

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

Solomon Sara, S.J. (Posthumously)
Georgetown University

Chapter 91. This is a Chapter in which *raff* ‘raising’ is selected and it is the *wagh* ‘surface form’ in all the *luḡāt* ‘dialects’

(Buwlaq vol. 1. p.194-195, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 163-165; Haruwn vol.1.
p.387-391)

(I. Chapter 91. P. 163. L.9) Yuwnus claimed that it is the saying of Ḥabiy Ḥamr. And that is as in your saying *Ḥammā Ḥal-Ḥabiydu fa-ḥuw Ḥabiydin* ‘as to slaves, then he is a possessor of slaves’, *Ḥammā Ḥal-Ḥabdu fa-ḥuw Ḥabdin* ‘as to a slave, then he is a possessor of a slave,’ and *Ḥammā Ḥabḏāni fa-ḥuw Ḥabdayni* ‘as to two slaves, then he is a possessor of two slaves’. The *raff* ‘raising’ was selected because of what you mentioned, in this case *Ḥasmāḥun* ‘names,’ and the *Ḥasmāḥu* ‘names’ do not follow the course of the *masʿādir* ‘origins’. Don’t you see that you say *huwa Ḥal-Ḥagulu Ḥilman wa Ḥighan* ‘he is the man with knowledge and understanding’ and you do not say *huwa Ḥal-Ḥagulu xaylan wa Ḥibilan* ‘he is the man with horses and camels’? Since that became unacceptable, they made what is after it *xabaran lahu* ‘a predicate for it’. It is as though they said *Ḥammā Ḥal-Ḥabiydu fa-Ḥanta fiyhim Ḥaw Ḥanta minhum ḥuw Ḥabiydin* ‘as to slaves, then you are among them or are one of them possessors of slaves’, which means that you have a share of slaves. It is as though you wanted to say *Ḥammā mina Ḥal-Ḥabiydi Ḥaw Ḥammā fiy Ḥal-Ḥabiydi* (L. 15) *fa-Ḥanta ḥuw Ḥabiydin* ‘with respect to slaves or relating to slaves, then you are in possession of slaves’ except that you delayed *min* ‘from’ and *fiy* ‘in’ and pre-posed the *mubtadaʿ* ‘initial’ after them and you implied in them their *Ḥasmāḥ* ‘names’. As for his saying *Ḥammā Ḥal-Ḥabdu fa-Ḥanta ḥuw Ḥabdin* ‘as to the slave, then you are a possessor of a slave’. It is as though he said *Ḥammā fiy Ḥal-Ḥabdi fa-anta ḥuw Ḥabdin* ‘as to being among the slaves, you are a possessor of slaves’, but he delayed *fiy* ‘in/among’ and implied in it its *Ḥism* ‘name’ as he did with the *Ḥabiyd* ‘slaves’. When it was unacceptable for them that it be with the status of a *masʿdar* ‘origin’

هذا كتاب سيبويه

المشهور في النحو واسمه الكتاب

(٩١) هذا باب ما يُختار فيه الرَّفْعُ وَيَكُونُ فِيهِ
الْوَجْهَ فِي جَمِيعِ اللُّغَاتِ

(م ١. ب ٩١. ص ١٦٣. س ٩) وزعم يونس أنه قول
أبي (س ١٠) عمرو. وذلك قولك: أَمَّا الْعَبِيدُ فَذُو
عَبِيدٍ وَأَمَّا الْعَبْدُ فَذُو عَبِيدٍ، وَأَمَّا عَبْدَانِ فَذُو عَبِيدِينَ.
وإنما اختير الرفع لأن ما ذكرت في هذا الباب أسماء
والأسماء لا تجرى مجرى المصادر. ألا ترى أنك تقول:
هو الرجلُ عِلْمًا وَفِقْهًا، ولا تقول: هو الرجلُ خَيْلًا
وَإِبِلًا. فَلَمَّا قُبِحَ ذَلِكَ جَعَلُوا مَا بَعْدَهُ خَبْرًا لَهُ، كَأَتَمُّهُمْ
قَالُوا: أَمَّا الْعَبِيدُ فَأَنْتَ فِيهِمْ أَوْ أَنْتَ مِنْهُمْ ذُو عَبِيدٍ؛
أَيُّ: لَكَ مِنَ الْعَبِيدِ نَصِيبٌ، كَأَنَّكَ أَرَدْتَ أَنْ تَقُولَ: أَمَّا
مِنَ الْعَبِيدِ أَوْ أَمَّا فِي الْعَبِيدِ (س ١٥) فَأَنْتَ ذُو عَبِيدٍ؛ إِلَّا
أَنْكَ أَخْرَجْتَ مِنْ وَفِي وَقَدَّمْتَ الْمَبْتَدَأَ بَعْدَهُمَا وَأَضْمَرْتَ
فِيهِمَا أَسْمَاءَهُمْ. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُهُ: أَمَّا الْعَبْدُ فَأَنْتَ ذُو عَبِيدٍ،
فَكَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: أَمَّا فِي الْعَبْدِ فَأَنْتَ ذُو عَبِيدٍ، وَلَكِنَّهُ أَخْرَجَ فِي
وَأَضْمَرَ فِيهِ اسْمَهُ كَمَا فَعَلَ ذَلِكَ فِي الْعَبِيدِ. فَلَمَّا قُبِحَ
عندهم أن يكون بمنزلة المصدر

¹ Arabic transcriptions are in italics.

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

and it was not permissible for them, they related it to this in order to avoid introducing into the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ what is not of it, just as Tamiym did with *ʕilm* ‘knowledge’ when they raised. It is as though you said *ʔammā ʔal-ʕabiydu fahum laka* ‘as to the slaves, they are yours’ and *ʔammā* (L. 20) *ʔal-ʕabdu fa-huwa laka* ‘as to the slave, he is yours’, because that is the meaning you want. We have heard some Arabs who say *ʔammā ʔibnu muzaniyyatin fa-ʔanā ʔibnu muzaniyyatin* ‘as to the son of Muzaniyyah, I am the son of Muzaniyyah’. It is as though he said *ʔammā ʔibnu muzaniyyatin fa-ʔanā dālika* ‘as to the son of Muzaniyyah, I am that one’. He made the latter the former just as he was saying that (P. 164) with *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* ‘ʔal-’ *ʔammā ʔibnu ʔal-muzaniyyati fa-ʔanā ʔibnu ʔal-muzaniyyati* ‘As to the son of the Muzaniyyah, I am the son of the Muzaniyyah’. If you so wished, you erected because they are a *hāl* circumstance’, just as you said *ʔammā sʿadiygan fa-ʔanta sʿadiygun* ‘as for a friend, you are a friend’ and *ʔammā sʿāhiban fa-ʔanta sʿāhibun* ‘as for a companion, you are a companion’. Yuwnus claimed that some of the Arabs say *ʔammā ʔal-ʕabiyda fa-ḍuw ʕabiydin* ‘as to slaves, he possesses slaves’ and *ʔammā ʔal-ʕabda fa-ḍuw ʕabdin* ‘as to a slave, he possesses a slave’. They make it follow the course of the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ equally. It is deceptively rare. That is, they likened it to the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ just as they likened *ʔal-gammāʔa ʔal-ʔafiyra* ‘the large crowd’ to the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ and they likened (L. 5) *xamsatahum* ‘the five of them’ to the *masʿdar* ‘origin’. It is as though these [people] permitted *huwa ʔal-ragulu ʔal-ʕabiyda* ‘he is the man/owner of the slaves’ and *ʔal-darāhima* ‘the dirhams’; that is, *li-ʕabiyd* ‘to the slaves’ and *li-ldarāhim* ‘to the dirhams’. This is not spoken, but its surface form and its correct form is *raffʿ* ‘raising’. This is the saying of the Arabs, of ʔabiy ʕamr, and of Yuwnus, and I am not aware that ʔal-Khalīl disagreed with them. They related it to the *masʿdar* ‘origin’ so the *naḥwiyyuwn* said *ʔammā ʔal-ʕilma wa ʔal-ʕabiyda fa-ḍuw ʕilmin wa ḍuw ʕabiydin* ‘as to knowledge and the slaves, he is a possessor of knowledge and slaves’. This is *gabiyyh* ‘unacceptable’, because if you were to make it singular, raising would be correct. It is deceptive since what is not a *masʿdar* ‘origin’ was made to follow the course of *masʿadir* ‘origins’, and they likened it to what is unacceptable like it, which is their saying *waylun lahum wa tabbun* ‘woe to them and perdition’. As to his saying *ʔammā* (L. 10) *ʔal-basʿratu fa-lā basʿrata laka* ‘as to Basrah, there is no Basrah for you’ and *ʔammā ʔal-hāriou fa-lā hāriou laka* ‘as to Harith, there is no Harith for you’, and *ʔammā ʔabuwka fa-lā ʔabā laka* ‘as to to your father, you have no father’, this cannot have in it anything

ولم يكن ممّا يجوز فيه عندهم ذلك حملوه على هذا فراراً من أن يُدخِلوا في المصدر ما ليس منه، كما فعلت تميمٌ ذلك في العِلْم حين رفعوا. كأنك قلت أمّا العبيد فهم لك، وأمّا (س ٢٠) العبدُ فهو لك؛ لأنك ذلك المعنى تُريدُ. وسَمِعنا من العرب من يقول: أمّا ابنُ مُزَيَّيةٍ فأنّا ابنُ مُزَيَّيةٍ، كأنه قال: أمّا ابنُ مُزَيَّيةٍ فأنّا ذلك. جعل الآخر هو الأوّل كما كان قائلاً ذلك (ص ١٦٤) في الألف واللام: أمّا ابنُ المُزَيَّيةِ فأنّا ابنُ المُزَيَّيةِ. وإن شئت نصبت على الحال كما قلت: أمّا صديقاً فأنّت صديقٌ وأمّا صاحباً فأنّت صاحبٌ. وزعم يونس أن قوماً من العرب يقولون: أمّا العبيد فذو عبيدٍ وأمّا العبد فذو عبدٍ، يُجرونه مجرى المصدر سواءً. وهو قليل خبيث؛ وذلك أنهم شبّهوه بالمصدر كما شبّهوا الجماء الغفير بالمصدر، وشبّهوا (س ٥) خمستهم بالمصدر. كأن هؤلاء أجازوا: هو الرجلُ العبيد والدرهم؛ أي: للعبيد وللدرهم. فهذا لا يُتكلّم به، وإنما وجهه وصوابه الرفع وهو قول العرب وأبي عمرو ويونس، ولا أعلم الخليل خالفهما. وقد حملوه على المصدر فقال النحويون: أمّا العِلْم والعبيد فذو علمٍ وذو عبيد. وهذا قبيح؛ لأنك لو أفردته كان الرفع الصواب، فخبث إذ أُجري غير المصدر كالمصدر. وشبّهوه بما هو في الرّداءة مثله وهو قولهم: وَيُلْ لهم وتبُّ. وأمّا قوله: أمّا (س ١٠) البَصْرَةُ فلا بَصْرَةَ لك، وأمّا الحارثُ فلا حارثَ لك، وأمّا أبوك فلا أباً لك. فهذا لا يكون فيه أبداً

except *raffʿ* 'raising', because it is a definite and known *ʔism* 'name' by which the addressee is known just as you knew. It is as though you said *ʔammā ʔal-hāriəu fa-lā hāriəa laka baʕdahu* 'as to Harith, there is no Harith for you after him' or *fa-lā hāriəa laka siwāh* 'there is no Harith for you beside him'. It is as though he said *ʔammā ʔal-basʕratu fa-laysat laka* 'as to Basrah, it is not for you' and *ʔammā ʔal-hāriəu fa-laysa laka* 'as to Harith, he is not for you', because that is the meaning he wants. If he were to say *ʔammā ʔal-ʕabiydu fa-ʔanta ɗuw ʕabiydin* 'as to the slaves, you are a possessor of slaves', he means the same slaves known by the speaker and the addressee. It is as though you said *ʔammā ʔal-ʕabiydu ʔal-laɗiyina taʕrifu* 'as to the slaves whom you know' (L. 15), it cannot be anything but in *raffʿan* raising', and his saying *ɗuw ʕabiydin* 'a possessor of slaves' is as though he said *ʔanta fiy-him ʔaw min-hum ɗuw ʕabiydin* 'you are one among them or one of the possessors of slaves'. If he were to say *ʔammā ʔabuwwa fa-laka ʔabun* 'As to your father, you have a father', it would be on the basis of *fa-laka bihi ʔabun* 'you have in him a father' or *fiyhi ʔabun* 'in him a father'. By saying *fiyhi ʔabun* 'in him a father' he wants to follow the course on the expansiveness of speech. There is no path to *nasʕb* 'erecting' here, but *nasʕb* 'erecting' is permitted in *ʕabiyd* 'slaves' when he does not make them something specifically known, because he likens it to the *masʕdar* 'origin'. The *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* 'ʔal-' may be introduced into a *masʕdar* 'origin' and is erected on account of what I mentioned to you. If you were to intend something in itself and it is the one that requires the *ʔiṣārah* 'mark', it would follow the path of Zaid, (L. 20) 'ʕamr, and your father'. As to the saying of the people to a man *ʔammā ʔan yakuwna ʕāliman fa-hwa ʕālimun* 'as to his being a scholar, he is a scholar' and *ʔammā ʔan yaʕlama ʕayʔan fahwa ʕālimun* 'as to his knowing something, he is knowledgeable'. It is permitted that you say *ʔammā ʔan lā yakuwna yaʕlamu fahwa yaʕlamu* 'as to the fact that he may know, he knows'. You want *ʔan yakuwna* 'that he be' just as it occurs in *liʔallā yaʕlama ʔahlu ʔal-kitābi* 'that the people of the book may know' (Sūrah LVII: 29) with the meaning of *liʔan yaʕlama ʔahlu ʔal-kitābi* 'so that the people of the book may know'. This seems to have the status of a *masʕdar* 'origin', because *ʔan* 'that' with the *fiʕl* 'action' that is a *sʕilah* 'connective' has the status of a *masʕdar* 'origin'. It is as though you said *ʔammā ʕilman wa ʔammā kaynuwnata ʕilmin fa-ʔanta ʕālimun* 'as to knowledge and as to the existence of knowledge, you are knowledgeable'. Don't you see that you say *ʔanta ʔal-ragulu ʔan tunāzila ʔaw tuxāʕima* 'you are the man who will challenge someone to a duel or quarrel'? It is as though you said

إِلَّا الرِّفْعُ؛ لِأَنَّهُ اسْمٌ مَعْرُوفٌ وَمَعْلُومٌ قَدْ عُرِفَ
 الْمُخَاطَبُ مِنْهُ مِثْلَ مَا قَدْ عَرَفْتَ، كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ: أَمَّا
 الْحَارِثُ فَلَا حَارِثَ لَكَ بَعْدَهُ أَوْ فَلَا حَارِثَ لَكَ سِوَاهُ،
 وَكَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: أَمَّا الْبَصْرَةُ فَلَيْسَتْ لَكَ، وَأَمَّا الْحَارِثُ
 فَلَيْسَ لَكَ؛ لِأَنَّهُ ذَلِكَ الْمَعْنَى يَرِيدُ. وَلَوْ قَالَ: أَمَّا الْعَبِيدُ
 فَأَنْتَ ذُو عَبِيدٍ، يَرِيدُ عَبِيدًا بِأَعْيَانِهِمْ قَدْ عَرَفَهُمْ
 الْمُخَاطَبُ كَمَعْرِفَتِكَ، كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ: أَمَّا الْعَبِيدُ الَّذِينَ
 تَعْرِفُ، (س ١٥) لَمْ يَكُنْ إِلَّا رَفْعًا. وَقَوْلُهُ: ذُو عَبِيدٍ،
 كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: أَنْتَ فِيهِمْ أَوْ مِنْهُمْ ذُو عَبِيدٍ. وَلَوْ قَالَ: أَمَّا
 أَبُوكَ فَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَكَ عَلَى قَوْلِهِ: فَلَمْ يَكُنْ بِهِ أَبٌ أَوْ فِيهِ أَبٌ.
 وَإِنَّمَا يَرِيدُ بِقَوْلِهِ: فِيهِ أَبٌ مُجْرَى الْأَبِّ عَلَى سَعَةِ الْكَلَامِ.
 وَلَيْسَ إِلَى النِّصْبِ هَهُنَا سَبِيلٌ. وَإِنَّمَا جَازَ النِّصْبُ فِي
 الْعَبِيدِ حِينَ لَمْ يَجْعَلْهُمْ شَيْئًا مَعْرُوفًا بِعَيْنِهِ؛ لِأَنَّهُ يَشْبَهُهُ
 بِالْمَصْدَرِ، وَالْمَصْدَرُ قَدْ يَدْخُلُهُ الْأَلْفُ وَاللَّامُ وَيَنْتَصِبُ
 عَلَى مَا ذَكَرْتُ لَكَ. فَإِذَا أَرَدْتَ شَيْئًا بِعَيْنِهِ وَكَانَ هُوَ
 الَّذِي تَلْزِمُهُ الْإِشَارَةُ، جَرَى مُجْرَى زَيْدٍ (س ٢٠)
 وَعَمْرٍو وَأَبِيكَ. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُ النَّاسِ لِلرَّجُلِ: أَمَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ
 عَالِمًا فَهُوَ عَالِمٌ، وَأَمَّا أَنْ يَعْلَمَ شَيْئًا فَهُوَ عَالِمٌ، فَقَدْ يَجُوزُ
 أَنْ تَقُولَ: أَمَّا أَنْ لَا يَكُونَ يَعْلَمُ فَهُوَ يَعْلَمُ، وَأَنْتَ تَرِيدُ
 أَنْ يَكُونَ، كَمَا جَاءَتْ: لِئَلَّا يَعْلَمَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ فِي مَعْنَى
 لِأَنْ يَعْلَمَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ. فَهَذَا يُشْبَهُ أَنْ يَكُونَ بِمَنْزِلَةِ
 الْمَصْدَرِ؛ لِأَنَّ أَنْ مَعَ الْفِعْلِ الَّذِي يَكُونُ صِلَةً بِمَنْزِلَةِ
 الْمَصْدَرِ، كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ: أَمَّا عِلْمًا وَأَمَّا كَيْتُونَةَ عِلْمٍ فَأَنْتَ
 عَالِمٌ. أَلَا تَرَى أَنَّكَ تَقُولُ: أَنْتَ الرَّجُلُ أَنْ تُنَازِلَ أَوْ أَنْ
 تُتَخَاصِمَ، كَأَنَّكَ قُلْتَ:

nizālan wa xusʿuwmatan ‘by way of challenging to a duel and quarreling’ (P. 165) and you want *ʔal-masʿdar* ‘the origin’ that is in his saying *faʿala ʿāka maxāfata ʿāka* ‘he did that for fear of that’. Don’t you see that you say *sakattu ʿanhu ʔan ʔagtarra mawaddatahu* ‘I was silent about him to contemplate his friendship’? Similarly, you say *ʔigtirāra mawaddatihi* ‘contemplating his friendship’. *ʔan* and its connective do not occur as a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’. The first is in the circumstance of its occurrence, because it is mentioned for what has not occurred yet. From there, it was made to follow the course of the first *masʿdar* which is the answer to *limah* ‘why’.

نزالاً وخصومةً، (ص ١٦٥) وأنت تريد المصدر الذي في قوله: فعَلْ ذاك مخافةً ذاك. ألا ترى أنك تقول: سكتُ عنه أن أجترَّ مودَّته، كما تقول: اجترارَ مودَّته. ولا تقع أن وصلتها حالاً يكون الأول في حال وقوعه؛ لأنها إنما تُذكر لما لم يقع بعد. فمن ثمَّ أُجريت مجرى المصدر الأول الذي هو جوابُ لِمَه؟

Chapter 92. This is a Chapter on what *yantas'ibu* 'gets erected' of *ʔasmāʔ* 'names' that are neither a *sʔifah* 'descriptive' nor *masʔādir* 'origins', because they indicate a *ḥāl* 'circumstance/state' in which *ʔamr* 'the action' takes place, so it gets erected because it is a *maʔʔuwl fiyhi* 'acted-upon of containment'

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.195-197, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 165-167; Haruwn vol.1. p.391-395)

(I. Chapter 92. P. 165. L. 4) And that is as in your saying *kallamtuhu fāhu ʔilā fiyya* 'I spoke with him, his mouth to my mouth' and *bāyaʔtuhu yadan bi-yadin* 'I transacted with him hand to hand'. It is as though he said *kallamtuhu mušāfahatan* 'I talked to him orally' and *bāyaʔtuhu naḡdan* 'I transacted with him with cash'. That is, I talked to him in this *ḥāl* 'circumstance'. Some Arabs say *kallamtuhu fuwhu ʔilā fiyya* 'I talked to him his mouth to my mouth', as though he is saying *kallamtuhu wa fuwhu ʔilā fiyya* 'I talked to him and his mouth (was) to my mouth'. That is, 'I talked to him in this circumstance'. *Rafʔ* 'raising' is based on his saying *kallamtuhu wa ḥādihi ḥāluhu* 'I talked to him and this is his circumstance'. And the *nasʔb* 'erecting' is based on his saying *kallamtuhu fiy ḥādihi ʔal-ḥāl* 'I talked to him in this circumstance'. It got erected because it is a *ḥāl* 'circumstance' in which the *fiʔl* 'action' occurred. As to *yadan bi-yadin* 'hand in hand', it cannot appear in anything except *nasʔb* 'erecting', because it is not acceptable that you say *bāyaʔtuhu wa yadun bi-yadin* 'I transacted with him and hand in hand', and he did not want (L. 10) to say *bāyaʔahu wa yaduhu fiy yadihi* 'he transacted with him, with his hand in his hand', rather he wanted to say *bāyaʔahu bi-ʔal-taʔgiyl* 'I transacted with him in a hurry', and he does not care whether he is nearby or far away. If he were to say *kallamtuhu fuwhu ʔilā fiyya* 'I talked to him, his mouth to my mouth', he wants to inform about his nearness to him and that he spoke orally to him and there was no one between them. Like it are the *masʔādir* 'origins' that require *ʔidʔāfah* 'annexion' with what is after them and what is permitted in *ʔal-ʔibtidāʔ* 'initiation' and they indicated a *ḥālan* 'circumstance', as in his saying *ragaʔa fulānun ʔawdahū ʔalā badʔihi* 'so and so returned to his starting place' and *ʔinʔanā fulānun ʔawdahū ʔalā badʔihi* 'so and so was turned from returning to his starting place'. It is as though he said *ʔinʔanā ʔawdan ʔalā badʔin* 'he was turned back from returning to his starting place'. And in speech his saying *ragaʔa ʔawdan ʔalā badʔin* 'he returned, returning to his starting place' is not used; rather, it was exemplified through it. And whoever (L. 15) *rafaʔa* 'raises'

(٩٢) هذا باب ما يَنْتَصِبُ من الأسماء التي
لَيْسَتْ بِصِفَةٍ وَلَا مَصَادِرَ لِأَنَّهُ حَالٌ يَقَعُ فِيهِ الْأَمْرُ
فَيَنْتَصِبُ لِأَنَّهُ مَفْعُولٌ فِيهِ

(م ١ . ب ٩٢ . ص ١٦٥ . س ٤) وذلك قولك: كَلَّمْتُهُ
فَأُهُ إِلَى فِيٍّ، وَبَايَعْتُهُ يَدًا بِيَدٍ، كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ: كَلَّمْتُهُ مُشَافَهَةً،
وَبَايَعْتُهُ نَقْدًا؛ أَي: كَلَّمْتُهُ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ. وَبَعْضُ الْعَرَبِ
يَقُولُ: كَلَّمْتُهُ فَوْهُ إِلَى فِيٍّ، كَأَنَّهُ يَقُولُ: كَلَّمْتُهُ وَفَوْهُ إِلَى فِيٍّ؛
أَي: كَلَّمْتُهُ وَهَذِهِ حَالُهُ. فَالرَّفْعُ عَلَى قَوْلِهِ: كَلَّمْتُهُ وَهَذِهِ
حَالُهُ، وَالنَّصْبُ عَلَى قَوْلِهِ: كَلَّمْتُهُ فِي هَذِهِ الْحَالِ،
فَانْتَصَبَ لِأَنَّهُ حَالٌ وَقَعَ فِيهِ الْفِعْلُ. وَأَمَّا بَايَعْتُهُ يَدًا بِيَدٍ،
فَلَيْسَ فِيهِ إِلَّا النَّصْبُ؛ لِأَنَّهُ لَا يَحْسُنُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: بَايَعْتُهُ
وَيَدًا بِيَدٍ، وَلَمْ يُرَدَّ أَنْ (س ١٠) يُخْبِرَ أَنَّهُ بَايَعَهُ وَيَدُهُ فِي
يَدِهِ، وَلَكِنَّهُ أَرَادَ أَنْ يَقُولَ: بَايَعْتُهُ بِالتَّعْجِيلِ، وَلَا يَبَالِي
أَقْرَبًا كَانَ أَمْ بَعِيدًا. وَإِذَا قَالَ: كَلَّمْتُهُ فَوْهُ إِلَى فِيٍّ، فَإِنَّمَا
يُرِيدُ أَنْ يُخْبِرَ عَنِ قُرْبِهِ مِنْهُ وَأَنَّهُ شَافَهُهُ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ بَيْنَهُمَا
أَحَدٌ. وَمِثْلُهُ مِنَ الْمَصَادِرِ فِي أَنْ تَلْزِمَهُ الْإِضَافَةُ وَمَا بَعْدَهُ
مِمَّا يَجُوزُ فِيهِ الْإِبْتِدَاءُ وَيَكُونُ حَالًا، قَوْلُهُ: رَجَعَ فُلَانٌ
عَوْدَهُ عَلَى بَدْتِهِ، وَانْتَشَى فُلَانٌ عَوْدَهُ عَلَى بَدْتِهِ، كَأَنَّهُ قَالَ:
انْتَشَى عَوْدًا عَلَى بَدْتِهِ. وَلَا يُسْتَعْمَلُ فِي الْكَلَامِ قَوْلُهُ:
رَجَعَ عَوْدًا عَلَى بَدْتِهِ، وَلَكِنَّهُ مِثْلُ بِهِ. وَمَنْ (س ١٥)
رَفَعَ

fuwhu ʔilā fiyya ‘his mouth to my mouth’, he permits the *raʔfʔ* ‘raising’ in his saying *ragaʕa fulānun ʕawduhu ʕalā badʔihi* ‘so and so returned, returning to his starting place’. What gets erected because it is a circumstance in which the action took place is your saying *biʕtu ʔal-šāʔa šātan wa dirhaman* ‘I sold the sheep, one sheep for one dirham’, *gāmartuhu dirhaman fiy dirhamin* ‘I gambled him a dirham for a dirham’, *biʕtuhu dāriy ʔirāʕan bi-dirhamin* ‘I sold him my house an arm’s length for a dirham’, *biʕtu ʔal-burra gaʕfiyayni bi-dirhamin* ‘I sold the wheat, two measures for a dirham’ and *ʔaxaʔtu zakāta mālihi dirhaman li-kulli ʔarbaʕiyina dirhaman* ‘I took alms from his wealth, a dirham for every forty dirhams’, *bayyantuhu lahu hiṣābahu bāban bāban* ‘I explained to him his account, chapter by chapter’, and *taʕaddagtu bi-māliy dirhaman dirhaman* ‘I gave charity from my wealth, a dirham for a dirham’. Know that in these cases a thing is not singled out without whatever follows it; and that is because it is not permitted for you to say *kallamtuhu fāhu* ‘I talked to him, his mouth’ until you say *ʔilā fiyya* ‘to my mouth’, because you want face to face, and face to face cannot be except with two. The meaning would be correct if you were to say *ʔilā fiyya* ‘to my mouth’. It is not permitted to say *bāyaʕtuhu yadan* ‘I transacted with him a hand’, because you want to say *ʔaxaʔa minniy wa ʔaʕtāniy* ‘he took from me and gave to me’. The meaning is correct with *bi-yadin* ‘in hand’, because (P. 166) they are *ʕamalān* ‘two activities’. It is not permitted to say *ʔinʕanā ʕawdah* ‘his returning was turned’, because you want that he did not interrupt his going until he connected it with a return. Rather, you wanted that he returned to his original condition; that is, he reversed his going by returning. It is possible that his going would be interrupted and then he returns and would say *ragaʕtu ʕawdiy ʕalā badʔiy* ‘I returned by returning upon my starting’. That is, *ragaʕtu kamā giʔtu* ‘I returned as I came’. The *magiyʔ* ‘coming’, connected with it, is the *ruḡuʕ* ‘returning’. It is *badʔun* ‘a starting’ and the *ruḡuʕ* ‘returning’ is *ʕawdun* ‘a coming back’. It is not permitted that you say *biʕtu dāriy ʔirāʕan* ‘I sold my house, an arm’s length’ when you want (L. 5) *bi-dirhamin* ‘for a dirham’ such that the addressee would have been shown that the whole house is an arm’s length. It is not permitted to say *biʕtu šāʔiy šātan šātan* ‘I sold my sheep, sheep for sheep’ when you want *bi-dirhamin* ‘for a dirham’ such that the addressee would be shown that you sold them one after another based out of loyalty. It is not permitted for you to say *bayyantuhu lahu hiṣābahu bāban* ‘I explained to him his account, a chapter’ such that the addressee would be shown that you made his account one chapter without explaining to him any further. Similarly, *taʕaddagtu bi-māliyu dirhaman* ‘I gave charity from my wealth a dirham’ is not permitted,

فوه إلى في، أجاز الرفع في قوله: رَجَعَ فَلَانٌ عَوْدُهُ عَلَى بَدْئِهِ. وَمَا يَنْتَصِبُ لِأَنَّهُ حَالٌ وَقَعَ فِيهِ الْفِعْلُ قَوْلُكَ: بَعْتُ الشَّاءَ شَاءَةً وَدِرْهَمًا، وَقَامَرْتُهُ دِرْهَمًا فِي دِرْهَمٍ، وَبِعْتُهُ دَارِي ذِرَاعًا بِدِرْهَمٍ، وَبِعْتُ الْبَرَّ قَفِيزَيْنِ بِدِرْهَمٍ، وَأَخَذْتُ زَكَاةَ مَالِهِ دِرْهَمًا لِكُلِّ أَرْبَعِينَ دِرْهَمًا، وَبَيَّنْتُ لَهُ حِسَابَهُ بَابًا بِأَبًا، وَتَصَدَّقْتُ بِهَالِي دِرْهَمًا دِرْهَمًا. وَاعْلَمْ أَنَّ هَذِهِ الْأَشْيَاءَ لَا يَنْفَرِدُ مِنْهَا شَيْءٌ دُونَ مَا بَعْدَهُ، وَذَلِكَ أَنَّهُ لَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: كَلَّمْتُهُ فَاهَ حَتَّى تَقُولَ إِلَى فِي؛ لِأَنَّكَ إِنَّمَا تَرِيدُ (س ٢٠) مُشَافَهَةً، وَالْمُشَافَهَةُ لَا تَكُونُ إِلَّا مِنْ اثْنَيْنِ، فَإِنَّمَا يَصِحُّ الْمَعْنَى إِذَا قُلْتَ: إِلَى فِي، وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ بَاعَيْتُهُ يَدًا؛ لِأَنَّكَ إِنَّمَا تَرِيدُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: أَخَذَ مِنِّي وَأَعْطَانِي، فَإِنَّمَا يَصِحُّ الْمَعْنَى إِذَا قُلْتَ: بِيَدٍ؛ لِأَنَّهَا (ص ١٦٦) عَمَلَانِ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: انْتَهَى عَوْدُهُ؛ لِأَنَّكَ إِنَّمَا تَرِيدُ أَنَّهُ لَمْ يَقْطَعْ ذَهَابَهُ حَتَّى وَصَلَهُ بِرَجُوعٍ، وَإِنَّمَا أَرَدْتَ أَنَّهُ رَجَعَ فِي حَافِرَتِهِ؛ أَي: نَقَضَ مَجِيئَهُ بِرَجُوعٍ، وَقَدْ يَكُونُ أَنْ يَنْقَطِعَ مَجِيئُهُ ثُمَّ يَرْجِعُ فَيَقُولُ: رَجَعْتُ عَوْدِي عَلَى بَدْئِي؛ أَي: رَجَعْتُ كَمَا جِئْتُ. وَالْمَجِيئُ مُوَصَّوْلٌ بِهِ الرَّجُوعُ فَهُوَ بَدْءٌ، وَالرَّجُوعُ عَوْدٌ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: بَعْتُ دَارِي ذِرَاعًا، وَأَنْتَ تَرِيدُ (س ٥) بِدِرْهَمٍ، فَيُرَى الْمَخَاطَبُ أَنَّ الدَّارَ كُلَّهَا ذِرَاعٌ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: بَعْتُ شَائِي شَاءَةً شَاءَةً، وَأَنْتَ تَرِيدُ بِدِرْهَمٍ، فَيُرَى الْمَخَاطَبُ أَنَّكَ بَعْتَهَا الْأَوَّلَ فَلِأَوَّلٍ عَلَى الْوَلَاءِ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ تَقُولَ: بَيَّنْتُ لَهُ حِسَابَهُ بَابًا، فَيُرَى الْمَخَاطَبُ أَنَّكَ جَعَلْتَ لَهُ حِسَابَهُ بَابًا وَاحِدًا غَيْرَ مَفْسَّرٍ. وَلَا يَجُوزُ تَصَدَّقْتُ بِهَالِي دِرْهَمًا،

such that the addressee would be shown that you donated only one dirham. This is the case with all that is similar. As to the saying of people *kāna ḡal-burru ḡafiyzayni* ‘the wheat was two measures’ and *kāna ḡal-samnu manawayni* ‘the oil was two pounds’. Here, they dispensed with the (L. 10) mention of the dirham due to it being part of their common knowledge and because the dirham is what *yusaḡḡaru* ‘the price is set on’. It is as though they are asking about the *ḡaman* ‘cost’ of the dirham in this context just as they say *ḡal-burru bi-sittiyina* ‘the wheat is for sixty’ and they left off *ḡal-kurr* ‘the bushel’ as a way of dispensing with what was part of their common knowledge and that of the addressee, because the addressee would have known what was meant. It is as though he was asked here about the price of *ḡal-kurr* ‘the bushel’ just as the former asked about the price of the dirham. This is the case with all that is similar. So, make it follow the course that the Arabs followed. ḡal-Khalīl claimed that *biḡtu ḡal-ḡāḡa ḡātun wa dirhamun* ‘I sold the sheep, a sheep for a dirham’ is permitted, but he wants *ḡātun bi-dirhamin* ‘a sheep for a dirham’ (L. 15) and he makes *bi-dirhamin* ‘for a dirham’ a predicate of the *ḡāt* ‘sheep’ and the *wāw* [w] has the status of the *bāḡ* [b] ‘for’ in meaning just as it was in your saying *kullu ḡagulin wa d’ayḡatuhu* ‘every man and his estate’ with the meaning of *maḡa* ‘with’. If he were to say *ḡātun bi-dirhamin* ‘a sheep for a dirham’ the *bi-dirhamin* ‘for a dirham’ is not built on an *ḡism* ‘name’ before it. Rather, it occurs to indicate the *siḡru* ‘price’, just as *laka* ‘to you’ occurred in *saḡyan* ‘by watering’ so you indicate what you mean. The *bāḡ* [b] here has the status of *ḡilā* ‘to’ in your saying *fāhu ḡilā fiyya* ‘his mouth to my mouth’. It is not built on what is before it. Similarly the case is with what got erected in this case and what occurred after it was permitted to be built on what occurred before it. *Raḡḡ* ‘raising’ is permitted in it and it is not permitted that it be built on what is before it in (L. 20) this case. ḡal-Khalīl claimed that it is permitted that you say *biḡtu ḡal-dāra ḡirāḡan bi-dirhamin* ‘I sold the house, an arm’s length for a dirham’, just like what was allowed with *ḡal-ḡāḡ* ‘sheep’. And he claimed that he says *biḡtu dāriy ḡal-ḡirāḡayni bi-dirhamin* ‘I sold my house, two arms’ length for a dirham’ and *biḡtu ḡal-burra ḡal-ḡafiyzāni bi-dirhamin* ‘I sold wheat, two measures for a dirham’. He did not liken this to his saying *fāhu ḡilā fiyya* ‘his mouth to my mouth’, because this case has the status of *mas’ādir* ‘origins’ that indicate a *ḡālan* ‘circumstance’ in which the affair occurs, like your saying *laḡiytuhu kifāhan* ‘I saw him struggling’ and like his saying:

فَيْرِي المَخَاطَبُ أَنَّكَ تَصَدَّقْتُ بِدِرْهَمٍ وَاحِدٍ. وَكَذَلِكَ
هَذَا وَمَا أَشْبَهَهُ. وَأَمَّا قَوْلُ النَّاسِ: كَانَ الْبُرُّ قَفِيْزَيْنِ،
وَكَانَ السَّمْنُ مَنَوَيْنِ، فَإِنَّمَا اسْتَعْنَوْا هَاهُنَا عَنْ (س ١٠)
ذَكَرَ الدِّرْهَمَ لِمَا فِي صَدُورِهِمْ مِنْ عِلْمِهِ وَلِأَنَّ الدِّرْهَمَ
هُوَ الَّذِي يَسْعَرُ عَلَيْهِ، فَكَأْتَهُمْ إِتْمَا يَسْأَلُونَ عَنْ ثَمَنِ
الدِّرْهَمِ فِي هَذَا الْمَوْضِعِ كَمَا يَقُولُونَ: الْبُرُّ بَسِيتَيْنِ،
وَتَرَكُوا ذَكَرَ الْكُرِّ اسْتِعْنَاءً بِمَا فِي صَدُورِهِمْ مِنْ عِلْمِهِ
وَبِعِلْمِ الْمَخَاطَبِ؛ لِأَنَّ الْمَخَاطَبَ قَدْ عَلِمَ مَا يَعْنِي،
فَكَأَنَّهُ إِذَا سُئِلَ هَاهُنَا عَنْ ثَمَنِ الْكُرِّ كَمَا سَأَلَ الْأَوَّلُ عَنْ
ثَمَنِ الدِّرْهَمِ. فَكَذَلِكَ هَذَا وَمَا أَشْبَهَهُ فَأَجْرُهُ كَمَا أَجْرُهُ
الْعَرَبِ. وَزَعَمَ الْخَلِيلُ أَنَّهُ يَجُوزُ: بَعْتُ الشَّاءَ شَاةً
وَدِرْهَمًا، إِتْمَا يَرِيدُ شَاةً بِدِرْهَمٍ، (س ١٥) وَيَجْعَلُ
بِدِرْهَمٍ خَبْرًا لِلشَّاءِ وَصَارَتْ الْوَاوُ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْبَاءِ فِي
الْمَعْنَى، كَمَا كَانَتْ فِي قَوْلِكَ: كُلُّ رَجُلٍ وَضِيعَتُهُ فِي مَعْنَى
مَعَ. وَإِذَا قُلْتَ: شَاةً بِدِرْهَمٍ، فَإِنَّ بَدِرْهَمٍ لَيْسَ مَبْنِيًّا عَلَى
اسْمٍ قَبْلَهُ وَلَكِنَّهُ إِتْمَا جَاءَ لِيَبَيِّنَ بِهِ السَّعْرَ، كَمَا جَاءَتْ لَكَ
فِي سَقِيًّا لَتَبَيِّنَ مِنْ تَعْنِي. فَالْبَاءُ هَاهُنَا بِمَنْزِلَةِ إِلَى فِي
قَوْلِكَ: فَاهُ إِلَى قِيٍّ، وَلَمْ تُبْنَ عَلَى مَا قَبْلَهَا. وَكَذَلِكَ مَا
انْتَصَبَ فِي هَذَا الْبَابِ وَكَانَ مَا بَعْدَهُ مِمَّا يَجُوزُ أَنْ يُبْنَى
عَلَى مَا قَبْلَهُ جَازٍ فِيهِ الرَّفْعُ وَلَا يَجُوزُ أَنْ يُبْنَى عَلَى مَا قَبْلَهُ
فِي (س ٢٠) هَذَا الْبَابِ. وَزَعَمَ الْخَلِيلُ أَنَّهُ يَجُوزُ أَنْ
تَقُولَ: بَعْتُ الدَّارَ ذِرَاعًا بِدِرْهَمٍ، كَمَا جَازَ لَكَ فِي الشَّاءِ.
وَزَعَمَ أَنَّهُ يَقُولُ: بَعْتُ دَارِي الذَّرَاعَانَ بِدِرْهَمٍ، وَبَعْتُ
الْبُرَّ الْقَفِيْزَانَ بِدِرْهَمٍ. وَلَمْ يَشْبَهُ هَذَا بِقَوْلِهِ: فَاهُ إِلَى قِيٍّ؛
لِأَنَّ هَذَا فِي بَابِهِ بِمَنْزِلَةِ الْمَصَادِرِ الَّتِي تَكُونُ حَالًا يَقَعُ
فِيهَا الْأَمْرُ، نَحْوُ قَوْلِكَ: لَقِيْتَهُ كِفَاحًا وَنَحْوُ قَوْلِهِ:

ʔarsalahā ʔal-ʕirāka ‘he sent her fighting’ and *faʕaltu ḏālika tāgatiy* ‘I did that to the best of ability’. The *ʔalif wa lām* ‘ʔal-’ is not introduced into every *masʕdar* ‘origin’ in this case. Rather, it becomes definite by annexion, and not all the *masʕadir* ‘origins’ in this chapter become definite by annexion (P. 167) and not all *masʕadir* ‘origins’ belong to this chapter. *ʔasmāʔ* ‘names’ are farther. That is why *ḏirāʕan* ‘by a yard’ was in *raʕʕ* ‘raising’, because it is not permitted to introduce the *ʔalif wa ʔal-lām* ‘ʔal-’ in your saying *lagiytuhu gāʔiman wa gāʕidan* ‘I met him standing up and sitting down’ so that would say *lagiytuhu ʔal-gāʔima wa ʔal-gāʕida* ‘I met him the one standing up and the one sitting down’. And you do not say *dʕarabtuhu ʔal-gāʔima* ‘I hit him, the one standing up’. When that turned out to be unacceptable with respect to *ʔal-ḏirāʕ* ‘the arm’s length’, it was given the status of your saying *lagiytuhu yaduhu fawga raʔsihi* ‘I met him with his hand over his head’. Like that is *biʕtuhu ribḥu ʔal-dirhami dirhamun* ‘I sold him the profit of the dirham, a dirham’. It cannot have *nasʕb* ‘erecting’ in it based on it being a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’. *ʔal-Khalīl* claimed that their saying *rabiḥtu ʔal-dirhama dirhaman* ‘I profited the dirham, a dirham’ is (L. 5) impossible until you say *fiy ʔal-dirhami* ‘by a dirham’ or *li-l-dirhami* ‘for a dirham’. Similarly, we found the Arabs speak. If a speaker were to say delete the letter of *garr* ‘pulling’ and allude to it, he would be told that it is not permitted to delete the letter *bāʔ* [b] just as *marartu ʔaxāka* ‘I passed your brother’ is not allowed; rather, you want *bi-ʔaxiyka* ‘by your brother’. If he were to say it is not permitted to delete the [b] in this, he would be told that this is not said also. *ʔal-Khalīl* said *kallamaniy yaduhu fiy yadiy* ‘he talked to me, his hand in my hand’ is with *raʕʕ* ‘raising’, and it cannot be otherwise, because this cannot be a characteristic of speech. *ʔal-Khalīl* said, if you so wished, you made *ragaʕta ʕawdaka ʕalā badʔika* ‘you made your return in your starting place’ a *maʕʕuwan* ‘acted-upon’ with the status of *ragaʕta ʔal-māla ʕalayya* ‘you returned the money to me’; that is, *radad-ta ʔal-māla ʕalayya* ‘you returned the money to me’. It is as though he said *ḏannayta ʕawdi ʕalā badʔi* ‘you turned my return to my starting place’.

أرسلها العراك، وفعلتُ ذاك طاقتي. وليس كلُّ مصدر في هذا الباب تدخله الألف واللام ويكون معرفةً بالإضافة، وليس كلُّ المصادر في هذا الباب يكون معرفةً بالإضافة، وليس كلُّ المصادر تكون في (ص) رفعاً لأنه لا يجوز أن تدخل الألف واللام في قولك: لقيته قائماً وقاعداً، أن تقول: لقيته القائم والقاعد، ولا تقول ضربته القائم. فلما قُبِح ذلك في الذراع جعل بمنزلة قولك: لقيته يده فوق رأسه. ومثل ذلك: بعته ربح الدرهم درهم، لا يكون فيه النصب على حال. وزعم الخليل أن قولهم: ربح الدرهم درهماً، (س ٥) محال، حتى تقول: في الدرهم وللدرهم. وكذلك وجدنا العرب تقول: فإن قال قائل: فاحذف حرف الجرّ وأنوه، قيل له: لا يجوز حذف الباء كما لا يجوز مررت أخاك وأنت تريد بأخيك. فإن قال: لا يجوز حذف الباء من هذا قيل له فهذا لا يقال أيضاً. وقال الخليل: كلّمني يده في يدي الرفع لا يكون غيره؛ لأنّ هذا لا يكون من صفة الكلام. وقال الخليل: إن شئت جعلت رجعت عودك في بدئك مفعولاً بمنزلة قولك: رجعت المال عليّ؛ أي: رددت (س ١٠) المال عليّ، كأنه قال: ثنيت عودي على بدئي.

Chapter 93. This is a Chapter in which the *ʔism* ‘name’ *yantas’ibu* ‘gets erected’ because it is *ḥāl* ‘a circumstance’ in which a *sifr* ‘price’ occurs

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.197-198, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 167; Haruwn vol.1. p.395-396)

(I. Chapter 93. P. 167. L. 11) even if you don’t pronounce the *fiʔl* ‘action’. But it is a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ in which there is a *sifr* ‘price’ so it gets erected just as it would get erected if it were a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ in which the *fiʔl* ‘action’ occurred, because it is a *ḥāl* ‘circumstance’ in which an event occurred in two locations simultaneously. And that is as in your saying *laka ʔal-šāʔu, šātan bi-dirhamin šātan bi-dirhamin* ‘you have the sheep, a sheep for dirham, a sheep for a dirham’. If you so wished, you cancelled *laka* ‘for you’ and you would say *laka ʔal-šāʔu, šātun bi-dirhamin šātun bi-dirhamin* ‘you have the sheep, a sheep for dirham a sheep for a dirham’, just as you said *fiyhā zaydun gāʔimun* ‘in it, Zaid is standing up’, (L. 15) you raised. If you said *ʔal-šāʔu laka* ‘you have the sheep’, then, if you so wished, you raised and if you so wished, you erected and *laka ʔal-šāʔu*, if you were to erect, had, for you, the status of *wagaba ʔal-šāʔu* ‘the sheep became necessary’ just as *kāna fiyhā zaydun gāʔiman* ‘Zaid was standing in it’ has the status of *ʔistagarra zaydun gāʔiman* ‘Zaid has settled standing up’.

(٩٣) هذا بابٌ ما يَنْتَصِبُ فيه الاسمُ لِأنَّه
حَالٌ يَقَعُ فيه السَّعْرُ

(م ١. ب ٩٣. ص ١٦٧. س ١١) وإن كنت لم تلفظ
بفعلٍ، ولكنه حالٌ يقع فيه السَّعْرُ فَيَنْتَصِبُ كما انتَصَبَ
لو كان حالاً وقع فيه الفعلُ؛ لِأنَّه في آنه حالٌ وقع فيه
أمرٌ في الموضوعين سَوَاءً. وذلك قولك: لك الشاءُ شاةٌ
بدرهمٍ شاةٌ بدرهمٍ. وإن شئت ألغيت "لك" فقلت:
لك الشاءُ شاةٌ بدرهمٍ شاةٌ بدرهمٍ، كما قلت: فيها زيدٌ
قائماً، (س ١٥) رَفَعْتَ. وإذا قلت: الشاءُ لك، فإن
شئت رفعتَ وإن شئت نصبتَ، وصار لك الشاءُ إذا
نصبتَ بمنزلة وَجَبَ الشاءُ، كما كان فيها زيدٌ قائماً
بمنزلة: استقرَّ زيدٌ قائماً.

**Chapter 94. This is a Chapter in which *rafi*
'raising' and *nas'b* 'erecting' are selected due to
the unacceptability of it being a *s'ifah*
'descriptive'**

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.198, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 167-168; Haruwn vol.1.
p.396-397)

(I. Chapter 94. P. 167. L. 17) And that is as in your saying *marartu bi-burrin gablu gafiyzun bi-dirhamin gafiyzun bi-dirhamin* 'I passed by wheat before, a measure for a dirham, a measure for a dirham'. We heard the Arabs who are trusted erect it. We have heard them saying *ʔal-ʔagabu min burrin mararnā bihi gablu gafiyzan bi-dirhamin gafiyzan bi-dirhamin* 'what a surprise about the wheat we passed by before, a measure for a dirham, a measure for a dirham'. They related it to the *maʔrifah* 'definite' and they left out the *nakirah* 'indefinite' (**L. 20**) due to the unacceptability of the *nakirah* 'indefinite' being described with what is not a *s'ifah* 'descriptive' but is a *ʔism* 'name' like *dirham* 'dirham' and *ħadiyd* 'iron'. Don't you see that you say *ħāḏā māluka dirhaman* 'this is your wealth in dirham' and *ħāḏā xātamuka ħadiydan* 'this is your ring made of iron'? It is not acceptable that you make it a *s'ifah* 'descriptive'. The thing may be (**P. 168**) acceptable if it is a *xabar* 'predicate' and unacceptable if it is a *s'ifah* 'descriptive'. As to those who raised it, they said *marartu bi-burrin gablu gafiyzun bi-dirhamin* 'I passed by wheat before, a measure for a dirham'. They made the *gafiyz* 'measure' a *mubtadaʔ* 'initial', because your saying *bi-dirhamin* 'for a dirham' is built on it.

(٩٤) هذا بابٌ يُختارُ فيه الرِّفْعُ والنَّصْبُ لِقُبْحِهِ
أَنْ يَكُونَ صِفَةً

(م ١ . ب ٩٤ . ص ١٦٧ . س ١٧) وذلك قولك:
مررتُ بِبُرٍّ قَبْلُ قَفِيْزٍ بدرهم قَفِيْزٍ بدرهم . وسمعنا
العربَ الموثوقَ بهم يَنْصِبُونَهُ ، سمعناهم يقولون :
العَجَبُ من بُرٍّ مررنا به قَبْلُ قَفِيْزاً بدرهم قَفِيْزاً
بدرهم ، فحملوه على المعرفة وتركوا النكرة (س ٢٠)
لقبح النكرة أن تكون موصوفةً بما ليس صفةً ، وإنما هو
اسمٌ كالدرهم والحديد . ألا ترى أنك تقول : هذا مالٌ
درهماً ، وهذا خاتمك حديداً . ولا يَحْسُنُ أَنْ تَجْعَلَهُ صِفَةً ،
فقد يكون (س ١٦٨) الشيءُ حَسَنًا إذا كان خبراً
وقبيحاً إذا كان صفةً . وأمَّا الذين رفعوه فقالوا : مررتُ
بِبُرٍّ قَبْلُ قَفِيْزٍ بدرهم . فجعلوا القفِيْزَ مبتدأً . وقولك
بدرهم مبنياً عليه .

Chapter 95. This is a Chapter of what is erected when there are *sʿifāt* ‘descriptives’ like the *nasʿb* ‘erecting’ of names in the first case

(Buwlāq vol. 1. p.198, Derenbourg vol.1. p. 167-168; Haruwn vol.1. p.396-397)

(I. Chapter 95. P. 168. L. 3) And that is as in your saying *ʔabiyʔuhu ʔal-sāʔata nāgizan bi-nāgizin* ‘I am selling it at this time, something present for something present’ and *sāduwka kābiran ʔan kābirin* ‘they have reigned over you, one generation after another’. This is like your saying *biʔtuhu raʔasan bi-raʔsin* ‘I sold it, a head for a head’.

(٩٥) هذا باب ما يتتصب من الصفات

كانتصاب الأسماء في الباب الأول

(م ١. ب ٩٥. ص ١٦٨. س ٣) وذلك قولك: أبيعُه

الساعةَ ناجزاً بناجز، وسادوك كابرأ عن كابر. فهذا

كقولك: بعته رأساً برأس.