

This is the Famous Book of Sībawayh on
Naḥw ‘Grammar’ and its Name is
*ʔal-kitāb*¹ ‘The Book’²

Solomon Sara, S.J.
Georgetown University

Chapter 56. This is a chapter in which the *fiʕl*
‘action’ is deleted due to its frequency in their
speech till it gets the status
of *ʔal-maʕal* ‘a proverb’

(Buwlaq vol. 1. P.141-146, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 119-122, Haruwn vol.1.
p.280-290)

(I. P. 119, L. 1) And that is in your saying *hāḏā wa lā zaʕamātika* ‘this and not your claims’. That is, *lā ʔatawahhamu zaʕamātika* ‘I do not mistake your claims’. An example of that is the saying of the poet who is *ḏuw ʔal-rummah* when he remembered the *manāzil* ‘houses’ and the *diyār* ‘homes’: (basiy³)³

Diyāra mayyata ʔiḏ mayyu musāʕifatun
Wa lā yarā miolahā ʕugmun wa lā ʕarabu

‘The homes of Mayyah when Mayyah is helping
Neither an Arab nor a non-Arab will see the like of her’

(L. 5) It is as though he said *ʔuḏkur diyāra mayyata* ‘Remember the homes of Mayyata’ but he does not mention *ʔuḏkur* ‘Remember’ due to the frequency of that in their speech and their use of it. And since there is *ḏikru ʔal-diyār* ‘mention of the homes’ before that, its expression is not used: (T⁴awiyl)⁴

Lagad xaṭṭa ruwmiyyun wa lā zaʕamātihi
Li-mayyata xaṭṭa an lam tubayyan mafāʕiyluhu

‘A Roman planned, and not his claims,
For Mayya a plan whose details are not clear’

He implied *wa lā ʔazʕumu zaʕamātihi* ‘I don’t claim his claims’ nor do I mistake this in their saying *wa lā zaʕamātika* ‘and not your claims’. Nor did he mention *wa lā ʔatawahhamu zaʕamātika* ‘I do not mistake your claims’

هذا كتاب سيبويه
المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٥٦) هذا بابٌ يُحذفُ منه الفعل لكثرتِه في
كلامهم حتى صار بمنزلة المثل

(م ١ . ب ٥٦ . ص ١١٩ . س ١) وذلك قولك هذا
ولا زعماتك أي ولا أتوهم زعماتك. ومن ذلك قولُ
الشاعر وهو ذو الرمة وذكر المنازل والديار: (بسيط)

ديار مية إذ ميّ مساعفة

ولا يرى مثلها عجم ولا عرب

(س ٥) كأنه قال أذكر ديار مية ولكنه لا يذكر أذكر
لكثرة ذلك في كلامهم واستعمالهم إياه ولما كان فيه من
ذكر الديار قبل ذلك ولم يستعمل إظهاره: (طويل)

لقد خطّ رومي ولا زعماته

لمية خطأ لم تبيّن مفاصله

أضمر ولا أزعم زعماته ولا أتوهم هذا في قولهم ولا
زعماتك ولم يذكر ولا أتوهم زعماتك

¹Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

²Simon Mauck and M. Alhawary reviewed early drafts of the translation.

³The meter of basiy³ is: *mustafsilun fāʕilun mustafsilun faʕilun* (twice).

⁴The meter of t⁴awiyl is: *faʕuwlun mafāʕiylun* (four times).

due to the frequency of their use of it and its pointing to what he sees in his situation, that he denies him his claim. Of that is the (L. 10) saying of the Arabs *kilayhimā wa tamran* ‘both of them and dates’. This is a proverb that has become frequent in their speech. Mention of the *fiʿl* ‘action’ is used and left out due to what speech occurred before it and it is as though he said *ʔaʕtʕiniy kilayhimā wa tamran* ‘give me both of them and dates’. Another example is their saying *kulla šayʔin wa lā hāḏā* ‘everything and not this’ and *kulla šayʔin wa lā šatiymata ḥurrin* ‘everything and not cursing/insulting a free one’. That is, *ʔiʔti kulla šayʔin wa lā tartakib šatiymata ḥurrin* ‘bring on everything and do not commit the cursing of a free one’. It has been deleted due to the frequency of their use of it so it followed the course of *wa lā zaʕamātika* ‘and not your claims’. There are some Arabs who say *kilāhumā wa tamran* ‘both of them and dates’. It is as though he said *kilāhumā liy oābitāni* ‘both of them are securely mine’ and *zidniy tamran* ‘give me more dates’ and *kullu šayʔin wa lā šatiymata ḥurrin* ‘everything and no cursing of a free one’. It is as though he said *kullu šayʔin ʔamamun wa lā šatiymata ḥurrin* ‘everything is simple and no cursing of the free one’. He left out (L. 15) mentioning the *fiʿl* ‘action’ after *lā* ‘not’ for the reason I mentioned to you and to conclude from his speech *kullu šayʔin* ‘everything’ that he forbids him. Some of the Arabs *yarfaʕu* ‘raise’ *ʔal-diyār* ‘the homes’ as though he said *tilka diyāru mayyata* ‘those are the homes of Mayyata’, and the poet said: (basiy⁵)

ʔiʕtāda galbaka min salmā ʕawāʔiduhu
Wa hāga ʔahwāʔaka ʔal-maknuwnata ʔal-ʕalalu

Rabʕun gawāʔun ʔaḏāʕa ʔal-muʕsʕirātu bihi
Wa kullu ḥayrāna sārīn māʔuhu xadʕilu

‘Your heart had become used to its memories from Salma
And the remains inflamed your hidden desires

A deserted house which was dispersed by rainy clouds
Every cruising cloud, with its heavy rain’

It is as though he wanted *ḏāka rabʕun* ‘that is a house’ or *huwa rabʕun* ‘it is a house’. He raised it on account of *ḏā* ‘that’ and what is like it. We have heard it from someone who reports from the Arabs. And like it is ʕumar bin ʔabiy rabiyyata: (basiy⁶)

⁵The meter of basiy⁵ is: *mustafʕilun fāʕilun mustafʕilun faʕilun* (twice).

⁶The meter of basiy⁶ is: *mustafʕilun fāʕilun mustafʕilun faʕilun* (twice).

لكثرة استعمالهم إيّاه ولا استدلاله بما يرى من حاله أنه
ينهاه عن زعمه ومن ذلك (س ١٠) قول العرب
كليهما وتمراً فهذا مثلٌ قد كثر في كلامهم واستعمل
وترك ذكر الفعل لما كان قبل ذلك من الكلام كأنه قال
أعطني كليهما وتمراً، ومن ذلك قولهم كل شيءٍ ولا
هذا وكل شيءٍ ولا شتيمه حُرُّ أي ائت كل شيءٍ ولا
ترتكب شتيمه حُرُّ فحذف لكثرة استعمالهم إيّاه
فأجري مجرى ولا زعماتك، ومن العرب من يقول
كلاهما وتمراً كأنه قال كلاهما لي ثابتان وزدني تمراً، و
كل شيءٍ ولا شتيمه حُرُّ كأنه قال كل شيءٍ أممٌ ولا
شتيمه حُرُّ وترك (س ١٥) ذكر الفعل بعد لا لما
ذكرت لك ولأنه يستدلُّ بقوله كل شيءٍ أنه ينهاه ومن
العرب من يرفع الديار كأنه قال تلك ديارٌ ميةً وقال
الشاعر: (بسيط)

اعتاد قلبك من سلمى عوائدهُ

وهاج أهواءك المكنونة الطللُ

ربّع قواء أذاع المعصراتُ به

وكل حيران سارٍ ماءه خضلُ

كأنه أراد ذاك ربّعٌ أو هو ربّعٌ رفعه على ذا وما أشبهه
سمعناه ممن يرويه عن العرب (س ٢٠) ومثله لعمر
بن أبي ربيعة: (بسيط)

Hal taʿrifu ʔal-yawma rasma ʔal-dāri wa ʔal-tʿalalā
Kamā ʕarafta bi-gafni ʔal-sʿaygali ʔal-xilalā

(P. 120) *Dārūn li-marwata ʔiḏ ʔahliy wa ʔahluhumu*
Bi-ʔal-kānisiyyati narʕā ʔal-lahwa wa ʔal-ʔazalā

‘Do you know today the erasing of the house and the remains
 As you knew the blemishes at the edge of the sword

A house of Marwa since my people and their people
 We take care of fun and romance at Kānisiyyah’

If you were to raise, then what is in your soul is what you expressed and if you erected then what is in your soul is other than what you expressed.

What is also erected in this *bāb* ‘chapter’ on account of the *fiʕl* ‘action’ whose expression has been left out are *ʔintahuw xayran lakum* ‘give it up, it is better for you’ and *warāʔaka ʔawsaʕ laka* ‘behind you is more spacious for you’ and *ḥasbuka xayran laka* ‘your reckoning is a better outcome for you’, if you are commanding. Of that is a saying of the poet and he is ʔibn (L. 5) ʔabiy rabiyʕata: (sariyʕ)⁷

Fa-wāʕidiyhi sarḥatay mālikin
ʔaw ʔal-rubā baynahumā ʔashalā

‘Promise him the two places of Malik
 Or the hillock between them is easier’

You erected *xayran laka* ‘better outcome for you’ and *ʔawsaʕa laka* ‘more spacious for you’ because when you said *ʔintahi* ‘cease’, you really want to take it out of a situation and introduce him into another. ʔAl-Khalil said you relate to that meaning as though you said *ʔintahi wa ʔudxul* ‘cease and enter’ in what is a better outcome for you. You erected it because you knew that if you were to say to him *ʔintahi* ‘cease’ you relate him to (L. 10) another issue and that is why it got erected and they erased the *fiʕl* ‘action’ due to the frequency of their use of it in speech and due to the knowledge of the addressee that it is related to an issue when he said *ʔintahi* ‘cease’. It became *badalan* ‘a substitute’ for his saying *ʔiʔti xayran laka* ‘come up, it is a better outcome for you’ and *ʔudxul fiymā huwa xayrun laka* ‘enter into what is a better outcome for you’. An equivalent of that is his saying *ʔintahi yā fulānu ʔamran ʕāsʕidan* ‘cease O someone the targeted thing’

هل تعرف اليوم رسم الدار والطللا

كما عرفت بجفن الصيقل الخلالا
 (ص ١٢٠) دار لمروة إذ أهلي وأهلهم

بالكانسية ترعى اللهو والغزلا

فإذا رفعت فالذي في نفسك ما أظهرت وإذا نصبت
 فالذي في نفسك غير ما أظهرت.

وما يتنصب في هذا الباب على إضمار الفعل المتروك
 إظهاره إنتهوا خيراً لكم ووراءك أوسع لك وحسبك
 خيراً لك، إذا كنت تأمر، ومن ذلك قول الشاعر وهو
 ابن أبي ربيعة: (سريع)

فواعديه سرحتي مالك

أو الربا بينهما أسهلا

وإنما نصبت خيراً لك وأوسع لك لأنك حين قلت
 إنته فأنت تريد أن تُخرجه من أمرٍ وتُدخله في آخر وقال
 الخليل كأنك تحمله على ذلك المعنى كأنك قلت إنته
 وأدخل فيما هو خيرٌ لك فنصبتَه لأنك قد عرفت أنك
 إذا قلت له إنته أنك تحمله على أمرٍ (س ١٠) آخر
 فلذلك انتنصب وحذفوا الفعل لكثرة استعمالهم إياه في
 الكلام ولعلم المخاطب أنه محمول على أمرٍ حين قال
 إنته فصار بدلاً من قوله إنته خيراً لك وأدخل فيما هو
 خيرٌ لك، ونظير ذلك قوله أنته يا فلانُ أمراً قاصداً إنما
 أدت إنته وائت أمراً قاصداً

⁷The meter of sariyʕ is: *mustaʕʕilun mustaʕʕilun fāʕilun*(twice).

except that this does permit you to express the *fīʿl* ‘action’ in it but I mentioned this to you so that I exemplify the first by means of it because it is frequent in their speech to the degree that it has the status of a proverb, so it is deleted just like their deletion in *mā raʿaytu ka-ʿal-yawmi ragulan* ‘I did not see like today a man’. And example of that is (L. 15) the saying of ʿal-gutāmiyy: (wāfir)⁸

Fa-karrat tabtayiyhi fa-wāfaḡthu
ʿalā damihi wa-masʿraḡihi ʿal-sibāʿa

‘And she returned looking for him and came upon
His blood and his death and the lions’
and like it is the saying of the poet ʿibn ʿal-ruciyyāt: (xafiyf)⁹

Lan tarāhā wa law faʿammalta ʿillā
Wa lahā fīy mafāriḡi ʿal-raʿsi ʿiyybā

‘You will not see her even if you looked intently, except
That it has in the parting in head, perfume’

He erected this because when he said *wāfaḡthu* ‘she came upon it’ and *lan tarāhā* ‘you will not see her’ it became known that *ʿal-ʿiyybā wa ʿal-sibāʿa* ‘perfume and lions’ (L. 20) have entered into view and coming into agreement and that they have included the meaning of what is after them. Similar to that is the saying of ʿibn gamiyyāta: (sariyy)¹⁰

Taḡkarrat ʿardʿan bi-hā ʿahluhā
ʿaxwālahā fīyhā wa-ʿaʿmāmahā

‘She remembered a land, in it her people,
Her uncles on her mother’s and father’s sides’

(P. 121) because *ʿal-ʿaxwāl wa ʿal-ʿaʿmāmahā* ‘uncles (on mother’s and father’s sides)’ have entered into remembrance. Of that is what ʿal-Khalīl claimed: (basiyy)¹¹

ʿiḡā tayanna ʿal-ḡamāmu ʿal-wurgu hayyaganiy
Wa law tayarrabtu ʿanhā ʿumma ʿammāri

‘If the gray doves sing, they excite me
Even if I go away, [remembering] Umm ʿammār’

ʿal-Khalīl said when he said *hayyaganiy* ‘it excited me’ it became known that there was a remembrance to remind him of the doves and his excitement so he transferred that which

إلا أن هذا يجوز لك فيه إظهار الفعل فإنما ذكرت لك ذا
لأمثل لك الأول به لأنه قد كثر في كلامهم حتى صار
بمنزلة المثل فحذف كحذفهم: ما رأيت كالיום رجلاً،
ومثل ذلك (س ١٥) قول القطامي: (وافر)

فَكَرَّرْتُ تَبْتَعِيهِ فَوَافَقْتُهُ

على دَمِهِ وَمَصْرَعِهِ السَّبَاعَا

ومثله قوله، وهو ابن الرقيات: (خفيف)

لن تَرَاهَا وَلَوْ تَأَمَّلْتَ إِلَّا

ولها في مَفَارِقِ الرَّأْسِ طِيْبَا

وإنما نَصَبَ هذا لأنه حين قال وافقته و قال لن تراهَا
فقد عَلِمَ أن الطيب والسباع قد دخلا في الرؤيَة
والموافقة وأنها قد اشتملا على ما بعدهما في المعنى،
ومثل ذلك قول ابن قميئة: (سريع)

تذكَرْتُ أَرْضاً بِهَا أَهْلُهَا

أَخْوَالُهَا فِيهَا وَأَعْمَامُهَا

(س ١٢١) لأن الأخوال والأعمام قد دخلوا في
التذكُر، ومثل ذلك فيما زعم الخليل: (بسيط)

إِذَا تَغَنَّى الْحَمَامُ الْوُزُقُ هَيَّجَنِي

وَلَوْ تَعَرَّبْتُ عَنْهَا أُمَّ عَمَّارٍ

قال الخليل: لما قال هَيَّجَنِي عُرِفَ أنه قد كان تَمَّ
تَذَكُّرُ لتذكرة الحمام وتَهْيِيجِهِ فَأَلْقَى ذلك الذي

⁸The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʿalatun mufāʿalatun faʿuwlun* (twice).

⁹The meter of xafiyf is: *fāʿilātun mustafʿilun fāʿilātun* (twice).

¹⁰The meter of sariyy is: *mustafʿilun mustafʿilun fāʿilun* (twice).

¹¹The meter of basiyf is: *mustafʿilun fāʿilun mustafʿilun faʿilun* (twice).

was known from himself to ʔumm ʕammār as though he said *hayyaganīy fa-ḏakkaraniy ʔumma ʕammārī* ‘he excited me and reminded me of ʔumm ʕammār’. An example of that (L. 5) also is the saying of ʔal-Khalīl which is the saying of ʔabīy ʕamr, *ʔalā ragula ʔimmā zaydan wa ʔimmā ʕamran* ‘would that there was a man, either Zaid or Amr’ because the moment he said *ʔalā ragula* he is hoping for a thing he asks about and he wants it. It is as though he said *ʔal-lāhumma ʔigʕalhu zaydan ʔaw ʕamran* ‘O God make it to be either Zaid or Amr’. Or *waffig liy zaydan ʔaw ʕamran* ‘make me lucky with Zaid or Amr’. If he so wished he expressed it in it and in all this in which it is represented. And if he so wished he became satisfied and he does not mention the *fiʕl* ‘action’ because it is known that he is hoping, asking for a thing and requesting it. And an example of that is the saying of the poet who is ʕabdu Banīy ʕabs: (ragaz)¹²

(L. 10) *gad sālama ʔal-ḥayyātu minhu ʔal-gadamā*
ʔal-ʔufʕuwāna wa-ʔal-ʕugāʕa wa ʔal-ʕagʕamā
Wa ḏāta garnayni dʿamuwzan dʿirzimā

‘He had made his peace with the snakes, with his rugged feet,
Their male, their brave, one and their long ones
And the double headed, the stealthy, and the aged’

He erected *ʔal-ʔufʕuwāna* ‘the male’ and *ʔal-ʕugāʕa* ‘the brave’ because he knew that the feet here were peaceful just as they were viewed peacefully, so he related the speech on the basis that they are peaceful. An example of this is the recitation of some of them by ʔaws bin ḥagar: (tʿawiyl)¹³

Tuwāhigu riglāhā yadāhā wa-raʔsuhu
Lahā gatabun xalfa ʔal-ḥagiybati rādifu

‘Its legs are caught up with its hands, and his head
Hunched, serves like a bag behind’

(L. 15) and the recitation of some of them by ʔibn ḥārīḃ: (tʿawiyl)¹⁴

Li-yubka yaziidu dʿārīʕun li-xuʕuwmatin
Wa-muxtabīʕun mim mā tuʕiyḥuʔal-tʿawāʔihu

‘Let Yazid be mourned by those submissive to adversity
And by those in need overcome by blows’

قد عُرف منه على أمِّ عمّار كأنه قال هيّجني فذكّرني أمّ
عمّار، ومثل ذلك (س ٥) أيضاً قول الخليل وهو قول
أبي عمرو ألا رجّل إمّا زيداً وإمّا عمراً لأنه حين قال
ألا رجّل فهو مُتمنّ شيئاً يسأله ويريده فكأنه قال اللهم
اجعله زيداً أو عمراً أو وفقّ لي زيداً أو عمراً، وإن شاء
أظهره فيه وفي جميع هذا الذي مُثّل به، وإن شاء اكتفي
فلم يذكر الفعل لأنه قد عُرف أنه مُتمنّ سائل شيئاً
وطالبه، ومثل ذلك قول الشاعر، وهو عبد بني عبس:
(رجز)

قد سالم الحياتُ منه القَدَمَا
الأفْعوانَ والشُّجاعَ الشَّجَعَا
وذاتَ قَرَيْنِ صَمُوزاً ضَرَزَمَا

فإنما نصب الأفْعوانَ والشُّجاعَ لأنه قد عُلم أن القدم
ههنا مسالمةٌ كما أنها مسالمةٌ فحمل الكلام على أنها
مسالمةٌ، ومثل هذا إنشادٌ بعضهم، لأوس بن حَجْرٍ:
(طويل)

تُواهرُ رِجْلاها يداها ورأسُهُ
لها قَتَبٌ خَلَفَ الحَقِيبةَ رادِفُ

(س ١٥) : وإنشادٌ بعضهم، للحرث بن هَبِيكٍ:
(طويل)

لِيُبَكَّ يَزِيدُ ضارِعٌ لِحُصُومَةٍ
وختبِطُ مِمَّا تُطِيحُ الطَوائِحُ

¹²The meter of ragaz is: *mustafʕilun* (six times).

¹³The meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʕuwluḥ mafāʕiylun* (four times).

¹⁴The meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʕuwluḥ mafāʕiylun* (four times).

when he said *Li-yubka yaziidu* ‘let Yazid be mourned’ it had the meaning of *Li-yabki yaziida* ‘let Yazid mourn’ just as it was with respect *ʔal-gadam* ‘the foot’ that it is *musālimah* ‘peaceful’. It is as though he said *li yabkiyhi d’āriṣun* ‘let a submissive one mourns him’. Of that is the saying of ʔabd ʔal-ʔaziiz ʔal-kilābiyy: (wāfir)¹⁵

Wagadnā ʔal-s’ālihiyna lahum gazāʔun
Wa gannātin wa ʔaynan salsabiylā

‘We found that the righteous have rewards
And paradises and a spring of fresh water’

(P.122) because *ʔal-wigdāna* ‘the finding’ is included in the meaning based on the *gazāʔ* ‘reward/conditional’ so he related the other to the meaning. If he were to erect the *ʔal-gazāʔ* as he erected *ʔal-sibāʔ* ‘the lions’ it would be permitted. And he said: (ragaz)¹⁶

ʔasgā ʔal-ʔilāhu ʔuduwāti ʔal-wādiy
Wa gawfahu kulla muliṯṯin yādiy
Kullu ʔagašša ḥāliki ʔal-sawādi

‘May God water the shores of the valley
And its center from every passing cloud
And [from] every thundering, dark ones’

(L. 5) It is as though he said *sagāhā kullu ʔagašša* ‘every thundering cloud watered it’ just as *d’āriṣu li-xus’uwmatin* ‘the submissive one to adversity’ is related to *li-yabki yazida* ‘let him mourn Yazid’ because in it is the meaning of *sagāhā kullu ʔagašša* ‘every thundering thing watered it’. It is not permitted that you say *yantahiy xayran lahu* ‘he gives it up, is a better outcome for him’ nor *ʔa-ʔantahiy xayran liy* ‘do I give it up is a better outcome for me’. Because if you forbid, you bring it to an issue, and if you were to inform or inquire, then you do not want anything from that, rather you inform of a news item or ask for information from an informer and it does not have the status of *wāfagathu ʔalā damihi wa masraʔihi ʔal-sibāʔu* ‘and she came upon his blood and his demise and the lions’, because *ʔal-sibāʔu* enters the meaning of *wāfagathu*. It is as though he said *wāfagati ʔal-sibāʔu ʔalā masraʔihi* ‘the lions agreed to its killing’ and *ʔal-xayru wa-ʔal-šarru* ‘the good and the bad’ are not (L. 10) related to *yantahiy* ‘he gives it up’ and the like. You cannot say *ʔintahaytu xayran* ‘I gave it up, it is better’ as you say *gad ʔas’abtu xayran* ‘I have come upon good’. It may be permitted for you to say:

¹⁵The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun faʔuwulun* (twice).

¹⁶The meter of ragaz is: *mustafʔilun* (six times).

لَمَّا قَالَ لِيُبَكِّ يَزِيدُ كَانَ فِيهِ مَعْنَى لِيُبَكِّ يَزِيدَ كَمَا كَانَ فِي
الْقَدَمِ أَنَّهَا مَسَالِمَةٌ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ لِيُبَكِّهِ ضَارِعٌ، وَمِنْ ذَلِكَ
قَوْلُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ الْكَلَابِيِّ: (وَأَفِرُّ)

وَجَدْنَا الصَّالِحِينَ لَهُمْ جَزَاءٌ
وَجَنَّاتٍ وَعَيْنًا سَلْسَبِيلًا

(ص ١٢٢) لِأَنَّ الْوَجْدَانَ مُشْتَمِلٌ فِي الْمَعْنَى عَلَى الْجَزَاءِ
فَحَمَلَ الْآخَرَ عَلَى الْمَعْنَى وَلَوْ نَصَبَ الْجَزَاءَ كَمَا نَصَبَ
السَّبَاعَ لَجَازَ، وَقَالَ: (رَجَزُ)

أَسْقَى الْإِلَهَ عُذْوَاتِ الْوَادِي
وَجَوْفَهُ كُلِّ مِثْلٍ غَادِي
كُلُّ أَجَشٍّ حَالِكِ السَّوَادِ

(س ٥) كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ سَقَاهَا كُلُّ أَجَشٍّ كَمَا حَمَلَ ضَارِعٌ
لِخُصُومَةِ عَلَى لِيُبَكِّ يَزِيدَ لِأَنَّهُ فِيهِ مَعْنَى سَقَاهَا كُلُّ
أَجَشٍّ وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ يَنْتَهِي خَيْرًا لَهُ وَلَا أَنْتَهِيَ
خَيْرًا لِي، لِأَنَّكَ إِذَا نَهَيْتَ فَأَنْتَ تَرْجِيهِ إِلَى أَمْرٍ وَإِذَا
أَخْبَرْتَ أَوْ اسْتَفْهَمْتَ فَأَنْتَ لَسْتَ تَرِيدُ شَيْئًا مِنْ ذَلِكَ
إِنَّمَا تُعَلِّمُ خَيْرًا أَوْ تَسْتَرْشِدُ خَيْرًا وَلَا يَسْتَرْشِدُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ وَافَقْتَهُ
عَلَى دَمِهِ وَمَصْرَعِهِ السَّبَاعَ، لِأَنَّ السَّبَاعَ دَاخِلٌ فِي مَعْنَى
وَافَقْتَهُ كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ وَافَقْتِ السَّبَاعَ عَلَى مَصْرَعِهِ، وَالْخَيْرُ
وَالشَّرُّ لَا يَكُونُ (س ١٠) مَحْمُولًا عَلَى يَنْتَهِي وَشِبْهِهِ لَا
تَسْتَطِيعُ أَنْ تَقُولَ انْتَهَيْتُ خَيْرًا كَمَا تَقُولُ قَدْ أَصَبْتُ
خَيْرًا، وَقَدْ يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ:

ʔalā ragula ʔimmā zaydun wa ʔimmā ʕamrun ‘O for a man, whether Zaid or Amr’. It is as though he has been told of this wished for thing so he said *zaydun ʔaw ʕamrun*. And like *li-yubka yazidu* ‘let Yazid be mourned’ is the reading of some of them: *Wa-kaḏālika zuyyina li-kaḥiyrin mina ʔal-muʕrikiyna gatlu ʔawlādihim ʕurakāʔuhum* (**Sūrah VI:137**) ‘similarly, for many polytheists the killing of their children was made alluring’. He raised the *ʕurakāʔa* ‘sharers/polytheists’ on the basis on which he raised *dʕāriʕ* ‘submissive one’.

أَلَا رَجُلٌ إِمَّا زَيْدٌ وَإِمَّا عَمْرٌو كَأَنَّهُ قِيلَ لَهُ مِنْ هَذَا
الْمُتَمَنَّى فَقَالَ زَيْدٌ أَوْ عَمْرٌو وَمِثْلُ لِيُبْكُ يَزِيدٌ قِرَاءَةٌ
بَعْضُهُمْ: (وَكَذَلِكَ زُيِّنَ لِكَثِيرٍ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ قَتْلُ
أَوْلَادِهِمْ شُرَكَاءُؤُهُمْ) رَفَعَ الشُّرَكَاءَ عَلَى مِثْلِ مَا رُفِعَ
عَلَيْهِ ضَارِعٌ.

Chapter 57. This is a chapter on what is erected based on the implication of the *fiʿl* ‘action’ whose expression is left out in other than *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* ‘the imperative and the prohibition’

(Buwlaq vol. 1. P.146-149, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 1122-12125, Haruwun vol.1. p.290-297)

(I. P. 122. L 14) And that is in your saying *ʔaxaḍtuḥu bi-dirhamin fa-sʿāʿidan* ‘I took it for a dirham and up’ and *ʔaxaḍtuḥu bi-dirhamin fa-zāʔidan* ‘I took it for a dirham and more’. They deleted the *fiʿl* ‘action’ due to their frequent use of it and they ascertained that it would be based on the *bāʔ* [b]. If you were to say *ʔaxaḍtuḥu bi-sʿāʿidin* ‘I took it with up’ it would be *gabiyyḥan* ‘unacceptable’ because it is a *sʿifāḥ* ‘descriptive’ and it does not occur in the location of an *ʔism* ‘name’, as though he said *ʔaxaḍtuḥu bi-dirhamin fa-zāda ʔal-ḥamanu sʿāʿidan* ‘I took it for a dirham and the price increased up’ or *fa-ḍahaba sʿāʿidan* ‘and it went up’ nor is it permitted that you say *wa-sʿāʿidan* ‘and up’ because you do not want to say that the dirham is with *sʿāʿidin ḥamanun li šayʔin* ‘up in price for a thing’ like your saying *bi-dirhamin wa ziyādatin* ‘with a dirham and an increase’. Rather, you start with the lowest price so you place it first, then you considered one thing after another for (L. 20) different prices. So you don’t want this meaning for the *wāw* [w], nor does the *wāw* [w] force the two things for one to come after the other. Don’t you see that if you were to say *marartu bi-zaydin wa ʔamrin* ‘I passed by Zaid and Amr’, there is no proof in this that you passed by Amr after Zaid. So *wa-sʿāʿidun* is a substitute for *zāda wa yazyidu* ‘it increased and it increases’ and *ḥumma* ‘then’ has the status of *fāʔ* [f] ‘then’. You say, *ḥumma sʿāʿidan* ‘and then up’ except that the *fāʔ* [f] ‘then’ is more frequent in their speech. What is erected in other than the *ʔal-ʔamr wa ʔal-nahiy* ‘the imperative and the prohibition’ in the *fiʿl* ‘action’ whose expression is left out (P. 123) is your saying *yā ʔabda ʔal-lāhi* ‘O Abdullah’ and all of the *nidāʔ* ‘vocative’. As for *yā zaydu* ‘O Zaid’, it has a cause. You shall see it in the chapter on the *nidāʔ* ‘vocative’, God willing. They deleted the *fiʿl* ‘action’ due to their frequent use of this in speech, and *yā* became a substitute for the expression of the *fiʿl* ‘action’ as though he said *yā ʔuriydu ʔabda ʔal-lāhi* ‘O, I want Abdullah’. So he deleted *ʔuriydu* ‘I want’ and *yā* became a substitute for it, because if you were to say *yā fulānu* ‘O someone’, it is known that you want him.

(٥٧) هذا بابٌ ما يَنْتصب على إضمار الفعل المتروك إظهاره في غير الأمر والنهي

(م ١ . ب ٥٧ . ص ١٢٢ . س ١٤) وذلك قولك أخذته بدرهم فصاعداً وأخذته بدرهم فزائداً، حذفوا الفعل لكثرة استعمالهم إياه ولأنهم آمنوا أن يكون على الباء لو قلت أخذته بصاعداً كان قبيحاً لأنه صفةٌ ولا يكون في موضع الاسم كأنه قال أخذته بدرهم فزاد الثمنُ صاعداً أو فذهبَ صاعداً، ولا يجوز أن تقول وصاعداً لأنك لا تريد أن تُخبرَ أن الدرهم مع صاعداً ثمنٌ لشيء كقولك بدرهمٍ وزيادةٍ ولكنك أخبرت بأدنى الثمن فجعلته أولاً ثم قرّوت شيئاً بعد شيء لأثباتٍ (س ٢٠) شتى، قالوا ولم تُردّ فيها هذا المعنى ولم تُلزم الواوُ الشيتين أن يكون أحدهما بعد الآخر ألا ترى أنك إذا قلت مررتُ بزید وعمرو لم يكن في هذا دليلٌ على أنك مررت بعمر و بعد زيد، وصاعداً بدلٌ من زاد ويزيد وثمّ بمنزلة الفاء تقول ثمّ صاعداً إلا أن الفاء أكثرُ في كلامهم، ومما يَنْتصب في غير الأمر والنهي على الفعل المتروك إظهاره (ص ١٢٣) قولك يا عبد الله والنداء كله، وأمّا يا زيدُ فله علةٌ سترها في باب النداء إن شاء الله حذفوا الفعل لكثرة استعمالهم هذا في الكلام وصار يا بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل، كأنه قال يا أريدُ عبد الله فحذف أريدُ وصارت يا بدلاً منها، لأنك إذا قلت يا فلانُ علمَ أنك تريدُه.

And what proves to you that it is erected due to the *fiʿl* ‘action’ and the *yā* became a substitute for the expression of the *fiʿl* ‘action’ (L. 5) is the saying of the Arabs *yā ʔiyyāka* ‘O, you’. You really said *yā ʔiyyāka ʔaʕniy* ‘O, you I mean’ but they deleted the *fiʿl* ‘action’ and *yā, ʔayyā* and *ʔay* are a substitute for the expression of the *fiʿl* ‘action’. Of that, is the saying of the Arabs *man ʔanta zaydan* ‘who are you, Zaid’. Yuwnus claimed that it is based on his saying *man ʔanta taðkuru zaydan* ‘who are you, do you remember Zaid’, but it was frequent in their speech and was used and they dispensed with its expression for the reason that it was known that Zaid was neither *xabaran* ‘predicate’ nor *mubtadaʔan* ‘initial’ nor built on a *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’, so that it must be built on the *fiʿl* ‘action’. It is as though he said *man ʔanta muʕarrifan ðā al-ʔism* ‘whom are you introducing by this name’. You do not relate Zaid to *man* ‘who’ nor to *ʔanta* ‘you’, and *man ʔanta zaydan* ‘who are you Zaid’ can not be (L 10) except a response, as though when he said *ʔanā zaydun* ‘I am Zaid’, he said *fa-man ʔanta ðākiran zaydan* ‘then who are you remembering Zaid’. Some of them raise but that is infrequent. It is as though he said *man ʔanta kalāmuka ʔaw ðikruka zaydun* ‘who are you, your speech and your remembrance is Zaid’. Raising was infrequent because in their engaging the *fiʿl* ‘action’ it is better that it be a predicate to a *masʕdar* ‘origin’ that is not in it/present but it is permitted *li-saʕat ʔal-kalām* ‘due to the expansiveness of speech’ like a proverb in use to the degree that they ask the man about someone else so the speaker among them says *man ʔanta zaydan* ‘who are you, Zaid’. It is as though he is speaking to the one who said *ʔanā zaydun* ‘I am Zaid’, that is, you are to me with the status of the one who said *ʔanā zayddun* ‘I am Zaid’. So it is said to him *man ʔanta zaydan* ‘who are you, Zaid’, just like you say to the man *ʔaʕirriy ʔinnaki nāʕilatun wa-ʔuħmugiy* ‘gather the camels and bring them together since you are with sandals’. That is to say, you have the status with me as the one to whom this is said. We heard one of their men remember a man and he said to a silent man who did not remember that man, *man ʔanta fulānan* ‘who are you, so and so’. Of that is the saying of the Arabs *ʔammā ʔanta munʕaligan ʔintʕalagtu maʕaka* ‘since you are leaving, I am leaving with you’. And *ʔammā zaydun ðāhiban ðahabtu maʕahu* ‘since Zaid is going, I am going with him’. The poet ʕabbās bin mirdās said: (basiy⁵)¹⁷

ومما يدلُّك على أنّه يَنْتصب على الفعل وأنّ يا صارت
بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل (س ٥) قول العرب يا إِيَّاكَ إِنَّمَا
قُلْتَ يا إِيَّاكَ أَعْنِي وَلَكِنَّهُمْ حَذَفُوا الفِعْلَ وصار يا وأيا
وأَيُّ بدلاً من اللفظ بالفعل. ومن ذلك قول العرب
مَنْ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا، وزعم يونس أنّه على قوله مَنْ أَنْتَ
تَذَكَّرُ زَيْدًا وَلَكِنَّهُ كَثُرَ فِي كَلَامِهِمْ واستعمل واستغنوا
عن إظهاره بأنّه قد علِمَ أن زيدا ليس خبِراً ولا مبتدأً
ولا مَبْنِيًّا على مبتدأٍ فلا بدّ من أن يكونَ على الفعل كأنه
قال مَنْ أَنْتَ مَعْرِفًا ذا الاسم ولم تحمِلْ زَيْدًا على مَنْ
ولا أَنْتَ ولا يكونَ مَنْ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا (س ١٠) إلا جواباً
كأنه لما قال أنا زَيْدٌ قال فَمَنْ أَنْتَ ذاكِراً زَيْدًا، وبعضهم
يرفع وذلك قليل كأنه قال مَنْ أَنْتَ كَلَامُكَ أو ذِكْرُكَ
زَيْدٌ، وإنَّما قَلَّ الرَفْعُ لأن إعمالهم الفعلَ أحسنُ من أن
يكونَ خبِراً لمصدرٍ ليس به ولكنه يجوز على سعة
الكلام وصار كالمثل الجاري حتّى إنهم يسألون الرجل
عن غيره فيقول القائل منهم مَنْ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا كأنه يكلمُ
الذي قال أنا زَيْدٌ أي أَنْتَ عندي بمنزلة الذي قال أنا
زَيْدٌ فقليل له من أَنْتَ زَيْدًا كما تقول للرجل (س ١٥)
أَطْرَبِي إِنَّكَ نَاعِلَةٌ وَأَحْقِي، أي أَنْتَ عندي بمنزلة التي
يقال لها هذا، سمعنا رجلاً منهم يذكُر رجلاً فقال
لرجل ساكتٍ لم يذكُر ذلك الرجلَ مَنْ أَنْتَ فلانًا، ومن
ذلك قول العرب أمّا أَنْتَ منطلقاً انطلقتُ معك وأمّا
زَيْدٌ ذاهباً ذهبْتُ معه، وقال الشاعر (العبّاس بن
مرداس): (بسيط)

¹⁷The meter of basiy⁵ is: *mustaʕfilun fāʕilun mustaʕilun faʕilun* (twice).

ʔabā xurāšata ʔammā ʔanta ḏā nafarin
Fa-ʔinna gawmiya lam taʔkuluhumu ʔal-dʿabuʕu

‘ʔabu Khurāšata you are a man with many relatives
 As for my people the hyenas don’t devour them’

(L. 20) It is an *ʔan* to which a *mā* is added and its *mā* of confirmation and it is necessary lest they deviate with it to become a replacement for *ḏahāb ʔal-fiʕl* ‘leaving out of the action’, just as the *hāʔ* [h] and *ʔalif* [A] a replacement in *zanādiga* and *ʔal-yamāniy*. And like *ʔan* in requirement of *mā* in *ʔimmā lā*. They made *mā* required as a replacement and this is preferable to requiring it since they used to say *ʔāʕiran mā* ‘preferable to’ (P. 124) so they held on to *mā*. They likened it to what is needed of the *nuwnāt* [n]s in *la-yafʕalanna* ‘that they do’ and the *lām* [l] in *ʔin kāna* in *la-yafʕalu* ‘so he would act’. Even if it is not like it but it is *šāḏḏun* ‘exceptional’, just like what it is likened to what is not like it. When it is unacceptable to them to mention the *ʔism* ‘name’ after *ʔan* and begin it after it, just like the unacceptability of *kay ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi yaguwlu ḏāka* ‘so that Abdullah would say that’. They related it to the *fiʕl* ‘action’ until it became as though they said *ʔiḏ sʿirta muntʿaligan fa-ʔanā ʔantʿaligu maʕaka* ‘if you were become a departing person then I will depart with you’, because it is with the meaning of *ʔiḏ* in this location (L. 5) and *ʔiḏ* is with its meaning also in that location except that with *ʔiḏ* the *fiʕl* ‘action’ is not deleted along with it. And in *ʔammā* the implied *fiʕl* ‘action’ is not mentioned after it because it belongs to the implied whose expressed is left out until it became a drop out with the status of their leaving that out in the *nidāʔ* ‘vocative’ and in *man ʔanta zaydan* ‘who are you, Zaid’. If you expressed the *fiʕl* ‘action’ you said *ʔammā kunta muʿaligan ʔintʿalagtu* ‘if you were to depart I would depart’. What you want is *ʔin kunta muʿaligan ʔintʿalagtu* ‘if you were to depart I would depart’. The deletion of the *fiʕl* ‘action’ is not permitted here, just as its expression is not permitted there, because *ʔammā* is frequent in their speech and has been used until it became like a used proverb. Not every particle is like this (L. 10), just as not every particle has the status of *lam ʔubal* ‘I am not concerned’ and *lam yaku* ‘there is not’ but they deleted this due to its frequency and for the sake of lightness. Similarly, they deleted the *fiʕl* ‘action’ from *ʔammā*.

أَبَا خُرَاشَةَ أَمَا أَنْتَ ذَا نَفَرٍ

فَإِنَّ قَوْمِي لَمْ تَأْكُلْهُمْ الضَّبْعُ

(س ٢٠) فَإِنَّمَا هِيَ أَنْ ضَمَّتْ إِلَيْهَا مَا وَهِيَ مَا التَّوَكِيدِ
 وَلَزِمَتْ كَرَاهِيَةَ أَنْ يُجْحِفُوا بِهَا لِتَكُونَ عَوْضًا مِنْ ذَهَابِ
 الْفِعْلِ كَمَا كَانَتْ الْهَاءُ وَالْأَلْفُ عَوْضًا فِي الرَّنَادِقَةِ
 وَالْيَمَانِي، وَمِثْلُ أَنْ فِي لَزُومٍ مَا قَوْلُهُمْ إِمَّا لَا فَالزُّمُوهُمَا مَا
 عَوْضًا، وَهَذَا أَحْرَى أَنْ يُلْزِمُوا فِيهِ إِذْ كَانُوا يَقُولُونَ آثِرًا
 مَا (ص ١٢٤) فَيُلْزِمُونَ مَا شَبَّهَهَا بِمَا يَلْزِمُ مِنَ
 التَّوْنَاتِ فِي كَيْفَعَلَنَّ وَاللَّامِ فِي إِنْ كَانَ كَيْفَعَلُ وَإِنْ كَانَ
 لَيْسَ مِثْلَهُ، وَإِنَّمَا هُوَ شَاذٌّ كَنَحْوِ مَا شَبَّهَ بِمَا لَيْسَ مِثْلَهُ فَلَمَّا
 كَانَ قَبِيحًا عِنْدَهُمْ أَنْ يَذْكُرُوا الْاسْمَ بَعْدَ أَنْ وَيَبْتَدِئَهُ
 بَعْدَهَا كَقُبْحِ كَيْ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ يَقُولُ ذَاكَ حَمْلُوهُ عَلَى الْفِعْلِ
 حَتَّى صَارَ كَأَنَّهُمْ قَالُوا إِذْ صرَتْ مُنْطَلَقًا فَأَنَا أَنْطَلِقُ
 مَعَكَ لِأَنَّهَا فِي مَعْنَى إِذْ فِي هَذَا الْمَوْضِعِ (س ٥) وَإِذْ فِي
 مَعْنَاهَا أَيْضًا فِي ذَا الْمَوْضِعِ إِلَّا أَنْ إِذْ لَا يُحْدَفُ مَعَهَا
 الْفِعْلُ وَأَمَّا لَا يُذَكَّرُ بَعْدَهَا الْفِعْلُ الْمُضْمَرُ لِأَنَّهُ مِنَ
 الْمُضْمَرِ الْمَتْرُوكِ إِظْهَارُهُ حَتَّى صَارَ سَاقِطًا بِمَنْزِلَةِ تَرْكِهِمْ
 ذَلِكَ فِي النِّدَاءِ وَفِي مَنْ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا، فَإِنْ أَظْهَرْتَ الْفِعْلَ
 قُلْتَ إِمَّا كُنْتَ مُنْطَلَقًا أَنْطَلَقْتُ إِنَّمَا تَرِيدُ إِنْ كُنْتَ
 مُنْطَلَقًا أَنْطَلَقْتُ فَحْدَفُ الْفِعْلُ لَا يَجُوزُ هَهُنَا كَمَا لَمْ يَجُزْ
 تَمَّ إِظْهَارُهُ لِأَنَّ أَمَّا كَثُرَتْ فِي كَلَامِهِمْ وَاسْتَعْمَلَتْ حَتَّى
 صَارَتْ كَالْمِثْلِ الْمُسْتَعْمَلِ وَلَيْسَ كُلُّ حَرْفٍ هَكَذَا (س
 ١٠) كَمَا أَنَّهُ لَيْسَ كُلُّ حَرْفٍ بِمَنْزِلَةِ لَمْ أَبْلُ وَلَمْ يَكُ
 وَلَكِنَّهُمْ حَذَفُوا هَذَا لِكَثْرَتِهِ وَلِلِاسْتِخْفَافِ فَكَذَلِكَ
 حَذَفُوا الْفِعْلَ مِنْ أَمَّا.

An example of that is their saying *ʔimmā lā* 'lest'. It is as though he said *ʔifʔal hādā ʔin kunta lā tafʔalu ʔayrahu* 'do this if you are not doing something else' but they deleted *ḏā* 'that' due to their frequent use of it and they varied until they did without it by this. Of that is their saying *marḥaban wa ʔahlan* 'greetings and welcome' and *ʔin taʔtiniy fa-ʔahla ʔalayli wa ʔal-nahāri* 'if you visit me, welcome day and night'. ʔal-Khalīl claimed when he exemplified it that it has the status of a man you saw him aiming an arrow so you said *ʔal-girfāsa* 'the sheet' that is *ʔasabta ʔal-girfāsa* 'you hit the sheet', (L. 15) that is, *ʔanta ʔindi mimman sayusʔiybuhu* 'I consider you of those who will hit it' and if his arrow is confirmed you said *ʔal-girfāsa* 'the sheet' that is *gad ʔistahagga wuguwʔuhu bi-ʔal-girfās* 'he deserved its falling on the sheet'. When you see a man going towards a place or looking for something you said *marḥaban wa ʔahlan* 'greetings and welcome' that is, you attained that and you were correct, so they deleted the *ʔifl* 'action' due to the frequency of their use of it. It is as though it became a substitute for *raḥbat bilāduka wa-ʔahilat* 'may your country be large and populated' just as *ʔal-ḥadāra* 'the warning' was a substitute for of *ʔiḥdar* 'be warned'. The respondent says *wa-bi-ka wa ʔahlan wa saḥlan bi-ka wa ʔahlan* 'and to you greetings and ease to you, greetings'. If he were to say *wa bika wa ʔahlā* 'to you and greetings', it is as though he pronounced the *marḥaban bika wa ʔahlā* 'greetings to you and welcome'. If he were to say *wa-bi-ka ʔahlan* 'to you and welcome' then he is saying *wa-laka* (L. 20) *ʔal-ʔahlu* 'and you have the folks' if you have the place and the expanse. If you were to return the greeting you would say *ʔanta ʔindi mimman yugālu lahu hādā law giʔtaniy* 'I consider you one of the people to whom this is said if you were to visit me'. You mentioned *bi-ka* 'to you' to prove whom you mean after you said *marḥaban* 'greetings', just as you said *laka* 'to you' after *sagyan* 'drink'. Some of them raise and make what is implied to be what is expressed. T^ʔufaylun ʔal-ʔanawiyy said: (t^ʔawiyl)¹⁸

Wa bi-ʔal-sahbi maymuwnu ʔal-nagiybati gawlulu
Li-multamisi ʔal-maʔruwfi ʔahlun wa marḥabu

'In the blessed low land in nature is one [buried] saying:
For the one seeking favor, folks and greetings'

(P. 125) that is, this is *ʔahlun wa marḥabun* 'welcome and greeting'. ʔabuww ʔal-ʔaswad said: (t^ʔawiyl)¹⁹

¹⁸The meter of t^ʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun maf āʔiyulun* (four times).

¹⁹The meter of t^ʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun maf āʔiyulun* (four times).

ومثل ذلك قولهم إِمَّا لَا فَكَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ أَفْعَلُ هَذَا إِنْ كُنْتَ لَا تَفْعَلُ غَيْرَهُ وَلَكِنَّهُمْ حَذَفُوا ذَا لِكثْرَةِ اسْتِعْمَالِهِمْ إِيَّاهُ وَتَصَرَّفُوا حَتَّى اسْتَعْنَوْا عَنْهُ بِهَذَا. وَمِنْ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُمْ مَرْحَبًا وَأَهْلًا وَإِنْ تَأْتِي فَأَهْلَ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ، وَزَعَمَ الْخَلِيلُ حِينَ مَثَلَهُ أَنَّهُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ رَجُلٍ رَأَيْتَهُ سَدَّدَ سَهْمًا فَقَلَّتِ الْقِرطَاسَ أَي أَصَبَتْ الْقِرطَاسَ (س ١٥) أَي أَنْتَ عِنْدِي مِمَّنْ سَيُصِيبُهُ وَإِنْ أَثْبَتَ سَهْمَهُ قَلَّتِ الْقِرطَاسَ أَي قَدْ اسْتَحَقَّ وَقُوعُهُ بِالْقِرطَاسِ، فَإِنَّمَا رَأَيْتَ رَجُلًا قَاصِدًا إِلَى مَكَانٍ أَوْ طَالِبًا أَمْرًا فَقَلَّتْ مَرْحَبًا وَأَهْلًا أَي أَدْرَكَتْ ذَلِكَ وَأَصَبَتْ فَحَذَفُوا الْفِعْلَ لِكثْرَةِ اسْتِعْمَالِهِمْ إِيَّاهُ وَكَأَنَّهُ صَارَ بَدَلًا مِنْ رَحِبَتْ بِلَاذُكَ وَأَهْلَتْ كَمَا كَانَ الْحَذَرُ بَدَلًا مِنْ أَحَذَرَ وَيَقُولُ الرَّادُّ وَبِكَ وَأَهْلًا وَسَهْلًا وَبِكَ وَأَهْلًا، فَإِذَا قَالَ وَبِكَ وَأَهْلًا فَكَأَنَّهُ قَدْ لَفَظَ بِمَرْحَبًا بِكَ وَأَهْلًا وَإِذَا قَالَ وَبِكَ أَهْلًا فَهُوَ يَقُولُ وَلَكِ (س ٢٠) الْأَهْلُ إِذَا كَانَ عِنْدَكَ الرَّحْبُ وَالسَّعَةُ، فَإِذَا رَدَدْتَ فَإِنَّمَا تَقُولُ أَنْتَ عِنْدِي مِمَّنْ يُقَالُ لَهُ هَذَا لَوْ جِئْتَنِي وَإِنَّمَا جِئْتَ بِبِكَ لِتَبَيَّنَ مَنْ تَعْنِي بَعْدَ مَا قَلَّتْ مَرْحَبًا كَمَا قَلَّتْ لَكَ بَعْدَ سَقِيًّا، وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَرْفَعُ فَيَجْعَلُ مَا يُضْمِرُهُ هُوَ مَا أَظْهَرَ، وَقَالَ طُفَيْلٌ الْغَنَوِيُّ: (طويل)

وَبِالسَّهْبِ مَيْمُونُ النَّقِيَّةِ قَوْلُهُ

لَمُلْتَسِ الْمَعْرُوفِ أَهْلٌ وَمَرْحَبٌ

(ص ١٢٥) أَي هَذَا أَهْلٌ وَمَرْحَبٌ، وَقَالَ أَبُو الْأَسْوَدِ:

(طويل)

ʔiḏā giʔtu bawwāban lahu gāla marḥaban
ʔalā marḥabun wādiyka ʔayru mudayyagi

‘If I came to his door man, he will say greeting
 Greeting, your valley is spacious not narrow’

Know in what I mentioned to you that the *fiʕl* ‘action’ follows along with the *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ along three courses: an expressed *fiʕl* ‘action’ whose implication is not acceptable, an implied *fiʕl* ‘action’ whose expression is used and an implied *fiʕl* ‘action’ whose expression has been left out. As for the *fiʕl* ‘action’ whose implication (L. 5) is not acceptable it is that you end up with a man who has no remembrance of *dʿarb* ‘striking’ nor does it come to his mind, so you say *zaydan* ‘Zaid’ then he must say *ʔidʿrib zaydan* ‘hit Zaid’, and you say to him *gad dʿarabta zaydan* ‘you have hit Zaid’, or it is a location where it is not acceptable to strip off the *fiʕl* ‘action’ like *ʔan* and *gad* and what is like them. As for the location in which it is implied and its expression is used is in your saying *zaydan* ‘Zaid’ to a man in remembrance of a *dʿarb* ‘striking’, you mean *ʔidʿrib zaydan* ‘strike Zaid’. As for the location where the *fiʕl* ‘action’ is implied whose expression is left out is of the *bāb* ‘chapter’ in which *ʔiyyāka* was mentioned to the *bāb* ‘chapter’ whose (L. 10) end is the remembrance of *marḥaban wa ʔahlan* ‘greeting and welcome’. You shall see that in what is coming up your way, God willing.

إذا جئتُ بواباً له قال مرحباً

ألا مرحب واديك غير مُضَيِّق

فاعرف فيما ذكرتُ لك أنّ الفِعْلَ يَجْرِي فِي الْأَسْمَاءِ عَلَى ثَلَاثَةِ مَجَارٍ، فِعْلٌ مُظْهِرٌ لَا يَحْسُنُ إِضْمَارُهُ وَفِعْلٌ مُضْمَرٌ مُسْتَعْمَلٌ إِظْهَارُهُ وَفِعْلٌ مُضْمَرٌ مَتْرُوكٌ إِظْهَارُهُ. أَمَّا الْفِعْلُ الَّذِي لَا (س ٥) يَحْسُنُ إِضْمَارُهُ فَإِنَّهُ أَنْ تَنْتَهِيَ إِلَى رَجُلٍ لَمْ يَكُنْ فِي ذِكْرِ ضَرْبٍ وَلَمْ يَخْطُرْ بِبَالِهِ فَتَقُولُ زَيْدًا فَلَا بَدَلَهُ مِنْ أَنْ يَقُولَ اضْرِبْ زَيْدًا وَتَقُولَ لَهُ قَدْ ضَرَبْتَ زَيْدًا، أَوْ يَكُونُ مَوْضِعًا يَقْبَحُ أَنْ يَعْرِىَ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ نَحْوُ أَنْ وَقَدْ وَمَا أَشْبَهَ ذَلِكَ، وَأَمَّا الْمَوْضِعُ الَّذِي يُضْمَرُ فِيهِ وَإِظْهَارُهُ مُسْتَعْمَلٌ فَنَحْوُ قَوْلِكَ زَيْدًا لِرَجُلٍ فِي ذِكْرِ ضَرْبٍ تَرِيدُ اضْرِبْ زَيْدًا، وَأَمَّا الْمَوْضِعُ الَّذِي يُضْمَرُ فِيهِ الْفِعْلُ الْمَتْرُوكُ إِظْهَارُهُ فَمِنَ الْبَابِ الَّذِي ذُكِرَ فِيهِ إِيَّاكَ إِلَى الْبَابِ الَّذِي (س ١٠) آخِرُهُ ذَكَرُ مَرْحَبًا وَأَهْلًا وَسْتَرَى ذَلِكَ فِيهَا تَسْتَقْبَلُ إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ.

Chapter 58. This is a chapter in which the *fiʿl* ‘action’ is expressed and the *ʔism* ‘the name’ is erected because it is *maʕfuwlun maʕahu* ‘an acted-upon of accompaniment’ and *maʕfuwlun bihi* ‘an acted-upon /direct object’ just as it erected itself in your saying *ʔimraʔan wa nafsahu* ‘a person and himself’

(Buwlaq vol. 1. P.150, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 125-126, Haruwn vol.1. p.297-298)

(I. P. 125. L. 11) And that is in your saying *mā sʿanaʕta wa ʔabāka* ‘what did you do and your father’ and *wa-law turikat ʔal-nāgatu wa fasʿiylihā la-radiʕahā* ‘if a she-camel were left be and its newborn he would suck her’. What you wanted is *mā sʿanaʕta maʕa ʔabika* ‘what did you do with your father’ and *wa-law turikat ʔal-nāgatu maʕa fasʿiylihā* ‘if a she-camel were left with its newborn’, the newborn is *maʕfuwl maʕahu* ‘acted-upon of accompaniment’ and so is the father. The *wāw* [w] does not change the meaning but it works on the *ʔism* ‘name’ that was before it. An example of (L. 15) that is *mā ziltu wa zaydan ḥatta faʕala* ‘I remained and Zaid until he acted’ that is *mā ziltu bi-zaydin ḥatta faʕala* ‘I remained being with Zaid until he acted’. It is a *maʕfuwl bihi* ‘an acted-upon/object’. And *mā ziltu ʔasiyru wa ʔal-niyli* ‘I continued to walk and the Nile’, that is *maʕa ʔal-niyli* ‘with the Nile’. And *ʔistawā ʔal-māʔu wa ʔal-xaʕabata* ‘the water leveled and the wood’ that *bi-ʔal-xaʕabati* ‘by means of the wood’. And *gāʔa ʔal-bardu wa ʔal-tʿayālisata* ‘the cold came and overalls’ that is *maʕa ʔal-tʿayālisati* ‘with the overalls’ and he said: (wāfir)²⁰

Fa-kuwnuw ʔantum wa baniy ʔabiykum
Makāna ʔal-kulyatayni mina ʔal-tʿih āli
 ‘So, you and the sons of your father be the
 Place of the two kidneys and the spleen’

and he said: (tʿawiyl)²¹

(L. 20) *Wa kāna wa ʔiyyāhā ka-ḥarrāna lam yufig*
ʕani ʔal-māʔi ʔiḏ lāgāhu ḥatta tagaddadā
 ‘He was with her like a thirsty one not leaving the water
 When he came upon it until he got over-bloated’

It proves to you that the *ʔism* ‘name’ is not based on the *fiʿl* ‘action’ so that if you were to say

(٥٨) هذا باب ما يظهر فيه الفعل ويتصّب فيه
 الاسم لأنه مفعول معه ومفعول به كما انتصب نفسه
 في قولك: إمرأاً ونفسه

وذلك قولك ما صنعت وأباك ولو تركت الناقة
 وفصيلها لرضعها إنما أردت ما صنعت مع أباك ولو
 تركت الناقة مع فصيلها فالفصيل مفعول معه والأب
 كذلك والواو لم تغير المعنى ولكنها تعمل في الاسم ما
 قبلها، ومثل (س ١٥) ذلك ما زلت وزيداً حتى فعل
 أي ما زلت بزید حتى فعل فهو مفعول به وما زلت
 أسير والنيل أي مع النيل واستوى الماء والحشبة أي
 بالحشبة، وجاء البرد والطيا لسة أي مع الطيا لسة،
 وقال: (وافر)

فكونوا أنتم وبني أبيكم
 مكان الكلتيين من الطحال

وقال: (طويل)

وكان وإياها كحران لم ينفق
 عن الماء إذ لاقاه حتى تفددا
 ويدلك على أن الاسم ليس على الفعل في صنعت أنك
 لو قلت

²⁰The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʕalatun mufāʕalatun faʕuwlun* (twice).

²¹The meter of tʿawiyl is: *faʕuwlun maʕ āʕiyun* (four times).

ʔuʔʔud wa ʔaxuwka ‘sit and your brother’ it is unacceptable until you say *ʔanta* ‘you’, because it is unacceptable to conjoin with the raised to what is implied . If you were to say *mā sʔanaʔta ʔanta* ‘what did you do’ (P. 126), if you were to leave out *hiyā* ‘she’, you have a choice, if you so wanted you related the last one to what you related the first, and if you so wished you related it to the first meaning.

أَقْعُدْ وَأَخْوَكْ كَانَ قَبِيحاً حَتَّى تَقُولَ أَنْتَ لِأَنَّهُ قَبِيحٌ أَنْ
تَعْطِفَ عَلَى الْمَرْفُوعِ الْمُضْمَرِ فَإِذَا قُلْتَ مَا صَنَعْتَ أَنْتَ
(ص ١٢٦) وَلَوْ تُرَكَّتْ هِيَ فَأَنْتَ بِالْخِيَارِ إِنْ شِئْتَ
حَمَلْتَ الْآخِرَ عَلَى مَا حَمَلْتَ عَلَيْهِ الْأَوَّلَ وَإِنْ شِئْتَ حَمَلْتَهُ
عَلَى الْمَعْنَى الْأَوَّلِ.

Chapter 59. This is a chapter on the meaning of *wāw* [w] that is in it, just as its meaning in the first chapter/previous chapter, except that it conjoins the *ʔism* ‘name’ here to what can not have after it except *rafʕan* ‘being raised’, in every case.

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.150-155, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 126-129 Haruwn vol.1. p.299-307)

(I. P. 126. L. 3) And that is in your saying *ʔanta wa šaʔnuk* ‘you and your situation’ and *kullu ragulin wa waḍʕayʕatuh* ‘every man and his town’ (L. 5) and *mā ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘what of you and Abdullah’ and *kayfa ʔanta wa gasʕatun min ʕariyidin* ‘how is it with you and bowl of Tharid’ and *mā šaʔnuka wa šaʔnu zaydin* ‘what is your situation and the situation of Zaid’. *ʔal-muxabbalu* said: (kāmil)²²

Yā zibriḡānu ʔaxā baniy xalafin
Mā ʔanta wayba ʔabiyka wa ʔal-faxru

‘You Zibriḡān the brother of Bani Xalaf
You are not a disgrace to your father and pride’

and Gamiyl said: (tʕawiyl)²³

Wa ʔanta ʔi-mruʔun min ʔahli nagdin wa ʔahlunā
Tahāmin fa-mā ʔal-nagdiyyu wa ʔal-mutayawwiru

‘You are a person of the people of Nagd, and our folks are
From Tihāma, then Nagd, then the low land’

(L. 10) and he said (wāfir)²⁴

Wa kunta hunāka ʔanta kariyima gaysin
Fa-mā ʔal-gaysiyyu baʕdaka wa-ʔal-fixāru

‘There you were the honorable of gays
So no honor after you to gays’

A difference has been made between this and the first chapter because it is *ʔism* ‘a name’ and the first one is a *fiʕl* ‘action’ so it is treated as though you said for the first *mā sʕanaʕta ʔaxāka* ‘what did you make your brother’. This is impossible. But I wanted to give you an example. If you were to say *mā sʕanaʕta maʕa ʔaxiyka* ‘what did you do with your brother’ and *mā ziltu bi-ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi* ‘I am still with Abdullah’,

(٥٩) هذا بابٌ معنى الواو فيه كمعناها في البابِ
الأوّلِ إلّا أنّها تعطفُ الاسمَ ههنا على ما لا يكونُ
ما بعده إلّا رفعاً على كلّ حال

(م ١٠١ ب ٥٩ . ص ١٢٦ . س ٣) وذلك قولك أنت
وشأنك وكلّ رجل وضيعته (س ٥) وما أنت وعبدُ
الله وكيف أنت وقصعة من ثريد، وما شأنك وشأنُ
زيد، وقال المُخَبَّلُ: (كامل)

يا زَبْرِقَانُ أخوا بني خَلَفٍ

ما أنت وَبَبَ أبيك والفَخْرُ

وقال جميل: (طويل)

وأنت امرؤٌ من أهل نَجْدٍ وأهلنا

تَهَامٍ فَمَا النَّجْدِيُّ وَالمَتَعَوِّرُ

(س ١٠) وقال: (وافر)

وكنْتَ هناك أنتَ كريمَ قيسٍ

فَمَا القَيْسِيُّ بَعْدَكَ وَالفِخَارُ

وإنما فُرق بين هذا وبين البابِ الأوّلِ لأنه اسمٌ والأوّلُ
فِعْلٌ فأعمل كأنك قلت في الأوّلِ ما صنعتَ أخاك
وهذا مُحَالٌ ولكن أردتُ أن أُمثّلَ لك ولو قلتَ ما
صنعتَ مع أخيك وما زلتُ بعبد الله

²²The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāʕilun* (six times).

²³The meter of tʕawiyl is: *faʕuwulun maʕāʕiylun* (four times).

²⁴The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʕalatun mufāʕalatun faʕuwulun* (twice).

then *maṣa ʔaxiyka* ‘with your brother’ and *bi-ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi* ‘with Abdullah’ would be in the location of erecting. If you were to say *ʔanta (L. 15) wa šaʔnuka* ‘you and your situation’ it is as though you said *ʔanta wa šaʔnuka* both are conjoined and *kullu ʔi-mriʔin wa waḍʔayʕatuhu* ‘every man and his town’ are conjoined because the *wāw* [w] has the meaning of *maṣa* ‘with’ here. What operates on what is after it is what operated on what is before it in terms of *ʔal-ʔibtidāʔ* ‘initiation’ and *mubtadaʔ* ‘the initial’. And like it is *ʔanta ʔaʕlamu wa mālika* ‘you are better informed and your wealth’. What you wanted was *ʔanta ʔaʕlamu maṣa mālika* ‘you are better informed with your wealth’. And *ʔanta ʔaʕlamu wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘you are better informed and Abdullah’ that is *ʔanta ʔaʕlamu maṣa ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi* ‘you are better informed with Abdullah’. If you so wished it can be in another surface form. It is as though you said *ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi ʔaʕlamu min ʔayrikumā* ‘you and Abdullah are more knowing than others’. If you were to say *ʔanta ʔaʕlamu wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘you are more knowing and Abdullah’ in the other *wagh* ‘aspect’, in it also operates the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ on what is after it, (L. 20) just as *sʕanaʕta* ‘you did’ operated on *mā sʕanaʕta wa ʔaxāka* ‘what did you do and your brother’. On whichever surface form you directed it, it became the *mubtadaʔ* ‘initial’ because the *wāw* [w] in the two meanings, both, operates on what is after it what operated on the *ʔism* ‘name’ to which you conjoin. Similarly, *mā ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘what is about you and Abdullah’ and *kayfa ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘how is it with you and Abdullah’ is as though you said *mā ʔanta wa mā ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi (P.127)* ‘what of you and what of Abdullah’. You want to denigrate his situation and similarly *kayfa ʔanta wa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘how is it with you and Abdullah’. You want to ask about their affairs, because you conjoin with the *wāw* [w] if you wanted the meaning of *maṣa* ‘with’ based on *kayfa* ‘how’, and *kayfa* ‘how’ with the status of *ʔibtidāʔ* ‘beginning’. It is as though you said *wa kayfa ʕabdu ʔal-lāhi* ‘and how is Abdullah’. It did what the beginning does, because it is not a *fiʕl* ‘action’ and because what is after it cannot be except *raʕʕan* ‘raising’. The saying of the poet leads you to it. He is Ziyād ʔal-ʔaʕgamu, and it is said other than him said: (wāfir)²⁵

(L. 5) *Tukallifuniy sawiyga ʔal-karmi garmun*

Wa mā garmun wa mā ḍāka ʔal-sawiygu

‘Garm entrust me the drink of the vineyard

What is this Garm and what is that drink’

لكان مع أخيك وبعبد الله في موضع نصب، ولو قلت أنت (س ١٥) وشأنك كنت كأنك قلت أنت وشأنك مقرونان، وكل امرئ وضيعة مقرونان لأن الواو في معنى مع ههنا يعمل فيما بعدها ما عمل فيما قبلها من الابتداء والمبتدأ، ومثله أنت أعلم ومالك فإنما أردت أنت أعلم مع مالك وأنت أعلم وعبد الله أي أنت أعلم مع عبد الله، وإن شئت كان على الوجه الآخر كأنك قلت أنت وعبد الله أعلم من غيركما، فإن قلت أنت أعلم وعبد الله في الوجه الآخر فإنها أيضاً يعمل فيما بعدها (س ٢٠) المبتدأ كما عملت في ما صنعت وأخاك صنعت فعلى أي الوجهين وجهته صار على المبتدأ لأن الواو في المعنيين جميعاً يعمل فيما بعدها ما عمل في الاسم الذي تعطفه عليه وكذلك ما أنت وعبد الله وكيف أنت وعبد الله كأنك قلت ما أنت وما عبد الله (ص ١٢٧) وأنت تريد أن تحقر أمره، وكذلك كيف أنت وعبد الله وأنت تريد أن تسأل عن شأنها لأنك إنما تعطف بالواو إذا أردت معنى مع على كيف، وكيف بمنزلة الابتداء كأنك قلت وكيف عبد الله فعملت ما عمل الابتداء لأنها ليست بفعل ولأن ما بعدها لا يكون إلا رفعا، يدلك على ذلك قول الشاعر (وهو زياد الأعجم ويقال غيره): (وافر)

(س ٥) *تكلّفني سويق الكرم جرّم*

وما جرّم وما ذاك السويق

²⁵The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʕalatun mufāʕalatun faʕuwulun* (twice).

Don't you see that he wants the meaning of *maʿa* 'with' and the *ʔism* 'name' on which the *mā* 'what' operates. An example of that is the saying of the Arabs *ʔinnaka mā wa xayran* 'you are nothing but good'. You want *ʔinnaka maʿa xayrin* 'you are with good/you are lucky'. šaddād ʔabuw šantarata said: (wāfir)

Fa-man yaku sāʔilan ʔanniy fa-ʔinniy
Wa girwata lā taruwdu wa lā tušāru

'Whoever is asking about me, then I
And Girwata [my horse] neither ignored nor shamed'

All this is erected in the same manner as the erecting of *ʔinniy wa zaydan muntʿaligāni* 'I and Zaid are taking off'. Their meaning is *maʿa* 'with' because *ʔinniy* here has the status of (L. 10) *ʔibtidāʔ* 'beginning' neither with *fiʕl* 'an action' nor with *ʔism* 'a name' with the status of *fiʕl* 'an action'. *Kayfa ʔanta wa zaydan* 'how are things with you and Zaid' and *ʔanta wa šaʔnuka* 'your situation', their example is one because the *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initiation' and *kayfa* and *mā* and *ʔanta* operate on what its meaning is *maʿa* 'with' in raising. And is related to the *mubtadaʔ* 'initial' just as it is related to the *ʔibtidāʔ* 'initiation'. Don't you see that you say *mā ʔanta wa mā zaydan* 'what of you and what of Zaid'. It is acceptable. If you were to say *mā sanaʕta wa mā zaydan* 'what did you do and what Zaid', it is not acceptable nor is it correct if you wanted the meaning of *mā sʿanaʕta wa zaydan* 'what did you do and Zaid'. *mā ʔanta* 'what of you' and *kayfa ʔanta* 'how are you', would not do the work of *sanaʕta* 'you did'. They are not *fiʕl* 'an action' nor did we see them being used to do anything of this sort in this way. If you were (L. 15) to erect, it is as though you said *sʿanaʕta zaydan* 'you made Zaid' like *dʿarabta zaydan* 'you struck Zaid'. And we have seen nothing of this. It is not *fiʕl* 'an action' with which this was done, so you would make it follow the course of the *fiʕl* 'action'. They claim that there are people who say *kayfa ʔanta wa zaydan* 'how are you and Zaid' and *mā ʔanta wa zaydan* 'what of you and Zaid'. That is infrequent in the speech of the Arabs. They do not relate speech to *mā* nor *kayfa* but they relate it to the *fiʕl* 'action', to a thing, if it were to be expressed so they would pronounce it, it does not contradict what they want of the meaning when they related speech to *mā* and *kayfa*. It is as though he said *kayfa takuwnu ʔanta wa gasʕatan min ʕariyd* 'how are you and a bowl of Tharid' and *mā kunta wa zaydan* 'what were up to and Zaid' because, (L. 20) *kunta* and *takuwnu* occur here frequently

ألا ترى أنه يريد معنى مَعَ والاسمُ تَعْمَلُ فِيهِ مَا، وَمِثْلُ
ذَلِكَ قَوْلُ الْعَرَبِ إِنَّكَ مَا وَخَيْرًا تَرِيدُ إِنَّكَ مَعَ خَيْرٍ.
وَقَالَ (وَهُوَ شَدَادٌ أَبُو عَنَتْرَةَ): (وَافِرٌ)

فَمَنْ يَكُ سَائِلًا عَنِّي فَإِنِّي
وَجِرْوَةٌ لَا تَرُودُ وَلَا تُعَارُ

فَهَذَا كُلُّهُ يَنْتَصِبُ انْتِصَابَ إِنِّي وَزَيْدًا مُنْطَلِقَانِ
وَمَعْنَاهُنَّ مَعَ لِأَنَّ إِنِّي هَاهُنَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ (س ١٠) الْإِبْتِدَاءِ
لَيْسَتْ بِفِعْلٍ وَلَا اسْمٍ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْفِعْلِ، وَكَيْفَ أَنْتَ وَزَيْدٌ
وَأَنْتَ وَشَأْنُكَ مِثْلَهُمَا وَاحِدٌ لِأَنَّ الْإِبْتِدَاءَ وَكَيْفَ وَمَا
وَأَنْتَ يَعْْمَلُنَ فِيهَا كَانَ مَعْنَاهُ مَعَ الرَّفْعِ وَيُحْمَلُ عَلَى
الْمُبْتَدَأِ كَمَا يُحْمَلُ عَلَى الْإِبْتِدَاءِ، أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّكَ تَقُولُ مَا
أَنْتَ وَمَا زَيْدٌ فَيَحْسُنُ، وَلَوْ قُلْتَ مَا صَنَعْتَ وَمَا زَيْدٌ لَمْ
يَحْسُنْ وَلَمْ يَسْتَقِمْ إِذَا أَرَدْتَ مَعْنَى مَا صَنَعْتَ وَزَيْدًا، وَلَمْ
يَكُنْ لِيَعْمَلْ مَا أَنْتَ وَكَيْفَ أَنْتَ عَمَلٌ صَنَعْتَ وَلَيْسَا
بِفِعْلٍ، وَلَمْ نَرَهُمَا أَعْمَلُوا شَيْئًا مِنْ هَذَا كَذَا، فَإِذَا (س
١٥) نَصَبْتَ فَكَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ صَنَعْتَ زَيْدًا مِثْلَ ضَرْبَتِ
زَيْدًا وَلَمْ تَرِ شَيْئًا مِنْ هَذَا لَيْسَ بِفِعْلٍ فَعَلَّ بِهِ هَذَا فَتَجْرِيهِ
تُجْرَى الْفِعْلِ، وَزَعَمُوا أَنْ نَاسًا يَقُولُونَ كَيْفَ أَنْتَ
وَزَيْدًا وَمَا أَنْتَ وَزَيْدًا، وَهُوَ قَلِيلٌ فِي كَلَامِ الْعَرَبِ وَلَمْ
يَحْمَلُوا الْكَلَامَ عَلَى مَا وَلَا كَيْفَ وَلَكِنَّهُمْ حَمَلُوهُ عَلَى
الْفِعْلِ عَلَى شَيْءٍ لَوْ ظَهَرَ حَتَّى يَلْفِظُوا بِهِ لَمْ يَنْقُضْ مَا
أَرَادُوا مِنَ الْمَعْنَى حِينَ حَمَلُوا الْكَلَامَ عَلَى مَا وَكَيْفَ كَأَنَّهُ
قَالَ كَيْفَ تَكُونُ أَنْتَ وَقِصْعَةٌ مِنْ ثَرِيدٍ وَمَا كُنْتَ وَزَيْدًا
لِأَنَّ (س ٢٠) كُنْتَ وَتَكُونُ يَقَعَانِ هَاهُنَا كَثِيرًا،

and they do not contradict what you want of the meaning of the discourse, so the *s'adr* 'onset' (P. 128) of speech goes by as though he spoke it even though he did not pronounce it due to its occurring here frequently. Then some of them recited: (mutacārib)²⁶

Fa-mā ḡanā wa ḡal-sayra fīy matlafīn
Yubarrihu bi-ḡal-ḡakari ḡal-d'ābit'i

'What with me and the debilitating travel
Ailing even the strong male-camel'

Because they say *mā kunta hāhunā kaḡiyrān* 'you were not here often'. And it does not contradict this meaning and in *kayfa* 'how' there is the meaning of *yakuwnu* 'it exists' so that *mā ḡanta* followed the course (L. 5) the course of *mā kunta* just as *kayfa* 'how' is based on *yakuwnu* 'it exists'. If he were to say *ḡanta wa šaḡnuka* 'you and your affairs', he makes his speech follow what he is in now. He does not want *kāna* or *yakuwnu* even if he related it to this and something beckoned him to it that he had attained. Rather, he began and related it to what is in it now and followed the course of what is built on the *mubtada'* 'initial'. This is why they did not use the *fīl* 'action' here from *kāna* and *yakuwnu* for the purpose of wanting to follow what I mentioned to you. ḡabuw ḡal-xat t'ābi claimed that he heard some of the Arabs of whose Arabic one is assured reciting (L. 10) this line with erect: (wāfir)²⁷

ḡa-tuwḡiduniy bi-ḡaymika yā ḡi-bna ḡahlīn
ḡuḡābātīn yuxāluwna ḡal-ḡibādā
Bi-mā ḡammaḡta min ḡad'anīn wa ḡamrīn
Wa mā ḡad'anun wa ḡamrun waḡal-ḡiyādā

'Do you threaten me with your people, O Ibn ḡahl
Mixed ones think slaves
What you have gathered of [tribes of] Hadan and Amr
And what are the Hadans and Amrs'

ولا يَنْقُضَانِ مَا تَرِيدُ مِنْ مَعْنَى الْحَدِيثِ فَمَضَى صَدْرُ
(ص ١٢٨) الْكَلَامِ وَكَأَنَّهُ قَدْ تَكَلَّمَ بِهَا وَإِنْ كَانَ لَمْ يَلْفِظْ
بِهَا لَوْ قَوَّعَهَا هَهُنَا كَثِيرًا، وَمِنْ ثَمَّ أَنْشَدَ بَعْضُهُمْ:
(مُتَقَارِب)

فَمَا أَنَا وَالسَّيْرِ فِي مُتَلَفٍ

يُبْرِحُ بِالذِّكْرِ الضَّابِطِ

لأنهم يقولون ما كنت ههنا كثيراً ولا يَنْقُضُ هذا المعنى
وفي كيف معنى يكون فجرى ما (س ٥) أنت مجرى ما
كنت كما أن كيف على معنى يكون، وإذا قال أنت
وشأنك فإنما أجرى كلامه على ما هو الآن فيه لا يريد
كان ولا يكون وإن كان حمله على هذا ودعا إليه شيء
قد كان بلغه فإنما ابتداء وحمله على ما هو فيه الآن
وجرى على ما يُبْنَى على المبتدأ، ولذلك لم يستعملوا
ههنا الفعل من كان ويكون لما أرادوا من الإجراء على
ما ذكرت لك، وزعم أبو الخطّاب أنه سمع بعض
العرب الموثوق بعريتهم يُنشدُ هذا (س ١٠) البيت
نصباً: (وافر)

أَتَوْعِدُنِي بِقَوْمِكَ يَا ابْنَ جَحْلٍ
أَشَابَاتٍ يُخَالُونَ الْعِبَادَا
بِهَا جَمَعَتْ مِنْ حَضَنٍ وَعَمْرٍو

وَمَا حَضَنٌ وَعَمْرٍو وَالْحِيَادَا

²⁶The meter of mutacārib is: *faḡuwlun faḡuwlun faḡuwl* (twice).

²⁷The meter of wāfir is: *mufāḡalatun mufāḡalatun faḡuwlun* (twice).

They claim that the shepherd was reciting this line with erect: (kāmil)²⁸

ʔazmāna gawmiy wa ʔal-gamāʕata ka-ʔal-laḏiy
Manaʕa ʔal-riḥālata ʔan tamiyla mamiylā

‘The times of my people and [their] gathering is like the one
That prevented the saddle from tilting this way or that’

(L. 15) It is as though he said *ʔazmāna kāna gawmiy wa ʔal-gamāʕata* ‘the times of my people and the gathering’. They related it to the *kāna* ‘he was’, because it occurs in this location frequently and does not contradict what they wanted of the meaning when they relate speech to what raises. It is as though he said *ʔazmāna gawmiy* ‘the times of my people’, its meaning is *ʔazmāna kāna gawmiy* ‘the times in which my people were’. As for *ʔanta wa ʕaʔnuka* ‘you and your situation’ and *kullu ʔu-mriʔin wa dayʕatuhu* ‘every person and his village’ and *ʔanta ʔaʕlam wa rabbuka* ‘you are more knowing and your God’ and the likes of that, all of it is *raff* ‘raising’; *nas^b* ‘erecting’ is not permitted in it because you want to inform on the circumstance in which what is talked about is in the circumstances of your speech so you said *ʔanta ʔal-ʔān kaḏālika* ‘you are now like that’, and you do not want to make that in what (L. 20) has passed, nor what in what is to happen, and it is not a location in which the *fiʕl* ‘action’ is used. As for *ʔistiʕh ām* ‘an interrogative’, they allowed *nas^b* ‘erecting’ in it, because they use the *fiʕl* ‘action’ in that location frequently. They say *mā kunta* ‘what were you’ and *kayfa takuwnu* ‘How is your situation’ if they wanted the meaning of *maʕa* ‘with’, and hence they said *ʔazmāna gawmiy wa ʔal-gamāʕata* ‘the times of my people and the gathering’ because it is a location in which the *fiʕl* is inserted (P. 129) frequently. They say *ʔazmāna kāna* ‘the times when he was’ and *ḥiyna kāna* ‘when he was’ and this is similar to the saying of S^ʕirmata *ʔal-ʔans^ʕāriyy: (t^ʕawiyl)*²⁹

Badā liy ʔanniy lastu mudrika mā maḏʕā
Wa lā sābigin ʕayʔan ʔiḏā kāna gāʔiyā

‘It became apparent to me that I am neither aware of what
has passed

Nor knowing in advance what is to come’

وزعموا أنّ الراعي كان يُنشدُ هذا البيت نصباً:
(كامل)

أزمان قومي والجماعة كالذي

منع الرحالة أن تميل تميلاً

(س ١٥) كأنه قال أزمان كان قومي والجماعة فحملوه على كان لأنها تقع في هذا الموضع كثيراً ولا تنقض ما أرادوا من المعنى حين يحملون الكلام على ما يرفع فكأنه إذا قال أزمان قومي كان معناه أزمان كان قومي، وأما أنت وشأنك وكل أمرئ وضعته وأنت أعلم وربك وأشباه ذلك فكله رفع لا يجوز فيه النصب لأنك إنما تريد أن تُخبر بالحال التي فيها المُحدث عنه في حال حديثك فقلت أنت الآن كذلك ولم ترد أن تجعل ذلك فيما (س ٢٠٩) مضى ولا فيما يُستقبل وليس موضعاً يُستعمل فيه الفعل، وأما الاستفهام فإتهم أجازوا فيه النصب لأنهم يستعملون الفعل في ذلك الموضع كثيراً يقولون ما كنت وكيف تكون إذا أرادوا معنى مع ومن ثم قالوا أزمان قومي والجماعة لأنه موضع يدخل فيه الفعل (ص ١٢٩) كثيراً يقولون أزمان كان وحين كان، وهذا شبيه بقول صرمة الأنصاري: (طويل)

بدلي أني لست مُدرك ما مضى

ولا سابق شيئاً إذا كان جائياً

²⁸The meter of kāmil is: *mutafāʕilun* (six times).

²⁹The meter of t^ʕawiyl is: *faʕuwlun mafāʕiyun* (four times).

They made speech based here on a thing that occurs frequently here. Like it, is the saying of ʔal-ʔaḥwasʔ: (tʔawiyl)³⁰

Mašāʔiyumu laysuw musʔliḥiyina ʔašiyratan
*Wa lā nāʔibin ʔillā bi-baynin ʔurābuha*³¹

‘Evil omens do not reconcile a tribe
Nor does its crow cry except with division’

(L. 5) They related it to *laysuw bi-musʔliḥinya* ‘they are not reconcilers’ and *lastu bi-mudrikin* ‘I am not aware’ and like it is the saying of ʔāmir ʔibn guwaynin ʔal-tʔāʔiyy: (tʔawiyl)

Fa-lam ʔara miḥlahā xubāsata wāḥidin
Wa nahnahtu nafsiy baʔda mā kidtu ʔaʔʔalah

‘I did not see the like of it, a dark thought
And I distracted myself before I was about to do it’

He related it to *ʔan* ‘if’ because the poets may use *ʔan* here frequently, necessarily.

فجعلوا الكلام على شيء يقع هنا كثيراً، ومثله قول
الأخوص: (طويل)

مَشَائِمُ لَيْسُوا مُصْلِحِينَ عَشِيرَةً
وَلَا نَاعِبٍ إِلَّا بَيْنَ غُرَابِهَا

(س ٥) حملوه على ليسوا بمُصْلِحِينَ ولستُ بمدرك،
ومثله لعامر بن جُوَيْن الطائي: (طويل)

فلم أَرِ مِثْلَهَا خُبَاسَةً وَاحِدٍ
وَمَهْنَهْتُ نَفْسِي بَعْدَمَا كِدْتُ أَفْعَلُهُ

حمله على أن لأن الشعراء قد يستعملون أن ها هنا
مضطربين كثيراً.

³⁰The meter of tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwulun mafāʔiyulun* (four times).

³¹Cf. chapter 37.

Chapter 60. This is a chapter in which *yud' miruwna* 'they imply' the *fi'l* 'action' due to the *gubh* 'unacceptability' of *kalām* 'speech' if its end is related to its beginning.

(Buwlāq vol. 1. P.155-156, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 129-130, Haruwn vol.1. p.307-310)

(I. P. 129. L.8.) And that is in your saying *mā laka wa zaydan* 'what is it to you and Zaid' and *mā šaʔnuka wa šamran* 'what is your situation and Amr'. The definition of speech here is *mā šaʔnuka wa šaʔnu šamrin* 'what is your situation and the situation of Amr'. If you were to relate the speech to the implied *kāf* [k], it is unacceptable; and if you were to relate to the *šaʔn* 'situation', it is not permitted, because the *šaʔn* is not confusable with *šabdi ʔal-lāhi* [šamr], but is confusable with the man that is implied in *šaʔn*. Since that was unacceptable, they related it to the *fi'l* 'action' so they said *mā šaʔnuka wa zaydan* 'what is your situation and Zaid'. That is *mā šaʔnuka wa tanāwuluka zaydan* 'what is your situation and your dealing with Zaid'. ʔal-miskiynu ʔal-dārmiiyu said: (wāfir)³²

Fa-mā laka wa-ʔal-taladduda hawla nagdin
Wa gad ʔasʔat tihāmatu bi-ʔal-rigāli

'What is it about your frequenting Nagd
And Tihāma is replete with men'
and he said :(tʔawiyl)³³

Wa mā lakumu wa ʔal-fartʔa lā tagrabuwnahu
Wa gad xiltuhu ʔadnā maraddin li-šāgili

'What is it with you with Fartʔ, you don't go near it
I have imagined it the least defense for an intellectual'

It proves to you also its unacceptability if it were related to the *šaʔn* 'situation' that if you were to say *mā šaʔnuka wa šabdu ʔal-lāhi* 'what is your situation and Abdullah', it would not have the acceptability of *mā garmun wa mā ḍāka ʔal-sawiygu* 'what Garm and what is that drink', because you allude that *ʔal-šaʔna* 'the situation' is the one that is confused with Zaid. Rather, the situation of the man is confused with the situation of Zaid and whoever wanted that then he is a puzzler, abandoning people's speech that (L. 20) gets into their hearts. If he were to express the *fi'l* 'action' he would say:

³²The meter of wāfir is: *mufāʔalatun mufāʔalatun faʔuwlun* (twice).

³³The meter of tʔawiyl is: *faʔuwlun mafāʔiyun* (four times).

(٦٠) هذا بابٌ منه يُضمرون فيه الفعلَ لقيح

الكلام إذا حمل آخره على أوله

(م ١٠ ب ٦٠ ص ١٢٩ س ٨) وذلك قولك ما لك
وزيداً وما شأنك وعمراً فإنما حدُّ الكلام ههنا ما
شأنك وشأن عمرو. فإن حملت (س ١٠) الكلام على
الكاف المضمرة فهو قبيح، وإن حملته على الشأن لم يجوز
لأنَّ الشأنَ ليس يلتبس بعبدِ الله إنما يلتبس به الرجلُ
المضمَّرُ في الشأنِ فلما كان ذلك قبيحاً حملوه على الفعلِ
فقالوا ما شأنك وزيداً، أي ما شأنك وتناولك زيداً،
قال المسكينُ الدارميُّ: (وافر)

فما لك والتلدد حول نجد

وقد غصت تهمامة بالرجال

(س ١٥) وقال: (طويل)

وما لكم والفرط لا تقرُّبونه

وقد خلته أذني مرَّد لعاقِل

ويدلك أيضاً على قبحه إذا حمل على الشأن أنك لو
قلت ما شأنك وما عبد الله لم يكن كحُسن ما جرَّم وما
ذاك السويق لأنك توهم أنَّ الشأن هو الذي يلتبس
بزيد، وإنما يلتبس شأن الرجل بشأن زيد ومن أراد
ذلك فهو مُلغزُّ تاركٌ لكلام الناس الذي (س ٢٠)
يسبق إلى أفئدتهم، فإذا أظهر الاسم فقال:

mā šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa ʔaxiyhi yaštumhu ‘what is the situation of Abdullah and his brother cusses him’. It cannot be (P. 130) except *garr* ‘pull’, because it is acceptable that speech be related to Abdullah because the expressed *magruwr* ‘pulled’ is to it related the *magruwr* ‘pulled’. We have heard some of the Arabs say *mā šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa ʔal-ʕarabi yasubbuhā* ‘what is the situation of Abdullah and he cusses the Arabs’. We also have heard from the Arabs whose Arabic is dependable say *mā šaʔnu gaysin wa ʔal-burri tasriguhu* ‘what is the situation of Qais and you steal wheat’. When they expressed the *ʔism* ‘name’ it became acceptable to them to relate the speech to the last one. If you were to imply it, it is as though you said *mā šaʔnuka wa mulābasatun zaydan* ‘what is your situation and the confusion with Zaid’ or (L. 5) *wa mulābasatuka zaydan* ‘your confusion with Zaid’ or *mulābasatuka zaydan* ‘your confusion with Zaid’. It is as though Zaid was related to the *fiʕl* ‘action’ and the *mulābasatu* ‘confusion’ to the *šaʔn* ‘situation’, because *šaʔnuka* having confusion with it is better than they make the expressed follow on the basis of the implied. If you were to express the *ʔism* ‘name’ in *garr* ‘pull’ it did the work of *kayfa* ‘how’ in raising’. And whoever said *mā ʔanta wa zaydan* ‘what is about you and Zaid’, also said *mā šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa zaydan* ‘what is the situation of Abdullah and Zaid’. It is as though he said *mā kāna šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa zaydan* ‘what was the situation of Abdullah and Zaid’. He related it to *kāna* ‘he was’, because *kāna* occurs here and *raffʕ* ‘raising’ is better and more frequent in *mā ʔanta wa zaydan* ‘what of you and Zaid’. And the *garr* ‘pull’ in your saying *mā šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi wa zaydin* ‘what is the situation of Abdullah and Zaid’ is acceptable and better. It is as though he said *mā šaʔnu ʕabdi ʔal-lāhi* (L. 10) *wa šaʔnu zaydin* ‘what is the situation of Abdullah and the situation of Zaid’. Whoever erected also said *mā li-zaydin wa ʔaxāhu* ‘what is to Zaid and his brother’. He wants *mā kāna li-zaydin wa ʔaxāhu* ‘what was to Zaid and his brother’; he wants *mā kāna šaʔnu zaydin wa ʔaxāhu* ‘what is the situation of Zaid and his brother’, because it occurs in this meaning here. It is as though he had already spoken it. Consequently, they said *hasbuka wa zaydan* ‘it is sufficient for you and Zaid’ when it had the meaning of *kafāka* ‘sufficient for you’ and it is unacceptable that they relate it to the implied. They intended the *fiʕl* ‘action’ as though he said *hasbuka wa yuḥsibu ʔaxāka dirhamun* ‘it is sufficient for you and your brother a dirham’. Similarly, are *kafyu-ka*, *gad-ka*, *gaʕ-ka*. As for *waylan lahu wa ʔaxāhu* ‘woe to him and his brother’ and *waylahu wa ʔabāhu* ‘woe to him and his father’. It got erected based on the meaning of the *fiʕl* ‘action’ that erected it. It is as tough you said *ʔalzamahu ʔal-lāhu waylahu* (L. 15) *wa ʔabāhu* ‘God brought upon him his woe and his father’.

ما شأن عبد الله وأخيه يَشْتُمُهُ فليس (ص ١٣٠) إِلَّا الجُرُّ لآنه قد حسن أن يُجْمَلَ الكلامُ على عبد الله لأنَّ المظْهَر المجرورَ يُجْمَلُ عليه المجرورُ، وسمعنا بعض العرب يقول ما شأن عبد الله والعرب يَسُبُّهَا، وسمعنا أيضاً من العرب من يوثق بعربيته يقول ما شأن قيسٍ والبرُّ تَسْرِقُهُ، لما أظهروا الاسمَ حسنَ عندهم أن يَحْمَلُوا عليه الكلامَ الآخرَ، فإذا أضمرت فكأنك قلتَ ما شأنك وملايسةً زيداً أو (س ٥) وملايستك زيداً، فكان أن يكون زيدٌ على فِعْلٍ وتكون الملايسةُ على الشأن لأن شأنك معه ملايسةٌ له أحسنُ من أن يُجْرُوا المظْهَر على المضمَر، فإن أظهرت الاسمَ في الجرِّ عمِلَ عمَلٌ كَيْفَ في الرفع، ومَنْ قال ما أنت وزيداً قال ما شأن عبد الله وزيداً كأنه قال ما كان شأن عبد الله وزيداً، وحمله على كان لأن كان يقع ههنا، والرفعُ أجودٌ وأكثرُ في ما أنت وزيدٌ، والجرُّ في قولك ما شأن عبد الله وزيدٌ أحسنٌ وأجودٌ كأنه قال ما شأن عبد الله (س ١٠) وشأن زيدٍ، ومَنْ نصب أيضاً قال ما لزيدٍ وأخاه يريد ما كان لزيدٍ وأخاه يريد ما كان شأن زيدٍ وأخاه لأنه يقع في هذا المعنى ههنا فكأنه قد كان تكلم به، ومن ثم قالوا حسبك وزيداً لما كان فيه معنى كفاك وقيح أن يَحْمَلُوهُ على المضمَر نَوُوا الفِعْلَ كأنه قال حسبك ويُحْسِبُ أخاك درهمٌ، وكذلك كَفَيْكَ وَقَدْكَ وَقَطَّكَ، وأما وَيْلًا له وأخاه وويْلَه وأباه فانتصب على معنى الفِعْلِ الذي نَصَبَه كأنك قلتَ ألزَمَهُ اللهُ وَيْلَه (س ١٥) وأباه.

He erected it on the basis of the meaning of the *fiʿl* that erected it; when it was such, and even if its relation to the meaning was not expressed. If you were to say *waylun lahu wa ʔabāhu* ‘woe to him and his father’, you erected because there is in it that meaning, just as *ħasbuka* ‘your opinion’ is raised due to *ʔibtidāʔ* ‘beginning’ and it has the meaning of *kaʔāk* ‘it is sufficient for you’. It is like *marartu bihi wa zaydan* ‘I passed by him and Zaid’; even if it is stronger because you mentioned the *fiʿl* ‘action’, it is as though you said *wa laġiytu ʔabāhu* ‘and I met his father’. As for *ħāḏā laka wa ʔabāka* ‘this is for you and your father’, it is unacceptable to erect *ʔal-ʔaba* ‘the father’ because no *fiʿl* was mentioned nor a particle with the meaning of a *fiʿl* ‘action’ so that it becomes as though he spoke with a *fiʿl* ‘action’.

فانتصب على معنى الفعل الذي نصبه فلما كان كذلك- وإن كان لا يظهر -حمله على المعنى، وإن قلت ويئل له وأباه نصبت لأن فيه ذلك المعنى، كما أن حسبك مرتفع بالابتداء وفيه معنى كفاك وهو نحو مررت به وزيداً وإن كان أقوى لأنك ذكرت الفعل كأنك قلت ولقيت أباه، وأما هذا لك وأباك فقيح أن تنصب الأب لأنه لم يذكر فعلاً ولا حرفاً فيه معنى فعل حتى يصير كأنه قد تكلم بالفعل.