

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

Solomon Sara, S.J.
Georgetown University

Chapter 31. This is a chapter on the *ḡafṣāl* 'actions' that *tusta ṣmalu* 'are used' and *tul ḡā* 'cancelled'

(Buwālāq vol.1. p. 61, Derenbourg vol.1. p.49, Haruwn vol.1. p. 118)

(I. P. 49. L.4) They are *ḡanantu* 'I supposed', *ḡasibtu* 'I figured', *xiltu* 'I imagined', *ḡuriyту* 'I was shown' *raḡaytu* 'I saw' (L. 5) and *zaḡamtu* 'I presumed/claimed' and whatever is derived from *ḡafṣālihinna* 'their actions'. When they are used/employed, then they have the status of *raḡaytu* 'I saw', *d'arabtu* 'I struck' and *ḡaḡaytu* 'I offered' in operations and *bināḡ* 'construction' with the first, with the *xabar* 'predicate', with the *ḡistifhām* 'interrogation' and everything, and that in your saying *ḡaḡḡunnu zaydan munt'aliḡan* 'I suppose that Zaid is leaving.' *ḡaḡḡunnu ṣamran ḡāhiban* 'I suppose that Amr is going', *zaydan ḡaḡḡunnu ḡabāka* 'Zaid I suppose to be your father', and *ṣamran zaḡamtu ḡaxāka* 'Amr I presumed to be your brother'. You say *zaidun ḡaḡḡunnuhu ḡāhiban* 'Zaid, I suppose him to be leaving'. Whoever said *ṣabda ḡal-lāhi d'arabtuḡu* 'Abdulah, I hit him. He erected and said *ṣabda ḡal-lāhi ḡaḡḡunnuhu ḡāhiban* 'Abdulah, I suppose him to be leaving'. You say *ḡaḡḡunnu ṣamran munt'aliḡan wa bakran ḡaḡḡunnuhu xāriḡan* 'I suppose Amr is leaving and Bakr I consider him to be going out/outside', just as you said *d'arabtu zaydan wa bakran kallamtuḡu* 'I hit Zaid and Bakr I talked to'. If you so wished, you could raise on account of raise in this. If you were to cancel (L. 10) you said *ṣabdu ḡal-lāhi ḡaḡḡunnu ḡāhibun* 'Abdulah, I suppose him to be leaving', *ḡāḡā ḡixālu ḡaxuwka* 'This is imagining your brother'. *ḡiyḡā ḡurā ḡabuwka* 'in it, I was shown your father'. Whenever you wanted cancellation then post-positioning is stronger and all this is good Arabic. The poet said, he is *ḡal-laḡiyu*: (*basiyḡ*)²

هذا كتاب سيبويه المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٣١) هذا باب الأفعال التي تُستعمل وتُلغى

(م. ١. ص. ٤٩. س. ٤) فهي ظننت
وحسبت وخلصت وأريت ورأيت (س. ٥)
وزعمت وما يتصرف من أفعالهن. فإذا
جاءت مستعملة فهي بمنزلة رأيت وضربت
وأعطيت في الإعمال والبناء على الأول في
الخبر والاستفهام وفي كل شيء وذلك قولك
أظن زيدا منطلقاً وأظن عمراً ذاهباً وزيداً
أظن أباك وعمراً زعمت أخاك وتقول زيداً
أظنه ذاهباً. ومن قال عبد الله ضربته نصب
فقال عبد الله أظنه ذاهباً وتقول أظن عمراً
منطلقاً وبكراً أظنه خارجاً كما قلت وضربت
زيداً وعمراً كلمته وإن شئت رفعت على
الرفع في هذا فإن الغيت (س. ١٠) قلت عبد
الله أظن ذاهباً وهذا إخال أخوك وفيها أرى
أبوك. وكلما أردت الإلغاء فالتأخير أقوى
وكل عربي جيد. وقال الشاعر وهو اللعين:
(بسيط)

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

²The meter for *basiyḡ* is: *mustafīlun fāḡilun mustafīlun faḡilun* (two time).

*ʔabā ʔal-ʔarāgiyzi yābna ʔal-lawmi tuw ʔiduni
wa-ʔiy ʔal-ʔarāgiyzi xiltu ʔal-lawmu wa ʔal-xawaru*

‘Father of poems, you child of blame, you promise me
In the poems I imagined the blame and the weakness’

Yuwnis recited it for us raised according to them. Post-positioning is stronger because it comes with *ʔakk* ‘doubt’ after he passes his speech beyond *yaʔiyn* ‘certitude’ or after he begins and he wants certitude, then *ʔakk* ‘doubt’ besets him. As (L. 15) you say *ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi sāhibu ʔāka bala ʔaniy* ‘Abdulah, the owner of that reached me’. Just as he said *man yaʔuwlu ʔāka tadriy* ‘whoever says that, you know.’ He post-positioned what does affect the beginning of his speech, rather he made that, from what reached him, after his speech had passed *yaʔiyn* ‘certitude’ and what *yadriy* ‘he knows’. If he were to begin his speech with what is in his intention of *ʔakk* ‘doubt’, he engaged the *ʔiʔ* ‘action’ whether he pre-positioned or post-positioned, just as he said *zaydan ra ʔaytu* ‘Zaid I saw’ and *ra ʔaytu zaydan* ‘I saw Zaid’. Whenever speech is extended, the post-positioning is weakened if you got it engaged. And that in your saying *zaydan ʔaxāka ʔaʔʔunnu* ‘Zaid is your brother I suppose’. This is weak just as *zaydan ʔāʔman dʔarabtu* ‘Zaid is standing, I hit’ weakens. By definition, the *ʔiʔ* ‘action’ is first if it is engaged. Of what occurred in poetry engaged with *za ʔamtu* ‘I presumed’ is the saying of the poet who is *ʔabuw ʔuʔayb*: (*tʔawiyl*)³

*Fa ʔin taz ʔumiyniy kuntu ʔaghalu ʔiykum
Fa ʔin ʔaraytu ʔal-ʔilma ba ʔdaki bi-ʔal-gahli*

‘If you were to presume that I was ignorant about you
If I have bought the dream of you with ignorance’

(P. 50) *ʔal-nābiyah ʔal-ʔaʔdiy said: (tʔawiyl)*⁴

*ʔadadta ʔuʔayran ʔiʔ faxarta fa-lam ʔusāʔ
Bi-ʔāka wa-lam ʔaz ʔamka ʔan ʔāka ma ʔzilā*

‘You counted one from *ʔuʔayr* as I honor without harm
With that nor do I presume you apart from that’

You say *ʔayna turā ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔāʔman* ‘where are you shown Abdulah to be staying?’ and *hal turā zaydan ʔāhiban* ‘are you shown Zaid to be going?’ Because *hal* ‘question marker’ and *ʔayna* ‘where’ are as though

³The meter for *tawiyl* is: *fa ʔuwluṅ mafāʔilun* (four times).

⁴The meter for *tʔawiyl* is: *fa ʔuwluṅ mafāʔilun* (four times).

أبالأراجيز يابن اللوم ثوعدني
وفي الأراجيز خلئت اللوم والخور

أنشدناه يونس مرفوعاً عنهم وإنما كان
التأخير أقوى لأنه إنما يجيء بالشك بعدما
يمضي كلامه على اليقين أو بعدما بتبدئ
وهو يريد اليقين ثم يدرّكه الشك كما
(س. ١٥) تقول عبد الله صاحب ذاك بلغني
وكما قال من يقول ذاك تدري فأخر ما لم
يعمل في أول كلامه وإنما جعل ذلك فيما
بلغه بعدما مضى كلامه على اليقين وفيما
يدري. فإذا ابتداء كلامه على ما في نيته من
الشك أعمل الفعل قدّم أو أخر كما قال زيدا
رأيت ورأيت زيدا وكلما طال الكلام ضعف
التأخير إذا عملت وذلك قولك زيدا أخاك
أظن فهذا ضعيف كما يضعف زيدا قائما
ضربت لأن الحد أن يكون الفعل مبتدأ إذا
أعمل. ومما جاء (س. ٢٠) في الشعر
معماً في زعمت قول أبي ذؤيب: (طويل)

فإن تزعميني كنت أجهل فيكم
فإني شربت الحلم بعدك بالجهل

(ص. ٥٠) وقال النابغة الجعدي: (طويل)

عددت فشيئراً إذ فخرت فلم أسأ
بذاك ولم أزعمك عن ذلك معزلاً

وتقول أين ثرى عبد الله قائماً وهل ثرى
زيداً ذاهباً لأن هل وأين كأنك

you did not mention them because what follows them is a *ḥibtidāʿ*? ‘beginning’. It is as though you said *ḥa-turā zaydan ḍāhiban* ‘Where you shown Zaid to be going?’ and *ḥa-taḍʿunnu samran muntaliḡan* ‘Do you suppose Amr is leaving?’. If you were to say *ḥayna* ‘where’ and you wanted (L. 5) to give it the status of *fiyhā* ‘in it’. If the *ḥibtidāʿ*? ‘beginning’ dispenses with it you said *ḥayna tura zaydan* ‘where are you shown Zaid to be?’ and *ḥayna tura zaydan* ‘where are you shown Zaid to be?’. Know that *ḡultu* ‘I said’ in the speech of the Arabs occurs on the occasion that it be imitated and what is imitated after the saying is *kalāman* ‘speech’ not *ḡawlan* ‘a statement’, like *ḡultu zaydun muntʿaliḡan* ‘I said, Zaid is leaving.’ Don’t you see that it is good that you say *zaydun muntaliḡan* ‘Zaid is leaving’. When you let be engaged *ḡulta* with *ḡalā* it is that it not be imitated except what is good to be *kalāman* ‘speech’ and that is in your saying *ḡāla zaydun samrun xayru ḥal-nāsi* ‘Zaid said Amr is the nicest of people.’ A justification of that is his saying, the powerful and exalted, *ḥiḍ ḡālat ḥal-malāḥikatu yā maryamu ḥinna ḥal-lāha yubašširuki* (Suwrah III:45) the angels said O Mary God has good news for you.” (L. 10) Were it not for that he would have said *ḥanna ḥal-lāh* ‘that God’. Similarly all that is derived from *fiḥlihi* ‘its action’ except *taḡuwlu in ḥistifhām* ‘interrogation’. They likened it to *taḍʿunnu* ‘you suppose’ and they did not make it like *ḥaḍʿunnu* ‘I suppose’ and *yaḍʿunnu* ‘he supposes’ in interrogation. Because it is not likely that one will query the *muxāʿab* ‘addressee’ about the supposition of someone else and he will not be queried except about his own supposition. It is made like *taḍʿunnu* just like *mā* ‘not’ is like *laysa* ‘it is not’ in the dialect of *ḥal-ḥigāz* as long as it is with its meaning. If it were to change from that or the *xabar* ‘predicate’ is pre-positioned it reverts to the *ḡiyās* ‘pattern’ and the dialects become like the dialect of *tamiym*. *ḡultu* is not made like *ḍʿanantu* because for them its origin is the *ḥikāyah* ‘imitation’ hence it does not belong to the (L. 15) *bāb* ‘class’ of *ḍʿanantu* by more than this just as the *mā* ‘not’ does not have the strength of *laysa* ‘it is not’ nor does it occur in all *mawādʿiḥihā* ‘its locations’ because its origin according to them is that there be *mubtadaʿan* ‘a beginning’ after it. You shall see, God willing, what can have the status of the *ḥarf* ‘letter’ in a thing then it is not with it in most of its states and it has been explained before. And that in your saying *mata taḡuwlu zaydan mutʿaliḡan* ‘when did you say Zaid is departing?’ and *ḥa-taḡuwlu samran ḍāhiban* ‘do you say Zaid is going?’

لم تذكرهما لأن ما بعدهما ابتداءً فكأنك قلت
أثرى زيداً ذاهباً وأتظنُّ عمرأً منطلقاً. فإن
قلت أين وأنت (س. ٥) تريد أن تجعلها
بمنزلة فيها إذا استغنى بها الابتداءً قلت
أين ثرى زيدٌ وأين ثرى زيداً واعلم أن قلتُ
في كلام العرب إنما وقعت على أن يُحكى
بها وإنما يُحكى بعد القول ما كان كلاماً لا
قولاً نحو قلتُ زيدٌ منطلقاً لأنه يحسن أن
تقول زيدٌ منطلقاً فلما أوقعت قلتُ على ألا
يُحكى بها إلا ما يحسن أن يكون كلاماً وذلك
قولك قال زيدٌ عمروٌ خيراً الناس وتصديق
ذلك قوله عز وجل إذ قالت الملائكة يا مريم
إن الله يُبشرك (س. ١٠) ولولا ذلك لقال أن
الله . وكذلك جميع ما تصرف من فعله إلا
تقول في الاستفهام شبهوها بتظنُّ ولم
يجعلوها كأظنُّ ويظنُّ في الاستفهام لأنه لا
يكاد يُستفهم المخاطب عن ظنِّ غيره ولا
يُستفهم هو إلا عن ظنِّه وإنما جعلتُ كتظنُّ
كما أن ما كليس في لغة أهل الحجاز ما
دامت في معناها فإذا تعيَّرت عن ذلك أو قدّم
الخبر رجعت إلى القياس وصارت اللغات
فيها كلغة تميم ولم يجعلُ قلتُ كظننتُ لأنها
إنما أصلها عندهم الحكاية فلم تُدخل في
(س. ١٥) باب ظننتُ بأكثر من هذا كما أن
ما لم تقو قوة لئس ولم تقع في كل مواضعها
لأن أصلها عندهم أن يكون مبتدأ ما بعدها
وسترى إن شاء الله ما يكون بمنزلة الحرف
في شيء ثم لا يكون معه على أكثر أحواله
وقد بين بعضه فيما مضى. وذلك قولك متى
تقول زيداً منطلقاً وأقول عمرأً ذاهباً

And *ʔa-kulla yawmin taʔuwlu samran muntʔaliʔan* ‘Is it every day you say Amr is departing?’ it is not separated in this as it is not separated in that in *ʔa-kulla yawmin zaydan tadʔribuhu* ‘Is it a fact every day you strike Zaid?’ If you were to say *ʔa-ʔanta taʔuwlu zaydun multʔaliʔan* ‘do you say Zaid is departing?’ you raise, because he separated (P. 51) between it and the particle of interrogation just as he separated it in his saying *ʔa-ʔanta zaydun mararta bihi* ‘Is it a fact you passed by Zaid?’ It has the status of its sisters and has been stabilized on the original. Kumayt said: (wāfir)⁵

ʔa-guhhālan taʔuwlu baniy lu ʔayyiy
La-ʔamru ʔabiyka ʔam mutagāhiliynā
 ‘Do you say you are ignorant sons of Luay
 By the age of your father, or feigning not to know’

ʔumar bin ʔabiy Rabiʔah said: (kāmil)⁶ (L. 5)

ʔammā ʔal-raḥiylu fa-duwna ba ʔdi ʔadin
fa-mata taʔuwlu ʔal-dāra tagma ʔunā
 ‘As to travel is before the morrow
 When do you say the house will gather us?’

If you so wish you raise with what you erected and you make it *ḥikāyah* ‘an imitation’. ʔabu ʔal-Xatʔāb claimed, and I asked him many a time, that Arab people whose Arabic is trustworthy and they are Banuw Sulaym make the *bāb* ‘class’ of *ʔultu* completely like *ḏʔanantu*. Note that the *masʔdar* ‘origin’ may be cancelled just as the *fiʔl* ‘action’ is cancelled. And that in your saying *mata zaydun ḏʔannaka ḏāhibun* ‘when did Zaid in your supposition leave?’, *zaydun ḏʔanni ʔaxuwka* ‘Zaid in my supposition is your brother’ and *zaydun ḏāhibun ḏʔanni* ‘Zaid is leaving in my supposition’. If you were to begin you said *ḏʔanni zaydun ḏāhibun* ‘in my supposition Zaid is going’ is weak and not allowed ever. (L. 10), just as is weak *ʔaḏʔunnu zaydun ḏāhibun* ‘I suppose Zaid is leaving’. It is better with *mata* ‘when’ and *ʔayna* ‘where’ if you were to say *mata ḏʔannaka zaydun ḏāhibun* ‘when in your supposition is Zaid leaving’ and *mata taḏʔunnu samrun muntʔaliʔan* ‘when do you suppose Amr is leaving?’ Because before there is *kalāman* ‘speech’. This is weakened in the beginning just as is weakened *ʔayra ʔakkin zaydun ḏāhibun* ‘without a doubt Zaid is going’ and *ḥaʔʔan samrun muntʔaliʔan* ‘truly, Amr is leaving’.

⁵The meter for wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa ʔuwlu* (two times).

⁶The meter for wāfir is: *mutafāʔilun* (six times).

وأكل يوم تقول عمراً منطلقاً لا يفصل بها
 كما لا يفصل بها في أكل يوم زيداً تضربه.
 فإن قلت أنت تقول زيداً منطلقاً رفعت لأنه
 فصل (ص. ٥١) بينه وبين حرف الاستفهام
 كما فصله في قوله أنت زيداً مررت به
 فصارت بمنزلة أخواتها وأقرت على
 الأصل. قال الكميت: (وافر)

أجهلاً تقول بني لؤي
 لعمر أبيك أم متجاهلين

وقال عمر بن أبي ربيعة: (س. ٥) (كامل)

أما الرحيل فدون بُعد غد
 فمتى تقول الدار تجمعنا

وإن شئت رفعت بما نصبت فجعلته حكاية.
 وزعم أبو الخطاب وسألته عنه غير مرة -
 أن ناساً من العرب يوثق بعربيتهم وهم بنو
 سليم يجعلون باب قلت أجمع مثل ظننت
 وأعلم أن المصدر قد يلغى كما يلغى الفعل
 وذلك قولك متى زيد ظنك ذاهباً وزيد ظني
 أخوك وزيد ذاهباً ظني. فإن ابتدأت فقلت
 ظني زيداً ذاهباً كان ضعيفاً لا يجوز البتة
 (س. ١٠) كما ضعف أظن زيداً ذاهباً. وهو
 في متى وأين أحسن إذا قلت متى ظنك زيداً
 ذاهباً ومتى تظن عمرو منطلقاً لأن قبله
 كلاماً. وإنما يضعف هذا في الابتداء كما
 يضعف غير شك زيداً ذاهباً وحقاً عمرو
 منطلقاً

And if you so wished you said *mata ḏ'annuka zaydan ḷamiyran* 'when is your supposition Zaid is Emir?' as in your saying *mata d'arbuka zaydan* when is your hitting Zaid?'. It may be permitted for you to say *ṣabdu ḷal-lāhi ḷaḏ'unnuhu munt'aliḷun* 'Abdulah, I suppose him leaving'. You make this *hā?* '[h]' dependent on that/him, it is as though you said *zaydun munt'aliḷun ḷaḏ'unnu ḏāka* 'Zaid is leaving, I suppose that' you don't refer the *hā?* '[h]' to Abdulah but you make it to that *mas'dar* 'origin' (L. 15). It is as though he said *ḷaḏ'unnu ḏāka ḷal-ḏ'anna* 'I suppose that supposition' or *ḷaḏ'unnu ḏ'anniy* 'I suppose my supposition'. This weakens if you were to cancel, because *ḷal-ḏ'anna* is cancelled in the locations of *ḷaḏ'unnu* 'I suppose' to the degree it becomes a substitute for pronouncing it. So it is unacceptable to make explicit the *mas'dar* 'origin' here, just as it is unacceptable to make explicit what is erected due to in *saḷyan* 'drinking'. You shall see that explained, God willing. *ḏāka* 'that' is better because it is not a *mas'dar* 'origin' but it is a *ḷismun mubham* 'undefined name' that accounts for everything. Don't you see that if you were to say *zaydun ḏ'anniy munt'aliḷun* 'Zaid in my supposition is leaving' it is not (P. 52) permitted that you put *ḏāka* 'that' with *ḷaḏ'unnu* in its place. And leaving out *ḏāka* if it is *laḷwan* 'nonsense'. It is stronger than if it were to occur with the *mas'dar* 'origin' because if *ḏāka* is *mas'daran* 'an origin' you would not use it, because a *mas'dar* is unacceptable that you bring it here. If the *mas'dar* is unacceptable, then your bringing in *ḏāka* is even less acceptable because it is *mas'dar*. *ḷaḏ'unnu* 'I suppose' without the *hā?* '[h]' is better lest it gets confused with the *ḷism* 'name' and it becomes clearer in that it is not operative. As to *ḏ'anantu ḷannahu munt'aliḷun* 'I supposed that he was leaving'. He dispensed with the *xabar* 'predicate' of *ḷanna*. You say *ḷaḏ'unnu ḷannahu* (L. 5) *fāḷilu kaḏā wa kaḏā* 'I suppose he is doing such and so'. you explain. But it is confined to this if it is known that he has dispensed with the *xabar* 'predicate' of *ḷanna*. It may be permitted to say *ḏ'anantu zaydan* 'I supposed Zaid' if he were to say *man taḏ'unnu* 'whom do you suppose?' that is to say whom do *tattahimu* 'you accuse'. Then you say *ḏ'anantu zaydan* 'I supposed Zaid'. It is as though he said *ḷittahamtu zaydan* 'I accused Zaid'. According to this it is said *ḏ'aniynun* that is to say *muttahamanun* 'accused'. They did not do that with *ḷasibtu* 'I figured', *xiltu* 'I imagined' and *ḷurā* 'I was shown' because it is part of the speech that they insert the meaning in the thing. It does not enter what is not like it.

وإن شئت قلت متى ظنك زيدا أميراً كقولك متى ضربك زيدا وقد يجوز أن تقول عبد الله أظنه منطلق تجعل هذه الهاء على ذلك كأنك قلت زيدا منطلق أظن ذلك لا تجعل الهاء لعبد الله ولكنا تجعلها ذلك المصدر (س. ١٥) كأنه قال أظن ذلك الظن أو أظن ظني. وإنما يضعف هذا إذا ألغيت لأن الظن يلغى في مواضع أظن حتى يكون بدلاً من اللفظ به فكره إظهار المصدر هاهنا كما قبح أن يظهر ما انتصب عليه سقياً وسترى ذلك إن شاء الله مبيئاً. وهو ذلك احسن لأنه ليس بمصدر وإنما هو اسم مبهمة يقع على كل شيء. ألا ترى أنك لو قلت: زيد ظني منطلق لم (ص. ٥٢) يجوز أن تضع ذلك مكانها وترك ذلك في أظن إذا كان لغواً أقوى منه إذا وقع على المصدر لأن ذلك إذا كان مصدراً فإنك لا تجيء به لأن المصدر يقبح أن تجيء به هاهنا فإذا قبح المصدر فمجيئك بذلك أقبح لأنه مصدر واطن بغير الهاء أحسن لئلا يلتبس بالاسم وليكون أبين في أنه ليس يعمل. فأما ظننت أنه منطلق فاستغنى بخبر أن تقول أظن أنه (س. ٥) فاعل كذا وكذا فتفسر. وإنما يقتصر على هذا إذا علم أنه مستغن بخبر أن. وقد يجوز أن تقول ظننت زيدا إذا قال من تظن أي من تتهم فنقول ظننت زيدا كأنه قال اتهمت زيدا. وعلى هذا قيل ظنين أي متهم ولم يجعلوا ذلك في حسبت وخطت وأرى لأن من كلامهم أن يدخلوا المعنى في الشيء لا يدخل في مثله.

I asked him about *ʔayyihim*, why don't they say *ʔayyahum mararta bihi* 'which one of them you passed by?'. He answered because *ʔayyahum* is a particle of interrogation. *ʔalif* is not introduced to it but rather (L. 10) *ʔalif* is left out *ʔistiymāʔan* 'by way of dispensing with', so it became with the status of *ʔbtidāʔ* 'beginning'. Don't you see that the definition of *kalām* 'speech/talk' is that you post-position the *fiʔl* 'action' and you say *ʔayyahum raʔayta* 'which one of them did you see?' As you do that with the *ʔalif*. It is by itself with the status of *ʔbtidāʔ* 'beginning'. If you were to say *ʔayyahum zaydun dʔaraba* 'Which one of them zaid hit?' it is unacceptable. Just as it was unacceptable with *mata* 'when' and its likes. It is so that the *fiʔl* 'action' must follow it is the *ʔasʔl* 'origin' because it is of the particles of interrogation and has no need for the *ʔalif*, so it became like *mata* 'when' and *ʔayna* 'where'. Similarly *man* 'who' and *mā* 'not' because they follow its course and do not abandon it. You say *man ʔamata ʔal-lāhi dʔarabahā* 'who struck the maid of the Lord/? *mā ʔamata ʔal-lāhi* 'not the maid of the Lord' it comes with *nasʔb* 'erect' in all this because that these particles be followed by the *fiʔl* 'action' is primary. Just as if a poet were to be forced in *mata zaydan dʔarabtuhu*. 'When did I strike Zaid.'

وسأله عن أيهم لم لم يقولوا أيهم مرتت به فقال لأن أيهم هو حرف الاستفهام لا يدخل عليه الألف وإنما (س. ١٠) تركت الألف استغناءً فصارت بمنزلة الابتداء ألا ترى أن حد الكلام أن تؤخر الفعل فتقول أيهم رأيت كما تفعل ذلك بالألف فهي نفسها بمنزلة الابتداء فإن قلت أيهم زيدا ضرب قبح كما قبح في متى ونحوها وصار أن يليها الفعل هو الأصل لأنها من حروف الاستفهام ولا يحتاج إلى الألف فصارت كمتى وأين وكذلك من وما لأنهما تجريان معها ولا تفارقانها تقول من أمة الله ضربها وما أمة الله أتاها نصب في كل ذا لأنه أن يلي (س ١٥) هذه الحروف الفعل أولى كما أنه لو اضطر شاعر في متى زيدا ضربته.

Chapter 32. This is a chapter on *ʾistifhām* ‘interrogation’ in which the *ʾism* ‘name’ is *rafʿan* ‘in raise’ because you begin with it to alert the *muxāʾab* ‘addressee’, then you query afterwards.

(Buwālāq vol. 1. p. 64, Derenbourg vol.1. p.52, Haruwn vol.1. p. 127)

(I. P. 52. L. 16) And that in your saying *zaydun kam marratan raʾaytahu* ‘Zaid, how many times did you see him?’; *ʿabdu ʾal-lāhi hal laʿaytahu* ‘Abdulah, did you meet him?’ and *ʿamrun hallā laʿaytahu* ‘Amr, Didn’t you just meet him?’ and similarly with the rest of the *ḥuruwf* ‘particles’ of *ʾistifhām* ‘interrogation’. The *ʿāmil* ‘operator’ in it being *ʾal-ʾibtidāʾ* ‘the first/subject’. It is as though you were to say *ʾaraʾayta zaydan hal laʿaytahu*. Did you see Zaid, Did you meet him? *ʾaraʾayta* ‘did you see?’ is the *ʿāmil* ‘operator’. Similarly, if you were to say *ʿad ʿalimtu zaydan kam laʿaytahu* ‘I know Zaid, how many times have you met him?’ *ʿalimtu* (P. 53) is the *ʿāmil* ‘operator’, similarly, this one. What is after the *mubtadaʾ* ‘the initial/subject’ of this *kalām* ‘speech’ is in place of its *xabar* ‘predicate’. If you were to say *zaydun kam marratan raʾayta* ‘Zaid, how many times did you see?’, it is weak except when you introduce the *hāʾ* [h], just as it was weak in his saying *kulluhu lam ʾasnaʿ* ‘all of it, I did not do.’ It is not permitted for you to say *zaydan hal raʾayta* ‘Zaid, did you see?’ except that you want the meaning of *hāʾ* [h] with its weakness so *tarfaʿ* ‘you raise’, because you have separated between the *mubtadaʾ* ‘the initial/subject’ and the *fiʾl* ‘action’, so the *ʾism* ‘name’ has become *mubtadaʾ* ‘the initial’ and the *fiʾl* ‘action’ after the *ḥarf* ‘particle’ (L. 5) of *ʾistifhām* ‘interrogation’. If this were good or permitted, you would say *ʿad ʿalimtu zaydun kam dʿuriba* ‘I have learned how often Zaid was struck.’ and you would say *ʾaraʾayta zaydun kam marratan dʿuriba* ‘did you see Zaid, how many times he was struck?’ in relation to the last *fiʾl* ‘action’. Since you see no escape from engaging the first *fiʾl* ‘action’. Similarly, you have no escape from engaging *ʾibtidāʾ* ‘initiation’ because you come up with *ʾistifhām* ‘interrogation’ after you have done with *ʾibtidāʾ* ‘initiation’. If they wanted engagement they would not begin with the *ʾism* ‘name’. Don’t you see that you say *zaydun hāʾā ʾaʿamrun dʿarabahu ʾam bišrun* ‘this is Zaid, did Amr strike him or Bishr?’, nor do you say *ʿamran ʾa-darabta* ‘Amr, did you hit?’. Just as this is not permitted neither is that permitted. *ḥarf* *ʾal-ʾistifhām* ‘particle of interrogation’ is not used to separate

(٣٢) هذا باب من الاستفهام يكون الاسم فيه رفعاً لأنك تبتدئه لثبته للمخاطب ثم تستفهم بعد

(م. ٢. ص. ٥٢. س. ١٦) وذلك قولك: زيدٌ كم مرّةً رأيته وعبداً الله هل لقيته وعمرو هُلاً لقيته وكذلك سائرُ حروف الاستفهام فالعاملُ فيه الابتداءُ كما أنك لو قلت رأيتَ زيداً هل لقيته كان رأيتَ هو العاملُ فكذلك إذا قلت قد علمتُ زيداً كم لقيته كان علمتُ (ص. ٥٣) هو العاملُ فكذلك هذا فما بعد المبتدأ من هذا الكلام في موضع خبره. فإن قلت زيدٌ كم مرّةً رأيتَ فهو ضعيفٌ إلا أن تُدخلَ الهاءَ كما ضعُفَ في قوله كُله لم أصنع. ولا يجوز أن تقول: زيداً هل رأيتَ إلا أن تريد معنى الهاء مع ضعفه فنرفعُ لأنك قد فصلت بين المبتدأ وبين الفعل فصار الاسمُ مبتدأً والفعلُ بعد حرف الاستفهام (س. ٥). ولو حسُنَ هذا أو جاز لقلتُ قد علمتُ زيدٌ كم ضربَ وقلتُ رأيتُ زيدٌ كم مرّةً ضربَ على الفعل الآخر فكما لا تجدُ بدأً من إعمال الفعل الأول كذلك لا تجدُ بدأً من إعمال الابتداء لأنك إنما تجيء بالاستفهام بعدما تفرغ من الابتداء. ولو أرادوا الإعمال لما ابتدءوا بالاسم ألا ترى أنك تقول زيدٌ هذا عمرو ضربَه أم بشرٌ ولا تقول عمراً أضربتُ فكما لا يجوز هذا لا يجوز ذلك. فحرفُ الاستفهام لا يُفصلُ فيه

(L. 10) between the *sāmil* ‘operator’ and the *maṣmuwl* ‘operated-upon’, then it remains in its *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’, if the *ḥalif* came first, otherwise it is introduced by the *xabar* ‘predicate’. What can not be except *raḥṣan* ‘raise’ is your saying *ḥa-ḥaxawāka ḥal-laḍāni raḥayta* ‘are they your two brothers whom you saw’ because *raḥayta* is a connector to *ḥal-laḍayni* and with it the *ḥism* ‘name’ is completed. It is as though you said *ḥa-ḥaxuwka s’āḥabanā* ‘Did your brother accompany us?’ if there were in any of this a thing that would erect something in *ḥal-ḥistifhām* ‘the interrogation’ you would say in the predicate *zaydan ḥal-laḍiy raḥaytu* ‘Zaid is the one whom I saw’. You erected, just as you say *zaydan raḥaytu*. ‘I saw Zaid’. If the *fiḥl* ‘action’ is in the location of *s’ifah* ‘descriptive/adjective’ so it is likewise, and that in your saying *ḥa-zaydun ḥanta ragulun tad’rubuhu* ‘Is it zayd, you’re a man who hit him?’ and *ḥa-kulla yawmin ḥawbun talbasuhu* ‘Is it every day, there is a garment you wear it?’ if it is *was’fan* ‘a description/adjectival’ (L. 15) it is better that it have the *ḥā? [h]* with it because it is not in the location of engagement, but it is permitted as it was permitted in *was’l* ‘connection’, because it is in the location of what pertains to *ḥism* ‘a name’. You would not say *ḥa-zaydan ḥanta ragulun tad’ribuhu* ‘Is it Zaid, you are the man to hit him?’. If you were to make *was’fan* ‘a description/ adjectival’ of the *fiḥl* ‘action’ you would not erect it because it is not in construction with the *fiḥl* ‘action’ but the *maṣsuwl* ‘acted-upon’ is in the position of *was’f* ‘description’ as it was in the location of the *xabar* ‘predicate’. As an example of that is the saying of the poet: (ragaz)⁷

ḥa-kulla ḥāmin na ḥamun taḥwuwḥahu
yul ḡiḥuhu ḡawmun wa-tantiguwḥahu

‘Is it every year that you herd-in the camel
Other People breed it and you gain the offspring’
and Zaid ḥal-xayl said: (t’awiyl)⁸

ḥa-fiḥy kulli ḥāmin ma ḥamun tab ḥaḥuwḥahu
ḥalā miḥmarin ḥawwabtamuwḥu wa-mā rud’ā

‘Is the case that in every year you send women
To a gathering of rude people and you did not reward it?’

(P. 54) and gariyr said in what there is no *ḥā? [h]*: (wāfir)⁹

(س. ١٠) بين العامل والمعمول ثم يكون على حاله إذا جاءت الألف أولًا وإنما يدخل على الخبر. ومما لا يكون إلا رفعاً قولك أخواك اللذان رأيت لأن رأيت صلة للذين وبه يتم اسماً فكأنك قلت أخواك صاحبانا. ولو كان شيء من هذا ينصب شيئاً في الاستفهام لقلت في الخبر زيدا الذي رأيت فنصبت كما تقول زيدا رأيت. وإذا كان الفعل موضع الصفة فهو كذلك وذلك قولك أزيد أنت رجلٌ تضربه وأكل يوم ثوبٌ تلبسه فإذا كان (س. ١٥) وصفاً فأحسنته أن يكون فيه الهاء لأنه ليس بموضع إعمالٍ ولكنه يجوز فيه كما جاز في الوصل لأنه في موضع ما يكون من الاسم. ولم تكن لتقول أزيداً أنت رجلٌ تضربه وأنت إذا جعلته وصفاً للمفعول لم تنصبه لأنه ليس بمبني على الفعل ولكن الفعل في موضع الوصف كما كان في موضع الخبر. فمن ذلك قول الشاعر: (رجز)

أكلَّ عامٍ نَعَمٌ تَحْوُونَهُ
يُلْقِحُهُ قَوْمٌ وَتَنْتَجُونَهُ

وقال زيد الخليل: (طويل)

أفى كلِّ عامٍ مَأْتَمٌّ تَبْعُونَهُ
على مَحْمَرٍ تَوَبَّئُمُوهُ وما رُضَا

وقال جرير فيما ليس فيه الهاء: (وافر)

⁷The meter for ragaz is: *mustafīlun* (six times).

⁸The meter for t’awiyl is: *fa ḥuwlun mafāḥīlun* (four times).

⁹The meter for wāfir is: *mufāḥalātun mufāḥalātun fa ḥuwlun* (two times).

ʔabaḥta ḥimā tihāmata ba ʔda nagdin

Wa-mā ʔay ʔun ḥamayta bi-mustabāḥin

'You proclaim the protection of Tihama after Najd

Nothing is a fair game that you protect.'

And the poet said: (wāfir)¹⁰

Fa-mā ʔadriy ʔa-ʔayyarahum tanāʔin

Wa-tʔuwlu ʔal-ʔahdi ʔam māʔun ʔasʔābuw

'I do not know, has long distance

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

(L.5) and what may not have except *raʔf* 'raise' is *ʔa-ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta ʔal-dʔāribu* 'Is it Abdulah, whom you are the striker?' Because you want the meaning of *ʔanta ʔal-laḏiy dʔarabahu* 'you are who hit him.' This does not follow the course of *yafʔalu*. Don't you see that it is not permitted for you to say *mā zaydan ʔanā ʔal-dʔāribu* 'It is not Zaid, I am the striker', and *lā zaydan ʔanta ʔal-dʔāribu* 'It is not Zaid, you the striker', rather you say *ʔal-dʔāribu zaydan* 'the striker of Zaid' on the model of your saying *ʔal-ḥasanu waghan* 'the handsome of face'. Don't you see that you don't say *ʔal-māʔata ʔal-wāhibu* 'the hundred the giver', like you say *ʔanta zaydan dʔāribun* 'you are a Zaid striker'. You say *ḥāḏā dʔāribun* 'this is a striker'. As you can see it comes with the meaning of (L.10) *ḥāḏā sayadʔribu* 'this will strike'. If you were to say *ḥāḏā ʔal-dʔāribu* 'this is the striker' you are introducing him to the meaning of the one who strikes. It can not be except *raʔʔan* 'in the raise'. Just as if you were to say *ʔa-zaydan ʔanta dʔāribuhu* 'Is it Zaid, you are his striker?' if you did not wish a *fi ʔ* 'action' for his *dʔāribuhu* 'his striker'. It became *ma ʔrifatan* 'definite'. You raised. Similarly, this one that does not occur except with this meaning, it has the status of a *fi ʔ* 'action', *nakirah* 'an indefinite' connecting the occurrence of the *fi ʔ* 'action' as a *sʔifah* 'description/adjective' to the *nakirah* 'indefinite', just as the *ʔism* 'name' can not be like the *fi ʔ* 'action' except as being *nakirah* 'indefinite'. Don't you see that if you were to say *ʔa-kulla yawmin zaydan tadʔribuhu* 'It is the fact that every day you strike Zaid?' It can not be except *nasʔban* 'as an erect' because it is not a description. If it were *wasʔf* 'a description' then the (L. 15) first will not be *mabniyyun* 'built' on it. Just as the *ʔism* 'name' can not *mabniyyun* 'be built' on it in the *xabar* 'predicate'.

أَبَحْتَ حِمَى تِهَامَةَ بَعْدَ نَجْدٍ
وَمَا شَيْءٌ حَمَيْتَ بِمُسْتَبَاحٍ

وقال الشاعر: (وافر)

فما أدري أُغَيَّرَ هُمْ تَنَاءٍ
وَطَوَّلُ الْعَهْدِ أَمْ مَالٌ أَصَابُوا

(س. ٥) ومما لا يكون فيه إلا الرفعُ أَعْبُدُ
الله أنت الضاربُ لأنك إنما تريد معنى أنت
الذي ضَرَبَهُ. وهذا لا يجري مجرى يَفْعَلُ أَلَا
تَرى أنه لا يجوز أن تقولَ ما زيدا أنا
الضاربُ ولا زيدا أنت الضاربُ وإنما
تقول الضاربُ زيدا على مثل قولك الحسنُ
وجهاً. أَلَا تَرى أنك لا تقول أنت المائة
الواهبُ كما تقول أنت زيدا ضاربُ. وتقول
هذا ضاربُ كما تَرى فيجيء على معنى هذا
يَضْرِبُ وهو يعمل في حال حديثك وتقول
هذا ضاربُ فيجيء على معنى (س. ١٠)
هذا سيضربُ. أو إذا قلت هذا الضاربُ فإنما
تُعرِّفه على معنى الذي يَضْرِبُ فلا يكون إلَّا
رفعاً كما أنك لو قلت أزيدُ أنت ضاربُ إذا لم
تُردِّ بضاربُ الفعلَ وصار معرفةً رفعتَ
فكذلك هذا الذي لا يجيء إلا على هذا
المعنى فإنما يكون بمنزلة الفعل نكرةً وأصل
وقوع الفعل صفةً للنكرة كما لا يكون الاسمُ
كالفعل إلا نكرةً أَلَا تَرى أنك لو قلت أكلتُ
يوم زيدا تَضْرِبُهُ لم يكن إلا نصباً لأنه ليس
بوصف. فإذا كان وصفاً فليس بمبنيٍّ عليه
(س. ١٥) الأَوَّلُ كما أنه لا يكون الاسمُ
مبنيّاً عليه في الخبر

¹⁰The meter for wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa fuwllun* (two times).

So *d'ārib* 'striker' does not have the status of *yafsalu* 'he strikes' and *tafsalu* 'you strike' except as *nakirah* 'indefinite'. You say *la-ḍakarun lan talida nāḡatuka laḥabbu ḥilayka lam ḥunθā* 'it is a male that your she-camel breeds for you that is more dear to you or a female?'. It is as though he said *la-ḍakarun nitāguhā laḥabbu ḥilayka lam ḥunθā* 'Is it a male product dearer to you or a female?'. *fa-lan talid* 'if she were to give birth' is *ḥism* 'a name' and *talidu* 'she gives birth' completes the *ḥism* 'name', just as *tal-laḍiy* 'the one/which' is completed by the *fiḥ* 'action'. It has no function here just as there is no function to the connection to the one who acted. You say *la-zaydun lan yadribahu samrun lamθalu lam bišrun* 'Is it the case that Zaid is more likely to be struck by Amr or by Bišr?'. It is as though he said *la-zaydun d'arbu samrin ḥiyyāhu lamθalu lam bišrun* 'Is it the case that Zaid, Amr striking him is more likely or Bišr?'. The *masdar* 'original/root' is built on the *mubtadaʿ* 'the beginning' and *lamθalu* 'more likely' is built on it. It is not brought down to the status of (L. 20) *yafsalu*. It is as though he said *la-zaydun d'āribuhu xayrun lam samrun* 'Is it the case that Zaid his striker is good or Amr?' That is, you began with it and you built on it and you made it *ḥism* 'a name' and Zaid is not confused with the *fiḥ* 'action', since it was *s'ilah* 'a connection' to it. Nor is *tal-d'āribahu* 'his striker' got confused with it when you said *Zaydun lanta tal-d'āribuhu* 'Zaid, you are his striker', except that *tal-d'āribuhu* 'his striker' is with the meaning *tal-laḍiy d'arabahu* 'the one who struck him' and the *fiḥ* 'action' is the completion of these *ḥismāʿ* 'names'. The *fiḥ* 'action' is not confused with the first if it is this way. You say *la-lan talida nāḡatuka ḍakaran laḥabbu ḥilayka lam ḥunθā* 'Is it a male that your she-camel breeds for you dearer to you than a female?' because you related it (P. 55) to the *fiḥ* 'action' that is the *s'ilah* 'connection' of *lan* 'that' so it became in connection of *lan* 'that' like your saying *tal-laḍiy raḥaytu ḥaxāhu zaydun* 'the one whose brother I saw is Zaid'. It is not permitted to begin with the *ḥax* 'brother' before the one which *raḥaytu ḥaxāhu zaydun* 'I saw his brother Zaid' operates on. Similarly, *nasb* 'erection' is not permitted in your saying *la-ḍakarun lan talida nāḡatuka laḥabbu ḥilayka lam ḥunθā* 'is it the case that a male that your she-camel bears for you is dearer to you than a female?' That is, if you were to say *ḥaxāhu tal-laḍiy raḥaytu zaydun* 'his brother whom I saw is Zaid' is not permitted. When what you want is *tal-laḍiy raḥaytu ḥaxāhu zaydun* 'the one whose brother I saw is Zaid'.

فلا يكون ضاربٌ بمنزلة يَفْعَلُ وَتَفْعَلُ إِلَّا نكرة. وتقول أدكرُ أن تَلِدَ ناقَتَكَ أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكَ أَمْ أَنْتَى كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ أَدَكَرُ نِتَاجُهَا أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكَ أَمْ أَنْتَى. فَأَنْ تَلِدَ اسْمٌ وَتَلِدُ بِهِ يَتَمُّ الْاسْمُ كَمَا يَتَمُّ الَّذِي بِالْفِعْلِ فَلَا عَمَلٌ لَهُ هُنَا كَمَا لَيْسَ يَكُونُ لَصَلَةِ الَّذِي عَمَلٌ. وتقول أزيدُ أن يَضْرِبَهُ عمرو وإياه أَمَثَلُ أَمْ بِشْرُ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ أزيدُ ضَرْبُ عمرو إياه أَمَثَلُ أَمْ بِشْرُ فَاَلْمَصْدَرُ مَبْنِيٌّ عَلَى الْمَبْتَدَأِ وَأَمَثَلُ مَبْنِيٌّ عَلَيْهِ وَلَمْ يُنْزَلْ مَنْزِلَةَ (س. ٢٠) يَفْعَلُ فَكَأَنَّهُ قَالَ أزيدُ ضاربُهُ خَيْرٌ أَمْ عمرو وذلك أنك ابتدأته فبنيتَ عليه فجعلته اسماً ولم يلتبس زيدٌ بالفعل إذ كان صلةً له كما لم يلتبس به الضاربُ حين قلتَ زيدٌ أنت الضاربُ إلا أن الضاربُ في معنى الذي ضربه والفعل تمامُ هذه الأسماء فالفعل لا يلتبس بالأول إذا كان هكذا. وتقول أن تلد ناقَتَكَ ذكراً أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكَ أَمْ أَنْتَى لِأَنَّ حَمَلَتَهُ (ص. ٥٥) عَلَى الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي هُوَ صِلَةٌ أَنْ فَصَارَ فِي صِلَةٍ أَنْ مِثْلَ قَوْلِكَ الَّذِي رَأَيْتُ أَخَاهُ زيدٌ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَبْتَدِئَ بِالْأَخِ قَبْلَ الَّذِي تُعْمَلُ فِيهِ رَأَيْتُ أَخَاهُ زيدٌ فَكَذَلِكَ لَا يَجُوزُ النَّصْبُ فِي قَوْلِكَ أَدَكَرُ أَنْ تَلِدَ نَاقَتَكَ أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكَ أَمْ أَنْتَى. وَذَلِكَ أَنَّكَ لَوْ قُلْتَ أَخَاهُ الَّذِي رَأَيْتُ زيدٌ لَمْ يَجْزِ وَأَنْتَ تَرِيدُ الَّذِي رَأَيْتُ أَخَاهُ زيدٌ.

What is not in interrogation except *raff* 'raise' is your saying *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi (L. 5) ʔanta ʔakramu ʔalayhi ʔam zaydun* 'Is it Abdulah that you are welcomed by more or Zaid?' and *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta lahu ʔasʔdaʔu ʔam bišrun* 'Is it Abdulah to whom you are more truthful or Bišr?'. It is as though you said *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta ʔaxuwahu ʔam samr* 'Is it Abdulah you are a brother to or Amr?' because *ʔafʔala* is neither a *fi ʔl* 'action' nor *ʔism* 'a name' that follows the course of the *fi ʔl* 'action', rather, it has the status of *ʔadiyd* 'tight' and *ʔasan* 'good' and similar ones. An example of that is *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔanta lahu xayrun ʔam šarrun* 'It is Abdulah whom you are good to or evil?'. You say *ʔa-zaydun ʔanta lahu ʔašaddu dʔarban ʔam samran* 'Is it Zaid you gave severer beating to or Amr?' The erecting of *ʔal-dʔarb* 'striking' is like erecting of Zaid in your saying *mā ʔaḥsana zaydan* 'How nice Zaid is!' and the erecting of *wagh* 'face' in your saying *ḥasanun waghā ʔal-ʔaxi* 'handsome of face is the brother'. The *masʔdar* 'origin/root' here is like the rest of the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' as in your saying *ʔa-zaydun ʔanta ʔatlaʔu (L. 10) lahu waghān ʔam fulānun* 'Is Zaid you are happier with or so and so?' It has no path for engagement nor does it have *wagh* 'aspect/face' for that. What can not be in *ʔistifhām* 'interrogation' except *raff* 'raise' is your saying *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔin tarahu tadʔribhu* 'Is Abdulah the one if you see him you strike him?'. Similarly, if you were to drop the *hāʔ* [h] with its unacceptability, you said *ʔa-sabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔin tara tadʔrib* 'Is Abdulah the one if you see you strike?' The last one has no path to the *ʔism* 'name' because it is *gazm* 'apocopation' and it is the *gawāb* 'response/apodosis' to the first *fi ʔl* 'action' and the first *fi ʔl* 'action' has no path because being with *ʔin* 'that' has the status of your saying *ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi ḥiyna ya ʔiniy ʔadʔrib* 'Is Abdulah, when he visits me I strike?' Abdulah has no share in *ya ʔiniy* 'he visits me' because it has the status of your saying *ʔa-sabda ʔal-lāhi yawma ʔal-gumʔati ʔadʔrubu* 'Is it Abdulah on Friday I strike?'; (L. 15) an example of that is *zaydun ḥiyna ʔadʔrubu ya ʔiniy* 'Zaid when I strike he visits me' because what depends on Zaid is at the end of *kalām* 'speech' which is *ya ʔiniy* 'he visits me'. Similarly, if you were to say *zaydan ʔidā ʔatāniy ʔadʔrubu* 'Zaid if he visits me I strike' it has the status of *ḥiyna* 'when/during' if you don't *apocopate* the other, you erect. And that in your saying *ʔa-zaydan ʔin raʔayta tadʔrub* 'Is it Zaid if you saw you strike?' It would be better if you were to introduce a *hāʔ* [h] to *raʔayta* 'you saw' because it is not used.

ومما لا يكون في الاستفهام إلا رفعاً قولك أَعْبُدُ اللهَ (س. ٥) أَنْتَ أَكْرَمُ عَلَيْهِ أَمْ زَيْدٌ وَأَعْبُدُ اللهَ أَنْتَ لَهُ أَصْدَقُ أَمْ بَشْرٌ كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ أَنْتَ أَخُوهُ أَمْ عَمْرُو لِأَنَّ أَفْعَلَ لَيْسَ بِفِعْلٍ وَلَا اسْمٍ يَجْرِي مَجْرَى الْفِعْلِ وَإِنَّمَا هُوَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ شَدِيدٍ وَحَسَنٍ وَنَحْوِ ذَلِكَ. وَمِثْلُهُ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ أَنْتَ لَهُ خَيْرٌ أَمْ بَشْرٌ. وَتَقُولُ أَزِيدُ أَنْتَ لَهُ أَشَدُّ ضَرْبًا أَمْ عَمْرُو فَإِنَّمَا انْتِصَابُ الضَّرْبِ كَانْتِصَابِ زَيْدٍ فِي قَوْلِكَ مَا أَحْسَنَ زَيْدًا وَانْتِصَابِ وَجْهِ فِي قَوْلِكَ حَسَنٌ وَجْهَ الْأَخِ. فَالْمَصْدَرُ هَاهُنَا كَغَيْرِهِ مِنَ الْأَسْمَاءِ كَقَوْلِكَ أَزِيدُ أَنْتَ أَطْلَقُ (س. ١٠) لَهُ وَجْهًا أَمْ فَلَانٌ. وَلَيْسَ لَهُ سَبِيلٌ إِلَى الْإِعْمَالِ وَلَيْسَ لَهُ وَجْهٌ فِي ذَلِكَ. وَمِمَّا لَا يَكُونُ فِي الْاسْتِفْهَامِ إِلَّا رَفْعًا قَوْلُكَ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ إِنْ تَرَهُ تَضْرِبُهُ وَكَذَلِكَ إِنْ طَرَحْتَ الْهَاءَ مَعَ قُبْحِهِ فَقُلْتَ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ إِنْ تَرَ تَضْرِبُ فَلَيْسَ لِلْآخِرِ سَبِيلٌ عَلَى الْاسْمِ لِأَنَّهُ جَزْمٌ وَهُوَ جَوَابُ الْفِعْلِ الْأَوَّلِ وَلَيْسَ لِلْفِعْلِ الْأَوَّلِ سَبِيلٌ لِأَنَّهُ مَعَ إِنْ بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ حِينَ يَأْتِينِي أَضْرِبُ فَلَيْسَ لِعَبْدِ اللهَ فِي يَأْتِينِي حَظٌّ لِأَنَّهُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ أَعْبُدُ اللهَ يَوْمَ الْجُمُعَةِ أَضْرِبُ. (س. ١٥) وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ زَيْدٌ حِينَ أَضْرِبُ يَأْتِينِي لِأَنَّ الْمُعْتَمِدَ عَلَى زَيْدٍ آخِرُ الْكَلَامِ وَهُوَ يَأْتِينِي. وَكَذَلِكَ إِذَا قُلْتَ زَيْدًا إِذَا أَتَانِي أَضْرِبُ وَإِنَّمَا هُوَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ حِينَ. فَإِنْ لَمْ تَجْزَمْ الْآخِرَ نَصَبْتَ ذَلِكَ قَوْلِكَ أَزِيدًا إِنْ رَأَيْتَ تَضْرِبُ. فَأَحْسَنُهُ أَنْ تُدْخَلَ فِي رَأَيْتَ الْهَاءَ لِأَنَّهُ غَيْرُ مُسْتَعْمَلٍ

The *huruf* ‘particles’ of *gazā?* ‘compensation/conditional’ in this are with the status of your saying *zaydun kam marratan raʿaytahu* ‘Zaid, how many times did you see him?’ If you were to say *ʾin tara zaydan tadʿrub* ‘if you saw Zaid, you strike’. It is nothing but this because it has the status of your saying *hiyna tara zaydan yaʿhiyka* ‘when you see Zaid, he is coming to you’ because it became in the location of the (L. 20) *mudʿmar* ‘implicit’ when you said *zaydun hiyna tadribuhu yakuwnu kaḏā wa kaḏā* ‘Zaid while you hit him he becomes such and so’. Even if it is permitted that you make Zaid *mubtadaʿan* ‘first/subject’ based on this *fiʾl* ‘action’ you would say *ʾal-Gitālu zaydan hiyna yaʿhiy* ‘fighting Zaid when he comes’ you want *ʾal-Gitālu hiyna yaʿhiy zaydan* ‘fighting, when Zaid comes’. You say in *xabar* ‘predicate’ and others *ʾin zaydan tarahu tadʿrub* ‘if Zaid you see him, you strike’ you erect Zaid because the *fiʾl* ‘action’ that follows *ʾin* ‘that’ is primary as that was (P. 56) in particles of interrogation and is farther from *rafʿ* ‘raise’ because the *ʾism* ‘name’ is not built on *mubtadaʿ* ‘first’ in it, rather they permitted pre-positioning the *ʾism* ‘name’ with *ʾin* ‘that/if’ because it is the mother of *gazā?* ‘compensation/conditional’ nor does it depart from it. What transpires in it is what transpires with the *ʾalif* of interrogation, what is not permitted with other particles. Namir ibn tawlab said: (kāmīl)¹¹

Lā tagza ʾiy ʾin munfisan ʾahlaktuhu

Wa- ʾiḏā halaktu fa- ʾinda ḏālika fa-gza ʾiy

‘Don’t be upset if I demolished a competitor

If I perish at that time then be upset’

(L. 5) If a poet needs to, he uses *ʾiḏā* ‘if’. He made it follow the course of *ʾin* ‘if’, so he said *ʾa-zaydun ʾiḏā tara tadʿrib* ‘Is it Zaid, if you see you strike?’ if he made *tadʿrib* ‘you strike’ *gawāban* ‘response/apodosis’. If he were to raise it, he erected because he did not make a *gawāb* ‘response/apodosis’. *Gawāb* ‘response’ is raised when the apocope is removed from the first in pronunciation. The *ʾism* ‘name’ here is *mubtadaʿ* ‘first’. If you were to apocopate like their saying *ʾayyuhum yaʿhiyka tadʿrib* ‘whoever of them visits you, you strike.’ if you were to apocopate because you came up with *tadʿrib* ‘you strike’ apocopated after the *ʾibtidāʿ* ‘beginning’ became engaged with *ʾayyuhum* so it has no chance to influence it.

فصارت حروف الجزاء في هذا بمنزلة قولك زيد كم مرة رأيته. فإذا قلت إن ترّ زيداً تضرب فليس إلا هذا لأنه بمنزلة قولك حين ترى زيداً يأتيك لأنه صار في موضع (س. ٢٠) المضمّر حين قلت زيداً حين تضرب يكون كذا وكذا. ولو جاز أن تجعل زيداً مبتدأ على هذا الفعل لقلت القتال زيداً حين يأتي تريد القتال حين يأتي زيداً. وتقول في الخبر وغيره إن زيداً تره تضرب تنصب زيداً إلا أن الفعل أن يلي إن أولى كما كان ذلك (ص. ٥٦) في حروف الاستفهام وهي أبعد من الرفع لأنه لا يُبنى فيها الاسم على مبتدأ. وإنما أجازوا تقديم الاسم في إن لأنها أم الجزاء ولا تزول عنه فصار ذلك فيها كما صار في ألف الاستفهام ما لم يجز في (الحروف) الأخر. وقال النمر بن تولب: (كامل)

لَا تَجْزَعِي إِنْ مَنُفَسًا أَهْلَكْتُهُ

وَإِذَا هَلَكْتُ فَعِنْدَ ذَلِكَ فَاجْزَعِي

وإن أضطرّ شاعر فجازى بإذا أجزاها في ذلك مجرى إن فقال أزيد إذا ترّ تضرب إن جعل تضرب جواباً وإن رفعها نصباً لأنه لم يجعلها جواباً ويرفع الجواب حين يذهب الجزم من الأول في اللفظ. والاسم هاهنا مبتدأ إذا جزمت نحو قولهم أيهم يأتيك تضرب إذا جزمت لألك جئت بتضرب مجزوماً بعد أن عمل الابتداء في أيهم فلا سبيل له عليه

¹¹The meter for kāmīl is: *mutafāʾilun* (six times).

Similarly, this one where you came up with it apocopated after the *ḥbtidāʔ* had engaged it. As to the first *fiʔl* ‘action’, it became (L. 10) with what is before it with the status of *ḥiyna* ‘when’ and the rest of the *dʿuruwf* ‘envelopes of time’. If you were to say *zaydan ḥḍā ya ḥiyni ḥadʿribu* ‘Zayd if he visits me, I strike’ you want the meaning of the *ḥāʔ* [h] and you do not want *zaydan ḥadʿribu ḥḍā ya ḥiyni* ‘Zaid I hit if he visits me’, rather you place *ḥadʿribu* ‘I strike’ here like *ḥadʿrib* ‘you strike!’ if you apocopated even if it is not apocopated, because the meaning is that of *magāzāt* ‘compensation/conditional’ in your saying *ḥa-zaydun ḥin ya ḥatika ḥadʿrib* ‘Is it Zaid, if he visits you, I strike’ and you don’t want from it *ḥadʿribu zaydan* ‘I strike Zaid’. it occurs at the beginning of *kalām* ‘speech’ and you raised it. It is good. Just as you did not want in this the beginning of *kalām*. Similarly, with *ḥiyna* ‘when/during’ if you said *ḥa-zaydun ḥiyna ya ḥatika tadʿribu* ‘Is it Zaid when he visits you, you strike?’. You raised the first in all this because (L. 15) you made *tadʿrib* ‘you strike’ and *ḥadʿrib* ‘I strike’ *gawāban* ‘a response/apodosis’, so it became as though it is its connection if it is of its completion and does not return to the first. Rather you return it to the first in what someone said *ḥin ḥataytaniy ḥātiyka* ‘if you visit me I will visit you’ which is *ḡabiyḥ* ‘unacceptable’ but it is permitted in poetry. If you were to say *ḥa-zaydun ḥin ya ḥatika tadʿribhu* ‘Is it Zaid, if he visits you, you strike him?’. The *ḥāʔ* [h] goes with nothing except with Zaid. And the last *fiʔl* ‘action’ is a *gawāban* ‘response’ to the first. What proves to you that it does not refer except to Zaid is that if you were to say *ḥa-zaydun ḥin ta ḥatika ḥamatu ḥal-lāhi tadʿribhā* ‘Is it Zaid, if the maid of the lord visited you, you strike her?’ is not permitted, because you began with Zaid and there must be a *xabar* ‘predicate’, and what is after it is not its *xabar* ‘predicate’ until it contains (P. 57) its *dʿamiyr* ‘pronoun’. If you were to say *zaydan lam ḥadʿrib* ‘Zaid, I did not strike’ and *zaydan lan ḥadʿriba* ‘Zaid I will not strike’, one can not have in it except the *nasʿb* ‘erect’ because you did not place after *lam* and *lan* anything that you may pre-position it to before them and it would be a different circumstance after them, as it was the case with *gazāʔ* ‘compensation/conditional’. *Lan ḥadʿriba* ‘I will not strike’ is a *naḥī* ‘denial’ to his saying *sa ḥaʿdribu* ‘I shall strike’ just as *lā tadʿrib* ‘don’t strike’ is a denial of his saying *ḥadʿrib* ‘strike’ and *lam ḥadʿrib* ‘I did not strike’ is a denial of *dʿarabtu* ‘I struck’. You say *kulla ragulin ya ḥiyka fa-dʿrib* ‘every man that visits you, strike’ it is *nasʿb* ‘erect’ because *ya ḥiyka* ‘he visits you’ here is *sʿifah* ‘descriptive/adjective’

وكذلك هذا حيث جئت به مجزوماً بعد أن عملَ فيه الابتداء وأما الفعل الأوّل فصار (س. ١٠) مع ما قبله بمنزلة حينَ وسائر الظروف. وإن قلت زيدا إذا يأتيني أضربُ تريد معنى الهاء ولا تريد زيدا أضربُ إذا يأتيني ولكنك تضع أضربُ هاهنا مثلَ أضربُ إذا جزمت وإن لم يكن مجزوماً لأنّ المعنى معنى المجازاة في قولك أزيدُ إن يأتِكَ أضربُ ولا تريد به أضربُ زيدا فيكونَ على أوّل الكلام رفعتَ عنده فجيّدُ كما لم تُردْ بهذا أوّل الكلام وكذلك حينَ قلت أزيدُ حينَ يأتِكَ تضربُ وإنما رفعتَ الأوّل في هذا كلّهُ لأنك (س. ١٥) جعلت تضربُ وأضربُ جواباً فصار كأنه من صلته إذ كان من تمامه ولم يرجع إلى الأوّل وإنما تُردّه إلى الأوّل فيمن قال إن أتيتني أتيتك وهو قبيحٌ وإنما يجوز في الشعر. وإذا قلت أزيدُ إن يأتِكَ تضربُ فليس تكون الهاء إلا لزيد ويكونُ الفعل الآخرُ جواباً للأوّل. ويدلّك على أنّها لا تكون إلا لزيد أنك لو قلت أزيدُ إن تأتِكَ أمّة الله تضربُها لم يجز لأنك ابتدأت زيدا ولا بدّ من خبرٍ ولا يكون ما بعده خبراً له حتّى يكون فيه (ص. ٥٧) ضميرُهُ وإذا قلت زيدا لم أضربُ أو زيدا لن أضربُ لم يكن فيه إلا النصبُ لأنك لم توقع بعد لم ولن شيئاً يجوز لك أن تُقدّمه قبلهما فيكون على غير حاله بعدهما كما كان ذلك في الجزاء ولن أضربُ نفيٌ لقوله سأضربُ كما أنّ لا تضربُ نفيٌ لقوله أضربُ ولم أضربُ نفيٌ لضربتُ. وتقول كلّ رجلٍ يأتيتك فاضربُ نصبٌ لأنّ يأتيتك هاهنا صفةٌ

and it is as though (L. 5) you said, *kulla ragulin s'ālihīn ḡad'rib* 'every good man I strike'. If you were to say *ḡayyahum ḡāḡaka fa-d'rib* 'whoever visits you then strike' you raised it because he put *ḡāḡaka* 'he visited you' in place of the *xabar* 'predicate', and that is because his saying *fa-d'rib* 'then strike' is in place of the *ḡawāb* 'response' and *ḡayyu* 'whoever' is a particle of compensation/conditional, and *kullu ragulin* 'every man' is not one of the particles of compensation. Like it is *zaydun ḡin ḡatāka fa-d'rib* 'Zaid if he visits you, then strike', except when you want the beginning of *kalām* 'speech' then you erect. And it would come in the definition of your saying *zaydan ḡin yaḡtika tad'rib* 'Zaid, if he visits you, you strike' and *ḡayyahum yaḡtika tad'rib* 'whoever of them visits you, you strike' it has the status of *ḡal-laḡiy* 'the one'. You say *zaydan ḡḡā ḡatāka fa-d'rib* 'Zaid if he visits you, then strike'. If you were to put it in the location of *zaydun ḡin yaḡtika tad'rib* 'Zaid if he visits you, you strike', you raised, so raise if (L. 10) *tad'rib* 'you strike' is a *ḡawāban* 'response/apodosis' to *yaḡtika* 'he visits you'. Similarly, *ḡiyna* 'when' and *nas'b* 'erect' in Zayd is better, if the *hā?* [h], its omission makes it weaker and less acceptable, just as the *fīḡ* 'action' is unacceptable, if it has no *maf'ḡawl* 'acted-upon' whether implicit or explicit, so engage it with the first. This is not part of the *ḡiyās* 'pattern', that is to say, if you don't apocopate with it because it has the status of *ḡiyna* 'when' and *ḡḡā* 'if'. *ḡiynun* 'when' is not one of them to be the *xabar* 'predicate' to Zaid. Don't you see that you don't say *zaydun ḡinā yaḡtiniy* 'Zaid when he visits me' because *ḡiyna* 'when' is not *d'arf* 'an envelope of time' for Zaid. You say *ḡal-ḡarru ḡina taḡtiniy* 'heat when it comes my way' it is a *d'arf* 'envelope of time' from what is in it of the meaning of the *fīḡ* 'action'. All (L. 15) *d'uruwf ḡal-zamān* 'envelopes of time' are not envelopes of time for *ḡuḡaḡ* 'corpses'. If you were to say *Zaydun yawma ḡal-gumḡati ḡad'ribu* 'Zaid, I strike on Friday', it can not be except *nas'b* 'erect', because here there is no meaning of compensation/conditional and *raf'* 'raising' is not permitted except on his saying *kulluhu lam ḡas'naḡ* 'all of it I did not do/I did none of it.' Don't you see that if you were to say *zaydun yawma lal-gumḡati fa-ḡanā ḡad'ribuhu* 'Zaid on Friday then I strike him.' it is not permitted. If you were to say *zaydun ḡḡā ḡāḡaniy fa-ḡanā* (P. 58) *ḡad'ribuhu* 'Zaid if he were to visit me, then I strike him'. It is good. This proves to you that it is different from his saying *zaydan ḡad'ribu ḡina yaḡtiyka* 'Zaid I strike him when he visits you.'

فكأنك (س. ٥) قلت كل رجل صالح اضرب. وإن قلت أيهم جاءك فاضرب رفعته لأنه جعل جاءك في موضع الخبر وذلك لأن قوله فاضرب في موضع الجواب وأي من حروف المجازاة وكل رجل ليست من حروف المجازاة. ومثله زيد إن أتاك فاضرب إلا أن تريد أول الكلام فتتصب ويكون على حد قولك زيداً إن يأتك تضرب وأيهم يأتك تضرب فيصير بمنزلة الذي. وتقول زيداً إذا أتاك فاضرب. فإن وضعته في موضع زيداً إن يأتك تضرب رفعت فارفع إذا (س. ١٠) كانت تضرب جواباً ليأتك وكذلك حين والنصب في زيد أحسن إذا كانت الهاء يضعف تركها ويقبح كما إن الفعل يقبح إذا لم يكن معه مفعول مضمراً أو مظهر فاعمله في الأول وليس هذا في القياس يعني إذا لم تجزم بها لأنها تكون بمنزلة حين وإذا وحين لا يكون واحدة منهما خبراً لزيد إلا ترى أنك لا تقول زيداً حين يأتيني لأن حين لا تكون ظرفاً لزيد وتقول الحر حين تأتيني فيكون ظرفاً لما فيه من معنى الفعل. وجميع (س. ١٥) ظروف الزمان لا تكون ظرفاً للجنث. فإن قلت زيداً يوم الجمعة أضرب لم يكن فيه إلا النصب لأنه ليس هاهنا معنى جزاء ولا يجوز الرفع إلا على قوله كله لم أصنع ألا ترى أنك لو قلت زيداً يوم الجمعة فأنا أضربه لم يجز ولو قلت زيداً إذا جاءني فأنا (ص. ٥٨) أضربه كان جيداً فهذا يدل على أنه يكون على غير قوله زيداً أضرب حين يأتيك.

Chapter 33. This is a Chapter on *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* ‘the command/ imperative and the prohibition’

(Buwlāq vol.1. p. 69, Derenbourg vol.1. p.58, Haruwn vol.1. p. 137)

(I. P. 58. L. 3) *ʔal-nasʔb* ‘the erect’ is selected for the *ʔism* ‘name’ in the *ʔal-ʔamr* ‘the command/imperative’ and *ʔal-nahiy* ‘the prohibition’ on which the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’ is built and it is built on the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’ as it was chosen in the chapter on *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’, because *ʔal-ʔamr* ‘the command/imperative’ and *ʔal-nahiy* ‘the prohibition’ (L.5) have to do with the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’, just as the *ʔuruwf ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘the particles of interrogation’ are primarily concerned with the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’. Originally, one was supposed to begin with the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’ before the *ʔism* ‘name’. Similarly, *ʔal-ʔamr* ‘the command/imperative’ and *ʔal-nahiy* ‘the prohibition’ because they do not occur except with a *ʔiʔl* ‘action’ *mudʔharan* ‘explicitly’ or *mudʔmaran* ‘implicitly’ and they are stronger in this than the *ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘the interrogative’ because *ʔuruwf ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘the particles of interrogation’ may be used with nothing after them except *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ as your saying *ʔa-zaydun ʔaxuwka* ‘(is) Zaid your brother?’ and *mata zaydun muntaliʔun* ‘when (is)Zaid departing?’ and *hal samrun ʔʔariyfun* ‘(is) Amr nice?’, but the *ʔal-ʔamr* ‘the command/imperative’ and *ʔal-nahiy* ‘the prohibition’ do not come about except with *ʔiʔl* ‘an action’ and that in your saying *zaydan ʔadʔribhu* ‘Zaid, strike him’ *ʔamran ʔumrur bihi* ‘Amr, pass by him’ and *xālid ʔadʔrib ʔabāhu*, ‘Xalid, strike his father’ and *zaydan ʔʔtari lahu ʔawban* ‘Zaid, buy him a garment’. Similar to that are *ʔammā zaydan* (L. 10) *fa-ʔtilhu* ‘as to Zaid, kill him’ and *ʔammā ʔamran fa-ʔʔtari lahu ʔawban* ‘as to Amr, buy him a garment’ and *ʔammā xālidan fa-lā taʔtim ʔabāhu* ‘as to Xalid, don’t cuss his father’ and *ʔammā bakran fa-lā tamrur bihi* ‘As to Bakr, don’t pass by him’. Of this sort are *zaydan li-yadʔribhu ʔamrun* ‘Zaid that Amr strike him’ and *biʔran li-yaʔtul ʔabāhu bakrun* ‘Bishr that Bakr kill his father’ because it is *ʔamrun* ‘command/imperative’ for the *ʔāʔib* ‘absent/3rd person’ with the status of *ʔafʔal* pattern for the *muxāʔʔab* ‘addressee’.

ʔal-ʔamr ‘the command/imperative’ and *ʔal-nahiy* ‘the prohibition’ may be that the *ʔiʔl* ‘action’ is built on the *ʔism* ‘name’ and that in your saying *ʔabdu ʔal-lāh ʔadʔribhu* ‘Abdulah, strike him’. You began with *ʔabdu ʔal-lāh*

(٣٣) هذا باب الأمر والنهي

(م. ١. ص. ٥٨. س. ٣) والأمر والنهي يُختار فيهما النصب في الاسم الذي يُبنى عليه الفعل ويُبنى على الفعل كما اختير ذلك في باب الاستفهام لأنّ الأمر والنهي إنما هما (س. ٥) للفعل كما أنّ حروف الاستفهام بالفعل أولى وكان الأصل فيها أن يُبدأ بالفعل قبل الاسم فكذا الأمر والنهي لأتهما لا يقعان إلا بالفعل مظهراً أو مضمراً. وهما أقوى في هذا من الاستفهام لأنّ حروف الاستفهام قد تُستعمل وليس بعدها إلا الأسماء كقولك أزيد أخوك ومتى زيدٌ منطلق وهل عمروٌ ظريفٌ. والأمر والنهي لا يكونان إلا بفعلٍ وذلك قولك زيداً اضربه وعمراً امرُ به وخالداً اضرب أباه وزيداً اشتر له ثوباً. ومثلاً ذلك: أمّا زيداً (س. ١٠) فاقتله وأمّا عمراً فاشتر له ثوباً وأمّا خالداً فلا تَشْتِمْ أباه وأمّا بكرأ فلا تمرر به ومنه زيداً ليضربه عمروً وبشراً ليقتل أباه بكرٌ لأنه أمرٌ للغائب بمنزلة افعل للمخاطب.

وقد يكون في الأمر والنهي أن يُبنى الفعل على الاسم وذلك قولك عبداً الله اضربه ابتدأت عبداً الله

and you raised it by *ʔibtidāʔ* ‘being the beginning’ and you alerted the addressee to it that he know it by its name then you build the *fīʔ* ‘action’ on it as you did that in *ʔal-xabar* ‘the predicate’. An example of that is *ʔammā zaydun fa-ʔuʔtulhu* ‘as to Zaid, kill him’. If you were to say *zaydun fa-ʔadʔribhu* ‘Zaid, strike him’ would not be correct that you relate it to (L. 15) the *ʔibtidāʔ* ‘beginning’. Don’t you see that if you were to say *zaydun fa-muntaliʕun* ‘Zaid is about to depart’ is not correct. This is proof that it is not permitted that it be a *mubtadaʔ* ‘beginning/subject’. If you so wished you erected it on account of something. This is an explanation just as it was in *ʔal-ʔstifhām* ‘the interrogative’. If you so wished on account of *ʔalayka* ‘on you’ as though you said *ʔalayka zaydan fa-ʔuʔtulhu* ‘Zaid is against you, then kill him’. It could be good and correct that you say *ʔabdu ʔal-lāh fa-ʔadʔribhu* ‘Abdulāh then strike him’ if it were build on *mubtadaʔ mudʔhar ʔaw mudʔmar* ‘an explicit or implicit beginning/subject’. As to the explicit, your saying *hāḏā zaydun fa-ʔadʔribhu* ‘this is Zaid, then strike him’. If you so wish you don’t show *hāḏā* ‘this’, and it does its work if it is explicit and that in your saying *ʔal-hilālu wa-ʔal-lāhi*, (L.20) *fa-ʔunḏʔur ʔilayhi* ‘the crescent, by God, look at it’. It is as though you said *hāḏā ʔal-hilālu* ‘this crescent’ and then you came up with the *ʔamr* ‘command/imperative’. What proves to you the goodness of the *fāʔ* [f] here is that if you were to say *hāḏā zaydun fa-ʔasanun gamiylun* ‘this is Zaid then Hasan is handsome’, was beautiful speech. On that is the saying of the poet: (tʔawiyl)¹²

Wa ʕāʔilatin xawlānu fa-ʔinkiḥ fatātahum

Wa ʔukruwmatu ʔal-ʔayyayini xilwun kamā hiyā

‘An f-sayer from Xawlān then marry their daughter

Be welcome to both parent quarters free to marry as she is’

(I. P. 59) This was heard from the Arabs reciting it. You say *hāḏā ʔal-ragula fa-ʔidʔribhu* ‘this man, then strike him’ if you made it a *wasʔf* ‘description’ and did not make it a *xabar* ‘predicate’. Similarly, *hāḏā zadan fa-ʔidribhu* ‘this is Zaid, then strike him’ if it is *maʔtuwf* ‘conjoined’ with the *hāḏā* ‘this’ or *badal* ‘a substitute’. You say *ʔal-laḏayani ya ʔiyānika fa-ʔidʔbribhumā* ‘the two that came to you, then strike them-d’. You erect it as you erected Zaid. If you so wished you may raise it that it be built on something explicit or implicit.

فرفعته بالابتداء ونبّهت المخاطب له ليعرفه باسمه ثم بنيت الفعل عليه كما فعلت ذلك في الخبر. ومثل ذلك أمّا زيداً فاقتله. فإذا قلت زيداً فاضربه لم يستقم أن تحمله على (س. ١٥) الابتداء. ألا ترى أنك لو قلت زيداً فمنطلق لم يستقم فهذا دليل على أنه لا يجوز أن يكون مبتدأ. فإن شئت نصبت على شيء هذا تفسيره كما كان ذلك في الاستفهام وإن شئت على عليك كأنك قلت عليك زيداً فاقتله. وقد يحسن ويستقيم أن تقول عبد الله فاضربه إذا كان مبنياً على مبتدأ مظهر أو مضمّر. فأما في المظهر فقولك هذا زيداً فاضربه وإن شئت لم تُظهر هذا ويعمل كعمله إذا كان مظهرًا وذلك قولك الهلال والله (س. ٢٠) فانظر إليه كأنك قلت هذا الهلال ثم جئت بالأمر. ومما يدل على حسن الفاء هاهنا أنك لو قلت: هذا زيداً فحسن جميل كان كلاماً جيداً. ومن ذلك قول الشاعر: (طويل)

وقائلة خولان فأكح فتاتهم
وأكرومة الحيين خلوا كما هيأ

(ص. ٥٩) فهذا سُمع من العرب تُنشدُه. وتقول هذا الرجل فاضربه إذا جعلته وصفاً ولم تجعله خبراً وكذلك هذا زيداً فاضربه إذا كان معطوفاً على هذا أو بدلاً. وتقول اللذين يأتيانك فاضربهما تنصبه كما نصبت زيداً وإن شئت رفعت على أن يكون مبنياً على مظهر أو مضمّر.

¹²The meter for tʔawiyl is: *fa ʔuwlān mafāʔiylan* (four times).

Or if you so wish, it can be a *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning/subject’ because it is correct that you make its *xabar* ‘predicate’ of other than the *ʾafʿāl* ‘actions’ without (L. 5) a *fāʿ* [f]. Don’t you see that if you were to say *ʾal-laḍiy yaʾtiniy fa-lahu dirhamun* ‘the one who comes to me, then he gets a dirham’. And *ʾal-laḍiy yaʾtiniy fa-mukramun maḥmuwl* ‘the one who comes to me, then he is honored, bearable’, it is good. If you were to say *zaydun fa-lahu dirhamān* ‘Zaid, then he has for him two dirhams’ it is not permitted but the other one is permitted because his saying *ʾal-laḍiy yaʾtiniy fa-lahu dirhamun* ‘the one who comes to me, then he gets a dirham’ has the meaning of *gazāʿ* ‘recompense/apodosis’, so the *fāʿ* [f] got introduced in its *xabar* ‘predicate’, just as it is introduced into the *xabar* ‘predicate’ of *gazāʿ* ‘recompense/apodosis’. Of such as that is his saying, the powerful and glorious *ʾal-laḍiy na yunfiʿuwna ʾamwālahum bi-ʾal-layli wa ʾal-nahāri sirran wa ʾal-āniyyatan fa-lahum ʾagruhum ʾinda rabbihim wa-lā xawfun ʾalayhim wa-lā yaḥzanuwn* ‘those who spend their goods by night and day, in secret and in public, they have their reward with their lord, and there is no fear for them nor are they saddened. (Sūrah II:274). Of such are their sayings *kullu ragulin yaʾtiyka fa-huwa sʾāliḥun* ‘every man that comes to you, then he is peaceful’ and *kullu ragulin* (L. 10) *gāʾa fa-lahu dirhamāni* ‘every man who came then, he gets two dirhams’ because the meaning of the discourse is *gazāʿ* ‘recompense/apodosis’. As to the saying of ʿaddi bin Zaid: (xafiyy)¹³

ʾa-rawāḥun muwaddi ʾun ʾam bukuwru
ʾanta fa- ʾundʿur li-ʾayyi ḍāka tasʿiyru
 ‘Whether a farewell in the evening or at dawn
 You, look then whither you are heading’

It is concerned that there be in *ʾal-laḍiy* ‘the one’ that raises in the circumstance of the erected in the one that erects that it is connected to something, this is its explanation. You say you raise *ʾanta* ‘you’ on account of an implied *fi ʾn* ‘action’ because the one on account of which it is raised is the implied *ʾism* ‘name’ that is in *ʾundʿur* ‘look’. It is permitted that it be *ʾanta* ‘you’ in his saying *ʾanta ʾal-hāliku* ‘you are the destroyer’ as it is said *ʾidā dukira* (L. 15) *ʾinsānun li-šayʾin* ‘if a person is remembered for a thing’, people say *zaydun* ‘Zaid’ and people say *ʾanta* ‘you’. This is not on account that you imply *hāḍā* ‘this’ because you do not point to the *muxātab* ‘addressee’ to himself nor do you need *ḍālika* ‘that’, you rather point him out to others.

¹³The meter for xafiyy is: *fāʾilātun mustafʾilun fāʾilātun* (twice).

وإن شئت كان مبتدأ لأنه يستقيم أن تجعل خبره من غير الأفعال (س. ٥) بالفاء. ألا ترى أنك لو قلت الذي يأتيني فله درهم والذي يأتيني فمكرمٌ محمولٌ كان حسناً. ولو قلت زيدٌ فله درهمان لم يجز. وإنما جاز ذلك لأن قوله الذي يأتيني فله درهمٌ في معنى الجزاء فدخلت الفاء في خبره كما تدخل في خبر الجزاء. ومن ذلك قوله عز وجل: الَّذِينَ يُنْفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُمْ بِاللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ سِرًّا وَعَلَانِيَةً فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ. ومن ذلك قولهم: كلُّ رجلٍ يأتيك فهو صالحٌ وكلُّ رجلٍ (س. ١٠) جاء فله درهمان لأن معنى الحديث الجزاء وأما قول عدي بن زيد: (خفيف)

أرواحٌ مودّعٌ أم بئورُ
 أنت فانظرُ لأبي ذاك تصيرُ

فإنه على أن يكون في الذي يرفعُ على حالة المنصوب في الذي يصبُّ على أنه على شيء هذا تفسيره تقول ترفعُ أنت على فعل مضمَرٍ لأن الذي من سببه مرفوع وهو الاسم المضمَر الذي في انظرُ وقد يجوز أن يكون أنت على قوله أنت الهالكُ كما يقال إذا ذكِرَ (س. ١٥) إنسانٌ لشيء قال الناسُ زيدٌ. وقال الناسُ أنت. ولا يكون على أن تضمِرَ هذا لأنك لا تُشيرُ للمخاطب إلى نفسه ولا تحتاج إلى ذلك وإنما تُشير له إلى غيره.

Don't you see if you were to point to him, to his person, then you said *hādā ʔanta* 'this is you' it is not correct. This is also permitted according to your saying *šāhidāka* 'your witnesses-d', that is, *šāhidāka* is what is established for you, or what is established for you is *šāhidāka*. The exalted God said *t'āṣatun wa ʔawlun ma ʔruwf* 'obedience' and a known statement' (Sūrah XLVII:21). It is like it. It is either that he implied the *ʔism* 'name' and made this its *xabar* 'predicate', so it is as though he said my command is *t'āṣatun wa ʔawlun ma ʔruwf* 'obedience' and a known statement', or he has implied the *xabar* 'predicate, is *ʔamṭal* 'more likely'. Know that the *duṣāʔ* 'supplication' has the status of *ʔamr wa nahiy* 'command/imperative and the prohibition'. (I. P. 60) It is called *duṣāʔ* 'supplication' because it is magnified that it is called *ʔamrun wa nahiyun* 'imperative and prohibition' and that in your saying *ʔal-lāhumma zaydan fa-ʔa ʔfir ḏanbahu* 'O God, Zaid, forgive his offenses', and *zaydan fa-ʔasʔliḥ ša ʔnahu* 'Zaid, repair his state' and *ʔamran li-yagzihi ʔal-lāhu xayran* 'Amr, may God grant him goodness'. You say *zaydan ʔata ʔa ʔal-lāhu yadahu* 'Zaid, may God cut off his hand' and *zaydan ʔamarra ʔal-lāhu ʔalayhi ʔal-ʔayša* 'Zaid, may God embitter life for him' because its meaning is the meaning of *zaydan li-yaḡʔa ʔi ʔal-lāhu yadahu* 'Zaid, that may God cut off his hand. ʔabuw ʔal-ʔaswad ʔal-duʔali said: (t'awiyl)¹⁴

ʔamirāni kānā ʔaxayāniy kilāhumā

Fa-kullan gazāhu ʔal-lāhu ʔanniy bi-mā ʔa ʔala

'Two princes were both brotherly

Each one may God reward on my behalf with what he did'

(L. 5) Raising is permitted in it whatever was permitted in *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* 'the command/imperative and the prohibition' and is unacceptable in it whatever is unacceptable in *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* 'the command/imperative and the prohibition'. You say *ʔammā zaydan fa-gad ʔan lahu* 'as for Zaid, amputation for him' and *ʔammā ʔumaran fa-sa ʔyan lahu* 'as for Umar, drink for him', because if you were to make explicit the one by which *sa ʔyan* and *gad ʔan* are erected you would erect Zaid and Umar. So its implicitness has the status of its explicitness as you say *ʔammā zaydan fa-dʔarban* 'as to Zaid, then striking'. You say *ʔammā zaydan fa-salāmun ʔalayhi* 'as to Zaid, then peace be on him'. *ʔammā ʔal-kāfiru fa-la ʔnatu ʔal-lāhi ʔalayhi* 'as to the infidel, then may God's curse be on him',

¹⁴The meter for t'awiyl is: *fa ʔuwlun mafāʔiylan* (four times)

ألا ترى أنك لو أشرت له إلى شخصه فقلت هذا أنت لم يستقم. ويجوز هذا أيضاً على قولك شاهدك أي شاهدك ما يثبت لك أو ما يثبت لك شاهدك. قال الله تعالى طاعة وقول معروف. فهو مثله. فإما أن يكون أضمر الاسم وجعل هذا خبره فكأنه قال أمرى طاعة وقول معروف (س. ٢٠) أو يكون أضمر الخبر فقال طاعة وقول معروف أمثل. واعلم أن الدعاء بمنزلة الأمر والنهي (ص. ٦٠) وإنما قيل: دعاء لأنه استعظيم أن يقال أمر أو نهى. وذلك قولك اللهم زيداً فاغفر ذنبه وزيداً فأصلح شأنه وعمراً ليجزه الله خيراً. وتقول زيداً قطع الله يده وزيداً أمر الله عليه العيش لأن معناه معنى زيداً ليقطع الله يده. وقال أبو الأسود الدؤلي: (طويل)

أميران كانا أخيانى كلاهما

فكلما جزاه الله عني بما فعل

(س. ٥) ويجوز فيه من الرفع ما جاز في الأمر والنهي ويقبح فيه ما يقبح في الأمر والنهي. وتقول أمماً زيداً فجداً له وأمماً عمراً فسقياً له لأنك لو أظهرت الذي انتصب عليه سقياً وجدداً لنصبت زيداً وعمراً فإضماره بمنزلة إظهاره كما تقول أمماً زيداً فضرراً. وتقول أمماً زيداً فسلاماً عليه وأمماً الكافر فلعنة الله عليه

because this got raised with the *ʔbtidāʔ* ‘beginning/subject’. As to his saying, the powerful and glorious, *ʔal-zāniyatu wa ʔal-zāniy fa-ʔagliduw kulla wāḥidin minhumā miʔata galdatin*. As to the adulteress and adulterer, flog each one of them one hundred stipes’ (Sūrah XXIV:2) and his saying, the exalted, *ʔal-sāriʔu wa ʔal-sāriʔatu (L. 10) fa-ʔiʔtaʔuw ʔaydiyahumā* ‘as to the thief-m and the thief-f, then cut off their hands-d’ (Sūrah V:41). This was not built on the *fiʔl* ‘action’ but came similar to his saying, the exalted, *maḥalu ʔal-gannati ʔal-lattiy wuʔida bihā ʔal-muttaʔuw* ‘parable of the garden which the righteous are promised’. (Sūrah XLVII:15) then he said afterwards there is in it such and so. The parable was placed for *ʔal-ḥadiyθ* ‘discussion’ that is after it, and afterwards news are mentioned and conversations, is as though according to his saying and from the stories a parable of the garden or what relates to them of the parable is the garden. It has a bearing on this implicitness and its likes, and God knows best. Similarly, *ʔal-zāniyatu wa ʔal-zāniy* ‘the adulteress and the adulterer’ it is as though when he said *suwratun ʔanzalnāhā wa faradʔnāhā* ‘it is Suwrah we have sent it down and we have imposed it’ (Sūrah XXIV:1). He said *ʔal-farāʔidʔu ʔal-zāniyatu wa ʔal-zāniy* ‘the obligations of the adulteress and the adulterer’ or *ʔal-zāniyatu wa ʔal-zāniy fiy (L. 15) ʔal-farāʔidʔu* ‘the adulteress and the adulterer have obligations’. Then he said *fa-ʔagliduw* ‘then flog’, he came up with the *fiʔl* ‘action’ after the *rafʔ* ‘raising’ has taken place. As he said: (tʔawiy) ¹⁵

Wa *Gāʔilatin xawlānu fa-ʔnkiḥ fatātahum*

‘An f-sayer from Xawlān then marry their daughter’

He came up with the *fiʔl* after what is implicit has worked on it. Similarly, *ʔal-sāriʔu wa ʔal-sāriʔatu* ‘the thief-m and the thief-f’, is as though he said as to the ordinance of God on them *ʔal-sāriʔu wa ʔal-sāriʔatu* ‘the thief-m and the thief-f’ or *ʔal-sāriʔu wa ʔal-sāriʔatu fiymā faradʔa ʔakaykum* ‘the thief-m and the thief-f of what he imposed on you’. These things came up after stories and conversations and were related to a pattern like this. An example of that is *wa-ʔal-laḏāni ya ʔiyānihā minkum (L. 20) fa-ʔāduwḥumā* ‘and the two of you that have committed them punish them-d’ (Sūrah IV:16). This may happen in Zaid and Amr according to this definition if you were to inform about things or recommend,

لأن هذا ارتفع بالابتداء. وأما قوله عزّ وجلّ
الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهُمَا مِائَةً
جَلْدَةً . وقوله تعالى وَالسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ
(س. ١٠) فاقطعوا أيديهما فإن هذا لم يُبنَ
على الفعل ولكنه جاء على مثل قوله تعالى
مَثَلُ الْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي وَعَدَ الْمُتَّقُونَ ثُمَّ قَالَ بَعْدَ فِيهَا
كَذَا وَكَذَا. فانما وُضِعَ المَثَلُ للحديث الذي
بعده وذكر بعد أخبار وأحاديث فكانه على
قوله وَمِنَ الْقِصَصِ مَثَلُ الْجَنَّةِ أَوْ مِمَّا يُقْصُ
عليكم مَثَلُ الْجَنَّةِ فهو محمول على هذا
الإضمار ونحوه. والله أعلم. وكذلك الزَّانِيَةُ
وَالزَّانِي كَأَنَّهُ لَمَّا قَالَ سُورَةُ أَنْزَلْنَاهَا
وَقَرَضْنَاهَا قَالَ الْفَرَايِضُ الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي
أَوْ الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فِي (س. ١٥) الْفَرَايِضُ
ثُمَّ قَالَ فَاجْلِدُوا فِجَاءً بِالْفِعْلِ بَعْدَ أَنْ مَضَى
فِيهِمَا الرِّفْعُ كَمَا قَالَ: (طويل)

وقائلة خَوْلَانُ فَانكحُ فَنَاتِهِم

فجاء بالفعل بعد أن عمل فيه المضمراً.
وكذلك وَالسَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ وَفِيمَا
فَرَضَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْكُمُ السَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ أَوْ
السَّارِقُ وَالسَّارِقَةُ فِيمَا فَرَضَ عَلَيْكُمُ . فانما
جاءت هذه الأشياء بعد قِصَصٍ وَأَحَادِيثٍ .
وَحَمَلَ عَلَى نَحْوِ مِنْ هَذَا وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ وَاللَّذَانِ
يَأْتِيَانِهَا مِنْكُمْ (س. ٢٠) فَأَذَوْهُمَا وَقَدْ يَجْرِي
هَذَا فِي زَيْدٍ وَعَمْرٍو عَلَى هَذَا الْحَدِّ إِذَا كُنْتَ
تُخْبِرُ بِأَشْيَاءٍ أَوْ تُوصِي

¹⁵The meter for tʔawiy is: *fa ʔuwlan mafāʔiylan* (four times).

then you say *zaydun* 'Zaid', that is, *zaydun fiyman luws'iya bihi fa-ḥāsin ḥayhi wa ḥakrimhu* 'Zaid who has been recommended, so be good to him and honor him'. Some people have read *ḥal-sāriḡa wa ḥal-sāriḡata* 'the thief-m and the thief-f' (P. 61) and *ḥal-zāniyata wa ḥal-zāniya* 'the adulteress and the adulterer'. It occurs in Arabic as I mentioned to you to a degree of strength. However, the populace objected except the *ḡirāḡata* 'recitation' with the raising. The surface form in *ḥal-ḥamr wa ḥal-naḥiy* 'the command/imperative and the prohibition' is *ḥal-nas'b* 'the erect', because the definition of *kalām* 'speech' is pre-positioning of the *fi ḥ* 'action'. It is more required if it were to occur with *ḥalif of ḥstifhām* 'interrogation' because both (*ḥamr, naḥiy*) do not occur except with a *fi ḥ* 'action' and it is not acceptable to pre-position the *ḥism* 'name' in the rest of the particles, because they are particles that occur before the *fi ḥ* 'action'. It may occur that the meaning of their discourse leads to the *ḡazāḡ* 'compensation' (L. 5) and the *ḡazāḡ* can not be except a *xabar* 'predicate'. The *ḡazāḡ* may occur in them in the *xabar* 'predicate' but it is not obligatory like the particles of *ḡazāḡ*. So they follow their course. The *ḥamr* 'command/imperative' has no particle except the *fi ḥ* 'action'. It resembles the particles of *ḡazāḡ*, so it is unacceptable to delete the *fi ḥ* 'action' from it, just as it is unacceptable to delete the *fi ḥ* after the particles of *ḡazāḡ*. It was unacceptable to delete the *fi ḥ* and making it implicit after the particles of *ḥstifhām* 'interrogation' due to their resemblance to the particles of *ḡazāḡ*. You said *zaydan ḥd'ribhu* 'Zaid, strike him' because *ḥd'ribhu* is engaged with the *ḥāḡ* [h] and the thing commanded must have one who commands. *ḥamr* and *naḥiy* do not happen except with the *fi ḥ* 'action' (L. 10) it does not dispense with implicitness if it does not become explicit.

ثم تقول زيد اي زيد فيمن أوصي به فأحسن إليه وأكرمه. وقد قرأ ناسٌ والسارق والسارقة (ص. ٦١) والزانية والزاني وهو في العربية على ما ذكرت لك من القوة. ولكن أبنت العامة إلا القراءة بالرفع. وإنما كان الوجه في الأمر والنهي النصب لأن حدّ الكلام تقديم الفعل وهو فيه أوجب إذ كان ذلك يكون في ألف الاستفهام لأنهما لا يكونان إلا بفعل. وقُبِحَ تقديم الاسم في سائر الحروف لأنها حروفٌ تُحَدَّثُ قبل الفعل. وقد يصير معنى حديثهنّ إلى الجزء (س. ٥) والجزاء لا يكون إلا خبراً وقد يكون فيهنّ الجزء في الخبر وهي غير واجبة كحروف الجزء فأجريت مجراها. والأمر ليس يُحَدَّثُ له حرفٌ سوى الفعل فيضارع حروفَ الجزء فيقُبِحَ حذفُ الفعل منه كما يقبِح حذفُ الفعل بعد حروفَ الجزء. وإنما قُبِحَ حذفُ الفعل وإضماره بعد حروف الاستفهام لمضارعها حروفَ الجزء. وإنما قلت زيداً اضربه لأن واضربه مشغولة بالهاء والمأمور لا بدّ له من امرٍ والأمر والنهي لا يكونان إلا بالفعل فلا (س. ١٠) يستغن عن الإضمار إذا لم يظهر.

Chapter 34. This is a Chapter on *ḥuruwf* ‘particles’ that follow the course of the *ḥuruwf* ‘particles’ of *ʔistifhām* ‘interrogation’ and the *ḥuruwf* ‘particles’ of *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* ‘the command/ imperative and the prohibition’

(Buwḷāq vol.1. p. 72-5, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 61-4, Haruwn vol.1. p. 145-50)

(I. P. 61, L. 11) They are *ḥuruwf ʔal-nafiy* ‘the particles of denial’. They likened them to the *ʔalif ʔal-ʔistifhām* ‘ʔalif of interrogation’ where the *ʔism* ‘name’ *ʕuddima* ‘is pre-positioned’ before the *ʔiʔ* ‘action’ because they are *ʔayr wāʕibah* ‘not obligatory’ just as the *ʔalif* [A] and *ḥuruwf ʔal-gazāʔ* ‘particles of the conditional/recompense’¹⁶ are not obligatory. Just as the *ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* ‘imperative and prohibition’ are not obligatory and it is easy to pre-position the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ in them because they are the denial of the obligatory and they are not like *ḥuruwf ʔal-ʔistifhām wa ʔal-gazāʔ* ‘particles of interrogation and conditional/recompense’ rather they are *mudʔāri ʔatun* ‘resemblers’. They come contrary to (L. 15) his saying *ʕad kāna* ‘it so happened’ and that in your saying *mā ʔaydan darabtuhu* ‘I did not hit Zaid’, *lā ʔaydan ʕataltuhu* ‘I did not kill Zaid’, *mā ʔumaran la ʕaytu ʔabāhu* ‘I did not meet Umar’s father’, *lā ʔumaran marartu bihi* ‘I did not pass by Umar’ *lā biʔran ʔiʔtartyu lahu ʕawban* ‘I did not buy Bishr a garment’. Similarly, if you were to say *mā ʔaydan ʔanā dʔāribuhu* ‘I am not a striker of Zaid’ if you do not make it a known name. Hudbatu bin ʔal-xaʔram ʔal-ʔiḏʔariy said: (tʔawiy)l¹⁷

Fa-lā ḏā galālin hibnahu li-galālihi
wa-lā ḏā dʔayāʔin hunna yatruckna li-l-fa ʕri

‘They did not grant the glorious his glory
Nor did they leave the lost to poverty’

Zuhayr said: (basiy^t)¹⁸

Lā ʔal-dāra ʔayyarahā ba ʔdiy ʔal-ʔaniysu wa-lā
Bi-ʔal-dāri law kallamat ḏā ḥāgatun sʔamamu

‘The distance of the familiar has not changed the dwelling
Nor is the dwelling deaf if it needs to speak’

¹⁶ *ʔal-gazāʔ* corresponds to *gawāb ʔal-ʔartʔ*, the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

¹⁷ The meter for tʔawiy is: *fa ʔuwḷun mafāʔiyḷun* (four times).

¹⁸ The meter for basiy^t is: *mustafʔilun fāʔilun mustafʔilun fa ʔilun* (twice).

(٣٤) هذا باب حروف أجريت مجرى
حروف الاستفهام و حروف الأمر والنهي

(م. ١. ص. ٦١. س. ١١) وهي حروف
النفي شَبَّهوها بألف الاستفهام حيث قُدِّم
الاسم قبل الفعل لأنهن غير واجبة كما أن
الألف وحروف الجزاء غير واجبة وكما أن
الأمر والنهي غير واجبين. وسَهِّل تقديم
الأسماء فيها لأنها نفي واجب وليست
كحروف الاستفهام والجزاء إنما هي
مضارعة وإنما تجيء لخلاف قوله
(س. ١٥): قد كان وذلك قولك ما زيدا
ضربته ولا زيدا قتلته وما عمراً لقيت أباه
ولا عمراً مررت به ولا بشراً اشتريت له
ثوباً. وكذلك إذا قلت ما زيدا أنا ضاربه إذا
لم تجعله اسماً معروفاً. قال هُدْبَةُ بن الخشرم
العُذْرِي: (طويل)

فلا ذا جلالِ هِبْنُهُ لجلاله
ولا ذا ضياعِ هنَّ يَثْرُكُن للفقر

وقال زُهَيْر: (بسيط) (س. ٢٠)

لا الدَّارَ غَيْرَها بَعْدِي الأنيسُ ولا
بالدَّارِ لو كَلَّمْتُ ذا حاجةٍ صَمَمُ

and Gariyr said: (wāfir)¹⁹

Fa-lā ḥasaban faxarta bi-hi li-taymin

Wa-lā gaddan ḥāḍā ḥāḍā ḥāḍā ḥāḍā

‘There is no noble deed you honored Tayma with
Nor a piece of luck worth mentioning’

(P. 62) If you so wished you raised. *Rafʿ* ‘raising’ is stronger in it than in *ḥāḍā ḥāḍā ḥāḍā ḥāḍā* ‘ḥāḍā of interrogation’ because they are the *nafiy* ‘denial’ of an obligation after which is begun and is built on the *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning/subject’ after them and they do attain to become what they are similar to. If you were to make *mā* ‘not’ have the status of *laysa* ‘it is not’ in the dialect of the people of ḥigāz, nothing is permitted except *rafʿ* ‘raising’ because with start with the *fiʿl* ‘action’ after what has the status of a *fiʿl* ‘action’ engages it, it raises as though you said *laysa zaydun dʿarabtuḥu*. ‘It is not Zaid I hit’ some of them recited (L. 5) this line of poetry with a raise, the saying of Muzāḥim ḥāḍā-ḥāḍā: (tʿawiyil)²⁰

Wa ḡāluw ta ḡarraḡḡā ḥāḍā-manāzila min minan

Wa-mā kullu man wāḡa minan ḡanā ḡāriḡu

‘We have been introduced to the dwelling in Mina
Not everyone who came from mina do I know’

If you so wished you relate it to *laysa* ‘it is not’ and if you so wished you relate it to *kulluḥu lam ḡasnaʿ* ‘all of it, I did not do’, but that is the farther of the two aspects. They claimed that some of them makes *laysa* ‘it is not’ like *mā* ‘not’ but that is rare; it is almost unknown. It is possible that it includes *laysa xalaḡa miʿḡahu* ‘he did not create like him’ is more poetic than it and *laysa ḡālahā zaydun* ‘Zaid did not say it’. ḡumayd ḥāḍā-ḡarḡata said: (tʿawiyil)²¹ (L. 10)

Fa-ḡasʿbaḡuw wa-ḡal-nawā ḡālin mu ḡarrasiḡim

Wa-laysa kulla ḡal-nawā yulḡi ḡal-masākiynu

‘They arose in the morning with pits scattered around them
Just as the poor do not dispose of all the pits’

(Cf. Ch.21)

وقال جرير: (وافر)

فَلَا حَسَبًا فَخَرْتَ بِهِ لَتَيْمٍ

وَلَا جَدًّا إِذَا ازْدَحَمَ الْجُدُودُ

(ص. ٦٢) وإن شئت رفعت والرفع فيه أقوى إذ كان يكون في ألف الاستفهام لأنهن نفي واجب يُبتدأ بعدهن ويُنَى على المبتدأ بعدهن ولم يبلغن أن يكن مثل ما شُبِهْنَ به فإن جعلت ما بمنزلة ليس في لغة أهل الحجاز لم يجز إلا الرفع لأنك تجيء بالفعل بعد أن يعمل فيه ما هو بمنزلة فعلٍ يرفع كأنك قلت ليس زيدٌ ضربته. وقد أنشد بعضهم (س. ٥) هذا البيت رفعا قول مُزاحم العُقَيْلي: (طويل)

وقالوا تَعَرَّفَها المَنَازِلَ من مِني
وما كُلُّ من وَاقَى مِني أَنَا عارِفٌ

فإن شئت حملته على ليس وإن شئت حملته على كُله لم أصنع. وهو أبعد الوجهين. وقد زعموا أن بعضهم يجعل ليس كما وذلك قليل لا يكاد يُعرَفُ فقد يجوز أن يكون منه ليس خَلَقَ مِثْلَهُ أشعر منه وليس قالها زيد. قال حُمَيْدُ الأَرْقَطُ: (بسيط) (س. ١٠)

فأصْبَحُوا والنَّوَى عَالِي مَعْرَسِهِمْ
وليس كلُّ النَّوَى يُلقِي المساكينُ

¹⁹The meter for wāfir is: *mufāḡalatun mufāḡalatun fa ḡuwḡun* (twice).

²⁰The meter for tʿawiyil is: *fa ḡuwḡun mafāḡiyḡun* (four times).

²¹The meter for tʿawiyil is: *fa ḡuwḡun mafāḡiyḡun* (four times).

Hišām the brother of ḏiy ḡal-rummah said: (basiyṯ)²²

hiya ḡal-šifāṯu li-dāṯi law ḏʿafirtu bi-hā
wa laysa min-hā šifāṯu ḡal-dāṯi mabḏuwlu

‘She is the cure for my illness if I were to gain her
But she is not attempting to cure me of my illness’
(Cf. Ch. 21)

All this was heard from the Arabs, both the definition and the surface is that you relate it to that there is in *laysa* ‘it is not’ an implication and this is *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning/subject’ like your saying *ḡinnahu ḡamatu ḡal-lāhi ḏāhibatun* ‘it is a fact the handmaid of the lord is departing’ Except that some of them claim they said *laysa ḡal-tiybu ḡilla ḡal-misku* ‘the perfume is nothing except musk’ (L. 15) and *mā kāna ḡal-tiybu ḡilla ḡal-misku* ‘the perfume was nothing but musk’. If you were to say *mā ḡanā zaydun laḡaytuhu* ‘I did not meet Zaid’. You raised except in the saying of one who erects *zaydan laḡiytuhu* ‘Zaid I met’. Even if it is *mā* ‘not’ which has the status of *laysa* ‘it is not’. Similarly, it is as though you said *lastu zaydun laḡaytuhu* ‘It is not Zaid I met’ because you engage the *fiʿl* ‘action’ with *ḡanā* ‘I/me’ and this *kalām* ‘speech’ is in location of its *xabar* ‘a predicate’. And it is stronger in this case, because it operates on the *ḡism* ‘name’ that is after it. The *ḡalif* [A] of *ḡistifhām* ‘ḡalif of interrogation’ and *mā* ‘not’ in the dialect of Tamiym they separate so they do not operate (on them). If it got together that you separate and engage the particle. It is stronger. Similarly, *ḡnniy zaydun laḡaytuhu* ‘that I meet Zaid’ and *ḡanā samrun dʿarabtuhu* ‘I struck Amr’; *laytaniy sabdu ḡal-lāhi marartu bihi* ‘would that I had passed by Abdulah’. Because it is (L. 20) an *ḡism* ‘name’ that is *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning/subject’, then one begins after it. Or an *ḡism* ‘name’ in which *fāmil* ‘operator’ has operated on, then one began after it and the speech is in the location of the its *xabar* ‘predicate’. As to his saying, the powerful and glorious, *ḡinnā kulla šayṯin xalaḡnāhu bi-ḡadarin* ‘we have created everything according to a measure (Sūrah LIV:49). It occurs according to *zaydan dʿarabtuhu* ‘Zaid, I struck him’ and it is a frequent Arabic use. Some of them have read *wa-ḡammā ḡamuwda fa-hadaynāhum* ‘as to Thamud, we have guided them’ (Sūrah ?), but the recitation is not to be contradicted because it is the *sunna* ‘law’. like the particles (P. 63) of *ḡal-ḡistifhām* ‘interrogation’ and the particles of *ḡazāʿ* ‘conditional/recompense’ and what is likened to them

وقال هشام أخو ذي الرمة: (بسيط)

هي الشفاء لدائي لو ظفرت بها
وليس منها شفاء الداء مبدول

هذا كله سُمِعَ من العرب والحدُّ والوجه أن
تَحْمَلُهُ على أنَّ في ليس إضماراً وهذا مبتدأ
كقولك إنه أمة الله ذاهبة. إلا أنهم زعموا أن
بعضهم قال ليس الطيبُ إلا المسكُ (س).
١٥) وما كان الطيبُ إلا المسكُ. وإن قلت
ما أنا زيدٌ لقيته رفعتَ إلا في قول من نصبَ
زيداً لقيته وإن كانت ما التي هي بمنزلة ليس
فكذلك كأنك قلت لستُ زيدٌ لقيته لأنك شغلت
الفعل بأنا وهذا الكلام في موضع خبره وهو
فيه أقوى لأنه عاملٌ في الاسم الذي بعده.
وألف الاستفهام وما في لغة تميم يَفْصِلْنَ فلا
يَعْمَلْنَ. فإذا اجتمع أنك تَفْصِلُ وتُعْمَلُ الحرفُ
فهو أقوى. وكذلك إني زيدٌ لقيته وأنا عمرو
ضربته وليتني عبدُ الله مررتُ به لأنه إنما
(س. ٢٠) هو اسمٌ مبتدأ ثم ابْتَدَى بعده أو
اسم عَمَلٍ فيه عاملٌ ثم ابْتَدَى بعده والكلام
في موضع خبره فأما قوله عزَّ وجلَّ إِنَّا كَلَّمُ
شَيْءٍ خَلَقْنَاهُ بِقَدْرٍ فَإِنَّمَا جَاءَ على زيداً
ضربته وهو عربيٌّ كثيرٌ. وقد قرأ بعضهم
وَأَمَّا تَمُودَ فَهَدَيْنَاهُمْ إِلَّا أَنَّ الْقِرَاءَةَ لَا تُخَالَفُ
لأنها السُّنَّةُ. وتقول كنتُ عبدُ الله لقيته لأنه
ليس من الحروف التي يُنْصَبُ ما بعدها
كحروف (ص. ٦٣) الاستفهام وحروف
الجزاء ولا ما شَبَّهَ بها

²²The meter for basiyṯ is: *mustafīlun fāfīlun mustafīlun fa fīlun* (twice).

and is not a *fi ʔ* ‘action’ that you have mentioned to work on anything so they erect or raise it, then they are added to first *kalām* ‘speech’ the *ʔism* ‘name’ with whatever it is shared with it, like your saying *zaydan darabtu* ‘Zaid, I struck’, *ʔumarān marartu bihi* ‘Umar, I passed by him’. However, something worked on the *ʔism* ‘name’ then you put this in place of *xabarihi* ‘its predicate’ preventing it from being erect as in your saying *kāna ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔabuwhu muntaliʔun* ‘the father of Abdulah was departing’. If you were to say *kuntu ʔaxāka* ‘I was your brother’, and *zaydan marartu bihi* ‘Zaid, I passed by him’ you erected because it was executed in the *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ (L. 5) and got erected then you added to it *ʔisman wa ʔi ʔlan* ‘a name and an action’. If you were to say *kuntu zaydun marartu bihi* ‘I was Zaid, I passed by him’ it became in place of *ʔaxāka* ‘your brother’ and prevented the *fi ʔ* ‘action’ that it operate. Similarly, *ʔasibtuniy ʔabdu ʔal-lāhi marartu bihi* ‘I figured I passed by Abdulah’ because this implied the erected one is in place of the erect by *kuntu* ‘I was’ because it needs the *xabar* ‘predicate’ as the need for the *ʔism* ‘name’ for *kuntu* and the need of the *mubtadaʔ* ‘beginning/subject’. This is in the location of its *xabar* ‘predicate’ just as it was in the location of the predicate of *kāna* ‘I was’. He just wanted to say *kuntu hādīhi hāliy* ‘this was my circumstance’ and *ʔasibtuniy hādīhi hāliy* ‘I figured this was my circumstance’. Just as he said *laʔaytu ʔabda ʔal-lāhi wa zaydun yadribhu ʔamrun* ‘I met Abdulah, and Zaid, Amr was striking him’. What he said was *laʔaytu ʔabda ʔal-lāhi* (L. 10) *wa zaydun hādīhi hāluhu* ‘I met Abdulah and Zaid this is his circumstance’. He did not *yaʔiʔhu* ‘conjoined it’ to the first discourse that it be like its meaning and he did not want to say *faʔtu wa faʔala*. Similarly, he did not want to revert it in the first. Don’t you see that the *fi ʔ* ‘action’ does not penetrate in *kuntu* to the *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ with which the speech dispenses like *kuntu* ‘I was’ dispensing with its *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’, for these are in the location of predication and speech dispenses with them. If you were to say *zaydan dʔarabtu wa ʔamran marartu bihi* ‘I struck Zaid and Amr I passed by’ the second is not in the location of the *xabar* ‘predicate’ nor do you want a thing to be dispensed with. It is not completed except with it. Its circumstance is the circumstance of the first that it is a *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ and this second one does not (L. 15) prevent the first one from its *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ that it erect it, because it is not in the location of its *xabar* ‘predicate’. So how can the erect be selected for it when something has intervened

وليس بفعلٍ ذكرته ليعملَ في شيءٍ فينصبه أو يرفعه ثم يضمُّ إلى الكلام الأول الاسم بما يشركُ به كقولك زيداً ضربتُ وعمراً مررتُ به ولكنه شيءٌ عملَ في الاسم ثم وضعتُ هذا في موضع خبره مانعاً له أن ينصبَ كقولك كان عبدُ الله أبوه منطلقٌ ولو قلتُ كنتُ أخاك وزيداً مررتُ به نصبتُ لأنه قد أنفذَ إلى مفعول (س. ٥) ونُصب ثم ضمنتُ إليه اسماً وفعلًا. وإذا قلتُ كنتُ زيداً مررتُ به فقد صار في موضع أخاك ومنعَ الفعل أن يعملَ. وكذلك حسبتُني عبدُ الله مررتُ به لأنَّ هذا المضمَرَ المنصوبَ بمنزلة المرفوع في كنتُ لأنه يحتاج إلى الخبر كاحتياج الاسم في كنتُ واحتياج المبتدأ فإنما هذا في موضع خبره كما كان في موضع خبر كان فإنما أراد أن يقولَ كنتُ هذه حالي وحسبتُني هذه حالي كما قال لقيتُ عبدَ الله وزيدٌ يضربه عمروٌ فإنما قال لقيتُ عبدَ الله (س. ١٠) وزيدٌ هذه حاله ولم يعطفه على الحديث الأول ليكون في مثل معناه ولم يردُّ أن يقولَ فعلتُ وفعلَ وكذلك لم يردُّه في الأول. ألا ترى أنه لم يُنفذَ الفعل في كنتُ إلى المفعول الذي به يستغنى الكلام كاستغناء كنتُ بمفعوله. فإنما هذه في مواضع الإخبار وبها يستغنى الكلام. وإذا قلتُ زيداً ضربتُ وعمراً مررتُ به فليس الثاني في موضع خبر ولا تريد أن يستغنى به شيءٌ لا يتمُّ إلا به فإنما حاله كحال الأول في أنه مفعولٌ وهذا الثاني (س. ١٥) لا يمتنعُ الأولُ مفعوله أن ينصبه لأنه ليس في موضع خبره فكيف يُختار فيه النصبُ وقد حال

between it and its *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’ and it became in its place so that it erects it on the basis of your saying *zaydan dʿarabtuhu* ‘Zaid, I struck him’. An example of that is *Gad ʕalimtu la-ʕabdu ʕal-lāhi ʕadʿribuhu* ‘I have learned that I definitely will strike Abdulah’. The introduction of *lām* [l] shows you that what he intended by it was what he wanted, if there is nothing before it, because it is not one of those to which one thing is added to something except the thing like the particles of *ʕal-ʕštirāk* ‘participation’. Similarly, the leaving out of the *wāw* [w] in the first is like introducing the *lām* [l] here. If he so wished he may erect as the poet said, he is *ʕal-marrār ʕal-ʕasadiy: (tʿawiyl)*²³

Wa-law ʕannahā ʕyyāka ʕadʿdʿatka mi ʕluhā
Gararta ʕalā mā šī ʕta naḥran wa-kalkalā

‘If it were to wrestle you down like itself
 You drag and pull all you can with chest and torso’.

بينه وبين مفعوله وصار في موضعه إلا أن
 ينصبه على قولك زيداً ضربته. ومثل ذلك
 قد علمتُ لعبدُ الله أضربهُ فدخل اللام يذكُر
 أنه إنما أراد به ما أراد إذا لم يكن قبله شيءٌ
 لأنها ليست ممّا يُضمُّ به الشيءُ إلى الشيءِ
 كحروف الاشتراك وكذلك تركُ الواو في
 الأول هو كدخول اللام هاهنا. وإن شاء
 نصبَ كما قال الشاعر وهو المرّار (س).
 (٢٠) الأسدِي: (طويل)

ولو أنّها إيّاكَ عَضَّتْكَ مِثْلَهَا
 جررتَ على ما شئتَ نَحْرًا وَكَلْكَلا

²³The meter for tʿawiyl is: *fa ʕuwlun mafāʕiyun* (four times).

Chapter 35. This is a Chapter on *fi l* ‘action’ used with the *ism* ‘name’ then in the place of that *ism* ‘name’ *tubdilu* ‘you substitute’ another *ism* ‘name’, and it operates on it as it operated on the first .

(Buwlāq vol.1. p. 75-9, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 64-8, Haruwn vol.1. p. 150-58)

(I. P. 64) And that in your saying *raʔaytu ʕawmaka ʔakṭarahum* ‘I saw your people, most of them’; *raʔaytun baniy zaydin ʕuluʕayhim* ‘I saw baniy Zaid, two thirds of them’; *raʔaytu baniy sammika nāsan minhum* ‘I saw your cousins, people of them’; *raʔaytun sabda ʔal-lāhi šaxsahu* ‘I saw Abdulah, in person’; *sʔarāftu wuguwhahā ʔawwalihā* ‘I dismissed their faces, the first ones’. This occurs under two aspects, in that he wanted *raʔaytu ʔakṭar ʕawmika* ‘I saw most of your people’; *raʔaytu ʕulʕay ʕawmika* ‘I saw two thirds of your people’ and *sʔarāftu wuguwhā ʔawwalihā* ‘I dismissed the faces of the first ones’. However (L. 5) he dualized/said it again the *ism* ‘name’ *tawkiydan* ‘as confirmation’ just as he said *fa-sagada ʔal-malāʔikatu kulluhum ʔagma suwn* ‘then all the angels knelt, all-of-them-together’ (Sūrah XV:30), and things similar to that. An example of that is the saying of the powerful and glorious *yas ʔaluwnaka šani ʔal-šahri ʔal-ḥarāmi ʕitālin fiyhi* ‘they ask you about the forbidden month, there is fighting in it’ (Sūrah II:217). The poet said: (ragaz)²⁴

Wa-ḏakarāt taʕtuda barda māʔihā

Wa-šataku ʔal-bawli šalā ʔansāʔihā

‘She remembered Taʕtuda, the coolness of its waters

The yellowness of urine on its creatures’

and it is of the other aspect that I mention to you and it is in that he talks and says *raʔaytu ʕawmaka* ‘I saw your people’ and it occurs to him to explain what he saw of them, then he says *ʕuluʕayhim* ‘two thirds of them’ or people from them. It is not permitted that you say *raʔaytu (L. 10) zaydan ʔabāhu* ‘I saw Zaid, his father’. The father is other than Zaid, because you explain it by means of other than itself and not by something in it. Similarly you do not *dualize*/double the *ism* ‘name’ in confirmation and it is not of the first nor anything of it but you *dualize*/double it and confirm it as a dual with what is of it or it is it. It is permitted to say *raʔaytu zaydan ʔabāhu* ‘I saw Zaid, his father’ and *raʔaytu zaydan samran* ‘I saw Zaid, Amr’.

²⁴The meter for ragaz is: *mustafīlun* (six times).

(٣٥) هذا باب من الفعل يستعمل في الاسم
ثم تُبدل مكان ذلك الاسم اسماً آخر فيعمل
فيه كما عمل في الأول

(م. ١. ص. ٦٤. س. ١) وذلك قولك رأيتُ
قومك أكثرهم ورأيتُ بني زيد ثلثيهم ورأيتُ
بني عمك ناساً منهم ورأيتُ عبدَ الله شخصه
وصرفتُ وجوهها أولها فهذا يجيء على
وجهين على أنه أراد رأيتُ أكثرَ قومك و
رأيتُ ثلثيَ قومك وصرفتُ وجوهَ أولها
ولكنه (س. ٥) تئى الاسم توكيداً كما قال
فَسَجَدَ الْمَلَائِكَةُ كُلُّهُمْ أَجْمَعُونَ وَأَشْبَاهُ ذَلِكَ.
فمن ذلك قوله عزّ وجلّ يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الشَّهْرِ
الْحَرَامِ قِتَالٍ فِيهِ وقال الشاعر: (رجز)

وذكرتُ ثَقَدَ بَرْدَ مَائِهَا

وَعَتُّكَ الْبَوْلَ عَلَى أَنْسَائِهَا

ويكون على الوجه الآخر الذي أذكره لك
وهو أن يَنْكَلَمَ فيقولَ رأيتُ قومك ثم يَبْدُو له
أن يبيِّنَ ما الذي رأى منهم فيقولَ ثلثيهم أو
ناساً منهم ولا يجوز أن تقول رأيتُ (س).
(١٠) زيدا أباه والأب غيرُ زيد لأنك لا تبيِّنه
بغيره ولا بشيء ليس منه وكذلك لا تثنِّي
الاسم توكيداً وليس بالأوّل ولا شيء منه
فإنما تثنّيه وتوكِّده مُتَنَّى بما هو منه أو هو
هو. وإنما يجوز رأيتُ زيدا أباه ورأيتُ زيدا
عمراً

It is either that he wanted to say *raʿaytu ʿamran* ‘I saw Amr’ or *raʿaytu ʿabāhu* ‘I saw his father’. He made a mistake or forgot, then he corrected his speech or he shunned that, went away from it and put Amr in its place. As to the first, it is good Arabic and like it is the saying of the powerful and glorious *wa-li-llāhi ʿalā ʿal-nāsi ḥaggun ʿal-bayti man* (L. 15) *ʾiṣṭatʿāsa ʾilayhi sabiylan* ‘To God, people owe a pilgrimage to the house, those who can find a way’ (Sūrah III:97) because they are from among the people and similar to it except they return the particle of *garr* ‘pull’. He said *ʿal-malaʿu ʿal-laḍiyna ʾiṣṭakbaru min ʿawmihi li-llaḍiyna ʾiṣṭudʿifuw li-man ʿāman minhum* ‘Those who are arrogant of their people to those who are weakened of those of them who have believed’ (Sūrah VII:75). On this topic your saying *bi ʿstu matāʿaka ʿasfalahu ʿabla ʿal-nāh* ‘I sold your furniture its lowest before its highest. *ʾiṣṭaraytu matāʿaka ʿasfalahu ʿasraʿa min ʾiṣṭirāʿi ʿal-nāh* ‘I bought your furniture, its lowest faster than my buying the highest’ and *ʾiṣṭaraytu matāʿaka baʿdʿahu ʿasgala min baʿdʿin* ‘I bought your furniture some of it quicker than other’; and *saʿaytu ʾiblaka sʿiḡārahā ʿaḥsana min saʿiy kibārahā* ‘I watered you camels, their little ones better than their bigger ones’; and *dʿarabtu ʿal-nāsa baʿdʿahum ʿāʾiman wa-baʿdʿahum ʿāʾidan* ‘I struck the people some of them standing and some of them sitting’. This can not have except the *nasʿb* ‘erect’ because what you mentioned after it (L. 20) is not built on it so it becomes *mubtadaʿan* ‘beginning’, it becoming a *naʿfi* ‘description’ of the *fiʿl* ‘action’. You claimed that his selling of the lower was before his selling of the higher and the buying of some was quicker than some other and his watering the little ones was better than his watering of the big ones and you did not make it a *xabar* ‘predicate’ due to what is before it of *mubbadal* ‘what is substituted for’.

Of the same kind is *marartu bi-matāʿika* (P. 65) *baʿdʿihi marfuwʿan wa baʿdʿihi matʿruwʿan* ‘I passed by your furniture some of it raised and some of it discarded’. This can not be raised because you related the *naʿfi* ‘qualification/adjective’ to the *muruwʿ* ‘passing by’ and you made a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ to the *muruwʿ* ‘passing by’ and you did not make it built on the *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning’. If you were not making it a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ for the *muruwʿ* ‘passing by’, raising would be permitted’. Of this topic is *ʿal-zamtu ʿal-nāsa baʿdʿahum baʿdʿan* ‘I coerced the people to be with each other’ and *xawwaftu ʿal-nāsa dʿaʿiyyahum ʿawiyahum* ‘I frightened the people, their weak ones, their strong ones’

إمّا أن يكون أراد أن يقول رأيتُ عمراً أو رأيتُ أباه فغلط أو نسي ثم استدرك كلامه وإمّا أن يكون أضرب عن ذلك فنحاه وجعل عمراً مكانه . فأما الأول فجيّد عربي مثله قوله عزّ وجلّ ولله على الناس حجّ البيت من (س. ١٥) استطاع إليه سبيلاً لأنهم من الناس ومثله إلبا أنهم أعادوا حرف الجرّ قال الملاء الذين استكبروا من قومهم للذين استضعفوا لمن آمن منهم ومن هذا الباب قولك بعثت متاعك أسفله قبل أعلاه واشتريت متاعك أسفله أسرع من اشتراي أعلاه واشتريت متاعك بعضه أعجل من بعض وسقيت إبلك صغارها أحسن من سقي كبارها وضربت الناس بعضهم قائماً وبعضهم قاعداً فهذا لا يكون فيه إلا النصب لأن ما ذكرت بعده (س. ٢٠) ليس مبنياً عليه فيكون مبتدأ وإنما هو من نعت الفعل زعمت أن بيّعه أسفله كان قبل بيعه أعلاه وأن الشراء كان في بعضه أعجل من بعض وسقيته الصغار كان أحسن من سقيه الكبار ولم تجعله خبراً لما قبله من المبدل.

ومن ذلك مررت بمتاعك (ص. ٦٥) بعضه مرفوعاً وبعضه مطروحاً فهذا لا يكون مرفوعاً لأنك حملت النعت على المُرور فجعلته حالاً للمرور ولم تجعله مبنياً على المبتدأ. وإن لم تجعله حالاً للمرور لجاز الرفع. ومن هذا الباب ألزمت الناس بعضهم بعضاً وخوفت الناس ضعيفهم قويهم

and *lazima ʔal-nāsu ba ʔdʔuhum* (L. 5) *ba ʔdʔan* ‘people clung some of them to each other’. When you said *ʔalzamtu* ‘I forced’ and *xawwaftu* ‘I scared’ it became a *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ and made the second follow the course the first followed which is the *fāʔil* ‘actor’, so it became a *fi ʔl* ‘action’ that transivizes *maʔʔulayn* ‘two acted-upons’, of that also is *dafa ʔtu ʔal-nāsa ba ʔdʔuhum bi-ba ʔdʔin* ‘I pressed the people some of them on others’ based on your saying *dafa ʔa ʔal-nāsu babdʔuhum ba ʔdʔan* ‘people pushed some of them against others’. The introduction of the *bāʔ* [b] here has the status of your saying *ʔalzamtu* ‘I coerced’ as though you said by way of representation *ʔadfa ʔtu* ‘I pressed against’ just as you say *ʔahabta bihi min ʔindinā* ‘you took him away from us’ and *ʔadhabtahu min ʔindinā* ‘you made him go away from us’ and *ʔaxragtahu ma ʔaka* ‘you took him out with you’ and *xaragta bihi ma ʔaka* ‘you exited with him’. Similarly, *mawayztu matāʔaka ba ʔdʔahu min ba ʔdʔin* ‘I separated you furniture some of it from the other’, and *ʔawsʔaltu ʔal-ʔawma* (L. 10) *ba ʔdʔahum ʔilā ba ʔdʔin* ‘I connected the people some of them with the others’. You made it a *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ according to the term that you made what was before it and his saying *ʔilā ba ʔdʔ* ‘to some’ and *min ba ʔdʔ* ‘from some’ became in the place of an erected *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’.

Of that is *fadʔdʔaltu matāʔaka ʔasfalahu ʔalā ʔalāh* ‘I preferred your furniture its upper over its lower’. He made is a *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ due to his saying *xaraga matāʔuka ʔasfaluhu ʔalā ʔalāh* ‘your furniture got out its lower on its higher’. It is as though by way of representation *fadʔala matāʔuka ʔasfaluhu ʔalā ʔalāh* ‘your furniture remains its lower on its upper’, so *ʔalā ʔalāh* ‘on its higher’ is in the location of *nasʔb* ‘erect’. An example of that is *sʔakaktu ʔal-ʔagarayni ʔaʔadahumā bi-ʔal-ʔāxari* ‘I rubbed the two stones one with the other’ on the ground that it is a *maʔʔuwl* ‘acted-upon’ from *ʔisʔʔakka ʔal-ʔagarāni ʔaʔadahumā bi-ʔal-ʔāxari* ‘he rubbed the two stones one with the other’. An example of that is the saying of the powerful and the glorious *wa-lawlā difāʔu* (L. 15) *ʔal-lāhi ʔal-nāsa ba ʔdʔahum bi-ba ʔdʔin* ‘were it not the defense of God of the people some of them with others’ (Sūrah II:251). This follows the course of the *magruwr* ‘pulled with an [i]’ as it follows the *mansʔuwb* ‘the erect with an [a]’, and that in your saying *ʔagibtu min dafʔi ʔal-nāsi ba ʔdʔihim fi-ba ʔdʔin* ‘I was pleased with the defense of the people some of them by others’.

ولزِمَ النَّاسُ (س. ٥) بَعْضُهُمْ بَعْضًا فَلَمَّا قَلْتُ أَلْزَمْتُ وَخَوِّفْتُ صَارَ مَفْعُولًا وَأَجْرِيَتِ الثَّانِي عَلَى مَا جَرَى عَلَيْهِ الْأَوَّلُ وَهُوَ فَاعِلٌ فَصَارَ فِعْلًا يَتَّعَدَى إِلَى مَفْعُولَيْنِ وَعَلَى ذَلِكَ دَفَعْتُ النَّاسَ بَعْضُهُمْ بِبَعْضٍ عَلَى قَوْلِكَ دَفَعَ النَّاسُ بَعْضُهُمْ بَعْضًا. وَدَخُولُ الْبَاءِ هَاهُنَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِكَ أَلْزَمْتُ كَأَنَّكَ قَلْتَ فِي التَّمْثِيلِ أَدْفَعْتُ كَمَا أَنَّكَ تَقُولُ ذَهَبْتَ بِهِ مِنْ عِنْدِنَا وَأَدْهَبْتَهُ مِنْ عِنْدِنَا وَأَخْرَجْتَهُ مَعَكَ وَخَرَجْتَ بِهِ مَعَكَ. وَكَذَلِكَ مَيَّزْتُ مَتَاعَكَ بَعْضَهُ مِنْ بَعْضٍ وَأَوْصَلْتُ (س. ١٠) الْقَوْمَ بَعْضَهُمْ إِلَى بَعْضٍ فَجَعَلْتَهُ مَفْعُولًا عَلَى حَدِّ مَا جَعَلْتَ الَّذِي قَبْلَهُ وَصَارَ قَوْلُهُ إِلَى بَعْضٍ وَمِنْ بَعْضٍ فِي مَوْضِعِ مَفْعُولٍ مَنْصُوبٍ.

وَمِنْ ذَلِكَ فَضَّائَتْ مَتَاعَكَ أَسْفَلَهُ عَلَى أَعْلَاهُ فَإِنَّمَا جَعَلَهُ مَفْعُولًا مِنْ قَوْلِهِ خَرَجَ مَتَاعُكَ أَسْفَلَهُ عَلَى أَعْلَاهُ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ فِي التَّمْثِيلِ فَضَّلَ مَتَاعُكَ أَسْفَلَهُ عَلَى أَعْلَاهُ فَعَلَى أَعْلَاهُ فِي مَوْضِعِ نَصْبٍ وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ صَكَّكَ الْحَجَرَيْنِ أَحَدَهُمَا بِالْآخِرِ عَلَى أَنَّهُ مَفْعُولٌ مِنْ اصْطِطَّكَ الْحَجَرَانِ أَحَدَهُمَا بِالْآخِرِ. وَمِثْلَ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَلَوْ لَأَدْفَعُ (س. ١٥) اللَّهُ النَّاسَ بَعْضُهُمْ بِبَعْضٍ وَهَذَا مَا يَجْرَى مِنْهُ مَجْرُورًا كَمَا يَجْرَى مَنْصُوبًا وَذَلِكَ قَوْلِكَ عَجِبْتُ مِنْ دَفَعَ النَّاسَ بَعْضُهُمْ بِبَعْضٍ

If you make *ʔal-nās* ‘the people’ *maʔfuwliyn* ‘acted-upons’ it has the status of your saying *ʔagibtu min ʔdhābi ʔal-nāsi baʔdʔihim baʔdʔan* ‘I was pleased by the pressing of the people, some of them others’, because if you were to say *ʔaʔʔaltu* you dispense with the *bāʔ* [b] and if you were to say *faʔʔaltu*, *ʔhʔtagta* ‘you needed’ the *bāʔ* [b]. It followed the course of *garr* ‘pull with an [i]’ according to your saying *dafaʔtu ʔal-nāsa baʔdʔahum bi-baʔdʔin* ‘I pushed the people some of them against others’. If you make the *nās* ‘people’ *fāʔiliyn* ‘actors’ you say *ʔagibtu min dafʔi ʔal-nāsi baʔdʔihim baʔdʔan* ‘I am pleased with people pushing each other’. It followed the course of the *garr* ‘pull with an [i]’, according to the term of its course in (L. 20) the *raʔʔ* ‘raising with an [u]’ just as it took its course in the first according to its course in the *nasʔb* ‘erect with an [a]’ and it is your saying *dafaʔa ʔal-nāsu baʔdʔuhum baʔdʔan* ‘the people pushed each other’ and similarly all that we have mentioned. If you were to engage the *masʔdar* ‘root’ with it, it follows its course in the *fiʔl* ‘action’ and of that is your saying *ʔagibtu min muwāʔaʔata ʔal-nāsi ʔaswadihim ʔahmarahum* ‘I am pleased with the agreement of the people, of their black ones with the red ones’. It followed the course of your saying *wāʔaʔa ʔal-nāsu ʔaswaduhum ʔahmarahum*. ‘The people agreed their black ones with their red ones’ and you say *samiʔtu* (P. 66) *waʔʔa ʔanyābihi baʔdʔihā faʔʔa baʔdʔin* ‘I heard the fall of his canines some on top of others’ follows the course of your saying *waʔʔaʔat ʔanyābuhu baʔdʔuhā faʔʔa baʔdʔin* ‘his canines fell some on top of others’ and you say *ʔagibtu min ʔyʔāʔi ʔanyābihi baʔdʔihā faʔʔa baʔdʔin* ‘I am please with the falling of his canines some of them on others’ in terms of the definition of your saying *ʔuwʔiʔat ʔanyābuhu baʔdʔuhā faʔʔa baʔdʔin* ‘his canines have been dropped some on top of others’. This is the aspect of the agreement of the *raʔʔ* ‘raising’ and the *nasʔb* ‘erecting’ in this chapter and the choice of the *raʔʔ* ‘raising’ and the choice of the *nasʔb* ‘erecting’. You say *raʔʔaytu matāʔaka baʔdʔuhu faʔʔa baʔdʔin* ‘I saw your furniture some of it above the other,’ if you make *faʔʔan* ‘above’ in the location of an *ʔism* ‘name’ that is built on the *mubtadaʔ* ‘beginning/subject’ (L. 5) and you made the first *mubtadaʔ* ‘beginning/subject’ as though you said *raʔʔaytu matāʔaka baʔdʔuhu ʔahsanu min baʔdʔin* ‘I saw your furniture some of it is nicer than the other’ and *faʔʔa* ‘above’ is in place of *ʔahsana* ‘nicer’. If you consider *hāl* ‘circumstances’ with the status of your saying

إذا جعلت الناس مفعولين كان بمنزلة قولك إذا جعلت الناس مفعولين كان بمنزلة قولك عجبته من إذهاب الناس بعضهم بعضاً لأنك إذا قلت أفعلت استغنيت عن الباء وإذا قلت ففعلت احتجت إلى الباء وجرى في الجر على قولك دفعت الناس بعضهم ببعض. وإن جعلت الناس فاعلين قلت عجبته من دفع الناس بعضهم بعضاً جرى في الجر على حد مجراه في (س. ٢٠) الرفع كما جرى في الأول على مجراه في النصب وهو قولك دفع الناس بعضهم بعضاً. وكذلك جميع ما ذكرنا إذا عملت فيه المصدر فجرى مجراه في الفعل. ومن ذلك قولك عجبته من موافقة الناس أسودهم أحمرهم جرى على قولك وافق الناس أسودهم أحمرهم. وتقول سمعت (ص. ٦٦) وقع أنيابه بعضها فوق بعض جرى على قولك وقعت أنيابه بعضها فوق بعض. وتقول عجبته من إيقاع أنيابه بعضها فوق بعض على حد قولك أوقعت أنيابه بعضها فوق بعض. هذا وجه اتفاق الرفع والنصب في هذا الباب واختيار النصب واختيار الرفع. تقول رأيت متاعك بعضه فوق بعض إذا جعلت فوقاً في موضع الاسم المبني على المبتدأ (س. ٥) وجعلت الأول مبتدأ كأنك قلت رأيت متاعك بعضه أحسن من بعض وفوق في موضع أحسن. وإن جعلته حالاً بمنزلة قولك

marartu bi-matāḥika baḥḍiḥi matʿruwḥan wa-baḥḍiḥi marfuwḥan ‘I passed by your furniture some of it thrown down and some lifted up’. You erected it because you did not build anything on it so you can begin with it. If you so wished you said *raḥaytu matāḥaka baḥḍiḥi ḥaḥsana min baḥḍiḥin* ‘I saw your furniture some of it is nicer than the other’. It becomes of the status of *raḥaytu baḥḍiḥi matāḥaka ḥal-gayyida* ‘I saw some of your good furniture’ you connected with the *maḥḥwuliyn* ‘acted-upons’ because *ḥabdalta* ‘you substituted’ so you became as though you said *raḥaytu baḥḍiḥi matāḥaka* ‘I saw some of your furniture’. *Raḥḥ* ‘raising’ in this is *ḥaḥraf* ‘better known’ because they likened it to your saying (L. 10) *raḥaytu zaydan ḥabuwhw ḥaḥḍiḥi minhu* ‘I saw Zaid, his father is nobler than him’ because it is *ḥism* ‘a name’ that is for the first and because of it, just as this one is for it and because of it and the last one is the first that is begun with, just as the other one here is the first *mubtadaʿ* ‘beginning’ and if you were to erect that would be good Arabic. What came raised is his saying, the powerful and the glorious, *wa-yawma ḥal-ḥiyāmati tarā ḥal-laḥiyana kaḥabuw ḥalā ḥal-lāhi wuguwhumum muswaddatun* ‘on the day of the resurrection, you will see those who lied to God their faces blackened’ (Sūrah XXXIX:60). What came with *naḥḥb* ‘erecting with [a]’ we heard of one whose Arabic we trust say *xalaḥa ḥal-lāhu ḥal-zarāḥata yadayḥa ḥaḥwala min riḥlayḥa* ‘God created the giraffe, its hands are longer than its legs’. Yuwnis has informed us that the Arabs recite this verse and it is of *ḥabdata bin ḥal-tʿabiyb*: (tʿawiyl)²⁵

Fa-mā kāna ḥaysun hulkuhu hulku/a wāḥidin
Wa-lākinnaḥu bunyānu ḥawmin tahaddamā

‘Nor was Gays whose death was the death of one
Rather he was a structure of a people destroyed’

A man of *bagiylata* or *xaḥḥam* said: (wāfir)²⁶

ḥariyniy ḥinna ḥamraki lan yutāḥā
Wa-mā ḥalfaytiniy ḥilmiy mudʿāḥā

‘Permit me that your order will not be obeyed
and you will not find me with my dream lost’

Someone else said on *badal* ‘substitution’: (ragaz)²⁷ (L.20)

مررت بمتاعك بعضه مطروحاً وبعضه مرفوعاً نصبته لأنك لم تبني عليه شيئاً فتبتدئه. وإن شئت قلت رأيت متاعك بعضه أحسن من بعض فيكون بمنزلة قولك رأيت بعض متاعك الجيد فتوصله إلى مفعولين لأنك أبدلت فصرت كأنك قلت رأيت بعض متاعك. والرفع في هذا أعرف لأنهم شبهوه بقولك (س. ١٠) رأيت زيدا أبوه أفضل منه لأنه اسم هو للأول ومن سببه كما أن هذا له ومن سببه والآخر هو المبتدأ كما أن الآخر هاهنا هو المبتدأ الأول. وإن نصبت فهو عربي جيد. فمما جاء رفعاً قوله عز وجل ويوم القيامة ترى الذين كذبوا على الله وجوههم مسودة. ومما جاء في النصب أنا سمعنا من يوثق بعربيته يقول خلق الله الزرافة يديها أطول من رجليها. وحدثنا يونس أن العرب تنشد هذا البيت وهو لعبد بن الطبيب: (طويل)

فما كان قيس هلكه هلك واحد
ولكنه بئيان قوم تهدما

وقال رجل من بجيلة أو خثعم: (وافر)

دريني إن أمرك لن يطاعا
وما ألقيتني حلمي مضاعا

وقال آخر في البذل: (رجز) (س. ٢٠)

²⁵The meter for tʿawiyl is: *faḥuwlun maḥāḥiyun* (four times).

²⁶The meter for wāfir is: *mufāḥalatun mufāḥalatun faḥuwlun* (twice).

²⁷The meter for ragaz is: *mustaḥḥilun* (six times).

ʔinna ʔalayya ʔal-lāha ʔan tubāyi ʔā
Tu ʔaxaḏa karhan ʔaw tagi ʔa t'āʔi ʔan
 'I swear by God that you endorse
 You take it reluctantly or you come willingly'

إِنَّ عَلَيَّ اللَّهُ أَنْ تُبَايَعَا
 تُؤْخَذُ كَرْهًا أَوْ تَجِيءُ طَائِعًا

(P. 67) This is good Arabic and the first one is better known and more frequent. You say *ga ʔaltu matāʔaka ba ʔd'ahu ʔaw ʔa ba ʔd'in* 'I set you furniture some of it over the other' This has three aspects in *nas' b* 'erecting with [a]'. If you so wished you make *ʔaw ʔa* 'over/above' in the location of the *ḥāl* 'state/circumstance' as though he said *ʔamaltu matāʔaka wa huwa ba ʔd'uhu ʔalā ba ʔd'* 'I made your furniture some of is on the other', that is in the *ḥāl* 'circumstance' as you did with *ra ʔaytu ʔiy ru ʔyati ʔal-ʔayn* 'I saw, the seeing of the eye' and if you so wished you erected it according to your erecting *ra ʔaytu zaydan waghahu ʔaḥsana min waghī fulān* 'I saw Zaid, his face is nicer than the face of so and so'. Your intend the sight of (L. 5) the heart and if you so wished you erected it on the basis that if you said *ga ʔaltu matāʔaka* 'I made your furniture' the meaning of *ʔal ʔaytu* 'I tossed' enters into it and becomes as though you said *ʔal ʔaytu matāʔaka ba ʔd'ahu ʔaw ʔa ba ʔd'in* 'I tossed your furniture some of it on top of the other' because *ʔal ʔaytu* 'I tossed' is like *ʔas ʔattu matāʔaka ba ʔd'ahu ʔaw ʔa ba ʔd'in* 'I dropped your furniture some of it on top of the other' and it is *ma ʔsuwl* 'acted-upon' according to your saying *sa ʔat'a mata ʔuka ba ʔd'ud'hu ʔaw ʔa ba ʔd'in* 'your furniture some of it fell over the other'. It followed the course as that of *s'akaktu ʔal-ḥagarayni ʔaḥadahumā bi-ʔal-ʔāxari* 'I rubbed the two stones one with the other' your saying *bi-ʔal-ʔāxari* 'with the other' is not the location of *ʔism* 'a name' which is the first but in the place of the other *ʔism* 'name' in your saying *s'akka ʔal-ḥagarāni ʔaḥduhumā ʔal-ʔāxara* 'he rubbed two stones one of them with the other', but you connected the *ʔi ʔ* 'action' with the *bāʔ* '[b]' just as (L. 10) *marartu bi-zaydin* 'I passed by Zaid' the *ʔism* 'name' from it is in the place of *ʔism mans'uwb* 'an erected name'.

(ص. ٦٧) هذا عربي حسن والأول أعرف وأكثر. وتقول جعلت متاعك بعضه فوق بعض فله ثلاثة أوجه في النصب إن شئت جعلت فوق في موضع الحال كأنه قال علمت متاعك وهو بعضه على بعض أي في هذه الحال كما فعلت ذلك في رأيت في رؤية العين. وإن شئت نصبته على ما نصبت عليه رأيت زيدا وجهه أحسن من وجه فلان تريد رؤية (س. ٥) القلب وإن شئت نصبته على أنك إذا قلت جعلت متاعك يدخل فيه معنى ألقيت فيصير كأنك قلت ألقيت متاعك بعضه فوق بعض لأن ألقيت كقولك أسقطت متاعك بعضه على بعض وهو مفعول من قولك سقط متاعك بعضه على بعض فجرى كما جرى صككت الحجرين أحدهما بالآخر. فقولك بالآخر ليس في موضع اسم هو الأول ولكنه في موضع الاسم الآخر في قولك صكك الحجران أحدهما الآخر ولكنك أوصلت الفعل بالباء كما (س. ١٠) أن مررت بزید الاسم منه في موضع اسم منصوب.

An example of this is *t'arāḥtu ʔal-matāʔa ba ʔd'ahu ʔalā ba ʔd'in* 'I dropped the furniture some of it on the other' because its meaning is *ʔas ʔat't'u* 'I let fall' so it followed its course even if there is no *ʔāʔil* from *la ʔd'* 'expression' and a confirmation of that is his saying, the powerful and the glorious, *wa-yag ʔala ʔal-xabiy ʔa ba ʔd'ahu ʔalā ba ʔd'in* 'and he places the evil some on the other' (Sūrah VIII:37).

ومثل هذا طرحت المتاع بعضه على بعض لأن معناه أسقطت فأجري مجراه وإن لم يكن من لفظه فاعل وتصديق ذلك قوله عز وجل وَيَجْعَلُ الْخَبِيثَ بَعْضُهُ عَلَى بَعْضٍ

The third aspect is that you make it like *ḏʿanantu matāfaka baṣḏʿahu ṭaḥsana min baṣḏʿ* ‘I supposed your furniture some of it is better than the other’. *Raff* ‘raising’ in it is frequent Arabic. You say *gaṣaltu matāfaka baṣḏʿuhu ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘I made your furniture some of it on the other’. The aspect of the *raff* ‘raising’ in it is what was in *raṭaytu* ‘I saw’. You say *ṭabkaytu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ṣalā baṣḏʿ* ‘I make your people cry some of them for the others’. (L. 15) and *ḥazzantu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ṣalā baṣḏʿ* ‘I make your people sad some of them for the others’. You made this follow the definition of the *fāṣil* ‘actor’ if you said *bakā ḡawmuka baṣḏʿuhum ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘your people cried some of them over the others’ and *ḥazina ḡawmuka baṣḏʿuhum ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘your people grieved some of them over the others’. The aspect here is the *nasʿb* ‘erecting’ because if you were to say *ṭaḥzantu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘I saddened your people some of them over the others’ and *ṭabkaytu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘I made your people cry some of them over the others’ you did not want to say *baṣḏʿahum ṣalā baṣḏʿin* ‘some of them over the others’ in terms of aid nor that their bodies were on top of each other, then the *raff* ‘raising’ would be the surface. Rather you made it follow the course of your saying *bakā ḡawmuka baṣḏʿuhum baṣḏʿan* ‘your people, some of them made others cry’. You connected that *fi* ‘action’ to the *ḥism* ‘name’ with the particle of (L 20) *garr* ‘pull with an [i]’ and the *kalām* ‘speech’ is in the location of an *ḥism mansʿuwb* ‘erected name’. Just as you say *marartu bi-zaydin* ‘I passed by Zaid’, its meaning is *marartu zaydan* ‘I passed Zaid’. If (P. 68) you said *ḥazzantu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿuhum ṭafdʿala min baṣḏʿin* ‘I saddened you people, some of them are better than others’ and *ṭabkaytu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ṭakrum min baṣḏʿin* ‘I honored your people, some of them are more noble than others’, *raff* ‘raising’ is the surface because the other is the first and did not place in the location of the *mafʿuwl* ‘acted-upon’, it is not the first. If you so wished, you erected it with an [a] on the basis of your saying *ḥazzantu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum ḡāḥiman wa baṣḏʿahum ḡāḥidan* ‘I saddened you people, some of them standing and some of them sitting down’ according to *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ because you may say *raṭaytu ḡawmaka ṭakṭarahum* ‘I saw your people, most of them’ and *ḥazzantu ḡawmaka baṣḏʿahum* ‘I saddened your people, some of them’. If this is permitted, then you followed it with what is a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’.

والوجه الثالث أن تجعله مثل ظننت متاعك بعضه أحسن من بعض والرفع أيضاً عربي كثير تقول جعلت متاعك بعضه على بعض فوجه الرفع فيه على ما كان في رأيت وتقول أبكيت قومك بعضهم على بعض (س. ١٥) وحزنت قومك بعضهم على بعض فأجريت هذا على حد الفاعل إذا قلت بكى قومك بعضهم على بعض وحزن قومك بعضهم على بعض فالوجه هاهنا النصب لأنك إذا قلت أحزنت قومك بعضهم على بعض وأبكيت قومك بعضهم على بعض لم ترد أن تقول بعضهم على بعض في عون ولا أن أجسادهم بعضها على بعض فيكون الرفع الوجه ولكنك أجريته على قولك بكى قومك بعضهم بعضاً وإنما أوصلت الفعل إلى الاسم بحرف (س. ٢٠) الجر والكلام في موضع اسم منصوب كما تقول مررت على زيد ومعناه مررت زيدا فان (ص. ٦٨) قلت حزنت قومك بعضهم أفضل من بعض وأبكيت قومك بعضهم أكرم من بعض كان الرفع الوجه لأن الآخر هو الأول ولم يجعله في موضع مفعول هو غير الأول. وإن شئت نصبته على قولك حزنت قومك بعضهم قائماً وبعضهم قاعداً على الحال لأنك قد تقول رأيت قومك أكثرهم وحزنت قومك بعضهم فإذا جاز هذا أثبتته ما يكون حالاً

(L. 5) If it is of those that are followed by two *mafiwlayn* 'acted-upons' your extended it to it because it is as though nothing before it is mentioned and it is as though you said *raʔaytu ʕawmaka* 'I saw your people' and *hazzantu ʕawmaka* 'I saddened your people' except that it is the more Arabic and the more frequent, if the last one is the first that it begins, and if you make it follow the course of the *nasʔb* 'erecting' then it is good Arabic.

(س. ٥) وإن كان مما يتعدى إلى مفعولين أنفذته إليه لأنه كأنه لم تذكر قبله شيئاً كأنك قلت رأيتُ قومك وحزنت قومك. إلا أن أعربه وأكثره إذا كان الآخر هو الأول أن يُبتدأ وإن أجرئته على النصب فهو عربي جيد.