiyhi wa nusarru fiyhi* 'We are hurt in it and we are gladdened on it'. They claim that some Arabs say *ṣahrūn ḡara wa ṣahrūn tarā wa ṣahrūn marṣā* 'a month (of) abundance, a month (of) observation, a month (of) grazing', he means by it *tarā fiyhi* 'on which you see'

إلا أنه إن شاء (س. ١٥) نصبه بأته ظرفاً
 وإن شاء أعمل فيه الفعل كما أعمله في عبد
 الله لأنه يكون ظرفاً وغير ظرف. ولا
 يحسن في الكلام أن تجعل الفعل مبنياً على
 الاسم ولا تذكر علامة إضمار الأول حتى
 تخرج من لفظ الأعمال في الأول ومن حال
 بناء الاسم عليه وتثقله بغير الأول حتى
 يمتنع من أن يكون يعمل فيه ولكنه قد يجوز
 في الشعر وهو ضعيف في الكلام. قال
 الشاعر وهو أبو النجم العجلي: (رجز)
 (س. ٢٠)

قد أصبحت أم الخيار تدعي
 علي ذنباً كله لم أصنع

فهذا ضعيف وهو بمنزلته في غير الشعر
 لأنّ النصب لا يكسر البيت ولا يخل به ترك
 إظهار الهاء. وكأنه قال: كله غير مصنوع.
 وقال امرؤ القيس: (مقارب)

فأقبلت زحفاً على الركبَيْنِ
 فتوبت عليّ وثوب أجر

(ص. ٣٤) وقال النمر بن توبل وسمعناه
 من العرب يُنشِدونه: (مقارب)

فَيَوْمٌ عَلَيْنَا وَيَوْمٌ لَنَا وَيَوْمٌ نُسَاءُ وَيَوْمٌ نُسَرُ

يريدون: نساء فيه ونسر فيه. وزعموا أن
 بعض العرب يقول: شهر ثرى وشهر ثرى
 وشهر مرعى. يريد: ثرى فيه.

²²The meter for ragaz is: mustafīlun (six times)

²³The meter for mutaḡārib is faʿuwlun faʿulun faʿuwlun faʿuwl (twice).

²⁴The meter for mutaḡārib is faʿuwlun faʿulun faʿuwlun faʿuwl (twice).

and he said: (Wāfir)²⁵ (I. Ch. 25. P. 34. L. 5)

ḥalāṭhun kulluhunna ʿataltu samdan
fa ʿaxza ʿal-lāhu rābi Satan ta suwdu
 'All three I killed intentionally
 May God disgrace me with the return of the fourth'

This is weak. The more common and known form is the *nasʿb* 'erect'. They, however, have likened it to *ʿal-laḍiy raʿaytu fulānun* 'The one I saw (was) so-and-so.' where they do not mention the *hāʿ* '[hu] him'. It is because of this that it is better, because *raʿaytu* 'I saw' is the *tamām* 'complement' of the name and by it *yatimmu* 'it is complete'. It is neither a *xabar* 'predicate' nor a *sʿifah* 'descriptive/adjective'. They disliked its length where it is in place of one name, just as they disliked the length of *ʿišhiybāb* 'gray-and-whiteness', and they said *ʿišhibāb*. Omission of the *hāʿ* [h] is better in the descriptives/adjectives than in the predicates and based on this, it is weak and does not have the goodness of the one with *hāʿ* '[hu] it', (I. Ch. 25. P. 34. L. 10) because it is in place of what is *mina ʿal-ʿism* 'from the name/nominal', and what follows its path, nor is there detached from it a predicate that is built on it nor is it *mubtadaʿ* 'an initial'. Hence it resembled what complements the name even though it is not its complement or of it in structure. An example of that is your saying *hāḍā ragulun dʿarabtuhu* 'This (is) a man, I hit him', and *ʿal-nāsu ragulān, ragulun ʿakramtuhu wa ragulun ʿahantuhu* 'People (are) of two kinds, (one) man, I honored him, (another) man, I dishonored him'. It is as though he said *hāḍā ragulun madʿruwbun* 'this (is) a stricken man', and *hāḍā ragulun mukramun* 'This (is) an honored man' and *hāḍā ragulun muhānun* 'This (is) a dishonored man'. If you deleted the *hāʿ* '[hu] him', is permissible and is stronger than what would be in a predicate. What occurred in poetry like that is the saying of gariyr: (wāfir)²⁶ (I. Ch. 25. P. 34. L. 15)

ʿabaḥtu ḥimā tihāmata ba sda nagdin
wa mā šay ʿun ḥamayta bimustabāhi
 'You proclaim the protection of Tihama after Najd
 Nothing is fair game that you protect.'

He intends *hāʿ* '[hu] it'.

وقال: (وافر) (س. ٥)

ثلاث كلهن قتلت عمداً
 فأخزى الله رابعة تعود

فهذا ضعيفٌ والوجهُ الأكثرُ الأعرَفُ
 النصبُ وإنما شَبَّهوه بقولهم الذي رأيتُ فلانٌ
 حين لم يذكروا الهاء. وهو في هذا أحسن
 لأن رأيتُ تمامَ الاسمِ وبه يَتِمُّ وليس بخبرٍ
 ولا صفةٍ فكَرِهوا طولَه حيث كان بمنزلةِ
 اسمٍ واحدٍ كما كرهوا طولَ إِنْهِيَابٍ فقالوا:
 إِنْهِيَابٍ. وهو في الوصفِ أمثلٌ منه في
 الخبرِ وهو على ذلك ضعيفٌ ليس كحَسَنِه
 بالهاء (س. ١٠) لأنه في موضع ما هو من
 الاسمِ وما يَجْرِي عليه وليس بمنقطعٍ منه
 خبراً مَبْنِيّاً عليه ولا مبتدأً فَضارِعَ ما يكون
 من تمامِ الاسمِ وإن لم يكن تماماً له ولا منه
 في البناء. وذلك قولك: هذا رجلٌ ضربتهُ
 والناسُ رجلان: رجلٌ أكرمتهُ ورجلٌ أهنتهُ
 كأنه قال: هذا رجلٌ مضروبٌ وهذا رجلٌ
 مُكْرَمٌ ورجلٌ مُهان. فإن حذفْتَ الهاءَ جاز
 وكان أقوى ممَّا يكون خبراً. ومما جاء في
 الشعر من ذلك قولُ جرير: (وافر) (س ١٥)

أبَحْتُ حِمَى تِهَامَةَ بَعْدَ نَجْدٍ
 وما شيءٌ حَمِيَّتْ بِمُسْتَبَاحِ

يريد الهاء.

²⁵Meter for wāfir is: mufāʿalatun mufāʿalatun aʿuwulun (twice).

²⁶Meter for wāfir is: mufāʿalatun mufāʿalatun aʿuwulun (twice).

And the poet ʔal-hāriḡ bin Kaladah said: (wāfir)²⁷

famā ʔadriy ʔa ʔayyarahum tanāʔin

wa tʔuwlu ʔal-ʔahdi ʔam mālun ʔasʔābuw

'I do not know, has long distance

Or long time changed them or have they hit it rich'

He wants *ʔasʔābuwhu* 'they have come upon it' and there is no chance for *nasʔb* 'erect' even if you leave in the *hāʔ*?[hu] it' because it is *wasʔf* 'a description', just as there is 'erect' in what you complement the name with meaning the *sʔilah* 'the connector/link'. Accordingly it was stronger than in what occurs in place of what is built on the *mubtadaʔ* 'initial' because it can not be 'erected' by it. They are prevented from 'erecting' a name with the action if it were *sʔifah* 'a descriptive' for it. The descriptive is a complement of the name. Don't you see, if in your saying *marartu bizaydin ʔal-ʔahmar* 'I passed by Zaid, the red' is like your saying *marartu bizaydin* 'I passed by Zaid'. This is so, if you needed to *tanʔut* 'qualify', and you said *marartu bizaydin* 'I passed by Zaid' and you intend *ʔal-ʔahmar* 'the red', and he is not known until you say 'the red' then the name will not be complete. It flows *manʔuwtan* 'qualified' in the path of *marartu bizaydin* 'I passed by Zaid', if it is known by itself, and 'the red' became as though it were its *sʔilah* 'connector/link'.

وقال الشاعر الحارث بن كَلَدَةَ: (وَأَفِر)

فَمَا أَدْرِي أُغَيِّرَهُمْ تَنَاءً

وَطَوَّلُ الْعَهْدِ أَمْ مَالٌ أَصَابُوا

يريد: أصابوه ولا سبيلَ إلى النصب وإن تركت الهاء لأنه وصفٌ كما لم يكن النصبُ فيما أتممت به الاسمَ يعني الصلة.

فمن ثمَّ كان أقوى مما يكون في موضع المبني على المبتدأ (س. ٢٠) لأنه لا يُنصبُ به. وإثما منعهم أن يُنصبُوا بالفعل الاسمَ إذا كان صفةً له أن الصفة تمامُ الاسمِ ألا ترى أن قولك مررتُ بزيدٍ الأحمر كقولك مررتُ بزيدٍ وذلك أنك لو احتجتَ إلى أن تتعتَ فقلت: مررتُ بزيدٍ وأنت تريد الأحمر وهو لا يُعرفُ حتى تقول الأحمر لم (ص. ٣٥) يكن ثمَّ الاسمُ فهو يجري منعوتاً مجرى مررتُ بزيدٍ إذا كان يُعرفُ وحدَه فصار الأحمرُ كأنه من صلته.

²⁷Meter for wāfir is: mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun aʔuwlun (twice)