

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

Solomon Sara, S.J.  
Georgetown University

### Chapter 51. This is a chapter in which the *fi ḥ* 'action' is implied whose expression is used in other than *ḥamr* 'imperative' and *nahiy* 'prohibition'

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.129-130, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 109, Haruwn  
vol.1. p. 257-258)

(I. P. 109. L. 3) And that is if you were to see a man going in the direction of *ḥal-ḥagg* 'pilgrimage', purposeful in the state of *ḥal-ḥagg* then you said *makkata wa rabbi ḥal-ka ḥbah* 'Mecca, by the Lord of the Kaḥbah' where (L. 5) you were sure that he wants Mecca. It is as though you said *yuriydu makkata wa ḥal-lāhi* 'he wants Mecca, by God', and it is permitted that you say *makkata wa ḥal-lāhi* 'Mecca, by God' based on your saying *ḥarāda makkata wa ḥal-lāhi* 'He wants Mecca, by God'. It is as though you predicated with such a description about him that he was in it yesterday so you said *makkata wa ḥal-lāhi* 'Mecca, by God'; that is, he wanted Mecca at that time. Of that is the saying of the Powerful and Glorious *bal millata ḥbraḥiyma ḥaniyfan* 'rather the creed of righteous Abraham' (Sūrah II. 135), rather, we follow the creed of righteous Abraham. It is as though it was said to them 'be followers' when it was said to them 'be Jews or Christians'. Or when you saw a man aiming an arrow towards a sheet of paper you said *ḥal-ḥirtāsa wa ḥal-lāhi* 'the sheet of paper, by God'. That is, he hits the sheet of paper. If (L. 10) you were to hear the falling of the arrow into the sheet of paper you said *ḥal-ḥirtāsa wa ḥal-lāhi* 'the sheet of paper, by God' that is he hit the sheet of paper. If you were to see people looking at the crescent moon and you are distant from them and *kabbaruw* 'they said *ḥallāhu ḥakbar*, you would say *ḥal-hilāla wa rabbi ḥal-ka ḥbah* 'the crescent moon, by the lord of Kaḥbah', that is, they saw the crescent moon. If you were to see *d'arban* 'a strike' you said by way of optimism *ḥabda ḥal-lāhi* 'Abdulah'. That is, 'it befell Abdulah'.

هذا كتاب سيبويه  
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٥١) هذا باب ما يُضمَرُ فيه الفِعْلُ المستعمَلُ  
إظهاره من غير الأمر والنهي

(م ١٠٩ ص ٥١ ب ١) وذلك إذا رأيت  
رجلاً متوجّهاً وجهاً الحاج قاصداً في هيئة الحاج فقلت  
مكّة وربّ الكعبة حيث (س ٥) ركنت أنه يريد مكّة  
كأنك قلت يريد مكّة والله ويجوز أن تقول مكّة والله  
على قولك أراد مكّة والله كأنك أخبرت بهذه الصفة  
عنه أنه كان فيها أمس فقلت مكّة والله أي أراد مكّة إذ  
ذاك ومن ذلك قوله عز وجل بل ملّة إبراهيم حنيفاً  
أي بل نتبع ملّة إبراهيم حنيفاً كأنه قيل لهم أتبعوا حين  
قيل لهم كونوا هوداً أو نصارى أو رأيت رجلاً يسدّد  
سهماً قبل القرطاس فقلت القرطاس والله أي يصب  
القرطاس وإذا (س ١٠) سمعت وقع السهم في  
القرطاس قلت القرطاس والله أي أصاب القرطاس  
ولو رأيت ناساً ينظرون الهلال وأنت منهم بعيد  
فكبروا لقلت الهلال وربّ الكعبة أي أبصروا  
الهلال أو رأيت ضرباً فقلت على وجه التناؤل  
عبد الله أي يقع بعبد الله أو بعبد الله يكون.

<sup>1</sup>Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

It is an example of when you see a man who wants to do a deed or you saw him in the situation of a man who had done a deed or you were told about it concerning the act so you say *zayd-an* 'Zaid' you want *ʔidʔrib zayd-an* 'hit Zaid' or *ʔa-tadʔribu zayd-an* 'Are you hitting Zaid'. Of it (L. 15) is that you see a man or are told about him that he did a deed and he actually did it, so you say *ʔakulla hāḏā buxlan* 'all this, stingily'. That is, you do all this stingily'. If you so wished, you raised it, so you don't relate it to the *fiʔ* 'action' but you make it *mubtadaʔan* 'initial'. You implied the *fiʔ* 'action' here, while you are addressing, because as an informed addressee you don't supply it with another *fiʔ* 'action' that relates to what is reported on, and you are in the imperative for the *ʔāʔib* 'absent' and you have supplied it with another *fiʔ* 'action'. It is as though you said *ʔul lahu li-yadʔrib zaydan* 'tell him to strike Zaid' or *ʔul lahu ʔidʔrib zaydan* "tell him, 'strike Zaid'" or command him *ʔan yadʔriba zaydan* 'that he strike Zaid'. So it became weak due to the confusion that enters into a single matter that *fiʔān* 'two actions' for two things are implied in it.

ومثّل ذلك أن ترى رجلاً يريد أن يُوقِعَ فعلاً أو رأيته في حال رجلٍ قد أوقعَ فعلاً أو أُخبرتَ عنه بفعلٍ فتقول زيدا تريد إضرب زيدا أو أتضربُ زيدا ومنه (س) ١٥ أن ترى الرجلَ أو تُخبرَ عنه أنه قد أتى أمراً قد فعله فتقول أكلَ هذا بخلاً أي أتفعلُ كلَّ هذا بخلاً وإن شئتَ رفعتَه فلم تحمله على الفعل ولكنك تجعله مبتدأ وإنما أضمرتَ الفعلَ ها هنا وأنت تُخاطبُ لأنَّ المخاطبَ المُخبرَ لستَ تجعلُ له فعلاً آخرَ يعمل في المُخبرِ عنه وأنت في الأمر للغائب قد جعلتَ له فعلاً آخرَ كأنك قلتَ قُلْ له ليضربَ زيدا أو قُلْ له اضربَ زيدا أو مره أن يضربَ زيدا فضعفَ عندهم مع ما يدخل من (س ٢٠) اللبس في أمرٍ واحدٍ أن يُضمَرَ فيه فعلاً لشيئين.

**Chapter 52. This is a chapter in which the *fi ʔ* 'action' is implied whose expression is used after *ḥarf* 'a particle'**

(Buwlaq vol. 1. P.130-138, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 109-116, Haruwn vol.1. p. 258-273)

(I. P. 109. L. 21) And that in your saying *ʔal-nāsu magzuyyuwna bi-ʔa smālihim ʔin xayr-an fa-xayr-un wa ʔin šarr-an fa-šarr-un* 'people are reciprocated for their works if it is good then it is good, and if it is evil then it is evil'. *ʔal-marʔu maḡtuwlun bi-mā ḡatala bihi ʔin xangar-an fa-xangar-un* (P. 110) *wa ʔin sayf-an fa-sayf-un* 'a person is killed with what he killed, if a dagger then a dagger and if a sword then a sword'. If you so wanted you expressed the *fi ʔ* 'action' and said *ʔin kāna xangar-an fa-xangar-un* 'if it was a dagger then it is a dagger' and *wa ʔin kāna šarr-an fa-šarr-un* 'if it was evil then it is evil'. Some of the Arabs say *ʔin xangar-an fa-xangar-an* 'if a dagger then a dagger' and *ʔin xayr-an fa-xayr-an* 'if good then good' *wa ʔin šarr-an fa-šarr-an* 'and if evil then evil'. It is as though he said if the one who did good was rewarded with good or was good, and the one who killed with a dagger was the one who was killed with a dagger. The *raff* 'raising' is better and more frequent in the end because if you were to introduce the *fāʔ* [f] in the *gawāb* (L. 5) *ʔal-gazāʔ* 'the apodosis/result of the conditional' you resumed what is after it and it became acceptable for *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' to occur. However, they permitted the *nasʔb* 'erecting' where the *nasʔb* 'erecting' occurs in what was *gawābuhu* 'its result/apodosis', because *yugzamu* 'it is apocopated', like it is apocopated, and the correctness of one does not occur except with the other. They likened the *gawāba* 'result/apodosis' with the *xabar* 'predicate' of *ʔal-ʔbtidāʔ* 'the initial', even if it were not like it in all its circumstances, just as they liken one thing to another thing even if it is not like it nor close to it. We have already mentioned that in what has passed and we shall mention it again, God willing. If you were to imply, then it is better to imply the *nāsʔiba* 'one which erects' because if you were to imply the *rāfiʔ* 'one which raises' you also implied (L. 10) *xabarn* 'a predicate' or something that is in the location of its predicate. The more implication there is the weaker it is. If you were to imply the *nāsʔiba* 'one which erects' just as you implied the *rāfiʔ* 'one which raises' it is good Arabic. And that is in your saying *ʔin xayr-un fa-xayr-un* 'if good then good' and *ʔin xangar-un fa-xangar-un* 'if a dagger then a

(٥٢) هذا باب ما يُضمرُ فيه الفعلُ  
المستعملُ إظهاره بعد حرفِ

(م ١٠٩ . ص ١٠٩ . س ٢١) وذلك قولك الناسُ مجزيونَ بأعمالهم إن خيراً فخيرٌ وإن شراً فشرٌ والمرءُ مقتولٌ بما قتلَ به إن خنجراً فخنجرٌ (ص ١١٠) وإن سيفاً فسيفٌ وإن شئتَ أظهرتَ الفعلَ فقلتَ إن كان خنجراً فخنجرٌ وإن كان شراً فشرٌ ومن العرب من يقول إن خنجراً فخنجرٌ وإن خيراً فخيراً وإن شراً فشرّاً كأنه قال إن كان الذي عمِلَ خيراً مجزياً أو كان خيراً وإن كان الذي قتلَ به خنجراً كان الذي يُقتلُ به خنجراً والرفعُ أكثرُ وأحسنُ في الآخرِ لأنك إذا أدخلتَ الفاءَ في جوابِ (س ٥) الجزاءِ استأنفتَ ما بعدها وحسنتَ أن يقعَ بعدها الأسماءُ وإنما أجازوا النصبَ حيث كان النصبُ فيما هو جوابُه لأنه يُجزمُ كما يُجزمُ ولأنه لا يستقيم واحدٌ منهما إلا بالآخرِ فشبهوا الجوابَ بخبرِ الابتداءِ وإن لم يكن مثله في كل حاله كما يشبهون الشيءَ بالشيءِ وإن لم يكن مثله ولا قريباً منه وقد ذكرنا ذلك فيما مضى وسنذكره أيضاً إن شاء الله وإذا أضمرتَ فإن تُضمرَ الناصبَ أحسنُ لأنك إذا أضمرتَ الرفعَ أضمرتَ (س ١٠) أيضاً خبراً أو شيئاً يكون في موضع خبره فكلمها أكثرَ الإضمارِ كان أضعفَ وإن أضمرتَ الرفعَ كما أضمرتَ الناصبَ فهو عربيٌّ حسنٌ وذلك قولك إن خيراً فخيرٌ وإن خنجراً

dagger'. It is as though he said 'if there was a dagger with him where he killed then what he will be killed with is a dagger'. If there was good in their deeds, then what they are rewarded with is good'. And it is permitted that you make *ʔin kāna xayrun* 'if there was good' the basis of *ʔin waḡaḡa xayrun* 'if good occurred'. It is as though he said *ʔin kāna xayrun* 'if it was good' so that *ʔal-laḏiy yugzawna bihi xayrun* 'what they are rewarded with is good'. Yuwnis claimed that the Arabs recite this line of hudbahta ʔibn xašram: (tʔawiyl)<sup>2</sup> (L. 15)

*Fa-ʔin taku fiy ʔamwālinā lā nudʔiḡ bi-hā*  
*ḏirāsan wa-ʔin sʔabrun fa-nasʔbiru li-l-sʔabru*

'If it is due to our possessions we will not be short armed  
And if it is patience then we will be patient for the sake  
of patience'

*nasʔb* 'erecting' in it is good to attain to the first explanation, and *rafʔ* 'raising' is according to his saying *ʔin waḡaḡa saʔbrun* 'if patience were to occur' or *ʔin kāna fiynā sʔabrun* 'if there was patience in us' then we are patient'. As to the saying of the poet, nuḡmān ʔibn ʔal-munḏir: (basiyḏ)<sup>3</sup>

*ḡad ḡiyla ḏālika ʔin ḡaḡan wa ʔin kaḏiban*  
*Fa-mā ʔi stiḏāruka min šay ʔin ʔiḏā ḡiylā*

'That has been said truly or falsely  
And what is your excuse for a thing if it has been said'

(L. 20) the *nasʔb* 'erecting' is based on the first interpretation and the *rafʔ* 'raising' is permitted based on his saying *ʔin kāna fiyhi ḡaḡun wa ʔin kāna fiyhi bāʔilun* 'if there was good in it or if there was falsity in it' just as that was permissible in *ʔin kāna fiy ʔaḡmālihim xayrun* 'if there was good in their works'. It is also permitted based on his saying *ʔin waḡaḡa ḡaḡun wa ʔin waḡaḡa bāʔilun* 'if good occurs and if falsity occurs'. Of that is the saying of the Powerful and Glorious *wa ʔin kāna ḏuw ḡusratin fa-naḏʔiratun ʔilā maysaratin* 'if he were in difficulty then a reprieve till time of repayment' (Sūrah II: 280). An example of that is a proverb of the Arabs *ʔin lā ḡaḏʔiyyatun fa lā ʔaliyyatun* 'if it found no favor, then I spared no effort'. That is, 'if I am one of those who has found no favor, (P. 111) then I am not 'deficient'.

<sup>2</sup>The meter of tʔawiyl is: *fa ḡuwlun mafāʔilun* (four times).

<sup>3</sup>The meter of basiyḏ is: *mustafʔilu fāʔilun* (four times).

فخنجرٌ. كأنه قال إن كان معه حيث قتل خنجرٌ فالذي  
يقتل به خنجرٌ وإن كان في أعمالهم خيرٌ فالذي يُجزون  
به خيرٌ ويجوز أن تجعل إن كان خيرٌ على إن وقع خيرٌ  
كأنه قال إن كان خيرٌ فالذي يُجزون به خيرٌ وزعم  
يونس أن العرب تُنشدُ هذا البيت لهذبة (س ١٥) ابن  
خَشْرَم: (طويل)

فإن تك في أموالنا لا نُضق بها

ذراعاً وإن صبرٌ فنصبرٌ للصبرِ

والنصبُ فيه جيدٌ بالغٌ على التفسيرِ الأولِ والرفعُ على  
قوله وإن وقع صبرٌ أو إن كان فينا صبرٌ فإننا نصبرٌ  
وأما قول الشاعر لنعمان بن المنذر: (بسيط)

قد قيل ذلك إن حقاً وإن كذباً

فما اعتذارك من شيءٍ إذا قبلاً

(س ٢٠) فالنصبُ على التفسيرِ الأولِ والرفعُ يجوز  
على قوله إن كان فيه حقٌ وإن كان فيه باطلٌ كما جاز  
ذلك في إن كان في أعمالهم خيرٌ ويجوز أيضاً على قوله  
إن وقع حقٌ وإن وقع باطلٌ ومن ذلك قوله عز وجل  
وإن كان ذو عسرةٍ فنظرةٌ إلى ميسرةٍ ومثل ذلك قول  
العرب في مثلٍ من أمثالهم: إن لا حظيةٌ فلا أليةٌ أي إن  
لا تكن له في الناس حظيةٌ (ص ١١١) فإني غيرٌ أليةٌ.

It is as though she said by way of meaning, *ʔin kunta mimman lā yuḥḏā ʔindahu* 'if you were one of those who have found no favor with him' *fa- ʔinni ʔayru ʔaliyyatin* 'then I am not to be blamed'. If she means 'one who was aided by favoritisms' itself it can not be except *nasʔban* 'erect' if you were to place *ʔal-ḥaḏʔiyata* 'favoritism' according to the first interpretation. An example of that is *ʔad marartu bi-ragulin ʔin tʔawiylan wa ʔin ʔasʔiyan* 'I passed by a man either tall or short'. And *ʔamrur bi-ʔayyuhum ʔafdʔalu ʔin zaydan wa ʔin samran* 'I pass by either one who is preferable, whether Zaid or Amr', and *ʔad marartu bi-ragulin ʔablu ʔin zaydan wa ʔin samran* 'I passed by a man before, either Zaid or Amr'. Nothing occurs in this except the *nasʔb* 'erecting' because it is not permitted that (L. 5) *ʔal- tʔawiyl wa ʔal-ʔasʔiyr* 'the long and the short' be related to other than the first; neither is Zaid nor Amr. As for whether *ḥaʔʔun* 'true' or *kaḏibun* 'false' you are able to relate it to the first and say *ʔin kāna fiyhi ḥaʔʔun ʔaw kāna fiyhi kaḏibun* 'if it contains the truth or if it contains a falsehood' or *ʔin waʔa ʔa ḥaʔʔun ʔaw bāʔilun* 'if truth occurred or falsity'. It will not be correct in this if you don't want other than the first if you had mentioned it. You would not able to say whether there was *tʔawiyl* 'long' in it or whether there was Zaid in it. And it is not permitted that it be based on *ʔin waʔa ʔa* 'if it occurred'. Laylā ʔal-ʔaxyaliyyatu said: (kāmil)<sup>4</sup>

*Lā taʔrabanna ʔal-dahra ʔāla mutʔarrifin*  
*ʔin ḏʔāliman ʔabadan wa ʔin maḏʔluwmā*

'Do not approach the people of ʔāl mutarrifin,  
Whether you are always an oppressor or an oppressed'

(L. 10) Ibn hammām ʔal-saluwliyy said: (mutaʔārib)<sup>5</sup>

*Wa ʔaḥḏʔartu ʔuḏriy ʔalayhi ʔal-ʔuhuwdu*  
*ʔin ʔāḏiran liy wa ʔin tārikā*

'I presented my excuse to him with witnesses  
Whether accepting my excuses or letting it be'

He erected it because he meant the Amiyr, the addressee. If he had said *ʔin ʔāḏiran liy wa ʔin tārikun* 'Whether accepting my excuses or letting go',

<sup>4</sup>The meter of kāmil is: *mutaʔāʔilun* (six times).

<sup>5</sup>The meter of mutaʔārib is : *fa ʔuwlu fa ʔuwlu fa ʔuwlu fa ʔuwlu* (twice).

كأنها قالت في المعنى إن كنت ممن لا يُحظَى عنده فإنني  
غير أليّة ولو عنت بالخطية نفسها لم يكن إلا نصبا إذا  
جعلت الخطية في التفسير الأوّل ، ومثّل ذلك: قد  
مررتُ برجلٍ إن طويلا وإن قصيرا وامررُ بأيهم أفضل  
إن زيدا وإن عمرا وقد مررتُ برجلٍ قبل إن زيدا وإن  
عمرا لا يكون في هذا إلا النصبُ لأنه لا يجوز أن يحمل  
(س ٥) الطويل والقصير على غير الأوّل ولا زيدا ولا  
عمرا وأما إن حقٌّ وإن كذبٌ فقد تستطيع ألا تحمله  
على الأوّل فتقول إن كان فيه حقٌّ أو كان فيه كذبٌ أو  
إن وقع حقٌّ أو باطلٌ ولا يستقيم في ذا أن تريد غير  
الأوّل إذا ذكرته ولا تستطيع أن تقول إن كان فيه  
طويلٌ أو كان فيه زيدا ولا يجوز على إن وقع وقالت  
ليلى الأَحْيَلِيَّة: (كامل)

لا تقرّين الدهرَ آلَ مُطَرِّفٍ

إن ظالماً أبداً وإن مظلوماً

(س ١٠) وقال ابن همام السَّلُولِيُّ: (متقارب)

وأحضرتُ عُذري عليه الشُّهُودُ

إن عاذرًا لي وإن تاركًا

فَنَصَبَهُ لَأَنَّهُ عَنِي الأَمِيرَ المَخاطَبَ ولو قال إن عاذرٌ لي  
وإن تاركٌ

intending to say 'whether there was among the people one who would accept my excuses or not', it would be permitted. *ʔal-nābiyah ʔal- ʔubyanīyy* said: (kāmil)<sup>6</sup>

*ħadibat ʕalayya butʕuwnu ʕdinnata kulluhā  
ʔin ʔʕāliman fīyhim wa ʔin maʔħuwīmā*

'All the bellies of Dinna were bent against me  
Whether their oppressor or oppressed'

(L. 15) Of those is also your saying *marartu bi-ragulin sʕāliħin wa ʔin lā sʕāliħan fa-tʕāliħun* 'I passed by a good man and if not good then evil'. Of the Arabs who say *ʔin lā sʕāliħan fa-tʕāliħan* 'if not good then evil'. It is as though one says *ʔin lā yakun sʕāliħan* 'if he is not good' *fa-Ġad marartu bihi ʔaw la Ġaytuhu tʕāliħan* 'I passed by him or I found him evil'. Yuwnis claimed that there are some Arabs who say *ʔin lā sʕāliħin fa-tʕāliħin* 'if he is not good then evil' based on *ʔin lā ʔakun marartun bi-sʕāliħin fa-tʕāliħin* 'if I am not passing by a good one then an evil one'. This is unacceptable and weak because you imply after *ʔin lā* 'if not' another *fīʕ* 'action' different from the one you imply after *ʔin lā* 'if not' in your saying *ʔin lā yakun sʕāliħan fa-tʕāliħun* 'if he is not being good then he is evil'. It is not permitted to imply *ʔal-ġarra* 'the puller', but when they mentioned it in the beginning of their speech, they likened it to something different from it (L. 20) in the *fīʕ* 'action' and this, among them, was considered stronger if you were to imply *rubba* 'may be' or its likes in their saying: (ragaz)<sup>7</sup>

*Wa-baldatin laysa bi-hā ʔaniysu  
ʔillā ʔal-ya ʕāfiyru wa ʔillā ʔal-ʕiysu*

'And a town that has in it no companionship'  
Except the brown gazelles and camels'

(P. 112) Following that, Yuwnis said *ʔumrur ʕalā ʔayyuhum ʔafʕʕalu ʔin ʔaydin wa ʔin ʕamrin* 'pass by any of them whoever of them is better whether Zaid or Amr'. He means *ʔin mararta bi-ʔaydin ʔaw mararta bi-ʕamrin* 'whether you passed by Zaid or passed by Amr'. Know that nothing is erected after *ʔin* 'if' nor is raised except by *fīʕ* 'action' because *ʔin* 'if' is one of the *ħuruwf* 'particles'

<sup>6</sup>The meter for kāmil is: *mutafāʕilun* (six times).

<sup>7</sup>The meter for ragaz is: *mustafāʕilun* (six times).

يريد إن كان لي في الناس عاذرٌ أو غيرُ عاذرٍ جاز. وقال  
النابعة الذبياني: (كامل)

حَدَبْتُ عَلَيَّ بَطُونٌ ضِنَّةٌ كُلِّهَا

إن ظالماً فيهم وإن مظلوماً

(س ١٥) ومن ذلك أيضاً قولك مررتُ برجلٍ صالحٍ  
وإن لا صالحاً فطالِحٌ ومن العرب من يقول إن لا  
صالحاً فطالِحاً كأنه يقول إن لا يكنُ صالحاً فقد مررتُ  
به أو لقيته طالِحاً وزعم يونسُ أن من العرب من يقول  
إن لا صالحٍ فطالِحٍ على إن لا أكنُ مررتُ بصالحٍ  
فطالِحٍ وهذا قبيحٌ ضعيفٌ لأنك تُضمِرُ بعد إن لا فعلاً  
آخَرَ غيرَ الذي تُضمِرُ بعد إن لا في قولك إن لا يكنُ  
صالحاً فطالِحٌ ولا يجوز أن تُضمِرَ الجارَّ ولكنهم لما  
ذكروه في أوّلِ كلامهم شبهوه بغيره (س ٢٠) من  
الفعل وكان هذا عندهم أقوى إذا أضمرت رُبَّ  
ونحوها في قولهم (رجز)

وَبَلَدَةٍ لَيْسَ بِهَا أُنَيْسٌ

إِلَّا الْيَعَافِيرُ وَإِلَّا الْعَيْسُ

(ص ١١٢) ومن ثمَّ قال يونسُ: أمرُّ على أيُّهم أفضلُ  
إن زيدا وإن عمرو يعني إن مررتُ بزيدا أو مررتُ  
بعمر. واعلم أنه لا ينتصبُ شيءٌ بعد إن ولا يرفعُ  
إلا بفعلٍ لأنَّ إن من الحروف

on which the *fi ʔ* 'an action' is built. These are the *ʔin* 'if' of the *mugāzāt* 'conditionals' and it is not one of the particles with which one begins with *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' so that the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' would be built on it. Rather he wanted by his saying *ʔin zaydin wa ʔin samrin* 'whether Zaid or Amr' *ʔin mararta bi-zaydin wa ʔin mararta bi-samrin* 'if you were to pass by Zaid or if you were to pass by Amr' (L. 5) so speech followed the course of another *fi ʔ* 'action' and the *ʔism ʔingarra* 'the name got pulled' with a *bāʔ* [b-] because the *fi ʔ* 'action' does not reach it except with the *bāʔ* [b-], just as when it erected it, it was related to *kāna* 'he was'. Whoever sees *ʔal-garr* 'the pull' in this says *marartu bi-ragulin ʔin Zaydin wa ʔin samrin* 'I passed by a man either Zaid or Amr'. He wants *ʔin kuntu marartu bi-zaydin wa ʔin kuntu marartu bi-samrin* 'if I had passed by Zaid and if I had passed by Amr'. If you were to say *ʔindanā ʔayyuhum ʔafdʔalu ʔaw ʔindanā ragulun* 'we have whoever is better or we have a man' then you said *ʔin zaydan wa ʔin samran* 'either Zaid or Amr', its erecting was based on *kāna* 'he was'. If you were to raise it, you raised it on the basis of *kāna*. It is as though you said *ʔin kāna ʔindanā zaydun ʔaw kāna ʔindanā samrun* 'if Zaid was with us or Amr was with us'. Its raising is not on the basis of *ʔindanā* 'with us' on account of the fact (L. 10) that *ʔindanā* is not a *fi ʔ* 'action' and after *ʔin* 'if' it is not permitted' for *ʔindanā* to be built on *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' nor are the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' built on *ʔinda* 'at', just as it is not permissible for you to build *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' on *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' after *ʔin* 'if'. Know that it is not permitted for you to say *ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔal-maʔtuwla* 'Abdulah the killed' when you want is *kun ʔabda ʔal-lāhi ʔal-maʔtuwla* 'be Abdulah the killed' because there is no *fi ʔ* 'action' that reaches from one thing to another and because you are not pointing to anyone. Of that is the saying of the Arabs: (ragaz)<sup>8</sup>

*Min ladu ʔawlan fa-ʔilā ʔatlā ʔihā*

'From the time of drying of its milk to its fullness'

(L. 15) He erected because he wanted a time reference and *ʔawl* is neither a time reference nor a place reference; therefore *ʔal-garr* 'the pull' is permitted in it as in your saying *min ladu ʔal-ʔalāti ʔal-ʔasʔri* 'since the time of the afternoon prayer' to such and such a time and as your saying *min ladu ʔal-ʔāʔi ʔilā makāni kaḏā* 'from near the wall to such a place'.

<sup>8</sup>The meter of ragaz is: *mustafīlun* (six times).

التي يُبنى عليها الفعل وهي إن المجازاة وليست من الحروف التي يُبتدأ بعدها الأسماء لتبني عليها الأسماء فإنها أراد بقوله إن زَيْدٍ وإن عمرو وإن مررت بزید وإن مررت بعمرو فجزى (س ٥) الكلام على فعل آخر وانجر الاسم بالباء لأنه لا يصل إليه الفعل إلا بالباء كما أنه حين نصبه كان محمولاً على كان ومن رأى الجر في هذا قال مررت برجلٍ إن زیدٍ وإن عمرو يريد إن كنت مررت بزیدٍ أو كنت مررت بعمرو ولو قلت عندنا أيهم أفضل أو عندنا رجلٌ ثم قلت إن زيدا وإن عمرا كان نصبه على كان وإن رفعته رفعته على كان كأنك قلت إن كان عندنا زيدٌ أو كان عندنا عمرو ولا يكون رفعه على عندنا من قبل (س ١٠) أن عندنا ليس بفعل ولا يجوز بعد إن أن تبني عندنا على الأسماء ولا الأسماء تبني على عند كما لم يجوز لك أن تبني بعد إن الأسماء على الأسماء واعلم أنه لا يجوز لك أن تقول عبد الله المقتول وأنت تريد كن عبد الله المقتول لأنه ليس فعلا يصل من شيء إلى شيء ولا تك لست تشير إلى أحدٍ ومن ذلك قول العرب: (رجز)

من لد شولا فيلى أثلاها

(س ١٥) نصب لأنه أراد زمانا والشؤل لا يكون زمانا ولا مكانا فيجوز فيه الجر كقولك من لد صلاة العصر إلى وقت كذا وكقولك من لد الحائط إلى مكان كذا.

So when he wanted the time reference he related the *šawl* to a thing that is good to be a time reference if it operates in the *šawl* and it is no good except for that, just as it is not good to begin with *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' after *ʔin* 'if', until you implied that which is after it is acceptable to operate on the *ʔasmāʔ* 'names'; similarly this. It is as though you said *min ladu ʔan kānat šawlan fa-ʔlā ʔatlā ʔhā* 'from the time it is expecting till its fulness'. Some folks *garrahu* 'have pulled it' on the basis of *sa ʔat* 'expansiveness' (L. 20) of speech and gave it the status of *masʔdar* 'origin', that is, they gave *šawl* the status of *masʔdar*. It is as though he said *šālat šawlan* 'she is completely dry'. They added *ladu* to *šawl* and gave it the status of *ʔal-ʔiyn* 'when/during' like you say *ladu maʔdami ʔal-ʔāggi* 'since the time of the beginning of the pilgrimage', so *maʔdamun* is a *masʔdar*. They may give it the status of *ʔiyn* but he wants during such and such a time even if it does not have the same power of *masʔdir* because (P. 113) they don't function as they function. Know that not every *ʔarf* 'particle/word' after which a *ʔil* 'action' occurs is such that the *ʔil* 'action' is deleted. However, you imply after what the Arabs imply with these particles and locations, and you express what they expressed. And you make these things follow the course of what they consider light with the status of what they delete of the same speech and whatever is in speech according to the course they follow. It is not the case that every particle/word from which something is deleted or confirmed like *yaku* and *yakun* 'there is' (L. 5), *lam ʔibal wa ʔubāli* 'I did not pay any heed, I heed'. It does not lead them to do that to others in a like manner. Nor does it lead them, were they to confirm and say in *mur*, *ʔuwmur* 'command' and in *xuḍ* to say *ʔuwxuḍ* 'take' and in *kul* to say *ʔuwkul* 'eat'. So pause at these matters where they paused then pattern after them. As for the saying of the poet: (wāfir)<sup>9</sup>

*La ʔad kaḍabatka nafsuka fa-ʔkḍibnahā*

*Fa-ʔin gaza ʔan wa ʔin ʔigmāla sʔabri*

'Your soul has given you the lie, so give it the lie

Whether it brings fear or a courtesy of patience'

فلما أراد الزمان حمل الشَّوْلَ على شيء يحسن أن يكون  
 زمانا إذا عمل في الشَّوْلِ ولم يحسن إلا إذا كما لم يحسن  
 ابتداء الأسماء بعد إن حتى أضمرت ما يحسن أن يكون  
 بعدها عاملاً في الأسماء فكذلك هذا كأنك قلت من لَدُ  
 أن كانت شَوْلاً فيلإ أتلائها وقد جرّه قومٌ على سعة  
 (س ٢٠) الكلام وجعلوه بمنزلة المصدر أي الشَّوْلَ  
 بمنزلة المصدر كأنه قال شالت شَوْلاً فأضافوا لَدُ إلى  
 الشَّوْلِ وجعلوه بمنزلة الحين كما تقول لَدُ مَقْدَمِ الحاجِّ  
 فمَقْدَمٌ مصدرٌ قد جعلوه بمنزلة الحين وإنما يريد حين  
 كذا وكذا وإن لم يكن في قوّة المصادر لأنها لا (ص  
 ١١٣) تتصرّف تصرّفها واعلم أنه ليس كلُّ حرف  
 يظهر بعده الفعل يُحذفُ فيه الفعل ولكنك تُضمرُ بعد  
 ما أضمرت في العرب من الحروف والمواضع وتُظهِرُ  
 ما أظهرها وتُجْري هذه الأشياء التي هي على ما  
 يستخفون بمنزلة ما يحذفون من نفس الكلام ومما هو  
 في الكلام على ما أجروا فليس كلُّ حرفٍ يُحذفُ منه  
 شيءٌ ويُثبتُ فيه نحو يَكُ ويَكُنْ (س ٥) ولم أُبَلْ وأبَالِ  
 لم يحملهم ذاك على أن يفعلوه بمثله ولم يحملهم إذ كانوا  
 يُثبتون فيقولون في مَرٍّ أو مَرٌّ أن يقولوا في خُذْ أو خُذْ وفي  
 كُلُّ أو كُلِّ فقف على هذه الأشياء حيث وقفوا ثم قس  
 بعد. وأما قول الشاعر: (وافر)

لقد كذبتك نفسك فاكذبها

فإن جرعاً وإن إجمال صبر

<sup>9</sup>The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa ʔuwlun* (twice).



This is based on *ḥimmā* 'whether' and not on *ḥin* 'if' of the *gazā?* 'conditional'. It is not like your saying *ḥin ḥaḡḡan wa ḥin kaḏiban* 'whether true or false'. This is related (L. 10) to *ḥimmā* 'whether'. Don't you see that you introduce the *fā?* [f] even if it were the *ḥin* of *gazā?* 'conditional'. Since you introduced you would need an apodosis. His saying *fa-ḥingaza ḥan* 'if in fear' is not like his saying *fa-ḥimmā mannan baḥdu wa-ḥimmā fidāḥan* 'either generosity afterward or ransom' (Sūrah XLVII:4). If you were to say *Fa-ḥin gaza ḥun wa ḥin ḥigmālu s'abrin* 'either fear or the courtesy of patience', it would be permissible. It is like your saying *fa-ḥimmā ḥamriy gaza ḥun wa ḥimmā ḥigmālu s'abri* 'my situation is either anxiety or a courtesy of patience', for if you were to correct it, and said *ḥimmā*, that would be permissible in it, and it is not permitted to drop the *mā* from *ḥimmā* except in poetry. Namir ḥibn tawlab said: (mutaḡārab)<sup>10</sup>

(L. 15) *Saḡathu ḥal-rawāḥidu min s'ayyifin*

*Wa ḥin min xariyfin fa-lan ya ḥdamā*

'It was watered in thundering summer clouds

It will not be in lack of it in the fall'

He wants *wa-ḥimmā min xariyfin* 'as to fall'. Whoever permitted that in speech he is permitted to say *marartu bi-ragulin ḥin s'āliḥin wa ḥin t'āliḥin* 'I passed by a man whether good or bad'. He wanted *ḥimmā* 'whether' and if he were to want *ḥin* of the conditional, it is permitted because he implies the *fi ḥ* 'action' in it that reaches the *ḥarf* 'particle'. As for *ḥimmā* what comes after it here is for *ḥibtidā?* 'initial' and based on the beginning of speech. Don't you see that you say *ḡad kāna ḏālika ḥimmā s'alāḥan wa ḥimmā fasādan* 'that was like whether honestly or corruptedly'. It is as though you said *ḡad kāna ālika s'alāḥan* (L. 20) *ḥaw fasādan* 'that happened to be either honestly or corruptedly', the *nas'ḥ* 'erecting' was based on another *kāna*. *Raff* 'raising' is permitted on the basis of what we have said. What is erected on the basis of the implication of the *fi ḥ* *ḥal-mustaḥmali ḥḏ'ḥāruhu* 'the action that is used expressly' is your saying *hallā xayran min ālika* 'Isn't there something better than that' and *ḥallā xayran min ḏālika* 'lest there be something better than that or something else'. It is as though you said *ḥallā tafḥalu xayran min ḏālika* 'Don't you do better than that'

<sup>10</sup>The meter of mutaḡārab is: *fa ḥuwlun fa ḥuwlun fa ḥuwlun fa ḥuwl* (twice).

فهذا على إِمَّا وليس على إِنْ الجزاءِ وليس كقولك إِنْ  
حقاً وإِنْ كذباً فهذا على (س ١٠) إِمَّا محمولٌ ألا ترى  
أَنْك تَدْخِلُ الفَاءَ ولو كانت على إِنْ الجزاءِ وقد  
استقبلتَ الكلامَ لِاحتجتَ إلى الجوابِ فليس قوله  
فإن جزعا كقوله إِنْ حقاً وإِنْ كذباً ولكنه على قوله  
تعالى فإِمَّا مَنَّا بَعْدُ وإِمَّا فِدَاءً ولو قلتَ فإن جزعٌ وإِنْ  
إِجمالٌ صَبِرَ كانَ جائِزاً كأنك قلتَ فإِمَّا أَمْرِي جَزَعٌ وإِمَّا  
إِجمالٌ صَبِرٍ لأنك لو صححتَها فقلتَ إِمَّا جازَ ذلكَ  
فيها ولا يجوزُ طَرُحُ ما مِنْ إِمَّا إلا في الشعرِ قال النَّمِرُ  
بن تَوَلَّبٍ: (مقارِب)

(١٥) سَقَتَهُ الرَّوَّاعِدُ مِنْ صَيِّبٍ

وإِنْ مِنْ خَرِيْفٍ فَلَنْ يَعْذَمَا

وإنما يريد وإِمَّا مِنْ خَرِيْفٍ وَمَنْ أَجازَ ذلكَ في الكلامِ  
دَخَلَ عليه أن يقولَ مررتُ برجلٍ إِنْ صالحٍ وإِنْ طالِحٍ  
يريد إِمَّا وإِنْ أرادَ إِنْ الجزاءِ فهو جائِزٌ لأنه يُضْمَرُ فيها  
الفِعْلُ الذي يصلُ بحرفِ وأَمَّا إِمَّا فيجري ما بعدها  
ههنا على الابتداءِ وعلى الكلامِ الأوَّلِ ألا ترى أَنَّك  
تقولُ قد كانَ ذلكَ إِمَّا صَلاحاً وإِمَّا فَساداً كأنك قلتَ  
قد كانَ ذلكَ صَلاحاً (س ٢٠) أو فَساداً ولو قلتَ قد  
كانَ ذلكَ إِنْ صَلاحاً وإِنْ فَساداً كانَ النَّصْبُ على كانَ  
أُخْرَى ويجوزُ الرَّفْعُ على ما ذكرنا . ومما يَنْتصبُ على  
إِضمارِ الفِعْلِ المُستعملِ إِظهارُهُ قولُكَ هَلَّا خيراً مِنْ  
ذلكَ وأَلَّا خيراً مِنْ ذلكَ أو غيرَ ذلكَ كأنك قلتَ أَلَّا  
تَفْعَلُ خيراً مِنْ ذلكَ

or (P. 114) *ʔallā ʔafʔalu ʔayra ḏālika* 'lest you do other than that' and *hallā taʔiy xayran min ḏālika* 'would you not come up with something better than that'. Probably you proposed this to yourself and you became *muxātʔab* 'addressee' in it as in your saying *hallā ʔafʔalu* 'don't I do' and *ʔallā ʔafʔalu* 'lest I do'. If you so wished you raised it. We have heard the raising of some of it from the Arabs and from someone who had heard it from the Arabs. It was permitted to imply what raises just as it was permitted to imply what erects. Of that is your saying *ʔa-wa-faraʔan xayran min ḥubbin* 'is fear better than love' that is *ʔa-wa-ʔafraʔuka faraʔan xayran min ḥubbin* 'is making you fear, a fear better than love'. He related it to the *fiʔl* 'action' (L. 5) because he was asked about his action so he answered him on the basis of the action than he was engaged in. If he were to raise, it would be permissible. It is as though he said *ʔawa-ʔamriy faraʔan xayrun min ḥubbin* 'is my case fear is better than love'. He rather erected this kind on the basis that the man is in the midst of an action and you want to move him over, or he be moved to another action. On account of that he erected *ʔa-wa-faraʔan* 'out of fear', because he responded to *ʔafraʔu* 'I fear' and he quit love. What is erected on the basis of implying the action whose expression is used is your saying *ʔalā tʔaʔāma wa-law tamran* 'would that there was food even if it were dates'. It is as though you said *wa-law kāna tamran* 'even if it is dates', and *waʔ-tiniy bi-dābbatin wa-law ḥimāran* 'bring me a beast even if it were a donkey'. If you so wished you said *ʔalā tʔaʔāma wa-law tamrun* 'would that there was food even if dates'. It is as though you said *wa-law* (L. 10) *yakuwnu ʔindanā tamrun* 'even if we have dates' and *wa-law saʔata ʔilaynā tamrun* 'even if dates fell down for us'. What can best be implied, is better similarly best expressed. Though it is acceptable that you imply it, it is better if expressed. If you were to say *wa-law ḥimārin* 'even if a donkey', *gararta* 'you pulled' it has its status with *ʔin* 'if' and like it is the saying of some of them if you were to say *giʔuka bi-dirhamin fa-hallā diynārin* 'I brought you a dirham, how about offering a dinar'. It has the status of *ʔin* 'if' in this location on which the *ʔafʔāl* 'actions' are built. Raising is unacceptable in *fa-hallā diynārun* 'then why not a dinar' and in *wa-law ḥimārun* 'even if a donkey', because if you were not to relate it to an implication of *yakuwnu* 'he becomes/is', then the *fiʔl* 'action' of the proclaimer has priority with it and raising in this and in *wa-law ḥimārun* is remote. It is as though he would say: *wa-law yakuwnu mim mā yaʔiniy bihi ḥimārun* 'even if the one who brings it to me it is a donkey', and *wa law* 'even if' has the status of an

أو (ص ١١٤) أَلَا تَفْعَلُ غَيْرَ ذَلِكَ وَهَلَّا تَأْتِي خَيْرًا مِنْ ذَلِكَ وَرَبِمَا عَرَضَتْ هَذَا عَلَى نَفْسِكَ فَكَنْتَ فِيهِ كَالْمَخَاطَبِ كَقَوْلِكَ هَلَّا أَفْعَلُ وَأَلَا أَفْعَلُ وَإِنْ شِئْتَ رَفَعْتَهُ فَقَدْ سَمِعْنَا رَفَعَ بَعْضُهُ مِنَ الْعَرَبِ وَمَنْ سَمِعَهُ مِنَ الْعَرَبِ فَجَازَ إِضْمَارًا مَا يَرْفَعُ كَمَا جَازَ إِضْمَارًا مَا يَنْصِبُ وَمِنْ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُكَ أَوْفَرَقًا خَيْرًا مِنْ حُبِّ أَيِّ أَوْفَرَقَكَ فَرَقًا خَيْرًا مِنْ حُبِّ وَإِنَّمَا حَمَلَهُ عَلَى الْفِعْلِ (س ٥) لِأَنَّهُ سُئِلَ عَنْ فِعْلِهِ فَأَجَابَهُ عَلَى الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي هُوَ عَلَيْهِ وَلَوْ رَفَعَ جَازَ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ أَوْ أَمْرِي فَرَقٌ خَيْرٌ مِنْ حُبِّ وَإِنَّمَا انْتَصَبَ هَذَا النِّحْوُ عَلَى أَنَّهُ يَكُونُ الرَّجُلُ فِي فِعْلٍ فَيُرِيدُ أَنْ تَنْقُلَهُ أَوْ يَنْتَقِلَ هُوَ إِلَى فِعْلِ آخَرَ فَمَنْ تَمَّ نَصَبَ أَوْفَرَقًا لِأَنَّهُ أَجَابَ عَلَى أَفْرَقٌ وَتَرَكَ الْحُبَّ وَمَا يَنْتَصِبُ عَلَى إِضْمَارِ الْفِعْلِ الْمُسْتَعْمَلِ إِظْهَارُهُ قَوْلُكَ: أَلَا طَعَامٌ وَلَوْ تَمَّرًا كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ وَلَوْ كَانَ تَمَّرًا وَأَتَيْتَنِي بِدَابَّةٍ وَلَوْ حِمَارًا وَإِنْ شِئْتَ قُلْتَ أَلَا طَعَامٌ وَلَوْ تَمَّرًا كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ وَلَوْ (س ١٠) يَكُونُ عِنْدَنَا تَمَّرٌ وَلَوْ سَقَطَ إِلَيْنَا تَمَّرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ مَا تُضْمَرُ فِيهِ أَحْسَنُهُ فِي الْإِظْهَارِ وَلَوْ قُلْتَ وَلَوْ حِمَارٍ فَجَرَرْتَ كَانَ بِمَنْزِلَتِهِ فِي إِنْ وَمِثْلُهُ قَوْلُ بَعْضِهِمْ إِذَا قُلْتَ جِئْتُكَ بِدَرَاهِمٍ فَهَلَّا دِينَارٌ وَهُوَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ إِنْ فِي هَذَا الْمَوْضِعِ تُبْنَى عَلَيْهَا الْأَفْعَالُ وَالرَّفْعُ قَبِيحٌ فِي: فَهَلَّا دِينَارٌ وَفِي وَلَوْ حِمَارٌ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ لَمْ تَحْمَلْهُ عَلَى إِضْمَارٍ يَكُونُ فِعْعَلٌ الْمَخَاطَبِ أَوْلَى بِهِ وَالرَّفْعُ فِي هَذَا وَفِي وَلَوْ حِمَارٌ بَعِيدٌ كَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ وَلَوْ يَكُونُ مِمَّا يَأْتِينِي بِهِ حِمَارٌ وَلَوْ بِمَنْزِلَةِ

*ʾin* 'if', with nothing after it except (L. 15) *ʾal-ʾaḥḥāl* 'the actions'. If after it a name is dropped, then within it there is an implied action in this location on which the names are built. If you were to say *ʾalā māʾa wa-law bāridan* 'O for water even if cold'. It is not acceptable except with erecting, because *bāridan* 'cold' is a *sʾifah* 'descriptive'. If you were to say *ʾiʾtiniy bi-bāridin* 'bring me something cold' it is unacceptable. If you were to say *ʾaʾtiniy bi-tamrin* 'bring me dates' it is acceptable. Don't you see how unacceptable it is to put the *sʾifah* 'descriptive' in the location of *ʾism* 'a name'. Of that is the saying of the Arabs *ʾadfaʿ ʾal-šarra wa-law ʾisʾba san* 'push away/repel evil even if a finger length'. It is as though he said *wa-law dafaʿtahu ʾisʾba san* 'even if you pushed away a finger length' and *wa-law kāna ʾisʾba san* 'even if it were a finger length'. It is not acceptable if you were to relate it to what raises, because if you don't relate it to implication of *yakuwna* 'it be'. The *fiʾl* 'action' (L. 20) of the mentioned proclaimer gets priority and it is closer, so raising in this and *ʾiʾtiniy bi-dābbatin wa-law ʾimārūn* 'bring me a beast of burden even if a donkey' is remote. It is as though he is saying *wa-law yakuwnu mim mā ʾiʾtiniy bihi ʾimārūn* 'even if what you are bringing me is a donkey' and *wa-law yakuwnu mim mā tadfaʿtu bihi ʾisʾba san* 'even if what you are pushing away with is a finger'. What is erected on the basis of implying the *fiʾl* 'action,' that is expressly used is that you see that a man has come from a trip and you say *xayra ma ʾadamin* 'Good arrival'. Or the man says *raʾaytu fiymā yarā ʾal-nāʾimu kaḏā wa kaḏā* 'I saw in what the sleeper sees such and such', then you say *xayran lanā wa šarran li-šaduwwinā* 'good to us and evil to our enemy' and *xayran wa mā sarran* 'goodness and what no evil'. If you so wished, you said *xayru ma ʾadamin* 'good arrival' and *xayrun lanā wa šarrun li-šaduwwinā* 'good to us and evil to our enemy'. As for *nasʾb* 'erecting' it is as though he built it on his saying *ʾadimtu* (P. 115) 'I have arrived'. Then he says *ʾadimtu xayra ma ʾadamin* 'you have arrived a happy arrival'. Even if this expression is not heard from him but his arrival and his seeing him has the status of his saying *ʾadimtu* 'you have arrived'. Similarly, if it is said *ʾadima fulānun* 'so and so arrived'. Similarly, if he said *raʾaytu fiymā yarā ʾal-nāʾimu kaḏā wa kaḏā* 'I saw in what the sleeper sees so and such', then you say *xayran la-nā wa šarrun li-šaduwwinā* 'good for us and evil to our enemy'. If he were to erect then it is on the basis of the *fiʾl* 'action', but as to *raff* 'raising' it is on the basis that he made that a confirmed matter and he did not want to relate it to the *fiʾl* 'action'.

إن لا يكون بعدها إلا (س ١٥) الأفعال فإن سقط بعدها اسم ففيه فعلٌ مضمَّرٌ في هذا الموضع تُبني عليه الأسماءُ. فإذا قلت ألا ماءً ولو بارداً لم يحسن إلا نصبُ لأن بارداً صفةٌ ولو قلت ائتني بباردٍ كان قبيحاً ولو قلت ائتني بتمرٍ كان حسناً ألا ترى كيف قبح أن تَضَع الصفةَ موضعَ الاسم ومن ذلك قولُ العربِ اذْفَعِ الشَّرَّ ولو اِصْبَعًا كأنه قال ولو دفعته اِصْبَعًا ولو كان اِصْبَعًا ولا يحسن أن تحمله على ما يرفعُ لأنك إن لم تحمله على اِضْمارٍ يكون فعلٌ (س ٢٠) المخاطب المذكور أولى وأقرب فالرفع في هذا وفي ائتني بدابةٍ ولو حمارٌ بعيد كأنه يقول ولو يكون مما تأتيني به حمارٌ ولو يكون مما تدفع به اِصْبَعٌ ومما يتنصب على اِضْمارِ الفعل المستعمل اِظْهَارُهُ أن ترى الرجلَ قد قَدِمَ من سفرٍ فتقولُ خَيْرٌ مَقْدَمٍ أو يقولُ الرجلُ: رأيتُ فيما يرى النائمُ كذا وكذا فتقولُ خيراً لنا وشرًّا لعدوِّنا وخيراً وما شرٌّ وإن شئت قلت خيراً مَقْدَمٍ وخيراً لنا وشرًّا لعدوِّنا أمَّا النصبُ فكأنه بناه على قوله قَدِمْتُ (ص ١١٥) فقال قَدِمْتُ خَيْرٌ مَقْدَمٍ وإن لم يُسْمَع منه هذا اللفظُ فإن قَدومَه ورؤيته إياه بمنزلة قوله قَدِمْتُ وكذلك إن قيل قَدِمَ فلانٌ وكذلك إذا قال رأيتُ فيما يرى النائمُ كذا وكذا فتقولُ خيراً لنا وشرًّا لعدوِّنا فإذا نصبَ فعلى الفعلِ وأمَّا الرفعُ فعلى أنه جعل ذلك أمراً ثابتاً ولم يرد أن يحمله على الفعلِ.

He made it a *mubtadaʿ* 'initial' or built it on a *mubtadaʿ* 'initial' (L. 5). It is as though he said *hādā xayru maʿdamim* 'this is a good arrival'. And *hādā xayrun la-nā wa šarrun li-šaduwwinā* 'this is good for us and evil for our enemy'. And *huwa xayrun* 'it is good' and *mā šarra* 'not evil'. And then they said *musʿāhabun muṣānun* 'with helpful company' and *mabruwrūn maʿguwrūn* 'piously rewarded'. It is as though he said *ʾanta musʿāhabun* 'you are accompanied' and *ʾanta mabruwrūn* 'you are pious'. If you were to raise these things, what is in your mind is what you have expressed, and if you were to erect what is in your mind is different from what you expressed which is the *fiʾl* 'action' and what you have expressed is the *ʾism* 'name'. As to their saying *rāšidan mahdiyyan* 'guided on the right path', they implied *ʾiḥab rāšidan mahdiyyan* 'go-imp guided in the right path'. If you so wished, you raised, just as you raised *musʿāhabun muṣānun* 'accompanied and aided', but *nasʿb* 'erecting' is frequent in their speech because *rāšidan* (L. 10) *mahdiyyan* has the status of what became *badalan* 'a substitution' for the expression with the *fiʾl* 'action'. It is as though he expressed it with *rašidta wa hudiyta* 'you became wise were counseled and guided'. You shall see the explanation of that God willing. And like is *haniyyan mariyyan* 'happiness and serenity'. If you so wished you erected and said *mabruwrūn maʿguwrūn* 'pious and rewarded' and *musʿāhabun muṣānun* 'accompanied and aided'. Ṣiysā, Yūwnus and others have told us that about the Arabs. It is as though he said *ragasta mabruwrūn* 'you returned rewarded' and *ʾiḥab musʿāhabun* 'Go accompanied'.

What is erected is also on the basis of the implication that is expressly used is the saying of the Arabs *ḥaddā ʿa fulānun bi-kaḏā wa kaḏā* 'so and so discussed such and so' and you say *sādiʿan wa-ʾallāhi* 'By God, he is truthful'. He recites you a poem and you say *sādiʿan wa-ʾallāhi* 'By God, he is truthful'. That is he said it (L. 15) truly, because if he recites to you it is as though he said such and such. Of that also is the case of your seeing a man *ʿad wāʿsa ʾamran* 'take up a cause' or became subjected to it so you say *mutaṣaridʿan li-ʾanin lam ya ʾnihi* 'exposed to what does not concern him'. That is he came to such a matter being subjected to matters that do not concern him'. He omitted the mention of the *fiʾl* 'action' because of what he sees of the situation. Similar to is the *bayʿa ʾal-malatʿiyy lā ṣahda wa lā ʿada* 'sale of plaster neither promise nor contract', that is, if you are in the state of *musāwamah* 'bargaining' and the situation of a sale

وجعله مبتدأً أو مبنياً على مبتدأ (س ٥) فكأنه قال هذا خيرٌ مقدّمٌ وهذا خيرٌ لنا وشرٌّ لعدونا وهو خيرٌ وما شرٌّ ومن ثمّ قالوا مُصاحبٌ مُعانٌ ومبرورٌ مأجورٌ كأنه قال أنت مُصاحبٌ وأنت مبرورٌ فإذا رفعت هذه الأشياء فالذي في نفسك ما أظهرت وإذا نصبت فالذي في نفسك غير ما أظهرت وهو الفعل والذي أظهرته الاسمُ وأما قولهم راشدٌ مَهدياً فإنهم أضمروا اذْهَبْ راشداً مَهدياً وإن شئت رفعت كما رفعت مُصاحبٌ مُعانٌ ولكنه كثرَ النصبُ في كلامهم لأن راشداً (س ١٠) مَهدياً بمنزلة ما صار بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل كأنه لفظٌ برشدتَ وهُديتَ وسُتري بيان ذلك إن شاء الله ومثله هَنِيئاً مَرِيئاً وإن شئت نصبت فقلت مبروراً مأجوراً ومُصاحباً مُعاناً حدَّثنا بذلك عن العرب عيسى ويونس وغيرهما كأنه قال رجعت مبروراً واذْهَبْ مُصاحباً .

ومما يَنْتصب أيضاً على إضمار الفعل المستعمل إظهاره قول العرب حَدَّثَ فلانٌ بكذا وكذا فتقول صادقاً والله أو أنشدك شعراً فتقول صادقاً والله أي قاله (س ١٥) صادقاً لأنك إذا أنشدك فكأنه قد قال كذا ومن ذلك أيضاً أن ترى رجلاً قد واقعَ أمراً أو تعرَّضَ له فتقول متعرِّضاً لَعَنَ لِم يَعْنِي أي دنا من هذا الأمر متعرِّضاً لَعَنَ لِم يَعْنِي وتركَ ذكرَ الفعل لما يرى من الحال ومثله بَيْعَ المَلْطَى لا عهدَ ولا عقدَ وذلك إن كنتَ في حال مساومةٍ وحالِ بَيْعٍ

so you let me with you you whatever is in the circumstances.  
And like it is: (t<sup>1</sup>awiyl)<sup>11</sup>

*Mawāfiyda surǧuwbin ʔaxāhu bi-yaθribi*  
'Promises of surǧuwb his brother in yaθrib'

It is as though he said you promised me the promises of the one whose brother is a liar but he left out *wāṣadtaniy* 'you promised me' by doing without what is present in it of background, and satisfaction with what was between them before that. Of the Arabs are those who say (P. 116) *muta ʔarrid<sup>f</sup>u* 'exposed to', and of them who say *sādiǧun wa-ʔal-lāhi* 'by God, he is truthful'. All of it is Arabic. Like it is *ʔad<sup>f</sup>aba ʔal-xayli ʔal-lugumi* 'the horses rage against the bridles'. It is as though he said *ʔad<sup>f</sup>ibta* 'you were mad at' or *raʔāhu ʔad<sup>f</sup>bāna* 'he saw him angry' so he said *ʔad<sup>f</sup>iba ʔal-xaylu* 'the rage of the horses'. It is as though it is with the status of his saying *ʔad<sup>f</sup>ibta ʔay ʔad<sup>f</sup>ibta ʔad<sup>f</sup>ba ʔal-xayli ʔal-lugumi* 'you got mad, that is, you got mad, the madness of the horses at the bridles'. There are some Arabs who raise and say: *ʔad<sup>f</sup>abu ʔal-xayli ʔal-lugumi* 'the rage of the horses against the bridles', so he raised it as some of them raised *ʔal-δ<sup>f</sup>ibāʔu ʔal-lugumi* 'the gazelles against the cows'. Like it is that you hear the man mention a man then you said *ʔahlā āka wa ʔahlāhu* 'folk of that and his folks'. (L. 5) That is you recalled his folks because in your remembering he relates it to the meaning. If he so wished, he raised on the basis of *huwa* 'he' and its erecting it. Its explanation is the explanation of *xayra maǧdamin* 'good arrival'.

فَتَدَعُ أَبَايَعُكَ اسْتِغْنَاءً لِمَا فِيهِ مِنَ الْحَالِ وَمِثْلُهُ: (طَوِيل)

مَوَاعِيدَ عُرُقُوبٍ أَخَاهُ يَيْثْرِبِ

كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ وَاعْدَتْنِي مَوَاعِيدَ عُرُقُوبٍ أَخَاهُ وَلَكِنَّهُ تَرَكَ  
وَاعْدَتْنِي اسْتِغْنَاءً بِمَا هُوَ فِيهِ مِنْ ذِكْرِ الْخُلْفِ وَاسْتِغْنَاءً  
بِعِلْمٍ مِنْ يَعْنِي بِمَا كَانَ بَيْنَهُمَا قَبْلَ ذَلِكَ وَمِنَ الْعَرَبِ مَنْ  
يَقُولُ (ص ١١٦) مُتَعَرِّضٌ وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَقُولُ صَادِقٌ  
وَاللَّهِ وَكُلُّ عَرَبِيٍّ وَمِثْلُهُ غَضَبَ الْخَيْلِ عَلَى اللَّجْمِ كَأَنَّهُ  
قَالَ غَضِبْتَ أَوْ رَأَى غَضْبَانَ فَقَالَ غَضَبَ الْخَيْلِ فَكَأَنَّهُ  
بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِهِ غَضِبْتَ غَضَبَ الْخَيْلِ عَلَى اللَّجْمِ وَمِنَ  
الْعَرَبِ مَنْ يَرْفَعُ فَيَقُولُ غَضَبُ الْخَيْلِ عَلَى اللَّجْمِ فَرَفَعَهُ  
كَمَا رَفَعَ بَعْضُهُمُ الطُّبَّاءُ عَلَى الْبَقْرِ وَمِثْلُهُ أَنْ تَسْمَعَ  
الرَّجُلَ ذَكَرَ رَجُلًا فَقُلْتَ أَهْلَ ذَلِكَ وَأَهْلَهُ أَيِ ذَكَرْتَ  
أَهْلَهُ لِأَنَّكَ فِي ذِكْرِهِ فَحَمَلَهُ عَلَى الْمَعْنَى وَإِنْ شَاءَ رَفَعَ  
عَلَى هُوَ وَنَصَبَهُ وَتَفْسِيرُهُ تَفْسِيرُ خَيْرٍ مَقْدَمٍ.

<sup>11</sup>The meter of t<sup>1</sup>awiyl is: *fa suwluṇ maṣāṣiyṭun* ( four times).

**Chapter 53.** This is a chapter on what *yantas'ibu* 'is erected' on the basis of *ʔidʔ smār* 'implication' of the *fi ʔ* 'action' whose expression has been left out by *ʔistiynāʔan ʔanhu* 'doing away with it'

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.138, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 116,  
Haruwn vol.1. p.273)

**(I. P. 116. L. 7)** I will exemplify it for you explicitly so you will learn what they intended, God willing, The Exalted.

(٥٣) هذا باب ما يَتَّصِبُ عَلَى إِضْمَارِ الْفَعْلِ

الْمُتْرُوكِ إِظْهَارُهُ اسْتِغْنَاءً عَنْهُ

(م ١ . ص ١١٦ . س ٧) وَسَأُمَثِّلُهُ لَكَ مُظْهِرًا لِيَتَّعَلَّمَ

مَا أَرَادُوا إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى.

## Chapter 54. This is a chapter on what follows the pattern of *ʔamr* 'imperative/command' and the *taħḏiyr* 'warning'

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.138-140, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 116-117, Haruwn vol.1. p.273-277)

(I. P. 116. L. 9) And that is your saying if you were warning *ʔiyyāka* 'beware' (L. 10) as though you said *ʔiyyāka nahhi wa ʔiyyāka bāsid wa ʔiyyāka ʔittaGi* 'beware-- let go, beware-- stay away from, beware-- be careful about' and what is like that. An example of that is your saying *nafsaka yā fulānu* 'yourself--O so and so' that is *ʔittaGi nafsaka* 'take care of yourself' except in this it is not permitted to express what you have implied, but I mentioned it to exemplify for you that which is implied but not expressed. Of that are also your saying *ʔiyyāka wa ʔal-ʔasada* 'beware of the lion' *wa ʔiyyāya wa ʔal-ʔarra* 'and let me beware of evil'. It is as though he said *ʔiyyāka fa-ʔittaGianna wa ʔal-ʔasada* 'beware and avoid the lion'. It is as though he said *ʔiyyāya la ʔattaGianna wa ʔal-ʔarra* 'let me beware that let me beware evil', *fa-ʔiyyāka muttaGan* is what is avoided *wa ʔal-ʔasada wa ʔal-ʔarra muttaGayān* 'the lion and evil are both avoided' both of them are *maʔsuwlun* and *maʔsuwlun minhu* 'acted-upon/object and acted-from/object'. Similar to it is *ʔiyyāya wa ʔan yaħḏifa ʔaħḏikum ʔal-ʔarnaba* 'I should beware that one of you should wipe out the rabbit'. Like it is *ʔiyyāka, ʔiyyāh, (L. 15) ʔiyyāya, and ʔiyyāh* 'beware, beware him, beware me, and beware him'. It is as though he said *ʔiyyāka bāsid wa ʔiyyāh* 'beware, you keep your distance from him' *ʔaw nahhiy* 'or turn away'. And it as claimed that when some of them are told as *ʔiyyāka* 'beware, you', he says *ʔiyyāya* 'let me beware'. It is as though he said *ʔiyyāya ʔaħḏu wa ʔaħḏaru* 'let me beware, be on guard and be warned'. They deleted the *fi ʔ* 'action' from *ʔiyyāka* due to the frequency of their use of it in speech and so it became *badalan* 'a substitute' for the *fi ʔ* 'action'. They erased it as they erased *hiyna ʔiḏin ʔal-ʔān* 'at that time now'. It is as though he said *ʔiħḏar ʔal-ʔasada* 'beware of the lion' but the *wāw* [w] is required because it is one name added to the other. Of that is *ra ʔsahu wa ʔal-ħāʔit'a* 'watch out for his head and the wall'. It is as though he said *xalli ʔaw da ʔ ra ʔsahu ma ʔa ʔal-ħāʔit'a* 'let or place his head on the wall'. *Fa-ʔal-ra ʔsu maʔsuwl* 'the head is an acted-upon/object' and *ʔal-ħāʔit'u maʔsuwlun ma ʔahu* 'the wall is acted-upon/object of accompaniment', so they got all erected.

(٥٤) هذا باب ما جرى منه

على الأمر والتحذير

(م ١ ب ٥٣ ص ١١٦ س ٩) وذلك قولك إذا كنت تحذّر إِيَّاكَ (س ١٠) كأنّك قلت إِيَّاكَ نَحَّ وإِيَّاكَ بَاعِدْ وإِيَّاكَ اتَّقِ وما أشبهه ذا ومن ذلك أن تقول نفسك يا فلانُ أي اتَّقِ نفسك إلا أن هذا لا يجوزُ فيه إظهارُ ما أضمرتَ ولكن ذكرته لأمثَل لك ما لا يُظهِرُ إضماره ومن ذلك أيضاً قولك إِيَّاكَ والأسدَ وإِيَّاكَ والشرَّ كأنه قال إِيَّاكَ فاتَّقِيَنَّ والأسدَ وكأنه قال إِيَّاكَ لاتَّقِيَنَّ والشرَّ فإِيَّاكَ مُتَّقِيَّ والأسدَ والشرَّ مُتَّقِيَانِ فكلاهما مفعولٌ ومفعولٌ منه ومثله إِيَّاكَ وأن يحذف أحدكم الأرنبَ ومثله إِيَّاكَ وإِيَّاهُ (س ١٥) وإِيَّاكَ وإِيَّاهُ كأنه قال إِيَّاكَ بَاعِدْ وإِيَّاهُ أو نَحَّ وزعم أن بعضهم يقال له إِيَّاكَ فيقول إِيَّاكَ كأنه قال إِيَّاكَ أَحْفَظْ وأحذِرْ وحذفوا الفعل من إِيَّاكَ لكثرة استعمالهم إِيَّاهُ في الكلام فصار بدلاً من الفعل وحذفوا كحذفهم حينئذٍ الآن فكأنه قال إحذِرِ الأسدَ ولكن لا بدّ من الواو لأنه اسمٌ مضموم إلى آخرَ ومن ذلك رأسه والحائطُ كأنه قال خلّ أو دَعْ رأسه مع الحائطِ فالرأسُ مفعولٌ والحائطُ مفعولٌ معه فانتصباً جميعاً

And of that (L. 20) is their saying *ša ḥnaka wa ḥal-ḥagga* 'your affair and the pilgrimage'. It is as though he said *ṣalayka ṣa ḥnaka ma ṣa ḥal-ḥagg* 'you have your affair in relation to the pilgrimage'. Of that is *ḥimra ḥan wa nafsahu* 'a person and himself'. It is as though he said *da ḥ ḥamra ḥan ma ṣa nafsahi* 'let a person be with himself'. The *waw* [w] became with the meaning of *ma ṣa* 'with' just as it became with the meaning of *ma ṣa* 'with' in their saying *mā s'ana ṣta wa ḥaxāka* 'what did you do together with your brother'. If you so wish it does not have to have that meaning and it is good Arabic. It is as though he said *ṣalayka ra ḥsaka wa ṣalayka ḥal-ḥāḥit'a* 'watch our for your head, and watch out for the wall'. It is as though he said *da ḥ ḥimra ḥan wa da ḥ nafsahu* 'let a person be and let him be himself'. This does not contradict what you wanted in the meaning of *ma ṣa* 'with' in (P. 117) the discussion.

An example of that is *ḥahlaka wa ḥal-layla* 'your people and the night'. It is as though he said *bādir ḥahlaka ḡabla ḥal-layli* 'get to your people before the night'. The meaning is that he warns him that night is upon him and the night has been warned against just as the lion a person is protected from. Of that is their saying *māzi ra ḥsaka wa ḥal-sayfa* 'shun from your head the sword' just as you say *ra ḥsaka wa ḥal-ḥāḥit'a* 'your head and the wall'. He is warning him as though he said *ḥittaḡi ra ḥsaka wa ḥal-ḥāḥit'a* 'protect your head from the wall'. They deleted the *fi ḥl* 'action' in these things when they doubled due to its frequency in their speech and dispensing with it by what (L. 5) they see of the circumstances and what has occurred by way of recollection and the first *mafḥuwl* 'acted-upon' became *badalan* 'a substitute' for the expression of the *fi ḥl* 'action' when it became to them like *ḥiyyāka* 'beware' and it does not become like *ḥiyyāka* if you were to reduce it to one because it is not as frequent in their speech with the frequency of *ḥiyyāka*. It has been likened to *ḥiyyāka* when speech is lengthened and it is frequent in speech. If you were to say *nafsaka* 'yourself' or *ra ḥsaka* 'your head' or *ḥal-gidāra* 'the wall', the expression of the *fi ḥl* 'action' is *ḡāḥiz* 'permissible' like your saying *ḥittaḡi ra ḥsaka* 'protect your head' and *ḥiḥfaḍ' nafsaka* 'protect yourself' and *ḥittaḡi ḥal-gidāra* 'avoid the wall'. When *ḥannayta* 'you doubled' it assumed the status of *ḥiyyāka* 'beware', and *ḥiyyāka* 'beware' becomes a substitute for the expression of the *fi ḥl* 'action' just as the *mas'ādir* 'origins' were like *ḥal-ḥaḍara* (L. 10) *ḥal-ḥaḍara* 'a warning, a warning'.

ومن ذلك (س ٢٠) قولهم شأنك والحج كأنه قال عليك شأنك مع الحج. ومن ذلك امرأً ونفسه كأنه قال دع امرأً مع نفسه فصارت الواو في معنى مع كما صارت في معنى مع في قولهم ما صنعت وأخاك وإن شئت لم يكن فيه ذلك المعنى فهو عربي جيد كأنه قال عليك رأسك وعليك الحائط وكأنه قال دع امرأً ودع نفسه فليس ينقض هذا ما أردت في معنى مع من (ص ١١٧) الحديث.

ومثل ذلك أهلك والليل كأنه قال بادِرْ أهلك قبل الليل وإنما المعنى أن يحذره أن يدركه الليل والليل محذّر منه كما كان الأسد محتفظاً منه ومن ذلك قولهم مازِ رأسك والسيف كما تقول رأسك والحائط وهو يحذره كأنه قال أتقِ رأسك والحائط وإنما حذفوا الفعل في هذه الأشياء حين ثنوا لكثرتها في كلامهم واستغناء بما (س ٥) يرون من الحال وبما جرى من الذكر وصار المفعول الأول بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل حين صار عندهم مثل إياك ولم يكن مثل إياك لو أفردته لأنه لم يكثر في كلامهم كثرة إياك فشبهت بإياك حيث طال الكلام وكان كثيراً في الكلام ولو قلت نفسك أو رأسك أو الجدار كان إظهار الفعل جائزاً نحو قولك أتقِ رأسك واحفظ نفسك وأتقِ الجدار فلما ثنيت صار بمنزلة إياك وإياك بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل كما كانت المصادر كذلك نحو الحذر (س ١٠) الحذر.



What is considered a substitute for the expression of the *fi ʔl* 'action' is their saying *ʔal-ḥaḍara ʔal-ḥaḍara* 'a warning, a warning' *ʔal-nagāʔa ʔal-nagāʔa* 'escape, escape' and *darban, darban* 'a blow, a blow'. This has been erected on the basis of *ʔlzami ʔal-ḥaḍara* 'take precaution', *ʔalayka ʔal-nagāʔa* 'you must escape' but they deleted it because it assumed the status of *ʔifʔal* 'do' and the introduction of *ʔlzam* 'get hold of' and *ʔalayka* 'you must' to *ʔifʔal* 'do' is impossible. Hence he said, and it is the saying of ʔamr ʔibn maʔdiy kariba: (wāfir)<sup>12</sup>

*ʔuriydu ḥibāʔah wa yuriydu ʔatliy*  
*ʔaḍiyra min xaliylika min murād*  
 'I wish him well and he wants my death  
 Get your excuse from your friend from Murād'

(L.15) and Kumayt said: (tʔawiy)<sup>13</sup>

*Na ʔāʔi guḍāman ʔayra mawtin wa-lā ʔatlin*  
*Wa lākin firāʔan lilda ʔāʔimi wa-ʔal-ʔasʔli*  
 'Lament guāma for their death or killing  
 But for abandoning their principles and origin'

And *ḍuw ʔal-ʔisʔbaʔ ʔal-ʔadwāniyy*: (hazag)<sup>14</sup>

*ʔaḍiyra ʔal-ḥayyi min ʔadwāna*  
*Kānuw ḥayyata ʔal-ardʔi*  
 The excuse for the neighborhood from ʔadwān  
 They were the serpent of the Earth'

It is not permitted to express the *fi ʔl* 'action' and *ʔabuḥa* 'it is unacceptable' as that is *muḥāl* 'impossible'.

ومما جُعِلَ بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل قولهم الحَذَرَ الحَذَرَ  
 والنَّجَاءَ النَّجَاءَ وَضَرْباً ضَرْباً فَإِنَّمَا انْتَصَبَ هَذَا عَلَى  
 الزِّمِّ الحَذَرَ وَعَلَيْكَ النَّجَاءَ وَلَكِنَّهُمْ حَذَفُوا لِأَنَّهُ صَارَ  
 بِمَنْزِلَةِ إِفْعَلٍ وَدَخُولِ الزِّمِّ وَعَلَيْكَ عَلَى إِفْعَلٍ مُحَالٌ وَمَنْ  
 تَمَّ قَالَ وَهُوَ لَعَمْرٍ وَبَيْنَ مَعْدِي كَرِبَ: (وَأَفِر)

أُرِيدُ جِبَاءَهُ وَيُرِيدُ قَتْلِي  
 عَذِيرَكَ مِنْ خَلِيلِكَ مِنْ مُرَادٍ

(س ١٥) وَقَالَ الْكُمَيْتُ: (طَوِيل)

نَعَاءٍ جُدَامًا غَيْرَ مَوْتٍ وَلَا قَتْلٍ  
 وَلَكِنْ فِرَاقًا لِلدَّعَائِمِ وَالْأَصْلِ

وَقَالَ ذُو الْإِصْبَعِ الْعَدَوَانِي: (هَزَج)

عَذِيرَ الْحَيِّ مِنْ عَدَوَا  
 --- نَ كَانُوا حَيَّةَ الْأَرْضِ

فلم يجوز إظهار الفعل وقبح كما كان ذلك محالاً.

<sup>12</sup>The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun fa ʔuwlun* (twice).

<sup>13</sup>The meter of tʔawiy is: *fa ʔuwlun mafāʔiylun* (four times).

<sup>14</sup>The meter of hazag is: *mafāʔiylun mafāʔiylun* (two times).

**Chapter 55. This is a chapter on what is *maṣ'uwfan* 'conjoined', in this chapter, with the *fā'il* 'actor' that is implied in the *niyyah* 'intention' and it is conjoined to the *maṣ'uwl* 'acted-upon' and whatever is a *s'ifah* 'descriptive' of the *marfuw* 'raised' that is implied in the intention and is based on the *maṣ'uwl* 'acted-upon'**

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.140-141, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 117-118, Haruwn vol.1. p.277-279)

(I. P. 117. L. 21) And that is in your saying *ḥiyyāka ḥanta nafsuka ḥan taffala* 'that you yourself to do' and *ḥiyyāka nafsaka ḥan taffala* 'beware that yourself do'. If you intended the implied *fā'il* 'actor' in the intention (P. 118) you said *ḥiyyāka ḥanta nafsuka* 'that you yourself'. It is as though you said *ḥiyyāka naḥḥi ḥanta nafsuka* 'that you turn away you yourself'. You related it to the *ḥism* 'name' that is implied in *naḥḥi*. If you were to say *ḥiyyāka nafsuka* 'that you yourself' you want the implied name that is *fā'il* 'an actor', it is *ḡabiyḥun* 'unacceptable', and despite its unacceptability it is *raḥḥun* 'a raise'. What leads you to its unacceptability is that if you were to say *ḥiḥhab nafsuka* 'go yourself', it would be unacceptable until you add *ḥanta* 'you' and following that then *naḥḥb* 'erecting' is better, because if you were to describe with *nafsika* 'yourself' the implied that is erect without *ḥanta* 'you', it is permissible. You say *ra ḥaytuka* (L. 5) *nafsaka* 'I saw you yourself' and you do not say *ḥintala ḡta nafsuka* 'you departed yourself'. If *ḥatafta* 'you were to conjoin' you said *ḥiyyāka wa zaydan wa ḥal-ḥasada* 'beware of Zaid and the lion'. Similarly, *ra ḥsaka wa riglayka wa ḥal-d'arba* 'your head, your feet-d and the blow'. For you have ordered him to guard against the two of them together and the blow. If you were to relate the second one to the implied name that is raised it is unacceptable because if you were to say *ḥiḥhab wa zaydun* 'go and Zaid' it is unacceptable until you say *ḥiḥhab ḥanta wa zaydun* 'go you and Zaid'. If you were to say *ḥiyyāka ḥanta wa zaydun* 'that you and Zaid' then you have a choice. If you so wished, you related it to the *maṣ'uw* 'erected' or if you so wished you related it to the implied that is raised, because if you were to say *ra ḥaytuka* 'I saw you' you said *ḥāka ḥanta wa zaydun* 'that is you and Zaid'. It is permissible. If you were to say (L. 10) *ra ḥaytuka* 'I saw you' you said *ḥāka wa zaydan* 'that and Zaid'. *Naḥḥb* 'erecting' is

(٥٥) هذا باب ما يكون معطوفاً في هذا الباب  
على الفاعل المضمّر في النيّة ويكون معطوفاً على  
المفعول وما يكون صفة المرفوع المضمّر في النيّة  
ويكون على المفعول

(م ١. ب ٥٥. ص ١١٧. س ٢٠) وذلك قولك إِيَّاكَ  
أَنْتَ نَفْسُكَ أَنْ تَفْعَلَ وَإِيَّاكَ نَفْسُكَ أَنْ تَفْعَلَ فَإِنْ عَنَيْتَ  
الْفَاعِلَ الْمُضْمَرَ فِي النِّيَّةِ (ص ١١٨) قَلْتَ إِيَّاكَ أَنْتَ  
نَفْسُكَ كَأَنَّكَ قَلْتَ إِيَّاكَ نَحَّ أَنْتَ نَفْسُكَ وَحَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى  
الاسْمِ الْمُضْمَرَ فِي نَحَّ فَإِنْ قَلْتَ إِيَّاكَ نَفْسُكَ تَرِيدُ الْاسْمَ  
الْمُضْمَرَ الْفَاعِلَ فَهُوَ قَبِيحٌ وَهُوَ عَلَى قُبْحِهِ رَفَعٌ وَيَدُلُّكَ  
عَلَى قُبْحِهِ أَنَّكَ لَوْ قَلْتَ إِذْ هَبْ نَفْسُكَ كَانَ قَبِيحاً حَتَّى  
تَقُولَ أَنْتَ فَمَنْ تَمَّ كَانَ النِّصْبُ أَحْسَنَ لِأَنَّكَ إِذَا  
وَصَفْتَ بِنَفْسِكَ الْمُضْمَرَ الْمَنْصُوبَ بِغَيْرِ أَنْتَ جَازٌ  
تَقُولَ رَأَيْتُكَ (س ٥) نَفْسُكَ وَلَا تَقُولَ انْطَلَقْتَ نَفْسُكَ  
وَإِذَا عَطَفْتَ قَلْتَ: إِيَّاكَ وَزَيْدًا وَالْأَسَدَ وَكَذَلِكَ رَأْسَكَ  
وَرِجْلَيْكَ وَالضَّرْبَ وَإِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ أَنْ يَتَّقِيَهُمَا جَمِيعاً  
وَالضَّرْبَ فَإِنْ حَمَلْتَ الثَّانِي عَلَى الْاسْمِ الْمَرْفُوعِ الْمُضْمَرَ  
فَهُوَ قَبِيحٌ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ قَلْتَ إِذْ هَبْ وَزَيْدٌ كَانَ قَبِيحاً حَتَّى  
تَقُولَ إِذْ هَبْ أَنْتَ وَزَيْدٌ فَإِنْ قَلْتَ إِيَّاكَ أَنْتَ وَزَيْدٌ فَأَنْتَ  
بِالْخِيَارِ إِنْ شِئْتَ حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الْمَنْصُوبِ وَإِنْ شِئْتَ عَلَى  
الْمُضْمَرَ الْمَرْفُوعِ لِأَنَّكَ لَوْ قَلْتَ رَأَيْتُكَ قَلْتَ ذَاكَ أَنْتَ  
وَزَيْدٌ جَازٌ فَإِنْ قَلْتَ (س ١٠) رَأَيْتُكَ قَلْتَ ذَاكَ وَزَيْدًا  
فَالنِّصْبُ

better, because the erect is conjoined to the implied erect and it is not conjoined to the implied raised except in poetry and that is unacceptable. Yuwnus recited for us from gariyr: (mutagārab)<sup>15</sup>

*ʔiyyāka ʔanta wa ʔabda ʔal-masiyḥi  
ʔan taGrabā Gīblata ʔal-masgidi*

'Beware You and the worshiper of the Messaiah  
to come close to the mosque'

He recited it to us *mans'uwban* 'erect'. He claimed that the Arabs so recite it. Know that you are not permitted to say *ʔiyyāka zaydan* 'beware Zaid', just as it is not permitted to say that you *raʔsaka ʔal-gidāra* 'your head, the wall' until you say *mina al-gidāri* 'from the wall' or *wa ʔal-gidāra* 'and the wall'. Similarly, *ʔan taffala* 'that you do' (L. 15) if you wanted *ʔiyyāka wa ʔal-fiʔa* 'that you and the action'. If you were to say *ʔiyyāka ʔan taffala* 'beware that you do', you want *ʔiyyāka ʔa ʔiḏ' u maxāfata ʔan taffala* 'you I exhort fearing that you might do' or *min ʔagli ʔan taffala* 'so that you may do'. It is permitted, because you do not want to group it with the first *ʔism* 'name' as though to say *ʔiyyāka naḥḥi li-makāni kaḏā wa kaḏā* 'beware that you remove yourself to such and such a place'. If you were to say *ʔiyyāka ʔal-ʔasada* 'beware the lion' you mean *mina ʔal-ʔasadi* 'from the lion'. It is not permitted, as it was permitted with *ʔan* 'that', except that they claimed that ʔibn ʔabiy ʔishāg permitted this in a line of poetry: (t'awiyl)<sup>16</sup>

*ʔiyyāka ʔiyyāka ʔal-mirāʔa fa-ʔinnahu  
ʔilā ʔal-ʔarri da ʔʔāʔun wa li-l ʔarri gālibu*

'Beware, beware of hypocrisy, because  
To evil it invites and towards evil it attracts'

(L. 20) It is as though he said *ʔiyyāka* and then he implied after *ʔiyyāka* another *fiʔa* 'action' and he said *ʔittaGi ʔal-mirāʔa* 'avoid the controversy'. ʔal-Khalīl said that if a man were to say *ʔiyyāka nafsika* 'beware yourself' *lam ʔu ʔannifhu* 'I will not scold him' because this *kāf* [k] is *magruwrah* 'pulled'. And someone whom I do not doubt told me a report from ʔal-Khalīl that he said he heard an Arab saying when a man reaches sixty *fa-ʔiyyāhu wa ʔiyyā ʔal-ʔawābbi* 'beware of him and the young girls'.

<sup>15</sup>The meter of mutagārab is: *fa ʔuwlun fa ʔuwlun fa ʔuwlun fa ʔuwl* (twice).

<sup>16</sup>The meter of t'awiyl is: *fa ʔuwlun mafāʔiyun* (four times).

أَحْسَنُ لِأَنَّ الْمَنْصُوبَ يُعْطَفُ عَلَى الْمَنْصُوبِ الْمَضْمَرِ وَلَا  
يُعْطَفُ عَلَى الْمَرْفُوعِ الْمَضْمَرِ إِلَّا فِي الشَّعْرِ وَذَلِكَ قَبِيحٌ  
أَنْشَدَنَا يُونُسُ لَجْرِيْرِ: (مُتَقَارِبٌ)

إِيَّاكَ أَنْتَ وَعَبْدَ الْمَسِيحِ أَنْ تَقْرَبَا قِبْلَةَ الْمَسْجِدِ

أَنْشَدَنَا مَنْصُوبًا وَزَعَمَ أَنَّ الْعَرَبَ كَذَا تُنْشِدُهُ وَاعْلَمْ  
أَنَّهُ لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ إِيَّاكَ زَيْدًا كَمَا أَنَّهُ لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ  
رَأْسَكَ الْجِدَارَ حَتَّى تَقُولَ مِنَ الْجِدَارِ أَوْ وَالْجِدَارَ  
وَكَذَلِكَ أَنْ تَفْعَلَ (س ١٥) إِذَا أَرَدْتَ إِيَّاكَ وَالْفِعْلَ فَإِذَا  
قُلْتَ إِيَّاكَ أَنْ تَفْعَلَ تَرِيدُ إِيَّاكَ أَعْظَمُ مَخَافَةً أَنْ تَفْعَلَ أَوْ مِنْ  
أَجْلِ أَنْ تَفْعَلَ جَازَ لِأَنَّكَ لَا تَرِيدُ أَنْ تُضَمَّهُ إِلَى الْاسْمِ  
الْأَوَّلِ كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ إِيَّاكَ نَحَّ لِمَكَانٍ كَذَا وَكَذَا وَلَوْ قُلْتَ  
إِيَّاكَ الْأَسَدَ تَرِيدُ مِنَ الْأَسَدِ لَمْ يَجْزِ كَمَا جَازَ فِي أَنْ إِلَّا  
أَتَمَّ زَعَمُوا أَنَّ ابْنَ أَبِي إِسْحَاقَ أَجَازَ هَذَا الْبَيْتَ فِي  
شَعْرِ: (طَوِيلٌ)

إِيَّاكَ إِيَّاكَ الْمِرَاءَ فَإِنَّهُ

إِلَى الشَّرِّ دَعَاءٌ وَلِلشَّرِّ جَالِبٌ

(س ٢) كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ إِيَّاكَ ثُمَّ أَضْمَرَ بَعْدَ إِيَّاكَ فَعَلًا آخَرَ  
فَقَالَ اتَّقِ الْمِرَاءَ قَالَ الْخَلِيلُ لَوْ أَنَّ رَجُلًا قَالَ إِيَّاكَ  
نَفْسِكَ لَمْ أَعْتَفْهُ لِأَنَّ هَذِهِ الْكَافَ مَجْرُورَةٌ وَحَدَّثَنِي مَنْ لَا  
أَتَمُّ عَنْ الْخَلِيلِ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ أَعْرَابِيًّا يَقُولُ إِذَا بَلَغَ الرَّجُلُ  
السِّتِينَ فَإِيَّاهُ وَإِيَّا الشَّوَابَّ .