

This is the Famous Book of Sibawayh on *nahw* 'Grammar' and its  
Name is *ʔal-kitāb* 'The Book'

Solomon Sara, S.J.  
Georgetown University

In the Name of God the most merciful and the most compassionate.  
From him we seek help.

Chapter 1. This is *bāb* 'a chapter' on the *ʔilm* 'science':  
What are the Words of Arabic

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.2, Derenbourg vol.1. p.1, Haruwn vol.1. p.12)<sup>1</sup>

Words are: *ʔism* 'name', *ʔiʔl* 'action', and *ḥarf* 'particle'<sup>2</sup>. Particle *gāʔa limaʔnah* 'has meaning'. It is neither *ʔism* 'a name' nor *ʔiʔl* 'an action'. *ʔism* 'name'<sup>3</sup> is: *ragulun* 'man', *farasun* 'horse' *ḥāʔiṭun* 'wall'. As for *ʔiʔl* 'action', examples were taken from the *lafḏ* 'expression' for the *ʔalfāḏ* 'events' of the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', and were constructed for what *madʔā* 'has passed, what *yakuwnu* 'is to be' but has not *yaḡaʔ* 'happened', and for what is *kāʔin* 'existent' and has not *yanḡaʔiʔ* 'ceased'. As for the structure of what *madʔā* 'has passed', it is: *ḏahaba* 'he went', *samiʔa* 'he heard', *makuḏa* 'he remained', and *ḥumida* 'he was thanked'. As for the structure of what has not *yaḡaʔ* 'happened', it is, as your statement in giving a command: *ʔiḏhab* 'go!', *ʔuḡtul* 'kill!', *ʔidʔrib* 'hit!', and *muxbiran* 'predicating': (L.5) *yaḡtulu* 'he kills'<sup>4</sup>, *yaḏhabu* 'he goes', *yadʔribu* 'he hits', *yuḡtalu* 'he is killed', and *yudʔrabu* 'he is hit'. Similarly is the structure of what has not *yanḡaʔiʔ* 'ceased' and is still *kāʔin* 'existent', if you were to predicate about it. These *ʔamḏilah* 'examples' are taken from the *lafḏ* 'expression' for the *ʔaḥḏāḏ* 'events' of the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', and they have many structures which will be explained, God willing. As for *ʔaḥḏāḏ* 'events', examples are: *ʔal-dʔarb* 'the hit', *ʔal-ḡatl* 'the kill', and *ʔal-ḥamd* 'the praise'.

<sup>1</sup>This translation will be based on Derenbourg's edition of *ʔal-kitāb* as the base. All chapter, page and line numbers refer to this edition.

<sup>2</sup>This tri-partite division will be elaborated on in the rest of *ʔal-kitāb*. Also to be mentioned is that a decision was made to be as faithful to the literal meaning of the terms as possible.

<sup>3</sup>The way Sībawayh explains terms like *ʔism* 'name', *ʔiʔl* 'action', and *ḥarf* 'particle', is by way of exemplification.

<sup>4</sup>This form may be glossed as 'he is killing'.

هذا كتاب سيويه  
المشهور في النحو واسمه  
الكتاب

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم  
وبه نستعين

(١) هذا باب علم ما الكلم من  
العربية

فالكلم اسمٌ وفِعْلٌ وحرْفٌ جاء  
لمعنى ليس باسم ولا فعل  
فالأسم رجلٌ وفرسٌ وحائطٌ  
وأما الفعل فأمثلة أخذت من  
لفظ أحداث الأسماء وبُنيت لما  
مضى ولما يكون ولم يقع وما  
هو كائن لم ينقطع فأما بناء ما  
مضى فذهبَ وسمعَ ومكثَ  
وحمدَ وأما بناء ما لم يقع فانه  
قولك امرأ اذهب واقْتُلْ  
واضربْ ومخير {س ه} يَقْتُلْ  
ويذهبُ ويضربُ ويُقتلُ  
ويضربُ وكذلك بناء ما لم  
ينقطع وهو كائن إذا أخبرت  
فهذه الأمثلة التي أخذت من لفظ  
أحداث الأسماء ولها أبنية كثيرة  
ستبين إن شاء الله والأحداث  
نحو الضربِ والقْتلِ والحمدِ.

As for what has meaning but is neither *ʔism* 'a name' nor *fiʔl* 'an action' they are such as: *θumma* 'then', *sawfa* 'future marker', *wāw ʔal-qasam* '[w] of oath', *lām* '[l]' of *ʔal-ʔidāfah* 'annexion', and similar ones.<sup>5</sup>

وأما ما جاء لمعنى وليس باسم  
ولا فعل فنحو *ثُمَّ* و*سَوْفَ* و*وَأَوْ*  
القسم و*لَام* الإضافة ونحو هذا.

<sup>5</sup> At this early stage, the three classes of words are described both by what they are, names and events, with temporal indicators marking the variety of actions, and by what they are not with the particles being different from both names and names of events and the temporality of actions. Each class will be more fully attended to in the subsequent chapters.

## Chapter 2 .This is a Chapter on *magāriy* ‘channels’ at the *ʔawāxir* ‘ends’ of Arabic Words

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.2, Derenbourg vol. 1. p.1, Haruwn vol.1. p.13)

They flow into eight channels: the *naṣb* 'erect', (L. 10) the *garr* 'pull', the *rafʿ* 'raise', the *gazm* 'cut', the *fath* 'open', the *kasr* 'break', the *d'amm* 'close', and the *waḡf* 'pause'. These eight channels are expressly grouped together into four *ʔadʿrub* ‘types’: the *naṣb* 'erect' and the *fath* 'open'<sup>6</sup> in *ʔal-lafʿ* ‘the articulation’ are *dʿarb wāhid* ‘one type’, the *garr* 'pull' and the *kasr* 'break'<sup>7</sup> expressions are one type, similarly are *ʔal-rafʿ* 'the raise' and *ʔal-d'amm* 'the close'<sup>8</sup>, and *ʔal-gazm* 'the cut' and *ʔal-waḡf* 'the pause'<sup>9</sup>. I mentioned to you eight channels<sup>10</sup> in order to distinguish between what can

## (٢) هذا باب مجاري أواخر الكلم من العربية

وهي تجري على ثمانية مجاري  
على النصب {س ١٠} والجرّ  
والرفع الجزم والفتح والكسر  
والضمّ والوقف وهذه المجاري  
الثمانية يجمعهنّ في اللفظ  
أربعة اضرب فالنصب والفتح  
في اللفظ ضرب واحد والجرّ  
والكسر ضرب واحد وكذلك  
الرفع الضمّ والجزم والوقف  
وإنما ذكرت لك ثمانية مجاري  
لأفرق بين ما

<sup>6</sup>The eight channels/ends of words are grouped into four types to align the function with the expression of the function. E.g. the *naṣb* 'erect' with its phonetic expression of *fath* 'open [a]' .

<sup>7</sup>The *garr* 'pull' and its phonetic expression *kasr* 'break [i]' .

<sup>8</sup> *ʔal-rafʿ* 'the raise' and its phonetic expression *ʔal-d'amm* 'the close [u]' .

<sup>9</sup>*ʔal-gazm* 'the cut' and its phonetic expression in *ʔal-waḡf* 'the pause', i.e. are without motion.

<sup>10</sup>The issue of channels may be brought under control thinking of them as processes and their expressions, simplified in the following table:

Channels	
Processes ( <i>maxārig</i> )	Expressions ( <i>ʔalfād</i> )
<i>naṣb</i> 'erect'	<i>fath</i> 'open'
<i>rafʿ</i> 'raise'	<i>d'amm</i> 'close'
<i>garr</i> 'pull'	<i>kasr</i> 'break'
<i>gazm</i> 'cut'	<i>sukuwn</i> 'stillness'

happen (Vol. 1. P. 2.) to any of these four types due to what the *ḥāmīl* 'operator'<sup>11</sup> effects in them. The effect is not part of them, but is removable from them<sup>12</sup>; however, what the word is built on is a structure which does not disappear due to any change effected in it by the *ḥawāmīl* 'operators'. Each *ḥāmīl* 'operator' produces a kind of *lafḍ* 'pronunciation' of the *ḥarf* 'letter', and that *ḥarf* 'letter' is the *ḥarf* 'letter' of *ḥiḥrāb* 'inflection'. *naṣb* 'erect', *garr* 'pull', *rafḥ* 'raise', and *gazm* 'cut' pertain to *ḥuruwf* 'the letters' of inflection. The *ḥuruwf* 'letters' of inflection pertain to *ḥasmāḥ* 'the names' that are *mutamakkinah* 'capable'<sup>13</sup>, and pertain to the *ḥaḥḥāl* 'actions' that are similar to *ḥasmāḥ ḥāḥilīn* 'actors' names' (L. 5) at *ḥawāḥilīhā* 'whose beginnings' are the four *zawāḥid* 'augments', which are *ḥamza* '[ʔ]', *tāḥ* '[t]', *yāḥ* '[y]' and *nūn* '[n]'. And that is your saying: *ḥaḥḥalu ḥanā* 'I act', *taḥḥalu ḥanta*, *ḥaw ḥiya* 'you or she act/s', *yaḥḥalu ḥuwa* 'he acts', *naḥḥalu ḥaḥnu* 'we act'<sup>14</sup>. The *naṣb* 'erect' is in the names as: *raḥaytu zayd-an*<sup>15</sup> 'I saw Zayd', and the *garr* 'pull' is in: *marartu bi zayd-in*<sup>16</sup> 'I passed by Zayd', and the *rafḥ* 'raise' as in: *ḥāḥdā zayd-un*<sup>17</sup> 'this is Zayd'. There is no *gazm* 'cut' in names because of *tamakkinihā* 'their capability'<sup>18</sup>, and because of the *ḥilḥāḥ* 'suffixation' of *nunation* '[n]'<sup>19</sup>.

يَدْخُلُهُ {ص ٢} ضَرْبٌ مِنْ هَذِهِ الْأَرْبَعَةِ لَمَّا يُحْدِثُ فِيهَا الْعَامِلُ وَلَيْسَ شَيْءٌ مِنْهَا إِلَّا وَهُوَ يَزُولُ عَنْهُ وَبَيْنَ مَا يُبْنَى عَلَيْهِ الْحَرْفُ بِنَاءٍ لَا يَزُولُ لِغَيْرِ شَيْءٍ أَحْدَثَ ذَلِكَ فِيهِ مِنَ الْعَوَامِلِ الَّتِي لِكُلِّ عَامِلٍ مِنْهَا ضَرْبٌ مِنَ اللَّفْظِ فِي الْحَرْفِ وَذَلِكَ الْحَرْفُ حَرْفُ الْإِعْرَابِ فَالْنَّصْبُ وَالْجَرُّ وَالرَّفْعُ وَالْجَزْمُ لِحُرُوفِ الْإِعْرَابِ وَحُرُوفِ الْإِعْرَابِ لِلْأَسْمَاءِ الْمُتَمَكِّنَةِ وَلِلْأَفْعَالِ الْمُضَارِعَةِ لِأَسْمَاءِ الْفَاعِلِينَ {س ٥} الَّتِي فِي أَوَائِلِهَا الزَّوَائِدُ الْأَرْبَعُ الْهَمْزَةُ وَالتَّاءُ الْيَاءُ وَالنُّونُ وَذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ أَفْعَلُ أَنَا وَتَفْعَلُ أَنْتَ أَوْ هِيَ وَيَفْعَلُ هُوَ وَتَفْعَلُ نَحْنُ فَالْنَّصْبُ فِي الْأَسْمَاءِ رَأَيْتَ زَيْدًا وَالْجَرُّ مَرَرْتُ بِزَيْدٍ وَالرَّفْعُ هَذَا زَيْدٌ وَلَيْسَ فِي الْأَسْمَاءِ جَزْمٌ لَتَمَكِّنِهَا وَلِلْحَاقِ التَّنْوِينِ.

<sup>11</sup>The concept of an operator is introduced to give a rationale for the added variations at the end of the words.

<sup>12</sup>The variation is at the end of the word, i.e. the last letter of the word with/without one of the three motions.

<sup>13</sup>That is capable of inflection.

<sup>14</sup>The prefixed augments provide part of the paradigm for *mud'āriḥ* paradigm.

<sup>15</sup>*naṣb* 'erect' is indicated at the end of the *ḥism* 'name' by an [-a].

<sup>16</sup>*garr* 'pull' is indicated at the end of the *ḥism* 'name' by [-i].

<sup>17</sup>*rafḥ* 'raise' is indicated at the end of the *ḥism* 'name' by [-u].

<sup>18</sup>The names have full participation in all possible inflectional ending, [-a, -i, -u].

<sup>19</sup>Nunation is always at the end of names.

If *nunation* '[n]' is deleted, they do not delete both *nunation* '[n]' and *ḥarakah* 'motion' from the name. The *naṣb* 'erect' in the *mud'āriḥ* 'resembler'<sup>20</sup> of *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' is *lan yafʔal-a* 'he will not act'<sup>21</sup>, the *rafʔ* 'raise' is *sayafʔal-u* 'he will act'<sup>22</sup>, and the *gazm* 'cut' *lam yafʔal-* 'he did not act'<sup>23</sup>. There is no *garr* 'pull' in the resembling actions, just as there is no *gazm* 'cut' in names<sup>24</sup>, because the *magruwr* 'pulled' (L.10) enters into the *mud'āf ʔilayhi* 'annexed to' construction as an alternate to *nunation* '[n]', which does not occur in these actions. Rather *d'āraḥat* 'they resemble' *ʔasmāʔ ʔal-fāʔiliyn* 'actor names'. You say: *ʔinna ʔabda ʔa-llāhi la-yafʔalu* 'Indeed, Abdullāh will act'. Your statement corresponds to *la-fāʔilun* 'he (is) the actor'<sup>25</sup>. It is as if you said: *ʔinna zaydan lafāʔilun* 'Indeed, Zaid (is) an actor', for the meaning you intend. This *lām* '[l]'<sup>26</sup> attaches to it in the same way it attaches to *ʔism* 'a name'. This *lām* '[l]' does not attach to the *faʔala* 'he acted' form<sup>27</sup>. You say: *sayafʔalu dālika* 'He is about to do that', *sawfa yafʔalu dāka* 'He will do that'. These two *ḥarfayn* 'particles'<sup>28</sup> attach to them for a meaning, just as the *ʔalif lām* '[ʔal-]' attaches to the names for *maʔrifah* 'definiteness'.

فإذا ذهب التنوين لم يجمعوا على الاسم ذهابه وذهاب الحركة والنصب في المضارع من الأفعال لن يفعل والرفع سيفعل والجزم لم يفعل وليس في الأفعال المضارعة جر كما انه ليس في الأسماء جزم لان المجرور {س ١٠} داخل في المضاف إليه معاقب للتنوين وليس ذلك في هذه الأفعال وإنما ضارعت أسماء الفاعلين أنك تقول إن عبد الله ليفعل فيوافق قولك لفاعل حتى كأنك قلت إن زيدا لفاعل فيما تريد من المعنى وتلحقه هذه اللام كما لحقت الاسم ولا تلحق فعل اللام وتقول سيفعل ذلك وسوف يفعل ذاك فتلحقها هذين الحرفين لمعنى كما تلحق الألف واللام الأسماء للمعرفة.

<sup>20</sup>The resembler is a term applied to these action type words that participate, like the nominals, in being sensitive to inflection by means of motions at the end. They resemble specifically the agentive type of names, e.g. *fāʔil* 'actor' so that one may say: *yaktubu ʔal-darsa* 'he writes the lesson' as being equivalent to *kātibu ʔal-darsa* '(He is) the writer of the lesson'.

<sup>21</sup>*naṣb* 'erect' in *ʔal-ʔafʔāl* 'actions' is indicated by an [-a] at the end.

<sup>22</sup>*rafʔ* 'raise' in *ʔal-ʔafʔāl* 'actions' is indicated by an [-u] at the end.

<sup>23</sup>*gazm* 'cut' in *ʔal-ʔafʔāl* 'actions' is indicated by the absence of a motion at the end.

<sup>24</sup>Actions may participate in only two motions [a, u] and they may be without a motion at the end. Here is also another distinction is drawn between the names and the actions, i.e. *garr* and *tanwiyn* in names but not in actions, *sukuwn* in actions but not in names.

<sup>25</sup>The form *yafʔalu* is equivalent and has the same semantic import as *fāʔilun*.

<sup>26</sup>This is the initial *lām* [la-] at the beginning of the form.

<sup>27</sup>Here the past tense pattern is intended.

<sup>28</sup>i.e. the particles [sa] and [sawfa].

It will become clear to you that they<sup>29</sup> are not *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', because if you were to put them in *mawādʿ* 'locations' of *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', it will not (L. 15) be permitted. Don't you see that if you were to say: *ʔinna yadʿriba*<sup>30</sup> *yaʔtīnā* 'Indeed, Hits he visits us', and similar ones, are not meaningful speech<sup>31</sup>. Except that they resemble the *fāʔil* 'actor' because of their commonality of meaning, and you shall see that in its place. So for the addition of the *lām* '[l-]', God most high said *waʔinna rabbaka la-yaḥkumu baynahum* 'Indeed, your lord will judge between them.' (Sūrah XVI:124), that is, he will be *la-ḥākimun* 'the judge'<sup>32</sup>. And whatever attaches to it of *sīn* and *sawfa* 'future markers', just as the *ʔalif lām* '[ʔal-]' attaches to the name for *maʔrifah* 'definiteness'<sup>33</sup>.

As to the *fath* 'open', the *kasr* 'break', the *ḍamm* 'close' and the *waḡf* 'pause', and they are for names that are resemblers according to them, other than the inflectable, which are neither names nor actions, they have meaning and nothing else, like *sawfa* 'future marker', and *ḡad* 'indeed, might'. As for the *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' that do not flow in (L. 20) the channel of the *mudʿāraʔah* 'resemblers' and the *ḡurūf* 'particles' that are neither *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' nor *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' that do not occur except for a meaning, then the *fath* 'open [a]' for the names are their saying: *ḡayθ-u* 'wherever', *kayf-a* 'how', and *ʔayn-a* 'where'; and for *kasr* 'break [i]' in them, examples are *ʔulāʔ-i* 'those', *ḡadār-i* 'beware', and *badād-i* 'scatter', and examples of *ḍamm* 'close [u]' are *ḡayθ-u* 'wherever', *ḡabl-u* 'before', and *baʔd-u* 'after', and examples of *waḡf* 'pause' are *man* 'whoever', *kam* 'how many', *ḡaʔ* 'never', *ʔiḡ* 'thence'<sup>34</sup>.

ويُبين لك أنها ليست بأسماء  
انك لو وضعتها مواضع  
الأسماء لم {س ١٥} يجوز ذلك  
ألا ترى انك لو قلت إن يَضْرِبَ  
يأتينا وأشباه هذا لم يكن كلاما  
إلا أنها ضارعت الفاعل  
لاجتماعهما في المعنى وسترى  
ذلك في موضعه ولدخول اللام  
قال الله تعالى وَإِنَّ رَبَّكَ لَيَحْكُمُ  
بَيْنَهُمْ أَيُّ لِحَاكِمٍ وَلَمَّا لِحَقَّهَا مِنْ  
السَّيْنِ وَسَوْفَ كَمَا لِحَقَّتِ الْأَلْفُ  
وَاللَّامِ الْاِسْمَ لِلْمَعْرِفَةِ وَأَمَّا الْفَتْحُ  
وَالْكَسْرُ وَالضَّمُّ وَالْوَقْفُ  
فَلِأَسْمَاءٍ غَيْرِ الْمَتَمَكِّنَةِ  
الْمُضَارِعَةِ عِنْدَهُمْ مَا لَيْسَ بِاسْمٍ  
وَلَا فِعْلٍ مِمَّا جَاءَ لِمَعْنَى لَيْسَ  
غَيْرُ نَحْوِ سَوْفَ وَقَدْ وَلِلْأَفْعَالِ  
الَّتِي لَمْ تَجْرُ {س ٢٠} مَجْرَى  
الْمُضَارِعَةِ وَلِلْحُرُوفِ الَّتِي  
لَيْسَتْ بِأَسْمَاءٍ وَلَا أَفْعَالٍ وَلَمْ  
تَجِئْ إِلَّا لِمَعْنَى فَالْفَتْحُ فِي  
الْأَسْمَاءِ قَوْلُهُمْ حَيْثُ وَكَيْفَ  
وَأَيْنَ وَالْكَسْرُ فِيهَا نَحْوُ أَوْلَاءِ  
وَحَذَارٍ وَبَدَادٍ وَالضَّمُّ نَحْوِ  
حَيْثُ وَقَبْلُ وَبَعْدُ وَالْوَقْفُ نَحْوِ  
مَنْ وَكَمْ وَقَطُّ وَإِذْ.

<sup>29</sup>i.e. *ʔafʔāl mudʿāraʔah*

<sup>30</sup>This is a *fīʔl mudʿāriʔ* in the location where a name occurs, i.e. after the operator *ʔinna* which is not permitted.

<sup>31</sup>Though there is semantic equivalence between the *mudʿāriʔ* and the *ʔism fāʔil*, there is no distributional equivalence between them.

<sup>32</sup>This indicates the semantic equivalence of the *yaḥkumu* and *ḡākimun* forms.

<sup>33</sup>The particles [sa] and [sawfa] are attached to a *mudʿāriʔ* just as [ʔal-] is attached to *ʔasmāʔ*. [la-] is attached to a *mudʿāriʔ* and *ʔism fāʔil*.

<sup>34</sup>The four inflectional markers also occur with the particles not as case markers but as individual markers.

The *fath* 'open [a]' in *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' which do not follow the channel of *mud'āraʔah* 'the resemblers' is their saying *d'araba* 'he hit'. Similarly every structure for *fiʔl* 'an action' whose meaning is similar to the *faʔala* form. They did not *yusakkinuw* 'quiesce' the end of *faʔala* 'he acted', because there is in it some of what is in the *mud'āraʔah* 'resemblers'. You say *hāḏā ragulum d'arabanā* 'this is a man, he hit us'. You describe with it the *nakirah* 'indefinite'. It is in the *mawḏiʔ* 'location' of a *d'ārib* 'hitter', if (Vol. 1. p. 3) you were to say *hāḏā ragulum d'ārib* 'This is a hitter-man' and you say *ʔin faʔala faʔaltu* 'if he did, I did.', which is a meaning of *ʔin yafʔal ʔafʔal* 'If he does, I do'. They are *fiʔl* 'an action' just as the *mud'āriʔ* 'resembler' is *fiʔl* 'an action'<sup>35</sup>. They occurred in its location with *ʔin* 'if', and they occurred in the location of names in a description, just as the *mud'āraʔah* 'resemblers' occur with description. They did not *yusakkinuwḥā* 'render them quiescent' just as they did not quiesce of *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' of what resembled the *mutamakkin* 'capable' nor of what was formed from the *mutamakkin* 'capable' in a location with the status of other than the *mutamakkin* 'capable'. The *mud'āriʔ* 'resembler' *min ʔal-u* 'from above' *ḥarrakuwhu* 'they set it in motion', because they might say (L.5) *min ʔal-in* 'from above', thus, *yagurruwnahu* 'they pull it with an [i]'<sup>36</sup>. As to the *mutamakkin* 'capable' that was given the status of other than the *mutamakkin* 'capable' in a location, as your saying *ʔibdaʔ bihāḏā ʔawwalu* 'begin with this first', and *wa yā ḥakamu* 'O, You arbiter'; and in *waʔf* 'pause' in their saying in the *ʔamr* 'imperative': *ʔid'rib-hu* 'hit him!'. They did not set it in motion, because it is not described with, nor does it occur in the location of the *mud'āraʔah* 'resemblers'. So it was distanced from the *mud'āraʔah* 'resemblers' the distance of *kam* 'how many', and *ʔiḏ* 'thence' from the *mutamakkinah* 'capable ones'.

والفتح في الأفعال التي لم تجري مجرى المضارعة قولهم ضربَ وكذلك كل بناء من الفعل كان معناه فَعَلَ ولم يُسكَّنوا آخِرَ فَعَلَ لأن فيها بعض ما في المضارعة تقول هذا رجلٌ ضَرَبْنَا فنَصَف بها النكرة وتكون في موضع ضاربٍ إذا {ص ٣} قلت هذا رجلٌ ضارب وتقول إن فَعَلَ فَعَلْتُ فيكون في معنى إن يَفْعَلُ أفعَلَ فهي فَعَلٌ كما أن المضارع فَعَلٌ وقد وقعت موقعها في إن ووقعت موقع الأسماء في الوصف كما تقع المضارعة في الوصف فلم يسكَّنوها كما لم يسكَّنوا من الأسماء ما ضارع المتمكَّن ولا ما صيِّرَ من المتمكَّن في موضع بمنزلة غير المتمكَّن فالمضارع مِنْ عَلٌ حركوه لأنهم قد يقولون {س ٥} مِنْ عَلٍ فيجرّونه وأما المتمكَّن الذي جعل بمنزلة غير المتمكَّن في موضع فقولك إِبْدَأْ بهذا أوْلُ ويا حَكْمُ والوقف قولهم اضربه في الأمر لم يحرّكوها لأنها لا يوصف بها ولا تقع موقع المضارعة فبعُدت من المضارعة بُعْدَ كم وإذ من المتمكنة.

<sup>35</sup>There is a parallelism between *ʔin faʔala faʔaltu* 'if he did, I did' and *ʔin yafʔal ʔafʔal* 'If he does, I do'. Both share in being *ʔafʔāl*, just as there is a parallelism in *yafʔalu* being set in motion due to its resemblance to an *ʔism fāʔil* as *faʔala-a* is set in motion due its sharing something with *yafʔal-u*.

<sup>36</sup>The operator *min* is responsible for the suffix *-in*.

Similarly, every structure from a *fiʿl* ‘action’ whose meaning is that of *ʔifʿal* ‘act!’<sup>37</sup>. The *fath* ‘open’ in the *huruf* ‘particles, which do not exist except for a meaning and which are neither *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ nor *ʔafʿāl* ‘actions’ is their saying *sawfa* ‘future marker’, and *θumma* ‘then’. And the *kasr* ‘break’ in them is their saying *bāʔ ʔal-ʔidʿāfah wa lāmiha* ‘[b-] of annexion and its [l-]’ in *bi-zaydin* ‘by Zaid’ and *li-zaydin* ‘for Zaid’. And the *ḍamm* ‘close’ in them is (L. 10) *munḏu* ‘since’ for the one who *garra* ‘pulled’<sup>38</sup> with it, because it has the status of *min* ‘from’ with *ʔayyām* ‘days’<sup>39</sup>. The *wāʕf* ‘pause’ in them is their saying *min* ‘from’, *hal* ‘interrogative marker’, *bal* ‘rather’, and *vad* ‘corroborative particle’<sup>40</sup>. *lā dʿamma* ‘there is no closure with an [u]’ in *fiʿl* ‘action’, because there is no third apart from the *mudʿarīʔ* ‘resembler’. On these two meanings is based the structuring of every *fiʿl* ‘action’ after the *mudʿarīʔ* ‘resembler’.

Know that if you were to dualize the one, two affixes are attached to it. The first of the two is the *ḥarf* ‘particle’ of *madd* ‘length’ and *liyn* ‘softness’, which is the *ḥarf* ‘particle’ of *ʔiʿrāb* ‘inflection’, which is neither *mutaḥarrik* ‘in motion’, nor *munawwan* ‘with nunation’. In *rafʿ* ‘raising’ it is an *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ and not a *wāw* ‘[w]’<sup>41</sup>, to separate the *taḥniyah* ‘dualization’ and the *gamʿ* ‘plural’, which defines duality. In the *garr* ‘pull’ it is a *yāʔ* ‘[y]’ before a *fath* ‘open’, and it is not broken, (L. 15) to separate between the dualization and the plural, which defines duality. It<sup>42</sup> is similarly for the *naṣb* ‘erection’<sup>43</sup>. They did not make the *naṣb* ‘erection’ an *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ to be similar to it in the plural and in this it follows that in which the *garr* ‘pull’ is primary,

وكذلك كل بناء من الفعل كان معناه افعلاً والفتح في الحروف التي ليست إلا لمعنى وليست بأسماء ولا أفعال قولهم سوف وثم والكسر فيها قولهم في باء الإضافة ولأما بزيدي ويزيدي والضمّ فيها {س ١٠} مُنْذُ فِيمَنْ جَرَّ بِهَا لِأَنَّهَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ مَنْ فِي الْأَيَّامِ وَالْوَقْفِ فِيهَا قَوْلُهُمْ مَنْ وَهَلْ وَبَلْ وَقَدْ وَلَا ضَمَّ فِي الْفِعْلِ لِأَنَّهُ لَمْ يَجِئْ ثَالِثٌ سِوَى الْمَضَارِعِ وَعَلَى هَذَيْنِ الْمَعْنَيْنِ بِنَاءُ كُلِّ فِعْلٍ بَعْدَ الْمَضَارِعِ وَاعْلَمْ أَنَّكَ إِذَا ثَنَيْتَ الْوَاحِدَ لِحَقِّهِ زِيَادَتَانِ الْأُولَى مِنْهُمَا حَرْفُ الْمَدِّ وَاللَّيْنِ وَهُوَ حَرْفُ الْإِعْرَابِ غَيْرُ مَتَحَرِّكٍ وَلَا مَنْوًى تَكُونُ فِي الرَّفْعِ أَلْفًا وَلَمْ تَكُنْ وَأَوَّالِ الْفِعْلِ بَيْنَ التَّنْيَةِ وَالْمَجْمَعِ الَّذِي عَلَى حَدِّ التَّنْيَةِ وَتَكُونُ فِي الْجَرِّ يَاءً مَفْتُوحًا مَا قَبْلَهَا وَلَمْ يُكْسَرْ {س ١٥} لِيُفْصَلَ بَيْنَ التَّنْيَةِ وَالْمَجْمَعِ الَّذِي عَلَى حَدِّ التَّنْيَةِ وَتَكُونُ فِي النِّصْبِ كَذَلِكَ وَلَمْ يَجْعَلُوا النِّصْبَ أَلْفًا لِيَكُونَ مِثْلَهُ فِي الْجَمْعِ وَكَانَ مَعَ هَذَا أَنْ يَكُونَ تَابِعًا لِمَا الْجَرُّ مِنْهُ أُولَى

<sup>37</sup>The *ʔamr* ‘imperative’ form.

<sup>38</sup>*Munḏu* is an operator that pulls the following name with an [-i], e.g. *munḏu ʔayyāmin* ‘days hence’.

<sup>39</sup>i.e. *min ʔayyāmin* ‘since days’.

<sup>40</sup>Particles participate in the occurrence of motions and quiescence, but not as termination case markers with syntactic or semantic import.

<sup>41</sup>*rafʿ* ‘raise’ is expressed with an [u] which is related to the [w]. Here, however, the *rafʿ* ‘raise’ in the dual is expressed by an *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ which is related to an [a]. The switch is for the reasons given. E.g. *yaktubu* ‘he writes’, but *yaktubāni* ‘they-d write’.

<sup>42</sup>i.e. the [y].

<sup>43</sup>*yāʔ* [y] marks both the *garr* and the *naṣb* in the dual formation.



because *garr* 'pull' is for the *?ism* 'name' and does not go beyond it. The *rafʿ* 'raise' may be carried over to the *fiʿl* 'action'. This was the more frequent and the stronger. The second augment is a *nuwn* '[n]'. It is as though a *ʿiwad'un* 'a replacement' for what is prevented from accepting a motion and nunation. It is the *nuwn* '[n]' and its motion is a the *kasr* 'break [i]'. And that is as in your saying *humā ʿal-ragul-ā-ni* 'They (are) men-d', *raʿaytu ʿal-ragul-ay-ni* 'I saw the men-d', and *maratu bi ʿal-ragul-ay-ni* 'I passed by the men-d'<sup>44</sup>. If you pluralize as you defined the dual, (L. 20) two affixes are added to it. The first of the two is the *ḥarf* 'letter' of *madd* 'length' and *liyn* 'softness', and the second is *nuwn* '[n]'. The condition of the first is in *sukuwn* 'quiescence' and dropping *tanwiyn* 'nunation'. It is the *ḥarf* 'particle' of *ʿiʿrāb* 'inflection', the condition of the first affix of the dual, except that it is a *wāw mad'muwmun* 'rounded [w]', before it in the *rafʿ* 'raise', the *garr* 'pull' and *naṣb* 'erection' is a *yāʿ* '[y]' preceded by a break [i], and its *nūn* '[n]' is open with an [a]<sup>45</sup>. They distinguished between it and the *nuwn* '[n]' of the dual. Just as the letter of *liyn* 'softness', which is the letter of *ʿiʿrāb* 'inflection', is different in both of them, as your saying *ʿal-muslim-uw-na* 'the muslims', (Vol. 1. P. 4) *raʿaytu ʿal muslim-iy-na* 'I saw the Muslims', and *marartu bi-ʿal-muslim-iy-na* 'I passed by the Muslims.' Thence they made *tāʿ* '[t]' of the *gamʿ* 'plural' in both *garr* 'pull' and *naṣb* 'erection' *maksuwa* 'broken with an [i]', because they made the *tāʿ* '[t]', which is the letter of *ʿiʿrāb* 'inflection', like the *wāw* '[w]', *yāʿ* '[y]', and nunation in place of *nuwn* '[n]', because in the feminine it is parallel to *wāw* '[w]' and *yāʿ* '[y]' in the *taḍkiyr* 'masculinization', so they made it flow in its channel.

لان الجرّ للاسم لا يجاوزه  
والرفع قد ينتقل إلى الفعل فكان  
هذا اغلب وأقوى وتكون  
الزائدة الثانية نونا كأنها عوضٌ  
لما منع من الحركة والتنوين  
وهي النون وحركتها الكسر  
وذلك قولك الرجلان ورأيت  
الرجلين ومررت بالرجلين وإذا  
جمعت على حدّ التنثية {س  
٢٠} لحقتها زيادتان الأولى  
منهما حرف المدّ واللين  
والثانية نون وحال الأولى في  
السكون وترك التنوين وأنها  
حرف الإعراب حال الأولى  
في التنثية إلا أنها واو مضمومٌ  
ما قبلها في الرفع وفي الجرّ  
والنصب ياء مكسورٌ ما قبلها  
ونونها مفتوحة فرقوا بينها  
وبين نون الاثنين كما أن  
حرف اللين الذي هو حرف  
الإعراب مختلف فيهما وذلك  
قولك المسلمون {ص ٤} ورأيت  
بالمسلمين ومن ثم جعلوا تاء  
الجمع في الجرّ والنصب  
مكسورة لأنهم جعلوا التاء التي  
هي حرف الإعراب كالواو  
والياء والتنوين بمنزلة النون  
لأنها في التانيث نظيرة الواو  
والياء في التذكير فاجروها  
مجراها.

<sup>44</sup>The dual's two augments for *rafʿ* 'raise' are: first [-ā-] as in *ragul-ā-ni* 'two men' and for *naṣb* 'erect' and *garr* 'pull' is [-ay-] as in *ragul-ay-ni*. The second augment is [-ni] for all these.

<sup>45</sup>The plural's two augments for *rafʿ* 'raise' are: first [-uw-] as in *muslim-uw-na* 'muslims' and for *naṣb* 'erect' and *garr* 'pull' is [-iy-] as in *muslim-iy-na*. The second augment is [-na] for all these to distinguish it from the dual -ni.

Know that if *taṯniya* ‘dualization’ is attached to the *ʔafʔāl ʔal-mudʔaraʔah* ‘the remember actions’, as a marker for the *fāʔilayn* ‘actors-d’, *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ and *nuwn* ‘[n]’ follow it, and the *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ is not the inflectional marker (L. 5), because you do not want to dualize the *yafʔalu* form of this *bināʔ* ‘structure’, by adding to it another *yafʔalā* ‘they did-d’ form. You, however, attached this to it as a mark of the *fāʔilayn* ‘actors-d’, and it is not with nunation, nor is there a motion attached to it, because it is overtaken by *ʔal-gazm* ‘the cut’ and *sukuwn* ‘quiescence’. The first one will be the particle of the *ʔiʔrāb* ‘inflection’ and the other like *tanwiyn* ‘nutation’. When the state of the *yafalu* form in the *wāhid* ‘singular’ is other than the state of the name in *taṯniyah* ‘dualization’, then it is not *bi-manzilatihī* ‘of its status’. They made its *ʔiʔrāb* ‘inflection’ in the *rafʔ* ‘raise’ the *ṯabāt* ‘affirmation’ of the *nuwn* ‘[n]’, so that it becomes for it in the dual the marker of the *rafʔ* ‘raise’ as it was in the *wāhid* ‘singular’, since the *ḥarf* ‘particle’ of *ʔiʔrāb* ‘inflection’ was forbidden. They made the *nuwn* ‘[n]’ *maksuwrah* ‘broken with an [i]’, as its state in the *ʔism* ‘name’. (L. 10) They did not make it the *ḥarf* ‘particle’ of inflection, since it was *mutaḥarrikah* ‘set in motion’, and it could not be maintained in the *gazm* ‘cut’. They were not about to delete the *ʔalif* ‘[A]’ because it is the marker of *ʔidmār* ‘pronominalization/ concealment’ and *taṯniyah* ‘dualization’, in the saying of the one who said *ʔakaluwniy ʔal-barāʔiyθu* ‘the lice have eaten me up’, and the status of the *tāʔ* ‘[t]’ in *ʔultu* ‘I said’ and *ʔālat* ‘she said’, *ʔaṯbatuwhā* ‘they affirmed it’ in the *rafʔ* ‘raise’, and *ḥaḍafuwhā* ‘they deleted it’ in the *gazm* ‘cut’, just as they deleted the *ḥarakah* ‘motion’ in the *wāhid* ‘singular’. The *naṣb* ‘erect’ was in agreement with the *gazm* ‘cut’ in the *ḥaḍf* ‘deletion’, just as the *naṣb* ‘erect’ is in agreement with the *garr* ‘pull’ in names, because the *gazm* ‘cut’ in *ʔafʔāl* ‘actions’ is *nadiyr* ‘comparable’ to the *garr* ‘pull’ in *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’<sup>46</sup>. The *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ take no part in *gazm* ‘cut’, just as there is no taking part for the *fiʔl* ‘action’ in *garr* ‘pull’, as your saying *humā yafʔal-ā-ni* ‘They-d-m. act-d’, (L. 15) *lan yafʔal-ā* ‘they did not act-d’, and *lan yafʔal-ā* ‘they will not act-d.’

واعلم أن التثنية إذا لحقت  
الأفعال المضارعة علامة  
للفاعلين لحقها ألف ونون ولم  
تكن الألف حرف الإعراب  
لأنك {س ٥} لم ترد أن تثني  
يفعل هذا البناء فنضم إليه يفعل  
آخر ولكنك إنما ألحقته هذا  
للفاعلين ولم تكن منوثة ولا  
تلتزمها الحركة لأنه يُدرَكها  
الجزم والسكون فيكون الأول  
حرف الإعراب والآخر  
كالتنوين فلما كان حال يفعل  
في الواحد غير حال الاسم وفي  
التثنية لم يكن بمنزلته فجعلوا  
إعرابه في الرفع ثبات النون  
لتكون له في التثنية علامة  
الرفع كما كان في الواحد إذ  
منع حرف الإعراب وجعلوا  
النون مكسورة كحالها في  
الاسم {س ١٠} ولم يجعلوها  
حرف إعراب إذ كانت متحركة  
لا تثبت في الجزم ولم يكونوا  
ليحذفوا الألف لأنها علامة  
الإضمار والتثنية فيمن قال  
أكلوني البراغيث وبمنزلة التاء  
في قلت وقالت فأنبتوها في  
الرفع وحذفوها في الجزم كما  
حذفوا الحركة في الواحد  
ووافق النصب الجزم في  
الحذف كما وافق النصب الجر  
في الأسماء لأن الجزم في  
الأفعال نظير الجر في الأسماء  
وليس للأسماء في الجزم  
نصيب كما انه ليس للفعل في  
الجر نصيب وذلك قولك هما  
يفعلان {س ١٥} ولم يفعل  
ولن يفعل

<sup>46</sup> *Garr* occurs with *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ only, just as *gazm* occurs with *ʔafʔāl* ‘actions’ only.

Similarly, if the *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' were followed by a marker of the plural, they are followed by *zāʔidatān* 'two augments', except that the first is a *wāw* '[w]' before which is *madʔmuwm* 'closed with an [u]', because the plural is not like the dual, and its *nuwn*'[n]' is *maftuwḥah* 'open with an [a]', *bi-manzilatihā* 'with its status' in *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', just as you did that with *taḥniyah* 'dualization', because they both occurred in the *taḥniyah* 'dualization' and the *gamʔ* 'plural' here, just as they are that way in the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names'. And it is your saying *hum yafʔal-uw-na* 'they p-m. act-p', *lam yafʔal-uw* 'they did not act p-m', and *lan yafʔal-uw* 'they will not act p-m'<sup>47</sup>. Similarly, if you were to attach the *taʔniyθ* 'femininization' in the *muxāṭabah* 'addressing', except that the first one is a *yāʔ* '[y]', and *taftaḥu* 'you open with an [a]' the *nuwn* '[n]', because the *ziyādah* 'augment' that is before it has the same status as the *ziyādah* 'augment' that is in (L. 20) the *gamʔ* 'plural'. And they occur in the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', in the *garr* 'pull' and the *naṣb* 'erect', and that is in your saying *ʔanti tafʔal-iy-na* 'you s-f.act-f-s', *lam tafʔal-iy* 'you did not act s-f.', and *lan tafʔal-iy* 'you will not act s-f.'.

If you wished *gamʔ* 'pluralization' of the *muʔannaθ* 'feminine' in the *fiʔl ʔal-mudʔariʔ* 'resembler action', you attached to it, as a marker, a *nuwn*'[n]'. It became the marker of *ʔidʔmār* 'pronominalization/concealment' and the *gamʔ* 'plural' for the one who said *ʔakaluw-niy ʔal- barāʔiyiθu* 'the lice ate me up'. *ʔaskanta* 'you quiesced' what was in the *wāḥid* 'singular', the *ḥarf* 'letter' of *ʔiʔrāb* 'inflection', just as you did that with the *faʔala* form 'he acted', when you said *faʔal-na* 'they acted -p-f.', and *faʔal-tu* 'I acted'. This was quiesced here and *buniy~* 'was constructed' with this (Vol. 1. p. 5) marker. Just as the *faʔala* form *ʔuskina* 'was quiesced', because it is *fiʔl* 'an action', just as it is *fiʔl* 'an action', and it is *mutaḥarrik* 'set in motion' just as it is *mutaḥarrik* 'set in motion'. This is not to be considered far fetched that it and the *faʔala* form are both the same thing in relation to form *yafʔalu* 'he acts', since, for them, *ʔiʔrāb* 'inflection' was permitted in them when *dʔaraʔat* 'they resembled' the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' and were not names, and that is in your saying *hunna yafʔal-na* 'they f-p. act f-p.', *lan yafʔal-na* 'they will not act f-p.' and *lam yafʔal-na* 'they did not act f-p.'

وكذلك إذا لحقت الأفعال علامة للجمع لحقتها زائدتان إلا أن الأولى واو مضموم ما قبلها لأن لا يكون الجمع كالتثنية ونونها مفتوحة بمنزلتها في الأسماء كما فعلت ذلك في التثنية لأنهما وقعتا في التثنية والجمع هاهنا كما انهما في الأسماء كذلك وهو قولك هم يفعلون ولم يفعلوا ولن يفعلوا وكذلك إذا ألحقت التأنيث في المخاطبة إلا أن الأولى ياء وتفتح النون لأن الزيادة التي قبلها بمنزلة الزيادة التي في {س ٢٠} الجمع وهي تكون في الأسماء في الجر والنصب وذلك قولك أنت تفعلين ولم تفعلي ولن تفعلي وإذا أردت جمع المؤنث في الفعل المضارع ألحقت له للعلامة نونا وكانت علامة الإضمار والجمع فيمن قال أكلوني البراغيث وأسكنت ما كان في الواحد حرف الإعراب كما فعلت ذلك في فعل حين قلت فعَلنَ وفعلتُ فأسكن هذا هاهنا وبُني على هذه {ص ٥} العلامة كما أسكن فعلَ لأنه فعلٌ كما أنه فعلٌ وهو متحرك كما انه متحرك وليس هذا بأبعد فيها إذ كانت هي وفعلَ شيئاً واحداً من يفعلُ إذ جاز لهم فيها الإعراب حين ضارعت الأسماء وليست بأسماء وذلك قولك هنَّ يفعلنَ ولن يفعلنَ ولم يفعلنَ.

<sup>47</sup> Both *gazm* and *naṣb* are marked by the loss of *nuwn* [n].

The *nuwn* '[n]' is 'open with an [a]', because it is a *nuwn* '[n]' of *gamʕ* 'plural'. It is not deleted because it is *ʕalāmah* 'a marker' of prononimization/,concealment and the *gamʕ* 'plural' in what the one who says *ʔakaluw-niy ʔal-barāyiyθu* 'the lice ate me up'. (L. 5) The *nuwn* '[n]' here in *yafʕal-na* 'they act f-p.', is with its status in *faʕal-na* 'they acted f-p.', and the *lām* '[l]' of *yafʕal-u* 'he acts' was treated as the *l~m* '[l]' of *faʕala* 'he acted', as I have mentioned to you. It may, in all that, *tubnā* 'be constructed' with the 'open [a]' as in your saying *hal tafʕalan-na* 'do you act f-p. ?'. They imposed *sukuwn* 'stillness' on the *l~m* '[l]' of *faʕala* 'he acted', constructed it with the marker, and deleted the *ḥarakah* 'motion' when they augmented, because it is in the singular whose ending is not a particle of inflection, as I mentioned to you.

Know that some of the speech is *ʔaθGal* 'heavier' than other. The *ʔafʕāl* 'actions' are *ʔaθGal* 'heavier' than *ʔasmāʔ* 'names', because the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' are primary, and have greater *tamakkunan* 'capability'<sup>48</sup>. Hence they<sup>49</sup> are not followed by *tanwiyn* 'nunation', but they are followed by the *gazm* 'cut' and the *sukuwn* 'stillness'. They are, however, from names. (L. 10) Don't you see that *fiʕl* 'an action' needs *ʔism* 'a name', otherwise, there would be no *kal~m* 'speech'. *ʔism* 'a name' can be without *fiʕl* 'an action', You say *ʔallāhu ʔilāhunā* 'God (is) our God', *ʕabdu ʔallāhi ʔaxuwna* 'Abdul ʔallah (is) our brother'. Know that what of the names in speech that *dāraʕa* 'resembled' the *fiʕl ʔal mud'āriʕ* 'resembler action' and is in agreement with it in the *bināʔ* 'construction', *lafḏuhu* 'its pronunciation' was made to flow in the channel of what *yastaθgiluwn* 'they consider heavy', and prevented it from what belongs to what *yastaxiffuwna* 'they consider light', so it is 'open with an [a]' in the *mawd'iʕ* 'position' of *garr* 'pull'. *ʔistaθGaluwḥu* 'they considered it heavy' when it approximated the *fiʕl* 'action' in *kalām* 'speech' and agreed with it in *bināʔ* 'structure'. And that is like *ʔabiyad'a* 'white' *ʔaswada* 'black', *ʔaḥmara* 'red' and *ʔaʕfara* 'yellow'.

وَتَفْتَحُ النون لأنها نون جمع ولا تُحذف لأنها علامة إضمار وجمع فيمن قال أكلوني البراغيث {س ه} فالنون هاهنا في يَفْعَلْنَ بمنزلتها في فَعَلْنَ وفعل بلام يَفْعَلُ ما فعل بلام فَعَلَ لما ذكرت لك ولأنها قد تُبْنَى مع ذلك على الفتحة في قولك هل تَفْعَلْنَ وألزموا لام فَعَلَ السكون وبنوها على العلامة وحذفوا الحركة لما زادوا لأنها في الواحد ليس آخرها حرف الإعراب لما ذكرت لك واعلم أن بعض الكلام أثقل من بعض فالأفعال أثقل من الأسماء لان الأسماء هي الأولى وهي اشدّ تمكناً فمن ثم لم يلحقها تنوين ولحقها الجزم والسكون وإنما هي من الأسماء إلا {س ه} ترى أن الفعل لا بدّ له من الاسم وإلا لم يكن كلاماً والاسم قد يستغني عن الفعل تقول الله إلهنا وعبد الله أخونا واعلم أن ما ضارع الفعل المضارع من الأسماء في الكلام ووافقه في البناء أجري لفظه مجرى ما يستثقلون ومنعوه ما يكون لما يستخفون فيكون في موضع الجرّ مفتوحاً استثقلوه حيث قارب الفعل في الكلام ووافقه في البناء وذلك نحو أبيض وأسود وأحمر وأصفر.

<sup>48</sup>Capability here means that the nominal forms have the greatest number of inflections [a,i,u] at the end as compared to the actions and particles.

<sup>49</sup>i.e., *ʔafʕāl* 'actions'.

This is the *bināʔ* ‘structure’ of *ʔaḏhabu* ‘I go’ and *ʔaʕlamu* ‘I know’. As for its resemblance in the *ʕifah* ‘descriptive’, if you were to say *ʔatāni* (L. 15) *ʔal yawma qawiyyun* ‘today a strong one visited me’, *ʔalā bāridan* ‘Ah, for a cold one!’, and *marartu bigamiylin* ‘I passed by a handsome one’, it is *dʕaʕiyf* ‘weak’, and it does not have the beauty of *ʔatāni ragulum qawiyyun* ‘A strong man visited me’, *ʔalā māʔan bāridan* ‘Ah, for some cold water’, and *marartu biragulin gamiylin* ‘I passed by a handsome man’. Don’t you see that this *yugbuḥu* ‘gets ugly’ here! And that *ʔal-fiʕl ʔal-mudʕariʕ* ‘the ressembler action’ is not spoken with except with *ʔism* ‘a name’ with it, because *ʔism* ‘name’ is prior to the *ʕifah* ‘descriptive’ just as it is prior to the *fiʕl* ‘action’. Along with this you see that the *ʕifah* ‘descriptive’ flows with the meaning of the form *yafʕalu* ‘he acts’, and *tanʕibu* ‘it erects’ as the action erects. You will see that. If it were *ʔism* ‘a name’, it would be lighter for them, and that is like *ʔafkalin* ‘group of people’ and *ʔaklubin* ‘dogs’ they are inflectable in the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’. Know that the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ is lighter for them (L. 20) than the *maʕrifah* ‘definite’, and it has greater *tamakkunan* ‘capability’, because the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’ is first, then something is introduced to it by which *tuʕarraʕu* ‘is made definite’. Thence most of *kal~m* ‘speech’ is inflectable in the *nakirah* ‘indefinite’. Know that the *wāḥid* ‘singular’ has greater *tamakkunan* ‘capability’ than the *gamiyʕ* ‘plural’, because singular is prior. Thence, they did not make inflectable what came from the plural as a pattern, and which does not occur in the singular such as *masāgida* ‘mosques’ and *mafātiyḥa* ‘keys’. Know that, for them, the *muḏakkar* ‘masculine’ is lighter than the *muʔannaθ* ‘feminine’, because the masculine is *ʔawwal* ‘prior’, and has greater *tamakkunan* ‘capability’. The *taʔniyθ* ‘femininization’ proceeds from the *taḏkiyr* ‘masculinization’. Don’t you see that the thing exists with all that is reported about it before it is known (Vol. 1. p. 6) whether it is *ḏakar* ‘male’ or *ʔunθā* ‘female’, the “thing” is masculine. Nunation, for them, is a marker for the *ʔamkan* ‘one with the greatest capability’ and the lightest; and leaving it out is a mark for what they consider heavy.

فهذا بناء أذهب وأعلم وأما مضارعه في الصفة فانك لو قلت أتاني {س ١٥} اليوم قوي وألا باردا ومررت بجميل كان ضعيفا ولم يكن في حسن أتاني رجل قوي وألا ماء باردا ومررت برجل جميل أفلا ترى أن هذا يقبح هاهنا كما أن الفعل المضارع لا يتكلم به إلا ومعه الاسم لأن الاسم قبل الصفة كما أنه قبل الفعل ومع هذا أنك ترى الصفة تجري في معنى يفعل وتتصّب كما ينصب الفعل وسترى ذلك فان كان اسما كان أخفّ عليهم وذلك نحو أفكّل وأكّلب ينصرفان في النكرة واعلم أن النكرة أخفّ عليهم {س ٢٠} من المعرفة وهي أشدّ تمكنا لأن النكرة أول ثم يدخل عليها ما تُعرّف به فمن ثم أكثر الكلام ينصرف في النكرة واعلم أن الواحد أشدّ تمكنا من الجميع لأن الواحد الأول ومن ثم لم يصرفوا ما جاء من الجميع على مثال ليس يكون للواحد نحو مساجد ومفاتيح واعلم أن المذكر أخفّ عليهم من المؤنث لأن المذكر أول وهو أشدّ تمكنا وإنما يخرج التأنيث من التذكير ألا ترى أن الشيء يقع على كل ما أخبر عنه من قبل أن يُعلم {ص ٦} اذكر هو أو أنتى والشيء مذكر فالتنوين علامة للأمكن عندهم والأخفّ عليهم وتركّه علامة لما يستقلون.

What is *yaṣṣarif* 'inflectable' and what is *lāyaṣṣarif* 'not inflectable' will be explained, God willing. As for all that is not inflectable, if *ʔalif* '[A]' and *lām* '[I]' are added to it, or annexed to another name, *ʔingarra* 'it becomes pulled', because they are names introduced to them and what is added to them is what is added to the inflectables. The *magruwr* 'pulled' is added to it just as it is added to the inflectables, and that is not possible in *ʔaffāl* 'actions' ( L.5 ), and that they did away with nunation 'final [n]' in *ʔaffāl* 'actions' ascertains that. All that, whose inflection is left out, is made to resemble the *fiʔl* 'action', because this was done to it, because it does not have the *tamakkun* 'capability' of other than it, just as the *fiʔl* 'action' does not have the *tamakkun* 'capability' of the *ʔism* 'name'. Know that the final, if it *yaskunu* 'quiesces' in the *rafʔ* 'raise', it is deleted in the *gazm* 'cut', lest the *gazm* 'cut' gets the status of *rafʔ* 'raise', so they deleted as they delete the motion and the *nuwn* '[n]' of the *ʔiθnayn* 'dual' and the *gamiyʔ* 'plural'. That is in you saying *lam yarmiy* → *lam yarmi* 'he did not throw', *lam yaγzuw* → *lam yaγzu* 'he did not invade', *lam yaxšā* → *lam yaxša* 'he was unafraid'. It is, in *rafʔ* 'raise', quiescent at the end. You say *huwa yarmiy* 'he throws', *yaγzuw* 'he invades', and *yaxšā* 'he is afraid'.

وسوف يبين ما ينصرف وما لا ينصرف إن شاء الله وجميع ما لا ينصرف إذا أدخل عليه الألف واللام أو أضيف انجرراً لأنها أسماء أدخل عليها ما يدخل على المنصرف وأدخل فيها المجرور كما يدخل في المنصرف ولا يكون ذلك في الأفعال وأمنوا {س هـ} التتوين فجميع ما يُثركُ صرفه مضارعٌ به الفعلُ لأنه إنما فعل ذلك به لأنه ليس له تمكُّنٌ غيره كما أن الفعل ليس له تمكُّنٌ الاسم واعلم أن الآخر إذا كان يسكن في الرفع حُذف في الجزم لئلا يكون الجزم بمنزلة الرفع فحذفوا كما حذفوا الحركة ونون الاثنين والجميع وذلك قولك لم يرْم ولم يعزْ ولم يخشْ وهو في الرفع ساكن الآخر تقول هو يرْمى ويعزُو ويخشَى.

### Chapter 3. This is a chapter on the *musnad* 'dependent' and the *musnad ṭilayhi* 'depended-on'

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.7, Derenbourg vol. 1. p.6, Haruwn vol.1. p.23)

The two<sup>50</sup> are what one *lā yastayniy* 'can not do without' the other, and the speaker finds no way out. A case of that is the *ṭism ṭal-mubtadaʿ* 'initial name' and what *mabniyyun* 'is built' on it, as is your saying *ṭabdu ṭallāhi ṭaxuwka* 'Abdullaah (is) your brother', *hādā ṭaxuwka* 'this (is) your brother'<sup>51</sup>, and similar to that is your saying *yaḏhabu zaydun* 'Zaid goes.' The *fiʿl* 'action' demands the *ṭism* 'name', just as the initial *ṭism* 'name' has no way without the other in *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation'<sup>52</sup>. What may be *bi-manzilat* 'with the status of' *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation' is your saying *kāna ṭabdu ṭallāhi munṭaliqan* 'Abdullaah was departing' and *layta zaydan munṭaliqun* 'Would that Zaid were departing.' This needs what is after it just as the need of the *mubtadaʿ* 'initial one' to what is after it<sup>53</sup>. Know (L. 15) that for the *ṭism* 'name', the *ṭawwal* 'first' of its states is the *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation'. The *nāṣib* 'erector' and *rāfiʿ* 'raiser' enter in other than the *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation', and the *g~rr* 'puller' enters the *mubtadaʿ* 'initial one'. Don't you see that what is *mubtadaʿ* 'an initial one', these things may enter it until it becomes non-initial and you don't reach the *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation' as long as what I mentioned to you lasts, except when you let it. And that is if you were to say *ṭabdu ṭallāhi munṭaliqun* 'Abdullāh is departing', if you so wish you introduce *raʿaytu* 'I saw' to it, and you would say *raʿaytu ṭabda ṭallāhi munṭaliqan* 'I saw Abdull~h departing', or you would say *kāna ṭabdullāhi munṭaliqan* 'Abdullāh was departing' or *marartu bi-ṭabdi ṭallāhi munṭaliqan*. 'I passed by Abdull~h departing'. *ṭibtidāʿ* 'initiation' is prior, just as the *wāhid* 'one' is the first (L. 20) of the numbers, and the *nakirah* 'indefinite' is before the *maʿrifah* 'definite.'

### (٣) هذا باب المُسند والمُسند إليه

{ص٦، س١٠} وهما ما لا يستغني واحدٌ منهما عن الآخر ولا يجد المتكلم منه بدءاً فمن ذلك الاسم المبتدأ والمبني عليه وهو قولك عبدُ الله أخوك وهذا أخوك ومثل ذلك يذهب زيدٌ فلا بدءٌ للفعل من الاسم كما لم يكن للاسم الأولُ بدءٌ من الآخر في الابتداء ومما يكون بمنزلة الابتداء قولك كان عبدُ الله منطلقاً وليتَ زيداً منطلقاً لأن هذا يحتاج إلى ما بعده كاحتياج المبتدأ إلى ما بعده واعلم {س١٥} أن الاسم أولُ أحواله الابتداء وإنما يدخل الناصبُ والرافع سوى الابتداء والجارُّ على المبتدأ ألا ترى أن ما كان مبتدأً قد تدخل عليه هذه الأشياء حتى يكون غير مبتدأ ولا تصل إلى الابتداء ما دام مع ما ذكرت لك إلا أن تدعّه وذلك أنك إذا قلت عبدُ الله منطلقٌ إن شئت أدخلت رأيتُ عليه فقلت رأيت عبدَ الله منطلقاً أو قلت كان عبدُ الله منطلقاً أو مررت بعبدِ الله منطلقاً فالابتداء أولُ كما كان الواحدُ أولُ {س٢٠} العدد والنكرة قبل المعرفة.

<sup>50</sup> *musand* 'dependedent' and the *musnad ṭilayhi* 'dependent-on'.

<sup>51</sup> In structures where one unit is built on an other. Here the second is built on the first.

<sup>52</sup> A parallel is drawn when a structure begins with a *fiʿl* which in turn requires a name.

<sup>53</sup> The structures may be expanded further, but whatever has the status of *mubtadaʿ* requires what completes the structure.

#### Chapter 4. This is a Chapter on *ʔal-lafḍ* ‘the expression’ for the *maʔāniy* ‘meanings’

#### (٤) هذا باب اللفظ للمعاني

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.7, Derenbourg vo. 1. p.6, Haruwn vol.1. p.24)

Know that in their speech, a difference in *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘the two expressions’ is due to a difference in *ʔal-maʔnayayyn* ‘the two meanings’, (Vol. 1: P. 7), the difference in *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘the two expressions’ but *ʔal-maʔnā* ‘the meaning’ is one, and an *ʔittifāḡ* ‘agreement’ of *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘the two expressions’ but the difference is of *ʔal-maʔnayayyn* ‘the two meanings’. You shall see that, God willing. As for a difference in the *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘two expressions’ due to difference in *ʔal-maʔnayayyn* ‘the two meanings’ is like *galasa* ‘he sat’ and *ḍahaba* ‘he left’<sup>54</sup>; as for differences in of *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘the two expressions’ but *ʔal-maʔnā* ‘the meaning’ is one, is like *ḍahaba* ‘he left’ and *ʔiṅṭalga* ‘he departed’<sup>55</sup> and *ʔittifāḡ* ‘agreement’ of of *ʔal-lafḍayn* ‘the two expressions’ but *ʔal-maʔnā* ‘the meaning’ is *muxtaliḡ* ‘different’ is your saying: *wagadtu ʔalayhi* ‘I got angry at him’ is from *ʔal-mawḡidah* ‘anger’, and *wagadtu* ‘I found’<sup>56</sup> if you intend finding the lost one. The likes of these are many.

{ص ٦، س ٢١} اعلم أن من  
كلامهم اختلاف اللفظين  
لاختلاف المعنيين {ص ٧}  
واختلاف اللفظين والمعنى  
واحد واتفاق اللفظين واختلاف  
المعنيين وسترى ذلك ان شاء  
الله تعالى . فاختلف اللفظين  
لاختلاف المعنيين هو نحو  
جلس وذهب واختلاف اللفظين  
والمعنى واحد نحو ذهب  
وانطلق واتفاق اللفظين  
والمعنى مختلف قولك وجدت  
عليه من الموجدة ووجدت اذا  
أردت وجدان الضالة وأشباه  
هذا كثير.

<sup>54</sup>What is different phonetically and semantically.

<sup>55</sup>What is different phonetically but the same semantically.

<sup>56</sup>What is the same phonetically but different semantically.



## Chapter 5. This is a Chapter on what Occurs in *ʔal-lafā* ‘the expression’ due to *ʔaʔrād* ‘accidents’

## (٥) هذا باب ما يكون في اللفظ من الأعراض

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.7, Derenbourg vol. 1. p.7, Haruwn vol.1. p.24)

Know that they delete from *ʔal-kalimu* ‘the words’ even if *ʔaʔluhu* ‘its origin’ in the *kalām* ‘speech’ was other than that. *yaḥḍifūna* ‘they delete’, *yuʔawidūwana* ‘they replace’, and *yastaynawna* ‘they do without’ one thing instead of another whose origin was in *kalāmihim* ‘their speech’ that it be used until it becomes *sāʕiṭan* ‘dropped’. You shall see that, God willing. Of what *ḥuḍifa* ‘was deleted’ but *ʔaʔluhu* ‘its origin’ in *kalām* ‘speech’ was other than that is *lam yakun* | *lam yaku* ‘there was not’, *lā ʔadriy* | *lā ʔadri* ‘I do not know’, and similar ones<sup>57</sup>. As for *ʔistiynāʔuhum* ‘their doing with one thing’ instead of another, they say *yadaʔu* ‘he lets’ but they do not say *wadaʔa* ‘he left’, *ʔistaynaw ʔanhā* ‘they made do without it’ with *taraka* ‘he left’<sup>58</sup> and many similar examples. As for the *ʔiwadū* ‘replacement’, it is their saying (L. 10) *zanādiḡatun* and *zanādiyḡu* ‘unbelievers’, *farāzinatun* and *farāziynu* ‘queens (in chess)’. They deleted the *yāʔ* ‘[y]’ and replaced it with *hāʔ* ‘[h/t]’<sup>59</sup>. Their saying *ʔaʔāʔa* ‘he was able’, *yusṭiyʔu* ‘he is able’, it is rather *ʔaʔāʔa* ‘he obeyed’, *yusṭiyʔu* ‘he obeys’. They added the *siyn* ‘[s]’ in replacement of the *ḍahāb* ‘removal’ of the *ḥarakah* ‘motion’ of the *ʔayn* ‘[ʔ]’ of *ʔaʔʔala* pattern<sup>60</sup>; and their saying *ʔallāhumma* ‘O God’<sup>61</sup>, they *ḥaḍaʔiw* ‘deleted’ the *yāʔ* ‘[y]’ and they appended the *miym* ‘[m]’ by way of *ʔiwadʔan* ‘replacement’<sup>62</sup>.

{ص ٧، س ٥} اعلم انهم مما يحذفون الكلم وان كان اصله في الكلام غير ذلك ويحذفون ويعوضون ويستغنون بالشيء عن الشيء الذي أصله في كلامهم أن يستعلم حتى يصير ساقطاً وسترى ذلك إن شاء الله فمما حذف وأصله في الكلام غير ذلك لم يك ولا أدر وأشبه ذلك وأما استغناؤهم بالشيء عن الشيء فإنهم يقولون يدع ولا يقولون ودع استغنوا عنها بترك وأشبه ذلك كثيرة والعوض قولهم {س ١٠} زنادقة وزناديق وقرانة وقرانين حذفوا الياء وعوضوا الهاء وقولهم أسطاع يُسطيع وإنما هي أطاع يُطيع زادوا السين عوضاً من ذهاب حركة العين من أفعل وقولهم اللهم حذفوا يا والحقوا الميم عوضاً.

<sup>57</sup>These are cases where radicals are deleted from the root.

<sup>58</sup>They use a form of one word for the form of another word.

<sup>59</sup>These are cases where one segment is replaced by another for no compelling reason.

<sup>60</sup>These are cases where a segment is inserted for no compelling reason.

<sup>61</sup>i.e. *yā ʔallāh* ‘O, God!’.

<sup>62</sup>These are cases where one vocative marker is substituted for another for no compelling reason.

**Chapter 6. This is a Chapter on the *ʔistigāmah*  
'straightforwardness' in speech and the *ʔihālah* 'impossibility'**

**(٦) هذا باب الاستقامة من  
الكلام والإحالة**

(Bulaq vol. 1. P.9, Derenbourg vol. 1. p.7, Haruwn vol.1. p.25)

Some of it is *mustaGiym ḥasan* 'straightforwardly acceptable', *muḥāl* 'impossible'<sup>63</sup>, *mustaGiym kaḍib* 'straightforwardly false', *mustaGiym Gabiyḥ* 'straightforwardly unacceptable', and what is *muḥāl kaḍib* 'impossibly false'. As for the *mustaGiym ḥasan* 'straightforwardly acceptable' is your saying *ʔataytuka ʔamsi* 'I visited you yesterday', (L. 15) and *saʔātiyka ʔadan* 'I will visit you tomorrow'<sup>64</sup>. As for the *muḥāl* 'impossible', is if *tanḡud* 'you were to contradict' the beginning of your speech with its end and you say *ʔataytuka ʔadan* 'I visited you tomorrow' *saʔātiyka ʔamsi* 'I will visit you yesterday'<sup>65</sup>. As for the *mustaGiym kaḍib* 'straightforwardly false' is your saying *ḥamaltu ʔal-gabala* 'I carried the mountain', *šaribtu māʔa ʔal-baḥri* 'I drank the sea water', and similar ones<sup>66</sup>. As for the *mustaGiym Gabiyḥ* 'straightforwardly unacceptable', is if you place *ʔal-lafḍa* 'the expression' in other than its location, as in your saying *\*ḡad zaydan raʔaytu* 'Zaid I had seen', *\*kay zaydun yaʔtiyaka* 'in order Zaid to visit you'<sup>67</sup>, and similar ones. As for the *muḥāl kaḍib* 'impossibly false', is when you say *sawfa ʔašrabu māʔa ʔal-baḥri ʔamsi* 'I will drink the sea water yesterday'<sup>68</sup>.

{ص ٧، س ١٣} فممه مستقيم  
حسن ومحال ومستقيم كذب  
ومستقيم قبيح وما هو محال  
كذب فأما المستقيم الحسن  
فقولك أتيتك أمس {س ١٥}  
وسأتيك غداً وأما المحال فإن  
تتقض أول كلامك بآخره فتقول  
أتيتك غدا وسأتيك أمس وأما  
المستقيم الكذب فقولك حملت  
الجبل وشربت ماء البحر  
ونحوه وأما المستقيم القبيح فأن  
تضع اللفظ في غير موضعه  
نحو قولك قد زيدا رأيت وكى  
زيد يأتيتك وأشباه هذا وأما  
المحال الكذب فإن تقول سوف  
اشرب ماء البحر أمس.

<sup>63</sup>i.e. contradictory and other than *mustaGiym* .

<sup>64</sup>This is the case where the tenses follow the appropriate corresponding actions.

<sup>65</sup>This is the case where the actions and the times of their occurrence contradict each other.

<sup>66</sup>This is the case where the unrealistic is considered ordinary.

<sup>67</sup>This is the case where the units of the sequence fall in the incorrect functional slots. For example, the separation of the particle *ḡad* from the following *fiʔl* 'action' is unacceptable.

<sup>68</sup>This is the case where there is combination of two unacceptable structures, the unreal being considered ordinary and a contradiction in the sequence of tenses within the actions.